

# PUBLIC MEETING of the BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Wednesday, April 25, 2012

4:30 p.m.

Scholfield Boardroom, Brealey Room #5920  
Peterborough, ON

## 2010-2015 Strategic Priorities

1. Achieving Excellence in Student Learning
2. Providing Superior Services and Facilities
3. Leading in Sustainability
4. Growing with Positive Results
5. Building Community Success
6. Developing the Fleming Working Environment

AGENDA ITEM	SPEAKER	Est. Time
1. CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME, INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS	Chair	
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA		
3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION		10 min
4. REPORT OF THE BOARD CHAIR ( <i>Handout, to be received</i> )		
5. REPORT OF THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT ( <i>Handout, to be received</i> )		
<b>6. UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGENDA</b>		
<i>The following items/recommendations have been identified as part of the consent agenda for the public meeting of the Board; Governors are encouraged to call the President/Board Chair/Board Secretary in advance of the meeting if there are questions about a listed consent agenda item.</i>		
<b>ITEMS:</b> ( <i>Enclosed</i> )		
6.1 Minutes of the March 28, 2012 public meeting of the Board		
6.2 Report on the Activities of Board Committees for April 2012		
6.3 Program Advisory Committee Meeting Summaries		
6.4 Schedule of Program Advisory Committee Meetings March – June 2012		
6.5 Index of Correspondence for March and April 2012		
<b>MEETING AGENDA</b>		
<b>7. BUSINESS ARISING</b>		
None identified.		
<b>8. BOARD BUSINESS</b>		
8.1 <u>Amendment to By-Law 1-102</u>	Chair	3 min
Recommended by the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College: <b>Notice is hereby served of the intent to amend s. 4.1 of By-law 1-102</b> to include a statement ( <i>italicized below</i> ) required by the Canada Revenue Agency. The full context of an amended s.4.1 of By-Law 1-102 will read:		
<i>The College is a non-share corporation. The affairs of the College shall be managed by a Board of Governors (hereinafter called the "Board") which shall consist of such persons as are from time to time appointed or elected as governors (hereinafter called the "Governors") in accordance with the provisions of the current Legislation, Regulations, the "Minister's Binding Policy Directives", and in accordance with this By-law. The College shall be carried on without purpose of gain for its members, and any profits or other gains to the College shall be used in promoting its purpose.</i>		
8.2 <u>Requests to Change Meeting Schedule</u>	Chair	3 min
The <i>Advancement Committee</i> : reschedule the May 9 meeting to June 13 with a 12:00 p.m. start time. The <i>Executive Committee</i> : reschedule the May 9 meeting to May 10 via conference call.		
8.3 <u>Financial Plan 2012-2013</u> ( <i>Enclosed</i> )	Gov. Nesbitt	10 min
8.4 <u>New Program: Wireless Information Networking</u> ( <i>Enclosed</i> )	Gov. Maki	5 min
8.5 <u>Status of the Internal Election Process</u>	Dr. Tilly	3 min
8.6 <u>Fundraising Outcomes for 2011-2012</u> ( <i>Enclosed</i> )	Gov. Hayes	5 min
8.7 <u>Revised College Policy – Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans</u> ( <i>Enclosed</i> )	Gov. Maki	2 min
8.8 <u>Report from the In-Camera Meeting</u>	Chair	1 min

**9. STRATEGIC DISCUSSION / DECISION ITEMS**

No item scheduled.

**10. GENERAL LEARNING ABOUT THE COLLEGE / COLLEGE SYSTEM**

10.1 President's Advisory Council, meeting of April 19, 2012

Dr. Tilly

3 min

**11. OTHER BUSINESS *(includes items removed from the Consent Agenda)***

**12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING** approx. 5:20 p.m.

	<b>HANDOUT</b>	<b>ACTION REQUIRED:</b>
Board of Governors In-Camera Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Information</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Board of Governors Public Meeting</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Decision <input type="checkbox"/>

**SUBJECT:** *Report of the Board Chair*

**PRESENTED BY:** Governor McLean, Chair – Board of Governors

The College's Advancement and Alumni Relations Office is accepting nominations for the prestigious **2012 Premier's Awards** for outstanding college graduates. If you know of a Fleming College graduate who is deserving of this award, please download a nomination package from the College's website; the deadline to submit a nomination package is May 17, 2012.

Attendance at the annual **Spring Open House** was strong, with over 1,000 registered guests at the April 14 event. Over 100 full-time academic programs and continuing education options were on display; visitors were also afforded an opportunity to participate in applied learning activities and demonstrations. Many students decide to come to Fleming because of their experience at Open House.

### **Board Recruitment**

It is with pleasure that we announce that **John Mackle** has been **appointed** by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College, for a term April 18, 2012 through August 31, 2014.

The process to fill two upcoming vacancies continues. The Board is committed to having a full complement of Governors in place for 2012-2013.

Outcomes of the internal process are provided as a separate agenda item.

### **Upcoming Events / Key Dates**

**Convocation** is a special time for the Board, College staff and, most importantly, for our graduates, their families and friends. The 2012 ceremonies are set, beginning with the Haliburton ceremony on Friday, May 25 followed by the Frost Campus ceremony on Friday, June 1. Sutherland Campus ceremonies are held over three days, June 5 through 7, with morning and afternoon ceremonies. Additional information about convocation may be found on the College's web site

<http://flemingcollege.ca/convocation/convocation-schedule>

	<i>HANDOUT</i>	<b>ACTION REQUIRED:</b>
Board of Governors In-Camera Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Information</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Board of Governors Public Meeting</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Decision <input type="checkbox"/>

**SUBJECT:** *Report of the President*

**PRESENTED BY:** Dr. Tilly, President – Fleming College

### Achieving Excellence in Student Learning

Earlier this month, the USA Rice Federation hosted its first *culinary student recipe competition*, which took place at George Brown College. From more than 50 recipes submitted from culinary institutions across Canada, three semi-finalists (Fleming College, George Brown College and Vancouver Island University) had one hour to re-create their recipes in front of a panel of judges during which time they were scored on their ability to maintain a clean work station and display of culinary finesse. Judges then sampled each dish and applied a final score. Congratulations to Fleming's **Jordan Rusk** who was awarded second place and \$500 for his Southwestern Buffalo Cheesy Rice Balls recipe.

On April 2, almost 125 student athletes, coaches and staff attended the **41<sup>st</sup> Annual Athletic Awards** event recognizing excellence on the playing field and in the classroom. Congratulations and thanks are extended to the individual award recipients, the teams for their efforts throughout the year, and the many coaches and staff who work with the students.

### Providing Superior Services and Facilities

The results of the province-wide **Key Performance Indicators survey for 2011** were released last week. KPI surveys, which are carried out annually at all of Ontario's 24 colleges, measure the success rates and satisfaction levels for students and graduates. Overall results are available on the Colleges Ontario website, [http://www.collegesontario.org/outcomes/key-performance-indicators/2011\\_KPI\\_English.pdf](http://www.collegesontario.org/outcomes/key-performance-indicators/2011_KPI_English.pdf)

Highlights for Fleming include:

- Overall student satisfaction rates at Fleming rose to 77.1% this year, up from 74.6% last year; this is above the system average of 76.1%.
- Graduate satisfaction rates rose to 79.4% from 77.9% last year, also above the provincial average.
- Employer satisfaction with Fleming graduates fell just slightly to 92.8% and our employment rate remained about the same at 82%.

We will soon receive more detailed college and program-specific results which will allow us to both reflect upon and celebrate our successes, and identify areas where we will focus our efforts over the next year.

A number of **renovations** will occur at the College's main campus over the summer. These include re-establishing the student centre in the current student services area 181, relocating Health Services, Student Life and International Offices to a new student services cluster located in the 405-409 corridor (currently home to Academic Operations), locating the first aid service with Security, relocating Academic Operations to the "Pod" in the 371 area, creating new faculty office space in an area above Tim Hortons, moving the Learning Technologist into the Centre for Learning and Teaching area, moving the Archives collection to the Farmhouse, and giving the Continuing Education department a higher profile by moving the staff to Brealey in space across from the

Registrar's Office. While renovations are occurring, classrooms will be available for the displaced services.

### **Leading in Sustainability**

Congratulations to the third-year Ecosystem Management students for their efforts in planning and hosting the "*Big Communities, Little Planet*" conference held on April 12 at the Frost Campus. The conference brought students and community members together to learn about environmental issues and solutions. Keynote speakers at this 5<sup>th</sup> annual conference were Maude Barlow, National Chairperson of the Council of Canadians, and Jacob Rodenburg, Executive Director of Camp Kawartha.

The College was pleased to learn that the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, FedDev Ontario, has processed our application for extension funding of our project under the *Applied Research and Commercialization Initiative*.

### **Growing with Positive Results**

A report on *growth opportunities, plans and constraints* will be a main discussion of the May meeting, not April as referenced in an earlier Report.

With the upcoming closure of the Buttonville Airport, the Peterborough Airport has been selected as the preferred location of choice for Seneca College's **aviation and flight technology program**. This exciting news will be job opportunities to the greater Peterborough area, and opens up possibilities for Fleming College.

### **Building Community Success**

On April 4, Fleming College participated in an event, hosted by Peterborough MPP Jeff Leal, to promote the Peterborough region to the Ontario cabinet. MPP's gathered after Question Period to sample local products, from wines and beer, to famous Kawartha Dairy ice cream. Also on hand for the **4<sup>th</sup> Annual Peterborough Day at Queen's Park** were representatives of the Greater Peterborough Area Economic Development Corporation, the New Canadians Centre, the Peterborough Airport, Peterborough Green Up, and Trent University.

A number of Fleming staff and students participated in the **6<sup>th</sup> Annual Bring Back the Salmon Earth Week Event** on April 20 along with students from the Cobourg District Collegiate Institute East and CDCI West high schools. Bring Back the Salmon is a multi-year restoration initiative involving more than 40 partners, including Fleming College. The salmon are raised in our hatchery by fisheries students.

The **2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Community Innovation Forum** was held in Peterborough on April 5, providing 109 students from Fleming College and Trent University the opportunity to display their applied projects. The Forum is a result of the merging of three previous events – the Greater Peterborough Innovation Cluster's *Innovation Summit*, Fleming College's *Showcase of Applied Projects* and the Trent Centre for Community-based Education's *Knowledge in Action Forum*.

Students of the **Collections Conservation and Management** program have a new exhibit on the fifth floor of the Sutherland Campus. *Handle with Care: Invite Preventive Conservation into Your Home* is on display through to June 15. The exhibit highlights everyday factors that can cause irreversible damage to objects and features examples of at-home treatments gone wrong, as well as tips and tricks to prolong the lifespan of items. The **Museum Management and Curatorship**

students launched an exhibit on display at the Peterborough Museum and Archives until June 10. *Sustainable Peterborough: Looking Back, Moving Forward* shows how Peterborough's pioneers practised sustainability. The students' project coincided with the launch of the Greater Peterborough Area Community Sustainability plan, which offers goals and initiatives to make the community more sustainable in 25 years.

On April 5, students in the **Emergency Management** program played out a mock emergency exercise depicting Northumberland County's response to a severe ice storm and its various potential impacts. The students were responsible for developing, controlling and evaluating the multi-centre exercise.

The first-ever **Ontario "time bank"** was unveiled at the Frost Campus on April 12. This is a system that credits people for volunteering their time; when an individual volunteers for one hour, he can "bank" that hour in the Time bank and redeem that credit to receive volunteer services from someone else. The system is open to everyone, including high school students looking for community hours. The project received funding through *C-Links*; established in 2011, C-Links facilitates community-academic relationships through community-based education and community service-learning.

### Developing the Fleming Working Environment

As an outcome of the recent call for nominations for representatives to the **President's Advisory Council**, congratulations are extended to the following individuals whose terms commence September 1, 2012: *Shirley Collins*, Support Staff – Frost Campus; *Roger Fitch*, Administrative Staff; *Christina Soliman*, Academic Staff – SENRS; *Susan Weaver*, Academic Staff – Centre for Learning and Teaching. In addition to the student government presidents, four student representatives are elected for one-year terms. Council continues to seek student representatives.

Congratulations to Fleming faculty member **Jack Roe** on receiving the Best Actor award at the Eastern Ontario Drama League Festival in Ottawa. Jack won for his role in the Peterborough Theatre Guild's, "The Mouse House."

Earlier this month, **Dr. Jim Drennan**, Dean – School of Business, Trades and Technology, received a letter of appreciation from Glenn Murray, Assistant Deputy Minister Public Safety Division. Dr. Drennan presented at the Future of Policing Summit held March 6 and 7 in Toronto.

Fleming College is featured in the Spring 2012 issue of *College Administrator*. *A College Learns* outlines how the **School of Business, Trades and Technology** facilitate student rep sessions to identify issues and problems from the student point of view – and train future leaders.

### Other

The Board of Governors of *Humber College* has announced the *appointment of Chris Whitaker* to the position of *President*, to take effect upon the retirement of John Davies in July. Chris is the current President and CEO of St. Lawrence College.

The focus of the spring 2012 edition of *College Administrator* is *Learning Colleges*. The article by Brian Desbiens, past president of Fleming College, suggests asking whether learning is at the centre of every decision/action we take as leaders in the organization. Governors have been provided with a copy of the magazine; it is also available online, <http://www.ocasa.on.ca/communications/college-administrator>.

Board of Governors In-Camera Meeting   
Board of Governors Public Meeting

**ACTION REQUIRED:**  
Information/Discussion   
Decision

**SUBJECT: *Unanimous Consent Agenda***

**PRESENTED BY:** Governor McLean, Chair – Board of Governors

#### SOURCE / BACKGROUND

- Board Policy 1-102L, *Guidelines for the Consent Agenda*

#### RECOMMENDATION

**THAT the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College, by unanimous consent,**

**Approve the minutes of the**

**6.1 March 28, 2012 public meeting of the Board of Governors; and**

**Receive, for information, the**

**6.2 Report on the Activities of Board Committees for April 2012;**

**6.3 Meeting Summaries for the *Business Administration Marketing* (March 26, 2012),  
*International Trade* (March 29, 2012) and *Community and Justice Services* (April 4,  
2012) Program Advisory Committees;**

**6.4 Schedule of Program Advisory Committee Meetings for the March – June 2012  
timeframe; and the**

**6.5 Index of Correspondence received for March and April 2012.**

# BOARD OF GOVERNORS

## Public (*Open Session*) Meeting

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Room #321

Cobourg, ON

# MINUTES

---

**Present:** Mr. Degeer, Dr. Dockstator, Mr. Greene, Mr. Gulston, Ms. Hayes, Ms. Kalavrias, Mr. Lovenuk, Mr. MacDougall, Mr. Mackle, Ms. Maki, Mr. McLean, Mr. Nesbitt, Ms. Ross, Ms. Shill, Ms. Sutcliffe-Geens, and Dr. Tilly for the Board.  
Ms. McFadden.

**Regrets:** Mr. Astell.

**Administration:** Dr. Angel, Ms. Cameron, Ms. Crook, Mr. Harvey, Ms. Pawley-Boyd, Mr. Van Parys.

**Guests:** Ms. McEachran, College Communications;  
Dr. Drennan, Dean – School of Business, Trades and Technology;  
Ms. Clifford, Manager – Cobourg Campus; Ms. Foster, Administrative Project Coordinator – Cobourg Campus.

### 1. Call to Order, Welcome and Introduction of Guests

Board Chair, Mr. McLean, called the meeting to order at 4:39 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance to the Cobourg Campus. Thanks were extended to the staff of the Campus for hosting the meeting.

### 2. Approval of Agenda

BoG March28-2012 #1

Moved and Seconded by Mr. MacDougall and Mr. Lovenuk  
**THAT the agenda be approved, as circulated.**

Carried

### 3. Conflict of Interest Declaration

Governors were invited to declare conflict of interest with respect to the agenda; none were declared.

### 4. Report of the Board Chair

Governor McLean presented his Report, provided as a handout. Attention was drawn to the 2012 Convocation dates listed in the Report; the Chair encouraged members to confirm attendance with Mrs. McFadden. The Report was received, for information.

### 5. Report of the College President

The President presented his Report, provided as a handout, and highlighted a number of activities referenced in the document. The Report has been organized to represent the strategic priorities of the College. The Report was received, for information.

### 6. UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGENDA

There were five items identified on the Unanimous Consent Agenda. Governors were requested to identify those to be removed and placed on the regular public meeting agenda; none were identified.



BoG March28-2012 #2

Moved and Seconded by Mr. Lovenuk and Ms. Maki

**THAT the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College**

- **approve the minutes of the *Board of Governors public meeting* of February 22, 2012, 2011;**

receive, for information, the

- ***Report on the Activities of Board Committees* for March 2012;**
- ***Meeting Summary for the General Arts and Science (January 23, 2012) Program Advisory Committee;***
- ***Schedule of Program Advisory Committee meetings* for the March through June 2012 timeframe; and the**
- ***Index of Correspondence* received for the February and March 2012 timeframe.**

Carried

## BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETING AGENDA

### 7. Business Arising from the Minutes

None identified.

### 8. Board Business

8.1 Governor Nesbitt, Chair of the Finance and Property Committee, presented the Tuition, Compulsory Ancillary Fees and Student Levied Fees recommendations. Tuition increases are regulated by government policy and the province has extended for one year a cap of 5% on overall tuition fee increases at colleges and universities. Members noted both increases and decreases in the academic fees; Ms. Cameron clarified that these fees are linked to an activity, typically field camps, and are based on actual costs that vary because of changes in location of camps, number of students in the program, etc. Further clarification was provided with respect to factors that are taken into account in setting tuition. Parents and potential students also consider other factors, i.e. cost of living, not just tuition, in determining which college to attend.

Attention was drawn to a revised tuition sheet, provided as a handout, reflecting lower tuition for the first two high demand first year programs listed (Motive Power Techniques and Electrical Power Generation); the tuition listing provided in the pre-circulated materials reflected an incorrect percentage and amount.

BoG March28-2012 #3

Moved and Seconded by Mr. Nesbitt and Mr. MacDougall

**THAT the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College approve the *Tuition, Academic and Supply Fees for 2012-2013*, as presented.**

Carried, one opposed

BoG March28-2012 #4

Moved and Seconded by Mr. Nesbitt and Ms. Sutcliffe-Geens

**THAT the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College approve the *Compulsory Ancillary Fees for 2012-2013* approved by the Student Administrative Council and Student Association, as circulated.**

Carried, one opposed

BoG March28-2012 #5

Moved and Seconded by Mr. Nesbitt and Ms. Kalavrias

**THAT the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College approve the *Student Levied Fees for 2012-2013*, as circulated.**

Carried, one opposed

8.2 New Program – Ontario College Graduate Certificate in Project Management: Presented by Governor Maki, this program is designed for domestic and international college and university graduates who wish to obtain specific project management training and experience to work in business and organizations that promote project management practices.

BoG March28-2012 #6

Moved and Seconded by Ms. Maki and Ms. Shill

**THAT the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College approve the *Ontario College Graduate Certificate in Project Management* program effective September 2012, for forwarding to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities for funding approval.**

Carried

The Chair reiterated the Board's policy of approving all board and committee meetings as an annual schedule. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee would like to cancel the scheduled April meeting and rebook later in the month; committee members and the ex officio members are agreeable with an alternate meeting date. There was consensus to permit this.

8.3 Kawartha Trades and Technology Centre: Dr. Tilly provided an overview of the key themes and insights from the more than 40 employer visits and the follow-up corporate breakfast attended by over 80 guests, summarized in the document provided in the agenda package. Having received confirmation that the capital funding for the project is secure and unaffected by the provincial budget, the President will send out follow-up letters to the participants that will outline next steps, which include establishing an Advisory Committee, following-up with employers to secure financial or in-kind donations of support for the project, and proceeding with tendering and contract awarding for construction of the Centre.

While the initial timeline was to have "shovels in the ground" for the spring 2012 construction season and substantial completion in late 2013, some design changes were needed in order to keep the project within the available budget. The revised plan is to bring the recommendation to award the construction tender to the June meeting of the Board, begin construction this summer, with substantial completion in early 2014. Existing trades programs would then be moved into the new building, and the Centre would be ready for students September 2014.

The Board thanked Dr. Tilly and staff for their work on this strategic regional initiative.

8.6 Report from the in-camera meeting: The Board held an extensive conversation about the provincial budget and implications for Fleming College.

## **9. STRATEGIC DISCUSSION / DECISION ITEMS**

The 2012 Provincial Budget was delivered on March 27, reflecting the tough economic environment and the province's plan to balance the budget by 2017/18. It is also a complex document, with modest increases in some areas and scaling back in others. Dr. Tilly observed that it will take some time to analyze the impacts on Fleming; some elements will not be fully understood until background papers and technical briefings are delivered by the Ministry.

Staff have been updated on the provincial budget through an all-staff email. The College's commitment to delivering an exceptional applied learning experience, growing enrolment from a variety of sources, and construction of the Kawartha Trades and Technology Centre remain unchanged by the provincial budget.

While less relevant, it was noted that the federal budget would be released March 29.

**10. GENERAL LEARNING ABOUT THE COLLEGE / COLLEGE SYSTEM**

10.1 The Board welcomed Ms. Clifford, Manager of the Cobourg Campus, who provided the Cobourg Campus Update 2011-2012. The Report provides a summary of the activities of the Campus over a 14-month timeframe. Speaking to the document provided in the meeting materials, the Board commented on the positive results in responding to the needs of the community. Partnerships continue to move forward. A key growth area is in developing training programs in technical and leadership skills for local manufacturing companies.

Members expressed their appreciation to Ms. Clifford for the opportunity to interact with two different groups of students – Academic Upgrading and Esthetician – prior to the meetings.

10.2 Liaison Governor Reports – President’s Advisory Council: Dr. Tilly provided an update on the February 23 meeting of the Council; the key item was a presentation on Aboriginal Education and Services. The March 22 meeting was held at the Frost Campus as an “Open Forum” on the topic of *Student Services: Supporting Our Diverse Student Population*. Council is in a nomination/election process seeking employee representatives for the term September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2014 and student representatives for one year September 1, 2012 through August 2013.

**11. OTHER BUSINESS**

None identified.

**12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING** at 5:40 p.m. by Mr. Nesbitt and Ms. Kalavrias.

**REPORT TO THE BOARD**

April 25, 2012 – Agenda Item 6.2

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Board of Governors In-Camera Meeting   
**Board of Governors Public Meeting**

**ACTION REQUIRED:**

**Information**   
 Decision

**SUBJECT: *Report on the Activities of Board Committees***

The following report details activities of the Board Committees for meetings held in April 2012.

**Academic and Student Affairs Committee**

*Governor Maki – Committee Chair*

The Committee met on April 17, 2012. Members received two Program Review Reports for information. The first report was from the School of Environmental and Natural Resource Sciences on the Fish and Wildlife Technician/Technology program. The second report was from the School of The Arts on the Ceramics program.

Items requiring Board approval are listed on the agenda.

**Advancement Committee**

*Governor Hayes – Committee Chair*

The Committee met on April 11, 2012. Members received reports on the activities of the Advancement and Alumni Relations department. At an upcoming meeting, the Committee will present, for Board approval, a new policy on gift acceptance.

**Finance and Property Committee**

*Governor Nesbitt – Committee Chair*

The Committee met on April 11, 2012. Members wish to acknowledge the work of the Finance Team in bringing forward a budget during the accounting year-end period.

Items requiring Board approval are listed on the agenda.

**Executive Committee**

*Governor Ross – Committee Chair*

The Committee met on April 11, 2012. Items requiring Board approval are listed on the agenda.

The Executive was not required to act on the Board's behalf.



**Fleming College**

LEARN | BELONG | BECOME

**Business Administration Marketing  
Program Advisory Committee  
March 26, 2012  
Room 5920, Brealey Campus**

## MEETING SUMMARY

**Present:** Doug Leach (RBC Financial Planning); Caitlyn Simon (Kashyaps Pharmasave); Ashley Saltern (Akzonbel); Sara Atkins (Trent Severn Waterway); Carla Guest (Siemens Milltronics); Neil Morton (Couples Magazine); Carey Smith (Nefab Chick Packaging); Janet Lafortune (Marketing Consultant); Tara Mels-King (BoatSmart); John Good (Canadian Parks Council)

**Regrets:** Jake Dudas (Copywriter self employed); Julie Howe (Nexicom); Martin Brooke (Fusion Inc); Neil Hamilton (Marketing Consultant)

**Fleming Staff:** Jim Drennan (Dean, School of Business, Trades and Technology); Russell Turner (Coordinator (Marketing Program)); Wayne Bonner (Chair); Terri Geerinck (Curriculum Consultant); Lori Humphrey (Marketing); Raymond Yip Choy (Faculty); Joanne Tully (Faculty)

**Students:** Ashley Dolan, Ryan Pinkerton

**Recorder:** Pam Selkirk, School Operations Liaison

	Key Points / Actions	Follow-up / Status
<b>Action Items</b>		
1.	The Committee formally endorsed and validated the need for a new post graduate certificate in Project Management for September 2012, within the School of Business, Trades and Technology.  Unanimous support received from external members.	Dean/and Chair to follow-up, as appropriate. Program will move forward through the internal program approval process.
2.	Committee members will elect a new Chair at the March 2012 meeting.	Committee members
<b>Non-Action Items</b>		
1.	Committee members were advised of convocation dates in June 2012. All members are invited to attend and requested to advise School Operations Liaison, to confirm attendance.	Committee members.
2.	An update was provided on the status of the current strategic planning process and the consultation that is currently occurring – internally and externally.	None required.
3.	A Campus Principal's report was distributed, for the committee's information. The report included an update on provincial activity as well as an overview of campus/school activities over the past academic year including the increase in marketing initiatives, KPI results and the combining of the School of Business, with the School of Trades and Technology and an update on the Kawartha Trade & Technology Centre.	None required.

*A complete set of meeting minutes is available to Governors in the Board Circulation binder*





International Trade Program Advisory Committee  
March 29, 2012  
Room 5920, Brealey Campus

**MEETING SUMMARY**

- Present:** Jody McLean (Deloitte & Touche); Tony Jacques (Fed Ex Networks); Victor Deyglio (Logistics Institute); Bill Lee Jr (Limpact International Limited); Eric Howe (Nefab Inc); Vanessa Head (Farrow International); Steven Godsmark (Volkswagen Group Canada); Rob James (Loblaws); Jeffery Dick (Crestright)
- Regrets:** Jeff Pinkney (Ministry of Economic Development and Trade)
- Fleming Staff:** Jim Drennan (Dean); Russell Turner (Co-ordinator); Peter Malkovsky (Faculty); Wayne Bonner (Chair); Raymond Yip Choy (Faculty); Kathleen Gordon (Faculty)
- Students:** Christina Rampton, Chris Gaspari, Laura Davis, Charlie Dickinson
- Recorder:** Pam Selkirk (School Operations Liaison)

Key Points / Actions		Follow-up / Status
<b>Action Items</b>		
1.	The Committee formally endorsed and validated the need for an in-school student-run business operation project for the Fleming agency applied project students.	Co-ordinator to review costs, liabilities and challenges. Program will move forward through the internal program approval process.
2.	The Committee formally endorsed and validated the continuation and renewal of the international student exchange (Mexico).	Co-ordinator to work with the Fleming International Student support coordinator to renew the agreement.
2.	Committee members will elect a new Chair at the March 2012 meeting.	Committee members
<b>Non-Action Items</b>		
1.	Committee members were advised of convocation dates in June 2012. All members are invited to attend.	Committee members to confirm attendance with School Operations Liaison.
2.	An update was provided on the status of the current strategic planning process and the consultation that is currently occurring – internally and externally.	None required.
3.	A Campus Principal's report was distributed, for information. The report included an update on provincial activity as well as an overview of campus/school activities over the past academic year including the increase in marketing initiatives, KPI results and the combining of the School of Business, with the School of Trades and Technology and an update on the Kawartha Trade & Technology Centre.	None required.

*A complete set of meeting minutes is available to Governors in the Board Circulation binder*





**Community & Justice Services Program Advisory Meeting  
April 4, 2012  
Room 5920, Sutherland Campus**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**Present:** Nancy Best (McKinnon House), Andrea Clavin (Brookside Youth Centre) Christine Cairns (Warkworth), Oliver Doyle (Doyle & Associates), Jerry Dunk (Edmison House), Doug Gould (Mon Ami), Wyatt Lamoureux (Youth Emergency Shelter), Dana Hetheron (John Howard Society), Andy Schweigert (Park Place); Scott Bonang, 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester Student Representative; Susan Parrett, 4<sup>th</sup> Semester Student Representative

**Regrets:** Rosalinde Douma (Kennedy House), James Culp (Brookside), Holly Wallace (Central East), Kathy Neill (John Howard Society)

**Fleming Staff:** Karen Bateman (Faculty), Cindy Gervais (Coordinator/Faculty) Deb Holts (Chair), Paul Legacy (Dean)

**Recorder:** Janice Miller, School Operations Liaison

	Key Points / Actions	Follow-up / Status
<b>Action Items</b>		
<b>Non-Action Items</b>		
1.	The Committee received an update regarding current program enrolment numbers for 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> year. There should be 61 graduates this year. Projected 3 <sup>rd</sup> semester numbers for field placement could be up to 75. The target for September enrolment is 64.	
2.	Student presentations included the results of a 4 <sup>th</sup> semester survey completed by 17 students with various questions on their overall experience in the program.	
3.	A Dean's Report formally acknowledged the work of Cindy Gervais as Coordinator for the program. An update was also provided on the reorganization at the college and within the school.	
4.	Members of the advisory committee expressed best wishes to Paul L. on his upcoming retirement from the college.	

*A complete set of meeting minutes is available to Governors in the Board Circulation binder*



April 2012

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE

### March – June 2012

<b>Business, Trades &amp; Technology</b>	
International Trade	<b>March 29, 2012</b> 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Room 5920
Business Administration Marketing	<b>March 26, 2012</b> 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Room 5920
Electrical Techniques/Fire Systems	<b>May 2, 2012</b> 8:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., Room 3620
Instrumentation & Control Engineering Technician	<b>May 2, 2012</b> 8:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m., Room 3620
Accounting	<b>May 10, 2012</b> 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m., Room 5920
Computer Engineering Tech/Technologist	<b>May 15, 2012</b> 10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m., Room 3620
Hotel and Resort Management	<b>May 18, 2012</b> 8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., Room 5920
Culinary Management	<b>June 1, 2012</b> 8:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., Room 5920
Construction Skills	<b>June 14, 2012</b> 8:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m., Room 5920
Human Resource Management	<b>June 26, 2012</b> 3:00 p.m.- 6:00 p.m., Room 5920
<b>Education, Health &amp; Wellness</b>	
Paramedic	<b>March 23, 2012</b> 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Room 5920
Personal Support Worker	<b>April 5, 2012</b> 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., (Frost Campus)
Pharmacy Technician	<b>April 11, 2012</b> 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., Room 5920
Early Childhood Education	<b>April 13, 2012</b> 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., Room 5920
Occupational Therapist Assistant and Physiotherapist Assistant	<b>April 26, 2012</b> 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m., Room 470H
Health Information Management	<b>April 27, 2012</b> 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m., Room 515
<b>Environmental &amp; Natural Resource Sciences (All meetings @ Frost)</b>	
Blasting Techniques	<b>March 22, 2012</b> 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., Room 252
Outdoor Adventure Skills	<b>April 12, 2012</b> 2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Room 252
Arboriculture/Forestry/Urban Forestry	<b>April 13, 2012</b> 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., Room 252
Blasting Techniques	<b>April 19, 2012</b> 12:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m., Room 506 (Heavy Equipment Building)
Ecological Restoration	<b>April 27, 2012</b> 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m., Room TBD (Meeting will be held at Trent University)
GIS	<b>May 15, 2012</b> 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., Room 252



<b>Haliburton</b>	
Expressive Arts	<b>May 1, 2012</b> 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., Room 8
<b>Law, Justice &amp; Community Services</b>	
Recreation & Leisure Services	<b>March 29, 2012</b> 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., Room 5920
Biotechnology Forensics	<b>April 5, 2012</b> 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., Room 5920
Emergency Management	<b>April 18, 2012</b> 12:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m., Room 5920
Developmental Service Worker	<b>April 27, 2012</b> 9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m., Room 5920
Social Service Worker	<b>May 7, 2012</b> 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Room 5920
Arts & Heritage	<b>June 15, 2012</b> 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., Room 5920

**Please contact Mary Jane Jackman ([mjackman@flemingc.on.ca](mailto:mjackman@flemingc.on.ca)) to obtain agenda, meeting material**

**REPORT TO THE BOARD**

April 25, 2012 – Agenda Item 6.5

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Board of Governors In-Camera Meeting   
**Board of Governors Public Meeting**

**ACTION REQUIRED:**

**Information**   
 Decision

**SUBJECT: *Index of Correspondence for March and April 2012***

A report to detail the correspondence received and available for review in the **Circulation Binder**. By providing the index in advance, Governors are able to flag items they may wish to have discussed or clarified.

**MINISTRY OF TRAINING, COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES CORRESPONDENCE**

Programs Approved for Funding:

- Applied and Community-Based Research, Ontario College Graduate Certificate effective September 2012; approval of the proposed annual tuition fee of \$3,732 for this new, two semester, high demand program
- Outdoor and Adventure Education, Ontario College Diploma effective September 2012; approval of the proposed annual tuition fee of \$4,900 for this new high demand program

**COLLEGE SYSTEM CORRESPONDENCE**

*The College Dispatch*

- April 9, 2012 issue

*Inside ACCC*

- March 30 and April 13, 2012 issues

*The Hot Spot*, Educational Technology Committee Newsletter – Issue 11, March 2012

Memorandum from The Honourable Bob Chiarelli, dated April 5, 2012 re Ontario's 2012 Budget

**PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES**

- Business Administration Marketing (March 26, 2012)
- International Trade (March 29, 2012)
- Community and Justice Services (April 4, 2012)

Board of Governors In-Camera Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	ACTION REQUIRED:	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Board of Governors Public Meeting</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Information	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<b>Discussion/Decision</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SUBJECT:** *Financial Plan 2012-2013*

**PRESENTED BY:** Governor Nesbitt, Chair – Finance and Property Committee

#### **SOURCE / BACKGROUND**

- Finance and Property Committee, meeting of April 11, 2012

#### **DISCUSSION / OPTION**

As detailed in the attached document.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College approve the *Financial Plan 2012-2013* as circulated, which provides for**

**Total Revenue of \$ 93,064,375**  
**Expenditures of \$ 93,064,375**  
**Capital Expenditure of \$ 12,435,459**  
**Net Assets at March 31, 2013 of \$11,567,000**



# Fleming College Financial Plan 2012-2013

Board of Governors – April 25, 2012

**Table of  
Contents**

**I. Summary ..... 3**

**II. Revenue ..... 5**

**III. Expenditures..... 9**

**IV. Capital..... 12**

---

## **I. Summary**

Total revenues in this Financial Plan are \$93 million, up marginally from the 2011/12 Update Budget. Total expenditures are \$93 million, also up marginally from Update. The financial plan provides a balanced budget for the year.

Total net assets are budgeted to remain relatively unchanged.

**Fleming College Financial Plan Preliminary Budget 2012/13**

**SUMMARY**

(\$ 000's)

	2012/13 Preliminary Budget	2011/12 Update Budget	Increase (Decrease)
<b>Revenue</b>			
Grants & Reimbursements	\$ 44,994	\$ 44,444	\$ 550
Tuition & Other	32,594	30,735	1,859
Amortization	3,640	3,748	(108)
Skills, Bursaries, Ancillary & Projects	11,836	12,771	(935)
Adjustment to Deferred Derivative Liability	-	680	(680)
<b>Revenue</b>	<b>93,064</b>	<b>92,378</b>	<b>686</b>
<b>Operating Expenses</b>	<b>74,944</b>	<b>73,400</b>	<b>1,544</b>
Amortization Expense	5,673	5,487	186
Skills, Bursaries, Ancillary & Projects	12,447	12,811	(364)
<b>Expenses</b>	<b>93,064</b>	<b>91,698</b>	<b>1,366</b>
<b>Excess of Revenue over Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 680</b>	<b>\$ (680)</b>

	Projected Balance Mar 31/13	Budgeted Balance Mar 31/12	Change
<b>NET ASSETS</b>			
<b>Invested in Capital Assets</b>			
As of April 1, 1997	\$ 2,417	\$ 2,417	\$ -
Since April 1, 1997	8,978	8,970	8
<b>Total Invested in Capital Assets</b>	<b>11,395</b>	<b>11,387</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Unrestricted</b>			
Operating (Board Reserves)	1,112	1,120	(8)
Accrued vacation pay, Future Benefits and Derivative & Sick Leave	(7,533)	(7,533)	-
<b>Total Unrestricted</b>	<b>(6,421)</b>	<b>(6,413)</b>	<b>(8)</b>
<b>Internally Restricted Residences/Commitments</b>	<b>956</b>	<b>956</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Subtotal Net Assets</b>	<b>5,930</b>	<b>5,930</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Externally restricted</b>	<b>5,637</b>	<b>5,637</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>TOTAL NET ASSETS</b>	<b>\$ 11,567</b>	<b>\$ 11,567</b>	<b>\$ -</b>



## II. Revenue

College revenues are budgeted at \$ 93.1 million; an increase of 0.7% from revenues in the 2011/12 Update Budget.

Increase in tuition revenue, grants and other income were offset by decreases in adjustment to deferred derivative liability, Skills Programs, and revenues for facilities renewal and other funded projects.

	Current Year	Previous Year		
	Preliminary Budget	Update Budget	Change	%
	2013	2012		
<b>Revenue</b>				
Grants and Reimbursements	\$ 44,994,190	\$ 44,443,568	\$ 550,622	1.2%
Student Tuition Fees	20,713,339	19,498,277	1,215,062	6.2%
Contract Training	756,656	501,341	255,315	50.9%
Other Income				
Other Income	7,155,488	6,842,225	313,263	4.6%
Ancillary Fees	3,969,235	3,893,346	75,889	1.9%
Non-Operating Revenue	-	-	-	
<b>Total Other Income</b>	<b>11,124,723</b>	<b>10,735,571</b>	<b>389,152</b>	<b>3.6%</b>
Amortization of Deferred Capital Contributions	3,639,964	3,747,923	(107,959)	-2.9%
<b>Total Operating Revenues</b>	<b>81,228,872</b>	<b>78,926,680</b>	<b>2,302,192</b>	<b>2.9%</b>
Skills Programs	2,866,169	3,340,257	(474,088)	-14.2%
Tuition Holdback Bursaries	2,220,000	2,297,000	(77,000)	-3.4%
Ministry Bursaries	832,655	1,036,660	(204,005)	-19.7%
Special Projects	1,738,268	1,705,569	32,699	1.9%
Facilities Renewal and Renovation Projects	244,455	552,576	(308,121)	-55.8%
Ancillary Operations	3,933,956	3,839,572	94,384	2.5%
Adjustment to Deferred Derivative Liability	-	680,000	(680,000)	
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>93,064,375</b>	<b>92,378,314</b>	<b>686,061</b>	<b>0.7%</b>



---

## 1. Grants and Reimbursements

Grants are budgeted to increase by \$550,000 from the Update Budget as follows: (\$ 000's)

	<u>Preliminary</u> <u>2012-13</u>	<u>Update</u> <u>2011-12</u>	<u>Change</u>
Basic Operating Grant	\$31,000	\$31,000	\$ -
Enrolment Growth Grants	3,500	2,250	1,250
Federal Supported Training	0	363	(363)
BScN Grant	3,967	3,854	113
Second Career Grant	1,315	1,845	(530)
Northern & Rural Funding Grant	2,229	2,229	-
Apprentice Grant	684	697	(13)
Performance Funding Grant	505	505	-
Special Needs & Interpreter Grant	682	627	55
Municipal Tax Credit	484	474	10
CO-OP Diploma Apprentice Grant	0	118	(118)
Rental Grants	203	188	15
Medical & Clinical Grant	110	110	-
Misc. Recoveries	315	184	131
<b>Grants and Reimbursements</b>	<b>\$44,994</b>	<b>\$44,444</b>	<b>\$550</b>

The Operating grants are based on the initial allocations from the Ministry. The Basic Operating grant has remained unchanged.

The Enrolment Growth grants consisted of the Enrolment Bridging grant of \$665,500 which has been eliminated, and the Enrolment Growth grant which has increased by \$1,915,500 to \$3.5 million. This has resulted in a net increase in enrolment growth grants of \$1.25 million.

The Federal Supported Training grant of \$363,000 has been eliminated.

The Second Career grant has decreased by \$530,000. This is due to the change in criteria, implemented two years ago, resulting in a continued decline in individuals qualifying for Second Career funding. The intake of new Second Career students is to be budgeted the same as last year's intake numbers.

The Co-Op grant decrease is due to the completion of this program.

Miscellaneous Recoveries are mainly grants to cover recovery of expenses incurred such as staff secondments to the ministry.

---

## **2. Tuition Fees**

Tuition fee revenue is expected to be \$20.7 million up \$1.2 million or six percent from last year's update budget. Tuition fees have been increased as of Sept 1, 2012 as per board approved rates, an average of just under five percent.

Revenue from International enrolment has been budgeted to double from \$.9 million to \$1.8 million.

Part time enrolment is budgeted to remain unchanged from update budget.

## **3. Contract Training**

Contract training revenue has increased by \$255,000 from the update budget mainly in the School of Business and Technology.

## **4. Other Income**

Other income has increased by \$313,000 over the update budget.

OCAS application fee revenues will now be recorded by the college resulting in new revenue of \$589,000. Offsetting expenditures will also be recorded in Contract Services of \$539,000. An increase of \$154,000 has been budgeted for the completion of the Aboriginal Heritage Interpretation program. Increases have also been budgeted for Supply Fees and Administrative Fees.

School College Work Initiative is expected to decline by \$355,000 from the update budget.

## **5. Amortization of Deferred Capital Contribution**

Amortization of Deferred Capital Contribution revenues have decreased by \$108,000 due to decreases in capital funded from operating. This is offset by lower amortization expense for these funded items. Details of funded capital are included in the Capital section of this financial plan.

## **6. Skills Programs**

The Skills program revenues have declined by just over \$474,000 as continuation of the Targeted Initiative for Older Workers has not been confirmed. Offsetting this revenue reduction is an expenditure reduction of \$435,000.

## **7. Facilities Renewal and Funded Projects**

Facilities renewal and funded project revenues have decreased by \$308,000 to a total of \$244,000. Expenditures have also decreased by an equal amount.

The revenue recorded in this category represents funding received for facility and other projects as well funding received and allocated for items under \$5000 of value such as academic equipment and personal computers. Items over \$5000 are deemed capital. The mix of capital and expense will change from year to year.

---

The College Equipment Renewal Fund (CERF) will fund academic equipment and information technology this year totalling \$276,000 of which \$146,000 will be expense. This revenue will replace class room equipment across the college.

The balance of \$98,000 represents the expensed portion of Facilities Renewal grant and donated expenses.

**8. Adjustment to Deferred Derivative Liability**

The adjustment to deferred derivative liability of \$680,000, in the previous year, was mainly due to the Brealey Residence swap which ended in October 2011.

### III. Expenditures

SIR SANDFORD FLEMING COLLEGE  
 Financial Plan - Preliminary Budget  
 Fiscal Year 2013



	Current Year Preliminary Budget 2013	Previous Year Update Budget 2012	Change	%
<b>Expenditures</b>				
<b>Salaries and Benefits</b>				
Salaries, Full Time	37,143,734	35,882,519	1,261,215	3.5%
Salaries, Part Time	10,548,797	11,256,156	(707,359)	-6.3%
Benefits	9,840,625	9,376,336	464,289	5.0%
<b>Total Salaries and Benefits</b>	<b>57,533,156</b>	<b>56,515,011</b>	<b>1,018,145</b>	
<b>Non-Salary Expenses</b>				
Instructional Support Costs	4,372,351	4,501,635	(129,284)	-2.9%
Travel and Professional Development	1,163,232	1,190,107	(26,875)	-2.3%
Advertising	829,967	854,005	(24,038)	-2.8%
Telephone, Audit, Legal & Insurance	805,038	795,302	9,736	1.2%
Equipment Maintenance	380,068	376,172	3,896	1.0%
Plant and Security	2,240,444	2,314,752	(74,308)	-3.2%
Rentals and Taxes	984,655	951,672	32,983	3.5%
Utilities	1,953,873	1,990,531	(36,658)	-1.8%
Contract Services Trent	1,803,614	1,717,134	86,480	5.0%
Services & Other	2,786,168	2,075,010	711,158	34.3%
Long Term Debt Interest	90,800	118,847	(28,047)	-23.6%
Amortization of Capital Assets	5,673,234	5,486,960	186,274	3.4%
<b>Total Non-Salary Expenses</b>	<b>23,083,444</b>	<b>22,372,127</b>	<b>711,317</b>	<b>3.2%</b>
<b>Total Operating Expenditures</b>	<b>80,616,600</b>	<b>78,887,138</b>	<b>1,729,462</b>	<b>2.2%</b>
Initiatives and Investments	1,051,755	331,468	720,287	217.3%
Skills Programs	2,511,494	2,946,974	(435,480)	-14.8%
Tuition Holdback Bursaries	2,220,000	2,297,000	(77,000)	-3.4%
Ministry Bursaries	832,655	1,036,660	(204,005)	-19.7%
Special Projects	1,738,268	1,705,570	32,698	1.9%
Facilities Renewal and Renovation Projects	244,455	552,576	(308,121)	-55.8%
Ancillary Operations	3,849,148	3,940,928	(91,780)	-2.3%
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$93,064,375</b>	<b>\$91,698,314</b>	<b>\$1,366,061</b>	<b>1.49%</b>
<b>Net</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$680,000</b>	<b>(\$680,000)</b>	<b>-100.00%</b>

---

**9. Full Time Salaries**

Full time salaries have increased by \$1,261,000 from the Update Budget. Full time support salaries were budgeted based on the Collective Agreement that is currently in place. When the impact of the strike is taken into consideration, the actual increase in full time salaries is 1.5%

**10. Part Time Salaries**

Part time salaries have decreased by \$707,000 from the Update Budget across the college. Part time academic salaries have decreased by \$607,000 or six percent. Support part time salaries have decreased by \$77,000 or five percent. Student salaries have also declined slightly.

**11. Benefits**

Benefits have increased \$464,000 from the Update Budget mainly due to an increase in the pension costs of \$356,000.

**12. Instructional Support Costs**

Instructional Support costs have decreased \$129,000 from last year's Update Budget. Decreases have occurred mainly in Office Supplies (\$29,000), Small Non Academic Items (\$65,000), and Rental Copier (\$30,000).

**13. Plant and Security**

Plant and Security expenses have decreased by \$74,000 from the Update Budget. The previous year included strike related additional Security expenses of \$43,000. Increases in Contract Cleaning and Building expenses of \$34,000 to cover inflationary increases have been budgeted. Plant Maintenance and Renovation expenses are budgeted to decrease by \$53,000.

**14. Services and Other**

Services and Other expenses have increased by \$711,000 from the Update Budget. As mentioned under other income new OCAS application expenses of \$539,000 have been included and are covered by the new income. The increase in international enrolment has resulted in additional commission and contract service expenses of \$104,000.

Various other strategic initiatives such as Lean and E-learning strategy have also been included.

**15. Amortization of Capital Assets**

Amortization expenses have increased by \$186,000 from the update budget, mainly due to annualizing the cafeteria renovation amortization expense.

Details of funded capital are included in the Capital section of this financial plan.

---

## **16. Initiatives and Investments**

Initiatives and Investments totalling \$1,052,000 have been budgeted. These expenditures are for items such as student computer labs and classroom equipment (\$236,000), renovations (\$385,000), staff computers (\$83,200), student service software and equipment renewal (\$25,600) and network servers, storage and switches (\$25,000).

The balance of the investments is for strategic projects such as group wise migration, virtual desktop and active directory. These projects will provide cost savings to the college, increased student satisfaction, better utilization of resources and will support the E-learning strategy.

---

## IV. Capital

Capital spending in 2012/13 is budgeted at \$12.4 million of which \$10.7 million is from funded sources. The balance of \$1.7 million is capital from operating.

This level of capital expenditures will increase our Invested in Capital Assets as at March 31, 2013 to \$11.4 million, a slight increase from last year's budgeted level.

The budgeted funded capital sources include funding of KTTC (\$10,000,000), the Apprentice Equipment Fund (AEF) (\$205,000), Facility Renewal Program (FRG) (\$235,000), Donated capital (\$130,000) and College Equipment Renewal Fund (CERF) (\$130,000).

The remaining capital from operating includes academic capital (\$209,000), IT equipment and web registration software (\$844,000), residence capital (\$210,000), Building Renovations (\$115,000), marketing equipment (\$60,000), student services equipment (\$48,000), and an unallocated amount for emergency and new academic requirements (\$250,000).

Capital budgeted for 2012/13 is summarized below:

KTTC Building	\$10,000,000
Building Renovations	480,000
Residence Capital	210,000
Academic Equipment	543,545
Network Equipment, Web Registration software	844,000
Unallocated Capital equipment	250,000
Other Capital equipment	<u>107,914</u>
	<b>\$12,435,459</b>

Board of Governors In-Camera Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	ACTION REQUIRED:	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Board of Governors Public Meeting</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Information	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<b>Discussion/Decision</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SUBJECT:** *New Program – Wireless Information Networking*

**PRESENTED BY:** Governor Maki, Chair – Academic and Student Affairs Committee

### SOURCE / BACKGROUND

*Links with College Strategic Priority #4*

*Links with Board Objective #1*

- New Program Development and Approval Process, endorsed by the Board January 26, 2011
- Academic Planning and Development Committee – April 11, 2012
- Academic and Student Affairs Committee – April 17, 2012

### DISCUSSION / OPTIONS

**Credential:** *Ontario College Graduate Certificate*

**Program Length:** Four semesters incorporating applied project work for the final semester

**School:** Business, Trades and Technology

**Proposed Start Date:** Fall 2012

The program will prepare graduates to work in the electronics and computer industry specializing in the area of wireless technology, applications and systems. International students as well as domestic students will benefit with this additional certificate to compete in a growing job sector.

Attached, for information, are the Executive Summary and Financial Projection documents from the program proposal.

### FINANCIAL AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS / IMPACTS

This program is timely in its offering as very few colleges are offering the program at the graduate certificate level. Wireless technologies are increasing in usage nationally and internationally and expected to have exponential growth in coming years. The Wireless Information Networking program will add a graduate certificate to the current offerings in the School of Business, Trades and Technology.

### RECOMMENDATION

**THAT the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College approve the *Ontario College Graduate Certificate in Wireless Information Networking* program effective September 2012, for forwarding to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities for funding approval.**



## **Executive Summary**

### **Proposal to Offer an Ontario College Graduate Certificate in Wireless Information Networking**

This proposal is for Fleming College and the School of Business, Trades and Technology to offer an Ontario College Graduate Certificate in Wireless Information Networking. This graduate certificate is designed for learners to acquire computer and information network-based skills and knowledge to work in an expanding global economy that increasingly relies upon wireless networks and advanced technology applications. This certificate adds this skill set for graduates who wish to work and thrive in the global economy with advanced technical skills.

This graduate certificate program consists of four semesters of 15 weeks, and incorporates applied project work for the final semester. The program is designed for college and university graduates, international and domestic, who wish to obtain specific skills in this area of technology. International students who are seeking higher education in technical programs in Canadian colleges will find this program well-suited for their goals of working in information management and wireless networking in a variety of national and international settings.

International students are coming to Canadian colleges and universities in increasing numbers seeking diplomas and degrees in a variety of fields with information technology and business as major study areas. With more traditional university programming offered in countries such as Japan and Korea, this program will provide cutting-edge technical skills for international students. Canada's community colleges offer many outstanding programs to train young Canadians and their counterparts from around the world for the opportunities in today's economy. Building on the success of other colleges and incorporating the college's current best practices in business, Fleming would like to attract this growing market of students. A program in Wireless Information Networking includes the skills that international companies are seeking in employees.

The job market is strong as companies, organizations, and a variety of businesses expand into the wireless market to meet the needs of internal and external customers. The number of wireless applications continues to expand particularly in the areas of connectivity of wireless devices and e-commerce, adding to the increasing demand for employees in this field. This program is timely in its offering, will be attractive to the international market, and continue to expand the School's offerings of graduate certificates.



## Sir Sandford Fleming College - Program Costing

Program Name: Wireless Information Networking

	Tuition (net)	Sept 1/12	\$ 3,907
	Tuition - International (r	Sept 1/12	\$ 13,660
	BOG (per yr)		\$ 4,300
	Attrition		15%
(All values expressed in current dollars)	WFU		0.00

	Startup	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
First Semester		20	30	30	30	30	30
Second Semester		17	26	26	26	26	26
Third Semester			22	22	22	22	22
Fourth Semester			19	19	19	19	19
<b>Revenues</b>							
Tuition Fees	\$ -	\$ 252,710	\$662,510	\$662,510	\$ 662,510	\$ 662,510	\$ 662,510
MTCU Operating Grant Received							
<b>Total</b>		<b>252,710</b>	<b>662,510</b>	<b>662,510</b>	<b>662,510</b>	<b>662,510</b>	<b>662,510</b>
<b>Expenses</b>							
Academic Direct		133,222	228,264	228,264	228,264	228,264	228,264
Program Coordinator		15,612	15,612	15,612	15,612	15,612	15,612
International Dept (including commissions)		66,600	174,600	174,600	174,600	174,600	174,600
Course Supplies		4,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Dean & Other academic costs		14,657	38,426	38,426	38,426	38,426	38,426
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 234,091</b>	<b>\$464,902</b>	<b>\$464,902</b>	<b>\$ 464,902</b>	<b>\$ 464,902</b>	<b>\$ 464,902</b>
<b>Net Contribution or (Cost) of Proposed New Program before Overheads</b>		18,619	197,608	197,608	197,608	197,608	197,608
<b>Contribution %</b>		7.4%	29.8%	29.8%	29.8%	29.8%	29.8%
<b>Startup and Replacement Capital Costs</b>		62,500	62,500				
<b>Development Costs</b>		22,500					
<b>College Overhead</b>		82,383	215,978	215,978	215,978	215,978	215,978
<b>Net Contribution or (Cost) of Proposed New Program</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$148,765)</b>	<b>(\$80,870)</b>	<b>(\$18,370)</b>	<b>(\$18,370)</b>	<b>(\$18,370)</b>	<b>(\$18,370)</b>
<b>Cumulative Cash Flow</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$66,381)</b>	<b>\$68,727</b>	<b>\$266,335</b>	<b>\$463,943</b>	<b>\$661,552</b>	<b>\$859,160</b>

### Assumptions:

1. Dean and other academic administrative expenses allocated at 5.8% of revenue
2. Academic delivery costs are comprised of 50% FT Faculty and 50% PT/PL Faculty
3. College overhead is allocated at 32.6% of revenue
4. Commission on international tuition is included in international dept expenses

### Costing Note:

1. Proposed Ontario Budget changes include a reduction in the college's Basic Operating Grant and Municipal Tax Grant of \$825 per International Student. The impact of this change would not take affect until year 2 for new enrolments and year 3 for all enrolments. Once fully implemented, the potential reduction to the college's Basic Operating Grant and Municipal Tax Grant would be approximately \$40,000 per year. This amount is not reflected in the above calculations.

**REPORT TO THE BOARD**

**April 25, 2012 – Agenda Item 8.6**

---

Board of Governors In-Camera Meeting   
**Board of Governors Public Meeting**

**ACTION REQUIRED:**

**Information/Discussion**   
Decision

**SUBJECT: Fundraising Outcomes for 2011-2012**

**PRESENTED BY:** Governor Hayes, Chair – Advancement Committee

The 2011-2012 fundraising goal for the Advancement and Alumni Relations Office was \$1,546,795. Through the generosity of our donors, the tireless efforts of our volunteers and the hard work of the Advancement and Alumni Relations Office team, \$1,609,290 or 104% of the goal was secured to support student financial assistance and college capital projects.

A large segment of the funds secured were once again through the Ontario Trust for Student Support (OTSS) Program. Both our 1:1 and 3:1 fundraising ceilings were met with a small overage also being secured. In total, funds raised through the 2011-2012 OTSS campaign were \$595,705. This is the third consecutive year the Advancement and Alumni Relations Office has surpassed their fundraising ceilings for the OTSS program.

Board of Governors In-Camera Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	ACTION REQUIRED:	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Board of Governors Public Meeting</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Information	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<b>Discussion/Decision</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SUBJECT:** *Revised College Policy – Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*  
**PRESENTED BY:** Governor Maki, Chair – Academic and Student Affairs Committee

### SOURCE / BACKGROUND

- Policy 2-216, approved June 25, 2008; revised September 23, 2009
- Standards established by the Tri-Council: Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC)
- Fleming College Research Ethics Board
- Academic and Student Affairs Committee – April 17, 2012

The *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS) is a joint policy of Canada's three federal research agencies that expresses the Agencies' continuing commitment to promote the ethical conduct of research involving humans. As a condition of funding, the Agencies require that researchers and their institutions apply the ethical principles and the articles of the Policy and be guided by the application sections of the articles. To be eligible to receive and administer research funds from the Agencies, institutions must agree to comply with a number of Agency policies set out as schedules to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Agencies and institutions. Institutions must therefore ensure that research conducted under their auspices adhere to this Policy.

### DISCUSSION / OPTIONS

TCPS 2 has replaced the first edition of the TCPS (1998) as the official human research ethics policy of the Agencies. Fleming's policy required several revisions in order to ensure consistency with the second edition of TCPS. These include changes in definitions, language, membership requirements on the Ethics Review Board, etc.

The Board's Academic and Student Affairs Committee is responsible for reviewing all academic policies and practices developed by faculty and administration and recommending to the Board for approval.

The attached document indicates revisions to the current policy with ~~strikeout~~ and **highlighting** replacement or new language.

### FINANCIAL AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS / IMPACTS

N/A

### RECOMMENDATION

**THAT the Board of Governors of Sir Sandford Fleming College approve College Policy #2-216 – *Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, effective May 2012, as circulated.**

**SIR SANDFORD FLEMING COLLEGE**  
**POLICY MANUAL**

Revisions indicated  
by ~~strikeout~~ and  
highlighted text

<b>POLICY NUMBER:</b> 2-216 <b>PAGE NO</b> 1 of 14 <b>DATE APPROVED:</b> June 25, 2008 #4 <b>Revised:</b> September 23, 2009 #3	<b>APPROVED BY:</b> Board of Governors <b>SUPERCEDES:</b>
<b>ETHICAL CONDUCT FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS HUMANS</b>	

This document contains **constitutes** Fleming College's **Fleming's** policy and procedures for the review of ethical considerations arising from research involving **humans**. subjects.

There is a professional responsibility of researchers to adhere to the ethical norms and codes of conduct appropriate to their respective disciplines. When researchers are engaged in research supported by or conducted at Fleming, the College may, in some circumstances, be liable for research conducted by these researchers. Furthermore, most funding agencies require ethics review of research proposals which involve the use of human subjects. For these reasons, policy and procedures are required to ensure that appropriate safeguards are provided. This policy will enable Fleming to ensure that research conducted on human subjects meets the standards of the major granting agencies and regulatory bodies.

Norms for the ethics of research involving human subjects are developed and refined within an ever-evolving societal context, elements of which include the need for research and the research community, moral imperatives and ethical principles, and the law. All research at Fleming College must demonstrate that appropriate methods will be used to protect the rights and interests of the subjects in the conduct of research.

Research involving human subjects is premised on a fundamental commitment to advancing human welfare, knowledge and understanding, and to examining cultural dynamics. Researchers undertake or fund research involving human subjects for many reasons. An ethic of research involving human subjects should address two essential components:

- the selection and achievement of acceptable ends, and
- the acceptable means to those ends.

The first component is directed at defining acceptable ends in terms of the benefits of research for subjects, for associated groups, and for the advancement of knowledge. The second component is directed at ethically appropriate means of conducting research.

Fleming endorses the principles set out in the Tri-Council Policy Statement "*Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*," and this document describes how Fleming will apply the Tri-Council policy. Fleming uses the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS), (<http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/english/policystatement/policystatement.cfm>), as the reference and educational resource in developing and implementing this policy. These principles and guidelines have been widely adopted by diverse research disciplines. As such, they express common standards, values and aspirations of the research community: respect for human dignity, respect for free and informed consent, respect for vulnerable persons, respect for privacy and confidentiality, respect for justice and inclusiveness, balancing harms and benefits, minimizing harm, and maximizing benefit. Accordingly, this policy is intended to ensure that the highest ethical standards in the



conduct of research involving human participants are maintained at Fleming in compliance with the TCPS.

The law affects and regulates the standards and conduct of research involving human subjects in a variety of ways, such as privacy, confidentiality, intellectual property, competence, and in many other areas. Human rights legislation prohibits discrimination on a variety of grounds. In addition, most documents on research ethics prohibit discrimination and recognize equal treatment as fundamental. Research should also respect the spirit of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, particularly the sections dealing with life, liberty and the security of the person as well as those involving equality and discrimination.

The *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS or the Policy) is a joint policy of Canada's three federal research agencies—the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), or “the Agencies”. The people of Canada, through Acts of Parliament, have created and funded the Agencies to promote and assist research within their respective legislative mandates. In discharging their mandates, the Agencies wish to promote research that is conducted according to the highest ethical standards. The Agencies have therefore adopted this Policy as a benchmark for the ethical conduct of research. As a condition of funding, the Agencies require that researchers and their institutions apply the ethical principles and the articles of this Policy and be guided by the application sections of the articles. Indeed, to be eligible to receive and administer research funds from the Agencies, institutions must agree to comply with a number of Agency policies set out as schedules to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Agencies and institutions. Institutions must therefore ensure that research conducted under their auspices adhere to this Policy. Researchers are expected, as a condition of funding, to adhere to the TCPS. Institutions should support their efforts to do so.

The Ethics Framework of the TCPS acknowledges that research can benefit human society and that researchers must have academic freedom in order to maximize such benefits. At the same time, with academic freedom comes responsibility, including the responsibility to ensure that research involving humans meets high scientific and ethical standards that respect and protect the participants. Thus, respect for human dignity has been an underlying value of the TCPS and is expressed through the core principles of respect for persons, concern for welfare and justice. These core principles are considered the compass to navigate the course between the importance of research and its ethical conduct. The Policy is applied through a proportionate approach to REB review. The TCPS aims to assist those who use it, including REBs, to identify ethical issues in the design, conduct and oversight of research and to point the way to arriving at reasoned and ethical responses to those issues.

Fleming, the institution and its researchers, adheres to the TCPS; subsequent to the 2010 revisions to the Policy, Fleming College has undertaken to revise its research ethics policy to ensure compliance. This document endeavors to operationalize this compliance.

## DEFINITIONS

**TCPS2 contains a Glossary intended to assist in the understanding of its revised Policy Statement. The following definitions have been selected from this Glossary to highlight changes in terminology from the original TCPS (1998) to its revision (2010) and for their particular salience to Fleming's research ethics policy. This abbreviated list of definitions does not intend to replace the complete Glossary.**

**Research** is a systematic investigation to establish facts, principles or generalizable knowledge.

**Research** – An undertaking intended to extend knowledge through a disciplined inquiry or systematic investigation.

**Participant** – An individual whose data, or response to interventions, stimuli, or questions by a researcher are relevant to answering a research question; also referred to as “human participant,” and in other policies/guidance as “subject” or “research subject.”

**Human research** refers to any project that involves the collection of specimens, data or information from persons, through intervention or otherwise. Included are procedures that have a low degree of invasiveness (e.g. surveys, interviews, naturalistic observations, exercise or psychometric testing, examination of patient records), as well as more invasive procedures (e.g. blood sampling, administration of a substance).

A **subject** in human research is a person, who by virtue of his/her involvement in a data-gathering situation or activity is a source of primary data or information.

A **research ethics protocol** is a document submitted by the applicant for consideration by the Research Ethics Board (REB). This document contains a detailed description of the rationale/purpose of the study, procedures to be followed in soliciting participants for the research, obtaining their informed consent when possible, collecting their information or data, protecting their privacy or anonymity, and providing feedback regarding the study at its conclusion.

**Minimal risk** means that the risks of harm anticipated in the proposed research are not greater or more likely, considering probability and magnitude, than those ordinarily encountered in life, including those encountered during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.

**Minimal risk research** – 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 the aspects of their everyday life that relate to the research.

**Harm** – Anything that has a negative effect on participants’ welfare, broadly construed. The nature of the harm may be social, behavioral, psychological, physical or economic.

**Research Ethics Board (REB)** – A body of researchers, community members, and others with specific expertise (e.g. in ethics, in relevant research disciplines) established by an institution to review the ethical acceptability of all research involving humans conducted within the institution’s jurisdiction or under its auspices.

**Proportionate approach to research ethics review** – The assessment of foreseeable risk to determine the level of scrutiny a research proposal will receive (i.e. delegated review for minimal risk research or full REB review for research above minimal risk), as well as the consideration of foreseeable risks, potential benefits, and ethical implications of the research in the context of initial and continuing review.

**Delegated research ethics board (REB) review** – The level of REB review assigned to minimal risk research projects. Delegated reviewers are selected from among the REB membership, with the exception of the ethics review of student course-based research which can be reviewed by delegates from the student’s department, faculty, or an equivalent level.

**Full research ethics board (REB) review** – The level of REB review assigned to above minimal risk research projects. Conducted by the full membership of the research ethics board, it is the default requirement for the ethics review of research involving humans.

**Reciprocal research ethics board (REB) review** – An official agreement between two or more institutions, in which they accept, with an agreed level of oversight, the research ethics reviews of each other's REBs.

## **POLICY FLEMING RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW POLICY**

All research projects involving human subjects undertaken by members of or conducted at Fleming College – including all faculty, staff and students, including students carrying out research as part of class assignments – shall fall within the jurisdiction of a committee called the Fleming College Research Ethics Review Board (REB), irrespective of the source of financial support (if any) and irrespective of the location of the project, in the latter case, so long as the investigator represents the work as Fleming research. Projects conducted by researchers from outside the Fleming College community who access College resources (either equipment or personnel) will also fall within the jurisdiction of the Fleming College REB.

The President of Fleming College establishes the REB, defines the appropriate reporting relationship with the REB and ensures the REB is provided with necessary and sufficient ongoing financial and administrative resources to fulfill their duties. The latter include storage space for research data as well as the establishment of appropriate institutional security safeguards to protect privacy of data for the life cycle of information.

The Fleming College REB shall be the sole ethics review board of the College and shall apply the principles set out in the TCPS "*Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*" according to the procedures described in this Fleming document. These procedures may be varied to accommodate future approved amendments to the Tri-Council Policy.

Fleming's Research Ethics Board (REB) shall be the sole Research Ethics Board of the College and shall apply the principles and articles set out in the TCPS "*Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*" according to the procedures described in this Fleming document. These procedures may be varied to accommodate future approved amendments to the Tri-Council Policy.

Fleming grants 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. Fleming's REB is independent in its decision making and is accountable to the President for the process of research ethics review. Fleming College shall respect the authority delegated to the REB. Fleming cannot override an REB decision to reject a research proposal but may appeal a decision.

All research projects involving humans undertaken by members of, or conducted at Fleming College - including all faculty, staff and students, including students carrying out research as part of class assignments - shall fall within the jurisdiction of Fleming College's Research Ethics Review Board (REB), irrespective of the source of financial support (if any) and irrespective of the location of the project, in the latter case, so long as the investigator represents the work as Fleming research. Projects conducted by researchers from outside the Fleming College community who access College resources (either equipment or personnel) will also fall within the jurisdiction of the Fleming College REB.

### **1. Requirement for Ethics Review**

Except as provided for in policy section 2, Except for the exemptions that follow, all research projects involving human subjects humans conducted at, in collaboration with or under the auspices of Fleming College require prior ethics review and approval by the Research Ethics Board (REB). This requirement of prior ethics review and approval applies to:



- 1.1. All research involving ~~human subjects~~ **living human participants** conducted by the College's academic staff, administrative and support staff, or students, persons with adjunct appointments, visiting instructors, visiting professional associates, and research associates.
- 1.2. All research carried out on College premises or using College facilities, equipment or human, financial or material resources;
- 1.3. Research conducted elsewhere under the auspices of the College;
- 1.4. The research activities of formally affiliated organizations as a condition of affiliation; and
- 1.5. The research activities of organizations or individuals (whether formally affiliated or not) while on College premises or using College facilities, equipment or resources, including off-campus sites. When research takes place in a foreign country, the researcher must also assure that his/her procedures meet all legal requirements of that country, as well as the requirements of this policy.
- 1.6. All types of research involving humans. Specifically, prior ethics review and approval is required when research data are derived from, but not exclusively restricted to:
  - Information collected through intervention or interaction with a living individual(s);
  - Identifiable private information about individuals;
  - Information collected through naturalistic observation of humans, except as stipulated below in ~~item 2.3~~.
  - Human organs, remains, tissues and body fluids, cadavers, embryos or fetuses; and/or
  - Written or recorded information derived from individually identifiable humans.
- 1.7. In addition, ethics review is required for the following categories of research that may be overlooked or raise questions about the necessity for such a review:
  - Pilot studies and feasibility studies, even those involving only one ~~human subject~~ **participant**, require the same scrutiny as full-scale research projects involving many ~~subject human participants~~.
  - Projects that involve the secondary use of data on ~~human subjects~~ **participants** gathered in earlier projects.
  - Research conducted by administrative and academic units that involves the collection of survey replies or the use of records as correlates of survey replies from ~~human subjects~~ **humans** (e.g. students, staff and/or faculty members).
  - Research projects in which the researcher is a consultant unless the researcher has a strict consulting relationship in which all of the following are true: (a) the researcher is hired on his or her own time; (b) the researcher holds no rights in the work; and (c) neither the researcher nor the College retains any data. If any one of these three criteria is not met, prior ethics review and approval is required.
  - All independent student research projects conducted in partial fulfillment of certificate/diploma/degree requirements. Research projects conducted as part of formal course requirements may, in certain instances require REB review and approval. It is incumbent on the instructor to check the applicability of this requirement with the REB Chair.

## 2. Research Excluded

~~Prior ethics review and approval from an REB will not normally be required for:~~

**Some research is exempt from REB review where protections are available by other means. The policy allows the following exemptions from the requirement for REB review, as follows:**

~~2.1. A limited type of research most often found within the humanities, fine arts, and in some historical research which involves: (a) a public database where aggregated data that cannot be associated with any individual are obtained; and/or (b) information already in the public domain (e.g. autobiographies, biographies or public archives). Nevertheless, it is the responsibility of the researcher to ascertain that any information used from these sources is presented in an accurate fashion.~~

2.1 Research that relies exclusively on publicly available information does not require REB review when:

- (a) the information is legally accessible to the public and appropriately protected by law, e.g. any existing stored documentary material, records or publications, which may or may not include identifiable information such as death registries, publicly available archives; or
- (b) the information is publicly accessible and there is no reasonable expectation of privacy, e.g. identifiable information disseminated in the public domain through print or electronic publications; film, audio or digital recordings; press accounts; artistic installations. In addition, research that is non-intrusive and does not involve direct interaction between the researcher and individuals through the Internet, also does not require REB review e.g. cyber-material to which the public is given uncontrolled access on the Internet for which there is no expectation of privacy is considered to be publicly available information.

2.2. Archival analysis of records by College departments normally engaged in the collection, maintenance, and analysis of such records. Nevertheless, it is incumbent on such units to ensure that the anonymity of individuals and confidentiality of their records are maintained. (If individuals to whom the information refers have reasonable expectations of privacy then REB review is required.)

~~2.3. Naturalistic observation of participants in, for example, political rallies, demonstrations or public meetings where it can be expected that participants are seeking public visibility.~~

2.3 REB review is not required for research involving the observation of people in public places where:

- (a) it does not involve any intervention staged by the researcher, or direct interaction with the individuals or groups;
- (b) individuals or groups targeted for observation have no reasonable expectation of privacy; and
- (c) any dissemination of research results does not allow identification of specific individuals

2.4. Class research projects which involve human subjects and which are conducted by students on other members of the class as exercises to learn how to conduct research.

~~2.5. Evaluations of courses or training programs that are designed to provide feedback.~~

2.5 Quality assurance and quality improvement studies, program evaluation activities (such as evaluations of courses or training programs that are designed to provide feedback), and performance reviews, or testing within normal educational requirements when used exclusively for assessment, management or improvement purposes, do not constitute research and do not fall within the scope of REB review.

2.6. Preliminary, informal interviews or casual conversations that are carried out to help clarify the design of a research project.

2.7. Information gathering procedures in support of the general administration of the College where the primary purpose(s) are:

- To diagnose problems, identify appropriate solutions, provide advice for operation management, or assess performance.
- To collect data primarily designed to affect the operations of the College through affirming satisfaction with the status quo or leading to quality improvements.

Note: Most administrative information gathering procedures and practices are not conducted in the context of research or embedded in a research framework. Rather they are conducted for purpose of assessing choices, ascertaining satisfaction of clients, identifying service enhancements or for similar quality objectives. All such projects must also be done in accordance with the highest research ethical practices. However, in those cases where information gathering through such vehicles as surveys or interviews conducted by administration have a clear research direction, are on sensitive topics, are collected from vulnerable populations or where there may be an issue with the confidentiality of individual responses, REB review would be required.

~~2.8. Information gathering procedures to collect institutional level data for administrative purposes.~~

~~2.8~~

~~2.9. Research undertaken as a teaching exercise and entailing minimal risk shall be reviewed by school or department level committee on behalf of the REB.~~

2.9 Creative practice activities, in and of themselves, do not require REB review. However, research that employs creative practice to obtain responses from participants that will be analyzed to answer a research question is subject to REB review.

### 3. Uncertainty About the Need for REB Review

For research/scholarly work where the researcher is uncertain whether REB review is required, it is the responsibility of the researcher to obtain the written opinion of the Chair of the REB as to whether the research should be subjected to prior ethics review and approval.

### 4. Academic Freedom

~~All REBs and all persons involved in the ethics review process shall act in such a manner as to ensure that there is no infringement of the academic freedom of researchers.~~

Academic freedom is “The collective freedom of faculty and students to conduct research, and to disseminate ideas or facts without religious, political, or institutional restrictions. It includes freedom of inquiry, freedom to challenge conventional thought, freedom to express one’s opinion about the institution, its administration or the system in which one works, and the freedom from institutional censorship” (TCPS2, p. 189). Thus, all REBs and all persons involved in the ethics review process shall act in such a manner as to ensure that there is no infringement of the academic freedom of researchers.

### 5. Compliance

The College requires all faculty members, staff and students, as well as external researchers conducting research at the College, to adhere to this policy and the procedures that are derived from it. The College considers the improper treatment of human subjects humans in research to be a serious offence, subject to severe penalties, including but not limited to the withdrawal of privileges to conduct research involving human subjects humans, or disciplinary action.

### 6. Responsibilities of Researchers

Whenever research involving human subjects humans is to be performed under the auspices of Fleming College or by any College researcher, the researcher is responsible for meeting the following requirements:

~~6.1. Ensuring that the research being conducted is scientifically valid and/or appropriate in a scholarly sense, and that the benefits to knowledge that will result from the research warrant the investment of time, effort and risks to be incurred by the number of human subjects for which the research is planned. Scientifically invalid research or research that is more intrusive or requires more subjects to experience the research procedures than those warranted by the research design is unethical. The researcher shall carefully monitor and assure the validity of the research submitted to the REB.~~

6.1 Ensuring that the proposed research is both ethically acceptable and, where appropriate, adheres to relevant disciplinary scholarly standards. Researchers have a role to play in demonstrating to the REB whether, when and how appropriate scholarly review has been or will be undertaken for their research. Researchers ought be prepared to provide the REB with the full documentation of scholarly reviews already completed.

6.2. Reading and becoming thoroughly familiar with applicable ethical guidelines.

6.3. Determining if the proposed research requires ethics review. If there is any uncertainty about whether the research requires ethics review and approval, the researcher shall consult the Chair of the REB for advice and decision. Following initial REB approval, research ethics review shall continue throughout the life of the project. Continuing ethics review by an REB provides those involved in the research process (in particular, researchers and REBS) with multiple opportunities to reflect on the ethical issues surrounding the research.

6.4. Notifying the REB of the proposed research by submitting a completed Human Subject Research Ethics Protocol **Involving Humans** accompanied by any supplementary materials necessary for full ethics review, and providing any additional information requested by the REB in a timely fashion.

6.5. Not involving human subjects **commencing research involving human participants** in the proposed research until the REB has informed him/her of approval ~~in writing for the use of human subjects in the research~~ **of the proposed research**.

6.6. Abiding by all decisions of the REB, including following all modifications required for REB approval and not undertaking the research if it has not been approved.

6.7. Obtaining free and informed consent from all **subjects prospective participants** as outlined in section 7 of this policy **and document this consent regardless of participants' signatures. Maintain ongoing informed consent. Ensure participants understand they may withdraw consent at any time during the research. Their data will be withdrawn when possible. There are exceptions to the obtainment of informed consent e.g. research involving observation in a natural environments or virtual settings where people have a reasonable or limited expectation of privacy. In this case the researcher shall explain the need for an exception to the general requirement for consent.**

~~6.8. Maintaining the confidentiality of data obtained from subjects in the manner required by the REB and relevant organizations.~~

6.8 Researchers shall safeguard information entrusted to them and not misuse or wrongfully disclose it. Fleming shall support their researchers in maintaining promises of confidentiality. Researchers shall describe measures for meeting confidentiality obligations and explain any reasonable foreseeable disclosure requirements in their application materials they submit to the REB and during the consent process with prospective participants. Maintaining the

confidentiality of data obtained from subjects in the manner required by the REB and relevant organizations.

- 6.9. Promptly reporting to the Chair of the REB any injuries to human subjects, any unanticipated problems which involve risks or unusual costs to the subjects, or other adverse events resulting from the research. Initial reports may be verbal; subsequent reports shall be in the manner required by the REB in a timely manner any unanticipated issues that arise that may increase the level of risk or have other ethical implications. Researchers shall also submit to the REB in a timely manner requests for changes to their approved research.
- 6.10. Promptly reporting to the Chair of the REB any proposed changes in the research which would result in a significantly different involvement of human subjects and obtaining the approval of the REB prior to the changes being made, except where necessary to eliminate apparent and immediate hazards to subjects.
- 6.11. Promptly reporting to the Chair of the REB any proposed involvement of human subjects in research which previously had no plans, or only indefinite plans, for subject involvement and obtaining the approval of the REB prior to the involvement of any subjects.
- 6.12. Promptly reporting to the Chair of the REB any serious or continuing non-compliance with the requirements of this policy or of the procedures stipulated by an REB by any individual associated with the research.
- 6.10 Researchers have an obligation to disclose to the participants any material incidental findings discovered in the course of research. Incidental findings are findings that have been interpreted as having significant welfare implications for the participants, whether health-related, psychological or social. If in the course of research, material incidental findings are discovered, researchers have an obligation to inform the participants.
- 6.11 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 the exclusion. In addition, individuals or groups whose circumstances may make them vulnerable in the context of research should not be inappropriately included or excluded from participation in research on the basis of their circumstances.
- 6.12 Researchers should consider ways to ensure the equitable distribution of any benefits of participation in research.
- 6.13 Promptly reporting to the Chair of the REB any serious or continuing non-compliance with the requirements of this policy or of the procedures stipulated by an REB by any individual associated with the research.
- 6.14 Researchers have the right to request an appeal of an REB decision. An appeal can be launched for procedural or substantive reasons. The onus is on the researchers to justify the grounds on which they request an appeal and to indicate any breaches to the research ethics review process or any elements of the REB decision that are not supported by this Policy.
- 6.15 Qualitative Research Proposals
- 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, or access to data. REB review is not required for the initial exploratory phase

intended to discuss the feasibility of the research, establish research partnerships, or the design of a research proposal.

- Researchers shall explain in their research design the proposed procedures for seeking consent and the strategies they plan to use for documenting consent.
- In research involving observation in natural environments or virtual settings where people have a reasonable or limited expectation of privacy, the researcher shall explain the need for an exception to the general requirement for consent.
- If researchers plan to disclose the identity of participants, researchers shall discuss with prospective participants whether they wish to have their identity disclosed in publications or other means of dissemination. Where participants consent to have their identity disclosed, researchers shall record each participant's consent.
- In studies using emergent design in data collection, researchers shall provide the REB with all the available information to assist in the review and approval of the general procedure for data collection.

## 7. Free and Informed Consent of Subjects

- 7.1. **Consent shall be voluntary.** The researcher is responsible for obtaining free and informed consent from all prospective subjects **human participants**, or authorized third parties, prior to commencing research activities. ~~Free and informed consent must be maintained throughout participation in the research. Free and informed consent must be given voluntarily, without manipulation, undue influence or coercion.~~ Free and informed consent is ongoing throughout participation in the research. Incentives are neither recommended nor discouraged by the TCPS2. Incentives ought not be so large or attractive as to encourage reckless disregard of risks. Similarly, the offer of incentives in some contexts may be perceived by prospective participants as a way for them to gain favour or improve their situation. This may amount to undue inducement and thus negate the voluntariness of participants' consent.

~~7.1.1 In studies including randomization and blinding in clinical trials, neither the research subjects nor those responsible for their care know which treatment the subjects are receiving before the project commences. Such research is not regarded as a waiver or alteration of the requirements for consent if subjects are informed of the probability of being randomly assigned to one arm of the study or another.~~

**7.1.1 Free and informed consent must be given voluntarily, without undue influence or coercion. Consent can be withdrawn at any time. If a participant withdraws consent, the participant can also request the withdrawal of their data or human biological materials.**

- 7.2. ~~Evidence of free and informed consent in the form of a signed document by the subject or authorized third party should be obtained in writing and stored in a secure repository. Where written consent is culturally unacceptable, or where there are good reasons for not recording consent in writing, the procedures used to seek free and informed consent shall be documented.~~ Evidence of consent shall be contained either in a signed consent form or in documentation by the researcher of another appropriate means of consent.
- 7.3. The REB may approve a consent procedure that differs from that outlined in 7.1 and 7.2 if the REB finds that:
- The research involves no more than minimal risk to the ~~subjects~~ **participants**;
  - The alteration or waiver of the consent procedure is unlikely to adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects;
  - The research could not practicably be carried out without the alteration or waiver of the consent procedure;
  - Whenever possible and appropriate, ~~the subjects will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation; and~~ **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;

- The alteration or waiver of consent does not involve a therapeutic intervention.

7.4 Participants in naturalistic observation studies normally do not give informed consent because they are unaware they are being observed. The REB can approve such projects as long as the research records protect the identities of the subjects, as well as their dignity. If the research environment is staged, however, special care must be taken to ensure the privacy, well being, safety, and dignity of the subjects.

7.4

7.5 Researchers shall provide prospective subjects participants or authorized third parties with full disclosure of all information necessary for making an informed decision to participate in a research project:

- Information that the individual is being invited to participate in a research project and against which criteria subjects are being selected;
- A statement of the research purpose, identity of the researcher, the expected duration and nature of participation and a description of the research procedures and an explanation of the responsibilities of the participant;
  - A description of the reasonably foreseeable harms and benefits that may arise from research participation, as well as the likely consequences of non-action, particularly in research related treatment; A plain language description of all reasonably foreseeable harms and potential benefits that may arise from research participation;
  - An assurance that the privacy rights of all subjects will be honoured;
  - An assurance that, in the event of publication, the anonymity of all subjects will be preserved;
  - An assurance that prospective subjects are free not to participate and have the right to withdraw at any time without prejudice to pre-existing entitlements; and
  - The possibility of commercialization of the research findings, and the presence of any apparent or actual or potential conflict of interest on the part of researchers, their institutions or sponsors.
  - An assurance that prospective subjects are under no obligation to participate and have the right to withdraw at any time without prejudice to pre-existing entitlements; and
  - The possibility of commercialization of the research findings, and the presence of any apparent or actual or potential conflict of interest on the part of researchers, their institutions or sponsors.
  - The measures to be undertaken for dissemination of research results and whether participants will be identified directly or indirectly
  - The identity and contact information of a qualified designated representative who can explain scientific or scholarly aspects of the research to participants;
  - The identity and contact information of the appropriate individual(s) outside the research team whom participants may contact regarding possible ethical issues in the research;
  - An indication of what information will be collected about participants and for what purposes; an indication of who will have access to information collected about the identity of participants a description of how confidentiality will be protected, a description of the anticipated uses of data; and information indicating who may have a duty to disclose information collected, and to whom such disclosures could be made.

For consent to be informed prospective participants shall be given adequate time and opportunity to assimilate the information provided pose any questions they may have and discuss and consider whether they will participate. The time required for this initial phase of the consent process will depend on such factors as the magnitude and probability of harms, the complexity of the information conveyed, and the setting where the information is given.

7.5 Capacity—refers to the ability of prospective or actual participants to understand relevant information presented about a research project, and to appreciate the potential consequences of their decision to participate or not participate. This ability may vary according to the complexity of the choice being made, the circumstances surrounding the decision, or the point in time at which consent is sought. The determination of capacity to participate in research, then, is not a static determination. Assessing capacity is a question of determining, at a particular point in time, whether a participant (or prospective participant) sufficiently understands the nature of a particular research project, and the risks, consequences and potential benefits associated with it.

7.5.1 For research involving individuals who lack the capacity, either permanently or temporarily, to decide for themselves whether to participate, the REB shall ensure that, as a minimum, individuals who are not legally competent shall only be asked to become research subjects when:

- The research question can only be addressed using individuals within the identified group(s);
- Free and informed consent will be sought from their authorized representative(s); and
- The research does not expose them to more than minimal risks without the potential for direct benefits for them.

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

- the researcher involves participants who lack the capacity to consent on their own behalf 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 interests of the persons concerned
- The authorized third party is not be the researcher or any other member of the research team. The continued free and informed consent of an appropriately authorized third party will be required to continue the participation of a legally incompetent subject in research, so long as the subject remains incompetent.
- When authorization for participation was granted by an authorized third party, and a participant acquires or regains capacity during the course of the research, the researcher shall promptly seek the participant's consent as a condition of continuing participation;
- 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 the potential for 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 participation in research.

## ~~7.6 Research Subjects Who are Not Legally Competent~~

~~7.6.1 Subject to applicable legal requirements, individuals who are not legally competent shall only be asked to become research subjects when:~~

- ~~• The research question can only be addressed using individuals within the identified group(s);~~
- ~~• Free and informed consent will be sought from their authorized representative(s); and~~
- ~~• The research does not expose them to more than minimal risks without the potential for direct benefits for them.~~

~~7.6.2 For research involving legally incompetent individuals, the REB shall ensure that, as a minimum, the following conditions are met:~~



- The researcher shall show how the free and informed consent will be sought from the authorized third party and how the subject's best interests will be protected.
  - The authorized third party may not be the researcher or any other member of the research team. The continued free and informed consent of an appropriately authorized third party will be required to continue the participation of a legally incompetent subject in research, so long as the subject remains incompetent.
  - When a subject who was entered into a research project through third-party authorization becomes competent during the project, his or her informed consent shall be sought as a condition of continuing participation.
- 7.6.3. When free and informed consent has been obtained from an authorized third party and in those circumstances where the legally incompetent individual understands the nature and consequences of the research, the researcher shall seek to ascertain the wishes of the individual concerning participation. The potential subject's dissent will preclude his or her participation.

## 7.6

### 7.7 ~~Research in Emergency Health Situations~~ Research Ethics during Emergencies

7.6.1 Publicly Declared Emergencies – This section addresses research ethics review within the context of the official declaration of public emergencies. Fleming, in collaboration with their researchers and REB should develop preparedness plans for emergency research ethics review. Research ethics review during publicly declared emergencies may follow modified procedures and practices.

## 7.6.2

- 7.7.1 Emergency Health Situations – Research involving emergency health situations shall be conducted only if it addresses the emergency needs of individuals involved, and then only in accordance with criteria established in advance of the research by the REB. The REB may allow research that involves health emergencies to be carried out without the free and informed consent of the subject participant (or prospective participant) or of his or her authorized third party if ALL of the following apply:
- A serious threat to the prospective subject participant requires immediate intervention; and
  - Either no standard efficacious care exists or the research offers a real possibility of direct benefit to the subject in comparison with standard care; and
  - Either the risk of harm is not greater than that involved in standard efficacious care, or it is not clearly justified by the direct benefits to the subject; and
  - The prospective subject participant is unconscious or lacks capacity to understand risks, methods and purposes of the research; and
  - Third-party authorization cannot be secured in sufficient time, despite diligent and documented efforts to do so; and
  - No relevant prior directive by the subject participant is known to exist.
- 7.7.2 When a previously incapacitated subject participant regains capacity, or when an authorized third party is found, free and informed consent shall be sought promptly for continuation in the project and for subsequent examinations or tests related to the study.

## 8. ~~Fleming College Research Ethics Board Terms of Reference~~

### 8. Governance of Research Ethics Review

#### 8.1 Responsibilities

The Fleming College Research Ethics Review Board is responsible to the President of the College for:

- 8.1.1 Developing policies regarding ethical issues relating to the use of humans participants in research and experimental teaching protocols;
- 8.1.2 ~~Reviewing all protocols requiring the participation of human participants for ethical approval;~~

- ~~8.1.3~~ Reviewing annually all policies regarding ethical issues relating to the use of human participants in research projects to ensure that policies remain current;
- 8.1.2 Conducting research ethics review of all research involving humans;
- 8.1.3 Ensuring adherence of Fleming's research ethics policy with the most current version of the TCPS;
- 8.1.4 Dealing with matters concerned with human-based research involving humans referred to the REB by the President of the College;
- 8.1.5 Preparing an annual report for submission to the President, as outlined in Section 12 of this policy;
- ~~8.1.6~~ Participating in continuing education organized by Fleming research administrators for the College community in matters relating to ethics and the use of human participants.
- 8.1.6 Ensuring REB members participate in initial and ongoing training relevant to their responsibilities and duties to the REB.
- 8.1.7 Annually reviewing REB membership and overseeing nominations process and appointments and renewals of REB members.

The policies and practices adopted by the REB will be consistent with the current approved Tri-Council Policy Statement, "*Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans.*"

## 8.2 Composition of the Board

~~*Standing Membership* – Five (5) members: The normal term of office for REB members is three years, with no more than one-third being replaced each year; shorter or longer terms may be necessary from time to time. Members may not serve more than six consecutive years, but are eligible for re-appointment after an interval of one year. These members, including the Chair, shall be appointed by the President accordance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans. The Board shall consist of both men and women, of whom:~~

- ~~At least two members have expertise in the areas of research covered by the board;~~
- ~~At least one member is knowledgeable in the area of ethics;~~
- ~~In the case of biomedical research at least one member must be knowledgeable in the area of biomedical research law;~~
- ~~At least one community member with no affiliation to the institution;~~
- ~~At least one member whose primary area of interest is in a nonscientific area.~~

~~*Substitute membership* – As needed, substitute members may be appointed by the President in consultation with the Chair to serve as replacements for standing members when they are unable to attend. Such substitute members must not alter the membership structure and in all cases REB members must be competent to judge the acceptability of proposals and shall be knowledgeable of TCPS.~~

*Basic REB Membership Requirements* – Fleming may establish its own terms of appointment of REB members to allow for continuity of the research ethics review process. Currently, the normal term of office for REB members is three years, with no more than one-third being replaced each year; shorter or longer terms may be necessary from time to time. Members may not serve more than six consecutive years, but are eligible for re-appointment after an interval of one year.

*Selection of REB Members* – The selection of REB members, including the Chair, should be fair and impartial in accordance with Fleming's written policy that defines the process of appointing REB members. In appointing and renewing REB members, institutions should arrange the terms of members and their rotation to balance the need to maintain continuity with the need to ensure diversity of opinion, and the opportunity to spread knowledge and experience gained from REB membership throughout the institution and the community.

*REB Size* – Fleming may determine the size of its REB which will vary in accordance to institutional needs. In accordance with the TCPS, Fleming’s REB shall consist of *at least* five members, including both men and women, of whom:

- At least two members 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 institution’s legal counsel or risk manager). This is mandatory for biomedical research and is advisable, but not mandatory for other areas of research; and;
- At least one community member who has no affiliation with the institution. Their primary role is to reflect the perspective of the participant especially when participants are vulnerable and/or risks to participants are high;
- Research ethics administrative staff who have the requisite experience, expertise and knowledge comparable to what is expected of REB members may be appointed as non-voting members.

Ad hoc advisors may be consulted in the event that the REB lacks the specific expertise or knowledge to review the ethical acceptability of a research proposal competently.

At a minimum, it is advisable that each member be appointed to formally fulfill the requirements of only one of the above categories. Where the size of the REB exceeds the minimum requirements, additional members may fulfill more than one capacity.

To ensure the independence of REB decision making, Fleming senior administrators shall not serve on the REB nor attend meetings even as non-voting members. However, the involvement of administrative staff dedicated to research ethics functions may be relevant and appropriate to support REB procedures. In cases where research ethics administrative staff has the requisite experience, expertise and knowledge comparable to what is expected of REB members, Fleming may appoint them as non-voting members.

*Substitute membership* – Fleming will nominate substitute REB members so that the REB can continue to function when regular members are unable to attend due to illness or other unforeseen eventualities. The appointment of substitute members should not, however, alter the REB membership composition. Substitute members should have the appropriate knowledge, expertise and training to contribute to the research ethics review process.

Ad Hoc Members – From time to time, the REB may find it necessary to consult with ad hoc advisors in the event that it lacks the specific expertise or knowledge to review the ethical acceptability of a research proposal competently. In each case, the responsibility for appointing these ad hoc members will rest with the Chair. Such ad hoc members will not be counted in the quorum of the REB nor be voting members of the REB. Their input as consultation may or may not be considered in the REB’s final decision. If similar ad hoc members be regularly required, the membership of the REB should be modified to ensure appropriate expertise on the REB.

Research ethics administration should maintain general records related to REB membership and qualification of members (e.g. copies of curriculum vitae, participation in relevant research ethics training).

*REB Chair* – is responsible for ensuring that the REB review process conforms to the requirements of the TCPS2. The Chair provides overall leadership for the REB and to facilitate the REB review process, based on institutional policies and procedures and the TCPS. The Chair should monitor the REB's decisions for consistency and ensure that these decisions are recorded accurately and communicated clearly to researchers in writing as soon as possible by the Chair or his or her designate. Fleming shall provide the necessary resources and adequate administrative support to enable the REB chair to fulfill his or her responsibilities.

### 8.3 Quorum

~~The quorum shall consist of 50% of duly appointed members of the REB, but decisions are only adopted if the attending members possess the range of background and expertise stipulated in 8.2, above, and Article 1.3 of TCPS. Normally consensus will be sought; when required, decision will be by majority vote of the appointed members.~~ Quorum rules must meet the minimum requirements of membership. As long as Fleming's REB is minimally constituted and whereby individual members contribute a single critical attribute of REB membership then quorum is full attendance. To maintain quorum when REB members are geographically dispersed or in unexpected circumstances input from member(s) is allowed by other means, such as the use of technology e.g. videoconferencing, teleconferencing. Use of such technologies requires the Chair to ensure active participation of members not physically present.

### 8.4 ~~Ad Hoc Members~~

~~The REB may find it desirable, on occasion, to call on specialists to provide expert advice. In each case, the responsibility for appointing these ad hoc members will rest with the Chair. Such ad hoc members will not be voting members of the REB but may participate in the REB's deliberations.~~

### 8.4

### 8.5 Meetings

The REB members shall meet regularly at dates and times that are publicly announced in advance (preferably for the entire academic year) to discharge their responsibilities and will normally meet face to face to review proposed research that is not assigned to delegated review. Normally, the REB meets monthly, however this may not be required at certain times of year (July and August). Regularly scheduled REB meetings may be canceled if no protocols have been received by the submission deadlines.

### 8.5 On-going Training

Fleming will provide REB members (including community members) with the necessary training opportunities to effectively review the ethical issues raised by research proposals that fall within the mandate of their REB. This includes training opportunities for all members in core principles and understanding of the TCPS, basic ethics standards, Fleming's policy, and legal or regulatory requirements. This training should be tailored to the types and complexities of the research the REB reviews and should be offered both upon the appointment of new members, and periodically throughout a member's tenure.

## PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEW OF A RESEARCH PROPOSAL

### 1. **Submission**

While it is not essential for the REB to review a research proposal before it is submitted to a funding agency, it is expected that the review process will be in-process at the time of funding application. REB approval however must be obtained before the research begins. Visiting researchers should contact the chair of the Fleming College Research Ethics Board well in advance of the anticipated start date of research. Submissions for review should be submitted to the REB using the appropriate

forms and by following the instructions on that form. Prospective applicants may approach the REB chair or any REB member for assistance in selecting the appropriate forms for submission.

## **2. Scholarly Review**

- 2.1 In case of research proposals that present more than minimal risk, the design of the project must be peer reviewed to assure that it is capable of addressing the question(s) being asked in the research. Sufficient peer review may be considered to be any one of the following:
- Successful approval by the REB (if research is in the REB's field of expertise).
  - Successful funding of grant proposal by a funding agency.
  - Ad hoc independent external review reporting directly to the REB.
- 2.2 The extent of the review required for biomedical research that does not involve more than minimal risk will vary according to the research being carried out.
- 2.3 Research in the humanities and the social sciences, which poses, at most, minimal risk shall not normally be required by the REB to be peer reviewed. The REB will undertake review of qualitative research studies in accordance with the TCPS2; in particular its particular aspects such as emergent research design, planned disclosure of participants' identities, absence of signed consents or exceptions to consents, and initial exploratory phases (though not pilot studies).
- 2.4 Certain types of research, particularly in the social sciences and the humanities, may legitimately have a negative effect on public figures in politics, business, labour, the arts or other walks of life, or on organizations. Such research should not be blocked through the use of harms/benefits analysis or because of the potentially negative nature of the findings. The safeguard for those in the public arena is through public debate and discourse and, in extremis, through action in the courts for libel.
- 2.5 Critical Inquiry – Permission is not required from an organization in order to conduct research on that organization. If a researcher engages the participation of members of an organization without the organization's permission, the researcher shall inform participants of any foreseeable risk that may be posed by their participation.

## **3. Principle of Proportionate Review**

The REB will use a proportionate approach based on the general principle that the more invasive the procedures involved in the research, the more diligent the assessment of the perceived risks inherent in the study procedures must be. The REB will continue to be responsible for the ethics of all research involving humans within its mandate and jurisdiction regardless of the review strategy. The REB will tailor its level of scrutiny to the level of risk presented by the research, and assesses the ethical acceptability of the research through consideration of the foreseeable risks, the potential benefits and the ethical implications of the research, both at the stage of the initial review and throughout the life of the project (continuing ethics review).

## **4. Normal Review Process**

- 4.1 The REB shall normally meet face to face in order to review submitted research proposals. In case of controversial research proposals, the REB may meet face to face with researchers in order to consider the ethical solutions proposed by researchers for problems arising in their studies.
- 4.2 The REB shall accommodate reasonable requests from researchers to participate in discussions about their proposals, but not be present when the REB is making its decision.

- 4.3 Minutes will be kept for these meetings and inserted into the appropriate case files. Meeting minutes ~~will~~ shall clearly document the REB's decisions, and any dissents of the REB and the reasons for them. REB decisions should be supported by clear references (e.g. date of decision, title of project), documentary basis for decision (i.e. 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 approval. Providing reasons for REB decisions is optional when ethics approval is granted.
- 4.4 The REB shall keep an "open file" in a secure location determined by the Chair of the REB, for researchers applying for ethical approval. The file shall be opened by the Chair when sufficient information has been submitted by the researcher to start the review process. The original application, descriptions of research and methodology, correspondence, relevant documents, ethical certificates, revised materials, and any comments from the public or other information relevant to the research project shall be kept in the file.
- 4.5 It is the responsibility of the researcher to address all the recommendations made by the REB and keep the file complete and up-to-date at all times. When the research project is finished, and the researcher(s) notifies the REB, these files shall be "closed" and kept for a period of at least five years by the REB as records demonstrating compliance with the TCPS. The files remain the property of Fleming College and cannot be removed from their secure location by the researchers. These files shall be subject to audit by authorized representatives of Fleming College (research administrators), members of Appeal Boards, and funding agencies. The REB file on applications for ethical review should contain the following documents:
- Application form;
  - Trial protocol and amendments;
  - Written informed consent forms and any updates;
  - Subject recruitment procedures (e.g. advertisements);
  - Investigator's brochure (if one exists);
  - Available safety information;
  - Information about payments and compensation available to subjects;
  - Investigator's current curriculum vitae and/or other document on qualifications;
  - Any other documents that the REB may need to fulfill its responsibilities.

All research receiving ethical approval, ~~whether through the normal or expedited process~~ following a full or delegated review, as well as that receiving departmental level review shall require a proper file showing compliance with the TCPS. Insufficient information in the file is grounds for refusing or delaying ethical approval.

## 5. Expedited Delegated Review

Expedited Delegated review does not require face-to-face meetings of the REB members. The researcher must choose to apply for expedited delegated or full review and the REB Chair may reject any application for expedited delegated review and refer it to the REB for full review. The Chair must report requests for expedited delegated review and results of such reviews to other members of the REB at an appropriate time. Expedited Delegated review is review by two members (the Chair may be one of these) rather than the full REB. It is available only in cases, which fulfill one of the following criteria:

- Research which obviously involves no more than minimal risk (~~as defined in the TCPS: "if potential subjects can reasonably be expected to regard the probability and magnitude of possible harms implied by participation in the research to be no greater than those encountered by the subject in those aspects of his or her everyday life that relate to the research, then the research can be regarded as within the range of minimal risk"~~). Given the heterogeneous nature of subjects, a "reasonable person's" definition of "minimal risk" as is



~~often employed in the courts concerning subjective harms will also be acceptable to the REB. The researcher is responsible for an acknowledgement of minimal risk to the REB.~~

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

## 6. Division/Departmental Level Review

This policy requires that all research involving human subjects must be submitted to the REB. If, however, a study is a teaching exercise (i.e. part of a diploma or undergraduate degree level course) and entailing no more than minimal risk, it must be reviewed by a divisional/departmental level committee on behalf of the REB and in compliance with the TCPS. The Departmental ethics committee must report results of such reviews to the REB at the end of the academic year.

Student research deemed to be beyond minimal risk must be reviewed by the REB. Department level review should not be used to review research undertaken by a student as part of a faculty member's research program.

## 7. Review of Multi-Centered Research

~~It is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that multi-centered research is reviewed by all institutions where the research is undertaken. To facilitate the review of multi-centered research protocols, the REB may share documents and findings with REBs at other institutions. The REB may also review the documents and findings of REBs of other institutions as part of its ethics review process.~~ Contemporary research often involves collaborative partnerships among researchers from multiple institutions or countries. It may call upon the participation of a number of local populations and involve multiple institutions and/or multiple research ethics boards (REBs).

### 7.1 Review Mechanisms for Research Involving Multiple Institutions and/or Multiple REBs.

This refers to ethics review mechanisms for research involving multiple institutions and/or multiple REBs. It is not intended to apply to ethics review mechanisms for research involving multiple REBs within the jurisdiction or under the auspices of a single institution.

Fleming's REB, with permission from the President, may approve alternative review models for research involving multiple REBs and/or institutions, in accordance with the TCPS2. REB review models may include 1) Independent Ethics Review by Several REBs, 2) Research Ethics Review Delegated to an External, Specialized or Multi-Institutional REB, and 3) Reciprocal REB review. The institution remains responsible for the ethical acceptability and ethical conduct of research undertaken within its jurisdiction or under its auspices irrespective of where the research is conducted.

### 7.2 Ethics of Research Conducted Outside the Institution

Where research conducted under the auspices of Fleming and performed in whole or in part outside of Canada has been approved under the REB review model involving multiple institutions and/or REBs consistent with the TCPS, the terms of that model apply.

The information to be provided to the researcher's home REB will be determined by the provisions of the research ethics review model. When conducting research outside the jurisdiction of their home institution whether at a site abroad, or in Canada, researchers shall provide their home REBs with:

- The relevant information about the rules governing research involving humans and the ethics review requirements at the research site, where any exist;
- The names and contact information for the relevant REBs or comparable ethics bodies, if known, that will review the proposal at the research site; and,

- Relevant information about the target populations and circumstances that might have a bearing on the research ethics review by the researcher' home REB.

## ~~8. Review of Research in Other Jurisdictions or Countries~~

~~Research performed in another jurisdiction or country shall undergo ethics review by the REB and, where such exists, the equivalent REB in the country or jurisdiction where the research is to be conducted.~~

### 8.

#### 9. Continuing Ethics Review

The REB's approval of a research project covers only the procedures outlined by the applicant in his/her original application. Any changes in the procedures affecting interaction with human subjects should be reported to the REB. Significant changes will require the submission of a revised application for Ethics approval. The rigor of continuing ethics review will be subject to the appropriate review process as determined by the principle of proportionate review outlined in Section 3 of the Procedural Guidelines for the Review of a Research Proposal.

### 8.1

9.4 Ongoing research shall be subject to continuing ethics **review throughout the life of the project.** The Chair of the REB must be promptly notified of any substantial change to the research plan or research protocol. Researchers will be asked to include monitoring mechanisms by which the public participating in the research may contact the Chair of the REB. Problems or complaints will be taken seriously by the REB and researchers may be asked to modify their studies in view of such complaints.

### 8.2

9.2 All protocol approvals are for a maximum of one year and may be renewed by submission of an annual report prior to the anniversary date of the original protocol approval. Such reports should clearly indicate the status of data collection and, if there will be changes to the protocol that was approved, specify in detail the nature of any changes that are required. If no substantial change has been made to the research plan or research protocol, the Chair of the REB may issue a one-year renewal. If, in the opinion of the REB Chair, the research plan or research protocol has been substantially changed, re-submission and review by the REB is required. Protocol submissions for data collection for a period less than one year lapse at the end of the time specified.

### 8.3

9.3 The researcher shall promptly notify the REB when the project concludes.

### 9.

#### ~~10. Conflict of Interest~~

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 declare their interest and remain neutral or not be present while the REB is discussing or making its decision. In cases of disagreement over conflicts of interest, both the REB member in potential conflict and the researcher may present evidence and offer a rebuttal concerning the nature of the conflict of interest. The other members of the REB will make a final decision regarding the conflict and how to proceed.

### 10.

#### 11. Decisions of the REB

After review by a REB, the protocol submission may be:

- Approved as submitted;
- Approved with suggestions for minor changes;
- Approved with conditions (that must be met before final approval is granted);
- Deferred, pending receipt of additional information or major revisions;



- Not approved.

#### 10.1

41.4 The REB shall notify each researcher in writing of its decision regarding his/her proposed research activity. Normally the researcher will accept the proposed modification or offer a counter-proposal to the Chair of the REB. This exchange is concluded normally when an ethically acceptable form for the research is agreed upon. To facilitate the continuing processing of such research ethics protocols between meetings, the REB should specify conditions that should be met to enable the Chair to review and grant approval on behalf of the REB.

#### 10.2

41.2 Researchers have the right to request, and REBs have an obligation to provide, reconsideration of decisions affecting a research project.

#### 10.3

41.3 If the REB does not approve a research activity for ethical reasons, the notification shall include a statement of the reasons for its decision, and the researcher shall be given an opportunity to respond in writing or in person. The Chair will make himself or herself available to the applicant on a reasonable basis to endeavor to develop a proposal that will meet the ethical standards required by the REB. The REB may, at its discretion, review and reconsider its decision to not approve the research activity.

#### 10.4

41.4 In the case of ongoing research, the REB has the authority to terminate research that deviates from an approved research protocol and as a result no longer complies with the criteria set forth in these policies or the TCPS.

### 11.

#### 12. Appeal

Researchers must apply in writing to the President of Fleming College to appeal a negative REB **decision based on substance or process**. Appeals must be in writing and a copy of the appeal letter should also be sent to the REB Chair. Fleming College shall use a duly constituted Appeal Committee to review decisions of the REB. The Appeal Committee will be appointed by the President and consist of at least five members, none of whom is a member of the REB. Appeal committees shall have the same constitution as the REB. ~~The Appeal Committee shall consist of both men and women, of whom:~~

- ~~• At least two members have expertise in the area of research covered by the Appeal Committee;~~
- ~~• At least one member is knowledgeable in the area of ethics;~~
- ~~• In the case of biomedical research, at least one member must be knowledgeable in the area of biomedical research law;~~
- ~~• At least one community member with no affiliation to the institution;~~
- ~~• At least one member whose primary area of interest is in a nonscientific area.~~

Non-compliance with the substance of the TCPS is a reason for refusing to grant an appeal. Appeals may be granted only on procedural grounds or when there is a significant disagreement over an interpretation of the TCPS. The decision of the Appeal Committee shall be binding.

### 12.

#### 13. Reports of Research Ethic Board Committee Decisions

An annual activity report from the REB will be submitted to the President of Fleming College, the Executive Leaders Team, and the Academic Leaders Team.

### 13.

#### 14. Adverse Events Reports

Normally it is anticipated that research will proceed with little (or no) special costs or harm to **subjects participants**, beyond those noted in the protocol. However, unanticipated negative reactions by

subjects or other unexpected events may occur. Researchers are obliged to immediately report, in writing, any known serious adverse event to the REB.

## 14.

### 15. Administration

#### 14.1

#### 15.4 Administrative Support

The work involved in the ethical review process should be distributed appropriately among faculty members, staff, researchers, and administrators. Fleming will provide administrative support to the REB including:

- Distribution of forms and materials necessary for submission of research proposals to the REB;
- Collection of submissions and distribution of submissions to REB members;
- Keeping minutes of REB meetings;
- Storing submissions and related materials in a secure location;
- Supporting the REB in its educational activities;
- Acting as the point of contact for the Tri-Council Advisory Group;
- Other duties related to the support of the REB in carrying out its mandate.

Deans will provide significant support to the REB, with respect to:

- Ensuring that research projects requiring ethical review are submitted to the REB;
- Advising their faculty members about the need to comply with the TCPS.

Individual departments are expected to support and train students so that their research projects are ethical and those that exceed minimal risk may be efficiently reviewed by the REB. Departments should screen student applications for ethical review prior to submission to the REB where such review is required. The REB may return applications to the department if they do not conform to the requirements of the TCPS.

#### 14.2

#### 15.2 College Support

Fleming College supports the administrative processes and educational activities required by the REB so that the College as a whole remains in compliance with TCPS.

#### 14.3

#### 15.3 Reporting of Non-Compliance

The REB role is limited to reporting cases of failure to comply with the provisions of the TCPS and Fleming College research policies to the President.

#### 14.4

#### 15.4 Interpretation

Questions of interpretation or application of this policy or its procedures shall be referred to the President or designate whose decision shall be final.

## 15.

### 16. Forms

Ethical Guidelines and the required forms for submission to the REB will be made available from the secretary **administrative assistant** to the REB.

# SIR SANDFORD FLEMING COLLEGE

## POLICY MANUAL

<b>POLICY NO:</b> 2-216 <b>APPROVED:</b> June 25, 2008 #4 <b>Revised:</b> September 23, 2009 #3 <b>Revised:</b> April 25, 2012	<b>APPROVED BY:</b> Board of Governors <b>SUPERCEDES:</b>
<b>ETHICAL CONDUCT FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMANS</b>	

**EFFECTIVE May 2012.**

This document constitutes Fleming's policy and procedures for the review of ethical considerations arising from research involving humans.

The *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS or the Policy) is a joint policy of Canada's three federal research agencies—the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), or “the Agencies”. The people of Canada, through Acts of Parliament, have created and funded the Agencies to promote and assist research within their respective legislative mandates. In discharging their mandates, the Agencies wish to promote research that is conducted according to the highest ethical standards. The Agencies have therefore adopted this Policy as a benchmark for the ethical conduct of research. As a condition of funding, the Agencies require that researchers and their institutions apply the ethical principles and the articles of this Policy and be guided by the application sections of the articles. Indeed, to be eligible to receive and administer research funds from the Agencies, institutions must agree to comply with a number of Agency policies set out as schedules to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Agencies and institutions. Institutions must therefore ensure that research conducted under their auspices adhere to this Policy. Researchers are expected, as a condition of funding, to adhere to the TCPS. Institutions should support their efforts to do so.

The Ethics Framework of the TCPS acknowledges that research can benefit human society and that researchers must have academic freedom in order to maximize such benefits. At the same time, with academic freedom comes responsibility, including the responsibility to ensure that research involving humans meets high scientific and ethical standards that respect and protect the participants. Thus, respect for human dignity has been an underlying value of the TCPS and is expressed through the core principles of respect for persons, concern for welfare and justice. These core principles are considered the compass to navigate the course between the importance of research and its ethical conduct. The Policy is applied through a proportionate approach to REB review. The TCPS aims to assist those who use it, including REBs, to identify ethical issues in the design, conduct and oversight of research and to point the way to arriving at reasoned and ethical responses to those issues.

Fleming, the institution and its researchers, adheres to the TCPS; subsequent to the 2010 revisions to the Policy, Fleming College has undertaken to revise its research ethics policy to ensure compliance. This document endeavors to operationalize this compliance.

## DEFINITIONS

TCPS2 contains a Glossary intended to assist in the understanding of its revised Policy Statement. The following definitions have been selected from this Glossary to highlight changes in terminology from the original TCPS (1998) to its revision (2010) and for their particular salience to Fleming's research ethics policy. This abbreviated list of definitions does not intend to replace the complete Glossary.

**Research** – An undertaking intended to extend knowledge through a disciplined inquiry or systematic investigation.

**Participant** – An individual whose data, or response to interventions, stimuli, or questions by a researcher are relevant to answering a research question; also referred to as “human participant,” and in other policies/guidance as “subject” or “research subject.”

A **research ethics protocol** is a document submitted by the applicant for consideration by the Research Ethics Board (REB). This document contains a detailed description of the rationale/purpose of the study, procedures to be followed in soliciting participants for the research, obtaining their informed consent when possible, collecting their information or data, protecting their privacy or anonymity, and providing feedback regarding the study at its conclusion.

**Minimal risk research** – 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 the aspects of their everyday life that relate to the research.

**Harm** – Anything that has a negative effect on participants' welfare, broadly construed. The nature of the harm may be social, behavioral, psychological, physical or economic.

**Research Ethics Board (REB)** – A body of researchers, community members, and others with specific expertise (e.g. in ethics, in relevant research disciplines) established by an institution to review the ethical acceptability of all research involving humans conducted within the institution's jurisdiction or under its auspices.

**Proportionate approach to research ethics review** – The assessment of foreseeable risk to determine the level of scrutiny a research proposal will receive (i.e. delegated review for minimal risk research or full REB review for research above minimal risk), as well as the consideration of foreseeable risks, potential benefits, and ethical implications of the research in the context of initial and continuing review.

**Delegated research ethics board (REB) review** – The level of REB review assigned to minimal risk research projects. Delegated reviewers are selected from among the REB membership, with the exception of the ethics review of student course-based research which can be reviewed by delegates from the student's department, faculty, or an equivalent level.

**Full research ethics board (REB) review** – The level of REB review assigned to above minimal risk research projects. Conducted by the full membership of the research ethics board, it is the default requirement for the ethics review of research involving humans.

**Reciprocal research ethics board (REB) review** – An official agreement between two or more institutions, in which they accept, with an agreed level of oversight, the research ethics reviews of each other's REBs.

## FLEMING RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW POLICY

The President of Fleming College establishes the REB, defines the appropriate reporting relationship with the REB and ensures the REB is provided with necessary and sufficient ongoing financial and administrative resources to fulfill their duties. The latter include storage space for research data as well as the establishment of appropriate institutional security safeguards to protect privacy of data for the life cycle of information.

Fleming's Research Ethics Board (REB) shall be the sole Research Ethics Board of the College and shall apply the principles and articles set out in the TCPS "*Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*" according to the procedures described in this Fleming document. These procedures may be varied to accommodate future approved amendments to the Tri-Council Policy.

Fleming grants 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. Fleming's REB is independent in its decision making and is accountable to the President for the process of research ethics review. Fleming College shall respect the authority delegated to the REB. Fleming cannot override an REB decision to reject a research proposal but may appeal a decision.

All research projects involving humans undertaken by members of, or conducted at Fleming College - including all faculty, staff and students, including students carrying out research as part of class assignments - shall fall within the jurisdiction of Fleming College's Research Ethics Review Board (REB), irrespective of the source of financial support (if any) and irrespective of the location of the project, in the latter case, so long as the investigator represents the work as Fleming research. Projects conducted by researchers from outside the Fleming College community who access College resources (either equipment or personnel) will also fall within the jurisdiction of the Fleming College REB.

### 1. Requirement for Ethics Review

Except for the exemptions that follow, all research projects involving conducted at, in collaboration with or under the auspices of Fleming College require prior ethics review and approval by the Research Ethics Board (REB). This requirement of prior ethics review and approval applies to:

- 1.1. All research involving living human participants conducted by the College's academic staff, administrative and support staff, or students, persons with adjunct appointments, visiting instructors, visiting professional associates, and research associates.
- 1.2. All research carried out on College premises or using College facilities, equipment or human, financial or material resources;
- 1.3. Research conducted elsewhere under the auspices of the College;
- 1.4. The research activities of formally affiliated organizations as a condition of affiliation; and
- 1.5. The research activities of organizations or individuals (whether formally affiliated or not) while on College premises or using College facilities, equipment or resources, including off-campus sites. When research takes place in a foreign country, the researcher must also assure that his/her procedures meet all legal requirements of that country, as well as the requirements of this policy.
- 1.6. All types of research involving humans. Specifically, prior ethics review and approval is required when research data are derived from, but not exclusively restricted to:

- Information collected through intervention or interaction with a living individual(s);
- Identifiable private information about individuals;
- Information collected through naturalistic observation of humans, except as stipulated below.
- Human organs, remains, tissues and body fluids, cadavers, embryos or fetuses; and/or
- Written or recorded information derived from individually identifiable humans.

1.7. In addition, ethics review is required for the following categories of research that may be overlooked or raise questions about the necessity for such a review:

- Pilot studies and feasibility studies, even those involving only one human participant, require the same scrutiny as full-scale research projects involving many human participants.
- Projects that involve the secondary use of data on human participants gathered in earlier projects.
- Research conducted by administrative and academic units that involves the collection of survey replies or the use of records as correlates of survey replies from humans (e.g. students, staff and/or faculty members).
- Research projects in which the researcher is a consultant unless the researcher has a strict consulting relationship in which all of the following are true: (a) the researcher is hired on his or her own time; (b) the researcher holds no rights in the work; and (c) neither the researcher nor the College retains any data. If any one of these three criteria is not met, prior ethics review and approval is required.
- All independent student research projects conducted in partial fulfillment of certificate/diploma/degree requirements. Research projects conducted as part of formal course requirements may, in certain instances require REB review and approval. It is incumbent on the instructor to check the applicability of this requirement with the REB Chair.

## **2. Research Excluded**

Some research is exempt from REB review where protections are available by other means. The policy allows the following exemptions from the requirement for REB review, as follows:

2.1 Research that relies exclusively on publicly available information does not require REB review when:

- (a) the information is legally accessible to the public and appropriately protected by law, e.g. any existing stored documentary material, records or publications, which may or may not include identifiable information such as death registries, publicly available archives; or
- (b) the information is publicly accessible and there is no reasonable expectation of privacy, e.g. identifiable information disseminated in the public domain through print or electronic publications; film, audio or digital recordings; press accounts; artistic installations. In addition, research that is non-intrusive and does not involve direct interaction between the researcher and individuals through the Internet, also does not require REB review e.g. cyber-material to which the public is given uncontrolled access on the Internet for which there is no expectation of privacy is considered to be publicly available information.

2.2. Archival analysis of records by College departments normally engaged in the collection, maintenance, and analysis of such records. Nevertheless, it is incumbent on such units to ensure that the anonymity of individuals and confidentiality of their records are maintained. (If individuals to whom the information refers have reasonable expectations of privacy then REB review is required.)

2.3 REB review is not required for research involving the observation of people in public places where:



- (a) it does not involve any intervention staged by the researcher, or direct interaction with the individuals or groups;
  - (b) individuals or groups targeted for observation have no reasonable expectation of privacy; and
  - (c) any dissemination of research results does not allow identification of specific individuals
- 2.4. Class research projects which involve human subjects and which are conducted by students on other members of the class as exercises to learn how to conduct research.
- 2.5. Quality assurance and quality improvement studies, program evaluation activities (such as evaluations of courses or training programs that are designed to provide feedback), and performance reviews, or testing within normal educational requirements when used exclusively for assessment, management or improvement purposes, do not constitute research and do not fall within the scope of REB review.
- 2.6. Preliminary, informal interviews or casual conversations that are carried out to help clarify the design of a research project.
- 2.7. Information gathering procedures in support of the general administration of the College where the primary purpose(s) are:
- To diagnose problems, identify appropriate solutions, provide advice for operation management, or assess performance.
  - To collect data primarily designed to affect the operations of the College through affirming satisfaction with the status quo or leading to quality improvements.
- Note: Most administrative information gathering procedures and practices are not conducted in the context of research or embedded in a research framework. Rather they are conducted for purpose of assessing choices, ascertaining satisfaction of clients, identifying service enhancements or for similar quality objectives. All such projects must also be done in accordance with the highest research ethical practices. However, in those cases where information gathering through such vehicles as surveys or interviews conducted by administration have a clear research direction, are on sensitive topics, are collected from vulnerable populations or where there may be an issue with the confidentiality of individual responses, REB review would be required.
- 2.8. Research undertaken as a teaching exercise and entailing minimal risk shall be reviewed by school or department level committee on behalf of the REB.
- 2.9. Creative practice activities, in and of themselves, do not require REB review. However, research that employs creative practice to obtain responses from participants that will be analyzed to answer a research question is subject to REB review.

### **3. Uncertainty About the Need for REB Review**

For research/scholarly work where the researcher is uncertain whether REB review is required, it is the responsibility of the researcher to obtain the written opinion of the Chair of the REB as to whether the research should be subjected to prior ethics review and approval.

### **4. Academic Freedom**

Academic freedom is “The collective freedom of faculty and students to conduct research, and to disseminate ideas or facts without religious, political, or institutional restrictions. It includes freedom of inquiry, freedom to challenge conventional thought, freedom to express one’s opinion about the institution, its administration or the system in which one works, and the freedom from institutional censorship” (TCPS2, p. 189). Thus, all REBs and all persons involved in the ethics review process

shall act in such a manner as to ensure that there is no infringement of the academic freedom of researchers.

## **5. Compliance**

The College requires all faculty members, staff and students, as well as external researchers conducting research at the College, to adhere to this policy and the procedures that are derived from it. The College considers the improper treatment of in research to be a serious offence, subject to severe penalties, including but not limited to the withdrawal of privileges to conduct research involving humans, or disciplinary action.

## **6. Responsibilities of Researchers**

Whenever research involving humans is to be performed under the auspices of Fleming College or by any College researcher, the researcher is responsible for meeting the following requirements:

- 6.1 Ensuring that the proposed research is both ethically acceptable and, where appropriate, adheres to relevant disciplinary scholarly standards. Researchers have a role to play in demonstrating to the REB whether, when and how appropriate scholarly review has been or will be undertaken for their research. Researchers ought be prepared to provide the REB with the full documentation of scholarly reviews already completed.
- 6.2. Reading and becoming thoroughly familiar with applicable ethical guidelines.
- 6.3. Determining if the proposed research requires ethics review. If there is any uncertainty about whether the research requires ethics review and approval, the researcher shall consult the Chair of the REB for advice. Following initial REB approval, research ethics review shall continue throughout the life of the project. Continuing ethics review by an REB provides those involved in the research process (in particular, researchers and REBS) with multiple opportunities to reflect on the ethical issues surrounding the research.
- 6.4. Notifying the REB of the proposed research by submitting a completed Research Ethics Protocol Involving Humans accompanied by any supplementary materials necessary for full ethics review, and providing any additional information requested by the REB in a timely fashion.
- 6.5. Not commencing research involving human participants in the proposed research until the REB has informed him/her of approval of the proposed research.
- 6.6. Abiding by all decisions of the REB, including following all modifications required for REB approval and not undertaking the research if it has not been approved.
- 6.7. Obtaining free and informed consent from all prospective participants as outlined in section 7 of this policy and document this consent regardless of participants' signatures. Maintain ongoing informed consent. Ensure participants understand they may withdraw consent at any time during the research. Their data will be withdrawn when possible. There are exceptions to the obtainment of informed consent e.g. research involving observation in a natural environments or virtual settings where people have a reasonable or limited expectation of privacy. In this case the researcher shall explain the need for an exception to the general requirement for consent.
- 6.8 Researchers shall safeguard information entrusted to them and not misuse or wrongfully disclose it. Fleming shall support their researchers in maintaining promises of confidentiality. Researchers shall describe measures for meeting confidentiality obligations and explain any reasonable foreseeable disclosure requirements in their application materials they submit to the REB and during the consent process with prospective participants. Maintaining the

confidentiality of data obtained from subjects in the manner required by the REB and relevant organizations.

- 6.9. Promptly reporting to the Chair of the REB in a timely manner any unanticipated issues that arise that may increase the level of risk or have other ethical implications. Researchers shall also submit to the REB in a timely manner requests for changes to their approved research.
- 6.10 Researchers have an obligation to disclose to the participants any material incidental findings discovered in the course of research. Incidental findings are findings that have been interpreted as having significant welfare implications for the participants, whether health-related, psychological or social. If in the course of research, material incidental findings are discovered, researchers have an obligation to inform the participants.
- 6.11 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 the exclusion. In addition, individuals or groups whose circumstances may make them vulnerable in the context of research should not be inappropriately included or excluded from participation in research on the basis of their circumstances.
- 6.12 Researchers should consider ways to ensure the equitable distribution of any benefits of participation in research.
- 6.13 Promptly reporting to the Chair of the REB any serious or continuing non-compliance with the requirements of this policy or of the procedures stipulated by an REB by any individual associated with the research.
- 6.14 Researchers have the right to request an appeal of an REB decision. An appeal can be launched for procedural or substantive reasons. The onus is on the researchers to justify the grounds on which they request an appeal and to indicate any breaches to the research ethics review process or any elements of the REB decision that are not supported by this Policy.
- 6.15 Qualitative Research Proposals
  - 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, or access to data. REB review is not required for the initial exploratory phase intended to discuss the feasibility of the research, establish research partnerships, or the design of a research proposal.
  - Researchers shall explain in their research design the proposed procedures for seeking consent and the strategies they plan to use for documenting consent.
  - In research involving observation in natural environments or virtual settings where people have a reasonable or limited expectation of privacy, the researcher shall explain the need for an exception to the general requirement for consent.
  - If researchers plan to disclose the identity of participants, researchers shall discuss with prospective participants whether they wish to have their identity disclosed in publications or other means of dissemination. Where participants consent to have their identity disclosed, researchers shall record each participant's consent.
  - In studies using emergent design in data collection, researchers shall provide the REB with all the available information to assist in the review and approval of the general procedure for data collection.

## **7. Free and Informed Consent of Subjects**

- 7.1. Consent shall be voluntary. The researcher is responsible for obtaining free and informed consent from all prospective human participants, or authorized third parties, prior to commencing research activities. Free and informed consent is ongoing throughout participation in the research. Incentives are neither recommended nor discouraged by the TCPS2. Incentives ought not be so large or attractive as to encourage reckless disregard of risks. Similarly, the offer of incentives in some contexts may be perceived by prospective participants as a way for them to gain favour or improve their situation. This may amount to undue inducement and thus negate the voluntariness of participants' consent.
- 7.1.1 Free and informed consent must be given voluntarily, without undue influence or coercion. Consent can be withdrawn at any time. If a participant withdraws consent, the participant can also request the withdrawal of their data or human biological materials.
- 7.2. Evidence of consent shall be contained either in a signed consent form or in documentation by the researcher of another appropriate means of consent.
- 7.3. The REB may approve a consent procedure that differs from that outlined in 7.1 and 7.2 if the REB finds that:
- The research involves no more than minimal risk to the participants;
  - The alteration or waiver of the consent procedure is unlikely to adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects;
  - The research could not practicably be carried out without the alteration or waiver of the consent procedure;
  - 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;
  - The alteration or waiver of consent does not involve a therapeutic intervention.
- 7.4. Researchers shall provide prospective participants or authorized third parties with full disclosure of all information necessary for making an informed decision to participate in a research project:
- Information that the individual is being invited to participate in a research project and against which criteria subjects are being selected;
  - A statement of the research purpose, identity of the researcher, the expected duration and nature of participation and a description of the research procedures and an explanation of the responsibilities of the participant;
  - A plain language description of all reasonably foreseeable harms and potential benefits that may arise from research participation;
  - An assurance that prospective subjects are under no obligation to participate and have the right to withdraw at any time without prejudice to pre-existing entitlements; and
  - The possibility of commercialization of the research findings, and the presence of any apparent or actual or potential conflict of interest on the part of researchers, their institutions or sponsors.
  - The measures to be undertaken for dissemination of research results and whether participants will be identified directly or indirectly;
  - The identity and contact information of a qualified designated representative who can explain scientific or scholarly aspects of the research to participants;
  - The identity and contact information of the appropriate individual(s) outside the research team whom participants may contact regarding possible ethical issues in the research;
  - An indication of what information will be collected about participants and for what purposes; an indication of who will have access to information collected about the identity of participants a description of how confidentiality will be protected, a description of the anticipated uses of

data; and information indicating who may have a duty to disclose information collected, and to whom such disclosures could be made.

For consent to be informed prospective participants shall be given adequate time and opportunity to assimilate the information provided pose any questions they may have and discuss and consider whether they will participate. The time required for this initial phase of the consent process will depend on such factors as the magnitude and probability of harms, the complexity of the information conveyed, and the setting where the information is given.

7.5 Capacity—refers to the ability of prospective or actual participants to understand relevant information presented about a research project, and to appreciate the potential consequences of their decision to participate or not participate. This ability may vary according to the complexity of the choice being made, the circumstances surrounding the decision, or the point in time at which consent is sought. The determination of capacity to participate in research, then, is not a static determination. Assessing capacity is a question of determining, at a particular point in time, whether a participant (or prospective participant) sufficiently understands the nature of a particular research project, and the risks, consequences and potential benefits associated with it.

7.5.1 For research involving individuals who lack the capacity, either permanently or temporarily, to decide for themselves whether to participate, the REB shall ensure that, as a minimum, individuals who are not legally competent shall only be asked to become research subjects when:

- The research question can only be addressed using individuals within the identified group(s);
- Free and informed consent will be sought from their authorized representative(s); and
- The research does not expose them to more than minimal risks without the potential for direct benefits for them.

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

- the researcher involves participants who lack the capacity to consent on their own behalf 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 interests of the persons concerned
- The authorized third party is not be the researcher or any other member of the research team. The continued free and informed consent of an appropriately authorized third party will be required to continue the participation of a legally incompetent subject in research, so long as the subject remains incompetent.
- When authorization for participation was granted by an authorized third party, and a participant acquires or regains capacity during the course of the research, the researcher shall promptly seek the participant's consent as a condition of continuing participation;
- 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 the potential for 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 participation in research.



## 7.6 Research Ethics during Emergencies

7.6.1 *Publicly Declared Emergencies* – This section addresses research ethics review within the context of the official declaration of public emergencies. Fleming, in collaboration with their researchers and REB should develop preparedness plans for emergency research ethics review. Research ethics review during publicly declared emergencies may follow modified procedures and practices.

7.6.2 *Emergency Health Situations* – Research involving emergency health situations shall be conducted only if it addresses the emergency needs of individuals involved, and then only in accordance with criteria established in advance of the research by the REB. The REB may allow research that involves health emergencies to be carried out without the free and informed consent of the participant (or prospective participant) or of his or her authorized third party if ALL of the following apply:

- A serious threat to the prospective participant requires immediate intervention; and
- Either no standard efficacious care exists or the research offers a real possibility of direct benefit to the subject in comparison with standard care; and
- Either the risk of harm is not greater than that involved in standard efficacious care, or it is not clearly justified by the direct benefits to the subject; and
- The prospective participant is unconscious or lacks capacity to understand risks, methods and purposes of the research; and
- Third-party authorization cannot be secured in sufficient time, despite diligent and documented efforts to do so; and
- No relevant prior directive by the participant is known to exist.

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

## 8. **Governance of Research Ethics Review**

### 8.1 Responsibilities

The Fleming College Research Ethics Review Board is responsible to the President of the College for:

- 8.1.1 Developing policies regarding ethical issues relating to the use of humans in research and experimental teaching protocols;
- 8.1.2 Conducting research ethics review of all research involving humans;
- 8.1.3 Ensuring adherence of Fleming's research ethics policy with the most current version of the TCPS;
- 8.1.4 Dealing with matters concerned with research involving humans referred to the REB by the President of the College;
- 8.1.5 Preparing an annual report for submission to the President, as outlined in Section 12 of this policy;
- 8.1.6 Ensuring REB members participate in initial and ongoing training relevant to their responsibilities and duties to the REB.
- 8.1.7 Annually reviewing REB membership and overseeing nominations process and appointments and renewals of REB members.

The policies and practices adopted by the REB will be consistent with the current approved Tri-Council Policy Statement, *"Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans."*

### 8.2 Composition of the Board

*Basic REB Membership Requirements* – Fleming may establish its own terms of appointment of REB members to allow for continuity of the research ethics review process. Currently, the normal term of

office for REB members is three years, with no more than one-third being replaced each year; shorter or longer terms may be necessary from time to time. Members may not serve more than six consecutive years, but are eligible for re-appointment after an interval of one year.

*Selection of REB Members* – The selection of REB members, including the Chair, should be fair and impartial in accordance with Fleming’s written policy that defines the process of appointing REB members. In appointing and renewing REB members, institutions should arrange the terms of members and their rotation to balance the need to maintain continuity with the need to ensure diversity of opinion, and the opportunity to spread knowledge and experience gained from REB membership throughout the institution and the community.

*REB Size* – Fleming may determine the size of its REB which will vary in accordance to institutional needs. In accordance with the TCPS, Fleming’s REB shall consist of *at least* five members, including both men and women, of whom:

- At least two members 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 institution’s legal counsel or risk manager). This is mandatory for biomedical research and is advisable, but not mandatory for other areas of research; and;
- At least one community member who has no affiliation with the institution. Their primary role is to reflect the perspective of the participant especially when participants are vulnerable and/or risks to participants are high;
- Research ethics administrative staff who have the requisite experience, expertise and knowledge comparable to what is expected of REB members may be appointed as non-voting members.

Ad hoc advisors may be consulted in the event that the REB lacks the specific expertise or knowledge to review the ethical acceptability of a research proposal competently.

At a minimum, it is advisable that each member be appointed to formally fulfill the requirements of only one of the above categories. Where the size of the REB exceeds the minimum requirements, additional members may fulfill more than one capacity.

To ensure the independence of REB decision making, Fleming senior administrators shall not serve on the REB nor attend meetings even as non-voting members. However, the involvement of administrative staff dedicated to research ethics functions may be relevant and appropriate to support REB procedures. In cases where research ethics administrative staff has the requisite experience, expertise and knowledge comparable to what is expected of REB members, Fleming may appoint them as non-voting members.

*Substitute membership* – Fleming will nominate substitute REB members so that the REB can continue to function when regular members are unable to attend due to illness or other unforeseen eventualities. The appointment of substitute members should not, however, alter the REB membership composition. Substitute members should have the appropriate knowledge, expertise and training to contribute to the research ethics review process.

Ad Hoc Members – From time to time, the REB may find it necessary to consult with ad hoc advisors in the event that it lacks the specific expertise or knowledge to review the ethical acceptability of a research proposal competently. In each case, the responsibility for appointing these ad hoc members will rest with the Chair. Such ad hoc members will not be counted in the quorum of the REB nor be voting members of the REB. Their input as consultation may or may not be considered in the REB's final decision. If similar ad hoc members be regularly required, the membership of the REB should be modified to ensure appropriate expertise on the REB.

Research ethics administration should maintain general records related to REB membership and qualification of members (e.g. copies of curriculum vitae, participation in relevant research ethics training).

*REB Chair* – is responsible for ensuring that the REB review process conforms to the requirements of the TCPS2. The Chair provides overall leadership for the REB and to facilitate the REB review process, based on institutional policies and procedures and the TCPS. The Chair should monitor the REB's decisions for consistency and ensure that these decisions are recorded accurately and communicated clearly to researchers in writing as soon as possible by the Chair or his or her designate. Fleming shall provide the necessary resources and adequate administrative support to enable the REB chair to fulfill his or her responsibilities.

### 8.3 Quorum

Quorum rules must meet the minimum requirements of membership. As long as Fleming's REB is minimally constituted and whereby individual members contribute a single critical attribute of REB membership then quorum is full attendance. To maintain quorum when REB members are geographically dispersed or in unexpected circumstances input from member(s) is allowed by other means, such as the use of technology e.g. videoconferencing, teleconferencing. Use of such technologies requires the Chair to ensure active participation of members not physically present.

### 8.4 Meetings

The REB members shall meet regularly at dates and times that are publicly announced in advance (preferably for the entire academic year) to discharge their responsibilities and will normally meet face to face to review proposed research that is not assigned to delegated review. Normally, the REB meets monthly, however this may not be required at certain times of year (July and August). Regularly scheduled REB meetings may be canceled if no protocols have been received by the submission deadlines.

### 8.5 On-going Training

Fleming will provide REB members (including community members) with the necessary training opportunities to effectively review the ethical issues raised by research proposals that fall within the mandate of their REB. This includes training opportunities for all members in core principles and understanding of the TCPS, basic ethics standards, Fleming's policy, and legal or regulatory requirements. This training should be tailored to the types and complexities of the research the REB reviews and should be offered both upon the appointment of new members, and periodically throughout a member's tenure.

## **PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEW OF A RESEARCH PROPOSAL**

### **1. Submission**

While it is not essential for the REB to review a research proposal before it is submitted to a funding agency, it is expected that the review process will be in-process at the time of funding application. REB approval however must be obtained before the research begins. Visiting researchers should contact the chair of the Fleming College Research Ethics Board well in advance of the anticipated

start date of research. Submissions for review should be submitted to the REB using the appropriate forms and by following the instructions on that form. Prospective applicants may approach the REB chair or any REB member for assistance in selecting the appropriate forms for submission.

## **2. Scholarly Review**

- 2.1 In case of research proposals that present more than minimal risk, the design of the project must be peer reviewed to assure that it is capable of addressing the question(s) being asked in the research. Sufficient peer review may be considered to be any one of the following:
  - Successful approval by the REB (if research is in the REB's field of expertise).
  - Successful funding of grant proposal by a funding agency.
  - Ad hoc independent external review reporting directly to the REB.
- 2.2 The extent of the review required for biomedical research that does not involve more than minimal risk will vary according to the research being carried out.
- 2.3 Research in the humanities and the social sciences, which poses, at most, minimal risk shall not normally be required by the REB to be peer reviewed. The REB will undertake review of qualitative research studies in accordance with the TCPS2; in particular its particular aspects such as emergent research design, planned disclosure of participants' identities, absence of signed consents or exceptions to consents, and initial exploratory phases (though not pilot studies).
- 2.4 Certain types of research, particularly in the social sciences and the humanities, may legitimately have a negative effect on public figures in politics, business, labour, the arts or other walks of life, or on organizations. Such research should not be blocked through the use of harms/benefits analysis or because of the potentially negative nature of the findings. The safeguard for those in the public arena is through public debate and discourse and, in extremis, through action in the courts for libel.
- 2.5 Critical Inquiry – Permission is not required from an organization in order to conduct research on that organization. If a researcher engages the participation of members of an organization without the organization's permission, the researcher shall inform participants of any foreseeable risk that may be posed by their participation.

## **3. Principle of Proportionate Review**

The REB will tailor its level of scrutiny to the level of risk presented by the research, and assesses the ethical acceptability of the research through consideration of the foreseeable risks, the potential benefits and the ethical implications of the research, both at the stage of the initial review and throughout the life of the project (continuing ethics review).

## **4. Normal Review Process**

- 4.1 The REB shall normally meet face to face in order to review submitted research proposals. In case of controversial research proposals, the REB may meet face to face with researchers in order to consider the ethical solutions proposed by researchers for problems arising in their studies.
- 4.2 The REB shall accommodate reasonable requests from researchers to participate in discussions about their proposals, but not be present when the REB is making its decision.
- 4.3 Minutes will be kept for these meetings and inserted into the appropriate case files. Meeting minutes shall clearly document 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 project), documentary basis for decision (i.e. 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 approval. Providing reasons for REB decisions is optional when ethics approval is granted.

- 4.4 The REB shall keep an "open file" in a secure location determined by the Chair of the REB, for researchers applying for ethical approval. The file shall be opened by the Chair when sufficient information has been submitted by the researcher to start the review process. The original application, descriptions of research and methodology, correspondence, relevant documents, ethical certificates, revised materials, and any comments from the public or other information relevant to the research project shall be kept in the file.
- 4.5 It is the responsibility of the researcher to address all the recommendations made by the REB and keep the file complete and up-to-date at all times. When the research project is finished, and the researcher(s) notifies the REB, these files shall be "closed" and kept for a period of at least five years by the REB as records demonstrating compliance with the TCPS. The files remain the property of Fleming College and cannot be removed from their secure location by the researchers. These files shall be subject to audit by authorized representatives of Fleming College (research administrators), members of Appeal Boards, and funding agencies. The REB file on applications for ethical review should contain the following documents:
- Application form;
  - Trial protocol and amendments;
  - Written informed consent forms and any updates;
  - Subject recruitment procedures (e.g. advertisements);
  - Investigator's brochure (if one exists);
  - Available safety information;
  - Information about payments and compensation available to subjects;
  - Investigator's current curriculum vitae and/or other document on qualifications;
  - Any other documents that the REB may need to fulfill its responsibilities.

All research receiving ethical approval, following a full or delegated review, as well as that receiving departmental level review shall require a proper file showing compliance with the TCPS. Insufficient information in the file is grounds for refusing or delaying ethical approval.

## **5. Delegated Review**

Delegated review does not require face-to-face meetings of the REB members. The researcher must choose to apply for delegated or full review and the REB Chair may reject any application for delegated review and refer it to the REB for full review. The Chair must report requests for delegated review and results of such reviews to other members of the REB at an appropriate time. Delegated review is review by two members (the Chair may be one of these) rather than the full REB. It is available only in cases, which fulfill one of the following criteria:

- Research which obviously involves no more than minimal risk
- Research projects which have already received approval by the Fleming College REB, have complied fully with any requirements, have an up to date file, and the applicant is simply renewing the ethical approval without significant changes to the ongoing research process.

## **6. Division/Departmental Level Review**

This policy requires that all research involving human subjects must be submitted to the REB. If, however, a study is a teaching exercise (i.e. part of a diploma or undergraduate degree level course) and entailing no more than minimal risk, it must be reviewed by a divisional/departmental level committee on behalf of the REB and in compliance with the TCPS. The Departmental ethics committee must report results of such reviews to the REB at the end of the academic year.



Student research deemed to be beyond minimal risk must be reviewed by the REB. Department level review should not be used to review research undertaken by a student as part of a faculty member's research program.

## **7. Review of Multi-Centered Research**

Contemporary research often involves collaborative partnerships among researchers from multiple institutions or countries. It may call upon the participation of a number of local populations and involve multiple institutions and/or multiple research ethics boards (REBs).

### **7.1 Review Mechanisms for Research Involving Multiple Institutions and/or Multiple REBs.**

This refers to ethics review mechanisms for research involving multiple institutions and/or multiple REBs. It is not intended to apply to ethics review mechanisms for research involving multiple REBs within the jurisdiction or under the auspices of a single institution.

Fleming's REB, with permission from the President, may approve alternative review models for research involving multiple REBs and/or institutions, in accordance with the TCPS2. REB review models may include 1) Independent Ethics Review by Several REBs, 2) Research Ethics Review Delegated to an External, Specialized or Multi-Institutional REB, and 3) Reciprocal REB review. The institution remains responsible for the ethical acceptability and ethical conduct of research undertaken within its jurisdiction or under its auspices irrespective of where the research is conducted.

### **7.2 Ethics of Research Conducted Outside the Institution**

Where research conducted under the auspices of Fleming and performed in whole or in part outside of Canada has been approved under the REB review model involving multiple institutions and/or REBs consistent with the TCPS, the terms of that model apply.

The information to be provided to the researcher's home REB will be determined by the provisions of the research ethics review model. When conducting research outside the jurisdiction of their home institution whether at a site abroad, or in Canada, researchers shall provide their home REBs with:

- The relevant information about the rules governing research involving humans and the ethics review requirements at the research site, where any exist;
- The names and contact information for the relevant REBs or comparable ethics bodies, if known, that will review the proposal at the research site; and,
- Relevant information about the target populations and circumstances that might have a bearing on the research ethics review by the researcher's home REB.

## **8. Continuing Ethics Review**

The REB's approval of a research project covers only the procedures outlined by the applicant in his/her original application. Any changes in the procedures affecting interaction with human subjects should be reported to the REB. Significant changes will require the submission of a revised application for Ethics approval. The rigor of continuing ethics review will be subject to the appropriate review process as determined by the principle of proportionate review outlined in Section 3 of the Procedural Guidelines for the Review of a Research Proposal.

- 8.1 Ongoing research shall be subject to continuing ethics review throughout the life of the project. The Chair of the REB must be promptly notified of any substantial change to the research plan or research protocol. Researchers will be asked to include monitoring mechanisms by which the public participating in the research may contact the Chair of the REB. Problems or complaints will be taken seriously by the REB and researchers may be asked to modify their studies in view of such complaints.

8.2 All protocol approvals are for a maximum of one year and may be renewed by submission of an annual report prior to the anniversary date of the original protocol approval. Such reports should clearly indicate the status of data collection and, if there will be changes to the protocol that was approved, specify in detail the nature of any changes that are required. If no substantial change has been made to the research plan or research protocol, the Chair of the REB may issue a one-year renewal. If, in the opinion of the REB Chair, the research plan or research protocol has been substantially changed, re-submission and review by the REB is required. Protocol submissions for data collection for a period less than one year lapse at the end of the time specified.

8.3 The researcher shall promptly notify the REB when the project concludes.

## **9. Conflict of Interest**

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 declare their interest and remain neutral or not be present while the REB is discussing or making its decision. In cases of disagreement over conflicts of interest, both the REB member in potential conflict and the researcher may present evidence and offer a rebuttal concerning the nature of the conflict of interest. The other members of the REB will make a final decision regarding the conflict and how to proceed.

## **10. Decisions of the REB**

After review by a REB, the protocol submission may be:

- Approved as submitted;
- Approved with suggestions for minor changes;
- Approved with conditions (that must be met before final approval is granted);
- Deferred, pending receipt of additional information or major revisions;
- Not approved.

10.1 The REB shall notify each researcher in writing of its decision regarding his/her proposed research activity. Normally the researcher will accept the proposed modification or offer a counter-proposal to the Chair of the REB. This exchange is concluded normally when an ethically acceptable form for the research is agreed upon. To facilitate the continuing processing of such research ethics protocols between meetings, the REB should specify conditions that should be met to enable the Chair to review and grant approval on behalf of the REB.

10.2 Researchers have the right to request, and REBs have an obligation to provide, reconsideration of decisions affecting a research project.

10.3 If the REB does not approve a research activity for ethical reasons, the notification shall include a statement of the reasons for its decision, and the researcher shall be given an opportunity to respond in writing or in person. The Chair will make himself or herself available to the applicant on a reasonable basis to endeavor to develop a proposal that will meet the ethical standards required by the REB. The REB may, at its discretion, review and reconsider its decision to not approve the research activity.

10.4 In the case of ongoing research, the REB has the authority to terminate research that deviates from an approved research protocol and as a result no longer complies with the criteria set forth in these policies or the TCPS.

## **11. Appeal**

Researchers must apply in writing to the President of Fleming College to appeal a negative REB decision based on substance or process. Appeals must be in writing and a copy of the appeal letter

should also be sent to the REB Chair. Fleming College shall use a duly constituted Appeal Committee to review decisions of the REB. The Appeal Committee will be appointed by the President and consist of at least five members, none of whom is a member of the REB. Appeal committees shall have the same constitution as the REB.

Non-compliance with the substance of the TCPS is a reason for refusing to grant an appeal. Appeals may be granted only on procedural grounds or when there is a significant disagreement over an interpretation of the TCPS. The decision of the Appeal Committee shall be binding.

## **12. Reports of Research Ethic Board Committee Decisions**

An annual activity report from the REB will be submitted to the President of Fleming College, the Executive Leaders Team, and the Academic Leaders Team.

## **13. Adverse Events Reports**

Normally it is anticipated that research will proceed with little (or no) special costs or harm to participants, beyond those noted in the protocol. However, unanticipated negative reactions by subjects or other unexpected events may occur. Researchers are obliged to immediately report, in writing, any known serious adverse event to the REB.

## **14. Administration**

### **14.1 Administrative Support**

The work involved in the ethical review process should be distributed appropriately among faculty members, staff, researchers, and administrators. Fleming will provide administrative support to the REB including:

- Distribution of forms and materials necessary for submission of research proposals to the REB;
- Collection of submissions and distribution of submissions to REB members;
- Keeping minutes of REB meetings;
- Storing submissions and related materials in a secure location;
- Supporting the REB in its educational activities;
- Acting as the point of contact for the Tri-Council Advisory Group;
- Other duties related to the support of the REB in carrying out its mandate.

Deans will provide significant support to the REB, with respect to:

- Ensuring that research projects requiring ethical review are submitted to the REB;
- Advising their faculty members about the need to comply with the TCPS.

Individual departments are expected to support and train students so that their research projects are ethical and those that exceed minimal risk may be efficiently reviewed by the REB. Departments should screen student applications for ethical review prior to submission to the REB where such review is required. The REB may return applications to the department if they do not conform to the requirements of the TCPS.

### **14.2 College Support**

Fleming College supports the administrative processes and educational activities required by the REB so that the College as a whole remains in compliance with TCPS.

### **14.3 Reporting of Non-Compliance**

The REB role is limited to reporting cases of failure to comply with the provisions of the TCPS and Fleming College research policies to the President.

14.4 Interpretation

Questions of interpretation or application of this policy or its procedures shall be referred to the President or designate whose decision shall be final.

**15. Forms**

Ethical Guidelines and the required forms for submission to the REB will be made available from the administrative assistant to the REB.