BCIT Research Ethics Board

BCIT REB Expedited Review Protocol

Background

The requirement to provide an expedited review of some applications for REB approval can be found at Section 4.5 of the BCIT Policy Research Ethics for Human Participants (policy # 6500). That section of the policy states generally that researchers applying for REB approval of their research can request expedited review if their research presents no more than minimal risk (see BCIT REB Statement on Minimal Risk) for the human subject(s) of the research. Also, where the REB has already approved an application, under certain circumstances (see Policy at 4.2.b) an expedited review can be provided for renewals of the ethical approval certificate.

Practice

When a researcher requests an expedited review of their application, that request must be submitted in writing such that the chair of the REB is alerted to the request on initial reading of the application. It is the researcher's responsibility to make and possibly defend an assessment of the risk associated with their research. All research submitted for expedited review will first be evaluated for compliance with this requirement. For original applications, the assessment will be in accordance with the BCIT REB Statement on Minimal Risk. For renewals, the assessment will be to determine if there is any increase in the degree of risk that was described in the original application.

Once accepted for expedited review the chair of the REB will immediately request the participation of two members of the REB to assist in the review of the application.

Within 2 working days of receiving an application accompanied by a request for expedited review copies of the application will be distributed to all members of the REB for their information or if requested by the chair for their input. Members of the REB who are not specifically requested by the chair to participate in an expedited review may at their pleasure provide input to the chair for consideration.

REB members, who agree to participate in an expedited review of an application, will be asked to commit to completing their review within 5 working days of receiving the application for review. An expedited review of any application will be as thorough and comprehensive as if it were a review undertaken by the full REB. Expedited review refers only to the time element involved in the review and

does not diminish the REB's responsibility to the subjects of the research to be diligent in carrying out its responsibilities. Upon completion of their review of an application REB members who undertake an expedited review with the chair may request a face-to-face meeting for the purpose of discussing any part of the application or they may decline to provide an opinion and request that the application be reviewed by the full REB at the next scheduled meeting of the REB.

Decisions
Decisions of the panel participating in an expedited review will be implemented in the same manner as if the full REB conducted the review. (see Policy at 5.0)

Reporting of results to applicant
Results of the expedited review will be reported to the applicant in the same manner as if the review were conducted by the full REB.

Reporting to REB
The chair will report all requests for expedited review and the results of the review to the REB at the first meeting subsequent to the completion of the review.

Appeal
At the request of the researcher, an application which receives a negative decision from an expedited review may be submitted to the full REB for re-consideration (see Policy section 5.1) If a negative decision results from the full REB review of the application, the researcher will have access to the appeal procedure at section 5.2 of the Policy.

Criteria for Referral to Full Panel for Review

Consent reasons

1. **Undue influence**: The participant is a member of a vulnerable group or is ill and the project involves the use of a treatment that may help them get better.

2. **Inability to consent**: The participant is cognitively impaired or is a child

3. **Deception**: The true purpose of the project will not be revealed to the participants for scientific reasons.

Methodologic reasons

4. **Random Assignment**: The project involves random assignment to treatment and control (treatment as usual) groups.

Risk of Harm reasons

5. **Invasive Procedures**: The project involves testing a new drug, surgical technique or other invasive procedure.

6. **Minor Adverse Effects 1**: The project involves collecting information that might be embarrassing or uncomfortable for participants.

7. **Minor Adverse Effects 2**: There is a reasonable belief that the project may cause minor adverse effects for participants.

8. **Lack of Anonymity**: Individually identifiable information will be used.

9. **Data linking**: Individually identifiable information will be used to link several databases together in order to gather more complete information.

10. **Electronic Recording**: (audio or video taping) Recording done without the participant's knowledge.