Roles and Responsibilities: Approval Process for Safe Human Participant SRC Plans

Overview of Responsibilities

Chair/Director

- As appropriate, consult with the PI prior to submitting a Safe SRC Plan to determine the likelihood of approval, appropriate approval pathway, or to preemptively troubleshoot issues or concerns with the proposed plan.
- Review the Safe Human Participant / Field SRC Plan Form, particularly focusing on the PI's prior knowledge of the proposed SRC activities as well as local knowledge of the proposed SRC space and other local building occupants or constraints.
- If approved, send to the Dean or their designate.
- If not approved, provide comments to the PI.

Dean/Designate

- As appropriate, consult with the PI prior to submitting a Safe SRC Plan to determine the likelihood of approval, appropriate approval pathway, or to preemptively troubleshoot issues or concerns with the proposed plan.
- Review the Safe Human Participant / Field SRC Plan Form, considering faculty-level priorities as well as building-level space and density constraints.
- If approved, and if 2-metre physical distancing can be maintained, send the approved form to the PI for REB submission.
- If approved and physical distancing cannot be maintained, send to EHS.
- If not approved, provide comments to the PI.

EHS (if required)

- As appropriate, consult with the PI prior to submitting a Safe SRC Plan to determine safety and mitigation options for their proposed SRC activities.
- Review requests where 2-metre physical distancing cannot be maintained to ensure appropriate safety measures are in place.
- If approved, send the approved form to the PI for REB submission.
- If not approved, provide comments to the PI.

Research Ethics/REB

- Consult with and help guide the PI in determining the appropriate approval process depending on the nature of the SRC activity.
- The PI attaches the Safe Human Participant / Field SRC Plan Form to their ethics protocol(s) and submits it to the REB via the Online Ethics Portal for REB review and approval.
- Review to ensure that what is proposed abides by Ryerson's policies and by the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS 2018).
- If approved, the PI sends the Safe Human Participant / Field SRC Plan Form and the REB approval letter to the OVPRI for final approval.

- If not approved, REB provides comments to the PI.

OVPRI

- Ensure that the process is followed and aligns with guidelines, criteria and overarching institutional coordination.
- If approved, provides approval to the PI and notifies all others in the approval chain.
- If not approved, provides comments to the PI.

Guidelines for Reviewing Safe Human Participant / Field SRC Planning Forms

Chairs/Directors and Deans are crucial to the review and approval of Safe SRC Plans, as they have the most direct knowledge of the SRC programs and personnel of the responsible faculty members, the SRC facilities identified for use, or the proposed field locations.

During the Limited Resumption of Human Participant SRC Activities phase of Ryerson's SRC re-opening strategy, Chairs/Directors and Deans must carefully review and judge submitted Safe SRC Plans against the criteria being considered at this time.

In all cases, there must be adequate personnel (students, staff) available to safely, and in compliance with local public health directives, conduct the human participant SRC activity.

In addition, the following criteria apply:

For Human Participant SRC Activities

- They are COVID-19-related SRC activities or they are REB-approved studies for which there is a demonstrated need to sustain human participant SRC activities, such as in any of the following cases:
    - Prevention of material and data loss (e.g., longitudinal studies).
    - Human participant SRC activities that cannot be effectively, efficiently and compliantly accomplished virtually and when there is a demonstrated impact to student or project timelines. Examples of time-sensitive SRC activities include students' thesis-related research (particularly when a defence is impending), student or postdoctoral fellow publication revisions, sponsored projects (industry, philanthropic, or non-Tri-Council grants with tight milestones or deliverables and no possibility for extension), projects using time-sensitive materials or models, or projects/studies that are time-sensitive or seasonally dependent.

For Field SRC Activities

- The field SRC activities can be conducted safely while complying with physical distancing and hygiene protocols as required by local health authorities (e.g., Toronto Public Health, the Province of Ontario, Indigenous communities, the Government of Canada, other jurisdictional health authorities).
- The field SRC activities are time sensitive in nature (e.g., student progression, project timelines, seasonal study) or part of a longitudinal study.
- Travel for Ryerson personnel is within Canada and not to vulnerable, isolated or remote communities without the express formal consent of an appropriate authority within the involved communities.
- Approvals as required are in place, as with normal field SRC activities.

Reviewers should take into consideration their own *a priori* knowledge of the SRC activities, spaces and/or field locations in addition to the provided information in their judgement.

The checklist on the following page can be used as you review your Safe SRC Plan forms submitted for approval by your faculty members. If the answer to any question in this checklist is No or Insufficient, the form should be returned with appropriate comments to the responsible faculty member for revision and resubmission, or for contemplation at a later phase of return to on-campus SRC activities, depending on the nature of the concern.

Review Checklist: Human Participant / Field SRC Plan Form

	Yes	No	Insufficient
General			
Is the form complete?	○	○	○
Is the form accurate to the best of your knowledge?	○	○	○
Section 1: Rationale			
Is the appropriate faculty member identified?	○	○	○
Is there a real need to conduct the proposed SRC activities in person or in the field?	○	○	○
Is the rationale provided for resuming the SRC activities appropriate, and does it meet the criteria currently being provided?	○	○	○
In your opinion, are the students/personnel listed appropriate?	○	○	○
Has the faculty member confirmed the willingness of listed personnel to participate in the proposed SRC activities?	○	○	○
Section 2: Safe Human Participant SRC Plan			
Are the appropriate REB approvals in place for the project?	○	○	○
Does the participant study size seem appropriate?	○	○	○
Is the description of the identified SRC space(s) accurate?	○	○	○
Are appropriate Third Party Safety measures in place if required?	○	○	○
If the SRC activity is to take part in a restricted location, is appropriate authorization provided in the form of a letter or email from a duly authorized representative?	○	○	○
Is the number of identified personnel appropriate for the SRC space identified, recognizing physical distancing requirements?	○	○	○
If shared facilities are to be used, are appropriate schedules and guidelines in place?	○	○	○
Are the project dates reasonable and appropriate?	○	○	○
Has an appropriate schedule and/or calendar been developed to maintain physical distancing and to log access for potential contact tracing?	○	○	○
Are additional considerations appropriate for the SRC activity and space?	○	○	○
Is the assessment of physical distancing appropriate?	○	○	○
If 2-metre physical distancing cannot be maintained, do the mitigation measures seem appropriate at a high level?	○	○	○
Is the study population appropriate for resuming in-person human participant research (i.e., are they at a normal risk for COVID-19)?	○	○	○
If support persons are required, is there an appropriate plan to deal with them and maintain physical distancing, etc.?	○	○	○
Is the method of screening and consent appropriate?	○	○	○
Is the plan for handling participants throughout their visit sufficient?	○	○	○

If biological samples are to be taken, are the measures put in place sufficient to safeguard researchers and participants?	○	○	○
Is the face mask plan sufficient and appropriate?	○	○	○
Are there detailed and appropriate cleaning protocols in place?	○	○	○
If this is a collaborative study, are the appropriate protocols for all stakeholders in place?	○	○	○
Are there plans in place to safely shut down the study should conditions dictate?	○	○	○
Section 3: Safe Field SRC Plan			
Is the proposed location described in sufficient detail?	○	○	○
Is the proposed location outside of any known restricted or high-risk areas?	○	○	○
Are the travel plans appropriate for all members of the team?	○	○	○
Are the plans to comply with local health directives upon arrival and throughout the duration of the stay in place and appropriate for the location?	○	○	○
Are appropriate Third Party Safety measures in place if they are required?	○	○	○
Is the plan for accommodations appropriate?	○	○	○
Is the plan for managing personal interactions with non-research team members appropriate?	○	○	○
If required, are the appropriate certifications and approvals in place?	○	○	○
Section 4: Signatures			
Has the faculty member verified the contents?	○	○	○