

IRB meeting minutes September 7, 2016

Attendees: Tim Beyer, Mita Mahato, Sarah Moore, Geoff Proehl, Brad Richards, Andreas Udbye, Barbara Warren, Tatiana Kaminsky, Joel Elliott, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Kristine Bartanen

Protocols Approved:

1516-001: Renewal

1516-092: Modification

1617-001: Expedited

Call to order at 12:00 by Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Faculty Senate liaison to the IRB committee.

Election of new chairperson: Tim Beyer was elected to serve as chair.

Tatiana Kaminsky volunteered to serve as secretary for the year.

Senate Charges. Ramakrishnan outlined the three charges that have been decided upon by the Faculty Senate, two based on the end of year report from last 2015-2016. The third stems from a portion of the bylaws that states that animal research comes under the jurisdiction of the IRB. Animal research is becoming more active on campus and there are also an increasing number of federal grants that are being awarded to Puget Sound faculty members, so clearer oversight of animal research is needed. Currently, there is a group on campus overseeing animal research, the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), but it is not supervised by IRB at this time. The IACUC is headed up by Alyce DeMarais.

The Senate Charges read as follows:

1. Make recommendations on how the IACUC fits into the IRB structure.
2. Develop training of new IRB members including procedures for follow-up/transition of protocols and regular reviews of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU).
3. Formulate practices for off-campus researchers to conduct research with members of the campus community.

Beyer asked about other issues that may need to be considered and suggested cultural/language competency and literacy, specifically for researchers conducting studies internationally or with diverse groups within the United States. Mahato brought up the CITI training that is now required of student researchers and the need to follow up with how that is going. Moore suggested considering the possibility of expanding its use to faculty members. Bartanen mentioned needing a community member to serve on the committee. Beyer will follow up with our community member from last year to gauge interest. Kaminsky suggested clearer procedures for following up with campus researchers who have submitted protocols but who haven't responded to feedback, which would fit under the second Senate charge. Beyer indicated that completion of closure forms would also fit under that charge. Moore suggested that we follow up with Sociology and Anthropology to make sure the MOU approved last year is still working and to consider whether or not any other departments on campus would benefit from that MOU.

Meeting Time: It was agreed that noon on Wednesday is the best time. We will plan on meeting once or twice a month. Next meeting will be on September 21 to discuss charges further and create working groups. October 12, November 9, December 7 will be designated for reviewing protocols.

Training for new members: Beyer will send out information about what is on the shared IRB drive. New members will also need to get CITI training for IRB members.

Further Discussion of Senate Charges: Initiated discussion about how to address Senate charges. Beyer suggested that Charge #2 and CITI training follow up be considered together since they are both about procedures. Charge #1 seems to stand alone. Warren asked about the scope of the animal research that is being done on campus and whether or not the IACUC needs to be its own committee. There are also questions about lab safety. Especially for animal research that is funded federally, there needs to be a group that meets regularly to consider procedures. A possible outcome may be to recommend that the IACUC become an independent standing committee. Beyer will follow up with Professor DeMarais to find out more about the committee's work and needs. Charge #3 would be a separate area to consider.

Action: Beyer will draft a proposal outlining ways to group various issues that have been raised and subgroup duties and send it out to the IRB members to be discussed at our next meeting.

Other Business: A question arose about a faculty member who is named as a researcher on a project that was completed in Colorado. IRB approval was obtained from the other institution since research was conducted with students at that university. There was funding awarded to the Puget Sound faculty member from the University Enrichment Committee (UEC). The question is whether or not IRB approval needs to be obtained from the University of Puget Sound since that is a UEC requirement. Warren clarified that the research is done and the funding would be retroactive. Discussion about the next steps to take. Decision made that we do not need to review the research. Beyer to send a message to UEC clarifying that nothing further is needed from the IRB.

Warren brought up a discussion point about how IRB is viewed by the campus community and questioned how we could educate the community members about the procedures and role of the committee. Some discussion about that issue. CITI training was mentioned as one way to address that. Consistency with reviews was also discussed as a way to address some of the campus concerns. The question arose about levels of review and whether research that is completed simply as a class project vs. research that is to be posted on SoundIdeas or disseminated beyond the campus community should be reviewed differently. Need to be certain that this would not return to the designate system. Ramakrishnan mentioned that the Faculty Senate will be creating a FAQ page to answer questions and ease the transition to having a common hour. That may be something to consider as a way to answer frequent questions/concerns/misconceptions about the IRB.

Adjourned at 12:49.

Respectfully submitted,
Tatiana Kaminsky