

IRB meeting minutes September 21, 2016

Attendees: Tim Beyer, Mita Mahato, Sarah Moore, Brad Richards, Andreas Udbye, Barbara Warren, Tatiana Kaminsky, Joel Elliott

Call to order: 12:00 pm by Beyer

Minutes from 09/07/16 approved

Announcements.

- 1) Beyer communicated with Sunil about Gary McCall's request for funding; all issues are resolved and Professor McCall's funding has been released.
- 2) Troy Christensen, our community member from the past couple of years, will not be able to serve as the community member representative for this academic year; Beyer is working on locating a community member who can fill that required position before the next full board meeting
- 3) The shared drive is infected with a virus that impacts access to files on the drive. A small number of files have been affected. Tech Services has said that it is safe to access the shared drive even though the problem has not been fully resolved. Some committee members are uncomfortable with accessing the shared drive with it in that state. Beyer is going to work with Jimmy McMichael to set up a new shared drive and will also work on streamlining the material on the shared drive to avoid having materials that are no longer needed or relevant on the shared drive.
- 4) The complications with the shared drive led to a delay with getting information about the required IRB training out to members but that information should now be available to members.
- 5) Beyer contacted Alyce DeMarais about the Senate charge addressing IRB supervision of IACUC. She is expecting contact from working group members (see below). Her opinion is that the bylaws should be changed so that the IRB does not provide oversight to the IACUC.
- 6) Chris Edwards (from CHWS) wants to use Healthy Minds Study instead of CORE survey; the survey is administered through Institutional Research, which has a MOU with the IRB. A letter from Chris Edwards will be sent to the IRB describing the reasons for the change. Beyer will provide more information when that is received.
- 7) CITI training – two options are appearing for students who are completing the training. Students only need to do one. At this time, work is underway to get the second option removed. In the meantime, instructions will be revised so that it is clearer to student researchers about what they should be doing.

Protocol 1617-002. This full board protocol has been received by the IRB and some outstanding questions have arisen (it is a revision of a protocol that was submitted in AY 15/16).

Questions have been sent to the department that the protocol comes from and information will be shared with the committee when it is received.

Work groups to address Senate charges. Based on the Senate charges and other issues identified during our last meeting, Beyer proposed work groups and timelines.

- 1) IACUC workgroup:** Make recommendations on how the IACUC fits into the IRB structure.
 - a. Contact Alyce DeMarais to collect information on the general function of the IACUC.
 - i. How many protocols are typically reviewed per academic year?
 - ii. How is the review process structured? Who sits on the committee?
 - iii. What else falls under their purview (e.g., walk through of non-human animal facilities, lab safety issues, etc.)
 - b. Make recommendation about the Senate charge; Alyce DeMarais suggested that the IACUC should be separate and that the bylaws ought to be changed
 - c. Recommendation possible by 10/12?
 - d. Workgroup members: Joel Elliott and Barbara Warren

- 2) Procedures workgroup:**
 - a. Develop training of new IRB members including:
 - i. Procedures for follow-up/transition of protocols
 - ii. Regular reviews of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU)
 - iii. To be addressed Fall 2016
 - b. CITI training
 - i. Follow up on new requirement for students (To be addressed Fall 2016)
 - ii. Consider expanding to faculty colleagues (To be addressed Spring 2017)
 - c. Follow-up with principal investigators (PIs)
 - iii. Develop clearer procedures for PIs who have submitted protocols but haven't responded to feedback (To be addressed Fall 2016)
 - iv. Study closure forms (To be addressed Spring 2016)
 - d. Develop clearer guidelines of how to apply MOUs to balance the ability to use the MOU when appropriate, but not overuse it (Fall 2015; Spring 2016)
 - e. Workgroup members: Tim Beyer, Sarah Moore, Geoff Proehl, Brad Richards, Andreas Udbye

- 3) Research guidelines workgroup:** Formulate practices for off-campus researchers to conduct research with members of the campus community
 - a. Look to peer institutions and guidelines common to them regarding off-campus researchers
 - b. Formulate recommendation aiming for end of Fall 2016 (If we wish to limit off-campus researchers then we should have the recommendation sooner rather than later on our website). That should include the format that outside researchers follow (e.g. should they use the same information in the same order that is required by on campus researchers? Should student researchers from other institutions complete the CITI training?)

- c. Workgroup members: Mita Mahato and Tatiana Kaminsky

4) Miscellaneous (Beyer)

- a. Recruit community member to sit on committee (before next full board meeting)
- b. Follow up with IR, SOAN, and Psychology re usefulness of MOUs (Fall 2016 to inform Procedures Subcommittee discussion point d)

5) Potential timeline for workgroup reporting to full committee:

10/12 = Workgroup 1 recommendation?

11/9 = Workgroup 3 recommendation? Workgroup 2 Student CITI update?

12/7 = Workgroup 2 new training, PI follow-up, MOU usage?

****This schedule is quite tight, especially if we have multiple full board protocols to review.

The remainder of the meeting was spent with workgroups discussing and creating plans for addressing the charges.

Adjourned at 12:50.

Respectfully submitted,
Tatiana Kaminsky