Institutional Review Board Meeting February 25, 2019

Members present: Lisa Ferrari, Alexa Tullis, Ann Wilson, Jane Sweeney, Hajung Lee, Mike Pohl, Wendell Nakamura, Mark Reinitz, Derek Buescher

Minutes Taker: Derek Buescher

4:02 PM Co-Chair Tullis called the meeting to order

Approval of minutes from January 28, 2019 M/S/P

Puget Sound IRB Approval with Washington State Department of Corrections

Ann Wilson raised a series of questions from a faculty member regarding IRB approval for a protocol that another institution will approve when that institution will not accept an external IRB approval and the study concerns a vulnerable population. Specifically, the study will be conducted with The Department of Corrections. The question is if Puget Sound IRB also needs to approve the study. Lisa Ferrari indicated that Puget Sound IRB does need to grant approval as well, but that, historically, Puget Sound has allowed submission of the materials submitted to the external IRB as documentation. Still, the IRB needs oversight to provide a consistent policy. Question 2: since this work is with a vulnerable population and will be reviewed by the full board of the DoC does it need full board review at Puget Sound as well. In other words, if the submitter comes to us with a full board approval from an external IRB do we need full board approval from Puget Sound IRB.

The committee continued to discuss the best practices of this process and whether we could evaluate this as a case-by-case basis to determine Puget Sound's process of review or to be specifically careful given the potential to set precedent.

<u>Action</u>: Co-Chair Ann Wilson will convey to the submitter that, by policy, the Puget Sound IRB needs to review the protocol as a full board review.

CITI Training of Faculty

Members of IRB were asked in January to reach out to departments regarding having faculty who submit protocols and oversee students doing research on human subjects undertaking CITI training. All members who reached out to department with high numbers of protocol submissions indicated departments prefer to have faculty undergo CITI training. One member of the committee reported that a department said: "Going through CITI training is a small price to pay for the privilege of working with human subjects."

<u>Action</u>: Consistent with the Puget Sound IRB committee proposal from 2017-2018, the IRB will require all faculty conducting research or advising student researchers to complete all appropriate CITI training modules. The committee chairs will contact departments that submit a significant number of protocols.

IRB Handbook

The committee continues to review the IRB handbook with the desire to make the handbook manageable and clear. The IRB committee also seeks to make the handbook helpful for both committee members and those submitting protocols. The general consensus is that the current handbook is overwhelming and difficult to navigate. Tullis indicated the need to review and modernize the handbook. Some details the committee seeks to change in order to streamline the handbook:

- place forms onto the IRB webpage with links or referrals to the online location
- clarity of descriptions and removal of examples of consent forms
- clean-up duplicate and outdated material

<u>Action</u>: The committee decided to update the IRB handbook so it is consistent with our current protocol and forms in line with ongoing conversations.

<u>Action</u>: Co-Chair Tullis proposed creating a handbook update subcommittee. The committee is charged with evaluating the current handbook and looking at examples from other institutions. The full committee will examine select examples at the March meeting. Specifically, Mike and Alexa will gather data from other institutions. Mark and Lisa will sort material into categories for IRB members and protocol submitters.

Common Rule

The committee discussed the updated common rule that went into effect in January and its impact on participant observation.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:07