

Minutes
Institutional Review Board
September 12, 2011

Present: Garrett Milam (Chair), Mary Rose Lamb, Julia Looper, Andrew Gardner, Anne James, Yvonne Swinth, Andrew Rife, Sue Hannaford (representing the Senate)

Meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm

Announcements: None

Orders of Business:

1. Selection of a new Chair and Secretary

After a brief discussion, Garrett Milam was elected the new chair of the IRB. He is returning to this role after a year furlough. His election was unanimous.

After additional discussion, the committee settled on a rotating secretary plan. The secretary will be nominated or volunteer before each meeting commences.

2. Review of Protocol #1012-001

The committee briefly discussed this proposal. Overall, the committee found the proposal to be extremely light on pertinent details. However, this issue was eclipsed by the fact that proper procedures were not followed. The proposal, which most probably merits expedited review, should have been passed directly to the departmental delegate (or, in lieu of a departmental delegate, the department chair) for review.

Action Item: The IRB chair will contact the department chair and review IRB procedure. The protocol will be returned to the departmental delegate without evaluation.

3. Modification Request for Protocol #0910-012

The committee received a request for a modification for this proposal. The request concerned the age-based exclusion/inclusion criteria for the project. After a short discussion, the IRB unanimously approved this modification.

4. Schedule for Future Meetings

The committee briefly discussed the schedule for future meetings. It was decided that we would continue to meet every other week. Every second meeting will be devoted to reviewing proposals; remaining meetings will be devoted to the other work before the committee.

4. Wednesday @ 4 Commitment

The committee discussed our obligation to host a Wednesday @ 4 discussion of IRB issues. Overall, the committee's intentions for the meeting are to broadcast some of the perceived challenges we face in advance of the revision of the IRB procedures and manual. We also noted

that it should be made clear that no specific protocols will be discussed at the meeting. In a wide-ranging discussion, the committee brainstormed a few themes for the discussion/conversation:

- a. The committee is interested in gauging whether faculty feel that non-clinical types of research is being forced to conform to clinical standards.
- b. The committee wishes to hear faculty perspectives on the proposal that all research conducted abroad must pass a full IRB review.
- c. The committee is interested in ascertaining how it might preserve (and even formalize) the flexibility needed to serve diverse research interests on campus.

The committee felt that more issues could be added to this list. Andrew Gardner promised to distill the discussions into a set of topical points. These points would then be circulated to other members for comment and revision in advance of the Wednesday @ 4 commitment. The revised version would serve as the introduction for the discussion with faculty who attend the discussion.

Action Items: Andrew Gardner will forward the aforementioned list of topics to members of the committee. The committee will also endeavor to advertise the event in departments that might have a particular interest in discussing these issues.

The meeting was then concluded.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Gardner