

Minutes
Institutional Review Board
October 17, 2012

Present: Garrett Milam (Chair), Lisa Ferrari, Andrew Rife, Grace Faucett (Grad Student Rep), Eda Gurel-Atay, Mita Mahato, Katie Hall (Undergrad Rep)

Meeting was called to order at 3:02 pm.

The board voted to approve minutes from the last two meetings (09/19/2012 and 10/03/2012).

Orders of Business:

1. Procedures on IRB Minutes: Lisa Ferrari and Garrett Milam reviewed the procedures for IRB minutes:

- Only faculty members can take minutes. Ferrari and Andrew Rife are not supposed to take minutes.
- Once the minutes are approved and signed, they are submitted to Jimmy McMichael.

2. Discussion on the Designate System Replacement Plan:

- Milam noted that the IRB committee has already started talking about the substance of the issue. Now, the committee needs a plan to move forward to identify the sequence of steps to revise the department designate system.
- Milam provided a brief summary of the problem for the undergrad rep Katie Hall: the review of exempt and expedited studies by department designates is out of compliance and needs to be changed.
- Milam noted that expedited protocols come from a small number of departments. Milam has served as the chair in the three out of last five years and he has the end-year reports that summarize the number of exempt and expedited protocols from those years.
 - Each year, there are fewer than five exempt protocols.
 - Expedited protocols are not spread out evenly across the year; they are submitted based on the student project deadlines:
 - AY 2008-2009: 134 protocols
 - AY 2009-2010: 101 protocols
 - AY 2010-2011: 81 protocols
 - Big numbers come from three departments: Physical Therapy (PT), Occupational Therapy (OT), and Psychology (Psy). In AY 2010-2011:
 - PT: 4 exempt, 3 expedited (Ferrari noted that this small number is strange unless they went to full board)
 - OT: 12 expedited
 - Psy: 38 expedited (2 faculty; 36 student projects)
 - In the psychology department, student research that did not qualify as research by federal regulations was handled in-house by department designates.

- It was noted that there are some expedited protocols for student research from comparative sociology and international political economy departments.
 - Hall mentioned that they have the thesis course in which they submit expedited protocols. Because of time restrictions, they are not allowed to go to the full board.
- The best ways to handle this situation was discussed:
 - Mahato suggested checking the language for the clarity on what constitutes research for IRB. Milam told that the definition could be open to some interpretation but it is still clear enough what constitutes research. He also noted that if all the results/research remains in the class settings, it is not human research for IRB (even humans are used in the research). Also, there is discussion on the definition of generalized knowledge. Mahato suggested having an additional self-assessment form for researchers to identify whether their research qualifies for IRB.
 - Milam suggested talking to the psychology and comparative sociology departments about student projects because even if they are expedited, it is still an additional commitment for IRB. It requires an increase in the size of the IRB board but not sure how to do it. Ferrari noted that Kris Bartanen is aware of the problem.
 - Andrew Rife asked if designates from OT, PT, and Psychology departments could do the preliminary work and if they could attend only to protocol meetings.
 - Ferrari referred to the curriculum committee and how they have sub-committees to work in small groups: sub-committees work separately, then, they come to the full committee and make suggestions. It was noted that a similar structure can be used for IRB. A sub-committee can attend protocol meetings only and full board can meet for approvals and administrative meetings.
 - It was noted that Ferrari and Rife can also review protocols.
 - It was asked if converting department designates to full board position would create backlash from departments as it would increase their work load. Ferrari said that it would actually decrease faculty load because they would be considered as IRB members and this would counted toward university service.
- Milam told that the next step to move forward, then, would be to define and establish the sub-committee structure. This would require two steps:
 - Talking to the departments (especially PT, OT, psychology, and comparative sociology) to see if they are willing to do that. It is necessary to approach these departments and understand if that is an acceptable solution for them.
 - Looking at from the administrative perspective, can we do that? Ferrari suggested creating a proposal with the rationale attached to provide Kris Bartanen as and writing a letter to share with the Faculty Senate Chair. Milam agreed to draft the proposal and letter and circulate it electronically before the next administrative IRB meeting.

3. Discussion on the Other Charges that were in the Year-End Report:

- Milam noted that some of them can be handled quickly.
- Self-charges #1: IRB will continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.
- Self-charges #2: Some improvements have been made to the website. Some of the materials are structured around the department designate system but we can revise the other parts. Milam will talk to Andrew Gardner about the website. Ferrari and Anne James will also be involved with the changes on the website. Ferrari noted that the handbook needs to be revised as well. It was decided that IRB members will look at the handbook and come up with suggestions.
- Self-charges #3: Milam will talk to Ellen Peters.
- Self-charges #4: It was noted that this one has low priority. It was driven by a proposal from the Health Services nit nothing has been resolved.
- Self-charges #5: As of now, no formal process for appeal exists.
- Self-charges #6: It was noted that this issue came up couple years ago but IRB does not communicate in any way with researchers about what they should do about this issue. It was asked if research had mandatory responsibility to report child abuse. Ferrari and Milam noted that it is not tied directly to IRB but as educators we have a requirement to provide guidance protecting children. Ferrari also noted that faculty is legally bound by ethical obligations and if it is a student research, then the faculty supervisor is responsible. It was mentioned that talking to Grace Kirchner would be helpful as she has knowledge on this issue. Rife will talk to her to find out what she knows and what is her respective on this issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Eda Gurel-Atay