

Minutes
Institutional Review Board
September 22, 2010

Present: Mary Rose Lamb (Chair), Julia Looper, Alexa Tullis, Andrew Gardner, Elise Richman

The meeting was called to order at 8:04 a.m.

Announcements:

Mary Rose announced that two proposals were on their way via e-mail; one will need a quick turnaround time and one already has approval from the IRB of another institution. Suggestions for new members reviewing for the first time were to review tips outlined on the following website: <http://www.kenyon.edu/x38946.xml> , as well as common sense.

Order of Business:

1. Approval of the minutes from the 9-8-10 meeting

2. Consideration of the revision to Proposal Consideration of #0910-012:

Prior to discussion of the revision, two issues related to reviewing revisions were clarified.

- a) Revisions could be approved by the chair alone or by the entire committee. I
- b) It is appropriate for members to re-evaluate the entire proposal and raise concerns about the original submission if a member felt it was necessary.

Discussion of proposed revisions ensued.

Action: There was a motion to approve the modifications, this was seconded and approved.

3. Discussion about proposals from projects carried out in Third World countries:

The issue discussed was whether or not Geography should be taken into account when deciding how to review a proposal. Fundamental questions raised were:

- a) Are our existing guidelines sufficient for determining whether a project based in the 3rd world be eligible for an expedited versus a full review?
- b) Do federal guidelines already have language in place to deal with such projects?

Action: The committee decided to table further discussion of this matter for now.

4. Discussion of the current Scientific Misconduct Policy:

The IRB needs to revise this document in light of two main issues:

- a) Federal guidelines now require that all students participating in research that is funded through the federal government undergo some form of scientific research ethics training.
- b) Policies and procedures in the university's Scientific Misconduct Policy (SMP) must comply with policies and procedures articulated in the Faculty Code.

Committee members discussed various issues related to the revision and quickly determined that key questions need to be answered before effective revisions can be proposed:

- a) What projects are included in the ethics training requirement (e.g., faculty research v. class projects)
- b) Who exactly needs the training (e.g., a student working full time on a project v. one who participates in one small aspect of a study; a PI v. someone working in the field translating a questionnaire for a research subject).
- c) Does the training have to be standardized across the university or can individual departments develop their own training regime?
- d) What about international studies?
- e) Dividing up: Compliance from Investigation onwards is probably where we need to check with the code.

Action: It was decided that (a) Julie will look into determining what exactly the ethics training requirement covers, (b) Mary Rose will begin comparing the policies and procedures in the current SMP document with that in the Faculty Code and removing all references to public health funding since the SMP applies to all kinds of scientific research, and (c) Andrew will investigate the international side of things by researching the on-line training required to earn a CITI training certificate.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Alexa Tullis