

**Minutes of the Institutional Review Board**  
**March 10, 2011**

**Present:** Andrew Gardner, Anne James, Mary Rose Lamb, Julia Looper, Elise Richman, Andrew Rife, Alexa Tullis

The meeting was called to order shortly after 8 AM.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as received.

We then moved to a discussion of the revision of the handbook.

Anne James brought a draft of her section on the types of reviews and we considered whether the section needed additional information and where the links to the NIH flow charts that help researchers decide on the type of review necessary should go.

Andrew Gardner has been working on the section on General Principles. We talked through some of the issues raised by Part D of General Principles. Gardner inquired whether all research protocols must require confidentiality. Are interviews of public officials confidential or a matter of public record? Can we soften the requirement for confidentiality in our campus document? What does a researcher do if a subject wants his or her name used?

In Part G of the General Principles, Gardner inquired about the reason a researcher must specify the rationale for choosing a particular research group. For social science protocols, this requirement seems a bit redundant.

James explained that this requirement comes from the history of medical research in which studies were done on white males with the expectation that all other people would respond in the same way. That has not been shown to be true, so researchers need to specify the reason for using a study group that doesn't reflect the general population. James also noted that the time this usually becomes a problem for the IRB, when an IRB can decide that a protocol is discriminatory, is when the research involves some sort of intervention.

Gardner noted that while very few social science protocols come to the IRB for a full review, the handbook is used by students to develop protocols and that a huge number of social science protocols are reviewed at the departmental level. How can we make this document more useful to them?

Julia Looper pointed out that with respect to Part G, social scientists would be likely to explain in their research question why that had chosen a particular group for study.

The discussion then moved to Part E. Gardner inquired whether one always had to have written consent and a written record of that consent. He also wondered whether that section could be modified from "in research involving risk" to "in research involving more than minimal risk". Members of the Board noted that there should be changes in the wording to allow verbal consent.

After allowing James to leave a bit early, we considered a modification to IRB protocol 1011-007. The modification was unanimously approved.

The IRB then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Rose Lamb