

Minutes
Institutional Review Board
January 31, 2014

Present: Tim Beyer (co-chair), Bill Breitenbach, Eda Gurel-Atay, Lisa Ferrari, Renee Houston (co-chair), Jung Kim, Garrett Milam, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Kirsten Wilbur

Beyer called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

The following protocols have been reviewed since the last meeting:

- 1314-039 – modifications requested
- 1314-032 – approved with modifications
- 1314-040 – approved
- 1314-029 – approved (full board)
- 1314-026 – modifications requested (full board)
- 1314-037 – modifications requested
- 1314-036 – approved requesting consent letter be on UPS letterhead
- 1314-038 – minor modifications requested
- 1314-023 – approved
- 1314-001 – modification approved
- 1314-007 – final approval granted
- 1314-042 – final approval granted
- 1314-041 – minor modification requested

Chairs' Update: Houston announced that Troy Christensen has agreed to serve as the community representative on the IRB.

Meeting times in the spring 2014 semester will be Fridays from 9:00 to 9:50 a.m. Full board meetings are scheduled for February 28, March 28, April 25, and May 16. The corresponding due dates for full board protocols are February 14, March 14, April 11, and May 9.

The minutes of the 12/13/2013 meeting were approved with minor corrections. A signed paper copy of approved minutes is to be sent to Jimmy McMichael.

Protocols during vacations. There was discussion of whether the IRB's 3-day response period applied to protocols received during the winter break. Members agreed that there should be a deadline in the fall semester for submitting protocols, which would be set on the Friday of Reading Period. After that date, no protocols will be accepted until the first day of class in the spring. The small number of protocols that are submitted during the summer tend to come from faculty. Ferrari will handle expedited protocols in the summer, and the IRB chair(s) will do the others.

Researcher-initiated changes to protocols. A question arose about how to deal with changes made to expedited protocols by researchers after they have submitted the

protocols for review but before an IRB member has reviewed them. The conclusion was to have researchers submit a form for modifications after the original protocol has been approved by the IRB reviewer.

Memo of Understanding with Office of Institutional Research. The OIR has drafted a new memo of understanding to authorize ongoing research without IRB approval at every instance. If the IRB approves the memo, it remains in place indefinitely, unless a sunset provision is included. The draft memo will be circulated to IRB for members' reading.

Subcommittees. Two subcommittees have been charged with updating the IRB forms, website, resources, and processes. The subcommittee on documents and website includes Houston (chair), Kim, Wilbur, Milam, and Breitenbach. It will meet on Wednesdays from 12:00 to 1:00 in Jones 300. The subcommittee on resources and sample protocols includes Beyer (chair), Gurel-Atay, Ramakrishnan, Peine, and Ferrari. It will meet from 9:00 to 10:00 in Wyatt 226 on February 14, March 7, April 11, and May 9.

Matters related to the Psychology Department. Beyer introduced three items. The first was the memo of understanding between the Psychology Department and the IRB regarding active deception and risk in upper-division courses, especially Psych 301. The current memo of understanding is approved without a sunset clause. Byer will circulate it for IRB consideration and discussion. He will also ask Prof. Carolyn Weisz to provide an explanation of common practices in Psych 301. Her draft will be circulated with the memo of understanding.

The second item involved the subject pool of Psychology students who receive class credit for participating as subjects in research projects. Because some projects also recruit student volunteers outside the subject pool, the IRB decided that psychology consent forms and recruitment materials should include this statement: "Students not eligible for class credit may still participate but will not receive class credit."

The third item concerned maintaining confidentiality of names, email addresses, and phone numbers on sign-up sheets. Researchers often request this information so as to be able to send reminders to participants the night before sessions. The concern is for the confidentiality of the contact information, not the sensitivity of the research study itself. The IRB decided that names and email addresses are public information, but phone numbers should not be collected on the sign-up sheets. However, phone numbers may be collected during participation in a study, if that process of collection is necessary and outlined in the protocol. For example, studies that require participants to attend multiple sessions on multiple days may wish to collect phone numbers to use them for reminding people of upcoming sessions.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.
Respectfully submitted,

William Breitenbach