

Minutes 4/25/2014

Meeting convened at 9:05 AM

- Beyer, Tim (co-chair)
- Breitenbach, Bill
- Christensen, Troy (community representative)
- Ferrari, Lisa
- Houston, Renee (co-chair)
- Kim, Jung
- Milam, Garret
- Peine, Emelie
- Ramakrishnan, Siddharth

Minutes from 3/28 are approved

Protocols reviewed:

- 1314-047 - approved
- 1314-065.1 - Full Board - Reconsideration after concerns addressed
- 1314-072 - Full Board - Approved
- 1314-081 - approved
- 1314-073 - approved
- 1314-082 - approved
- 1314-086 – expedited- approved
- 1314-083 – expedited- approved
- 1314-084 – expedited- approved
- 1314-076 - expedited- approved
- 1314-079 - expedited- approved
- 1314-088 – exempt- approved
- 1314-085 – expedited- approved
- 1314-067 – expedited- approved after major revisions
- 1314-062—expedited—approved
- 1314-070—expedited—approved

IRB members no longer need to submit a summary of research along with the decision document

And IRB email account (irb@pugetsound.edu) has been created. Members should send all email correspondence regarding protocols to this email address, including messages between IRB members, researchers, students, and faculty advisors, as well as messages between IRB members regarding any protocol. All emails should have the IRB protocol # in the subject line. Continue to cc Jimmy McMichael on these emails. Final decision document and final protocol should be uploaded to the share drive.

Full Board Review 1314-089

- Some language in the consent form needs to be changed to plain English
- Recruitment materials need to be included in the protocol
- The fact that the subject will be financially responsible for lost or stolen devices needs to be stated in the recruitment section and in the costs and benefits in the consent form
- Consent form should be shorter and more streamlined
 - the “alternative treatment” section needs to be included
- We need to see the forms that that subjects will be asked to fill out during the treatment
- Inconsistent ages: 18 or 21 as the lower cut off point?
- What is the waiver that the participants are being asked to sign? Is it for liability? For the machines?
- Inconsistent info on data storage and subject identification
- Why is the cost and payment table included?
- Subjects should not have to withdraw participation in writing. They should be able to terminate participation in any manner convenient to the participant

Once revisions are made the protocol will not be circulated to the full board but will be reviewed by one of the committee chairs.

Tasks for before the end of the year.

- Subcommittees will meet one more time to review the work of the other subcommittee.
 - Phase 1: New documents will be posted
 - Phase 2: Revising the website to make it more user friendly

Co-chairs Renee Houston and Tim Beyer will meet at 9 on May 7th to write the final report. Everyone on the committee can come to the presentation of the report at the senate meeting on May 12th.

Revisiting the question of whether we need to review all student research and how we might streamline the process.

- Beyer suggests that we should meet with social science methods instructors to clarify what the IRB would like from them and what they would like from the IRB committee.
- The question is whether the IRB is a pedagogical process that instructors want their students to go through or whether class projects are research under the federal definition.
- Sometimes a faculty member doesn't know until after the research is conducted whether the findings will be presentable outside the classroom

and so the project is sent to the IRB to preserve the possibility that it could be if it turned out well.

- Some members are not comfortable ever saying to a student that he or she does not have to have IRB oversight
- Could we have a standard letter that depts. have to sign off on that says “this project meets the minimal ethical guidelines set forth in ...”?
- Yes, as long as it is clear that the professor is not working as an IRB representative and is not approving the project on behalf of the IRB. If the student wants to go to grad school and continue the research then they have the letter from the faculty member, but he or she would have to get IRB approval for continued research.
- Many conferences and even journals don’t ask for evidence of IRB approval, so it may be less of an issue in some fields than others.
- Important conclusion: IRB should make it clear to instructors that if they are asking the IRB to review their students’ projects, it is the instructor’s responsibility to ensure that the protocol is ready to be considered for IRB approval

Next full board meeting is the May 16th.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
Emelie Peine