



**Institutional Review Board Minutes
Dec 13, 2017**

Participants:

Tim Beyer (Co-chair), Joel Elliott (Co-Chair), Wendell Nakamura, Mike Pohl, Sara Protasi, Mark Reinitz, Alexa Tullis, Andreas Udbye

Call to Order:

The meeting was held in Wyatt Hall, Rm. 326. Meeting started at ~10:00am.

Approval of Minutes:

Minutes from the meeting held on November 15, 2017 were unanimously approved.

Review of Exempt/Expedited Protocols:

1718-019-1	Expedited	Approved
1718-025	Expedited	Withdrawn by PI
1718-041	Expedited	Approved
1718-042	Expedited	Approved
1718-043	Expedited	Approved

Meeting time for spring 2018:

It was decided that meetings next semester would be Fridays 1:30-2:30, with specific dates to be announced later.

Discussion of how to deal with issues that keep appearing in protocols that require revisions from the PI

Members discussed the fact that many student protocols this semester appeared superficial and many suffered from similar content issues.

Reinitz articulated three recurrent issues in the proposals he read this term:

- The lack of empirical context for the proposed study, something that was reflected in the lack of references and citations.
- With the method of verbal consent - where the researcher reads a consent script to potential participants - there is little opportunity for those listening to the script to actually absorb the contact information for the student researcher, faculty advisor, and Associate Dean. Members thought that this issue could be addressed by having all contact information on a slip of paper or card that the researcher could give to the participants. Beyer will create a template for this.
- There was often very little information provided about the actual recruitment process - how exactly will people be asked? how will the researcher avoid coercion?

Thinking about how to avoid some of the issues that plagued student protocols this semester, Elliott, Beyer, and others suggested that meeting with members of departments that use ethnographic research (e.g., SOAN and History) might be helpful. Given that there is some tension between the role of the IRB in protecting human subjects and the need for ethnographic data to be collected in a setting as natural as possible, conversations with these faculty would be helpful in developing a new MOU for general ethnographic research.

Suggestions for what mechanisms could be put in place to help students produce more effective protocols included:

- Adding the guidelines directly to the protocol template form
- Creating a template for the informed consent script that included standard statements
- Providing written tips from the IRB for writing successful protocols
- Providing specific guidelines and best practices for how to keep raw data confidential (although this has not yet been a big problem)
- Emphasizing the need to carefully consider the meeting place for interviews - this place should be mutually agreed upon and be comfortable/safe for both researcher and participant.

Some other ideas to help students be successful in the protocol writing process were:

- Have students submit their revisions to their faculty advisor, who would then review the revisions and submit it to the IRB.
- Have students who have written problematic protocols meet with one of the co-chairs for a face-to-face discussion about how to improve the protocol.

Revised Protocol Form

Beyer will distill the suggested changes to the protocol and the IRB will revisit the document next semester.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50am. The date of the next meeting will be announced later.

Respectfully submitted,
Alexa Tullis