

IRB Minutes for Friday 3/23/18
Wyatt 226 from 1:30-2:30 pm

The meeting was called to order at 1:34 pm.

Attending: Tim Beyer (Co-chair), Joel Elliott (Co-Chair), Lisa Ferrari, Mike Pohl, Sara Protasi, Mark Reinitz, Alexa Tullis, Andreas Udbye, Jan Wolfe (Community representative)

Approval of *Minutes from 2/23/18:*

The minutes from the February 23rd meeting were approved.

Review of *Exempt/Expedited* protocols

The members in attendance registered 2 protocol modifications had been reviewed and approved: 1617 – 034-2, and 1617-118-02. Additionally, 20 protocols had been reviewed and approved: 1718-021, 047, 053, 054, 056, 057, 058, 061, 062, 063, 064, 066, 068, 070, 071, 072, 073, 074, 077, and 079. Finally, one proposal was rejected: 1718-052.

Updates and Announcements

The IRB committee yearly report is due to faculty senate on April 16. Beyer and Elliott will circulate a draft prior to the due date for comments.

Prof. Brad Richards from Computer Science has asked the IRB for guidance on an ongoing computer code project. After reviewing details of the project, committee members determined that to this point the research involved use of archival data. Going forwards the committee requests that Dr. Richards obtain verbal consent from students who opt in, informing them that if they choose to participate their progress through the assignment will be analyzed after the end of the semester.

At a recent IRB meeting it was decided that IRB would like all researchers to complete CITI training prior to submitting IRB protocols. Tim Beyer relayed this decision to Faculty Senate for comment; Senate responded that we should add CITI requirements as we see fit.

Other items:

Regarding a specific protocol there was a discussion about the safety of using Google Forms for research and storing data on Google server. The committee determined that this seems safe in current case, and will suggest specific language regarding confidentiality of information on the internet to be added to the consent form.

There were also brief discussions about the following issues:

1. It was pointed out that it is sometimes hard to locate changes in modifications. The committee will recommend that applicants highlight changes in revisions and modifications.
2. It was suggested that if a student doesn't hear back about their protocol in a week he or she should contact IRB.
3. We briefly discussed whether we should contact people who haven't sent back revisions within a week, and decided it is the submitter's responsibility.
4. During discussion it was noted that, although project approval is for one year from the day the protocol is submitted, the protocol decision document only has a space to indicate the date that the protocol was reviewed. To avoid possible confusion Beyer will make minor changes to protocol decision document to include separate spaces for submission date and approval date.

Full board review of protocol 1718-063

Discussion ensued, and members identified a number of points that must be clarified before the project can be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Reinitz