

Institutional Review Board Minutes
22 October 2018

Participants: Lisa Ferrari, Megan Gessel (just present for official vote on IRB Chairs), Hajung Lee, Wendell Nakamura, Mike Pohl, Brad Reich, Jane Sweeney (community liaison), Alexa Tullis (Co-chair), Andreas Udbye, Ann Wilson (Co-Chair).

Not in Attendance: Derek Buescher, Mark Reinitz.

Call to Order: The meeting was held in Wyatt Hall, Rm. 226. Tullis called the meeting to order at 4:00pm.

Approval of Minutes: Approval of September 24, 2018 minutes.

Agenda:

Topic: Jane Sweeney introduced to the IRB as the community liaison.

Topic: Official Vote on IRB Chair

Discussion and Decision: Alex Tullis and Ann Wilson were confirmed as co-chairs of the IRB committee.

Action Steps and Follow-up: None at this time.

Topic: Questions regarding protocol reviews

Discussion and Decision:

1. Some members of the IRB were not aware that certain SOAN protocols do not require written informed consent. AW provided handouts for the SOAN memorandum of understanding (MOU) that was created in April, 2016. This document is also available to all IRB members on the server. It was pointed out the current MOU for SOAN expires in April, 2019 and will need to be reviewed again. MOUs also exist for psychology and University of Puget Sound Institutional Research.

Action Steps and Follow-up: All IRB members to review the MOUs on the server for SOAN, psychology and institutional research. Check whether expiration dates apply for the other MOUs.

2. Issues were raised concerning verbal consent forms. Firstly, permission to record participant interviews is not always included in the verbal consent script. It was discussed that this information should be provided in verbal consent scripts in future. Secondly, students are

providing their personal cell phone numbers directly to study participants. It was discussed that students should not provide personal phone numbers to study participants.

Action and Follow-up: All IRB members will review protocols with these points in mind and request modifications where appropriate.

3. Several IRB members noted that when they receive revised documents from investigators, the entire application is not included. Often just the protocol is included. This means that a final approved application in its full form is not available on the IRB server. Another related point is that revised applications often do not highlight the changes made in the documentation, despite the instructions requesting this.

Action and Follow-up: All IRB members should request that when an application is revised and resubmitted, it should include all required materials (e.g. signed cover sheet, protocol, consent forms, CITI certificates, etc). WN sent out an email he had adapted from the standardized responses. Other committee members are to review the revised email content and provide feedback.

4. Applications are still being submitted using the old protocol format. Although the new forms are available on the IRB website, the IRB handbook needs updating to include the new protocol format.

Action and Follow-up: MP to update the IRB handbook.

5. Final reports are not being submitted by many investigators following the completion of their study.

Action and Follow-up: Discuss the IRB procedures for following-up with investigators for final/progress reports at a future committee meeting.

Topic: The use of on-line research tools

Discussion and Decision: A discussion was held about best practices for the use of online tools in research, especially tools used for online data storage and data collection (Senate charge). As part of this exercise, IRB members reviewed the Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee's draft of "Best Practices for Managing Sensitive Documents for ideas. One issue that arose from the conversation was the practice of investigators storing research data on personal computers (non-university owned desktops/ laptops). The library recommendations suggest no storage of sensitive data in personal computers.

Action and Follow-up: This matter needs looking into further. In particular, discussions need to be held to determine what constitutes "sensitive" data. AU volunteered to look into the possibility of categorizing the sensitivity of data being collected by any given study. The findings will be reported at a future fall meeting and a sub-committee may need forming if this turns out to be a complex issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

The next meeting will be 19th November 2018, 4:00pm-5:00pm, 226 Wyatt Hall.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Pohl