

Institutional Review Board

Minutes

January 31, 2020

Present: Andrew Gardner, Renee Houston, Hajung Lee, Wendell Nakamura, Michael Pohl, Brad Richards, Alexa Tullis, Andreas Udbye, Ann Wilson

Minutes: The minutes from the meeting on December 6, 2019 were approved.

Protocols reviewed and approved since 12/6/2019

1920-011
1920-019
1920-027
1920-035
1920-043
1920-044
1920-041
1920-042
1819-104-2
1920-004
1920-038
1920-045

Meeting Schedule for Spring 2020: Considering the quantity of work before the IRB, there was discussion concerning an increase in the number of scheduled meetings. This increase in the workload is partially due to the forthcoming Summer Research Proposals. There was general agreement to meet every three weeks rather than every four weeks. The following meetings were then scheduled: February 21, March 27, April 10, April 24, and May 8. This will also allow the IRB to establish a deadline for Full Board Review on March 13, in cadence with the summer research proposal timeline.

Community Representative and IRB Membership: The Puget Sound IRB needs to find a new community representative for membership, as this is a requirement. That person cannot work at the University, past or present, nor have any direct connection to the university (a spouse, for example). Several members of the IRB have acquaintances who might be able to serve on the IRB, and inquiries will be made.

There was some subsequent discussion of other issues concerning the constitution of the Puget Sound IRB — in conversation with the National Council of University Research Administrators representative on campus this week, it was clarified that although our IRB is currently in compliance, we need to ensure that we maintain a set of members from across the disciplines present on campus, including members from disciplines in the humanistic (non-scientific) traditions.

Annual Charges to the IRB: There was some discussion of the fourth charge, as delineated in the meeting notes from December 6, 2019. That fourth charge requires that the IRB stay abreast of federal requirements. Gardner noted that there is also longstanding concern that this charge also should allow

the Puget Sound IRB to gauge the required relationship between those Federal guidelines and campus IRBs.

Revisions to the CITI Training System: Nakamura suggested a hard roll out of revisions to the CITI training system be set for the start of the Fall semester in August 2020. This will ensure we have the time necessary to review and test those changes prior to the implementation of the new system. There was also a suggestion that the IRB begin to broadcast this upcoming change. Houston promised to speak about the forthcoming changes at the next Chairs, Deans, and Directors meeting.

There was some discussion about improving the entry point for campus researchers to the required CITI modules. Tullis has tested those modules and there has been a significant reorganization of the required and optional modules required of researchers at Puget Sound. Tullis has also written some instructions for faculty that will be incorporated into the online interface with researchers. The CITI system should also deliver certificates for the optional modules, it was noted. It was decided that the entry point to the CITI modules should be bifurcated into Faculty and Student entry points.

Concluding IRB-approved Research: Nakamura led a discussion concerning the process of closing research with the IRB. He intends to talk with Jimmy McMichael about this process. Ideally, researchers with expiring permission will receive a reminder email a month before the date of expiration. That email will remind researchers that either a final report or an extension/modification is soon due. Nakamura will inspect the current form before proceeding with discussion with Jimmy McMichael. Gardner suggested that we establish this process before the IRB attempts to tackle issues with low response rates.

Subcommittees for Task Completion: Nakamura and Pohl suggested that the IRB's intended revisions to the online materials for campus research comprise a substantial amount of work, and it was suggested that members of the IRB divide into working groups to tackle these various tasks.

Consent Form and Coversheet: Tullis, Gardner, Pohl

Handbook Revisions: Udbye, Richards, Wilson

Gender-inclusive Language: Hajung

Coordinating with Jimmy: Nakamura

Wilson noted that her contribution to the revisions of the handbook will consist of separating the portions of the text aimed at researchers in the campus community from portions of the text that are configured for members of the IRB.

Gardner also promised to present the IRB with a suggested revision to the protocol format by the end of the semester. That proposed revision will ask require researchers to briefly articulate a Data Management Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrew Gardner