

## **IRB Meeting Minutes – January 26, 2012**

**Attendance:** Garrett Milam, Yvonne Swinth, Lisa Ferrari, Mary Rose Lamb, Andrew Rife, Anne James

**Meeting Time:** Confirmed that bi-weekly Thursdays, 8:30-9:30 work for everyone.

- Protocol review meeting dates will be: 2/9, 3/8, 4/5, 5/3.
- General business meeting dates will be: 2/23, 3/22, and 4/19.

### **Workshop for Student Researchers**

Summer research protocols frequently do not meet the requirements needed for IRB review and/or approval. The idea of developing a workshop for students and faculty mentors was discussed. Discussion ensued re: timing of UEC applications and IRB application review dates to determine an appropriate time frame for the workshop and how can we coordinate deadlines so students can get IRB approval prior to grant reviews/decisions. We may need to review protocols from students who attend the workshop at a general business meeting in the spring.

Milam will discuss the time frame with UEC and Andreas Madlung re: the McCormick summer grants to find out their needs in terms of receiving confirmation of IRB approval for those using the grants for research. He will then contact representative from the following departments regarding a workshop to review the overall requirements of IRB (to be scheduled likely in mid-February):

- Economics
- Comparative sociology
- IPE
- P & G
- Psychology
- Music
- History
- Gender Studies
- African American Studies
- Math & Science

Rife proposed that we send a notice annually for summer research to remind students and faculty of the IRB deadline each year for summer research proposals. This semester, we may need to allow a later deadline for students who come to the meeting and are planning summer research.

Lamb asked if there is a system of formal help for students interested in summer research within the various departments. For example, Math & Science had a meeting for students. Milam reported that summer research in social sciences is fairly unusual and typically initiated by individual students. It is infrequent enough that there is no structure built in. Lamb wondered if other departments could benefit from a broader campus meeting for students interested in summer research. Swinth suggested an email to spark interest and to suggest students contact advisors. Lamb expressed concern that students would not

take initiative based on email. Ferrari wondered if a stronger designate system would provide needed support. Designates who are inexperienced in IRB often pass along weak proposals for full board review. Milam will also ask Kukreja and Madlung re: a more formalized process for introducing/supporting summer research.

**Protocol question**

Milam and Ferrari brought up a potential protocol re: tea drinking habits in Japan. The researchers want to look at generational differences, so the study would include children (over the age of 10). Data collection would likely include a survey and there would be some verbal interaction, although the study is still in development so the exact type of data collection has not been determined. Discussion ensued re: the nature of informed consent required. Suggestions were explored that might enable the researchers to include minors with parents/guardians, use verbal consent, etc. Swinth said she would be willing to discuss data collection options with the researchers. It was generally agreed that under IRB guidelines the proposed research method would mandate parental consent.

**Update on Professional Standards Committee**

PSC contacted Milam re: our recommendations related to ethics violations. He and Ferrari will meet with the PSC.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30am.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne James