

Minutes
Institutional Review Board
April 19, 2012

Present: Garrett Milam (Chair), Lisa Ferrari, Andrew Gardner, Anne James, Mary Rose Lamb, David Lopher, Andrew Rife, Yvonne Swinth, Evan Skamarock (Undergraduate Student Rep)

Meeting was called to order at 8:30am

Announcements: None

Orders of Business:

1. Reviewed proposed modifications and request for renewal of Proposal 1112-08.

Modifications were made in response to prior review. Discussion ensued re: the nature of the study. In particular, concern was expressed about risk associated with students who want to know whether they were high and low.

ACTION: Milam will consult with the IRB designate in Psychology (David Moore) and will report back. Minor changes needed were also discussed and will be addressed in the letter. Milam will get back to the committee re: next steps.

2. Gardner had the proposed modifications for the IRB website.

The committee had a number of recommendations, including:

- Add a link that defines “what fits the definition of research,”
- Add a link to the flow charts to help researchers determine if their study is exempt, expedited, or full review. This link would likely be from a link to more basic definitions of the levels of review.
- The yearly schedule will include both protocol due dates and protocol review dates.
- Examples of successful protocols and consent forms will be run through the IRB one more time to make sure all agree they are exemplars.
- Swinth asked if we wanted to have some kind of checklist ... this could be in the manual. Gardner said that he thought that it would be a part of the proposal itself. Swinth agreed. Gardner suggested it could be a part of the description. Milam thought an actual checklist would also be helpful for people submitting proposals to make sure they were complete. Concern was voiced regarding the range of research proposals that we see ... would we be able to create a document that would fit all types of research? The checklist is not intended to reflect all items that *should* be included, but rather a guideline to help students. Gardner expressed concern that it would need to include too much to encompass all possibilities and that researchers may perceive that if they have considered the checklist then they have addressed all requirements, which may not be accurate. Additional discussion shifted to perhaps having this occur at a departmental level. Lamb would like to see an example. Swinth and Ferrari thought they might be able to find a sample from UW that they could share.

ACTION: Subcommittee will clean up the current draft that will get made into a mock website for review. IRB will compare the new website to the current one to make sure there are no omissions.

3. The start of the final meeting of the IRB for the 1112 academic year on May 3, 2012 will be moved from 8:30 to 9:00am. The meeting will last one hour.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25am.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne James