

Minutes
Institutional Review Board
September 19, 2012

Present: Eda Gurel-Atay, Grace Faucett (Grad Student Rep), Lisa Ferrari, Andrew Gardner, Anne James, Mita Mahato, Garrett Milam (Chair), Andrew Rife, Kirsten Wilbur.

Meeting was called to order at 3:00pm.

Orders of Business:

1. Discussion Regarding National Standards and Standards of Compliance.

- James reported her experience has been to have the IRB chair coordinate anything expedited or exempt and the responsibility for reviewing protocols rotated among IRB members. Universities that did this had small departments and submissions came mostly from Occupational Therapy and Psychology. James asked what the definition of a full IRB member is and are department designates IRB members?
- Rife suggested we develop a diagram of the IRB structure to include board members and then other departments. Could there be teaming?
- Milam asked if the department designates could be considered full IRB members then how would that work with service to the university? Milam reported he had a conversation with David Moore in Psychology. Moore reported he is interested in being involved with the IRB decisions and will speak with his department faculty. Questions came up regarding what generates the need for protocols and what is considered research. Should it be the role of the advisor to pre-screen protocols?
- James questioned whether the IRB members should review anything that isn't research.
- Milam explained that the Psychology department may not want to let go of the IRB review.
- Gurel-Atay asked if as an advisor she can review IRB protocol in her own department. The board responded "No", even though you are a full IRB member it is a conflict of interest if you are also a co-researcher.
- Milam questioned whether we are able to expand the IRB board and yet we can't expect the current board to increase the amount of reading it currently does.

2. Best way forward.

- Milam suggested we create a diagrammatic representation to help make the decisions for the future and that there is value in exploring other IRB protocols at other campuses. He asked members to come back to the next meeting with best practices used at other institutions and ask the following questions 1) size of the existing IRB, 2) roles of the IRB members, 3) frequency of the review meetings, 4) volume and type of protocols.
- Rife stated that the website GLIFFY turns information into diagrams and may be helpful to us.

- Gardner asked what happens if data collected by a student is then later used in a journal article at a later date. Did that need IRB approval?
- James replied that in the medical field you could not do that. You would need IRB approval; however you could consider it as retrospective data.
- It was mentioned that for undergraduate thesis work it would be wise to get IRB approval. For data collected prior to the idea of a paper one could get IRB approval for retrospective data.
- Two concerns emerged: 1) What we've been doing doesn't meet compliance, and 2) In certain areas there seems to be more flexibility.
- Ferrari pointed out that we probably need to revise the designate position and we need to determine what to do about gray areas such as oral histories. She suggested we add the following questions to our list of what to ask other institutions: 1) Who can suspend research (who has the authority)? 2) How do you suspend research? 3) When is research suspended? 4) What do you do about research misconduct?
- James asked if we have a form for reporting when research goes wrong.
- Ferrari stated that that information is usually in the end of the year report.
- Someone asked if there is an incident report. Can we make minor modifications to the original protocol?
- Gardner had another concern regarding the approval of participation when researchers are based at several other universities across multiple countries. Should you provide your home university with a copy of the original IRB approval from another institution? Ferrari stated that IRB approval is approval of the research project, not the researcher.
- Milam asked what the status of the IRB website revisions was. Andrew Gardner stated he would help with revisions with the idea that changes will be made throughout the year as decisions are finalized.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kirsten Wilbur