

**Minutes**  
**Institutional Review Board**  
**February 1, 2013**

**Present:** Grace Faucett (Grad Student Rep), Lisa Ferrari, Andrew Gardner, Katie Hall (Undergrad Rep), Mita Mahato, Garrett Milam (chair), Andrew Rife, Kirsten Wilbur

Meeting was ordered at 1:02 PM

Milam opened by setting an agenda for the meeting:

- Okay schedule for this semester and other “nuts and bolts”
- Check-in about non-protocol-related charges task
- Discussion of replacing designate system

Nuts and Bolts

- The committee agreed to approve minutes for last two meetings at the next meeting.
- Announcement that the next protocol meeting would be in two weeks
- Discussion of Rife’s position as a community member with a protocol in action

Ferrari raised the issue that the community representative should not have any connection with the university; Rife may stay on the board, but we need to find a community rep who is not affiliated with the university in order to be within legal bounds.

Rife has suggestions about possible replacements; will check with them.

Ferrari explains that we need to have someone in place before we receive a protocol involving federally-funded research

Recommendation made to being in suggestions of possible community members (someone who brings the interests of the wider community to bear and also has an analytical mind)

Non-Protocol-Related Tasks

- Website modification

Ferrari will check with Jimmy McMichael to see who the contact is to make changes to the website

Gardner will meet with Ferrari to discuss website changes and then move forward

Discussion of Designate System

Milam explained need to establish next steps on designate system and to resolve certain questions:

How many new IRB members do we need to add given the workload?

Best way to handle student research from high volume departments?  
What constitutes research?

Additional questions: What can our approach be? What is our position as a board? Or what inquiries do we need to make to form an approach?

Ferrari suggested that we might tell departments that the IRB will not handle protocols that don't fill the definition of Research (federal definition). Milam clarified that the main issue that defined the federal definition is that there is a plan to disseminate information gathered outside of the classroom. Ferrari clarifies that it included a systematic inquiry designed to create generalizable knowledge. If does not mean to contribute to body of literature in the world, we could say that's not research

Gardner asked whether there would be contingencies or possibilities for the continuation of the project. Milam explained that the real problem is that you can't get approval for something already completed. Ferrari followed by suggesting that research could be made the property of the university; then it becomes archival data/research (might be cumbersome). She went on to say that the issue they'll run into is a future IRB board or a publisher will want to see an IRB approval; if there's federal funding for the project then have to follow the letter of the law—if not, can develop our own system for handling the situation.

Milam offered that we can't be the only institution who has this issue. He recommended that we investigate best practices elsewhere.

Gardner offered that he tries to convey to students that what they do *is* real research and the IRB process is what makes it real. He explained that the idea that somehow this research doesn't make it out in the public is antithetical to valuing the students' research.

Milam followed by explaining that the Psychology department seems to take a very similar line of thinking. But then there is the reality of our resources; can we create an IRB that handles that many expedited protocols per year? Responding to Gardner, he also clarified that we should be careful not be too dismissive of student research—it *is* still research (just not according to the *federal* definition).

Ferrari offered that if a department wants a human subjects review board process that reviews the protocols that are not research by federal definition, then we can put into place something like the current designate system (not linked to formal IRB).

Rife answered that he making the process “real life” for students does have tremendous benefits. He then asked how to go to these departments and say “We can't do all of these” or how do we get someone from the department to serve on IRB. It seems that either we can't do this or someone from the department needs to sit on the board.

Milam agreed on that framing. Gardner responded by offering a reversal of his position: Going back to the two tier system—giving designates some other title and keep doing what they're currently doing.

Ferrari explained that designates currently approve EVERYTHING that comes through that does not need full-board review. That would need to change.

Gardner responded that we might re-title. For instance: R Anderson-Connolly: can we call him “Student Research IRB member” and he comes to a meeting once a month? Ferrari responded that he would have to sit on the full board. Milam further offered that sub-committees would work, but all members would have to be full board members and review full board protocols; essentially are coming back around to original proposal of shifting responsibilities of board members where expedited protocols are handled by a sub-group.

Ferrari explained that Academic Standards divides in half, where half of the members do petitions etc. and the other half does the other work. At mid-year they switch. Could use a model like that.

Wilbur offered that most IRBs come in during winter break

Milam suggested that we could craft it any way we see fit. We could bring in CSOC, PSYCH, OTPT to handle expedited; subcommittee would divvy up all the expedited. If full IRB met once a month, the schedule wouldn't change. Subcommittee work could happen between there. Additional responsibilities to review expedited protocols and four meetings a year and any additional protocols.

Wilbur asked whether that would increase the burden [of those currently in the designate role]. Milam responded that it would depend on what their service obligations looked like and then recommended that we find out what other universities do. Gardner concurred that we need detailed examples from other universities.

Ferrari explained that schools (small schools) don't have students doing the kind of research that we have our students doing; they don't do anything through IRB (expected to be done through the departments) and so don't have anything like our designate system.

Milam closed by saying that we should make it the committee's explicit goal for next admin meeting to get information and come up with examples and solutions.

Meeting adjourns at 1:50

Respectfully submitted by Mita Mahato