

MINUTES
Institutional Review Board
January 26, 2010

Present: Garrett Milam (Chair), Lisa Ferrari, Mary Rose Lamb, Julia Looper, Grace Kirchner, David Lupher, Petra Perkins, and David Moore

Meeting was called to order at 8:10 a.m.

Announcements: Garrett reviewed the agenda for the meeting and explained that the Primary Investigator (PI) for protocol 0809-009 would be present for part of the meeting to discuss any questions or concerns about this renewal and modification. Besides discussing this protocol, Garrett announced that the other 2 primary orders of business were to settle on a meeting time for the remainder of the semester and also to review the Office of Institutional Research revised Survey Policy.

Orders of Business:

1. Deliberation on Protocol 0809-009 (Renewal and Modification). Key issues and questions included the following:

- Several committee members raised concerns regarding potential coercion. These concerns centered on the fact that the study was being carried out in the context of a university course, in which participants might find it difficult to say no to the research component, out of concerns that declining may negatively impact their grade and/or out of a desire to avoid disappointing the instructor/researcher. A related concern on this issue was that the specific sample for this proposal is comprised of socially isolated students who may inherently find it difficult to say “No” and thus may encounter difficulties in declining participation in the research component, should they wish to do so.
- The second concern focused on confidentiality. Here, the concern was that it may be difficult or impossible to protect participants’ identities since academic records (names, grades, enrollment records) would be kept for students as a result of their registration for the university course taught by the primary investigator.

The protocol was discussed briefly with the PI, who entered the meeting at 8:20. The PI then left the room before final deliberation and voting on the protocol.

Action: A vote was called on the protocol to approve the proposed study, pending revisions to adequately address the key issues noted above. The result of the vote was as follows: *3 For, 5 Against, 0 Abstain*. Thus, approval was denied.

2. Meeting time for remainder of semester. Based on the committee members’ collective schedules, Garret proposed Tuesdays at 8 a.m. as the most viable time to meet. Garrett indicated that he would Email the committee members with specific meeting

dates for the rest of the semester and requested committee members to “Reply All” to this message to confirm availability on these proposed dates.

3. **Unfinished business items.** Given the lateness of the hour, Garrett proposed that committee members give feedback via Email regarding two other key orders of business:

- a) Comments on the revised Survey Policy for the Office of Institutional Research.
- b) Comments on Protocol 0910-007, which was submitted in time for the first IRB meeting, but which had not been added to the meeting agenda and which the committee did not have time to discuss in person.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Moore