

Institutional Review Board Minutes

December 11, 2002

Members Present: Coogan, Finney, Kay, Preiss, Wells, Swinth, Woodward

Absent: Cohen, Ferrari-Comeau

Meeting was called to order at 9:05. The committee reviewed the minutes from the meeting on September 16. There was one modification to the minutes. Yvonne Swith took minutes for that day. With this addition, the minutes were approved.

Judith Kay reported on a recent discussion of the university's dissection policy conducted by Robin Foster. During the ensuing discussion, Finney felt that at this point, the IRB did not need to be involved in this policy debate. He felt it was largely a curricular issue. Preiss felt that as issues related to the dissection policy arise, the IRB could offer advice as necessary.

0203-001 There were some concerns about the wording of the interview. Coogan could not determine if the questions would be structured, semi-structured, or something else. He also queried the appropriateness and relevance of some of the questions on the sample form. Swinth suggested that the questions concerning, "what concerns or fears do you have?" be postponed in the interview. Also, there was concern over the purpose of photographing the subjects. Woodward suggested that the relevant paragraph in the consent form include the phrase, "will be used for non-commercial purposes." The consent forms should be modified so that the child could participate in the study without being photographed. The role of the audiotaping should also be clarified. Swinth and Kay felt that elements of the interview needed to be clarified -- how many interviews, the purpose of the interview, etc. Kay wondered if the applicant wants to delete the reference to child on page 2 of the protocol. All of this needs to be clarified. If they do want to include the child in the interview, the questions need to be rephrased. Kay and Swinth also recommended that the age range of the sample be consistent with the norming used for the main measure. The protocol was approved subject to revision.

0203-002 Preiss felt that he had a hard time discerning what was going to be done. Finney felt the same way in terms of making the protocol more explicit. We suggested that the applicant work with the advisor to include a great deal more detail before the IRB could make a decision on this protocol. The protocol was referred back to the applicant for major revisions.

0203-003 Preiss wondered about how the medical records will be reviewed. Swinth wondered if they need access to all of the records. There seemed to be an inconsistency in the age of the participants. Preiss also felt that the risks in the proposal may have been understated. The kind of interview proposed in the protocol may provoke emotional issues that are considerable. Wells felt that an interview guide should have been included. The way in which benefits of the study were presented could be rewritten. The protocol was referred back to the applicant for major revisions.

0203-004 Finney stated that the consent form should use the same format as other forms. That is, questions about the details of the study should not be directed to Finney's office. The appropriate format for what kind of questions the Associate Dean's office will answer are on the web page and should be used in both consent forms. Preiss felt that the benefits statement on page 5 could be restated so that not so much is promised to potential participants. The protocol was approved subject to revision.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50