Institutional Review Board Minutes
October 17, 2001

Members Present: Allen, Coogan, Finney, Kay, Lamb, Stewart, Wells.

This IRB meeting was opened at 11:30 AM in room 326 of Wyatt Hall.

1) Minutes from the 10/1/01 meeting were approved by a voice vote of 7-0-0 (7 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained).

2) Review of Protocol #0102-001

The following issues were raised by members of the Board:

- The investigator must describe not just where, but how subjects will be recruited. What information will potential subjects be given? Will there be a poster, flyer, script for verbal encounters? If so, it must be included with a revision. Are any incentives promised? Might any part of the recruitment procedure be interpreted as coercion?
- Will subjects be tested individually, or in groups?
- The investigator clarify further for the subjects just what they are being asked to volunteer for in the second phase of the investigation (see Experimenter Script - item V).
- The consent form indicates that participation will take approximately 20 minutes. This appears to be an underestimation. It is requested that the experimenter pilot the procedure to arrive at an accurate estimate of expected participation time requirements.
- Specific references to the Mary Bridge facility should be deleted, unless they have specifically agreed to allow the investigator to use the name of their facility in this study (if they have agreed, a copy of the letter to that effect should be included). The Board suggests substituting nonidentifying language, such as "a local hospital," or "a children's health care facility in Tacoma."
- The investigator will be asked if it is necessary to "rip up" the subject's information sheet prior to returning it to him/her. Does it need to be destroyed in front of him/her? Can it simply be returned to the subject?
- The investigator should indicate whether or not subjects will have access to information regarding their own scores on the tests taken.
- The investigator must indicate on the consent form that subjects may ask questions at any time during the procedure.
- The debriefing must be expanded significantly to articulate to the subjects exactly why deception was necessary to address this research question. Describe in the debriefing the "risks" to which you have alluded.
- It is suggested that the investigator allow subjects during debriefing the opportunity to express their thoughts or feelings regarding the deception involved and any issues regarding empathy which emerged for them as they participated in the procedure.
- The next two items are suggestions related to the design which the Board is passing on, that do not require action for the revision.
- Is the investigator proposing to actually measure empathy and correlate subject willingness to volunteer with an assessment of empathy, or has it been decided that subjects who are randomly chosen to fill out an empathy questionnaire have empathy and those who fill out the other form do not?
- The investigator may wish to work on the plausibility of the patient case. It does not read like a 12year old with leukemia. Consider discussing his pain, or perhaps his nausea secondary to chemotherapy. Perhaps consult with someone who actually works in pediatric oncology regarding the plausibility of the patient

you are describing. Again, this is not required for the IRB, it is merely a suggestion for consideration.

3) The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
Roger Allen, IRB Chair