

**Minutes**  
**Institutional Review Board**  
**September 8, 2010**

**Present:** Mary Rose Lamb (Chair), Julia Looper, Alexa Tullis, Andrew Gardner, Lisa Ferrari, Elise Richman

Meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m.

**Announcements:** We collectively reviewed the committee's tasks and responsibilities for the upcoming semester for the benefit of incoming members. In general terms, it was agreed that these tasks can be subdivided into two categories. First, the IRB needs to continually review incoming protocols; second, the IRB needs to substantially revise and simplify its online presence and other documentation available to faculty and students, with a particular focus on the Misconduct Policy. Of the tasks beyond the continuing review of protocols, it was decided that we will begin with the revision of the Misconduct Policy, for review by the PSC, and with the streamlining of the IRB website.

**Orders of Business:**

**1. Selection of a new Chair for the IRB:**

After some discussion, Dr. Mary Rose Lamb agreed to serve as the chair of the IRB for the academic year.

- 2. Potential Federal Registration of the Puget Sound IRB:** It was noted that our IRB is not currently registered with the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. IRBs must be registered to obtain Federalwide Assurance. However, several years ago we decided not to pursue Federalwide Assurance because it would require significant effort to maintain and we did not have faculty research grants to which it would apply. Lisa was uncertain whether there were requirements about or benefits to registering with OHRP if it is not our intention to seek Federalwide Assurance.

**Action:** Lisa will look further into this registration process.

- 3. Revision of the IRB Principles and Procedures Document:** This issue was reviewed for the incoming members of the committee. It was noted that we need to significantly revise the IRB Principles and Procedures Document. It was further noted that we need to produce a clear procedure for appealing the decision of the IRB. This was a central point of discussion last year, but we still have no clear policy or procedure for this appeal process.

**Action:** The revision of the IRB Principles and Procedures Document will be discussed at the next meeting as we establish our agenda for the semester.

- 4. Other recurrent issues from last year:** There was a brief discussion of investigator's potential obligations to report apparent child abuse that might be observed or noted during the research process. Andrew wondered how we might delineate that obligation in other cultural settings. Lisa noted that the committee's role is to interpret federal rules, some of which presumably apply only in a U.S. context. There was also a brief note concerning discussion last year as to whether proposals for foreign research should require approval by the full IRB.

5. **Meeting Schedule and Location:** The committee decided that we would meet every other week at 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday. The first meeting of the month would be devoted to reviewing protocols. The second meeting of the month would be devoted to the other tasks at hand. It was noted in a follow-up email that the meetings will now be held in Thompson 188.
6. **Departmental Delegates:** It was also noted that we need to reconnect with our departmental designates. We need to devise a plan in this regard.

**Action:** The departmental designate system will be discussed in the next meeting as we review our agenda for the upcoming semester.

7. **Ongoing Review of Protocols:** Several basic questions about the review process were asked by new members.

**Action:** Lisa will disseminate an IRB checklist that provides a good starting point for evaluating incoming protocols.

The meeting was concluded at 9:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Gardner