

Minutes
Institutional Review Board
November 3, 2010

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

The meeting was called to order at 8:04 a.m.

Business:

1. Discussion of the current Scientific Misconduct Policy:

The IRB needs to present recommendations to the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) about how to revise the current Scientific Misconduct Policy (SMP) document in light of two main issues:

- a) Federal guidelines now require that all students participating in research that is funded through the federal government undergo some form of scientific research ethics training.
- b) Policies and procedures in the university's SMP must comply with policies and procedures specified in the Faculty Code (Grievant Policy) and with those specified by the Federal Government (document entitled: **Requirements for Institutional Policies and Procedures on Research Misconduct Under the New PHS Policies on Research Misconduct, 42 CFR Part 93**; <http://ori.hhs.gov/documents/requrimnts.pdf>)

It was proposed that training students in research ethics NOT be part of the SMP. Members agreed that this is reasonable and discussed some ways in which ethics training could be implemented, including making it part of the submission process for research protocols and internal grants.

The committee proceeded to identify the following points of conflict between the SMP, the Faculty Code, and current Federal regulations:

- Definitions and terminology (e.g., complainant v. grievant)
- Timing of when complaints need to be made relative to when a suspected violation was detected, as well as the timing associated with various aspects of the procedures.
- What entity deems if there is enough evidence to warrant an investigation.
- Which person has the final say about what final action should be taken.
- Confidentiality issues: What aspects are to remain confidential and what are to be fully available
- Anonymity: Which parties can remain anonymous.
- Records: how long must records be retained following an investigation and what exactly happens to them after this time period.

It was proposed that one strategy for moving our task forward would be to recommend that the university adopt a version of the sample provisions described by the Office of Research Integrity FAQ document?

Action: Julia and Lisa formed a subcommittee to comb through the documents and summarize for the PSC areas that need to be resolved.

2. Meeting with the University Enrichment Committee (UEC)

Andrew and Mary Rose summarized a meeting that they had with UEC representatives in which the UEC proposed that they change the guidelines for Martin Nelson Jr. Sabbatical applications to eliminate the requirement for IRB approval of a proposal prior to review by the UEC. The rationale for this change was the timing was very awkward for the applicants. Some committee members expressed some major concerns about this change.

Action: Mary Rose will forward these major concerns to the chair of the UEC.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:53a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Alexa Tullis