

**Minutes**  
**Institutional Review Board**  
**December 13, 2013**

**Present:** Beyer, Tim (co-chair); Breitenbach, Bill; Gurel-Atay, Eda; Ferrari, Lisa; Houston, Renee (co-chair); Kim, Jung; Peine, Emelie ; Ramakrishnan, Siddarth; Wilbur, Kirsten

Meeting was called to order at 9:33 am.

The board voted to approve minutes from the 11/22/2013 meeting.

The following exempt/expedited protocols have been reviewed by members since the last meeting:

- 1314-031 – approved
- 1314-025 – approved
- 1314-035 – revision requested
- 1314-021 – approved
- 1314-028 – approved
- 1213-011 – approved after modification
- 1314-020 – approved
- 1314-027 – approved after modification
- 1314-007 – approved – full board
- 1314-030 – approved
- 1314-023 – approved
- 1213-001 – approved after modification – full board

Discussed how the minutes would be posted on the website: After approval, minutes are uploaded to the IRB folder and Jimmy posts them on Faculty Communications.

**Chair's Update:**

- Protocols 1213-001 and 1213-011 were approved (after modification) by co-chairs.
- It was reported that Andrew Gardner was concerned about his methods class. He will attend an IRB meeting in spring 2014 to talk about how his students' protocols look like.

**Review of Protocol 1314-026:**

The following issues were discussed:

- The use of Spanish: The protocol states that the consent form and interview questions will be translated to Spanish for participants who are not comfortable with English. The IRB board needs to see the translations before approving the protocol.
  - It was noted that these documents needed to be translated and back-translated, and these translations should be certified.
  - IRB needs to make sure that Spanish version reflects the same interview questions. Also, IRB needs to know if any sensitive questions would be asked to participants. We are supposed to protect subjects and don't want them to waste their time with sensitive questions. If those questions would be asked, there should be a reason. We need to know

which questions would be asked (both in English and Spanish) so that we can protect the subjects.

- It was decided to ask the researcher if s/he would use Spanish in the interviews. If the researcher decided not to use Spanish, then, this should be made clear in the protocol.
- Sampling procedure: The sampling procedure to recruit participants should explicitly identified in the protocol. There were some concerns about using the researcher's father's social group to recruit participants as those potential subjects might feel coerced. But it was noted that if the researcher's father does not have any power on his social group, then, subjects would not feel coerced.
- Status of immigrants in the US: The following suggestions were made.
  - Legal status of immigrants can be used as an inclusion/exclusion criterion. If a person does not legal permission to live in the US, then he can be excluded from the study.
  - Alternatively, subjects can be primed at the beginning of the interview and asked not to talk about illegal behaviors (e.g., illegal status in the US, illegal drug uses, etc.)
  - Fake names and/or pseudonym can be used throughout the interviews.
    - However, if records are subpoenaed, consent letters can be related to the fake names.
  - If the subject starts talking about illegal behaviors, the researcher should stop recording. This should be made clear both on the protocol and the consent form.
  - It was also suggested that verbal consent, instead of written consent, can be obtained from the subjects. But, then, it was noted that written consent is necessary for most research situations.
- Consent form:
  - The form should be printed on the University of Puget Sound letterhead.
  - Principal investigator's phone number should be listed on the consent form.
  - Any questions about the research should be answered by the principal investigator, not the faculty advisor.
  - The consent letter should clearly state that the status of immigrants in the US will not be recorded.
  - Leon Grunberg is a Professor of SOAN
  - Should be kept in a locked place when they are in San Francisco. Then, they should be kept locked in the faculty advisor's office or academic department
- Other issues:
  - Signatures of the principal investigator and the faculty advisor are needed on the first page of the protocol.
  - On the cover page, the number of subjects is identified as seven. On the protocol, it was identified as ten. They should be aligned.

- The interview questions refer to being a non-North American citizen and North American citizen. This may be confusing for subjects, “United States” can be used instead of “North American.”

A motion was made that the co-chairs will contact the principal investigator. If there would be many revisions/modifications, the board will review the protocol again. Otherwise, the co-chairs will review the protocol.

### **Review of Protocol 1314-029:**

The following issues were discussed:

- Attending a support group meeting:
  - A concern was raised about sitting in a meeting, then asking for participants as it might feel coerced. However, others noted that sitting in a meeting would develop trust. Because the researcher does not have power over the potential subjects, it would not be coercive.
  - A question was asked if people attending the meeting should be made aware that they would be observed. Similarly, a concern was raised about sitting in a meeting without the consent of attendees of the meeting. However, it was noted that it is a public meeting. The researcher can attend the meeting, take notes, and write anything about the meeting without a consent form. Also, the researcher does not have to say anything to the attendees of the meeting unless they would be identified in the researcher’s notes.
    - Then following question was asked: What constitutes private setting? The support group meeting is held with a limited set of people on a sensitive topic, it is organized by a specific organizations, it should specifically be sought out to be found, hence, it represents more of a private space than a public space. Accordingly, attendees of the meeting may be offended by the researcher. However, this would not violate human subjects’ protection.
    - It was also stressed that the field notes should not include any identification information.
- Consent form: The consent form is not complete.
  - The form should be printed on the University of Puget Sound letterhead.
  - “Description” section should be more detailed:
    - Should explicitly state that the interviews will be recorded.
    - Should state what type of questions will be asked.
  - Any questions about the research should be answered by the principal investigator, not the faculty advisor.

