

IRB Minutes March 27, 2015

Present:

- Ferrari, Lisa
- Houston, Renee
- Kim, Jung
- Ramakrishnan, Siddharth
- Richards, Brad
- Tiehen, Justin
- Wilbur, Kirsten (chair)

Kirsten Wilbur called meeting to order at 12:00 pm

Approval of minutes from February 20, 2015 meeting – no corrections – all in favor

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

- 1314-057.2- approved
- 1415-042- approved
- 1415-059 - approved
- 1415-063 - approved
- 1415-064 - approved
- 1415-066 – approved
- 1415-067 – approved
- 1415-068 – approved
- 1415-069 – approved
- 1415-070 – approved
- 1415-071 – approved
- 1415-072 – approved
- 1415-075 – approved
- 1415-076 – approved
- 1415-078 – approved
- 1415-079 – approved
- 1415-082 – approved
- 1415-083 – approved
- 1415-085 – approved
- 1415-086 – approved

Clarifications of the minutes were made with respect to how much detail needs to be included. As long as the themes of the discussion points are included committee agrees that is sufficient

Discussed how protocols for studies conducted by overseas should be reviewed as several committee members received protocols dealing with this topic. Generally protocols submitted by students have always required 2 committee reviewers while protocols

submitted by faculty required 1 committee reviewer as long as the protocol was deemed expedited or exempt. Further discussed whether overseas studies require a full board review or whether 2 committee reviewers is sufficient. The committee agreed moving forward that 2 reviewers are required for student protocols and 1 reviewer for faculty protocols. If a committee member receives student protocols that require overseas studies, contact Jimmy to have one additional member review it as well.

Reviewed how interview questions and consent forms in languages other than English require a back translation to English from the original translation to the appropriate foreign language. If a translator will be available during the interview then a back translation is not required.

Brad Richards raised a question about how detailed protocols need to be in the description of “recruitment of subjects” and how consent from the subject should be acquired. Committee agreed that it is okay to ask for more clarification in the methodology of a given protocol in order to properly decide whether to approve the protocol and to ensure protection of subjects at all times.

Review of full board protocol:

1415-057

Specific points and questions raised on the protocol:

- methodology of the interviews not very clear
- more clarification on the intent of the interview questions
- more information needed about the political volatility of the questions as the committee feels that some of the questions may pose considerable risks but without knowing the full intent of the study it is difficult to place the questions in context
- can the faculty advisor comment on the context of the interview questions provided by the student as per committee the questions as they are seem more “sensitive” in nature than what the researcher is intending?
- Is the committee aware or knowledgeable of the different institutions the researcher is interviewing?
- In communications back to the student, it may be useful to include the faculty advisor for additional help with clarification of the protocol

General discussion points on the current status of the IRB webpage:

- a comparison of the current format vs the outlay of the new, revised format
- on the new web page the following has been included:
 - CITI training link, instructions, and specific tracks required for students and faculty
 - A link for IRB members that include the following:
 - Summary forms

- A link to forms for students and researchers to include the following:
 - Cover page
 - Project description components
 - Consent forms
 - University letterhead
 - Checklist (copy from the handbook)
 - A distinction between when it is okay to receive verbal consent vs. written consent
 - Add the 3 criteria for when verbal consent is acceptable
- Per committee's suggestion any and all links to the Animal Care and Use will be removed and placed in the IACUC link
- Siddharth asked that committee members take a close look at the new format and provide comments/edits/suggestions that will continue to make navigation through the website user friendly

Last discussion point was the need to use the official University letterhead when corresponding with outside agencies when granting approvals and/or other IRB-related inquiries

Meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Jung Kim