

Minutes of the Institutional Review Board
MARCH 25, 2016

Members present: Tim Beyer, Tatiana Kaminsky (chair), Jung Kim, Mita Mahato, Sarah Moore, Brad Richards, Barbara Warren.

The following protocols have been approved:

Protocol Number	Level of Review	Protocol Number	Level of Review
1516-005	Full Board	1516-076	Expedited
1516-057	Full Board	1516-077	Expedited
1516-064	Expedited	1516-078	Expedited
1516-066	Expedited	1516-080	Expedited
1516-067	Full Board	1516-081	Expedited
1516-068	Expedited	1516-082	Expedited
1516-069	Expedited	1516-083	Expedited
1516-072	Expedited	1516-085	Expedited
1516-073	Expedited	1516-086	Expedited
1516-074	Expedited	1516-095	Expedited
1516-075	Expedited	1516-096	Expedited

Kaminsky called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. The focus of the meeting was CITI training, what to require/what is optional, and how to roll the training out effectively.

Kim outlined the CITI training modules by focusing on (1) the differences between the two tracks (SBER, Biomedical), and (2) student versus faculty modules. Kim noted that there were quite a few introductory modules and questioned what we should ask students and faculty researchers to complete. Kim noted that the “Conflict of Interest” and “Belmont Report” are quite foundational content and could be required by everyone.

Moore queried about the mismatching numbers (across tracks, despite same titles and similar content), and Beyer clarified that while the tracks use different numbers, many foundational modules (e.g., “Conflict of Interest”) are similar in content.

Kim noted that despite similarity in foundational modules, the differences between the two tracks are pretty vast (e.g., SBER has modules on conducting research with prisoners, children, and other vulnerable populations).

Kaminsky referred to the minutes from the previous discussion on the CITI training (December 2015) and noted that our decisions at that meeting entailed (1) a single course for student researchers to complete, and (2) creating a list of general modules, including optional modules. Student researcher would be required to do the single student module, and may be asked to complete optional modules, after review, as applicable.

Kaminsky outlined that this gives three general options:

- 1) Provide CITI training modules as a resource to campus, but not require that anyone completes CITI modules,

- 2) Everyone (Student AND Faculty researchers) who submits a protocol must do some form of CITI training,
- 3) Only student researchers complete CITI training; an updated cover page would ask student researchers to indicate that they completed the required module(s), and optional module(s), if applicable. (For example, if the student researcher proposes to conduct a study with prisoners, then they should complete the optional “Research with Prisoners” module.)

Kim suggested that the Belmont Report is the base; this should be required. One way to roll out this requirement is to say that if you want to do research, you must do the training. Once completed, training is good for three years.

Kaminsky noted that only faculty training is good for three years, students for one year. Thus, we shouldn't ask student researchers to do more than faculty researchers.

Moore suggested that we should separate student and faculty research. Generally, faculty research does not raise the concerns that are more typical in student research. In particular, some student protocols which come from disciplines that typically don't have human subject research in their courses suggest that the student researcher has not thought about risk and its implications for participants as critically as is desired by the IRB. Therefore, student researchers should be targeted with CITI training to provide an educational opportunity for them as they begin to engage research with human subjects.

Kaminsky summarized the discussion and noted that any student researcher who submits any protocol to the IRB must complete the student module. This new requirement would be put into place next academic year; and the next chair would be tasked to review this new requirement and continue to monitor its effectiveness. Kaminsky noted that the completion of this module should speed up the review process and help streamline review for everyone.

Moore suggested other disciplines need to be alerted that this will be a requirement; for example, some who teach methods courses may wish to plan their syllabi differently to include the CITI requirement.

Further discussion ensued as to how to best implement this new requirement. After discussion it was decided that there would be two different cover pages, one for faculty research and one for student research. The cover page for faculty research would remove the “Faculty Advisor” signature box; the cover page for student research would retain the “Faculty Advisor” signature box add a space for indicating completion of CITI module.

Kim volunteered to create the updated cover pages and meet with Jimmy McMichael to reorganize the IRB website.

Kaminsky requested that any comments regarding the SOAN MOU should be sent to her within a week; and that the committee would hold off on making any decisions about faculty CITI training requirements.

The next meeting will be held on 4/22/16 at 10 a.m. in WEY 318.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted

Tim Beyer