

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 22, 1996

Present: Ann Ekes, Ernest Graham, Keith Maxwell, Lisa Neal

The minutes from the October 8 and 15 meetings were approved as written.

There was a brief discussion concerning the detail with which the minutes should reflect discussion related to protocols. Those present agreed that protocols should be identified by IRB number rather than investigator's name and that the vote concerning the approval or disapproval of each protocol should be published. This issue will be brought up again at the next meeting for discussion and adoption by the full board.

Action taken on protocols reviewed:

#9697-10 Approved 4-0

#9697-11 Approved 4-0

Ekes read an electronic mail communication from Joe Detorri concerning his investigation into the possibility of having anyone from UPS who is interested in doing animal research join up with a co-investigator from Madigan so that the protocols could be handled through their IRB. In order for such collaboration to occur, anyone from UPS who wishes to do animal research would need to do the following:

- 1) Make contact with someone from Madigan who would be interested in being a co-investigator. Detorri indicated that this would not be difficult since Madigan is a teaching facility with a great demand for research.
- 2) Designate the co-investigator from Madigan as the primary investigator for legal purposes. That person would then be responsible for submitting the protocol to Madigan's IRB.
- 3) Ensure that the research in some way benefits Madigan. Again, Detorri feels that this is not difficult since virtually anything with medical implications would qualify.

Graham expressed concern about the possibility that this process would allow the Army to determine what type of animal research should/could be done at UPS. He also wondered if having an outside person as a primary investigator might infringe on a faculty member's academic freedom. Given the small number of members present at the meeting, the issue was tabled until December 6th at which time the discussion will continue.

There was a short discussion of ways to respond to the Senate's charge to the IRB re: addressing the appropriate handling of body fluids during research projects. Ekes suggested that wording be inserted into the IRB Guidelines directing investigators to refer to and review the procedures for handling body fluids in the University's policy on Blood Borne Pathogen Exposure Control. The board agreed and that change will be made when the Guidelines are revised later this year.

There was a short discussion regarding a student-generated survey that was sent to all UPS faculty members today as part of a class project. The project was not submitted to the IRB and the survey contains questions that some faculty members might find potentially sensitive and/or offensive. The faculty member of record for the class in which the students were conducting the study sent an electronic mail message assuming full responsibility for the students' actions and retracting the survey as part of the class project. Ekes has been in contact with the faculty member via voice mail and has invited her to the next IRB meeting in order to facilitate her understanding of the types of research activities that need to be approved by either the full IRB or a departmental designee.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ann Ekes