

Institutional Review Board Minutes

August 18th, 2011

I. Call to Order:

Meeting was called to order at 9:01 A.M.

Members present: (Scientific/ Non-scientific)

Name	Present	Absent	Name	Present	Absent
Dr. Timothy Buckner, Chair (NS)	X		Dr. Glenda Avery (vtel)	X	
Chase Taylor (NS) (NI)		X*	Dr. Isabelle Warren (vtel)		X*
Dr. Gina Mariano, Chair elect	X		Dr. Shari Hoppin	X	
Dr. Emma Peden	X		Dr. Frank Hammonds	X	
Dr. Dionne Rosser-Mims (pho)	X		Dr. Richard Caldarola (vtel)	X	
Dr. Eddie Clark (vtel)	X		Dr. Robert Abbey (phone)		X*
Dr. Dianne Barron, ex officio	X		Dr. Janet McNellis, ex officio	X	
Susan DuBose (NS) (NI)	X		Dr. William Foxx (vtel)	X	

X*- absent with notice

NS- non-scientist member

NI- non-institutional member

In Person: Dr. Tim Buckner, Dr. Gina Mariano, Dr. Emma Peden, Dr. Dianne Barron, Susan Dubose, Dr. Shari Hoppin, Dr. Frank Hammonds, Dr. Janet McNellis

Via V-Tel: Dr. Eddie Clark, Dr. Glenda Avery, Dr. Richard Cardarola, Dr. William Foxx

Via Phone: Dr. Dionne Rosser-Mims

Absent with Notice: Chase Taylor, Dr. Isabelle Warren, Dr. Robert Abbey

Absent without notice:

Guests/Researcher: Mr. Naga Guntupalli & Mr. Robert Moore

Meeting began with 10 voting members & 2 non-voting members, 3 were non-scientists

9:23- 11 voting members & 2 non-voting members, 3 were non-scientist

10:19- 9 voting members & 2 non-voting members, 2 were non-scientists

II. Introduction of New Members

Training requirements- send new members IRB quiz

III. Election of Chair Elect

Dr. Mariano nominated for chair elect by Dr. Hoppin, seconded by Dr. Clark.

No other nominations.

Dr. Mariano steps out of room at 9:09.

None opposed to Dr. Mariano as chair elect.

Dr. Mariano steps back in at 9:10.

IV. Approval of the minutes

Dr. Hammonds made a motion to approve the minutes.

Dr. Hoppin seconded the motion and the motion was passed with unanimous approval.

V. Update of prior meeting's full review research proposals

Ms. Geraldine Anderson: Implementation of DASH Diet to Prehypertension Patients-
The requested changes are still pending.

VI. Chair Comments on IRB Productivity

Since July 21st, the IRB received a total of 5 applications for review. There were two applications submitted by faculty, two were submitted by a student, and one was collaborative between a student and a faculty member. One of the applications was exempt, two were expedited, and one was a continuation. No applications are pending approval and one required a full review.

There were no known adverse events, unanticipated problems, or protocol violations/deviations that arose over the period.

VII. Review of Research Proposals

9:23- Dr. Dionne Rosser-Mims entered meeting

A. First study (Researcher 1)

9:26- Researcher 1 and Co-PI enter meeting and informed Board of study.

9:57- Researcher 1 and Co-PI stepped out of room for further IRB discussion.

10:16- Researcher 1 and Co-PI stepped back in.

10:19- Researcher 1 and Co-PI left meeting.

Discussion of application:

1. How are you selecting courses to participate in the study?
2. How will you avoid duplication of participants?
3. Will it be published?
4. Reason Co-PI is not listed as a PI?
5. Is it a thesis?

6. Will it be a problem for instructional time of teachers being used up?
 7. How will you work with faculty members?
 8. Can you incorporate the topic with the teachers' lesson?
 9. What are the concrete lists of variables for analyses?
 10. How will you/can you avoid repetitiveness in the questions?
 11. Does every question come from a public survey?
 12. Do you have permission to use these studies?
 13. Has the survey been tested by a student for understandability and timeliness?
 14. The term "hook-up" needs to be defined.
 15. Will Co-PI have access to these surveys?
 16. What is your intent or statement you are trying to make?
 17. How illegal is this?
 18. What if it's sent to someone under age?
 19. Is there counseling available?
- Discussion ended at 9:57 and Researcher 1 and Co-PI left the room

After IRB review, the study was determined to require the following corrections:

1. Address possibility of criminal behavior identified
2. Add Co-PI's name as a PI
3. Be more clear on confidentiality
4. Provide permission to use the altered surveys
5. Disclose who has access to the information from the surveys and how long/where it will be kept
6. Print a consent form and add it to the survey
7. Put in writing what is "instructed" of the students taking the survey
8. Disclose risks
9. Add that participants must be 19 years or older in the instructions
10. Inform participants that they may skip any questions they like and can stop at any time
11. Provide reference to the counseling center

None opposed to the application being tabled. The IRB Board will review the updated application and confirm that the investigator has completed the modifications requested by the IRB.

10:20- Dr. Buckner & Dr. Eddie Clark leave meeting.

VIII. Policies & Procedures- Waiting for federal guidelines to complete

IX. Quiz Changes- Refresh quiz to keep up with changes

X. Proposed Rule Changes

XI. Need for On-Site Training

XII. Application Changes

Methodology, ask if application is a thesis or dissertation, ask if there is intention to publish or present...

XIII. Requirement for students in Gen PSY2200 to participate in 2-3 hours of research- Dr. Hammonds

Alternative assignments need to be offered if they do not want to participate.
Not in favor, issue of coercion

XIV. Compensation Policy- Dr. Hoppin

Issue: coercion
Clarification from HR
Issue tabled

XV. Best practices in online research

A subcommittee was suggested to be formed by Dr. McNellis. The members of this committee are Dr. Hammonds, Dr. Hoppin, and Dr. Caldarola. Dr. Hammonds will serve as the chair.

XVI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:53 A.M.
The meeting lasted 1 hour and 52 minutes.