

# Institutional Review Board Minutes

## November 17th, 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		X*
Dr. Gina Mariano, Chair elect	X		Dr. Shari Hoppin	X	
Dr. Emma Peden (vtel)	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)(vtel)	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. Shari Hoppin, Dr. Frank Hammonds, Dr. Janet McNellis

**Via V-Tel:** Dr. Emma Peden, Dr. Glenda Avery, Dr. William Foxx, Susan DuBose

**Via Phone:** Dr. Dionne Rosser-Mims

**Absent with Notice:** Dr. Dianne Barron, Dr. Robert Abbey, Mr. Chase Taylor Dr. Eddie Clark, Dr. Isabelle Warren, Dr. Richard Caldarola

**Absent without notice:**

**Guests/Researcher:** Dr. Cathy Maxwell

Meeting began with 9 voting members & 2 non-voting member, 2 were non-scientists

### II. Approval of the minutes

Dr. Peden made a motion to approve the minutes.

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

### **III. Chair Comments on IRB Productivity**

Since September 15th, the IRB received a total of 37 applications for review. There were twelve applications submitted by faculty, twenty two were submitted by a student, and three were collaborative between a student and a faculty member. Four of the applications were exempt, twenty three were expedited, and three were a continuation. No applications are pending approval and five are pending receipt of additional information.

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

### **IV. Update of prior meeting's full review research proposals**

Mr. Naga Guntupalli: Examining Sexting Behaviors Through a Test of Self Control and Social Learning Theories-

The IRB received the requested changes and the application was approved on October 4, 2011 after review from the IRB Chair

### **V. Review of Research Proposals**

*A. First study (Dr. Cathy Maxwell & Ms. Elaine Mallory)*

9:18- Dr. Cathy Maxwell entered meeting and addressed issues.

9:39- Dr. Cathy Maxwell stepped out of room for further IRB discussion.

9:50- Dr. Cathy Maxwell stepped back in.

9:52- Dr. Cathy Maxwell left meeting.

Discussion of application: 9:09

1. Vulnerable population
2. Cognitively impaired giving consent; who is proxy? How do you know if you need one?
3. Recruitment methods? List from hospital? Legal issues?
4. Regulations- HIPPA form signed
5. Suggested to not know names, only room numbers
6. Reporting information back to nurses? Disclose either way
7. Risks: confidentiality, fatigue, stress
8. IC process: risks/benefits explained
9. IC form, simplify language
10. Elimination criteria: i.e. patient is obviously impaired
11. Waiver of IC, weigh risks and benefits
12. Explain to family members that trauma may cause patient to not be able to answer questions
13. Let family and patients know if they will get feedback

The discussion ended at 9:39 and Dr. Cathy Maxwell stepped out of the room.

There were no conflicts of interest among the IRB Board members.

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

1. Change informed consent: remove names and use room numbers
2. If reporting to staff, inform participants of this in informed consent
3. Modify risks in informed consent: potentially may cause fatigue/stress and explain that these are not diagnostic tests
4. Discuss how participants might be eliminated from study in methodology
5. If reporting to patients and family, explain in informed consent
6. Simplify language in informed consent
7. Explain how patients can have their information withdrawn
8. Explain that she will talk with nurses before she goes into the room
9. Potential issuance of a waiver of informed consent
10. Express that she will stop if patient shows extreme stress or emotion

None opposed to the application being denied as is. The IRB Chair will review the updated application and confirm that the investigator has completed the modifications requested by the IRB.

**VI. Update from “Compensation Guidelines” subcommittee-** Will add to IRB procedures when revised

**VII. Update from “Best Practices in Online Research” subcommittee-** Recommended search engines for surveys

Asking to include privacy information in informed consent?

Ability to remove survey and responses?

**VIII. Revised IRB application-** Define DNP (doctorate in nursing project)

Dr. Hopping motioned to approve with changes

Dr. Hammonds seconded the motion

**IX. Review of Non-Human Subjects review criteria-**

Identify funding source

Sacrifice method and pain elimination

Attach a copy of permit obtained

Indicate how they will follow guidelines

Remove non use of animals

**X. Spring training schedule-**

**XI. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:34 A.M.

The meeting lasted 1 hour and 33 minutes.