



## INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

### Minutes

Date 11/15/2016 Start Time 2:00 PM Adjournment Time 3:15 PM Location Library 640  
 Type of Meeting  Regular  Special

<b>CHAIR</b>	Dr. Greg Smith
<b>SECRETARY</b>	Dr. Courtney Robertson
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	9 attendees: Dr. Kris Bista, Dr. Grace Houston, Dr. Kenneth Clow, Dr. Debra Craighead, Dr. Joe McGahan, Dr. Courtney Robertson, Dr. Greg Smith, Dr. Carl Thameling, Ms. Diana Gooden (Ex-officio)
<b>ABSENT (EXCUSED)</b>	Dr. Srinivas Garlapati (excused), Ms. Gilbert-Bell (excused), Dr. Stan Williamson (excused)

### Agenda

<b>GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>	
Dr. Smith called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and briefly discussed the meeting's agenda.	
<b>DISCUSSION TOPICS</b>	
<p>I. Dr. Smith welcomed everyone and reminded the committee members of the proposal review process. He asked that members send review comments to Drs. Smith, Bista (as vice chair) and Ms. Gooden, keeping the IRB proposal number in the subject line or responding to the original email thread. This ensures all details are included for Dr. Smith and Ms. Gooden, and that Dr. Bista will have a smooth transition as committee chair next year.</p> <p>II. Subjects versus Participants          Dr. Smith presented the topic of utilizing the wording "Human Participants" as opposed to "Human Subjects" in proposals for discussion to ensure the committee's workload is minimized and provide clear guidelines for faculty submitting research proposals. The words "human subject" is used in federal literature and guidelines; Dr. Smith does not have an issue with using this terminology in faculty research proposals. Drs. Thameling and McGahan made favorable arguments for use of "participants" as humans are volunteering to participate in studies, rather than being subjected to procedures/processes. The American Psychology Association has suggested that the use of "participants" rather than "subjects" is favorable. Dr. Clow did not express a preference toward one choice of wording over the other, but felt the wording of informed consent forms should include "human participants." Dr. Smith did not suggest rejecting faculty proposals simply due to wording choice, and feels that the committee should be consistent in wording of policies. The committee members agreed. Dr. Thameling motioned for a gradual adoption of the word "participant" rather than "subject" into research proposals with first steps of changing all wording on IRB documents posted to Moodle. However, at this time, the committee will accept either word for proposal approval. Dr. McGahan seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>III. Review of IRB712:          The committee voted to conditionally approve the proposal on a motion from Dr. Craighead, seconded by Dr. Houston if the following is provided or done by the investigator: 1) Inclusion of subject selection criteria, including prior radiation exposure, gag reflex, and allergies included in screening/informed consent; 2) Review of consent with participant ensuring recollection of study details prior to second scan three months later; 3) Changes to the consent form, including removal of statements stating drugs aren't effective at treating Alzheimer's Disease and mediterranean diet is effective for treatment, that may potentially serve to coerce participants.</p>	

Future Meetings: The next meeting will be a full board review on Tuesday, November 29, 2016 at 2 PM. The first meeting for the Spring semester will be held on Tuesday, January 17, 2017 at 2 PM.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 PM following a motion by Dr. Kris Bista, seconded by Dr. Carl Thameling.

CONCLUSIONS		
The committee conditionally approved one IRB proposal, contingent upon additional information to be obtained from the investigator.		
The next meeting will be November 29, 2016 @ 2 PM.		

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Follow-up with principal investigators regarding additional information.	Ms. Diana Gooden	

Approved by committee/council chair  Yes on 12/07/16