

#### INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

## **Minutes**

Date 01/19/201 Type of Meeting	6 Start Time 3:00 PM Adjournment Time 4:15 PM Location Library 640 ☑ Regular ☐ Special		
CHAIR	Dr. Greg Smith		
SECRETARY	Dr. Scott Baggarly		
ATTENDEES	Dr. Scott Baggarly, Dr. Kris Bista, Dr. Ken Clow, Dr. Debra Craighead, Dr. Srinivas Garlapati, Dr. Joe McGahan, Dr. Greg Smith, Dr. Carl Thameling, Ms. Diana Gooden (Ex-officio)		
ABSENT (EXCUSED)	Dr. Leonard Clark (excused), Dr. Grace Houston (excused), Dr. John Sutherlin, Ms. Gilbert-Bell (excused)		

# Agenda

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS				
Dr. Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and briefly discussed the meeting's agenda.				
DISCUSSION TOPICS				

Dr. Smith informed the committee about changes to the Common Rule and provided an article for the committee to review before discussion at the next meeting.

### Open discussion:

The committee discussed the development of a policy addressing the issue of coercion of research participants and the importance of ensuring that the participants are willingly participating. It was suggested that investigators use age-appropriate, situationally-conscious language to inform potential participants in a study that they may decline to participate and have the freedom to withdraw at any time.

The committee discussed the need to update the IRB Request Form and suggested several possible enhancements.

Dr. Smith asked the committee members to submit points of discussion for the next meeting's agenda.

#### Future Meetings:

The regular committee meetings this semester will be held on February 16, March 15, and April 26.

### Review of proposals:

IRB-657: Following a motion by Dr. Ken Clow which was seconded by Dr. Srinivas Garlapati, the committee voted to return this proposal to the primary investigator for additional information. The following conditions must be satisfied: 1) Clarify how informed consent is to be obtained from school superintendent (or principal) and parents; and how assent is to be obtained from students. The assent information should inform the child that they may decline to participate even if their parents granted permission. 2) Define ULM completers. 3) If the survey is to be given to students in the third grade and above, the age ranges in the proposal (5-17) need to be corrected. 4) Letters of support from the study sites must be provided. 5) A more complete description is needed concerning how confidentiality is to be maintained; 6) The proposal needs more detailed information regarding the study methodology.

IRB-659: Following a motion by Dr. Srinivas Garlapati which was seconded by Dr. Debra Craighead, the committee voted to return this proposal to the primary investigator for additional information. The following conditions must be satisfied: 1) The investigator's contact information and a statement of possible risks and benefits should be provided on all consent forms. 2) A student assent form is needed. It should be written in age-appropriate language and inform the students that they may decline to participate even if their parents granted permission. 3) Clarify how privacy of the interview is to be maintained, and if there is to be an interview witness or open-door policy when interviewing students. 4) Is a counselor available if students become uncomfortable during the interview? This should be indicated in the proposal and informed consent forms.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The committee discussed policy development to ensure that research participants are willingly participating, a revision of the IRB Request Form, and reviewed two IRB Proposals. Both proposals were returned to the primary investigators for additional information.

The next meeting is Tuesday, February 16, 2016 at 3:00 p.m. in Library 640.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Follow-up with principal investigators regarding additional information.	Ms. Diana Gooden	02/16/2016
Work on revision of the IRB Request Form and policy development	Dr. Greg Smith, Ms. Diana Gooden	05/15/2016