Institutional Review Board meeting  
October 6, 2010  
President’s Board Room – Burnett Hall

Minutes

• Call to Order: 3:00 pm
• Board members in attendance: John Kraft (chair), Susan Arshack, Donna Brooks, Delana Nivens, Joyce Bergin, Trish Coberly-Holt, Jane Wong, Sara Plaspolh, Sean Eastman and John Markham.
• Board members who have completed their NIH PHRP training include: John Kraft, Susan Arshack, Donna Brooks, Delana Nivens, Joyce Bergin, Trish Coberly-Holt, Mark Finlay, Sara Plaspolh, and Sean Eastman. The remaining IRB members shall complete their training soon.
   o http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php
• Minutes from 09/08/10 meeting were approved after minor editing.
• John Markham asked for clarification on the expectations of videotaping participant behavior as described in a Physical Therapy IRB application.
   o Question: What is the value of taping if not all are required to tape?
   o Question: Would there be experimenter bias if a participant refused?
   o John Kraft responded that videotaping may provide an opportunity to review the motion of the participants and the tapes could be used to train researchers.
   o John Kraft suggested that John Markham, as the expedited reviewer, contact the student researcher directly and ask for clarification and assurances.
• Trish Coberly-Holt asked:
   o About why her name did not appear in the list of IRBs approved and John Kraft explained that two people reviewed that particular IRB and both names should appear.
   o To follow up on an IRB application from Regina Rahimi.
• The Board reviewed the first draft of a Institutional Review Board (IRB) Policies and Procedure document developed by Drs. Donna Brooks, Patricia Coberly-Holt, and Joyce Bergin
   o The board discussed whether the IRB was a University Committee, whether a Board differed from a committee, and whether it should be appointed by the President or VPAA. University practice and documentation does not clarify these questions.
     ▪ John Kraft volunteered to ask the President and VPAA for their preference.
   o The Board discussed the issue of indemnification of IRB members.
- Several members answered that generally, if university personnel follow policy then the university agrees to defend our practices.
  - The Board discussed the possibility of removing Assistant Deans from required membership on the IRB
    - Asst. Deans could be placed in conflict with their Deans if a Dean approved an IRB, but the Asst. Dean voted against an application.
    - Asst Deans could be burdened with many years of service to the IRB.
    - Removing Asst. Deans would allow room for more faculty members to serve.
    - Keeping the Asst. Deans would allow for more stability in IRB composition.
    - A majority of the board agreed that all Asst. Deans should not be required to serve on the IRB, but could be asked to serve as individual faculty.
  - The Board weighed the pros and cons of requiring tenure of all IRB members.
    - The general consensus was that the manual should ask for a balance of tenured and untenured faculty.
  - The Board considered whether the Director of Sponsored Programs should be required to serve on the IRB.
    - The possibility of a conflict of interest was discussed
    - The Director’s time could be better used
    - Communication between the IRB and Sponsored Programs was desirable but could be achieved in ways other than having the Director serve on the IRB
    - The generally consensus was that the Director of Sponsored Programs should not serve on the IRB (ex officio or otherwise).

- AASU IRB review of project already reviewed by other university IRBs or federal agencies.
  - As Chair of the IRB, John Kraft asked if it could be policy to allow a project reviewed at another institution or federal agency to be exempted from expedited or full review once the chair had reviewed the AASU IRB application and the other institution’s review of the project.
    - The board agreed that this was permissible if the chair reviewed the protocol and IRB application to assure that it met AASU standards.
    - The chair may still require an expedited or full review of an IRB application even though it was approved by another institution or agency.

- The Board meeting adjourned at approximately 4:15 pm.