Institutional Review Board meeting
November 3, 2101
President’s Board Room – Burnett Hall

• Call to order 3:00 PM
• Members present: John Kraft (chair), Susan Arshack, Joyce Bergin, Donna Brooks, Jane Wong, Trish Coberly-Holt, Sean Eastman, Delana Nivens, Sara Plaspohl, and Mark Finlay

• The minutes of 6 October 2010 were approved without change.
• Mark Finlay was asked to take minutes.
• Discussion of revisions to the IRB Policies and Procedures document.
  o Drs. Bergin, Brooks, and Coberly-Holt were members of the subcommittee that suggested various revisions to the document.
  o Dr. Bergin stressed that her committee focused on how our policies corresponded with the law in question: Title 45, Part 46.
  o A change was made on page two, now requiring students to append proof that they had completed requisite training to any IRB application.
  o There was much discussion concern Part III of the document, dealing with membership. Dr. Bergin and her colleagues argued that assistant deans should not be members of the committee for the following reasons: the mainstream faculty should be more directly involved with the IRB process; that a broad range of faculty members should go through the training and leadership experience of being on the committee; and that membership should not be in perpetuity. Because the IRB is charged simply with ensuring that the law is followed, she added, there is no need for administrators to oversee the process.
  o After some discussion, an amendment was proposed and approved to mandate that one department head and one assistant dean be included among the eight faculty members of this committee.
  o There also was discussion on how any changes to this document would be approved. Dr. Kraft suggested that both the VPAA and the President still have final authority.
  o There also was considerable discussion over the role of the Director of Sponsored Programs on this committee. Ms. Arshack left the room. Dr Bergin again stated that no persons should be members of the committee in perpetuity. Dr. Kraft suggested that the person in the office held special expertise on federal regulations. Dr. Plaspohl countered that a conflict of interest was possible, for the issue of grant management was not the same as grant ethics. Dr. Nivens pointed to a possible conflict of interest, particularly if the position of Director of Sponsored Programs were funded by “soft” money. There also was discussion about whether of not the job description for the Director of Sponsored Programs mandated membership on (or leadership of) the IRB. The consensus was that the Director of Sponsored Programs should attend meetings only when invited to address specific questions or concerns.
The Board meeting adjourned at about 4:20.