

Institutional Review Board
April 6, 2008
3:00 p.m.

Present: Karen Danbom, Louis De Maio, Scott Garman, Craig Haberman, Gary Nickell, Carol Okigbo, Lee Vigilant

Absent: Richard Adler, Wayne Alexander, Jane Bergland

Meeting called to order at 3:05 pm

Lee Vigilant moved, Karen Danbom seconded to approve the minutes of March 17, 2008. Motion carried.

Announcements

1. The undergraduate student representative was asked to step down from the IRB because training had not been completed.
2. President Barden asked for an explanation on IRB approval as it relates to the student presentations at the student academic conference. Lou De Maio had written to the conference committee suggesting that IRB approval be attached to proposals similar to the way Graduate Studies handles it. The response to his suggestion was not favorable. Lou De Maio reminded the IRB that it was important to maintain integrity of research and adhere to federal policy, but the IRB was not charged with policing the research of the university.

Full Review

Jody Mattern. *Self- Impressions of Creativity: Accuracy and Susceptibility to Change.*

Discussion:

- Survey is being done at three campuses.
- Secure server questioned. IRB can require that they submit information prior to approval.
- Use of deception deliberate; debriefing explains why.

Lee Vigilant moved, Karen Danbom seconded, to approve proposal pending notification that a secure server is being used for the survey. Motion carried.

DRC Review of Graduate Theses and Projects.

Tabled item from last meeting: Graduate theses and projects. The IRB has processed 57 proposals to date. Of those 10 were expedited. There would be a marked increase if thesis and projects were all sent to the IRB. Karen Danbom moved, Lee Vigilant seconded that DRCs continue to review graduate thesis and project proposals that did not include minors or vulnerable populations. Motion carried.

DRC issues.

Should there be a minimum number of proposals per year for DRCs? Should there be annual training? If a DRC does not have any proposals for a year, should they be required to re-train? Should DRC members be required to attend IRB meetings? Karen Danbom moved, Scott Garman seconded that a minimum number of reviews and annual training not be a requirement for DRCs. Lou De Maio amended the motion to include that DRCs that are dormant for more than a year receive another orientation and DRC members be required to do another on-line training course before being re-activated. Motion carried.

Karla Wenger, Secretary