

Institutional Review Board
Comments from the IRB Discussion
April 17, 2007, 3:00 p.m.
CMU 204

Present: Danbom, De Maio,, Okigbo, Nickell, Vigilant
Absent: Adler, Alexander, Bergland, Haberman
Visitors: Four students and the DRC members from Sociology and Criminal Justice

There was a brief announcement about the status of the IRB web-based proposal application program. Dr. De Maio stated that the program is ready for use. He plans to offer both the traditional paper applications, as well as, the electronic processing during the fall semester 2007. This will give him time to provide training to the IRB and DRC members.

The IRB was unable to conduct its business today due to a lack of members present to vote on two issues tabled from the last meeting. Although there were five members present, Dr. Vigilant was excluded from voting on these matters because of his involvement with them.

We decided to afford Dr. Vigilant and his students the opportunity to hear our comments about their proposal even though a decision could not be made at this time. We suggested a change in title, the establishment of a hot-line to deal with any potential discomfort from a survey question, and to select "embarrassment" on the ethical compliance questionnaire. Dr. Vigilant indicated that in all probability he and his students will not be conducting the proposed study. He stated that he was interested in them knowing about the inner workings of the IRB. There was some mention about them withdrawing their proposal, otherwise if approved, they will have to complete a continuing review, or a letter of withdrawal at a later time.

We also talked with the members of the Sociology and Criminal Justice DRC about concerns that were presented from their site visit. They were given the opportunity to explain their situation and present their position. Some of the DRC members acknowledged the violations cited in the DRC site visit report. However, they felt that the proposal in question was justified as exempt based on previous IRB rulings regarding studies dealing with sensitive topics. There were no solid explanations given for the PI signing the HRA form, the lack of compliance to recommendations from last year's site visit, and their lack of care in record keeping.

The discussion was concluded at 4:00 pm.

Submitted by,

Louis J. De Maio
Chair, MSUM IRB