

University of Louisiana at Monroe
Institutional Review Board
March 14, 2012
Minutes

Meeting was convened at 12 noon, at 640 Library, on the ULM campus. Present were Dr. Connie Smith, chair; Dr. Scott Baggarly, Mrs. Sandra Blate, Dr. Lynn Clark, Dr. Ann Findley, Dr. Melissa Melancon, Dr. Claire Stammerjohan.

Dr. Bhattacharjee and Dr. Lasiter were excused.

Because the majority of reviews have been exempt or expedited, and thus have been disposed, there were no new applications to consider.

I. Proposal Process

The committee discussed the current proposal process, and decided that as long as the requests were being reviewed and returned in a timely manner, the process would remain the same. That means that exempt and expedited review projects will be sent to various members for review instead of waiting for a full board review on the next scheduled date.

There was also discussion of how to encourage faculty to provide more approvable applications. Various training venues were suggested, but Dr. Melancon's suggestion for a "How to stay off the IRB's Hit List" online camtasia resource was preferred as most likely to be both useful and less onerous. Several ideas were provided, and others can be added through email. The included suggestions were:

1. All primary investigators and all collaborators must complete CITI training
2. Complete request for review
3. Provide all information requested/answer all questions on form.
4. Be sure all primary investigators, collaborators, and supervisors have signed the request.
5. Be sure to submit prior to the submission date for the next IRB meeting and allow 1 month between submission and beginning of data collection.
6. Provide Informed consent including statement that research is being performed, benefits, risks, contact information, and the fact that participation is voluntary, and that the participant may withdraw at any time.
7. Include all survey questionnaires and/or interview protocols.
8. If data is collected/obtained off campus, include a verifiable letter of support from an officer of the site.
- 9.

In addition, it was suggested that new projects that were sent to members for review be posted to the Moodle page as well, in case the reviewing member wanted the other board members to look at it and perhaps be able to review it in advance of a full board meeting.

II. Student Collaborators

It was clarified that until such time as class research projects were declared exempt by the new university policy, all class research projects requests for review would have to be signed by all student researchers. Dr. Smith will attempt to find out the status of the new policy.

III. Proposal Extensions

Discussion of the need for extensions of IRB approval achieved consensus that extensions were only needed if new data collection was still going on. Extensions would not be needed for ongoing analysis or writing. If the emerging data revealed a need for new data collection on unexpected topics, that might suggest a need for a modification request, as well as new data collection that would require an extension.

IV. Marketing Surveys

Faculty agreed that the marketing surveys often received from Aramark, faculty senate, or from other administrative areas would not need to be reviewed, as they constituted program review rather than research.

There was no other business.
Meeting was adjourned 1p.m.