**Diné College Institutional Review Board (IRB)**

**Meeting Minutes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Location:** NHC 300 and Shiprock North ITV room  | **Date and Time:** Friday, Dec 1, 2017, at 11am |
|  | **Attendees:** **IRB Members:** Sara Kien (Chair), Mark Bauer, Frank Morgan, Herman Cody, Perry Charley, Martha Austin-Garrison, Thomas Bennett, Oleksandr Makeyev**Invited Guests:**Monty Roessel, Geraldine Garrity, Marie Nez, Amanda McNeill, Lupita Montoya, Kathleen Stewart |
| **Agenda Item**  | **Notes and Actions** |
|  |  |
| 1. Approval of Oct 20 minutes
2. IRB Review Updates
3. Outside researchers: Meeting with the Dr. Roessel, OIPR (Velveena Davis), IGO (Amanda McNeill)
4. Review IRB proposal: “Impact of Heating Stove Replacement...”
5. Budget update
 | Eight IRB members voted in favor of approving the minutes (the Chair abstained)Three PSY 413 students’ proposals were reviewed through expedited review, in addition to the two students’ proposals that underwent full review in the Oct 20th IRB meeting. All five students successfully modified their IRB proposals according to recommendations and received final approval of their projects. All documentation has been uploaded to the IRB shared folder. Students names and IRB protocols are as follows:* Sheldon Begay DCIRB-17.01 (full review)
* Curtis Badonie DCIRB-17.02 (full review)
* Bryant jones DCIRB-17.03 (expedited review)
* Johnnie Bia DCIRB-17.04 (expedited review)
* Eulane Shirley DCIRB 17.05 (expedited review)

***Began with a summary of previous steps leading up to this joint meeting:***On Friday, Oct 20. The IRB determined that it does not have the jurisdiction or authority to serve as a gatekeeper for outside research and that all outside research should be approved by an academic administrator before proceeding for ethical review by the IRB.Sara presented these concerns to the FA on Friday, Nov 3rd, at 8am, along with a proposal to develop an additional approval process for outside research. THE FA voted in favor of the following proposals:* The DC IRB should have the authority to approve all aspects of research conducted by faculty as Principal Investigators (PI).
* Outside research should first be approved by a committee consisting of one chair or dean, a representative of the College’s Institutional Grants and Sponsored Projects Office (IGO), and an academic administrator. This approval would occur before submission to the DC IRB for evaluation regarding satisfaction of ethical requirements.

The Division Chairs met on Nov 6th and voted to approve the proposal outlined by the FA.The Executive Team reviewed this proposal at 11am on Nov 13th and expressed support. The President called for a joint meeting between the IRB, the IGO, and Executive Team members. ***Summary of the joint meeting:***The purpose of the joint meeting is to develop a process for approving external research. Key points from the discussion:* We will need to enshrine whatever we discuss in this meeting in policy.
* There is an example of a request coming in from an outside researcher to OIPR. What if the request for the person doing the research is asking too much of a department internally. How much of a department’s time should be dedicated to the request of the external researcher. This needs to be taken into consideration. An OIPR representative should serve on the approval team.
* What is the structure? Does the right hand know what the left hand does. Understanding what is going on is important as well. Even if the IGO should not be involved in non-research proposals, the IGO should at least know about it. There needs to be communication between departments.
* Researchers need to do their own work to build the relationships with key individuals at the college as part of their research, and they need to document and demonstrate these relationships as part of the application process.
* We should require collaboration with a key internal collaborator. In the case of external graduate students, an internal person at Dine College should serve as co-advisor on their thesis/dissertation. A Co-advisor at DC would remotely be part of the graduate thesis committee. This would not just help with facilitating collaborations but would also help to share the credit.
* We do not want to be the “token” (i.e., exploited as a tribal college for the benefit of other institutions/PIs). Some guidelines:
	+ No consultants. Only co-PIs. \*we already have that requirement as part of the IGO, but nobody knows that.
	+ The PI should submit a statement of purpose
* Can we find other examples? Unknown. There often is no additional oversight but this is a cultural issue.
* It’s going to require policy to set up a group to speak for the college in this way
* The committee should include: Academic administrator, dean/chair, IGO, OIPR
	+ It was later suggested to include student services as well.
* The IGO should serve an administrative function to insure completeness of application of outside researchers. All grant proposals proceed through the IGO.
* There should be a separate application for external researchers with a link on the IGO website.
* Could we have this committee housed under IRB
	+ We should keep IRB as pure as possible (i.e., specific to its mission of reviewing to ensure ethical standards).
* We will need BOR-approved policy and a BOR resolution to form a separate committee.
	+ Sara and Amanda will work on developing a draft of policies and a resolution to present to the BOR on Dec 8th 2017.
* There will also need to be modification of grant approval policy that applies to all research conducted by outside PIs.

Motion:Oleksandr Makeyev moved to establishment an outside research review board under the umbrella of the IGO consisting of the representation of one academic administrator, a representative of IGO, a representative of OIPR, one dean or chair, and one representative of student services. Amanda McNeill seconded. 13 in favor. The IRB Chair abstained.Lupita Montoya, Kathleen Stewart, Mark Bauer, Perry Charley. Protocol #DCIRB-17.06, Study title “Impact of Heating Stove Replacement on Indoor and Outdoor Pollutants and Respiratory Health in Shiprock, NM, Navajo Nation.” Full review due to survey questions about personal health and substance use. Proposal had been distributed earlier in the week.* There are some errors in the Navajo translations on the flyers that need to be corrected.
* The flyers should be adjusted so that it is clear that receiving a new stove does not depend on participation in the study.
* There should be a statement under the “Participant Payment or Costs” section of the protocol indicating that there will be efforts to obtain grant funding in order to compensate participants for their time and that participants may be compensated retroactively if possible.
* Survey questions about fuel used should allow for all possible response types. Perhaps an additional ‘Other’ option could be included on the Daily Activity Log, etc, with the participant defining what the ‘other’ fuel type might be.

Oleksandr Makeyev made a motion to approve conditional upon making recommended changes. Frank Morgan seconded. Five in favor. Three abstained.The IGO and Marie Nez are still working on the budget proposal. There is a suggestion from IGO to provide a retroactive stipend for the external member of IRB.  |
| **Meeting adjourned at 1:55pm** |  |
| **Next Meeting** | TBD |