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

**Meeting Minutes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Location:**  Conference Call | **Date and Time:** Tuesday, Jan 30, 2018, at 10:30am |
|  | **Attendees:**  **IRB Members:** Sara Kien (Chair), Mark Bauer, Frank Morgan, Herman Cody, Perry Charley, Thomas Bennett, Oleksandr Makeyev |
| **Agenda Item** | **Notes and Actions** |
|  |  |
| 1. Approval of Dec 1 2017 minutes 2. Update: External Research Review Committee 3. IRB review updates 4. New “Common Rule” 5. Open Discussion | Oleksandr moved and Herman seconded. Six IRB members voted in favor of approving the minutes (the Chair abstained)  Sara provided an update:  Amanda McNeill and Sara Kien developed a policy manual and a resolution to create an External Research Review Committee (ERRC). Sara Kien presented the resolution to the BOR on Friday, December 8th. The BOR approved the resolution. The purpose of the ERRC is to review and authorize research conducted by external PIs. The committee will consist of one academic administrator, one dean or chair, one representative of the IGO, one representative of OIPR, and one representative of Student Success.  IRB proposal DCIRB-17.06 entitled, “Impact of Heating Stove Replacement on Indoor and Outdoor Pollutants and Respiratory Health in Shiprock, NM, Navajo Nation” was reviewed by the IRB on December 1, 2017, and received conditional approval. Montoya et al. made the recommended changes the project received final approved on Dec 11th, 2017.  Sara Kien notified the IRB that PSY 413 students will be submitting their projects mid-semester.  Oleksandr Makayev inquired about whether one of his projects requires IRB approval and if so, whether informed consent is required. The project involves analyzing attendance data obtained from sign-up sheets for his tutoring lab. Student names are included on the sign-in sheets but the data are anonymized and aggregated. No informed consent was utilized. The intention is to publish the results. The response from the IRB (based on federal regulations) is that the project does need to be reviewed because there are plans to disseminate the findings and publish the results, but the the data are collected as part of institutional requirements and are publicly available, so consent forms are not required.  Mark Bauer submitted an IRB proposal for a project involving secondary data analysis of students’ educational activities (e.g., student presentations) in the Summer Research Enhancement Program (SREP) in order to examine the impact of changes that have made throughout five years of offering the program. The intention is to publish the results. There was a question about whether IRB review was required and whether informed consent is required. The response from the IRB (based on federal regulations) was that the project required IRB review due to plans for disseminating/publishing results, but that retroactive consent forms are not required and are only necessary if it is possible to contact students from the earlier cohorts. Informed consent should be obtained for future cohorts.   * The project qualifies for expedited review * Oleksandr Makayev volunteered to review the proposal (along with the IRB chair)   Sara inquired about a summer training/internship for Dine College faculty and students at George Mason University that is followed by a small grant during the 2018/2019 academic year to build research infrastructure in the Psychology BA program. The summer research internship will not involve Navajo participations and will not involve data collection on the Navajo Nation. The follow-up research activities during the 2018/2019 academic year will likely involve data collection on the Navajo Nation. The IRB consensus was that the summer internship/training does not require DC IRB approval because the research activities do not involve Navajo participants or the Navajo Nation. The follow-up research activities during the 2018/2019 academic year will require IRB approval if Navajo participants will be recruited.  There is a question about the line between assessment and research. The response is that data collected for purposes of internal decision making at the institution (including educational assessment activities) do not require IRB review. IRB review is required when there are plans to disseminate the results outside of the institutional/educational context (including scholarly publication).  Sara Kien reports that implementation of the new common rule (involving some changes to federal regulations for humans subjects research) has been delayed for 6 months (i.e., until July 2018). There is consensus that the IRB chair should make changes to the DC IRB procedure manual that reflect the new common rule and submit the updated procedures to the IRB for review.  There are concerns about the lack of an IRB budget. The proposal for any type of budget was approved by the Provost in Spring 2017 and a final draft of a budget proposal was submitted in September 2017. A budget has not yet been provided to the IRB. The IRB has been informed that the IGO is still working on it. VP Marie Nez reported to the BOR in December that they are creating an IRB budget. The IRB members discuss concerns for remaining in compliance with federal regulations given lack of training. One priority in the proposed budget was to obtain training regarding HHS regulations and changes to the common rule. A second priority is to provide a stipend for the IRB community member who is currently volunteering his time.   * Mark Bauer made a motion that Sara Kien continue to ask about the budget and submit a purchase requisition to hire a consultant who can provide training for IRB members * Frank Morgan seconded * Six voted in favor (the chair abstained)   Mark Bauer announced that he would be submitting a new proposal as part of an upcoming project.  Perry Charley announced that he is still in the process of working on a grant proposal for a uranium study on livestock. He inquired about the point at which he should seek IRB approval. The recommendation was to submit to the DC IRB when possible and then to follow up with proposed modifications and submission to the Navajo Nation Research Review Board when notification of funding award is received. |
| **Meeting adjourned at 12:00pm** |  |
| **Next Meeting** | Tuesday, March 6th, 2018, at 10:30am |