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

**Meeting Minutes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Location:**  NHC 300 and Shiprock North ITV room | **Date and Time:** Friday, Oct 20, 2017, at 11am |
|  | **Attendees:** Sara Kien (Chair), Mark Bauer, Frank Morgan, Herman Cody, Perry Charley, Martha Austin-Garrison, Thomas Bennett |
| **Agenda Item** | **Notes and Actions** |
|  |  |
| 1. Approval of Sept 22 minutes 2. IRB Full Reviews 3. IRB Expedited Reviews   **7**   1. Parameters of the Diné College IRB Mission/ purpose/ function 2. Merlee Arviso update 3. Warrior Webpage 4. Budget and IRB Training 5. Genetic research and data sharing | Recommended to provide full term for FWA (Federalwide Assurance) rather than just acronym. Perry Charley made a motion to approve, Martha Austin-Garrison seconded. Six in favor (the Chair abstained)  Sheldon Begay, student PI, Protocol #DCIRB-17.01, Study title “Native American Healing.” Full review due to interview questions about trauma and PTSD. Proposal had been distributed one week prior.   * Correct multiple errors, (e.g. "arthur's" instead of "author's" on multiple occasions, "could be of an assistant," "their conclusions they draw based on their findings," etc), particularly in the text of the informed consent form. * Clarify recruitment/sampling strategy. What is the approach that will be used to recruit participants? PI mentions both random and convenience sampling, so clarification is needed. * Clarify who will have access to audio recording and consent forms, given that these materials contain identifying information and anonymity is required, particularly in research involving trauma. * Emphasize that participants will not be asked to discuss details regarding ceremony, given that it may be unethical to ask for such information. * Submit a detailed referral plan that includes contact information and provide referral plan to all participants, regardless of whether they exhibit symptoms of trauma. * Provide a detailed description of the nature of the risk on the consent form, specifically, that participants’ PTSD symptoms may be triggered by the interview questions and that a referral plan will be provided. * State that participants are free to discontinue participation at any time in the risk section of the consent form. * Include a statement in the protocol that age will be determined before beginning the informed consent/study procedure in order to ensure that minors are excluded from the research. * Remove the following sentence from the protocol, given that research does not specifically address this goal: “Also to further investigate how & why other native traditional methods/mechanism are effective rather than just prescriptions and seeing the doctor at medical facility when it comes to treating symptoms of traumas.”   Frank Morgan made a motion to approve conditional upon making recommended changes. Herman Cody seconded. Seven in favor (Oleksandr Makeyev voted for conditional approval via email; the Chair abstained)  Curtis Badonie, student PI, Protocol #DCIRB-17.02, Study title “A LGBTQ+ Perspective of *k’e*: The Abstract Concept of Inclusion on the Diné Nation.” Full review due to sensitive minority population and potential to trigger trauma. Proposal had been distributed one week prior.   * Address informed consent forms in the data management plan by specifying where/how consent forms will be stored and who will have access. * There is an ambiguity in the number of participants (40 on the first page of the Protocol and 25 on the second page). * The research involves a sensitive population. This should be included and addressed in the protocol. * The research could trigger prior trauma, particularly related to experiences of discrimination and/or abuse. This should be addressed in the protocol and mentioned in the risk section of the consent form, along with a plan for addressing the risk (e.g., with a referral plan – include the referral plan with the proposal). * State that participants are free to discontinue participation at any time in the risk section of the consent form. * Remove the last statement of the Risk/Benefit ratio section of the protocol: “Furthermore, it will provide an insight on subgroup of people within a nation that oppresses their rights to marry.” The research does not specifically include questions about marriage equality. It may relate to the research but it is a bit beyond the scope of the research.   Mark Bauer made a motion to approve conditional upon making recommended changes. Thomas Bennett seconded. Seven in favor (Oleksandr Makeyev voted for conditional approval via email; the Chair abstained)  Reviewers assigned:  Johnnie Bia, student PI, Protocol #DCIRB-17.04, Study Title “Academic Motivation of Diné College Students.”   * Thomas Bennett volunteered to review * IRB Chair Sara Kien will also review   Eulane Shirley, student PI, Protocol #DCIRB-17-05, Study title “Perspectives from Diné Men on Early Fatherhood.”   * Herman Cody volunteered to review * IRB Chair Sara Kien will also review   Brandon Hanks, student PI (*NOTE:* Failed to submit complete proposal)   * Frank Morgan volunteered to review if Mr. Hanks if and when Mr. Hanks submits a complete proposal * IRB Chair Sara Kien will also review if Mr. Hanks submits   Bryant Jones, Student PI, Protocol #DCIRB-17.03, Study title “Pinon or Peanuts.”   * Martha Austin-Garrison volunteered to review * IRB Chair Sara Kien will also review   Sara Kien will send proposals to reviewers. All proposals and decision letters will also be available in the IRB dropbox so that any IRB member can review at any time.  The scope of the mission is restricted to review of ethics (see IRB Policies). The role of the IRB is not to decide whether outside research should be allowed to proceed at the college. There are outside/external PIs who would like to conduct their research at Diné College who assume that approval from the DC IRB is equivalent to administrative approval. What are our thoughts?  During a short discussion, there is consensus that the DC IRB does not have the jurisdiction or authority to serve as a gatekeeper for outside research. There is a proposal that all outside research should be approved by an academic administrator before proceeding for ethical review by the IRB and that a proposal from an outsider/external PI that is submitted to the DC IRB should be accompanied by a letter of approval from an administration.  The Chair, Sara Kien, will work with administration to develop this new procedure.  Sara Kien: During the summer there was an outside PI who wanted to submit a proposal to Diné College, but the DC IRB was not fully functioning. She obtained approval from the NNHRRB and on Oct 10, 2017, the IRB Chair wrote a letter to confirm that the NNHRRB approval letter was submitted to the DC IRB. The DC IRB will not review this proposal because it was submitted before the official DC IRB launch date, but the DC IRB is can confirm that the PI obtained approval from the NNHRRB. In the confirmation letter, the DC IRB Chair provided a list of several key administrators at Diné College who must be contacted in order to receive administrator approval and instructions for proceeding with data collection.  The DC IRB Warrior Webpage is up and running. Staff and Faculty can access this page by going to Warrior Web>Faculty/Staff>Committees>Institutional Review Board. Policies, Procedures, Agendas, Minutes, Contact info, and Next Meeting date are posted on this page.  The IGO Diretcor, Amanda McNeill, informs us that the budget for the IRB is still not set up. She is working with VP Marie Nez to get it set up but it is a slow process.  Mark Bauer: Dr. Bauer began to present but ITV was discontinued at that time. |
| **Meeting adjourned at 12:55pm** |  |
| **Next Meeting** | TBD |