

**Meeting Agenda**  
**Institutional Review Board, Dinè College**

Friday, 8/19/2022, 9:00 a.m.

1. Check-in
  - a. IRB members: C. Ami, M. Bauer, T. Bennett, H. Cody, S. Hakim, F. Morgan, S. Russ, J. Tutt
  - b. Guests: H. Peterson (DC Library, Tsaille), Rhiannon Sorrell (DC Library, Tsaille), D. Robinson (STEM), Propper (NAU STEM faculty)
2. Approval of minutes from 8/12/2022 meeting  
Motion by J. Tutt; Second by T. Bennett; Approved unanimously
3. Updates
  - a. Notification of due dates for reports and CITI expirations: S. Russ will be placing due dates on calendar for CITI training expiration and protocol reports. These will include an initial notification of the party/parties involved, followed by an alert one month and one week before the deadline.
  - b. Announcement of new research publications by DC faculty, staff, students: None
  - c. Other
4. Old Business
  - a. Reports: No concluding reports
  - b. CITI training certificates needed from four members. Notifications will be sent via calendar.
5. New Business:
  - a. Continuations: None
  - b. New Proposals: S. Hakim, D. Robinson, and C. Propper submitted a proposal for review "Multi-Institutional Transformation and Graduate Student Support Initiative (MITSI): Building Bridges and Transforming Institutions to Support Graduate STEM Education for Indigenous and Latinx Students."
    - i. Discussion:
      - Need for full protocol description
      - Question about role of faculty survey mentioned in consent form; only applicable to NAU faculty
    - ii. Motion to approve pending submission of full protocol by C. Ami.  
Seconded by H. Cody  
Approved (7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention by research team member)
  - c. Library: Conversation with library personnel about the status of the archives, the data repository, and the access for such resources
    - i. The archive currently lodged in museum for physical artifacts
    - ii. Repository lodged in digital form in library, containing primarily documents related to function and history of DC; no raw data. Examples from other universities include raw data only for federally funded grants that have that requirement. Discussion around the problems of storing data on indigenous peoples; the different function of indigenous research vs. western research; discussion that it would be a violation subject protections to store in excess of three years; observation that it would be problematic to have general public able to access such data; suggestion that perhaps requests to examine the raw data would go through a committee that included (if possible) the PI; observation that only data for which participants had given "broad approval" could be included.

Recommendation to form a working group to examine the matter; H. Peterson, C. Ami, and S. Russ volunteered.

- d. Forms: Review of the changed IRB forms, including (as time permits): Tabled by chair
6. Other: Suggestion to move to biweekly IRB meetings with posted deadlines for submission one week in advance. Suggestion that smaller working groups might meet more frequently.
7. Move to adjourn by M. Bauer; seconded by C. Ami. Meeting adjourned 10:12 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by S. Russ