

**IRB Committee Meeting
December 7, 2018 Meeting Minutes
Building 4, Room 2460 (1:00 p.m. ~ 3:00 p.m.)**

	RIE Director		Academic Senate Appointments		Academic Senate Appointments		Managers – Appointed by VPs		Unaffiliated Member
X	Barbara McNeice-Stallard (Behavioral Science) Co-Chair (Term: Ongoing)		Chara Powell (Behavioral Science) (Term: 2016-2019)	X	Shiloh Blacksher* (Behavioral Science) (Term: 2016-2019) Phone		George Bradshaw (Behavioral Science) (Term: 2015-2018)		Danielle Pearson Graham (Behavioral Science) (Term: 2015-2021)
	CSEA Appointments		Catherine McKee (Biomedical Science) (Term: 2018-2021)		Elizabeta Meyer* (Biomedical Science) (Term 2017-2020)		Sue Long (Behavioral Science) (Term: 2017-2020)		
X	Vincent Herrera (Non Scientist) (Term 2017-2020)		Carmen Rexach (Biomedical Science) (Term: 2018-2021)	X	Sierra (Vane) Powell* (Behavioral Science) (Term: 2017-2020) Phone	X	Tania Anders (Earth Sciences and Astronomy) (Term: 2018-2021)		
X	Beverly Heasley Term: 2018-2021		Misty Kolchakian (Behavioral Science) (Term: 2018-2021)	X	John Norvell* (Behavioral Science) (Term: 2018-2021)				
		X	Bettina Lee, (ACCESS) Instructor Specialist-Math Emphasis (Term 2018-2021)						

* Alternates (verify).

Also present: Doris Torres, Administrative Specialist III

Item	Topic	Outcome/Action Item
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IRB welcomed new alternate for the non-science position, Beverly Heasley from Information Technology. Her term is 2018-2021. She will get confirmation from CSEA shortly on her appointment.
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes from 11/2/2018 were approved. Edits were corrected.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRB Research Proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #1: Update: Barbara noted that #2018-409 study data collection is completed. • #2 Proposal Review #2018-410 – All members of the IRB at the meeting or on the conference call provided their input on this proposal. Notes from member who could not attend were reviewed by all too. The IRB unanimously approved proposal contingent on the following questions being addressed by the Principle Investigator and their faculty advisor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Demographics:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your demographic questions on race/ethnicity should be re-viewed to align with the federal government’s requirement (see FAQ #2 for some beginning guidance for your consideration: http://surveys.nces.ed.gov/ipeds/visFaq_re.aspx#602) • Your demographic questions on age should be re-examined. It appears you are missing some categories. ○ <u>Probation:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IRB would like to understand more about the population of students on academic probation and your access to their information. Does your knowing their names pose a legal issue or not? Is there a way that Research and IE Department or Student Services could be the ones to make first contact with these students? This would allow the students anonymity from you until they decide to contact you directly. In any case, students who have a FERPA block on their records should be omitted from the study. The technical Mt. SAC definition of Academic Probation and Progress Probation is https://www.mtsac.edu/accreditation/college_accreditation/2017/lic/IIC5_AcedemicPr obation.pdf#search=progress%probation ○ <u>Semi-structured questions:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider re-wording question #3 “barrier” word. Question #5a focuses on transition – from what to what?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Consent Form:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Please reinforce that you do not have access to their grades. Their participation or non-participation in the study will have no impact on their standing at the College now or in the future. ○ <u>Recruitment:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The IRB was unclear as to your recruitment process given that students would be less likely to be on campus. Are flyers viable? ○ <u>Gift Cards:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If students do not complete all questions in your protocol, they should still get the gift card, correct? If so, please edit your consent form accordingly. Consider reviewing the following: https://cphs.berkeley.edu/compensation.pdf ○ Security: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Where are you storing the data collected? When will you destroy it? Security passwords? Access by non-research personnel? Please use pseudonyms in all recordings. What if a participant does not wish to be recorded?
4.	CITI Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Members received email from D. Torres regarding their status. Members agreed to have their training completed before the next IRB meeting in March 2019. As Beverly is a new member, she has until July 1st to complete her CITI training. Beverly, Vincent, and Barbara will meet as follows to support each other in their CITI Training. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Jan. 7 from 3:00 – 5:00 ● Jan. 18 from 1:30 – 3:00 ● Feb. 1 from 3:00 – 5:00 ● Feb. 25 from 3:00 – 5:00 ● March 19 from 3:00 – 5:00
5.	AP #3260	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AP #3260: Members took some time to review the IRB. They suggested reviewing it every 1st meeting in fall and spring. Edits were made on it
6.	Membership Check-in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We need two community members. Barbara will put out a call to the regional researchers' listserv
	<p>Next meeting is March 1, 2019. Beverly gave her regrets. Meeting agenda:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome (All) 2. Ice Breaker (Sierra, Shilo, Misty) 	

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. CITI training – new murky, most likely to encounter (John)4. Re-review AP #3260 edits. (Barbara)5. IRB Research Proposals (All)6. Email and Quarterly report to President's Advisory Council (PAC) (Barbara)7. Other |
|--|---|