

2-11-2015

Consultative minutes 02/11/2015

Consultative Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult>

Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 02/11/2015" (2015). *Consultative Committee*. 119.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/119>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consultative Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Consultative Committee

February 11, 2015

Prairie Lounge

9:30 am

Present: Jayne Blodgett, Julie Eckerle, Rita Bolluyt, Jean Rohloff, Leslie Meek, LeAnn Dean, Michelle Page, Nancy Helsper, Sam Daniewicz, Megan Jacobsen, Lisa Harris

Absent: Allison Wolf

Guest: Heather Peters

Minutes from February 4th distributed and approved.

It seems that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has a new policy that is especially problematic for Morris. The Principal Investigator on a proposal can attend the meeting and answer any questions to speed up the process of being approved. If one cannot be there, then they send a letter/email with corrections/questions, so it takes longer. Heather believes that it is not realistic for those on coordinate campuses to drive three hours to sit outside of a door with the possibility of answering questions. She sent an email about this to the IRB, and never received a response. It is also a campus resource issue, as driving down takes gas money. Being present over Skype or phone would be much more feasible.

Roger Rose and Barbara Burke are listed as members of the IRB, so getting them involved may be helpful. [Committee members clarified that though both are listed on the web site, Barbara Burke is a former member of the IRB and Roger Rose is the current UMM representative on the Board.] An important question to pose is: how many other people are being affected? There are two issues: 1) being present at the IRB meetings to answer questions and 2) inconsistency of the IRB in approving studies. It was noted that getting approval for studies is taking longer and that often the IRB is concerning itself with study design rather than limiting its inquiries to protection of human subjects.

As someone with years of experience in getting studies approved by the IRB, Leslie believes that they have always been inconsistent in this way. But once again, it is not the IRB's job to critique design. Their job is to protect participants in research. This problem is, however, a bit more complicated than the initial problem brought forth. Making those from coordinate campuses miss a whole day while only making someone located in the Twin Cities miss an hour is just impractical. The problems that professors are having with the IRB and the animal equivalent are quite concerning. We will follow up with Roger about these problems.

Minutes from January 28 looked over and approved.

Going back to last week, we would be open to hearing directly from the custodians rather than through faculty. We have made the offer of closing the committee, if people want confidentiality; it is important to honor that request. The problem did not seem like it came from

a place of criticism, but a place of positive advocacy. The workload and new paper products no longer seem to be a problem.

Next week, Ted Pappenenfus will come to talk about the grants office. This is mainly to offer support.

Next week, there is a meeting with Sarah Matson and AFSCME at 10:00 am. Lisa and Jayne will be leaving early for this. If consensus from the committee could contribute anything to this meeting, it would be that the JEQ is not working. They are far too time consuming, amongst many other problems.