

**Gonzaga University IRB  
Meeting Minutes  
April 27, 2009**

**Present**

**Deborah Booth**, Chair; **Ted DiMaria**, Asst. Prof., Philosophy; **Chris Francovich**, Asst. Prof., Doctoral Leadership Studies; **Susan Norwood**, Prof., Nursing; **Randy Williams**, Prof., Special Education; **Adrian Popa**, Asst. Prof., Organizational Leadership; **Diane Zemke**, Grant Writer, Sponsored Research Office (Recorder).

**Opening**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:00 am. The March minutes were approved.

**Proposal Review**

1. Kemp
  - a. Suggest that she mail the consent form to the participant(s) after the initial phone contact, rather than have them complete it immediately prior to the interview.
  - b. In the transcriptionist confidentiality agreement, specify that the “transcriptions will be prepared on only one portable drive and delivered to the researcher without maintaining a copy.” This verbiage is in the proposal, but not in the transcriptionist confidentiality form.
  - c. Within the consent form, under “Risk, Stress, or Discomfort,” paragraph 2: Delete “you may contact me for follow-up discussion” and “which has agreed that a licensed professional may see you for a minimal fee.” Add “I will provide you with a list of licensed professionals or refer you to a local counseling center.” Thus, the sentence would read: “In the unlikely event...about your participation, I will provide you with a list of licensed professionals or refer you to a local counseling center.”
  - d. On page 2, A, second paragraph, second to last sentence: Add “without” and delete “with.” Thus the sentence will read “Both in the telephone conversation...leave the interview at any time **without** penalty.”
2. Williams
  - a. Research plan is poorly conceived
  - b. Sample size too small for adequate correlation
  - c. Correlation methods are not described
  - d. Can't state beforehand a positive or negative effect
  - e. Access to student records will require individual consent forms for participants
  - f. Checklist is not filled out
  - g. Need district approval
  - h. We do not view this proposal as complete. Deborah will contact the advisor and Williams to discuss the proposal

**Discussion**

1. Discussed the need for faculty applying for grants to be aware of IRB requirements. We would be willing to review proposals for at-risk populations before grant submission to catch any red flags. We will also ask that those grant applicants using human subjects

prepare a modified grant checklist to offer a point of discussion on IRB policies. Diane will create the checklist and add it to the SRP website and as a follow-up to the external funding form.

2. Discussed research misconduct, defined as fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism. Also discussed NSF requirements that student researchers be taught about research misconduct.

### **Conclusion**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 am. This meeting is the last regularly scheduled one for the academic year. If a full board review is needed over the summer, a meeting will be scheduled. All expedited proposals will be handled as during the year.