Minutes Faculty Council Meeting

11/25/15

Attendees:

Georgia Bishop, Amy Lovett-Racke, Paul Jansen, Ajit Chaudhari, Courtney Herbert, Ronald Pelletier, James Lang, Megan Merrill, Andrej Rotter, Nicholas Breitborde, Amanda Toland, Vijay Pancholi, Brett Worly, Laurie Belknap, Katja Turner, Amy Gewirtz (Webex)

Agenda:

1. Discussion with Dr. Karla Zadnik (IRB Chair)
2. Review minutes College Assembly meeting

Dr. Zadnik started her presentation by saying that she went over all the questions provided to her, and found them to address all the issues known to the IRB that are in need of improvement. The fact that the IRB is a peer reviewed process is its strength and weakness. Safeguards are in place that heavily depend on the individual reviewer, who is applying a spectrum of scrutiny to their reviews depending on the reviewer. The IRB meets every Monday to review documents that are prescreened by staff personnel from the Office of Responsible Research. That office has recently undergone personnel changes with varying learning curves of the new hires. As the lack of timely processing has been recognized, the process has been improved. The number of pending IRB reviews dropped from 98 in May 2015 to 37 in November - indicating an improvement in the process. Of note, those changes aren’t appreciated yet when checking the dashboard. Dr. Zadnik also mentioned that the expedited reviews were in fact even slower due to an enormous level of detail applied to the screening. This process is to be addressed. She brought up that the Western IRB, though faster in the throughput, is currently only appropriate for sponsored studies due to the additional costs of $2500. There is a possibility that this might be reevaluated, and become available for non-sponsored studies. On a positive note, Dr. Zadnik mentioned that the current “Continuing Review” process will disappear, and be replaced by addressing a few questions on a website instead of going through a review process. She agrees that the overall process seems to require a lot of “nagging” of the PI’s that might still be indicated in special cases where deadlines are critical. Dr. Zadnik couldn’t answer the question about the actual costs of an IRB, but mentioned that their work was being done with fewer FTE’s when compared to peer institutions, and assured that she would look into that question closer. The question was asked in the context of it being more cost effective to use the Western IRB for very labor-intensive protocols to actually save money and unload the IRB. Another question was brought up regarding the necessity of obtaining the patient’s consent for a
single patient case report with de-identified data. According to Dr. Zadnik, this isn’t an IRB requirement, but might be driven by the privacy officer, and she will look into that matter. Dr. Zadnik isn’t involved with the IRB for cancer studies, hence she couldn’t answer a question regarding processing time of Cancer IRB’s, but assumed it would be quicker due to stricter prescreening. She concluded her visit by saying that it is the charge of the IRB to balance the conductance of research and the protection of human subjects. In addition, she assured everybody that she would be more than happy to communicate with individuals (Zadnik.4@osu.edu), and volunteered to come back for a follow up visit in a few months (March) to reflect on process improvements.

Following her visit, the attendees discussed that it would be helpful to invite a representative from Dr. Moffat-Bruce’s office to talk about the procedures of conducting quality studies, as well as inviting the privacy officer Jennifer Elliot to explain the implications of privacy in de-identified single case studies, and the overlap of IRB and privacy issues when conducting research. Finally, Georgia Bishop announced that the IACUC voted recently that it would no longer be necessary to update the Chemical Hygiene Plan (CHP) whenever an IUCUC protocol or amendment to a protocol was submitted, which should help expedite the process.

The meeting was called at 8:35