AGENDA

HUMAN SUBJECTS POLICY BOARD

9:00 – 10:30 AM
February 9, 2007
Gerberding 142

1. Announcements       Jeff Cheek, Karen Moe
2. Updates and process improvements     Karen Moe
3. Update on accreditation process     Karen Moe
4. Briefing on issues and inquiries     Karen Moe, Jeff Cheek
5. DISCUSSION:  Standard care risks and consent forms     Jeff Cheek
   Many research studies involve research procedures combined with standard care. The Casa Pia dental amalgams study is an example. The federal regulatory agencies expect the risks of the standard care component of studies to be described in the research consent form, when appropriate. There is no federal guidance on this topic, but each institution is expected to devise a policy defining when it is appropriate. What should the UW’s policy be?

6. DISCUSSION:  Undergraduate research     Karen Moe
   UW policy allows undergraduate and graduate students to be the PI on an IRB application (with a faculty advisor). This is in contrast to UW policy about grant applications. In practice, faculty advisor oversight is often lacking. Many institutions require a faculty member to be the PI on the IRB application for research done by undergraduate and/or graduate students (UC San Francisco; University of Pennsylvania; Purdue, Rutgers). What are the advantages and disadvantages of the current UW policy of allowing students to be the PI? Should there be some limitations and/or requirements?

7. DISCUSSION:  Genetics Advisory Group     Karen Moe
   Several IRB members have strongly urged HSD to create a faculty Genetics Advisory Group, to develop appropriate questions for human subjects application forms, guidance for researchers doing genetics research, and issues for IRBs to address when reviewing genetics research.

8. Future agenda items       Board Members