

Committee Chair

Date submitted

Submitted to: Dr. Lee Renfro

I. Executive Summary

During the 2019-2020 academic year, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) received 26 new research proposals, 10 project renewals, and 50 addendums. 4 of the new research proposals, 3 of them required a full board review, as they included participants from protected groups: children and prisoners.

Six of the new proposals remain pending: three waiting for the Principle Investigator (PI) to submit revisions and one waiting for our external prisoner representative to review.

II. Committee's Charge from the Shared Governance Document

1. To review compliance with and administer the University of North Alabama Policy on the Use of Human Research Participants

2. To examine the University of North Alabama Policy on the Use of Human Research Participants annually and assess university practices in light of the information obtained

3. To propose changes in university practices relating to the use of human research participants

4. To handle any proposals the committee may make affecting university policy according to section C.2 - Shared Governance Procedure for Policy Change Recommendations

5. To submit a final written report electronically by the first day of the fall semester to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost with a copy sent to the Chair of the SGEC.

III. The Committee met on the following dates:

September 10, 2020
Full board review for IRB Protocol # 2019-001

October 1, 2020
Full board review for IRB Protocol # 2019-002

November 10, 2020
Full board review for IRB Protocol # 2019-003

December 1, 2020
Full board review for IRB Protocol # 2019-004 still pending approval

? I. What does the Committee plan to accomplish?

" . In the coming year

, he new chair, vice chair, and current committee plan to continue meeting the charge of this committee.

! . In future years

: on basis for judgment on this question.

? II. What are the Committee's weaknesses?

- a. During the 2018 term, the only weakness identified is that not all committee members attend the full board reviews.
- To accommodate varying schedules, a Doodle poll was sent out so that meetings could be scheduled when the most committee members were available. While the committee never achieved 100% attendance, we did have a quorum at every meeting.
 - Meetings were held virtually, via Microsoft Teams, in an effort to encourage more participation. Meetings were scheduled on a regular basis.

" . What can the Shared Governance Committee help you do to address the weaknesses?

? III. Comments

n/a