

DePaul University
Panel: IBC Panel
MINUTES OF MEETING
June 03, 2026

Members Present:	Members Absent:
Katie Abma (Voting) David George (Voting) Jingjing Kipp (Voting) left at 2:45 pm Janine Kirin (Voting) Justin Maresh (Chair) (Voting) Anna Bernadska (Non Voting) Melodie Fox (Non Voting)	Rima Barkauskas (Voting) Jeremie Fant (Voting) Nicolette Zielinski-Mozny (Voting)

The meeting was called to order at 01:05 P.M by J. Maresh, Chair.

EARLY AGENDA ITEMS

1. Welcome

2. New Business and Other Discussion Items

2.1. Membership and Quorum

- The committee discussed persistent challenges in achieving quorum due to a small membership base and upcoming leaves of absence. Concerns about maintaining adequate membership were heightened by Jingjing's upcoming leave and the absences of an external member.
- To address these challenges, the committee explored both short-term and long-term solutions. Jingjing reported that she has spoken with Joanna about potentially having Jianfei Zhao serve as a temporary replacement during her leave. Members also revisited prior discussions about expanding the committee by at least two additional members, even after Jingjing's return. They acknowledged that membership changes may require approval through the Provost's and President's offices.

Conclusion

- The committee discussed potential recruitment strategies and candidate sources, including contacts at regional institutions, the Botanic Garden, and recommendations from current member Rima, who serves on another IBC. The need for expertise in areas such as plant biology, cell culture, human cell lines, viral vectors, and genetic transformation was emphasized.
- The external member's participation will be reassessed, and the committee will consider

recruiting an additional external member.

2.2. William Gilliland's Teaching Protocol (BIO260)

- The committee discussed that the teaching protocol for BIO260 had not received IBC approval despite an associated laboratory course being conducted throughout the spring quarter. Members reviewed the status of the course and noted that laboratory activities were carried out under personnel listed on the protocol, raising concerns about operation of the course before approval was finalized.
- The committee reviewed previously communicated protocol revisions, distinguishing between minor administrative updates and more significant safety-related concerns. Particular attention was given to issues involving spill containment procedures and organism disposal practices, which were viewed as substantive biosafety matters. Members also reviewed the IBC's noncompliance procedures and discussed appropriate corrective actions for a first occurrence.

Conclusion

- The committee agreed that the most appropriate initial step is to verify the circumstances and request a written explanation from the principal investigator. The report should address why the course proceeded without IBC approval and document whether any laboratory incidents, including spills, occurred and how they were managed.
- Members agreed that the matter should be formally documented as a protocol deviation or noncompliance event, while reserving more extensive investigative measures for any future recurrence.

2.3. Spill Containment as a Standard Requirement

- The IBC Chair discussed the importance of explicitly incorporating spill containment procedures into all IBC protocols. Members noted that while protocols often include disinfection procedures, they do not consistently address containment measures, even though existing form instructions require this information. The committee emphasized that containment is a fundamental component of spill response and should be clearly described, particularly for larger spills. To improve consistency and investigator awareness, members agreed that this expectation should be reinforced through guidance materials.

Conclusion

- The committee agreed to require spill containment procedures to be included in all sanitation and disposal sections of IBC protocols.
- The committee also agreed to update the IBC FAQ guidance for principal investigators to clarify this requirement.

3. Current Protocols for Review

Protocol ID: IBC-2026-1946

Principal Investigator: Joanna Brooke

Title: Pre-lab preparation for BIO 220 Biotechnology.

Review Cycle Type: Full Review

Primary Reviewers: Justin Maresh and David George

- The committee reviewed the protocol supporting a biotechnology course and identified several revisions needed before approval. Reviewers noted that one laboratory location used for environmental sample manipulations was not included in the list of approved activity locations and should be added for consistency.
- The committee also discussed whether commercially sourced sauerkraut brine should be included in the protocol's biohazardous agents table.
- Members agreed that, because it contains a mixed microbial community and is being used as a culture material, it should be listed and treated as an environmental sample.
- During the review, it was clarified that the protocol covers pre-lab preparation activities only and does not involve direct student handling of the samples.
- Additional revisions were identified relating to spill response procedures. Reviewers noted a gap in the spill volume categories and recommended revising the language to ensure all spill volumes are addressed. They also emphasized that large spill response procedures should explicitly include containment measures consistent with applicable biosafety standards.

Conclusion

- The committee voted unanimously to request protocol modifications and delegated final approval authority to the primary reviewers once the revisions are satisfactorily addressed.

Required Revisions

- Add the omitted laboratory location to the list of approved activity sites.
- Include the sauerkraut brine in the biohazardous agents table and classify it as an environmental sample.
- Correct the spill volume categories to eliminate gaps in guidance.
- Add explicit containment procedures to the large spill cleanup process.

Protocol ID: IBC-2026-1940

Principal Investigator: Eric Norstrom

Other Investigators: Alyssa Hanson; Ava Lynch; Sedra Alkhudari

Title: Assessing the Toxic Potential of Amyloid Precursor Protein Metabolites Related to Alzheimer's Disease

Review Cycle Type: Full Review

Primary Reviewers: Justin Maresh, Katie Abma

- The committee reviewed IBC-2026-1940 and identified several areas requiring clarification and revision before approval. Discussion focused on regulatory classification, biosafety risk assessment, protocol accuracy, and completeness of supporting documentation.
- Reviewers noted inconsistencies and omissions throughout the submission, including an outdated proposed start date, discrepancies in the identification of bacterial strains used in the research, and incorrect responses regarding the source organisms of recombinant materials. The committee also raised concerns about the classification of the expression vector under NIH guidelines and requested that the investigator verify and correct the applicable category.
- Additional discussion focused on whether several gene products under study, which may have toxic properties, were appropriately addressed in the risk assessment. Members agreed that these materials should be included in the biohazardous agents table and that

supporting documentation should be provided to justify claims that they do not present a hazard to personnel. Reviewers also noted that a carcinogenic laboratory reagent was not addressed in the standard operating procedures and should be incorporated into handling guidance.

- The committee identified several procedural and administrative issues, including multiple conflicting versions of the SOP, the absence of emergency response and reporting information, and the need to certify laboratory equipment that is required by the protocol. Spill response procedures were also reviewed, with recommendations to simplify spill volume categories and revise disinfection contact times to align with established biosafety practices.

Conclusion

- The committee voted unanimously to request revisions to the protocol and delegated final approval authority to the primary reviewers once all required changes have been satisfactorily addressed.

Required Revisions:

- Update the proposed start date.
- Verify and correct the applicable NIH classification or exemption category.
- Clarify and consistently identify all bacterial strains used in the protocol.
- Correct the description of source organisms for recombinant materials.
- Include relevant gene products in the biohazardous agents table and provide supporting documentation regarding potential hazards.
- Add procedures for handling hazardous laboratory reagents to the SOP.
- Submit a single, updated SOP that includes emergency response and reporting procedures.
- Ensure required laboratory equipment certifications are current.
- Revise spill response language and update disinfection contact times as appropriate.

Protocol ID: IBC-2024-1310

Principal Investigator: Phillip Funk

Other Investigators: Elise Villwock

Title: The Role of the Avian chB6 Alloantigen in Apoptosis

Review Cycle Type: Full Review

Primary Reviewers:

- The committee began reviewing an annual renewal submission but was unable to vote after quorum was lost. Discussion focused primarily on procedural issues related to the inclusion of protocol changes within an annual renewal application.
- Members noted that the submission did not fit existing review pathways because it combined an annual renewal request with proposed protocol modifications. The committee reviewed current IBC procedures and determined that protocol changes should be submitted through a separate amendment process rather than incorporated directly into an annual renewal. Additional concerns were identified, including the absence of a required SOP and an outdated proposed start date.
- To ensure compliance with established procedures, the committee agreed that the annual renewal and protocol modifications should be submitted separately. Members also discussed the need to clarify application instructions to prevent similar issues in future submissions.

Conclusion

- No vote was taken due to the loss of quorum.

The committee agreed to:

- Return the submission to the investigator with instructions to:
 - Resubmit the annual renewal without protocol changes so it can be processed through the appropriate review pathway.
 - Submit all protocol modifications as a separate amendment for full committee review.
- Draft and review a communication to the investigator outlining the required resubmission process.
- Consider revising IBC application guidance to clarify that protocol changes must be submitted as amendments rather than included in annual renewals.

The meeting was adjourned at 03:30 P.M.

Justin J
Maresh

Digitally signed by Justin
J Maresh
Date: 2026.08.06 12:54:30
-05'00'

(Signature)

(Chair)

(Date)

(Signature)

(Manager)

(Date)