

DePaul University
Panel: IBC Panel
MINUTES OF MEETING
August 05, 2026

Members Present:	Members Absent:
Katie Abma (Voting) Rima Barkauskas (Voting) David George (Voting) Janine Kirin (Voting) Justin Maresh (Chair) (Voting) Anna Bernadska (Non Voting) Stuti Vaidya (Non Voting)	Jeremie Fant (Voting) Jingjing Kipp (Voting) (on leave) Nicolette Zielinski-Mozny (Voting)

The meeting was called to order at 12:36 P.M by Justin Maresh, Chair.

EARLY AGENDA ITEMS

1. Welcome

Justin opened the meeting at 12:36 and noted that Jianfei Zhao is joining the IBC, welcoming the addition of more PIs to the committee. Members were also asked to send any comments on the June 3rd minutes by the end of the day.

2. New Business, Policy Discussion, and Other Discussion Items

2.1. William Gilliland's Teaching Protocol (BIO260) - Review of the PI's response to the inquiry about why the course proceeded without IBC approval.

Documents Attached: William Gilliland's response

- The committee discussed the situation in which William Gilliland proceeded to teach his course without obtaining IBC approval, despite having received comments on his protocol. The discussion centered on the degree of fault, the role of the eProtocol system's notification failure, and how to formally handle the incident.
- Members noted concerns about fairness in holding investigators fully accountable when system issues may have contributed to the lapse, while also emphasizing that investigators remain responsible for obtaining required approvals before conducting activities.
- The committee considered the potential compliance and audit implications, although members noted that the specific activities involved presented relatively limited regulatory risk. Discussion focused on the importance of properly documenting the incident through

the formal reportable event process rather than handling it informally.

- Members also reviewed relevant policy language in the IBC Manual and concluded that existing procedures place responsibility on investigators to obtain and maintain required approvals. However, several members suggested clarifying the manual language to more explicitly emphasize the investigator's responsibility for tracking approval and renewal deadlines. Given the apparent system issue and the absence of evidence of intentional noncompliance, members generally favored treating the incident as a first occurrence while ensuring appropriate documentation and corrective actions moving forward.

Conclusion.

- William Gilliland is to be asked to submit a formal non-compliance/reportable event report via eProtocol. Communication to Gilliland should clarify that the report is for documentation purposes only and is not punitive. The communication should also inform him that it is the PI's responsibility to monitor protocol status in eProtocol, not solely to rely on system notifications. The policy and procedures manual will be updated to clarify PI responsibilities in multiple sections.

2.2. Policy and Procedures Manual: Identified Gaps and Proposed Updates

- During the discussion of the Gilliland case and the review of Joanna Brooke's protocol, multiple gaps and inconsistencies in the IBC policy and procedures manual were identified. The committee flagged specific sections for revision.
- The committee discussed several potential revisions to the IBC manual and related guidance documents. Members noted that certain sections of the manual could be interpreted as placing responsibility on investigators only after receiving notification from the institution, and recommended strengthening language to clearly state investigator responsibilities for monitoring protocol status, submitting amendments and renewals on time, and obtaining required approvals before beginning work.
- The committee also identified a need to expand and clarify provisions related to noncompliance, including clearer definitions and procedures for addressing compliance issues. Members suggested incorporating additional language on responsibility into existing sections of the manual and replicating language already used elsewhere regarding investigator accountability for renewals.
- Additional discussion focused on improving the accuracy and clarity of biosafety guidance. Proposed revisions included clarifying the application of NIH categories in biohazard tables; addressing the classification of environmental samples and biosafety levels; providing guidance on the handling and shipment of purified DNA for sequencing; clarifying requirements for sequencing activities involving synthetic nucleic acids; and ensuring that SOPs reference institutional procedures for transporting biological materials. Overall, the committee supported updates to improve regulatory clarity, consistency, and audit readiness.

Conclusion.

- Sections to be flagged for revision: 2.6, 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.11, and Section 7 (non-compliance).
- Justin will draft proposed language with track changes for review at the next (September) meeting.
- The RG2/BSL-1 mismatch issue and the sequencing/shipping clarification will be added to the next meeting agenda.
- The committee agreed that purified extracted DNA for sequencing is not a biohazardous agent for shipping purposes (unless it contains regulated sequences).

2.3. Scheduling: Transition from Doodle to Rally

- The committee discussed transitioning to a new scheduling platform for future meetings. Members were informed that the current scheduling tool limits free users to a single meeting poll, prompting a switch to an alternative platform that allows scheduling multiple meetings through a single poll. No concerns were raised regarding the change, and meeting polls for the upcoming fall meetings will be distributed using the new system.
- Janine will send out Rally polls this week to schedule fall meetings.

3. Current Protocols for Review

3.1. Protocol IBC 2026-2003 – Joanna Brooke (Bacteriophage Research)

- The committee conducted a detailed review of Joanna Brooke's research protocol involving environmental bacteriophage isolation and nanopore sequencing. Primary reviewers were Justin and Katie. Multiple issues were identified across the protocol and the attached SOP.
- Members requested clarification regarding project locations, noting that one room was listed multiple times and appeared inconsistent with the proposed activities. The committee also discussed whether sequencing-related synthetic nucleic acids should be identified within the protocol and agreed to require reporting to the IBC if sequencing results reveal toxin genes, antibiotic resistance genes, lysogeny-related genes, or other characteristics that could increase biosafety concerns. Investigators would be required to notify the IBC and discontinue further propagation of affected isolates pending review.
- The committee identified corrections needed in the biohazardous agent table, including the inappropriate use of an NIH category designation that applies only to recombinant or synthetic nucleic acid research. Members also discussed broader issues related to biosafety level and risk group classifications that warrant future committee consideration.
- Regarding shipment of materials, the committee agreed that purified extracted DNA sent for sequencing is not considered a biohazardous agent for shipping purposes and therefore does not require biohazardous shipping designation. However, members noted

that the protocol and SOP should more clearly address routine transport of biological materials between laboratory spaces and reference institutional transport procedures.

- The committee also identified inconsistencies in personal protective equipment requirements. Members determined that eye protection should be required for applicable aerosol-generating procedures and recommended revisions to protocol language to better distinguish universally required PPE from task-specific PPE.
- Additional revisions were requested to sanitation, spill response, and SOP language. Members recommended correcting spill response definitions, resolving inconsistencies between the protocol and SOP regarding biosafety level designations, removing unnecessary disposal requirements for non-contaminated materials, and eliminating references to regulatory requirements that are not applicable to this protocol. Overall, the committee requested a number of clarifications and corrections intended to improve consistency, accuracy, and alignment with institutional biosafety practices.

Conclusion.

- Decisions: Protocol IBC 2026-2003 is approved contingent on the PI (Joanna Brooke) addressing all required modifications identified during the review. Final approval will be granted by the primary reviewers (Justin and Katie) once revisions are submitted. Justin moved to approve the protocol, contingent on the PI addressing all identified issues. Katie: Seconded the motion. All members voted in favor; none opposed or abstained.

A list of the Protocols approved and reports reviewed is attached. The meeting was adjourned at 02:00 P.M.

Justin J
Maresh

Digitally signed by Justin
J Maresh
Date: 2026.09.14 13:19:31
-05'00'

(Signature)

(Chair)

(Date)

(Signature)

(Manager)

(Date)