

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES  
October 16, 2014

- I. Call to Order:  
 A. Meeting called to order at 9:16 am.  
 Members Present:  
 Total 11  
 Voting Members 11  
 Non-scientists 2  
 B. Members Absent 4

Quorum met, Attendance was as follows:

Members	In Person	Via Phone	Via Vtel	Absent	Absent with notice	Voting Member
Xiaoli Su (Chair)	X					YES
Karen Ross (NS)	X					YES
Jonathan Taylor			X			YES
Gurumani Manish	X					YES
Joel Campbell			X			YES
Cozetta Shannon			X			YES
JeeHae (Helen) Lee			X			YES
William Heisler		X				YES
Sandra Pollock					X	YES
Susan Sarapin		X				YES
Michael Green					X	YES
Tom Reiner			X			YES
Chase Taylor (NI)(NS)				X		YES
Kathleen Sauer (NI)(NS)		X				YES
Dianne Barron (ExOfficio)(HPA)					X	NO
NS: Non-scientist member / NI: Non-institutional member						
Guest : Mary Anne Templeton, Associate Dean Dr. Campbell enters at 9:19 via Skype. Dr. Taylor enters at 9:23 via VTel Dr. Sarapin exits the meeting at 10:06.						

- II. Approval of IRB Minutes  
 Approval of IRB Minutes from the September 18, 2014 meeting: will be conducted by electronic vote.
- III. IRB Productivity: Chair Comments and IRB Discussion  
 A. Exempt Applications: 3  
 B. Expedited Approvals:

1. 201405011-Johnson: Explicit Instruction of Writing Narrative Essays: A Multiple Case Study of Chinese Students' Perceptions and Performance. Dr. Ross & Dr. Su.
- C. Withdrawn Applications: 1
- D. Continued Review Approvals and Modifications: 1
- E. Pending Full Review:
1. 201409005-Mago: Examining and modeling the social drivers of drinking in U.S. adults. Faculty/Troy.
  2. 201410001-Hollett, Sluder & Howard-Shaughnessy: Combatting the Freshman Fifteen: Benefits of Women taking a Physical Activity Class during College. Collaborative/Troy.
  3. 201410002-Doss, Krach & McCreery: The effectiveness of an electronic social-skills training program as a secondary (Tier 2) Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBS/PBIS) intervention. Faculty/Montgomery.
- F. Full Review Approvals: None
- G. Pending Expedited Review: 2
- H. Needs Revisions or Information:
1. 201408001-Gourley: A Java Management Tool for Students within a Microsoft Operating System Environment. Student/Montgomery. Initial.
  2. 201407001- Pittman, Orrock & Faircloth: Hegemonic Masculinity, Depression, & its impact on Couples: Tools for Growing Emotional Intimacy. Collaborative/Troy. Full.
  3. 201409001-Smith: Sleep Disturbances in Primary Care Patients: Evaluation of Screening Practices. DNP Student/Troy. Full.
  4. 201403009-Hicks & Wimbish: Project PreK to K Literacy Transition Year 2. Faculty/Dothan. Initial.
  5. 201409002-Gibson C.: Education of Intravenous Heparin Policy/Procedure in a Community Hospital to Decrease Medication Errors. DNP Student/Troy. Dr. Lee & Dr. Su.
  6. 201407007-Sarapin, Morris & Jackson: Trash talking incognito: Private male locker-room speech and behavior and their effect on athletes' attitudes and behavior toward women. Dr. Ross & Dr. Su. Modification/Expedited.
- I. Outside Research Pending: None
- J. Outside Research Approvals: None
- IV. Review of Current Proposals for Full Review:
- A. 201409005-Mago: Examining and modeling the social drivers of drinking in U.S. adults. Faculty/Troy.
1. Full review of protocol begins at 9:23 am. Dr. Mago is present for review.
    - a. Dr. Mago provides an overview of the study.
    - b. Dr. Mago answers questions from IRB members from 9:28 to 9:43 am.
    - c. Dr. Mago exits meeting at 9:43 am.
    - d. Discussion continues from 9:44 to 10:08 am.
  2. Summary of Discussion and Recommendations:
    - a. Principal Investigators:
      - i. All PIs should be listed on the application.
    - b. Dates of proposed research

- i. The proposed start date cannot predate IRB approval date.
  - c. Source of funding for the protocol
    - i. Application should indicate the study is self-funded.
  - d. Description of Participants and Recruitment
    - i. The participants need to be 21 years or older.
    - ii. PI should clearly state the email addresses will be collected from all the participants to contact prizewinners. Once the prizes are distributed, the email addresses will be destroyed.
    - iii. The number of prizes should be clearly indicated. The IRB strongly recommends the \$400 valued prize be reduced to (4) \$100 prizes.
    - iv. How the PIs will get access to the initial group of participants needs to be clarified (where will the recruitment messages be posted).
  - e. The recruitment messages:
    - i. The statement “Troy University is seeking volunteers...” should be deleted. This research is not conducted by Troy University. Instead, please give the identification information of the PIs including full name, title, institutional affiliation, and the research they plan to conduct.
    - ii. PIs cannot state that the study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through Troy University IRB. Just state that “The research has been approved by TROY IRB.”
  - f. Methodology:
    - i. Should indicate that email addresses will be collected from all the participants only to contact prizewinners. Once the prizes are distributed, the emails will be destroyed.
  - g. Risks of Participation:
    - i. PIs should clearly state that the participants can quit the survey anytime; if the participants quit the survey, no data won’t be saved on the computer or the server they use.
    - ii. The risk of participation is underestimated. PIs should acknowledge potential risks to employability or reputation if confidentiality were breached in reference to participant’s alcohol usage. In addition, participants may experience discomfort when answering questions about their or their peer’s alcohol usage. PIs should clearly state that participants should immediately exit the survey if they feel discomfort when answering the questions.
    - iii. How data will be stored? When the PI mentions “save data on computers”, whose computers will that be? Who will have access to the data? How long the data will be stored (Federal Regulation requires at least 3 years)? Once the PIs obtain the data, will the online (server) data will removed? Will participants’ IP addresses be collected?
    - iv. PIs should clearly state that the participants may choose not to participate the research. Clicking the “I don’t agree” button will immediately lead the participants to an exit page.
  - h. Benefits of participation

- i. Benefits are under-stated. PIs should add that research can contribute to the greater research community. Emphasize the proposed research's unique contributions.
    - i. Informed Consent Process
      - i. The reading level of informed consent form is too high.
      - ii. Informed consent should include: "If you have any questions concerning the rights as a research participant, contact the Institutional Review Board by sending email to irb@troy.edu or calling 334-808-6294" in place of Dr. Ross's contact information.
      - iii. Should provide PIs identification information including names, title, and institutional affiliation.
      - iv. PIs should indicate the study is self-funded
      - v. Rights and Compensation: The statements should be deleted and just state there will be no compensation. There will be four gifts or gift cards. Email addresses of all participants will be collected for the announcement of the winners. Once the winners are informed and gifts or gift cards are out, those email addresses will be destroyed. Also need to clearly state how PIs are going to protect the email addresses before destroying them.
      - vi. Consent: Clearly state participants need to be 21 years or older.
      - vii. Emphasize the participation is voluntary. Participants may quit the survey anytime and no data will be saved. Clearly offer an option to, not participate (a no option). Need to state, "there are two icons you could choose from. Select agree button or select I don't agree button will lead you to an exit page". Please make sure that clicking the "I don't agree" will lead the participants immediately to an exit page.
      - viii. Remind the participants that they may print a copy of the informed consent form for their own record.
      - ix. The informed consent document should be changed to reflect the revisions to the Risks of Participation, Benefits of Participation, and Methodology sections of the application.
  - 3. Vote: Motion Not Approve as Written and for Chair to review revised Application: Dr. Ross, Second; Dr. Manish. Motion passes unanimously at 10:08.
- B. 201410002-Doss, Krach & McCreery: The effectiveness of an electronic social-skills training program as a secondary (Tier 2) Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBS/PBIS) intervention. Faculty/Montgomery.
  - 1. Full review of protocol begins at 10:09 am.
    - a. Discussion continues from 10:09 to 10:20 am.
  - 2. Summary of discussion and recommendations:
    - a. Dates of proposed Research:
      - i. The starting date of the proposed research needs changed to a later date. The start date cannot predate the IRB approval.
    - b. Description of Participants and Recruitment:
      - i. The teachers are also participants in this research. Need to check both "19 and over" and "under 19."

- c. Methodology:
    - i. The number of visits and time commitment should be clearly stated.
  - d. Risks of Participation:
    - i. There are risks of participation for teachers, since teachers will be asked to evaluate their working environment, their departmental head, or principal in terms of their emphasis on technology. Need to address confidentiality issues with data collected from the teachers.
    - ii. How the data will be stored; how long the data will be stored; who will have access to data? If the “researchers” will have access to data, who the researchers are should be clearly stated. (The process for both sets of data-the teachers and the students should be indicated.)
  - e. Informed Consent Process:
    - i. The reading level is too high. The reading level needs to be lower than a 9 on the Flesch Kincaide scale.
    - ii. Need to clearly state who the members of the research team are and provide the identification information for all of the PIs including name, title, and institutional affiliation. Clearly state that authorized graduate student(s) will be members of the research team assisting the PIs in the research. (Assisting graduate students will need to complete and submit IRB training certification.)
    - iii. Need to change the informed consent to reflect the revisions to the sections of Risks of Participation and Methodology in the application.
3. Vote: Motion to Not Approve as Written and for Chair to review revised Application; Dr. Campbell, Second; Dr. Manish. Motion passes unanimously at 10:20.
- C. 201410001-Hollett, Sluder & Howard-Shaughnessy: Combatting the Freshman Fifteen: Benefits of Women taking a Physical Activity Class during College. Collaborative/Troy.
- 1. Full review of protocol begins at 10:24 am.
    - a. Discussion continues from 10:24 to 10:35 am.
  - 2. Summary of Discussion:
    - a. The research has been conducted.
    - b. The study includes participants under the age of 19.
    - c. Parental consent cannot be obtained.
    - d. This research could be replicated.
  - 3. Vote: Motion to Not Approve use of extant data as proposed in application; Dr. Ross, Second; Dr. Manish. Motion passes unanimously at 10:40 am.
- V. Discussion of Corrections and Updates to Research proposals under Full Review:  
None submitted.
- VI. Information Items:  
None reported
- VII. Adjourn  
Motion to Adjourn: Dr. Campbell, Second: Dr. Manish.  
Motion passed unanimously.  
Meeting adjourned 10:44 am.