

Institutional Review Board- Feb 21, 2008 Minutes

Institutional Review Board Meeting February 21st, 2008

Minutes

I- Meeting was called to order at 8:30 am

II-Members Present:

- **In Person:** Dr. Janet McNellis, Dr. Iris Salitel, Dr. Stephen Landers, Dr. Carol Moore, Dr. Terry Anderson , Dr. Shari Hoppin and Dr. Eddie Clark
- **Via Vtel:** Dr. Glenda Avery, Dr. Richard Caldarola, and Dr. Shelia Bennett.
- **Via Phone:** Dr. Robert Abbey.
- **Absent with notice:** Dr. Dennis Self

III-Approval of Minutes:

Dr. Janet McNellis called for the vote on the January IRB meeting's minutes. A few changes were noted and all board members approved the minutes with the changes.

IV – Report of Applications

Dr. McNellis reported on the number and type of IRB applicants since the January meeting:

Total of 29 IRB applicants, 22 of which were exempt, 3 were expedited and 4 were full review. There were 21 student applicants and 8 faculty applicants.

V- Community Representatives:

Miss. Powell is unable to serve as a community representative for IRB because of her affiliation with a Troy University student. Need to look for a new community representative.

VI-Application Reviews:

A) A. Tucker

Institutional Review Board - Feb 21, 2008 Minutes

The Board members raised some questions to Dr. Tucker's attention. The questions covered the following:

- Sharing research results with the participants
- The amount of time devoted to the use of the Full Myers Briggs.
- The procedure of the questionnaire's distribution.
- Description of additional instruments.
- Writing form follow up
- Classification of the data collected.
- Expected number of participants.
- Clarification on the purpose of the study.

As a result, the IRB application cannot be approved as is.

Recommendations:

- ❖ Include a copy of the written document that you are sending to the fire chiefs.
- ❖ Give the participants an envelope in which they can place their completed surveys before they turn them in.
- ❖ In your informed consent letter, include the following:
 - A more accurate estimate of the time it will take to complete the questionnaires.
 - A description of the purpose of the study.
 - A statement that individual results will not be sent to the fire chiefs.

Institutional Review Board - Feb 21, 2008 Minutes

- The statement “Questions about the rights of research participants should be directed to the Troy University Institutional Review Board at irb@troy.edu or 334-670-5649.
- A statement informing the participants that they should keep the informed consent letter.

All IRB members motioned with agreement to the proposed recommendations for B. Tucker. Dr. McNellis was given the authority to check Dr. Tucker’s revised application and issue approval if the required changes are made.

❖ **B. Stoltz**

The board members raised concerns about the ambiguity of the purpose of the study, and the participants’ anonymity.

As a result, Stoltz’ IRB proposal cannot be approved as is.

Recommendations:

- ❖ .An informed consent cover letter should be attached to the survey. This letter should include all components of an Informed Consent document. Module 3 of the on-line training (at <http://www.research.umn.edu/cgi-bin/mod3s.cgi>) guides you step-by-step through the creation of a consent document. Make sure that you list all risks of participation, including letting the participants know that if their responses were linked to them it could affect their reputation and standing with Troy University. Make sure to explain the steps you are taking to protect their confidentiality, including the fact that you will only be reporting grouped results. Do not ask for the participants' signature. Instead, include a statement at the bottom that reads "If you would like to participate in this research, complete

Institutional Review Board- Feb 21, 2008 Minutes

the attached survey. Remove this page and keep it for your records." Include the University Counseling Center information in this page.

- ❖ If you have a compelling research reason to ask for the participants' age, sport and/or gender, state what that reason is. Otherwise, to protect confidentiality remove those questions from your survey.

Nine IRB members motioned with approval to the proposed recommendation for Stoltz while one member opposed. With the majority's approval vote, the recommendations were approved. All IRB members motioned with agreement to the proposed recommendations for Stoltz. Dr. McNellis was given the authority to check Stoltz's revised application and issue approval once the required changes are made.

C) M. Murell:

The board members raised concerns regarding the use of two groups (students and faculty), the ambiguity of the instruments, the data collection and the recruitment process. As a result, the research project is not approved as is.

Recommendations:

- ❖ The study should be reworded to make the purpose clearer. It is unclear from your study how you are going to answer your stated questions.
- ❖ Your methodology should be clarified – specifically, which variables are you going to correlate?
- ❖ An informed consent cover letter should be attached to the survey. This letter should include all components of an Informed Consent document. Module 3 of the on-line training (at <http://www.research.umn.edu/cgi-bin/mod3s.cgi>) guides you step-by-step through the creation of a consent document. Do not

Institutional Review Board - Feb 21, 2008 Minutes

ask for the participants' signature. Instead, include a statement at the bottom that reads "If you would like to participate in this research, complete the attached survey. Remove this page and keep it for your records."

- ❖ Because of confidentiality concerns and the risk to reputations, the study should be limited to only students: Faculty and staff members should not be included. If you believe that it is crucial to your research to include faculty and staff members then you will need to greatly increase the number of faculty and staff you are surveying and you will have to collect the data in such a way that insures anonymity (such as having the participants mail the completed surveys to you in envelopes that you provide).

All IRB members motioned with approval to the suggested changes. The Board agreed that the revised application should be reviewed by the Full Board.

D) Ellis

Upon reviewing Ellis' research study, the board members raised concern about the participants' compensation process and the use of age as a variable in the study.

As a result, the project is not approved as is and the following changes are recommended.

Recommendations:

- ❖ An informed consent cover letter should be attached to the survey. This letter should include all components of an Informed Consent document. Module 3 of the on-line training (at <http://www.research.umn.edu/cgi-bin/mod3s.cgi>) guides you step-by-step through the creation of a consent document. Do not ask for the participants' signature. Instead, include a statement at the bottom that reads "If

Institutional Review Board- Feb 21, 2008 Minutes

you would like to participate in this research, complete the attached survey.

Remove this page and keep it for your records.”

- ❖ Also in the informed consent page, include contact information for the TROY Student Counseling center for participants who wish to receive help with their aggressive feelings.
- ❖ If you have a compelling research reason to ask for the participants’ age and/or gender, state what that reason is. Otherwise, to protect confidentiality remove those questions from your survey.
- ❖ You will not be offering the extra credit personally. Therefore, remove mention of this from your application, and simply state that you will not offer any compensation.

Dr. McNellis was given the authority to check Ellis’s revised application and issue approval once the required changes are made.

VII- Subcommittee Reports:

A- Self-Study:

- ❖ Suggestions were reviewed by the board members
- ❖ Some questions will be sent to Dr. Barron.

B- Policies and Procedures:

- ❖ The committee has looked into other universities’ IRB procedures.
- ❖ The committee pointed out the need for the IRB policies to consider the complexity of having multiple campuses.
- ❖ The committee was referred to the self study for further questions to raise in the policies and procedures.

Institutional Review Board- Feb 21, 2008 Minutes

C- Website:

- ❖ Revisions are in progress.

VII- Training Needs-Representatives Report:

A- Troy Campus: Dr. McNellis has carried out a training session for Dr. Hammonds' class. A training workshop will be offered at the Troy campus in March.

B- Montgomery Campus: In progress

C-Dothan Campus: No needs at this time.

D-Phenix City Campus: In progress

E-University College: The train-the trainer program will be administered in August of this year. The Western Region needs to do a follow up.

E-Campus: Dr. McNellis suggested the possibility to offer training during the e-campus general meeting in April.

VIII- Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 am