I. Call to Order:

Meeting was called to order at 9:04 A.M.

Members present: (Scientific/ Non-scientific)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Timothy Buckner, Chair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Glenda Avery (vTel)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Taylor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Isabelle Warren</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dennis Self (vTel)*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Shari Hoppin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Emma Paden (vTel)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Frank Hammonds*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dionne Rosser-Mims (vTel)*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Richard Cardarola (vTel)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eddie Clark (vTel)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Robert Abbey (phone)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dianne Barron, ex officio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Janet McNellis, ex officio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Virginia Brookins (guest)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X*= absent with notice

In Person: Dr. Tim Buckner, Dr. Dianne Barron, Dr. Shari Hoppin
Via V-Tel: Dr. Glenda Avery, Dr. Richard Caldarola, Dr. Eddie Clark, Dr. Isabelle Warren
Via Phone: Dr. Robert Abbey
Absent with Notice: Dr. Frank Hammonds, Dr. Dennis Self, Dr. Dionne Rosser-Mims, Dr. Janet McNellis, Dr. Emma Peden
Absent without notice: Mr. Chase Taylor
Guests/Researcher: Ms. Virginia Brookins

II. Approval of the minutes

Dr. Hoppin made a motion to approve the minutes.
Dr. Clark seconded the motion and the motion was passed with unanimous approval.

III. Update of prior meeting’s full review research proposals

Researcher 1- The IRB requested changes were made and the study was approved by the IRB chair on March 15, 2011.
Researcher 2- Concern was expressed over confidentiality of the study date and findings. The researcher justified the need for questions 31 and 32. Both questions were approved
for inclusion in the study. The title and informed consent were modified and comply with the recommendations; approved by the IRB chair on March 29, 2011. Researcher 3- Changes were made to protect the anonymity of the participants. Still waiting for the certificate of confidentiality; Approved by the IRB chair contingent upon the receipt of certificate of confidentiality on March 25, 2011. Researcher 4- All changes were made except for the disclosure of reporting in the aggregate and inclusion of zip codes (both justified and kept) and confidentiality protected. Approved by the IRB chair on April 18, 2011.

IV. Chair Comments on IRB Productivity

Since February 17th, the IRB received a total of 25 applications for review. There were ten applications submitted by faculty, ten were submitted by students, and five were collaborative between a student and a faculty member. Five of the applications were exempt, twelve were expedited, and one was a continuation. Four applications were pending information from the researcher. One application is pending approval, one required a full review, and one application was deemed inactive.

V. Review of Research Proposals

A. First study (Researcher 1)

9:17- Ms. Brookins informed Board of her study.
9:36- Ms. Brookins stepped out of room for further IRB discussion.
9:49- Ms. Brookins stepped back in.
After IRB review, the study was determined to have inconsistencies in in-text and stated research questions. The board recommended that the student narrow her research questions from 3 to 1 and clarify the methodology. The date needs to be corrected, the procedures used needs to be included in the application, an explanation of the risks to parents and students needs to be included, the application needs to implicitly state if socio-economic data was going to be used, the risk and informed consent needs to be modified, the method to recruit needs to be disclosed, and the campus Ms. Brookins is attending and to provide her contact information on the application. The application was denied and it was suggested that she narrow the study and submit a new application.

VI. A Discussion of Sample Informed Consent- (Dr. Janet McNellis)
Defer to next meeting

VII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:59 A.M.