I. Call to Order:

Meeting was called to order at 9:01 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></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Dr. Isabelle Warren (vtel)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dennis Self (vtel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Dr. Shari Hoppin</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Emma Paden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Frank Hammonds</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dionne Rosser-Mims (phd)</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Richard Cardarola (vtel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eddie Clark (vtel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>Dr. Robert Abbey (phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</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. Geraldine Anderson(guest)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Foxx (guest)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X*- absent with notice

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

II. Approval of the minutes

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

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

Researcher 1- The requested changes are still pending.

IV. Chair Comments on IRB Productivity
Since April 21st, the IRB received a total of 4 applications for review. There were two applications submitted by faculty, one was submitted by a student, and one was collaborative between a student and a faculty member. One of the applications was exempt, none was expedited, and one was a continuation. One application is pending approval and one required a full review.

V. Review of Research Proposals

A. First study (Researcher 1)

9:09- Ms. Anderson enters meeting and informed Board of her study.
9:49- Ms. Anderson stepped out of room for further IRB discussion.
10:03- Ms. Anderson stepped back in.
10:05- Ms. Anderson left meeting.

After IRB review, the study was determined to require the following corrections:
1. Identify risk of potential physical follow up if determined to have hypertension
2. Identify who is included and excluded from the study (exclude pregnant women, under 21, etc.)
3. Obtain approval letters from the clinic, and any other recruiting location, to recruit in the area
4. Add a description to the diet and link to the DASH website
5. Address potential problems involved with changing ones diet, especially to that of high fiber (minimal risks)
6. Add to the benefits section (ex. weight loss, decrease in blood pressure, etc)
7. Identify yourself and your affiliation with Troy University
8. Include the Institutional Review Board contact information
9. Address how you will maintain the records (where, how long, who had access, etc.)
10. Eliminate certain language within application (ex. "focus group")
11. Decrease the reading level of the participant information to approximately an 8th grade level
12. Identify that the participants will only meet once a month
13. Change age of participants to 21 and over
14. Identify timeline on flyer to represent the 3 months testing period, including the latest date participant can sign up
15. Identify that the survey is voluntary and the participant can stop taking it if they feel necessary
16. Identify contact information on the flyer
17. Define "this institution" on page 7 as Troy University, your participating clinic, or whatever suffices

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)

VII. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 10:18 A.M.