Institutional Review Board Minutes
September 15th, 2011

I. Call to Order:

Meeting was called to order at 9:01 A.M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Timothy Buckner, Chair (NS)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Taylor (NS) (NI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gina Mariano, Chair elect</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Emma Peden (vtel)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dionne Rosser-Mims (pho)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eddie Clark (vtel)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dianne Barron, ex officio</td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan DuBose (NS) (NI)(vtel)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Glenda Avery (vtel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Isabelle Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Shari Hoppin</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Frank Hammonds</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard Cardarola (vtel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert Abbey (phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Janet McNellis, ex officio</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. William Foxx (vtel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X* - absent with notice
NS - non-scientist member
NI - non-institutional member

In Person: Dr. Tim Buckner, Dr. Gina Mariano, Dr. Shari Hoppin, Dr. Frank Hammonds, Dr. Janet McNellis, Dr. Isabelle Warren
Via V-Tel: Dr. Eddie Clark, Dr. Glenda Avery, Dr. Richard Cardarola, Dr. William Foxx, Susan DuBose, Dr. Emma Peden
Via Phone: Dr. Dionne Rosser-Mims
Absent with Notice: Dr. Dianne Barron, Dr. Robert Abbey
Absent without notice: Chase Taylor
Guests/Researcher: Mr. Naga Guntupalli & Dr. Robert Moore

Meeting began with 12 voting members & 1 non-voting member, 2 were non-scientists

II. Approval of the minutes

Dr. Warren made a motion to approve the minutes.
Dr. Hoppin seconded the motion and the motion was passed with unanimous approval.
III. Chair Comments on IRB Productivity

Since August 18th, the IRB received a total of 8 applications for review. There were four applications submitted by faculty, three were submitted by a student, and one was collaborative between a student and a faculty member. Two of the applications were exempt, three were expedited, and one was a continuation. No applications are pending approval and two are pending receipt of additional information. There were no known adverse events, unanticipated problems, or protocol violations/deviations that arose over the period.

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

Researcher 1: Examining Sexting Behaviors Through a Test of Self Control and Social Learning Theories- The researcher and co-pi are attending the meeting today.

V. Review of Research Proposals

A. First study (Researcher 1)

9:15- Researcher 1 and Co-PI enter meeting and addressed issues.
9:28- Researcher 1 and Co-PI stepped out of room for further IRB discussion.
9:41- Researcher 1 and Co-PI stepped back in.
9:45- Researcher 1 and Co-PI left meeting.

Discussion of application: 9:01
1. Look at checklist for consent form issues
2. Add risks on pg. 3 of application to IC
3. Is PI & Co-PI comfortable with counseling “emotional stress”
4. Wrong phone # for counseling (3700)
5. Attach consent form to front of survey
6. Mention students may be admitting to criminal activity
7. Permission to alter survey
8. Beta test on survey? 20 minute duration to complete test?
9. Confidentiality among survey pool?
10. Lawyer information
11. Requirements for IC: identify researchers and affiliation with Troy, contact information, IRB contact information, how long/where data will be stored, etc.
12. Re-word alternate participation

The discussion ended at 9:41 and Researcher 1 and Co-PI stepped out of the room.

There were no conflicts of interest among the IRB Board members.

After IRB review, the study was determined to require the following corrections:
1. Add written informed consent to the front of the survey
2. In the informed consent section of the methodology, spell out the procedure you are going to use to give the students the informed consent, read it to them, allow for any questions, and that they can take it with them.
3. Correct informed consent according to the checklist, looking for issues such as:
identification of researchers and their affiliation to Troy, the researchers contact
information, the IRB’s contact information, how/how long surveys will be stored
and who has contact with them
4. Expand risks in the informed consent to include those listed on page 3 of the
application
5. Include the attorney statement (will be provided)
6. Correct the number to the counseling center (3700)
7. Provide permission for the use/alteration of the surveys from the
author/publisher

None opposed to the application being denied as is. The IRB Chair will review the
updated application and confirm that the investigator has completed the modifications
requested by the IRB.

VI. Extra training needed- Board will inform Dr. McNellis if any training is needed

VII. Troy RCR Policies- An electronic vote was conducted on the RCR Policy manual
on 9-26-2011 and the 13 members who voted unanimously approved the manual.

VIII. Update from best practices in online research subcommittee- Dr. Frank
Hammonds

Biggest issues to address:
1. Confidentiality
2. Recruitment
3. Informed Consent

IX. Revised application- Board will look over and make any corrections and report to
Dr. McNellis

X. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:03 A.M.
The meeting lasted 1 hour and 02 minutes.