INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 17, 2013

I. Call to Order:
   A. Meeting was called to order at 9:00 am.
   Members Present:
      Total  10
      Voting Members  9
      Non-scientists  2
   B. Members Absent  5

Quorum was met. Attendance was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>In Person</th>
<th>Via Phone</th>
<th>Via Vtel</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Absent with notice</th>
<th>Voting Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Ross (Chair)(NS)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaoli Su (Chair Elect)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Foxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Mariano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cozetta Shannon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JeeHae (Helen) Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Heisler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Pritchett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Sarapin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionne Rosser-Mims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Taylor (NI)(NS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Sauer (NI)(NS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Barron (ExOfficio)(HPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS: Non-scientist member / NI: Non-institutional member

II. Approval of IRB Minutes
   Approval of IRB Minutes from the September 19, 2013 meeting:
   Motion to approve all minutes with revision: Dr. Campbell; Second:
   Dr. Shannon.
   The Motion passes: 8 in favor 1 abstained due to absence.

III. Current proposals for full review: None
IV. IRB Productivity: Chair Comments and IRB Discussion

A. Exempt Applications: 5

B. Expedited Approvals
   1. 201309004-Benson: Can sensors help detect a concussion in collegiate athletes? Faculty/Troy. Dr. Ross & Dr. Green.
   2. 201309005-Lee: The Effect of self-Defense Training on Teachers. Faculty/Dothan. Dr. Ross & Dr. Pritchett

C. Continued Review Approvals: 2

D. Pending Expedited Review:
   201309002-Wright: Hofstede’s Work Values: Is There Convergence? Faculty/Troy. Dr. Ross & Dr. Foxx.

E. Needs Revisions or Information:
   1. 201301009-Johnson: Future Trends: Arts and Design Management Within Cultural and Creative Industries. Faculty/Troy. Expedited Review: Dr. Mariano & Dr. Foxx.
   3. 201306002-Davis & Creamer: The Transition point Active Advising Project. Faculty/Troy. Dr. Ross & Dr. Pritchett.
   4. 201307004-Kouassi & Hamby: Are sunk costs used in decision making? Collaborative/Montgomery. Dr. Mariano & Dr. Lee.
   5. 201307005-Bixler & Hamby: Ethical Attitudes of Students During a Recession. Collaboration/Montgomery. Dr. Mariano & Dr. Lee.
   6. 201306010-Fretwell, Lewis & Crane: Linking Social Influence and Knowledge Management Systems Usage in Hospital Setting(s). Collaborative/Phenix City. Dr. Mariano & Dr. Rosser-Mims.
   7. 201308001-Russell: Role Models & “Read Alouds”. Faculty/ Phenix City. Incomplete/New Application.
   8. 201307009-Estes: Predictive measures of Reading Fluency. Student/Dothan. Dr. Mariano & Dr. Lee.
   9. 201307010-Spurlock & Colaco: Survey of Television Newsroom Assignment Editors in India. Faculty/Troy. Dr. Mariano & Dr. Pritchett.
  10. 201307008-Fitch & Marshall: Troy University Panama City Elevate Project. Faculty/Global. Full Review.

V. Discussion of Corrections and Updates to Research Proposals under Full Review:

A. 201308004-Krach: Can a Software Program Teach Social-Skills? A School-Based Assessment. Faculty/Montgomery. Approved

VI. Report from IRB Sub-Committees:
A. Website Revision Sub-Committee Report:
  1. Modify IRB training video
     a. Work with IT personnel to reduce file size to improve download time.
     b. Recommend breaking presentation into sections to improve download time.
  2. Modify IRB Quiz
     a. The current IRB quiz does not allow test takers to know which questions they missed and which ones they got right. Add report at end of quiz to display correct and incorrect answers.
  3. Addition to FAQ section of website
     a. Number statements and answers instead of using bullets.
     b. Add information about how to obtain a readability level.
  4. Correction to page entitled “How to Prepare a Proposal for Review”
     a. Change the current link for the committee members to the following: http://trojan.troy.edu/employees/standingcommittees/irb.htm
  5. Link for Continuing Review Application
     a. The link for Continuing Review Application should go to the Types of Review page that should describe this type of application. Then, that page should have the link for the actual document, which should be titled Continuing Review Application Form.
  6. Update IRB meeting schedule
  7. Modify IRB Application
     a. Recommend converting application to PDF form to minimize format disruptions and maintain format continuity.
     b. Methods Section of application
        1. Recommend expanding directions provided in Methods Section of application by adding guiding questions/statements to assist the applicant. The additional information will help IRB committee better understand proposed research study and identify areas of concern which typically stem from the methods section of a study.
     c. Recommended verbiage to be added to Methods Section of the application:
        1. Explain exactly what the participants will be asked to do. Include the amount of time that each participant will need to devote to the study. Insert copies of any questions or surveys that will be given to the participants. Describe your plans for data analysis: how you are going to collect data and what instrument you will use to interpret your data. If your research is a quantitative study, identify the computer programs you will be using to manipulate the data, and what statistical tests will be done in order to answer your research question(s). Include information about how and where your data will be stored and for how long. You should not collect any data, especially demographics, unless doing so is necessary and you have specific plans to analyze or otherwise make use of the data. Explain how each variable measured supports the purpose of your study. If this is part of a thesis, dissertation, or Doctor of Nursing Practice paper, insert your entire Methodology section below. Use as much space as necessary.
8. Dr. Barron is currently working with IT to update and make corrections to the IRB website.

9. Dr. Rosser-Mims will be consulting with other faculty in Technology Education to determine potential ways to upgrade the current website.

B. Annual Policy Revision Sub-Committee Report:
   1. The report from the Annual Policy Revision Sub-Committee was postponed because additional input was needed from the IRB Full Board before recommendations for revision could be made.
   2. The IRB discussed current IRB policies concerning requests to conduct research from researchers not affiliated with Troy University. The sub-committee will provide a report of proposed revisions to the IRB at the next scheduled meeting.

VII. Report from Human Protections Administrator
   Dr. Barron discussed the time frames for Expedited Reviews and the importance of the IRB’s function as the ‘gateway’ for research at Troy University.

VIII. New Business
   1. Dr. Ross and Dr. Pritchett led the IRB in discussing Action Research.
      a. Action Research requires review by the IRB.
      b. Teachers using their students for research purposes is potentially problematic and requires IRB review.
   2. The next IRB meeting will be scheduled for November 21, 2013 at 9:00 am.

IX. Adjourn
   Motion to Adjourn: Dr. Campbell, Second: Dr. Sarapin.
   Motion passed unanimously.
   Meeting adjourned 10:30 am.