Institutional Review Board Meeting
January 17th, 2008
Minutes

I. Meeting was called to order at 8:40 am

II. Members present
- **In person:** Janet McNellis, Stephen Landers, Shari Hoppin, Iris Saltiel, Eddie Clark and Terrie Anderson
- **Via Vtel:** Glenda Avery, Shelia Bennett, Richard Caldarola
- **Via phone:** Robert Abbey.

III. Application Reviews

A. Moss

After much discussion, the Board agreed that it could not approve the study as is. Needed changes were identified:

- We need to receive a copy of the recruitment flyer that the researcher will post in the business center.
- To reduce the risks of loss of confidentiality, the researcher needs to change his recruitment procedure. Instead of asking people who do not wish to participate to leave the room, simply hand the survey to everyone in the room and tell them that if they wish to participate to complete the survey and return it to his box. If they do not wish to participate, they may either dispose of the survey or turn in a blank survey. If it is important to his research design to include equal numbers of males/females, black/white, then the researcher needs to (1) ask participants to indicate their race by circling "black" or "white" on the survey and (2) randomly select enough completed surveys for each of his cells.
- To further reduce the risks to confidentiality, the IRB recommends that the researcher give the potential participants an envelope with his name on it to put their completed survey in before they return it. Including his name on the envelope will help ensure that the researcher receives the survey
- In the Risks section of his Informed Consent document, instead of stating that the IRB has approved the study, he should spell out the risks to the participants. The researcher should inform the participants that if the responses become linked to particular individuals, this could result in embarrassment, harm to reputation and/or harm to their employability.
- Do not ask his participants to sign the Informed Consent document, or this will link them to the study. Instead, under Statement of Consent, write "Completing and returning this survey means that the researcher consent to participate. Keep this document for future reference.
- In the Confidentiality section of his Informed Consent document, the researcher should explain how the researcher distribution and collection procedures (the preaddressed envelopes) will help protect their confidentiality.

- In his Informed Consent, the researcher should include a statement that the researcher is conducting the research for a class and for possible publication.
- Because the researcher will not be linking anyone's name with any particular survey, the researcher will not be able to withdraw anyone's data if they do not want to participate anymore. The researcher therefore should revise his "Right to Withdraw" section (Eliminate the last sentence in this section).
- To maximize confidentiality, in his survey reword question #22 so that the researcher gives them a list of possible titles to circle instead of leaving this open-ended.

The Board gave the Chair authority to check the revised and resubmitted application for the appropriate changes and to approve the protocol if the changes are made.

B. Brown

After much discussion, the Board agreed that it could not approve the study as is. Needed changes were identified:

- Give more details concerning how and where the researcher will be recruiting the participants and how the survey will be administered and collected. To reduce the risks of loss of confidentiality, the IRB recommends that the researcher give the potential participants a stamped envelope with her address on it so they can complete the survey in a private area and return it anonymously. The researcher also should include her address as the return address on the envelope so that the participants will not need to include their return address.
- To limit the risks of the study, the researcher should limit her participant pool to adults 21 or over.
- The researcher indicates that University Officials will be notified of the results. The IRB has determined that this is unnecessary and increases risks to confidentiality, and the researcher therefore should remove this from her application.
- In the Procedures section of her Informed Consent document, the researcher should let the students know how long it will take them to complete the questionnaire.
- In the Risks section of her Informed Consent document, the researcher should inform the students that if the participants' responses become linked to particular participants, this could result in embarrassment, harm to reputation and/or harm to their employability.
- In the Confidentiality section of her Informed Consent document, the researcher should discuss how her distribution and collection procedures (the preaddressed envelopes) will help protect the confidentiality.
- In her Procedures and Confidentiality sections, the researcher state that the researcher will use the collected data only for her class. However, if the researcher plans to present her findings anywhere or publish the results anywhere then the researcher should state that the results may be published.

- In her Contacts and Questions section, the researcher should include the IRB contact information as well. (Troy Institutional Review Board, irb@troy.edu, (334) 670-5649).
- The researcher asks several demographic questions (#15, #16, #17), but it is unclear how these relate to the purpose of her study. Unless the researcher has an important research reason for including these questions, the researcher should eliminate them to increase confidentiality.

The Board gave the Chair authority to check the revised and resubmitted application for the appropriate changes and to approve the protocol if the changes are made.

C. Sunich

After much discussion, the Board agreed that it could not approve the study as is. Needed changes were identified:

- We need to receive a copy of the letter that the researchers received from the school system stating that the researchers could conduct their research in their system.
- Specify how many schools will be used in the research.
- Clarify exactly how the researchers will recruit participants, especially in the alternative schools.
- Reword their Assent statement -- this is a statement that should be read to the participants after they have received parental consent, and right before they are given the survey. Make sure the researchers let the students know what the risks and benefits are in this statement.
- To maximize the protections to confidentiality, the researchers should be the ones collecting the data. Envelopes should be given to the students along with the surveys so that after the students complete their surveys they can put each one in their individual envelope before they turn them in.
- Do not involve other students in recruiting or collecting the data.

In addition, the following changes should be made in their Informed Consent document:

- Identify themselves, and provide their contact information. Let the parents know that they can contact the researchers if they would like to see a copy of the survey instrument.
- The researchers state that the researchers are asking for the "child's age, year in school and gender", but the researchers are also asking for their race, and this should be stated.
- There are risks in participating in this research -- the researchers are asking people if they are participating in illegal behaviors (underage gambling), and if others outside the researchers saw the students' responses it could be damaging to their reputation and bring other harmful consequences. This needs to be explained in the Informed Consent -- a one-sentence statement is fine. The researchers can then explain how the researchers will protect the confidentiality of the student (no school personnel will have access to the surveys at any time, they will turn it in in an envelope, the researchers will keep all data in their locked office, etc.)

- Include a space where the student's name can be written.
- Insert the sentence "For information or questions about the rights of research participants, contact the Troy University Institutional Review Board at 334-670-5649 or irb@troy.edu".
- Above the signature line, insert the statement, "I have received a copy of this form to keep" and either provide the parents with an extra copy or make the signature space a tear-off at the bottom, where they just return the signature (if the researchers do this, make sure that the student's name is on the part that is returned).

The Board gave the Chair authority to check the revised and resubmitted application for the appropriate changes and to approve the protocol if the changes are made.

IV. Subcommittee Formations and Charges

- Members were added to some of the subcommittees. The corrected membership is as follows:
  - *Self-Study:* Janet McNellis, Iris Saltiel, Glenda Avery, Shari Hoppin
  - *Policies and Procedures Handbook:* Richard Caldarola, Eddie Clark, Terry Anderson
  - *Website and Application Forms:* Richard Caldarola, Stephen Landers, Sheila Bennett, Carol Moore
- The Timeline for subcommittees reports was discussed and agreed upon (as listed in the "Spring 2008 Subcommittee Information" form).

V. Training Needs – Representatives will continue to identify training needs at their campuses and sites.

VI. Community Representatives – Members were notified that this is still a position that needs to be filled and they will look for qualified candidates.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 10:30.