Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research (IRB/HSR)
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway, Bakersfield, CA 93311-1099

Minutes of Meeting
Friday, 03 October 2003
DDH B-108

Members Present:
Scientific Concerns: Kaye Bragg, David Cohen [for Marianne Abramson], Peggy Leapley
Nonscientific Concerns: Bob Carlisle, Paul Newberry, J.J. Wang
Community Issues: Ann Marie Duquette, Patrick Mellon, Carolyn Wade-Southard

Members Absent:
none

Visitors:
Patricia Hall for Protocol 03-44, Sarah Larsen for Protocol 03-57, Shalise Pollock for Protocol 03-58, Candice Meares for Protocols 03-44, 03-57 and 03-58, Steve Bacon for Protocols 03-54 and 03-55, Edwin Sasaki, Ken Nyberg and Val Garcia for Protocols 03-61 and 03-63, Danny Osborne for Protocol 03-62

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Paul Newberry called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM.

PREVIOUS MINUTES:

Wang moved and Bragg seconded, a motion to approve the minutes for the IRB/HSR meeting of Friday, 13 June 2003 with several typos noted to be corrected. The motion was approved unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Pat Mellon was introduced as the new member for Community Issues. Jacquie Acosta was introduced as the new Administrative Support person for the IRB/HSR.

OLD BUSINESS: [none]

NEW BUSINESS:

Formal Board affirmation of protocols previously approved under standard, exempted, and expedited review since the January 2003 meeting.

Standard Review (approved conditionally at January 2003 meeting)

1. **Protocol 03-44** [Cherilyn Haworth, Psychology Student] "A Study of the Factors Related to the Family Reunification Process for Female Parolees" on 13 June 2003 [Bragg, Carlisle, Wade].

   [Carlisle moved, Bragg seconded, unanimously approved]

Expedited Review

1. **Protocol 03-47** (Mary Foster, MSW Student) "Bi-Cultural Identification Issues in International Adoptive Families" on 04 August 2003. [Carlisle, Leapley]

2. **Protocol 03-49** (Adiel Uzabakiriho, MSW Student) "An Exploratory Study of Refugee Immigrant Experiences in the United States" on 20 August 2003. [Bragg, Newberry]

   [Leapley moved, Wang seconded, unanimously approved]

Exempted from Full Review

1. **Protocol 03-45** (Janet Zaldua, PPA Student) "The Impact of Parent Involvement on Student Success: How Educators Can Implement Partnerships with Parents to Meet the Needs of Hispanic Students" on 06 June 2003.

2. **Protocol 03-46** (Ken Trone, PPA Student) "New Residential Development's Responsibility to Fund Cost of New Local Parks" on 26 June 2003.

3. **Protocol 03-48** (Steve Bacon, Psychology Department) "College Norms for the Scale of Functional Ability Ratings [SOFAR]" on 25 June 2003.

4. **Protocol 03-50** (Jo Lynn Feinstein, Claremont Graduate Student) "An Evaluative Assessment of the Generally Accepted University Credit-Awarding System" on 01 August 2003.

5. **Protocol 03-52** (Cheryl Piccirilli, Education Student) "The Effectiveness of Implementing a Read Aloud Program on the Attitudes toward Reading of a Group of Third Graders" on 10 September 2003.

   [Bragg moved, Wang seconded, unanimously approved]

Formal Board affirmation of protocols submitted and designated as not falling within the IRB/HSR definition of human subjects research (not within IRB/HSR purview) since the January 2003 meeting.

[none]

Formal Board affirmation of previously approved protocols granted **extensions** since the January 2003 meeting.

It was noted that the authors of six protocols listed as closed in the agenda have requested extensions since the agenda was printed. These have been added to the Extensions listed here and deleted from the Closure list in these minutes.

1. **Protocol 01-52** (John Valdez, PPA Student) "The Influence of Cyberspace, Society, and the Internet" on 06 June 2003.

2. **Protocol 02-50** (R. Steven Daniels, PPA) "Agency Merger and Organizational Transformation in the Department of Homeland Security" on 04 June 2003.

3. **Protocol 02-77** (Andrew Alvarado, Fresno State University) "Central Valley Nursing Diversity Program Evaluation" on 16 September 2003.

4. **Protocol 02-63** (Steve Suter, Psychology) "Visual Neuroscience Lab Assignments and Research Projects for 2002-2003" on 19 September 2003.

5. **Protocol 01-38** (Marianne Abramson, Psychology Department) "Vowel and Consonant Length Effects in Sentence Verification" end of September 2003.

6. **Protocol 01-45** (J. Daniel McMillin, Applied Research Center) "San Joaquin Community Hospital - Diabetes Demonstration Project Evaluation" end of September 2003.

7. **Protocol 01-46** (J. Daniel McMillin, Applied Research Center) , "KC Department of Public Health - KC Tobacco Education Program (TEP) Evaluation" end of September 2003.

8. **Protocol 02-02** (Marianne Abramson, Psychology Department) "Relatedness Effects and Memory for Voice Attributes in Silent Reading" end of September 2003.

9. **Protocol 02-67** (David Georgi, Teacher Education) "How Has Participation in Technology Projects Changed Instructional Practice?" end of September 2003.

10. **Protocol 02-68** (David Georgi, Teacher Education) "What Are Perceived Uses of and Problems with TaskStream in Teacher?" end of September 2003.

[Wang moved, Carlisle seconded, unanimously approved]

Formal Board action **closing** protocols (unless extension requested) whose authorization will end prior to the next IRB meeting.

1. **Protocol 01-11** (Jess Deegan, Psychology Department) "Sex, Sexual Orientation, and Gender Identity: Do These Impact Cognitive Task Battery Results?" end of December 2003.

2. **Protocol 01-43** (Kenneth Nyberg, Applied Research Center) "California Department of Transportation Highway Maintenance Program Driver Satisfaction Survey" end of September 2003.

3. **Protocol 01-47** (Kathleen Gilchrist, Department of Nursing) "It's Really All About Chocolate...Lived Experiences of Beginning Baccalaureate Nursing Students" end of September 2003.

4. **Protocol 02-55** (Lu Royce Anne Bishop, Education Student) "Participation in Self-Expressive Esteem Building Art May Have a Counteractive Effect Upon the Aggressive Behavior of High School Students" end of December 2003.

5. **Protocol 02-58** (Martin Cortez, MSW Student) "A Study of the Demographic Factors and Social Support Systems of Single Room Occupancy Residents in Old Town Kern" end of September 2003.

6. **Protocol 02-59** (Cary Larson-McKay, Child, Adolescent & Family Studies) "On-Line Classes as a Factor in Family Functioning" end of September 2003.

7. **Protocol 02-60** (Cary Larson-McKay, Child, Adolescent & Family Studies) "Grandparents on Parenting--Wisdom of the Generations" end of September 2003.

8. **Protocol 02-61** (Cary Larson-McKay, Child, Adolescent & Family Studies) "The Kindness of Children" end of September 2003.

9. **Protocol 02-62** (Ben Perlado, Public Policy and Administration Student) "A Study of Student Service Programs in Kern County for the Encouragement of Higher Education" end of September 2003.

10. **Protocol 02-64** (Laramee Lyda-Craft, Psychology Student) "Psychological Contracts" end of September 2003.

11. **Protocol 02-65** (Kathleen Munsell) "Pet Attitude Scale Revision" end of September 2003.

12. **Protocol 02-66** (Lisa Freiberg, MSW Student) "Antecedents and Causes to Retention and Turnover Amongst Employed Child Protective Service Workers" end of September 2003.

13. **Protocol 02-69** (Susan M. Schaufelberger, Nursing Student) "Nurses' Knowledge of Pressure Ulcer Prevention, Staging, and Description: A Replication" end of September 2003.

14. **Protocol 02-70** (Cary Larson-McKay, Child, Adolescent, & Family Studies) "Early Literacy" end of October 2003.

15. **Protocol 02-73** (Chandrasekhar Commuri, Public Policy & Administration) "Community Activists' Role in Nonprofit Service Determination in Bakersfield" end of September 2003.

16. **Protocol 02-74** (Debra Morrison-Orton, Social Work) " The Effect of Burnout Training on child Protection Services Workers' Intentions . . " end of October 2003.

17. **Protocol 02-75** (Christina Brown, CSUB AV Psychology Student) "The Effects of Aesthetics and Responsibility on Likeability of People with Visible Stigmas" end of October 2003.

18. **Protocol 02-79** (Carla Anita Tucker, PPA Student) "Decreasing the Disparity of Homeownership Between Minorities and Non-minorities Through Effective Home-buying Programs" end of December 2003.

19. **Protocol 02-80** (Stanley Eugene Clark, Political Science) "Latino Political Leaders in California's Southern San Joaquin Valley" end of December 2003.

20. **Protocol 02-81** (Stanley Eugene Clark, Political Science) "Culture, Food, and the Economics of Mexican Restaurants in California" end of December 2003.

21. **Protocol 02-82** (Patricia Campion, Applied Research Center) "Qualitative Evaluation: Implementation of Family Resource Centers in Kings County" end of December 2003.

22. **Protocol 02-83** (Niki Tucker, Social Work Student) "Public Perception of Social Workers in Bakersfield" end of December 2003.

23. **Protocol 02-84** (Francisco Javier Llamas, History Student) "Missing Stories: The Chicano Experience in the Vietnam War" end of December 2003.

24. **Protocol 03-01** (Debra Wilson, Nursing Student) "Quality Care at the End-Of-Life: Identifying Factors That Affect Decisions Made by Families of Seriously Ill Patients" end of December 2003.

25. **Protocol 03-02** (Michael Dulle, PPA Student) "Kern County In-Home Supportive Services Consumer Survey and Needs Assessment" end of December 2003.

26. **Protocol 03-04** (Douglas W. Robinson) "Reframing Higher Education Within the California State University" end of December 2003.

27. **Protocol 03-07** (Jarrett Fisher, PPA Student) "A Study of the Management & Operational Productivity of the CSUB Career Beginnings Program" end of December 2003.

28. **Protocol 03-08** (Amy Zachary, Nursing Student) "Perceptions of Rural Nurse Practitioners: The Experience of Providing Primary Care" end of December 2003.

29. **Protocol 03-10** (Carla Tucker, PPA Student) "An Evaluation of the Intensive English Language Center's Service Delivery Options" end of December 2003.

[Bragg moved, Carlisle seconded, unanimously approved]

Protocol Reviews:

1. **Protocol 03-53** "The Bulimic Patient's Perception of Health Care" with Patricia K. Hall, Nursing Student. [Cohen, Newberry, Duquette]

Following a round of introductions, Hall summarized the proposal. She wishes to explore whether patient perceptions of health care for bulimia is related to whether and how these patients seek health care. Participants will be recruited from a bulimia self-help group. The research is qualitative. Questions followed.

Q: Do you suspect that there is a problem with treatment of this disorder? A: She has noted negative comments from patients about the services of their providers.

Q: Do these comments suggest that patient perceptions might prevent their seeking treatment? A: Yes.

Q: How will you recruit your participants? A: By announcing the research at meetings and handing out flyers with contact information on them.

Q: Will data by stored at home? A: Yes, in a locked file cabinet.

Q: You need to make clear that if distressed, a participant may terminate their participation and that non-participation or termination will not affect their care. A: Will do.

Q: You need to clarify the duration of possible follow-up contacts on the consent form. A: Will do.

Q: How long will you keep the data? A: [Investigator was not sure. It was agreed to have a one year period specified after which the personal identifiers would be destroyed, but the data could be kept].

Q: What about potential participants who speak/read Spanish only? A: I was concerned about confidentiality in adding a translator, so they will not be included.

Q: Need to be more clear about what happens if a participant becomes distressed. A: Will do.

Q: Typos were noted on the demographic data survey materials A: These will be corrected.

Q: You need to clarify in the protocol how confidentiality will be maintained with respect to the name and consent form. A: Will do.

Q: Consent form needs to indicate the participant will get a copy. A: Will do.

Q: Are there any benefits to the participants of being in this study? If so, this belongs in the consent form. A: Will consider this.

Q: In what order will the materials in the appendices be administered? A: Consent form first, then the others.

The investigator was excused and more discussion followed. The IRB/HSR arrived at several conditions of approval:

1. Adding a confidentiality statement to be signed by the transcriber.

2. Edit the protocol for clarity re explaining how possible distress of a participant will be handled.

3. State in both the protocol and the consent form the specifics of how confidentiality will be maintained.

4. Add the following elements to the consent form:

   a. The decision to participate or not will not affect their care.

   b. The follow-up period for potential contact is one year.

c. When the data will be destroyed.

d. That the participant will receive a copy.

e. "For questions regarding my rights as a research participant I may contact" [the RERC].

There was a motion for conditional approval of the protocol. [Duquette moved, Wade-Southard seconded, unanimously approved]. It was explained to the investigator that the research could proceed when the conditions have been satisfied.

2. **Protocol 03-57** "The Lived Experiences of Heterosexual Woman with HIV" with Sarah E. Larsen, Nursing Student. [Cohen, Newberry, Wade-Southard]

Following a round of introductions, Larsen summarized the proposal. Little is known about the lived experiences of heterosexual women with HIV. Data collected might be helpful for prevention and treatment. Women will be recruited via two community mental health agencies and interviewed. The research is qualitative. Questions followed.

Q: Please clarify the purpose of this study. What do you expect to find? A: I'm primarily interested in the health promotion practices of participants.

Q: What are you getting at with Question #2? You'll get more useful results with a question that is clearer. A: Yes, will clarify.

Q: What will you do if there is mental illness, which is common in this population? Is this an exclusion factor? A: I haven't thought about that.

Q: How will the data be stored? A: At home in a locked file cabinet.

Q: You state in the protocol that there will be complete anonymity, but that is not true. That needs to be fixed in the protocol A: Will do.

Q: You state in the protocol, and in the letter to potential participants, that all data will be confidential, but you need to specifically state the extent of this and how this will be accomplished in both documents. A: Will do.

Q: How will you recruit your participants? A: I will talk with support personnel at the agencies.

Q: At the top of your consent form you try to state the purpose of your research, but this needs to be much more clear. A: Will do.

Q: You need to devise a way and explain it in the consent form, for services to participants to be totally independent of their participation in this study. A: Will do.

Q: In the consent form state that the investigator can associate your name and data. A: Will do.

Q: You need to simplify the general terminology in the consent form. A: Will do.

Q: State the time period of potential re-contact on the consent form. A: Will do.

Q: Please add a confidentiality statement for the transcriber to sign. A: Will do.

Q: In both the protocol and consent form you need to explain more clearly how you would deal with a distressed participant. A: Will do.

Q: There were a number of suggestions for improving the clarity of questions in the interview schedule.

The investigator was excused and more discussion followed. The IRB/HSR arrived at several conditions of approval:

1. In the protocol, deal with how mental competence of potential participants with be dealt with.

2. In the protocol, add a confidentiality statement to be signed by the transcriber.

3. In the protocol, specify how data will be handled and stored to preserve confidentiality. Edit the protocol for clarity re explaining how possible distress of a participant will be handled.

4. In the protocol and consent form, specify which data/information will be kept for how long.

5. In the protocol and consent form, specify how you will deal with participants who become distressed.

6. In the letter to the participant and in the consent form, clarify the extent to which there will be anonymity and confidentiality and how this will be accomplished, including that the investigator will have both names and the data.

7. In the letter to the facilities, add language to state that you will not provide information to the facility that is collected in this research, including information about who participates, and that the decision to participate must not affect services to the persons involved.

8. In the Appendix B letter, reword so that contact will always be from the prospective participant to you and never the other way around—*you are never given contact info for other potential participants.*

9. Add the following elements to the consent form:

    a. Clarify the purpose of your research.

    b. State that services to the participant will not be affected by the decision to participate or not.

    c. Simplify the terminology used in the consent form.

    d. Move the question about how to contact the participant to the consent form.

    e. "For questions regarding my rights as a research participant I may contact" [the RERC].

There was a motion for conditional approval of the protocol. [Carlisle moved, Duquette seconded, unanimously approved]. It was explained to the investigator that the research could proceed when the conditions have been satisfied.

3. **Protocol 03-58** "Perception of the Medical Management of Postpartum Women Experiencing Depression" with Shalise R. Pollock, Nursing Student. [Leapley, Carlisle, Mellon]

Following a round of introductions, Pollock summarized the proposal. Little is known about how postpartum women experiencing depression perceive their treatment. Data collected might be helpful in modifying the treatment of such women. Women will be recruited via via community and faith-based groups and interviewed. The research is qualitative. Questions followed.

Q: Are you associated yourself with the groups involved in recruitment? A: I'm involved professionally, but not as a participant in these groups.

Q: Will you have ongoing social contact with your potential participants? A: No.

Q: Are you doing this because you think that your population is not receiving adequate health care? A: Perhaps improvement is needed; in particular, I want to see what *their* perceptions are.

Q: How will the data be stored to preserve anonymity? A: The consent form will have names, but the data files will have only participant ID codes.

Q: You are not collecting ethnicity data, but that information seems important. A: It actually doesn't seem important for this study. No persons will be excluded by virtue of ethnicity however.

Q: How will you recruit your participants? A: Presentations at the groups and giving them contact information.

Q: You need to add to the consent form, a statement about the survey data that they will be asked to provide, beyond the interview. A: Will do.

Q: Can participants get a copy of the overall results if they want? A: Will add to consent form.

Q: Please specify in the protocol and consent form how you will deal with a distressed participant. Mention in the consent form that adverse reactions are possible. A: Will do.

The investigator was excused and more discussion followed. The IRB/HSR arrived at several conditions of approval:

1. In the protocol and consent form, specify the extent of confidentiality and how the data will be stored.

2. In the protocol, add a confidentiality statement to be signed by the transcriber.

3. Add the following elements to the consent form:

a. State the second sentence more clearly.

b. The participants will be asked to complete a questionnaire.

c. The gift certificate can be kept, regardless.

d. The only identifiers on the data will be participant ID numbers.

e. The participant will keep a copy of the consent form.

f. Participants can terminate participation if distressed and specify steps that will be taken if there is an adverse reaction.

g. The length of time during which the participant might be re-contacted.

There was a motion for conditional approval of the protocol. [Mellon moved, Cohen seconded, unanimously approved]. It was explained to the investigator that the research could proceed when the conditions have been satisfied.

4. **Protocol 03-54** "Outpatient Norms for the Scale of Functional Ability Ratings [SOFAR]" with Steve Bacon, Psychology Department. [Bragg, Wang, Duquette]

5. **Protocol 03-55** "Inpatient Norms for the Scale of Functional Ability Ratings [SOFAR]" with Steve Bacon, Psychology Department. [Bragg, Wang, Duquette]

Protocols 03-54 and 03-55 were presented and reviewed together because they are closely related. Following a round of introductions, Bacon summarized the proposals. He has been developing a scale to measure the functional abilities of mental health inpatients, which, at present, is not measured adequately, but has substantial clinical implications for treatment. He is now at the stage of needing norms for both inpatients and outpatients, which are the purposes of this research. Questions followed.

Q: Will you screen the potential participants? A: Yes, for their mental competency to give informed consent.

Q: How about if patients are drug impaired? A: That could be a rule out for mental competency.

Q: Are the consent forms appropriately tailored for outpatients and inpatients? A: Yes.

Q: How will you maintain confidentiality if the inpatient participants are recruited in a group setting? A: The research project will be announced in the group sessions, but individuals will approach the investigator later about participating.

Q: Will you be testing participants in groups in the inpatient study? A: Yes, the written data will be collected in groups, but if anything must be administered orally, then it would be done individually.

Q: Some of the tests are copyrighted. Are you buying those? A: Yes.

Q: The consent form seems to be "information dense." Are you sure it is appropriate. A: Think so. The consent form is read to each participant. The form gets very long if it is written at a lower reading level.

Q: Will the outpatient therapist get information about participation or the individual data? A: No.

Q: Are you comfortable sending out the entire packet together, including the consent form? A: This appears to be standard practice in this area.

Q: Is it a problem giving participants feedback on their responses prior to their finishing providing data on all of the scales. A: Seems O.K.

The investigator was excused and more discussion followed. It is understood that the data release form must be HIPAA compliant, but this is not a condition of approval. The IRB/HSR arrived at several conditions of approval:

For Protocol 03-54 [Outpatient]

1. Specify that the data will be stored in a "locked" file cabinet.
2. Participant's name will not be associated with the coded data.

For Protocol 03-55 [Inpatient]

1. Specify that the data will be stored in a "locked" file cabinet.
2. Participant's name will not be associated with the coded data.
3. If the scales are administered orally, this must be done individually.

There was a motion for conditional approval of both protocols. [Wang moved, Carlisle seconded, unanimously approved]. It was explained to the investigator that the research could proceed when the conditions have been satisfied.

6. **Protocol 03-61** "GEAR-UP: Limited Data Set" with Edwin H. Sasaki, Associate Academic Vice-President. [Leapley, Carlisle, Wade-Southard]

7. **Protocol 03-63** "GEAR-UP: Waiver of Signed Consent" with Edwin H. Sasaki, Associate Academic Vice-President. [Leapley, Carlisle, Wade-Southard]

Following a round of introductions, Sasaki summarized the proposal. The CSUB GEAR UP program is a 5-year grant project funded by the U. S. Department of Education, in which 6th and 7th grade students will be followed into high school. The aim is to increase the number of students who attend college. Questions followed.

Q: Is there an at-risk sub-group being studied within the overall population of students? A: No.

Q: Will you include special ed students? A: Yes, all of the students in these grade levels will be followed.

Q: Is this just the students performing at the specified grade level? A: No, it's the students who are assigned to those grades regardless of their academic performance level.

Q: The protocol is to receive the data? A: Correct.

Q: Why not just have the data sent without any personal identifiers? A: When students move from school to school they get new student codes, so their data could not remain properly associated.

Q: Will you include students who speak only Spanish? A: Yes, all of the children will be followed. The materials will be in both Spanish and English.

Q: Will you get parental approval to follow their children. A: No, we are asking for waiver of informed consent, except for the annual parent survey.

Q: How will you provide security for the data? A: Nyberg provided an overview of ARC data security procedures, but did not provide details in order to protect security.

Q: Will the parents have access to the data for their children? A: No.

Q: On the parent consent form for the annual survey, it should be clarified that aggregate parent data will be used to make GEAR UP alternations. A: Yes, will do.

Q: Who will have the info associating student ID# with the actual student? A: ARC.

Q: Note that the requests for data release will need to be revised to be FERPA compliant. A: O.K.

The investigator was excused and more discussion followed. The IRB/HSR arrived at several conditions of approval:

1. In the protocol, specify that someone will provided to read the survey materials in Spanish if needed.

2. In the protocol, justify the necessity of having personal identifiers in terms of tracking students as they move between schools.

3. In the protocol, specify that the participating schools will not be given any data that can be associated with individual students.

4. Revise the data release forms to be FERPA compliant.

5. Submit to the IRB/HSR the final survey instruments, including the Spanish versions.

6. In the protocol, refer to the standard ARC data security procedures to protect data confidentiality.

There was a motion for conditional approval of the protocol. [Mellon moved, Leapley seconded, unanimously approved]. It was explained to the investigator that the research could proceed when the conditions have been satisfied.

8. **Protocol 03-62 [Attachment H]** "Sexual Prejudice in the Schools: Applying the Integrated Threat Theory to Evaluation Bias" with Danny Osborne, Psychology Student. [Bragg, Wang, Mellon]

Following a round of introductions, Osborne summarized the proposal. Several predictions of the integrated threat theory of prejudice will be tested by having

Bakersfield College students rate the lecturing performance of a person who is or is not presented as a gay person. Questions followed.

Q: Who are your participants? A: Bakersfield College introductory psychology students.

Q: Do you think people really believe a manipulation like this? A: The alternatives to this approach seem to be less good.

Q: Why do you use the term "sex" rather than "gender?" A: Is less ambiguous.

Q: A number of methodological improvements and revisions of the questionnaire wording are suggested.

Q: The debriefing form needs work. Clarify that the data will not be used for employment purposes and add a paragraph explaining the manipulations and why they were necessary, including the necessity of deception.

Q: Why is there no question asking directly whether the person should be hired, which is the claimed focus of the study? A: Will add that.

The investigator was excused and more discussion followed. The IRB/HSR arrived at several conditions of approval:

1. In the protocol, specify that Bakersfield College introductory psychology students will be the prospective participants.

2. In the de-briefing form, clarify:

   a. The two independent variables involved in the study.

   b. Why deception was used.

   c. That the data will not, in fact, be used for hiring purposes.

There was a motion for conditional approval of the protocol. [Carlisle moved, Bragg seconded, unanimously approved]. It was explained to the investigator that the research could proceed when the conditions have been satisfied.

OTHER CONCERNS:

1. It was noted during earlier discussion that it would be useful to include on all the IRB/HSR cover pages a space to indicate if the protocol was a Master's thesis or project. The RERC agreed to make this addition to the cover pages.

2. A general concern was noted in earlier discussion that Spanish-speaking persons not be systematically excluded from studies by virtue of having English-only materials.

3. We need to be more careful with confidentiality when potential participants are contacting the investigator, <u>re</u> shared e-mail addresses and who picks up the phone at home.

4. A general summary of ARC data security procedures should be filed with the IRB/HSR, and referred to as appropriate in ARC protocols.

5. Candace Meares seemed receptive to the idea of providing Nursing students with a generic consent form to use in theses involving qualitative methodology that would address the interviewing, taping, transcribing, etc. issues so students would not have such variety in the aspects they left out of the form or explained inadequately.

NEXT MEETING:

Friday, 30 January 2004, 8 AM – meeting room to be announced

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:33 AM.

There was no IRB/HSR member training due to the length of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted

Steve Suter, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
and IRB/HSR Secretary