

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

---

**Minutes of Meeting**  
**Friday, 08 October 2004**  
**Old Pub Area**

**Members Present:**

Scientific Concerns: Kaye Bragg, Marianne Abramson  
Nonscientific Concerns: Emerson Case, Paul Newberry, J.J. Wang  
Administrative Oversight: Edwin Sasaki

**Members Absent:**

Anne Marie Duquette, Patrick Mellon, Carolyn Wade-Southard

**Visitors:**

Cheryl Lirette for Protocol 04-88 Second Review,  
Debra-Morrison-Orton for Protocols 04-88 and 04-94 Second Review and 04-120 Review,  
Bruce Hartsell for Protocol 04-88 Second Review and 04-120 Review,  
Gwendolyn Morris and Gigi Nordquist for Protocol 04-123 Review,  
Kathleen Gilchrist for Protocol 04-124 Review,  
Katie Fleming and Anne Duran for Protocol 02-126 Review  
New January 2005 IRB Members: Yeunjoo Lee, Rose Anna McCleary, Candace Meares

**CALL TO ORDER:**

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

The Chair welcomed temporary member Emerson Case [for Robert Carlisle, who is on leave Fall Quarter 2004], new member Edwin Sasaki [*ex officio*], and January 2005 incoming members Yeunjoo Lee, Rose Anna McCleary, and Candace Meares. Departing members Kaye Bragg, Peggy Leapley, and J. J. Wang were thanked for their service.

**PREVIOUS MINUTES:**

Bragg moved and Abramson seconded, a motion to approve the minutes for the IRB/HSR meeting of Friday, 11 June 2004. The motion was approved unanimously.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Sasaki provided an update on the IRB's request for university-wide implementation of a method to ensure IRB authorization of Masters theses and projects involving human subjects research. Programs having their own tracking documents for individual theses/projects have been requested to add lines [if absent] to verify IRB authorization. A generic document will be provided to programs who do not presently track. There was discussion about monitoring of the tracking documents so that potential violations can be detected and corrected early in the process. Sasaki will meet with graduate program coordinators. There will be a centralized spreadsheet to track all theses/projects. Outreach will be coordinated with IRB personnel.

**OLD BUSINESS:** [none]

## NEW BUSINESS:

- a. **Formal Board affirmation** of protocols previously approved under standard, expedited, and exempted review since the June 2004 meeting.

### Standard Review (conditionally approved at June 2004 meeting)

1. **Protocol 04-90 [Deyanira Gonzalez & Rose Anna McCleary, MSW]:** "The Role of Companion Animals in the Human Dying Process" [Duquette, Leapley, Wang] on 12 August 2004.

[Abramson moved, Leapley seconded, approved unanimously]

### Expedited Review

1. **Protocol 04-62** (Robert Carlisle, English) "The Influence of Sonority Sequencing on the Modification of /sC/ Onsets" [Leapley, Wang] on 02 July 2004.
2. **Protocol 04-89** (Katie Staley, MSW Student) "What Do Basque Women Believe Are the Expectations Toward Marriage Placed On Them By Their Culture and How Do These Basque Women Themselves Comply To These Expectations?" [Abramson, Newberry] on 09 June 2004.
3. **Protocol 04-91** (Jeffrey Moffit, Physical Education and Kinesiology) "The Effect of Cross Country Cycling Relay Racing on Cycling Power, Heart Rate, and Cycling Muscle Electromyographic Activity" [Abramson, Newberry] on 22 June 2004.
4. **Protocol 04-98** (S. Aaron Hegde, Economics) "The Mexican Migration Decision: An Empirical Study" [Leapley, Newberry] on 25 June 2004.
5. **Protocol 04-103** (Valerie Sizemore, Nursing Student) "Diabetic Patient Education: Effectiveness Measured by Hemoglobin Alc Levels" [Abramson, Wang] on 16 July 2004.
6. **Protocol 04-106** (Marianne Abramson, Psychology) "The Attenuation of Vowel- and Consonant-Length Effects by Concurrent Articulation" [Bragg, Newberry] on 23 July 2004.
7. **Protocol 04-108** (Zandree Stidham, English Student) "Socioeconomic Status and the Returning Student" [Leapley, Wang] on 29 July 2004.
8. **Protocol 04-116** (Terri Steinberg, Nursing Student) "The Lived Experience of Husbands Who Care for Their Wives or Significant Others with Dementia" [Bragg, Wang] on 22 September 2004.
9. **Protocol 04-117** (Tanya Boone, Psychology) "Homophobia and Condom Use Among Heterosexual Men" [Abramson, Newberry] on 22 September 2004.

[Bragg moved, Case seconded, approved unanimously]

### Exempted from Full Review

1. **Protocol 04-92** (Jodie Winningham, MSW Student) "Thesis for MSW Program" on 23 June 2004.
2. **Protocol 04-95** (Dan Ragle, Special Education Student) "Evaluation of Reading Programs for Learning Handicapped Students in a High School District" on 04 June 2004.
3. **Protocol 04-96** (Dan Durham, Special Education Student) "A Descriptive Study of After-School Programs" 11 June 2004.
4. **Protocol 04-99** (Barney Simons, Sociology Student) "The Stigmatized Neighborhood" on 27 June 2004.
5. **Protocol 04-100** (Debra Morrison-Orton, Department of Social Work) "Barriers to Screening for Domestic Violence and Substance Abuse" on 10 August 2004.
6. **Protocol 04-101** (Alejandra Perez, Department of Biology) "Effect Size of Microbiology Manual on the C- Student in Bio 260" on 22 June 2004.

7. **Protocol 04-102** (Laura Hecht, Department of Sociology/Anthropology) "Baker Street Area Business Survey" on 29 July 2004.
8. **Protocol 04-109** (Susan Koulos, Mathematics Student) "Writing in the Mathematics Curriculum: Its Purpose, Usage, and Effects on Student Learning" on 27 July 2004.
9. **Protocol 04-110** (Diane Butkiewicz, Special Education Student) "Effectiveness of *Learning Strategies Curriculum* for Simple Sentence Writing" on 16 August 2004.
10. **Protocol 04-111** (Erica Ballesteros, Psychology Student) "Racial Profiling and Stereotyping Tendencies" on 10 August 2004.
11. **Protocol 04-112** (Antonia Mejia, Psychology Student) "Perceptions of Friendships Involving Gay or Lesbian Issues" on 15 September 2004.
12. **Protocol 04-113** (Steve Bacon, Department of Psychology) "Reliability of the Scale of Functional Ability Ratings (SOFAR) in a College Sample" on 25 August 2004.
13. **Protocol 04-114** (Donna Graham, PPA Student) "How Effective Has The Local Americorps America Reads Program Been In Improving The Reading Proficiencies Of Its Participants?" on 13 September 2004.
14. **Protocol 04-115** (Muoi "Kim" T. Teeten, Teacher Education) "Teacher Perceptions: Efficacy and Beliefs about Teaching" on 16 September 2004.

[Leapley moved, Bragg seconded, approved unanimously]

- b. 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 June 2004 meeting.

1. **Protocol 04-105** (Paula L. Joseph, Special Education Student) "A Handbook of Comprehension and Learning Approaches for Students with Learning Disabilities" on 13 July 2004.

[Case moved, Bragg seconded, approved unanimously]

- c. Formal Board affirmation** of previously approved protocols granted **extensions** since the June 2004 meeting.

1. **Protocol 01-46** (William E. Wagner III, ARC) "KC Department of Public Health - KC Tobacco Education Program (TEP) Evaluation" on 24 September 2004.
2. **Protocol 02-48** (Bonita Coyle, Public Policy and Administration Student) "An Examination of the Effect of the Availability of Community Mental Health Services as a Factor in the Incidence and Treatment Expense of Inmates with Psychiatric Diagnoses" on 12 May 2004.
3. **Protocol 02-77** (Andrew Alvarado, CSU-Fresno) "Central Valley Nursing Diversity Program Evaluation" 13 September 2004.
4. **Protocol 03-03** (Steve Bacon, Psychology) "Establishment of a Participant Pool For the Department of Psychology" on 15 June 2004.
5. **Protocol 03-70** (Tanya Boone, Psychology) "Mother-Adolescent Health Communication" on 24 September 2004.
6. **Protocol 04-29** (Erik Thompson, Mathematics Student) "Master's Research Project on Parental Involvement" on 12 August 2004.

[Bragg moved, Abramson seconded, approved unanimously]

- d. Formal Board action closing** protocols (unless extension requested) whose authorization has ended or will end prior to the January 2005 IRB meeting.

1. **Protocol 01-38** (Marianne Abramson, Psychology) "Vowel and Consonant Length Effects in Sentence Verification" end of September 2004.
2. **Protocol 01-45** (William E. Wagner III, ARC) "San Joaquin Community Hospital - Diabetes Demonstration Project Evaluation" end of September 2004.
3. **Protocol 02-68** (David Georgi, Teacher Education) "What Are Perceived Uses of and Problems with TaskStream in Teaching?" end of September 2004.
4. **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 2004.
5. **Protocol 02-02** (Marianne Abramson, Psychology) "Relatedness Effects and Memory for Voice Attributes in Silent Reading," end of September 2004.
6. **Protocol 02-04** (Anne Duran, Psychology) "Measures of Attitudes Toward Outgroup Members" end of September 2004.
7. **Protocol 02-67** (David Georgi, Teacher Education) "How Has Participation in Technology Projects Changed Instructional Practice?" end of September 2004.
8. **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" end of August 2004.
9. **Protocol 03-53** (Patricia K. Hall, Nursing Student) "The Bulimic Patient's Perception of Health Care" end of September 2004.
10. **Protocol 03-56** (Long Le, Political Science) "Civil Liberties Survey" end of September 2004.
11. **Protocol 03-57** (Sarah E. Larsen, Nursing Student) "The Lived Experiences of Heterosexual Women with HIV" end of November 2004.
12. **Protocol 03-58** (Shalise R. Pollock, Nursing Student) "Perception of the Medical Management of Postpartum Women Experiencing Depression" end of September 2004.
13. **Protocol 03-59** (Erin C. Martinez, Nursing Student) "A Systematic Extension Replication Study: Informed Decision-Making about Hormone Replacement Therapy Among Postmenopausal Women" end of October 2004.
14. **Protocol 03-60** (Ruben Fuentes, PPA Student) "The POBRA/Miranda Dilemma" end of September 2004.
15. **Protocol 03-62** (Danny Osborne, Psychology Student) "Sexual Prejudice in the Schools: Applying the Integrated Threat Theory to Evaluation Bias" end of September 2004.
16. **Protocol 03-64** (Madhavappallil Thomas, MSW) "Social Workers' Use of Resilience-Based Knowledge and Skills in Foster Care Programs in Kern County," end of October 2004.
17. **Protocol 03-65** (Edwin Sasaki, Interim Dean, Undergraduate Studies) "Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs [GEAR UP]" end of September 2004.
18. **Protocol 03-66** (Emily Darling, Psychology Student) "Affective Experience" end of September 2004.
19. **Protocol 03-67** (Kenneth L. Nyberg, Applied Research Center) "NASA Dryden Flight Research Center [DFRC]—Research Grant NAG4-200" end of September 2004.
20. **Protocol 03-68** (Corinne Preston, Nursing Student) "Caring for Organ Donation Patients in the ICU Setting—Novice to Expert Study" end of October 2004.
21. **Protocol 03-69** (Nancy M. Bringman, Advanced Educational Studies) "Middle School Counselors' Preferences for Large Group Guidance Delivery Model" end of September 2004.
22. **Protocol 03-75** (Loida Ruane, MSW Student) "Factors Impacting the Acculturation of Filipino Americans in Kern County" end of November 2004.
23. **Protocol 03-76** (Elsita Mathew, Nursing Student) "Health Promoting Behaviors of Asian Indian Immigrant Women in the US" end of October 2004.

24. **Protocol 03-78** (Janice Nichols, Nursing Student) "A Micro-Ethnography: Exploring the Experience of African Americans Living with Hypertension" end of November 2004.
25. **Protocol 03-79** (John Maynard, History Department) "We Did All That Was Asked: Porterville, California and the Vietnam War" end of October 2004.
26. **Protocol 03-80** (Marie Farrell, Department of Nursing) "Exploring and Developing a Nursing Department's Community of Interest: A Replication Study" end of November 2004.
27. **Protocol 03-82** (Susan Pfetscher, Department of Nursing) "Critical Thinking Characteristics in Dialysis Staff" end of November 2004.
28. **Protocol 04-01** (Tanya Boone, Psychology) "Sexuality Messages and Sexual Attitudes" end of December 2004.
29. **Protocol 04-02** (Cheryl Smith, Department of English) "Analytical Thinking in a College Composition Class" end of December 2004.

[Abramson moved, Bragg seconded, approved unanimously]

### Review of Protocols

**Protocol 04-88.** "How Do Teen Mothers Decide to Have Children and What Are Their Experiences" with Cheryl Lirette & Debra Morrison-Orton, MSW. Originally reviewed at the meeting of 11 June 2004.

Following a round of introductions, Lirette summarized the proposal. As her MSW Thesis, she wants to do a qualitative study of teen mothers to find out why they have children and to explore their decisions to keep the children. She will be working through an Adolescent Family Life Program run by Clinica Sierra Vista in downtown Bakersfield. Questions followed.

- Q: How will you deal with the concerns about involvement of emancipated minors? A: They will have been screened out by the Program Coordinator.
- Q: And possible instances of rape and incest? A: They will have been screened out by the Program Coordinator.
- Q: Why are you excluding participation of Asians? A: We will not actually engage in any ethnic exclusion. This is not necessary.
- Q: Your rationale includes interest in decisions to keep babies, but there are no questions in the interview schedule dealing with this. A: We will add questions along those lines.
- Q: The consent form has no contact information for questions about rights as a research participant. A: We will add that information.
- Q: The purpose of the research does not seem to be explained well in the consent forms. A: We anticipate that persons wanting that information will seek it by contacting the investigators.
- Q: The consent forms will be stored so that only the faculty supervisor can gain access? A: Yes, they will be in a locked file cabinet in her office.
- Q: [The faculty supervisor asked about the required period of data storage, but the IRB had no guidance to provide. The RERC said he would seek information.]

The investigators were excused and deliberations followed in executive session.

There was a motion for conditional approval of **Protocol 04-88**. [Bragg moved, Abramson seconded, unanimously approved]. The investigators returned and were informed of the decision of the Board. The conditions were as follows:

1. Remove from the protocol words limiting participation to certain ethnic groups.
2. Explain the purpose of the research more clearly to potential participants and parents.
3. Revise the parental consent form to include all of the required elements of consent shown in the example consent forms provided online by the IRB/HSR.
3. Add questions to the interview schedule seeking to explore the decision to keep the baby.
4. If the investigator is not transcribing the data herself, provide a confidentiality form to be signed by the transcriptionist.

**Protocol 04-94.** "Effectiveness of Motivational Interviewing Training with Proposition 36 Counselors" with Debra Morrison-Orton & Bruce Hartsell, MSW. Referred for Standard Review following Expedited Review, June 2004.

**Protocol 04-120.** "The Impact of Motivational Interviewing on Outcomes with Proposition 36 Clients" with Debra Morrison-Orton & Bruce Hartsell, MSW. [Wade-Southard, Abramson, Newberry]

Because Protocols 04-94 and 04-120 are successive stages in the same research and were originally submitted in a single protocol, they were considered together. Following a round of introductions, Morrison-Orton and Hartsell summarized the proposals. The investigators had been asked to provide motivational training to counselors of Proposition 36 clients by an administrator of counseling services at KCDMH. This led to considerations of measuring outcomes to gauge effectiveness of the training, which is the nature of the proposed research.

Q: There will be videotaping in Stage 1? A: There will be videotaping in Stages 1 and 2. In Stage 1 this just involves counselors, including some role playing as clients. Clients are included in the videotaping of counseling sessions in Stage 2.

Q: What is "motivational training?" Is this something that is "franchised?" A: No, this is a model of counseling, not something we are selling to the agencies involved. There is quite a lot of current research looking at motivational training.

Q: The investigators intend to do both the motivational training and the ratings of effectiveness? A: Yes.

Q: Do you really need to videotape clients' faces? A: Yes, we need to see the clients to evaluate non-verbal elements of their communication in better assess effectiveness of the counselor training.

Q: Could you speak to the potential vulnerability of the counselors? A: No information about individual counselors will be given to anyone, including supervisors.

Q: Please explain how KCDMH works in terms of the overall agency and contractors. A: A number of providers contract with the overall agency. We will offer the motivational training to any providers who request to be trained.

Q: Who will actually do the videotaping? A: The counselors will do this themselves. Their motivation is in order for them to get feedback about their effectiveness as counselors.

Q: Are you using a standard motivational training scoring guide? A: No, we invented the evaluation methods that we will be using.

- Q: Your evaluation methods seem extremely subjective. Doesn't this subjectivity place the counselors at risk? A: Clinical supervision is always full of subjectivity.
- Q: Both of you will review the videotapes? A: Yes, the purpose is to allow an estimate of inter-rater reliability.
- Q: What is the purpose of the ASI? A: This is a rating of the client generated by the counselor based on their interactions with the client.
- Q: There seems to be lots of motivation to be deceptive on the client's part. Is the ASI such that this will be caught? A: Actually, the aim of motivational training is to get the client to "buy in" to the counseling, thus diminishing evasion. Motivational training requires a major shift in orientation for many counselors. It's an attempt to engage clients' motivation.
- Q: So simply getting clients to answer questions honestly would be a form of success? A: Yes.
- Q: What other indices of success will be included? A: Some of these are related to actual outcomes. A big aim is always keeping clients involved in a program long enough to make some gains.
- Q: Are the videotapes involved in measuring client outcomes? A: No, the Stage 2 videotape is only used to measure how well the counselor is implementing motivational training.
- Q: The consent form for Stage 2 could be more clear in terms of first person, third person language. A: We will correct that.
- Q: The earlier videotapes will be used in follow-up workshops? A: Yes, there will be follow-up training workshops.
- Q: It does not seem clear in the consent form about the follow-ups and who will see the videotapes. A: We will add clarifying language. Only the participating counselors will see their own videotapes.
- Q: Is there some way to do the videotaping so that the clients would be not identifiable. A: No, as explained earlier, we need to be able to see non-verbal elements of behavior.
- Q: Some of the client consent form language may sensitize the client and hence bias the interview process. A: It is probably useful to leave the language in to provide a small therapeutic nudge in the desired direction.
- Q: Why will counselors want to participate? A: They will get feedback about their effectiveness. There is some interest statewide among counselors in learning this technique.
- Q: How will the videotapes be stored? A: In one of the investigators' office.

The investigators were excused and deliberations followed in executive session.

There was a motion for conditional approval of **Protocols 04-94** and **04-120**. [Leapley moved, Newberry seconded, unanimously approved]. The investigators returned and were informed of the decision of the Board. The conditions were as follows:

1. Specify and implement a videotape security/confidentiality protocol addressing handling of the tapes following taping sessions up to the point at which tapes come into the physical possession of the investigators.
2. State that the videotapes will be destroyed within one year after taping.
3. On the consent forms:
  - a. Edit to make first person/third person language consistent.
  - b. State more clearly in the client consent form, how the videotape will be used and who will see it.
  - c. In the counselor consent form state that only the counselor and investigators will see the videotape.
  - d. Where reference is made to "data," always state what these data actually are.
  - e. In both consent forms, include statements about dealing with possible adverse reactions.
  - f. Include a statement in both consent forms about use of participant numbers to track data and the extent of confidentiality and anonymity afforded by this procedure.

**Protocol 04-123.** "Do Mentoring Programs for Children of Incarcerated Parents Benefit the Children and Their Families" with Gwendolyn M. Morris & Gigi Nordquist, MSW. [Mellon, Leapey, Case]

Following a round of introductions, Morris summarized the proposal. She wants to study the effectiveness of mentoring programs for children of incarcerated parents using focus groups. Different focus groups will involve mentors, at-home parents, and adult children of incarcerated or formerly incarcerated children.

Q: How will the focus groups work? A: Each will have 8 to 10 members. Sample questions are shown, but because of the nature of focus groups we can't fully anticipate where the discussions will go.

Q: Each focus group will deal with a different topic? A: Yes.

Q: How will you attempt to keep the information discussed confined to the members of the focus group? A: Each participant will sign a confidentiality pledge.

Q: Involvement in the mentoring program does not seem to be a benefit of participation because participants are already in the program. A: Yes, correct.

Q: Why do you propose to use focus groups? A: No particular reason. A group setting is a way to collect data more quickly than with participants individually.

Q: Please explain about your reference to "illegal behavior" in the consent form. A: This is about reportable offenses. We will not have person's names in the focus group setting, so risk is lowered.

Q: Could you give an example of such behaviors. A: Drug use might come up.

The investigators were excused and deliberations followed in executive session.

The investigators returned and were informed of the concerns of the Board. The Board wished to discuss a revised proposal with the investigators at either the special IRB meeting next week or at the next regular IRB meeting in January 2005. The concerns were as follows:

For approval the investigators need to convince the IRB that the potential benefits of the research outweigh the risks to the participants. One IRB concern about benefits is the use of a different focus topic for each of the three focus groups. Would this yield enough relevant information on any single issue to actually learn anything? Also, the IRB wonders if focus group methodology is the best way to test the seemingly straightforward stated hypothesis about whether mentoring reduces aggressive behaviors in children of incarcerated parents. The IRB would like an explanation of the reasoning here, including the anticipated data that would address the hypothesis. In addition, the

case would be stronger if the IRB were provided a more concrete explanation about how [specific] possible results would contribute to what is [specifically] already known about the effectiveness of programs for children of incarcerated parents. With respect to the level of risk to participants, we note that there will be some risk to participants whether the format is individual interview or group discussion, so there need to be potential benefits that outweigh the risks. The group format diminishes confidentiality, so that greater benefits need to be shown to support use of this methodology. In summary, the IRB would like to see additional information and/or protocol revisions that suggest increased potential benefits and/or diminished potential risks.

**Protocol 04-124.** "Are You INN? Outcomes of the INN Program Grant" with Cherie Rector & Kathleen L. Gilchrist, Nursing. [Duquette, Bragg, Wang]

Following a round of introductions, Gilchrist summarized the proposal. A program to increase the supply of nurses, known as Increase Nurses Now [INN], is underway. The proposed research is a program evaluation of INN. Data to be collected include demographics, scores on several standardized tests, responses to program evaluative questions posed periodically to the students, and retention statistics. Questions followed.

- Q: Could you explain what ATI is? A: These include a set of standardized tests looking at academic and nursing skills and achievement.
- Q: Will ATI scores reflect on the program in some way? A: Yes, they will help us evaluate the program.
- Q: You state inclusion criteria. Must a student meet all to be admitted to the program? A: No, the criteria are used together to obtain a score which is used for selection. The score needed for admission depends upon how many applicants there are.
- Q: You are looking at retention levels. Will ATI scores be used to make retention decisions? A: No, we will be tracking who passes which courses and who stays in the Nursing Program. This could turn out to be predicted by ATI scores.
- Q: You talk about only including students without impairments. How will you know that they lack these impairments? A: Well, they are students in the Nursing Program. We will note obvious impairments.

The investigators were excused and deliberations followed in executive session.

There was a motion for full approval of **Protocol 04-124**. [Leapley moved, Wang seconded, unanimously approved]. The investigators returned and were informed of the decision of the Board. The following requirements were to be stated in the authorization letter:

1. In the consent form, provide a definition of what is meant by "periodic" questionnaires.
2. Inform the IRB of the approximate number of participants planned.

**Protocol 04-126.** "Dominance and Deception: Is the Correlation Found in the Self-Oriented Lie?" with Katie Fleming & Anne Duran, Psychology. Primary readers are [Mellon, Leapley, Newberry]

Following a round of introductions, Fleming summarized the proposal. Previous research suggests gender differences in relationships between type of deception and dominance. She will use a videotaped task requiring delivery of deceptive messages to study this possibility in a three-part study.

- Q: How will you set up the deceptive messages? A: There will be two photos of persons differing in attractiveness created by digital photo editing. Participants will be asked to make truthful or deceptive statements to another person about the attractiveness of each picture.

Q: Where will you get the pictures? A: The photos will be of a family member living out of town.

Q: Who will do the videotaping? A: Katie does the videotaping, but others will judge the believability of the statements.

Q: Phase III involves CSUB students. Is it possible that they will know the participants on the tape? A: Yes, we have a question on that. We will look at that separately in the analyses.

Q: Please add a statement indicating when the videotapes will be destroyed. A: Will do.

Q: What is the contact phone number that is given? A: That is the faculty mentor's phone.

Q: Please explain about the measurement of dominance in Phase I. A: There will be a group task, following which participants will rate each others and their own dominance.

The investigators were excused and more discussion followed.

There was a motion for full approval of **Protocol 04-126**. [Bragg moved, Abramson seconded, unanimously approved]. The investigators returned and were informed of the decision of the Board. The following requirements were to be stated in the authorization letter:

1. Add to the consent form a statement that the participant could be recognized later.
2. State that the videotapes will be destroyed within one year.
3. Delete the e-mail address from the debriefing form.

**OTHER CONCERNS: none**

**NEXT MEETING:**

Friday, 28 January 2005 – Old Pub

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM.

[Bragg moved, Newberry seconded, approved unanimously]

Respectfully submitted

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