Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, 02 October 2009 [DDH A-108]

Members Present:
Scientific Concerns: Anne Duran, Kathleen Gilchrist, Roseanna McCleary
Nonscientific Concerns: Paul Newberry, Yeunjoo Lee, Thomas Blommers
Community Concerns: Gary Bashor

Members Absent:
Lily Alvarez

Visitors:
Linda Switzer for Protocol 09-136
Kathrine Powell for Protocol 09-151
Bruce Hartsell for Protocols 09-136 & 09-151
Denise Dawkins & Debra Wilson for Protocol 09-125
Kenisha Edwards-Ray & Bruce Friedman for Protocol 09-152
J.J. Wang & Brian Hemphill for Protocol 07-91 Quarterly Report
Maria Rubolino, Nancy Weinstein, & Gladys Garcia for Protocol 09-148 Progress Report

I. CALL TO ORDER:
Chair Paul Newberry called the meeting to order at 7:58 AM.

II. PREVIOUS MINUTES:
Duran totally moved and Gilchrist seconded a motion to approve the minutes of Friday, 10 June 2009. The motion was approved 6-0.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS:
A. CSU-Wide Survey on Human Subjects Protection Training. CSU-San Marcos is putting into place Human Subjects Protection Training and surveyed the other CSU’s about their programs. There is interesting variation in who must be certified, how long certification lasts, and the nature of the training.

[Bashor arrived]

B. Resignation of Carolyn Wade-Southard. Carolyn has had to resign because of scheduling conflicts and other demands on her time. She enjoyed her service and found it to be interesting and worthwhile. The Chair noted that Carolyn often added unique perspectives on human subjects protections because of her experience as a helping professional in the community.

IV. OLD BUSINESS:
A. Spanish Translations. Blommers, McCleary, and Suter submitted a brief written progress report. A list of essential elements of the consent form – a template – will be constructed in Spanish for investigators to use. RERC needs to get these elements to Blommers. Thus, the IRB will be assured that subjects will be adequately informed on the important elements and the volume of material that would require expert scrutiny will be reduced. Oral back-up is useful
when translated materials are used. Undesirability of “dumbing down” material in Spanish was emphasized in discussion.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Board members detected several clerical errors in the IRB Master Log entries, which were brought to the attention of GRASP personnel for correction, but remain in the Master Log material in these minutes.

A. Formal Board affirmation of protocols previously approved under standard review, expedited review, Third-Party Access, and Exemption from Full Review since the June 2009 meeting.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Final Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[Duran moved, Bashor seconded -- approved 7-0].


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Final Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[Bashor moved, Lee & Duran seconded -- approved 7-0]

3. Third-Party Access to Existing Data [1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Final Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[Gilchrist moved, Blommers seconded -- approved 7-0]


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Final Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-121</td>
<td>Melody Batelaan</td>
<td>Is Kern County Doing Enough to Prevent Fraud in the In-Home Supportive Services Program?</td>
<td>5/14/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/2/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>Reviewers</td>
<td>Final Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Duran moved, Blommers seconded -- approved 7-0]  

**B. Formal Board affirmation [2]** 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 2009 meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Final Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-101</td>
<td>Roseanna McCleary, Bruce Friedman</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Practicum Partnership Program Adoption Initiative</td>
<td>8/13/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/10/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-102</td>
<td>Roseanna McCleary, Bruce Friedman</td>
<td>Hartford Partnership Program for Aging Education Career Tracking Survey</td>
<td>8/13/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/10/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Gilchrist moved as corrected, Duran seconded -- approved 7-0]  

**C. Formal Board affirmation [8]** of previously approved protocols granted renewals since the June 2009 meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Final Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[Duran moved, Lee seconded -- approved 7-0]  

**D. Formal Board affirmation** of protocol closures [36] (unless extension granted) whose authorization have ended or will end prior to the Winter 2010 IRB meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors/Instructors</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-102</td>
<td>Debra Cook Hirai CALLI (Content Academic Language Literacy Instruction)</td>
<td>Debra Cook Hirai</td>
<td>10/24/2005-9/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-106</td>
<td>Roseanna McCleary &amp; Mayra Gonzalez Dolores Huerta Foundation Community Needs Assessment Project: Follow up data analyses and focus groups</td>
<td>Roseanna McCleary &amp; Mayra Gonzalez</td>
<td>9/8/2008-12/12/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-122</td>
<td>Debra Wilson (faculty) First Year Nursing Student's Perceptions about their Potential for Academic Success</td>
<td>Debra Wilson</td>
<td>10/15/2008-11/24/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-129</td>
<td>Juan C. Becerra Parental Support in Gender Differences in Hispanics</td>
<td>Juan C. Becerra</td>
<td>10/24/2008-11/20/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-130</td>
<td>Margarita Madera Phonemic Awareness Foundation for Reading</td>
<td>Margarita Madera</td>
<td>10/24/2008-11/13/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-135</td>
<td>Amy R. Self Special Education Students and Gang Affiliation During Adolescence</td>
<td>Amy R. Self</td>
<td>10/24/2008-11/17/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-141</td>
<td>Denine Tucker (McCoy) Teacher Perceptions: The Affect of Teacher Stress on Student Achievement</td>
<td>Denine Tucker (McCoy)</td>
<td>10/24/2008-11/17/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-142</td>
<td>Alejandra Roman Implementation of School Uniform Policy: The Effects on Student Behavior</td>
<td>Alejandra Roman</td>
<td>10/24/2008-11/13/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-146</td>
<td>Ashley Senes Older Adults and Drugs, Alcohol, and Tobacco; Exploring Contributing Risk Factors for Misuse</td>
<td>Ashley Senes</td>
<td>10/27/2008-11/14/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-152</td>
<td>Christina McDaniels The Cultural Awareness Program for Foster Parents</td>
<td>Christina McDaniels</td>
<td>11/13/2008-1/14/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-154</td>
<td>Feraz Ferozali Changes in Tolerance and Acceptance as a Result of Gender, Race, Ethnicity Courses</td>
<td>Feraz Ferozali</td>
<td>11/13/2008-11/18/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-155</td>
<td>Gregory Winkler Mental health needs assessment for aging HIV/AIDS patients in Kern County, CA</td>
<td>Gregory Winkler</td>
<td>11/14/2008-1/15/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-157</td>
<td>Jean Roberts Utility of an Assessment Tool in Early Identification of Community-Acquired Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus Aureas</td>
<td>Jean Roberts</td>
<td>11/14/2008-12/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-158</td>
<td>Kelly Levig Brain Activity to Real and Illusory Motion</td>
<td>Kelly Levig</td>
<td>11/14/2008-1/22/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-160</td>
<td>Barbara Bartholomew Task Analysis and Observations of Novice vs. Expert Reading Teachers</td>
<td>Barbara Bartholomew</td>
<td>11/19/2008-12/18/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-162</td>
<td>Theresa P. Aberg &amp; Dr. David Parks Pursuit of the Principalship</td>
<td>Theresa P. Aberg &amp; Dr. David Parks</td>
<td>11/26/2008-12/3/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-163</td>
<td>Jennifer Waller Improving Access to Mental Health Services for Persons with Alzheimer's Disease and other Dementias</td>
<td>Jennifer Waller</td>
<td>12/8/2008-1/6/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. New Protocol Reviews

1. Protocol 09-136: “A Qualitative Evaluation of a Program for Emancipated Foster Youth as Reported or Perceived by Emancipated Foster Youth” with Linda Switzer and Bruce Hartsell [Social Work]. Primary readers were Newberry, Gilchrist, Bashor.

Following introductions, Hartsell summarized. This project is the first step in carrying out an analysis of the effectiveness of the Kern County Dream Center (DC) as a resource for emancipated foster youth. The proposed project will involve focus group discussions by emancipated foster youth to develop questions that will be used in the second step, a mailed survey, which is not included in the present protocol.

Questions followed [Q = question, A = answer, C = comment]

Q: So, this is the first step in a several-step research process? A: Yes, the focus groups are to develop the questions for the survey.

Q: How will the potential participants be contacted? A: They will be contacted by mail using the DC address list of emancipated clients.

Q: What is the DC – it doesn’t say in the protocol? A: This is a drop-in facility for emancipated foster youth. It offers a variety of services, including career counseling and information, housing info, transportation guidance, tutoring, and mental health information.

Q: Is it potentially an issue for an emancipated foster youth to have others know his/her status? A: They usually know who is and isn’t a foster youth. Networking among them can be useful and nurture the sense of an extending family. There is a statewide emancipated foster youth network.

Q: Would any of the potential participants not want others to know? A: No.

Q: Where is the DC located? A: It’s at 1212 18th street, downtown.

Q: The consent form mentions possibly having a second meeting, “if needed”. It’s not clear what that means. A: This would be if we run out of time and need to meet again to clarify anything.

C: That should get clarified on the consent form.

C: There is a typo on the consent form that needs to be corrected.

Q: You point out that there are two categories of foster youth. Does that matter for this study? A: No.

Q: Have you developed an interview guide? It wasn’t with the written protocol. A: Yes. [Print copies of the interview guide were distributed to Board members at this time.]

Q: Have you done focus groups? A: No.

Q: How will you learn how to do focus groups? A: I have met with MSW students who know how to do focus groups.
C: You need to get trained. [McCleary noted that she could help with this.]

Q: The sessions will be audio-taped, so if the person doesn’t want to be taped, then he/she would be excluded from participation? A: Correct.

Q: You won’t be using names in your report of the data? A: Correct, no names.

Q: You also mention that a participant could request to have the audio-tape recorder turned off. Clarify with respect to what you said about excluding unless he/she agrees to the taping. A: This is if a participant wants not to have a particular comment on tape.

C: You should clarify that in your protocol and consent form.

C: You need to keep the data and consent forms stored separately.

Q: Are there existing surveys that you could use, rather than developing questions in this first phase? A: Apparently not, plus this is a very new facility.

Q: Are you interested in emancipated foster youth who are not using the DC? A: The second phase will involve all Kern County emancipated foster youth, but not this first phase.

C: Your questions are all set up to elicit only positive information. You should have some designed as prompts for possible negative information.

When there were no more questions, the student and faculty mentor were excused and the Board deliberated in executive session. There was a motion to conditionally approve Protocol 09-136. [Duran moved, McCleary seconded -- approved 7-0]

The following conditions were announced to the investigators when they returned:

1. Reorganize the protocol to reflect that it deals with the first step of a two-step project.
2. Develop and include a brief review of the most relevant research literature.
3. Include a description of the Dream Center, including its activities and goals.
4. Be more clear in protocol and consent form on the conditions that could prompt a second meeting.
5. Clarify the circumstances related to possibly turning off the audio recorder.
6. Provide specifics on storage of consent forms and data in order to keep them secure and confidential.
7. On consent form, the wording on keeping a copy of the consent form should be “have been”.
8. Fix the typo in the consent form.
9. Include questions to potentially elicit negative information.
10. Collect the demographic information in written format, rather than aloud.
11. Get trained in conducting focus groups before conducting the first emancipated foster youth focus group.

2. Protocol 09-151: “An Analysis of the Effects of Restored Sibling Connections on the Level of Perceived Emotional Support While in Foster Care” with Kathrine Parnell and Bruce Hartsell [Social Work]. Primary readers were Blommers, Duran, Bashor.

Following introductions, Parnell summarized. She had just been told yesterday that Kern County legal council had advised against allowing wards to be interviewed. Therefore, she was denied permission to interact directly with foster youth, meaning that Protocol 09-151, as submitted, is history. However, Plan B is to use observations by the foster parents to evaluate the effects on foster youth of visits with their siblings. These data will be collected pre- and post- with respect to a schedule of supervised visits/activities. Also the proposed age range would be expanded in order to increase the sample.

Questions followed [Q = question, A = answer, C = comment]
Q: The schedule of visits/activities that you will introduce, will this be just for purposes of your research or would you be doing this anyway as part of your work? A: This will be done as part of the research.

Q: So, you are going to make some changes and see what happens? A: Yes, although some way of having contact with siblings is encouraged in the foster care system.

Q: So, the visits/activities that you would introduce, will just make that easier? A: Correct.

Q: How often will these events happen? A: These will usually be once per month for four months.

Q: “Usually”? A: This would have to vary to some extent depending upon the placement.

Q: How would you know that there is MORE foster youth X sibling contact involved in your project? A: Well, I will be adding one event per month to whatever is ongoing.

Q: Who will be signing consent forms? A: The foster parents will need to sign for their own participation, but they can’t sign for the foster youth.

When there were no more questions, the student and faculty mentor were excused and the Board deliberated in executive session. There was a motion to disapprove Protocol 09-151 and invite the student and faculty mentor to submit a new protocol dealing with the new proposed research. [McCleary moved, Gilchrist seconded -- approved 7-0]

The student and faculty mentor were advised that the question of permission to interview the foster youth should have been resolved prior to submitting the project for IRB review.


Following introduction, Hennick summarized. She is a breast cancer survivor and oncology nurse. She has firsthand knowledge of some of the obstacles that this research is intended to address. This project involves young women, who face special problems, including a more severe prognosis on average as compared to older women. All will have already had genetic counseling, which is the focus of the project.

Questions followed [Q = question, A = answer, C = comment]

Q: Who will assist the participant in case of distress? A: The investigator will do that. There are also always a medical social worker available and the physician. The investigator has organized and runs a support group for the target participant population.

Q: You plan to reveal to the participants that you are a breast cancer survivor? A: All of them will know already.

Q: Is there previous research dealing with attitudes about genetic counseling among younger women diagnosed with breast cancer? A: Only one study was located that had two participants under age 40. The research literature is directed toward older women.

Q: You will be asking them about their breast cancer experience and with genetic testing and counseling? A: Yes.

Q: Your flyer specifies women under age 40. Isn’t it redundant to list the age requirement again on the consent form? A: It is probably still needed because there will be a mailing using the center’s database, to which the investigator already has access.

Q: You will be getting demographic information? A: Yes [A demographic sheet was circulated among Board members.]

Q: Tell us about data storage and who will do the transcription. A: Investigator will do the transcription; data and consent forms will be stored separately in locked locations.

Q: Is that your home contact information on the flyer? A: Yes.

C: We generally advise against that and recommend using the faculty mentor’s office contact info, if she agrees.

C: The flyer asks if the potential participant would like to become involved in cancer research. Persons might suppose this means research involving cancer treatments. This should be clarified or deleted.
Q: Do you need to be aware of type of treatment and cancer stage of your participants? A: No.

Q: You will interview at the center? A: Yes, there is a private room, or wherever the participant is most comfortable.

Q: There are some men with breast cancer . . . A: Yes, but they are almost always older men.

Q: The protocol mentions the Breast Cancer Navigator. What is that? A: It’s actually a person, who at present is a nurse practitioner. She will have already done the genetic counseling.

When there were no more questions, the student and faculty mentor were excused and the Board deliberated in executive session. There was a motion to conditionally approve Protocol 09-146. [Duran soo moved again, Gilchrist seconded -- approved 7-0]

The following conditions were announced to the investigators when they returned:

1. Include a brief review of the most relevant research literature in the protocol.
2. In the consent form, provide the specific contacts in case of distress.
3. Delete the statement about participating in cancer research in the flyer.
4. Indicate that you will store the consent forms and data in separate secure locations.
5. State more clearly the potential location of interviews in protocol and consent form.
6. Add the choice, “domestic partner”, to the demographics.


Following introductions, Edwards-Ray and Friedman summarized. “Code 288” is a code used for a call for a social worker following a sexual assault. She will ask questions to find out what African-American victims of sexual assault have in common. There are higher re-victimization rates of African-American sexual assault victims and there don’t seem to be many services specifically for the African-American community. Are the effects of disclosure different for African-American victims? Perhaps the information from this project could lead to an action-plan to better serve the needs of the African-American community.

Q: Your participants will be recruited from your church? A: Yes. The investigator is aware of a number of sexual assault victims at the church. Her father is the minister.

Q: All of the participants will be at least 18 years of age? A: Yes.

C: Your protocol mentions a number of different goals – understanding development, service options, particular needs of African-Americans, ethnic differences in service delivery, and effects of disclosure. Getting good data on any one of these would be a big task and you are only studying a few individuals. Wouldn’t it be better to narrow this down and focus on something more specific? A: This project involves exploring many broad areas in order to see how to narrow this research eventually. It’s exploratory.

Q: You mention about sexual assault possibly slowing down a developmental process. Are you going to follow participants across time? A: No, there will be a single interview and the purpose is to look for themes.

C: It seems that maybe you are really most interested in services. It seems like you could get that information using a survey.

Q: This is an extremely sensitive group that is known to be prone to “re-traumatization”. We are concerned about how you can get the information that you want, but still keep the participants safe from harm. Your referral for distress is a CSUB faculty person, who might not be available. Can you come up with some effective support that is more immediate? A: Barbara Reifel would interact with the participant and then provide a specific referral. However, Friedman notes that it should be possible to provide a specific, immediate source.

C: Your sample will not be representative of African-American victims of sexual assault. It’s really Christian church-goers, so you won’t be able to generalize much.

Q: How will you get your recruitment information to potential participants and allow them to establish contact with you without them being stigmatized? A: Investigator will stand up in church and announce the research project. [Student was not specific about what would happen next.]
C: The typos and errors on the consent form need to be fixed.

Q: Who will transcribe the audio interviews? A: The investigator will do that.

Q: This approach is described as qualitative research. Do you have experience with qualitative research? A: No. [Faculty mentor notes that it might be more like “grounded theory”.

Q: Describe how you plan to analyze the data? A: Investigator will rely upon the assistance of the faculty mentor. In general, the data will be searched for common themes across participants.

C: You need to clarify how the data will be handled, explaining how it will be secure and confidential.

Q: What is the word “autopsy” about again? A: This was tied to a story from the Christian bible and personal experiences.

When there were no more questions, the student and faculty mentor were excused and the Board deliberated in executive session. There was a motion to conditionally approve Protocol 09-152. [Duran moved, Lee seconded -- approved 7-0]

The following conditions were announced to the investigators when they returned:

1. Clarify the focus of your research. Then create a specific rationale for this focus, including a brief review of existing knowledge on that topic.

2. Revise the interview questions so that they directly address the focus of your research.

3. Provide the specific details of your planned recruitment of participants, including how you will get the necessary information to them and how they will establish contact with you.

4. Describe what you will do with the interview data in order to address the focus of your research.

5. State what direct, immediate resources will be made available in case of distress and provide the contact information in the consent form.

6. Remove the word “autopsy” from the consent form and any other recruitment materials and substitute other language.

7. Use years of age to operationally define what you mean by the word “adult”.

8. Create a “clean” consent form without errors.

[Newberry departed]

F. Continuing Review and Renewal of Authorized Protocols

1. Protocol 07-91: CS&O Quarterly Report for activities conducted assessing performance and outcomes of First 5 agencies in Kern County with J. J. Wang and Brian Hemphill. Primary Readers were all Board Members.

RERC provided context of this renewal -- Wang has replaced Crawford, but Hemphill and IRB were not informed, so that Wang first interacted with the IRB when the CS&O report was requested about one week ago. The RERC quarterly report included a list of changes and status of compliance with agencies. Following introductions, Wang summarized. Wang indicated he has read the CS&O X CSUB contract and their Protocol 07-91. He is aware of the need for authorized consent forms at the agencies and that personnel must be trained. He plans to be proactive, as his predecessors have been. He mentioned several levels of human subjects protections including the IRB, CS&O monitoring, and the personnel at the agency level. He will pursue adverse event monitoring and look for possible improvement. Wang has created a record keeping document to keep track of and report to the IRB compliance monitoring visits to agencies.

C: Hemphill added that he hoped that the positive relationship between CS&O and the CSUB IRB will continue. Hemphill will continue as liaison between the CS&O researcher [Wang] and the CSUB IRB.

C: The IRB is appreciative.
When there were no more questions, Wang and Hemphill were excused and the Board deliberated in executive session. There was a motion to accept the 07-91 quarterly report. [Blommers moved, Bashor seconded -- approved 6-0]

It was announced that the IRB will request that the quarterly report include a systematic listing of CS&O visits to agencies to monitor human subject protections and detect adverse reactions. The RERC, Wang, and Hemphill will meet about halfway toward the next quarterly report to coordinate and assess performance.

VI. OTHER CONCERNS:

A. National Children’s Study Progress Report. CSUB was picked as a site in the federally-funded nationwide longitudinal study of health in a developmental context. We’re in the second wave of participating sites, following New York and Orange County. We are in Phase I, which involves setting up the sampling, or the “geo-coding” in public health talk, to select the participants. Next step, personnel will go door to door to solicit participants, looking for pregnant or soon-to-be pregnant women. Then health care delivery agencies and physicians will get involved. A total of 250 participants per year will be recruited for four years, for a total of 1,000 local babies to track until they reach 21 years of age. Many health-related variables will be assessed across the developmental process.

C: RERC noted that Protocol 09-148 is for the Phase I geo-coding only and that these activities have already been reviewed and authorized by a statewide IRB. At CSUB, this qualifies for “Exemption From Full Review” for the participation of CSUB personnel, who won’t have access to any personal identifiers in this phase. There will probably be Standard Reviews for the activities at later phases as the actual data collection begins.

The NCS personnel were thanked for their presentation.

B. IRB Non-Compliance Update. SOE non-compliance with human subject protections continues, the only “culture of non-compliance” at CSUB. The RERC and IRB Chair have asked to meet with the Provost, but she has not yet set up a meeting. The Senate Chair, Jess Deegan, and Interim SOE Dean, Craig Kelsey, want to attend this meeting. The IRB will promote CSUB Handbook changes and the Senate Chair has stated he will facilitate. Kelsey does not believe that changes in SOE will be from “bottom-up”. Solutions are simple, but for many years SOE faculty have resisted the procedures in place in other graduate programs.

A. Possible New Community Members. Several possible new community members were discussed. Tommy Tunson is the Chief of Police at Arvin and serves on the Kern County Behavioral Health Board with McCleary. McCleary recommends him, noting he has a J.D. and is doing well in a difficult environment. Bashor indicated that Tunson is widely respected in the Arvin community. Grant Herdon is an attorney with the Bakersfield City School District. He lives down the street from Roseanna and Steve. Paul knows him socially and vouches for his smartness and being a good guy. As the discussion proceeded, Gary noted that he has accepted a job in the LA area and will be leaving. Michael Clark was proposed as a member, but he is associated with the university via part-time teaching and cannot serve, because community members must not be connected with the university.

VII. NEXT MEETING:

Friday, January 29th, 2010 [please mark your calendars!]

VIII. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM.

[Blommers moved, Lee seconded, approved 5-0]
IX. BOARD TRAINING:

A. Spot check of protocols authorized since last meeting [Expedited 09-82, Exemption 09-142]

Postponed due to the length of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted

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