

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

**Minutes of Meeting
Friday, 21 April 2006
[Cafeteria "Old Pub"]**

Members Present:

Scientific Concerns: Marianne Abramson, Candace Meares
Nonscientific Concerns: Bob Carlisle , Yeunjoo Lee , Paul Newberry
Community Concerns: Patrick Mellon, Anne Marie Duquette

Members Absent:

Roseanna McCleary, Carolyn Wade-Southard, Edwin Sasaki [ex-officio]

Visitors:

Steve Bacon for Protocol 03-03 Renewal

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Paul Newberry called the meeting to order at 8:02 AM.

PREVIOUS MINUTES:

Meares moved and Mellon seconded a motion to approve the minutes for the IRB/HSR meeting of Friday, 27 January 2006. The motion was approved 6-0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

IRB/HSR meeting dates are now posted on the website. Meares will forward to the RERC corrections noted for several online documents.

OLD BUSINESS: [none]

NEW BUSINESS:

- a. **Formal Board affirmation** of protocols previously approved under standard review, expedited review, and exemption from full review since the January 2006 meeting.

Standard Review (conditionally approved at January 2006 meeting)

Protocol Renewals Requiring Re-Review

1. **Protocol 02-05.** "Evaluation of First 5 California" with Brian Hemphill & Ken Nyberg, CSUB Applied Research Center on 3-07-06.

[Abramson moved, Lee seconded, approved 6-0]

New Protocol Reviews

1. **Protocol 06-04:** "Exploration of Pregnant Adolescents' Decisions in Labor Pain Management" with Kwaifa Mary Mack and Candace Meares [Abramson, Lee, Mellon] on 2-07-06.

2. **Protocol 06-06:** "Stereotypes of Lesbians" with Katrina Rodzon and Anne Duran [Meares, Newberry, Wade-Southard] on 02-03-06.

[Mellon moved, Abramson seconded, approved 6-0]

Expedited Review

1. **Protocol 06-05.** (Tanya Boone, Psychology) "Sexuality Messages from Parents, Media, and School: Influences on Sexual Attitudes and Behaviors" [Carlisle, Meares] on 1-31-06.
2. **Protocol 06-14.** (Chandrasekhar Commuri, PPA) "Knowledge Sharing in Public-Nonprofit Organizational Networks" [Abramson, Newberry] on 2-23-06.

[Meares moved, Duquette seconded, approved 6-0]

Exempted from Full Review

1. **Protocol 05-105** (Chatisee Fuqua, Psychology Student, AV) "Life Satisfaction Among College Students" on 2-10-06.
2. **Protocol 05-107** (Konni Ollivier, Education Student) "The Correlation of Vision Skills and Reading Ability in One 4th Grade Classroom" on 1-24-06.
3. **Protocol 06-01** (Steven F. Bacon, Department of Psychology) "Correlates of Support for Global Relief Efforts" 1-06-06.
4. **Protocol 06-02** (Shelley Getty, Education Student) "Cognitive Level of Student Learning in a Sketchpad Environment" on 1-23-06.
5. **Protocol 06-03** (Stacey Franciotti, Marketing Student) "Recruiting Student Enrollment for the School of Education" on 1-10-06.
6. **Protocol 06-12** (David Chenot, MSW Program) "Organizational Culture and Retention in Public Child Welfare Services" on 2-01-06.
7. **Protocol 06-13** (Huong Nguyen, PPA Student) "Chlamydia on Red Alert: A Program for the Prevention of Chlamydia in Kern County--Interviews" on 1-23-06.
8. **Protocol 06-15** (Leann Kraetsch, Education Student) "Quality Counts in Infant/Toddler Programs in Child Care Centers and Family Home Daycare" on 2-10-06.
9. **Protocol 06-17** (Ying Zhong, Library) "Information Needs and Information Seeking Behaviors of CSUB Students" on 1-26-06.
10. **Protocol 06-18** (Brian W. Hawkins, PPA Student) "How to Build a School" on 2-15-06.
11. **Protocol 06-19** (Deb Kasak, Education Student) "Pre-Kindergarten: The Connection between Teacher Knowledge and Reading Readiness" 2-16-06.
12. **Protocol 06-20** (Geri Mohler, Education--Reading/Literacy) "The Effect a Literacy Coach Has on a Preschool Classroom" on 2-14-06.
13. **Protocol 06-21** (Axelle Faughn, Mathematics Department) "Relating Proportional Reasoning to Achievement in Trigonometry" on 2-16-06.
14. **Protocol 06-22** (R. Steven Daniels, Public Policy and Administration) "The Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities [KSAs] of the CSUB Graduate" on 2-17-06.
15. **Protocol 06-23** (Felipe Rocha, Mathematics Student) "CAHSEE Preparation" on 2-20-06.
16. **Protocol 06-24** (Roseanna McCleary, MSW Program) "Clinician Competency in Provision of Treatment to Adults with Serious Mental Illness" on 3-02-06.
17. **Protocol 06-25** (Kristine Holloway, Librarian [AV]) "Traditional and Distance Learners' Awareness, Access, and Use of Periodical Databases" on 3-02-06.

18. **Protocol 06-26** (Roopa Dave, PPA Student) "The Changing Role of Non-Profit Organizations in the 21st Century" on 3-14-06.
19. **Protocol 06-27** (Ryan Howell, Department of Psychology) "The Daily Lives of College Students" on 3-27-06.
20. **Protocol 06-30** (Dianne Turner & Curt Guaglianone, Education) "Pilot Faculty Mentor Program School of Education" on 4-07-06.
21. **Protocol 06-31** (Anne Duran, Psychology Department) "Changes in Attitudes as a Result of Course Involvement" on 3-29-06.
22. **Protocol 06-32** (Eun-Ja Park, Special Education) "Effective Teaching Behaviors in Special Education Classrooms" on 4-03-06.
23. **Protocol 06-33** (Emerson Case, English & Curt Asher, Library) "A Survey of English 110 Students' Backgrounds In, and Attitudes Toward, Library Use" on 3-29-06.

There was discussion of why 05-107 was exempted from full review, given that it involved children. The RERC said this was because, although the investigator proposed to work directly with children as human subjects in administering the vision screening instrument, the fact that participants will be children does not change the level of review, according to federal regulations.

[Meares moved, Duquette seconded, approved 6-0]

- 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 January 2006 meeting.

1. **Protocol 06-09** (Huong Nguyen, Health Care Management Student) "Chlamydia on Red Alert: A Program for the Prevention of Chlamydia in Kern County" on 1-18-06.
2. **Protocol 06-28** (Sandra Munoz, PPA Student) "The Impact of the No Child Left Behind Act on School Accountability in California" on 3-14-06.
3. **Protocol 06-29** (Julie Parsons, Education -- Child Development Student) "Early Literacy -- The Foundation for Success -- A Professional Development Series" on 3-27-06.

[Mellon moved, Lee seconded, approved 7-0, IRB/HSR member Robert Carlisle arrived]

- c. Formal Board affirmation** of previously approved protocols granted **renewals** since the January 2006 meeting.

1. **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" 3-06-06.
2. **Protocol 05-46** (Debra Cook Hirai, Education) "Are We Closing the Gap for Reading Comprehension and Decoding for 9-12 Students?" on 1-26-06.

The investigator listed was corrected for Protocol 05-46.

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

- d. Formal Board action **closing**** protocols (unless extension granted) whose authorization will end prior to the June 2006 IRB meeting.

1. **Protocol 01-52** (John Valdez, PPA) "The Influence of Cyberspace, Society, and the Internet" end of May 2006.

2. **Protocol 04-77** (Rose Foley, Advanced Educational Studies Student) "Implementing Strategies for Sight Word Acquisition for Second Language Learners" end of April 2006.
3. **Protocol 05-49** (Brian Bell, Mathematics Student) "Student Comprehension and Understanding of Fractions" end of April 2006.
4. **Protocol 05-51** (Yesenia E. Galvez, Education Student) "Quality Child Care: A Case Study of Wasco Child Development Center" end of April 2006.
5. **Protocol 05-52** (Marianne Abramson, Department of Psychology) "Gender and Tone Effects in Implicit and Explicit Memory," end of April 2006.
6. **Protocol 05-54** (Shelia Hall-Vailes, PPA Student) "Nurse Retention Strategies" end of April 2006.
7. **Protocol 05-60** (Huong Nguyen, PPA Student) "Evaluation of the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults [RCIA] Program" end of April 2006.
8. **Protocol 05-61** (Ana Filomia, Education Student) "Structured Improvement of Sentence Coherence" end of April 2006.
9. **Protocol 05-63** (Norma Nava, Early Childhood Education Student) "Structured Improvement of Sentence Coherence" end of April 2006.
10. **Protocol 05-64** (Regina Benavides, PPA Student) "Alliance Against Family Violence and Sexual Assault's 'Teen Sexual Assault Prevention Program': A Program Evaluation" end of May 2006.
11. **Protocol 05-66** (Marsha Merz, Education Student) "Involving Students in Writing Rubrics for Math Story Problems" end of April 2006.
12. **Protocol 05-72** (Anne Duran, Department of Psychology) "Comparison of Outgroup Attitudes" end of May 2006.
13. **Protocol 05-75** (Karla D. Young, PPA Student) "Women in Public and Nonprofit Sector Leadership: What Are Effective Strategies to Overcome Gender Disparity" end of May 2006.
14. **Protocol 05-76** (Terri Kurz, Department of Teacher Education) "Family Math Night" end of May 2006.
15. **Protocol 05-77** (Terri Kurz, Department of Teacher Education) "Video Case Reflection" end of May 2006.

[Mellon moved, Duquette seconded, approved 7-0]

e. **Protocol Renewals Requiring Re-Review**

1. **Protocol 03-03.** "Psychology Department Participant Pool" with Steve Bacon, Psychology. All Board Members were Primary Readers.

Following introductions, Bacon provided a brief summary. Psychology faculty recruit participants and the student participants learn about research via this pool. It has been going smoothly and no adverse reactions have been reported. This renewal includes a request to increase the number of units required from 6.0 to 10.0 or from 1.5 to 2.5 hours of research participation. This is still less than required of introductory psychology students at most universities.

Q: Have there been any student complaints about research participation? **A:** No, perhaps partly because there is an alternative activity available, for example, finding a research write-up online and summarizing it. Some students mix and match part research participation and part alternative assignment.

Q: About how many choose the alternative? **A:** Somewhere around 25% do the alternative or partly the alternative.

Q: That 25% seems kind of high. Is it a typical figure for other places? **A:** Yes -- it runs around 25% at other schools. Often this is because of scheduling conflicts. For example commuting students sometimes minimize time spent on campus.

Q: Do you think the increased requirement will decrease the percentage of students who choose to participate? **A:** Probably not much because they won't be aware of what the requirement used to be. Note this does yield 5% of the course grade, assessed on a credit/no credit basis.

When there were no further questions, the investigator left the room and the IRB/HSR deliberated in executive session. There was a motion to renew Protocol 03-03 as revised [Carlisle moved, Mellon seconded, approved 7-0]. The investigator was complimented on the report and on the general operation of the subject pool.

f. New Protocol Reviews:

1. **Protocol 06-37.** "Visual Neuroscience Lab Assignments and Research Projects" with Steve Suter, Psychology. [Newberry, Lee, Mellon]

The investigator outlined the protocol. This is the resurrection of a protocol that ran for a number of years covering research projects in the Psychology Department Vision Laboratory. Authorization is sought for two types of participants: (a) those who are obtained using typical procedures, such as the subject pool and (b) those for whom consent is requested to release their data, collected in lab assignments, for research purposes.

Q: How are you able to identify which data to exclude in the case of non-consent with Type A participation. **A:** Data sheets are numbered and that number is used as the participant ID# when the data are recorded. The data release form for each student has the same number on it. If a student checks the non-consent box on the data consent for data release, the data associated with that number would be deleted from the data file.

Q: This is done after grades are recorded? How does that work? **A:** The data release forms are filled out and put in an envelope after the lab assignment is completed. The envelope isn't opened until grades have been submitted for the course. Then the forms are checked to see if there are any non-consents and data are deleted as necessary.

Q: How often do students decline to release their data? **A:** This has happened once out of several hundred students.

Q: Will this be used to assemble your own subject pool. **A:** No -- reference was to the introductory psychology subject pool. With Type B participation, participants are recruited as needed for a particular research project.

Q: What are the data that result from this? In what form are they? **A:** Brain activity picked up by electrodes on the surface of the scalp is amplified, filtered and sent into a computer. There the data can be analyzed to yield information about the size and timing of responses in different parts of the brain to the visual stimuli that were presented.

Q: What if the research reveals that something is wrong? **A:** Vision problems could be detected if there is a vision screening beforehand, but not from the brain activity data. People are rarely totally unaware that they have some kind of vision deficit. We

are mostly interested in finding consistent ways of responding rather than differences among people. The emphasis is more so on normal visual function, such as how the raw elements of vision are organized into our conscious visual world, rather than on deficits.

Q: You use disinfectants I see. They need to be mixed daily. **A:** PI expresses amazement and thanks Duquette and Meares for the heads up.

Q: The consent form could use a referral source for adverse reactions. **A:** OK.

Q: The consent form should note specifically that data could be used in presentations and publications. **A:** Will do.

When there were no more questions the investigator was excused and the IRB/HSR deliberated in executive session. There was a motion to conditionally approve Protocol 06-37 [Duquette moved, Carlisle seconded, 7 -0]. The conditions were:

1. Fix the zip code on both consent forms.
2. Add mention of possible presentation and publication of the data.
3. Mention the possibility of adverse reactions in the Type A consent form.

OTHER CONCERNS: (none)

NEXT MEETING:

Friday, 09 June 2006 – location to be announced

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 AM.

[Duquette moved, Mellon seconded, approved 7-0]

Respectfully submitted

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

TRAINING: Members discussed how long data and consent documents should be kept. It was agreed that materials allowing participants to be linked to their data, such as audio- or videotapes, should be destroyed as soon as the information of interest has been extracted from the tapes. Consent forms should probably be kept to enable the IRB/HSR to monitor compliance and in case of later ethical complaints from participants. In the case of student research, including theses, the mentoring faculty should be responsible for keeping consent forms. If the data do not include personal identifiers it does not seem to be within the purview of the IRB/HSR to recommend/require storage or destruction of data. The above do not reflect IRB/HSR policies and maybe not unanimous views of members. The RERC was asked to obtain information about policies and procedures at other institutions to inform debate at the next meeting, perhaps leading to a recommendation to some entity or entities on campus.