

## 2019-2020 Year-End Committee Report Form

**Committee:** Institutional Review Board (IRB)

**Chair:**

Priya Raman  
Associate Professor  
Communication Studies

**Chair-Elect for 2020-2021:**

Priya Raman,  
Associate Professor  
Communication Studies

**Number of Meeting held:**

4 (9/20, 11/15, 2/21, 3/20)

[priya.raman@sjsu.edu](mailto:priya.raman@sjsu.edu)

Campus Zip: -0112  
4-5371

(Please include phone/zip/email if available)

### Items of Business Completed 2019/2020

1. Full review of Protocol F15096
2. Update on last full review from Spring '19
3. Dissemination of new information from SJSU Title IX Office
4. Changes to Office of Research
5. Updated IRB Reviewer Desk Reference
6. Updated IRB Application
7. Created, updated and feedback provided on Data Management Handbook
8. Protocol Review FAQ and Clarifications
9. List of Best practices for submitting protocols
10. IRB Members presented and participated in New Faculty Development Program
11. Full review of Protocol F20033

### Unfinished Business Items from 2019/2020

1. None.

### New Business Items for 2020/2021

1. Training and implementation of new cloud-based IRB system.
2. Continue calibration of restrictions on in-person research in the context of COVID-19

**Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by June 16, 2020.**

## IRB Committee Meeting

### MEETING AGENDA

Meeting Dates	
2019	2020
Oct 18	Feb 21
Nov 15	Mar 20
Dec 20	Apr 17
	May 15

September 20, 2019,

9:00 – 10:00 AM

Location: WSQ 105

- I. INTRODUCTIONS AND BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS (5 minutes)
- II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM MAY 17, 2019 (~5 minutes)
- III. NEW BUSINESS (50 minutes)
  - a. Full review of Protocol F15096
  - b. Summary of attachments provided via email:
    - i. Original, previously approved protocol
    - ii. Modification request #1 – submitted for full review
    - iii. Modification request #2 and supplementary materials – submitted for full review
    - iv. Protocol timelines and emails related to the current full review
    - v. Articles submitted by PI to support the requests
  - c. Discussion of remaining issues w/ modification requests not addressed by PI
  - d. Discussion/Vote
- IV. ADJOURNMENT

## IRB Full-Committee Meeting Minutes

**Date/Time:** 9/20/2019

**Attendees:** Craig Cisar, Areum Jensen, Emily Slusser, Maureen Smith, Bernd Becker, Wes Maciejewski, Priya Raman (IRB chair), Sabrina Pinnell, Alice Butzlaff, Edith Kinney, Alena Filip (IRB analyst)

**1. Protocol review – “Sexual Coercion and Violence in College: Reforming Policies and Practices for Consent Education and Personal Agency.” Protocol F15096**

- **Summary of the purpose of the research, type of subjects, and methods of the research under review:**

The full review concerns a modification request to the original protocol submitted by the PI on 8/17/2019.

**Purpose of original study:** “To understand how students navigate their amorous relations with the intention of reducing harmful affects[sic] of the ambiguities that are now commonplace.”

Methods entailed an interview of SJSU students from a previous study cohort who agreed to be contacted by the PI for further follow up. Interview questions delved into personal relationships, beliefs about sex and sexuality, definitions for rape and consent and how they are similar or different to peers’ definitions. According to PI, recruitment materials contained advisory language stating that students who have experienced sexual harm should not participate.

In January 2016, the PI submitted a modification and received approval to conduct the study (interviews with students) at other campuses. The approval was granted with the condition that the PI follow up with the SJSU IRB as campuses were identified, permissions secured, and specific recruitment materials developed for each campus.

**Purpose of modification request under consideration:** PI divided the request into two parts.

Modification#1: Added interview questions for students who also happen to be gender-based violence peer educators. This sub-group would be asked both the original study questions as well as questions about their experiences with being a peer educator and how that has affected their beliefs about sexual consent and assault. The research team would ask the additional questions when the participant indicates on the intake form that they are involved in peer education under the field “current or anticipated school activities.” The interview would be conducted with two interviewers present (as was the case with the original study). The recruitment materials advise students who have experienced sexual harm to not participate.

Modification #2: To specifically recruit gender-based violence peer educators and only ask them the limited peer educator questions added by modification #1. The research team would differentiate between modification #1 and modification #2 participants by asking participants in this group to include “peer study” when responding via email. The request includes omitting the advisory language previously included in the original study and modification #1 from the recruitment materials. The request also

includes being able to conduct interviews via video-conferencing software and only using one interviewer instead of two.

- **Investigator qualifications** – is the investigator qualified? Are there any conflicts of interest?

Yes, the PI is a full professor in Counselor Education at SJSU and has taught and published on topics related to gender violence. There appear to be no conflicts of interest.

- **Subject recruitment plan** – who, where, when, how? Is the selection of subjects equitable?

Modification #1: "...posting the recruitment message flyers in authorized locations, emailing the recruitment message to faculty and staff to share with their students, in-person by approaching students tabling in public locations on campus, and speaking to them and/or handing them a copy of the flyer, and via social media groups."

Modification #2: "We would primarily recruit these students through their club or program activities. Hence, we would recruit via their club or program advisors and/or leaders, their organized meetings and events with permission, stopping at their display tables, their group's events and social media posts, flyers and visits to student leadership and training events with permission."

Comments: Both recruitment methods largely depend on flyers to communicate info about the study (no other recruitment scripts were submitted). Because the recruitment methods are similar, there is concern that it will be difficult to distinguish between students responding to two different flyers. The PI added instructions to the flyer for the second modification, but this doesn't seem like a fail-safe approach in distinguishing between subjects.

The other concern has to do with the advisory language being included for one request and omitted in another. Since the PI is not overtly recruiting participants who have experienced sexual harm, it seems like a double standard is being applied to students in terms of precautions or fair warnings prior to their agreement to participate in research.

- **Risks** – what are the main risks? Are they minimized by the study design? Are the main risks adequately summarized in the consent document?

Because a complete application was not submitted by the PI for the modification requests, the risks and benefits are not specifically addressed. In the original study the risks listed included emotional discomfort or distress and reawakening of past trauma. The mitigation plan included providing participants with info on psychological support resources.

In the current request, the PI indicated that there is no change in the risk profile. The PI also provided literature summarizing study findings that indicate participants do not experience significant harm when asked about sexual trauma in surveys.

Comments: The articles the PI provided refer to participants who had filled out anonymous surveys (e.g., campus climate surveys); one-on-one interviews present a different dynamic that may increase the discomfort of participants.

The principal risk appears to be diminished autonomy for subjects who do not receive the advisory language. The PI has not presented a plan to explicitly inform participants who may have experienced sexual harm that they will be asked questions about their experiences and beliefs. In addition, not giving participants a choice between one or two interviewers diminishes their autonomy. Given these facts, the modification request seems to increase risk for a subset of participants.

- **Potential benefits** – direct vs. indirect.

Because a complete application was not submitted by the PI for the modification requests, the risks and benefits are not specifically addressed. In the original protocol, no direct benefits were identified. Indirect benefits were described as giving participants the opportunity to reflect on their social interactions. The benefit profile is not altered by the modification request.

- **Risk/benefit ratio** – are the risks reasonable in relation to the potential benefits?

There are no direct benefits to participants but the risk has increased for a subset of students in comparison to the original protocol.

- **Confidentiality** – are provisions to protect privacy and confidentiality adequate?

No new info has been presented about confidentiality in the modification request. The original protocol plan was to use pseudonyms and to not report any information that could result in the identification of participants. This plan is adequate for protecting confidentiality, so long as the institutions where participants come from will not be named.

- **Data management/oversight** – is the data management plan appropriate? Is the data collection, storage, dissemination, and retention plan reasonable? Does the study design require ongoing monitoring for the purpose of identifying unexpected results that would indicate a need for study revision? Who will perform data oversight?

No new info has been included about data management. The updated IRB application requests more detailed information about data management that the PI should fill out. However, the original plan was to keep data in a locked cabinet or password protected electronic folder; each file would itself be password protected. All proper-nouns would be replaced by pseudonyms in web-based files. Access to files is limited to the PI and co-PI. This was approved as being an adequate data management plan.

- **Informed consent/assent process** – how, where, when? Written or verbal?

No new info has been provided about the consent process. The original protocol described reading the consent form to participants aloud prior to the interview and informing them that they can leave the study at any time. The participants signed the consent form before the interviewers proceeded with the interview.

- **Informed consent/assent document or waiver of documentation or consent** – does the consent document accurately describe the important aspects of the study? Is the consent

document likely to be understood by the subjects or guardians? Is the investigator requesting a waiver of documentation or a waiver of some or all of the elements of informed consent? If so, have the criteria allowing those waivers been met?

The research team will utilize a standard consent form and no waiver is being requested.

- **Vulnerable populations** – does the study target a vulnerable group that needs additional protection (e.g., children, adults who are not competent to give informed consent, educationally or economically disadvantaged persons, prisoners, and pregnant women)? Is the recruitment of these subjects relevant to the research topic? Is the investigator sensitive to the ethical issues involved with research including vulnerable subjects and is the investigator committed to conducting the research according to the highest ethical standards? Are there any special safeguards?

Vulnerable subjects, as outlined by federal regulations, are not being recruited for the study. The recruitment of subjects is relevant to the research topic, though in recruiting peer educators, the PI is moving away from the main study, which seeks to investigate the intimate relationships and consent practices of college students who have not experienced sexual harm. It's not clear what the PI hopes to achieve in allowing peer educators who have experienced sexual harm into the study without warning them about the sensitive nature of the questions. The flyer for the main study is more forthright, explaining that the research involves studying sexual negotiation and communication. The Belmont Report ethical principal "respect for persons" is compromised by not affording students the same level of autonomy prior to their meeting with the investigators.

- **Compensation and costs** – if compensation is offered, is it reasonable? Is the investigator sensitive to the issue of coercion and undue influence? Does the study involve increased costs to subjects and, if so, is the increased cost ethical in this situation and adequately explained in the consent document?

No compensation is being offered to participants and there are no costs to participants who agree to do the interview.

- **Summary of unresolved issues and discussion points**

\* The principal risk is that the recruitment strategy for peer educators doesn't give a full picture of the intent of the study, that the nature of the questions could be potentially sensitive, and that the research team has an interest in potentially including peer educators who have experienced sexual harm to provide their specific perspective. The flyer only refers to an interview about experiences with being a peer educator on a college campus. The recruitment strategy does not maximize autonomy for participants beforehand so that they can make a fully informed decision about whether or not they are comfortable with participating.

\* While there is some precautionary language in the interview script, not all participants may feel comfortable exercising their right to decline answering questions when they have already consented to be in the study and are face-to-face with the interviewer. There is a question that especially presses participants about their personal beliefs about sexual consent and assault when they fail to address the general question “how has doing this work affected you?” Some members wondered, given the grounded theoretical approach mentioned in the original protocol, whether the limited questions were only a sample of the questions to be added and whether there would be other probing questions that depend on the response of the participants.

\* In the materials submitted, there was no mention of [Title IX reporting requirements for faculty](#). For activities conducted on the SJSU campus, the PI is a mandated reporter. Given the changing landscape of Title IX requirements, this should be addressed in the new submission as well as in the consent procedures/documents.

\* The members considered the PI’s comments about having flexibility to only use one interviewer. However, most members felt that participants should have a choice about the number and gender of the interviewers if the questions will delve into participants’ beliefs and experiences about sexual trauma/harm. The members pointed out that some students may come from cultures and backgrounds where they may feel more comfortable answering sensitive questions with a female facilitator. Giving students more autonomy by giving them a choice did not seem like an unreasonable request to the IRB members.

\* The PI should use an official SJSU email on the consent documents provided to participants. The members noted that this was one of the requests in the original protocol and that the current submission has reverted back to use of a personal email address in the contact info on the consent forms.

**2. Vote (only if quorum is present) – approve, conditionally approve, not approve, abstain, recuse**

11 members were present at the beginning of the meeting, but one member had to leave early. There were 10 voting members present at the time of the vote, achieving a quorum.

A motion was made to not accept the modifications as submitted, and the motion was seconded. 9 members voted to not accept the modifications and 1 member abstained. The motion passed.

Rationale for decision: The recruitment of peer educators, some of whom may have experienced sexual harm, is a deviation from the original study approved from 2015 and merits submission of a new protocol that addresses all of the elements that the IRB is required to evaluate, including risks, benefits, data management, rationale for subject selection, and recruitment procedures. The IRB members unanimously agreed that the submission of a new protocol would facilitate a clearer understanding of this arm of the overall research and, as part of the vote, the IRB stipulated that no further modification requests will be considered for inclusion of peer educators into the study. Only submission of a new protocol will be considered.

- 3. Approval of minutes from previous meeting** – This agenda item was moved to the next meeting’s agenda, as there was not enough time to approve the 5/17/2019 minutes.

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 am

Minutes prepared by Alena Filip



## IRB Committee Meeting

### MEETING AGENDA

Meeting Dates	
2019	2020
<i>Sep 20</i>	Feb 21
<i>Oct 18</i>	Mar 20
Nov 15	Apr 17
Dec 20	May 15

November 15, 2019,

9:00 – 10:00 AM

Location: WSQ 105

- I. INTRODUCTIONS AND BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS (5 minutes)
- II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM 05/17/2019, 9/20/2019 (~5 minutes)
- III. NEW BUSINESS (50 minutes)
  - a. Update on last full review – information from SJSU Title IX Office
  - b. Changes to Office of Research:
    - i. Name – ORI
    - ii. New location – Clark 500
    - iii. Organizational structure - new positions: VPRI, etc.
  - c. Alena on vacation 12/14/19-1/20/20 – coverage info
  - d. Updated IRB Reviewer Desk Reference
  - e. Updates to IRB Application
  - f. Data Management Handbook feedback/discussion
  - g. Other Discussion
- IV. ADJOURNMENT

#### Attachments:

1. May 17 meeting minutes
2. September 20 meeting minutes
3. IRB Reviewer Desk reference
4. IRB application version 9.2019
5. Data management handbook version 9.2019
6. Data management checklist
7. Data management excel template.

## IRB Committee Meeting Minutes

**Date/Time:** November 15, 2019 @ 9am

**Attendees:** Craig Cisar, Areum Jensen, Elizabeth Mullen, Emily Slusser, Anad Ramasubramanian, Maureen Smith, Wes Maciejewski, Priya Raman (IRB chair), Sabrina Pinnell, Alice Butzlaff, Jeanne Rivard, Alena Filip (IRB analyst)

### I. INTRODUCTIONS AND BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS (5 minutes)

### II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM 05/17/2019, 9/20/2019 (~5 minutes)

12 voting members were present during the vote for the meeting minutes, achieving quorum.

- Motion was made to approve the 5/17/2019 meeting minutes and the motion was seconded. 9 members voted to approve and 3 abstained. The motion passed and the 5/17/2019 minutes were approved.
- Motion was made to approve the 9/20/2019 meeting minutes and the motion was seconded. 9 members voted to approve and 3 abstained. The motion passed and the 9/20/2019 minutes were approved.

### III. NEW BUSINESS (50 minutes)

#### a. Update on last full review – information from SJSU Title IX Office

Questions posed to SJSU Title IX Coordinator copied below. The coordinator is working on a response. Neither SJSU nor CSU has specific policies or recommended practices in place for researchers, the SJSU title IX coordinator recognizes the need and said it would be brought up during a CSU-wide meeting. Stay tuned.

1) One of the promises that researchers who conduct studies on sexual behavior/practices make to participants is confidentiality. This promise allows researchers to recruit participants who otherwise may not want to share their experiences if they know their identity would not be protected.

Do Title IX reporting requirements address this concern or provide any info about how to approach the reporting requirements in a research context?

2) Since a research topic about sex could but may not necessarily result in disclosure of sexual misconduct, at what point would a researcher provide info to student participants about his/her obligation to report sexual misconduct to the Title IX office? Is it sufficient to disclose this on the research consent form (for example where the study involves interviewing students about sexual practices), or does the researcher have to disclose this verbally to every participant as well?

3) How should researchers handle situations where a student relates an experience to a researcher that the student does not view as sexual misconduct but that is, by CSU policies, characterized as such? This came up in a recent IRB review of a research proposal about consent practices among college students. Most institutional policies define consent for sex as unambiguous, but some researchers in this field point to a more complicated interpretation by young adults.

4) Do reporting requirements apply only when both the alleged victim and alleged perpetrator are current SJSU students? If a researcher conducts a study with students at other colleges -- both in CA and in other states (as is the case with the consent study mentioned above) – does the researcher have an obligation to report disclosure of sexual misconduct to other universities even if they are not an employee at those universities? Does that same researcher need to report to the SJSU Title IX Office for student disclosures at other colleges?

5) Where the nature of the research may result in disclosure of sexual misconduct by students to the research team, may the IRB consult the Title IX office if we need guidance during IRB review of the research? Who would we contact?

Additional question of added by IRB reviewer: What if students are the ones collecting the data (e.g., conducting interviews) – are they required to report? Should they report to the PI first? What training is available for students to ensure they are qualified to understand when they should discuss obligation to report?

b. Changes to Office of Research:

**i. Name – Division of Research and Innovation** – two offices, one division.

**ii. New location – Clark 500** – is locked, but there is a phone outside.

**iii. Organizational structure - new positions:**

Filled:

- Vice President of Research and Innovation, Mohamed Abousalem
- Director of Research Development, Julia Gaudinski
- Project and Communication Coordinator, Raymond Harbert

Still to be filled:

- Director of Compliance
- Two new analyst positions under the director of compliance: one will be managing the biosafety committee, and the other will be managing the conflict of interest committee and responsible conduct of research.
- Three to four analysts under the Director of Research Development will be assigned to specific colleges,
- All of the innovation side of the division.

**c. Alena on vacation 12/14/19-1/20/20 – coverage info**

**No protocol screening will take place.** A comprehensive procedures binder will be provided to the person covering for Alena. Each reviewer will be assigned a protocol and we expect that the most that each reviewer will receive is two protocols during this time (based on last year's submission stats). Most protocols will qualify for exemption.

- Please be aware that you may get a protocol from a discipline that you have not reviewed before. If you have questions, consult with Priya or another veteran reviewer.

- Please make sure you select the correct review category and don't confuse the exemption categories with the expedited review categories.
- Please make sure to provide clear instructions on the reviewer sheet so that the person covering for me can copy and paste into an email without having to edit anything. Please be available if the person covering has any questions regarding the review comments, especially if they have been contacted by the PI.

Thank you!!!

#### **d. Updated IRB Reviewer Desk Reference**

- Digital format only.
- Includes the revised common rule and the updated SJSU policy.
- Re-read the section "Tips for Writing Comments and Requesting Revisions on IRB Protocols" on p 53 of desk reference.  
Summary of important points:
  - \* Take into account the probable experience of the PI, especially if they are student. Avoid open-ended comments, observations, or questions. Write imperative sentences that ask for specific revisions or clarifications.
  - \* If something about the protocol is confusing or not right, ask for further clarification, even if it is exempt (inconsistent info is the most common problem in protocols).
  - \* Be clear if a request is required vs. suggested.
  - \* What comments do IRB reviewers find frustrating or confusing when they were on the other side, submitting as PIs?
- Discussion of level of faculty involvement and whether advisors get compensated for their time helping students with their protocols – varies from department to department.
- The worksheet for expedited reviews in the desk reference is still valid. The questions on p 56-57 can also be used for exemption categories that require limited IRB review.
- The most common exemption categories are 1 and 2. We do not offer exemption categories 7 and 8 (broad consent) as an option for SJSU researchers. The most common issue that comes up under Category 1 is that the researcher is in a dual role as a researcher and instructor recruiting their own students. The most common issue that comes up under Category 2 is confusion between terms like "anonymous", "confidential", "private", and "secure."
- Questions on what to fill out on the reviewer form?

#### **e. Updates to IRB Application**

- Not announced; using fall semester to see what works and what doesn't. Will accept old application until I return from winter vacation, as long as the PIs address everything that is needed.
- Most significant update is to the data management section. Structured to follow the data management handbook, though it's not exact.
- Questions, comments, issues?

#### **f. Data Management Handbook feedback/discussion**

- Yes. It's long. I know. Hence the supplementary materials.
- Accumulated feedback so far (data management specialist at library, SJSU IT info security, CSU legal counsel).
- Most confusing points stem from the complexity and ambiguity of laws and policies on data ownership (raw research data is not IP, so who owns it?) and retention (CSU requires three years; IRB has the authority to require a shorter retention period for sensitive identifiers that are not needed for the research).
- So far it has been useful as back-up teaching tool when a protocol contains contradictory or inaccurate info about data management.

IV. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting adjourned at 10.03 am

Minutes prepared by Alena Filip

## IRB Committee Meeting

### MEETING AGENDA

February 21, 2019,  
9:00 – 10:00 AM  
Location: WSQ 105

Meeting Dates	
2019	2020
<i>Sep 20</i>	Feb 21
<del><i>Oct 18</i></del>	Mar 20
<i>Nov 15</i>	Apr 17
<del><i>Dec 20</i></del>	May 15

- I. INTRODUCTIONS AND BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS (5 minutes)
- II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM 11/15/2019 (~5 minutes)
- III. NEW BUSINESS (50 minutes)
  - a. Protocol Review
    - i. Questions and Clarifications
  - b. Submitting protocols – Best practices
  - c. New Faculty Development Program
    - i. Cordially invited to luncheon on March 5
  - d. Other Discussion
- IV. ADJOURNMENT

#### Attachments:

1. Nov 15 meeting minutes

## IRB Committee Meeting Minutes

**Date/Time:** February 21, 2020 @ 9am

**Attendees:** Craig Cisar, Areum Jensen, Edith Kinney, Elisa Mattarelli, Josh Nelson, Emily Slusser, Bernd Becker, Maureen Smith, Wes Maciejewski, Priya Raman (IRB chair), Sabrina Pinnell, Jeanne Rivard, Alena Filip (IRB analyst)

### I. INTRODUCTIONS AND BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS (5 minutes)

### II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM 11/15/2019 (~5 minutes)

13 voting members were present during the vote for the meeting minutes, achieving quorum.

Motion was made to approve the 11/15/2019 meeting minutes and the motion was seconded.

9 members voted to approve and 4 abstained. The motion passed and the 11/15/2019 minutes were approved.

### III. NEW BUSINESS (50 minutes)

#### a. Protocol Review – Questions and Clarifications

i) The 3 E's of IRB: An Overview of the IRB Process (handout) – outlines review types and what is required for each. Reviewers are one part of the process, which also includes initial screening, and final approval by the AVP. Try to return protocols as soon as possible, within 10 business days max.

Reviewers contact info will be added to the handout for future presentations, including the luncheon on 3/5/20.

#### b. Submitting Protocols – Best Practices

i) Sample purpose statement

ii) Best practices:

- Protocol should be well-written for an audience who is not familiar with the research.
- Don't use jargon unless it's clearly defined.
- Don't answer yes/no questions with N/A.
- Pay attention to dual roles that may result in undue influence (e.g., teacher/researcher recruiting one's own students).
- Provide the background context of the research. Don't assume IRB members will know the details.
- Follow instructions! Answer the specific question, not what you think the IRB wants to hear. Many questions are broken up into several parts to force PIs to avoid ambiguity.
- Be cautious about using the word "anonymous." Understand the difference between anonymity, confidentiality, and privacy.

- Take the process seriously, including student protocols that faculty sign off on. Getting IRB approval is an integral part of the research process. Preparation is key and a well-prepared protocol can also assist with a smooth research experience for PI and subjects.

#### **c. New Faculty Development Program (hosted by CFD)**

Invitation to attend luncheon 12pm-1:15 on March 5 in Student Union Meeting Room 4B.

IRB process at SJSU

Suggestions for presentation:

- Distinguish between faculty who are familiar with IRB from previous experience and want to know how SJSU IRB works vs. faculty who haven't had much research and are new to the IRB altogether.
- Provide examples of good and poorly written purpose statements and consent forms. Or provide examples of language written specifically for grant application vs language for a general audience on the consent form -- call to reviewers to provide examples.
- Provide reassurance that if faculty do their part and prepare, we will do our part to get IRB review and approval quickly. Stats: 80-85% of protocols qualify for exemption and are approved within 7-10 business days.

#### **d. Other Discussion**

Introduction of a protocol that was submitted recently and may need full review. Research involves evaluating an app that is designed to help adherence to medication for subjects with epilepsy. Question addressed during this meeting was whether the protocol would need full review if evaluated as submitted – the general consensus was that it would need full review.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting adjourned at 10.05 am**

Minutes prepared by Alena Filip



IRB Committee Meeting  
MEETING AGENDA

Meeting Dates	
2019	2020
<i>Sep 20</i>	<i>Feb 21</i>
<del><i>Oct 18</i></del>	<b>Mar 20</b>
<i>Nov 15</i>	Apr 17
<del><i>Dec 20</i></del>	May 15

March 20, 2020

9:00 – 10:00 AM

Location:

<https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/835921191>

I. BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS, TECH-CHECK, APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM 02/21/20 (~5 minutes)

II. NEW BUSINESS (50 minutes)

a. FULL Protocol Review: Protocol #20033

i. Q&A with PI Dr. Ericka Adams - ~15 minutes

ii. Committee Deliberations and Vote - ~35 minutes

III. OTHER BUSINESS (~5 minutes)

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Attachments:

1. Feb 21 meeting minutes

## IRB Committee Meeting Minutes

**Date/Time:** March 20, 2020 @ 9am via Zoom

**Attendees:** Areum Jensen, Edith Kinney, Elisa Mattarelli, Josh Nelson, Emily Slusser, Bernd Becker, Maureen Smith, Wes Maciejewski, Priya Raman (IRB chair), Sabrina Pinnell, Jeanne Rivard, Anand Ramasubramanian, Alena Filip (IRB analyst)

### I. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM 2/21/20

12 voting members were present during the vote for the meeting minutes, achieving quorum.

Motion was made to approve the 2/21/20 meeting minutes and the motion was seconded.

10 members voted to approve and 2 abstained. The motion passed and the 2/21/20 minutes were approved.

### II. FULL REVIEW OF PROTOCOL

“Impact of Loved Ones' Criminal Convictions on College Students' Lived Experiences” – Protocol # 20033

#### Q&A Session with PI:

- Revisions to recruitment, given shelter in place order for our county? (PI indicated the new approach would be to email the recruitment materials to faculty members and have them distribute it to students.)
- Why so many detailed questions about the person who has been convicted (e.g., names of schools they attended, circumstances of the conviction and incarceration, employment experiences pre and post incarceration)?
- Why focus on SJSU students specifically?
- Relationship to previously approved protocols about record clearance – previous approvals included interviews with family and the person with the conviction. PI mentioned it was difficult to get family members for interviews, as some had been estranged. This research is a continuation of that effort, focusing specifically on college students' experiences.
- Explored viability of doing a completely anonymous study (i.e., an anonymous online survey).

#### Open Discussion among IRB:

- Concern about SJSU students being stereo-typed. Can start with SJSU but should include other college students.
- Lack of clarity about focus of study – seems to be two studies.
- Connection to record clearance project and associated support system; could potentially be empowering to students (though recruitment is not being done via the record clearance project).
- Concern about lack of anonymity. PI has plan in place to protect the data and report info in aggregate, identifying themes instead of focusing on specific individuals. But PI may not get a high response.

- Asking students to use pseudonyms for family members at the outset should be the default rather than optional.
- Ethical concern over the considerable info that is being collected about a third party without their knowledge or consent.
- Potential concerns about student research assistants doing the interviews (will revisit once PI addresses the other concerns outlined here).
- Time commitment for the interview seems extensive.

**Vote:** 13 voting members were present during the vote, achieving quorum.

Motion was made to reject protocol 20033 and request a resubmit. The motion was seconded.

12 members voted to reject and request resubmit and one member abstained.

The motion was passed and protocol 20033 was rejected with a request to resubmit. Included in this request are the following:

- Consult and build on available literature for existing info on the impact of criminal convictions on family members. A sample of the literature previously sent to PI:

Lee, H., Porter, L., Comfort, M., Wildeman, C., Hacker, J., & Weaver, V. (2014). Consequences of Family Member Incarceration: Impacts on Civic Participation and Perceptions of the Legitimacy and Fairness of Government. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 651(1), 44-73.

Johnson, E., & Easterling, B. (2015). Coping With Confinement: Adolescents' Experiences With Parental Incarceration. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 30(2), 244-267

Siennick, S. (2016). Parental Incarceration and Intergenerational Transfers to Young Adults. *Journal of Family Issues*, 37(10), 1433-1457.

Kahya, O., & Ekinci, C. (2018). In their own words: School lives of children with an imprisoned parent. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 62, 165-173.

Nichols, E., Loper, B., & Meyer, A. (2016). Promoting Educational Resiliency in Youth with Incarcerated Parents: The Impact of Parental Incarceration, School Characteristics, and Connectedness on School Outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(6), 1090-1109.

Luther, K. (2016). Stigma Management among Children of Incarcerated Parents. *Deviant Behavior*, 37(11), 1264-1275.

Luther, K. (2015). Examining Social Support Among Adult Children of Incarcerated Parents. *Family Relations*, 64(4), 505-518.

- Be specific about the focus of the study – how a family member’s criminal convictions may have impacted the lived experiences of college students. Eliminate from the purpose statement how criminal record clearance impacts the life experiences of formerly convicted persons. These are two separate studies.
- Remove reference to SJSU students from protocol and focus on college students in general (ok to recruit from SJSU but the study should be expanded to other colleges as well).
- Pare down the interview questions to focus on the impact to students, lessening the amount of personal info about the third party family members, who are not being invited to participate. Remove personal questions about the third party that do not address impact on college students’ lives.
- Consider doing a survey first and following up with an interview. As submitted, the interview is likely to last a couple of hours. Having participants do a survey first would reduce the time commitment for the interview.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting adjourned at 10.00 am**

Minutes prepared by Alena Filip