

Springfield Technical Community College Institutional Review Board Bylaws

Purpose

The Springfield Technical College Institutional Review Board is an administrative body established to protect the rights and welfare of human research subjects recruited to participate in research activities at the College. The IRB has the authority to approve, require modifications in, or disapprove all research activities that fall within its jurisdiction as specified by both the federal regulations and College policy.

The United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requires peer review approval of all research involving human subjects conducted by investigators at institutions that receive funding from federal agencies. In accordance with federal regulations, all research involving human subjects conducted at Springfield Technical Community College or conducted by Springfield Technical Community College faculty, staff, or students, or conducted elsewhere but involving individuals due to their association with the college must be reviewed and approved by the College's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Failure to comply with this policy places the College at risk for losing its federal funding including funding of student programs (e.g., federal financial aid to students).

Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46 (45 CFR 46; Basic HHS Policies for Protection of Human Research Subjects) is at: <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.html>.

POLICIES

1. The Role and Scope of the IRB

The role of the IRB is to assure that appropriate steps are taken to protect the rights and welfare of human subjects including the students and employees of the college. To accomplish this, the IRB will review and approve research protocols and related materials (e.g., informed consent documents, questionnaires) to see if they comply with appropriate guidelines. The focus of the process is to ensure that risks to human subjects are minimized by using procedures that are consistent with sound research design; that the selection of human subjects for research projects is equitable; that subjects are being selected due to their ability to contribute to a field of knowledge and not for other reasons (such as ease of availability); that human research subjects are adequately informed of the risks and benefits of research participation and the procedures that will be involved in the research and that informed consent is obtained from each

subject in advance of participation; and that there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of human research subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of research data.

All research involving the collection of information, data or specimens/samples from or about human subjects or information or data, specimens/samples gathered from humans at some prior time must be reviewed and approved prior to such research being undertaken. This policy applies to all research projects conducted under Springfield Technical Community College auspices, including research conducted by any College employee, student, or agent either in the course of his or her College responsibilities or when using the College's name, symbols, property or services in connection with the research.

It is important to note that not all data gathering is research. In some cases it may be for the purpose of quality improvement as opposed to research and thus may not require IRB review. For the purposes of this document quality improvement may be defined as systematic, data-guided activities designed to bring about immediate improvement in standard practices while research may be defined as a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.

Indicators that a project is an example of quality improvement:

- Evaluates procedures that do not substantially change the educational environment
- Experiences and interventions are offered to all
- Continuous monitoring, data collection and assessment, allowing ongoing modification to correct deficiencies and make improvement
- Researchers may be involved to provide expertise with respect to evaluation or assessment methods
- An external sponsor may provide limited support but they are not involved in implementation and/or evaluation plans

Indicators that a project is an example of research subject to IRB review:

- Testing of issues that go beyond current knowledge based on science and experience
- Random allocation of subjects into different intervention groups
- Deliberate delay of feedback of data from those monitoring the implementation, especially if this is done to avoid bias
- Funding or substantial participation by parties outside the organization.

It is worth noting that overlaps exist between these two categories and in such cases where the distinction is vague it is best to err on the side of considering the work research.

2. STCC Requirements for Human-Subjects Research

If human-subjects research is to be performed that substantially involves STCC students, faculty or staff that there should be a clearly recognizable benefit to either STCC students, faculty or

staff or to the ability of the college to deliver educational and support services to its students or community. For this reason human-subjects research requiring review by the STCC IRB must demonstrate the following:

- a. That the intent of the research is to provide information that can be demonstrated to some degree to have direct benefit to STCC students or the STCC community or the ability of STCC to serve its students or community.
- b. That the experiment is designed well enough that there will be a reasonable expectation that the intended benefit will be realized.
- c. That the research includes substantial involvement of a member of the STCC faculty or staff as an investigator. Drawing from NIH definitions, substantial involvement may include:
 - cooperation, coordination, or participation in performing project activities, e.g., development of research protocols; data collection, analyses, and interpretations; or re-establishment of objectives during course of a project;
 - option to halt a project activity if risks are deemed to outweigh benefits or if the experimental design is deemed to be unlikely to produce useful data;
 - review or approval of one stage of a project before work may begin on a subsequent stage;
 - assistance with or approval of provisions or the selection of contractors or subawardees under the assistance award, and in the selection of key project personnel other than principal investigators of projects or sub-projects;
 - technical monitoring to permit specified kinds or directions of the work, including approval of changes in experimental approaches;
 - participation on committees or in other functions responsible for helping to guide the course of long-term projects or activities.

Researchers submitting proposals for review by the STCC IRB will need to demonstrate that they have received instruction in the ethical practices and procedures of human-subjects research. Providing certification of having completed the NIH web-based training on “Protecting Human Research Participants” will be considered sufficient as will documentation of other educational experiences demonstrating a similar depth of training. The NIH course may be accessed here, <http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php> and will provide a printable certificate on completion of the training.

3. Membership of the IRB

The STCC IRB is under the jurisdiction of the Office of Academic Affairs. The IRB of STCC shall have no less than five members, at least two of whom will be members of the faculty. The membership shall consist of individuals of varying backgrounds to promote complete and

adequate review of research activities commonly conducted at the College. The IRB shall be sufficiently qualified through the experience and expertise of its members and the diversity of the members, including consideration of their race, gender and cultural backgrounds and sensitivity to such issues as community attitudes, to promote respect for its advice and counsel in safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects. In addition to possessing the professional competence necessary to review specific research activities, the IRB shall be able to ascertain the acceptability of proposed research in terms of institutional commitments and regulations, applicable law, and standards of professional conduct and practice. The IRB shall therefore include persons knowledgeable in these areas. Ideally, the committee will include representation as follows:

- a. Social Sciences faculty
- b. Health faculty (clinical experience desirable)
- c. Individual external to the college (required by federal regulations)
- d. Grants
- e. Institutional Effectiveness
- f. Science faculty (Preferably someone with experience at conducting and/or publishing research).
- g. Student services
- h. Representative with awareness of vulnerable populations.

The IRB must make every nondiscriminatory effort to ensure that it does not consist entirely of men or entirely of women although selections should not be made purely on the basis of gender.

An IRB may, in its discretion, invite individuals with competence in special areas to assist in the review of issues which require expertise beyond or in addition to that available on the IRB. These individuals may not vote.

The term of office for members is for three years. Serving may be counted toward College Service for faculty. The Chair and Vice-chair for the committee are elected by the members of the committee for a one year term of office with the chair and vice chair being selected from among current members of the committee. The primary role of the vice-chair will be to stand in for the chair in the chair's absence. It is assumed the vice-chair will be the primary candidate for chair at the end of the chair's term.

The committee will meet at least once a semester during which, among any other considerations, the chair will report on all research submitted for review for the purpose of soliciting input from committee members. In addition to reviewing submitted research plans, the committee will be responsible for advertising its presence and function to the STCC community and making information available on conducting responsible research via the STCC website or other means.

No IRB member may participate in the review of any project in which the member has a conflicting interest, except to provide information requested by the IRB.

As per Federal policy, a list of current IRB members must be submitted to the Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR) and also kept with the IRB's records. The list must identify members by name, earned degrees, representative capacity, indications of experience

(such as board certifications and licenses) sufficient to describe each member's chief anticipated contributions to IRB deliberations, and any employment or other relationship between each member and the College (e.g., full-time employee, unpaid consultant, or board member).

Membership should be recruited with an eye to maintaining the perception of the IRB as fair and impartial, immune from pressure either by the institution's administration, the investigators whose protocols are brought before it, or other professional and nonprofessional sources.

4. General IRB Procedures

All STCC research projects and activities that involve human subjects, regardless of the risk foreseen, require review and approval by the IRB prior to the initiation of the project or activity. IRB review is required for projects or activities involving human subjects that are conducted on the College premises or elsewhere by faculty, students, or employees. The STCC IRB has the authority to approve, require modifications in, or disapprove all research activities that fall within its jurisdiction as specified by both the federal regulations and local institutional policy. Research that has been reviewed and approved by an IRB may be subject to review and disapproval by officials of the institution. However, those officials may not approve research if it has been disapproved by the IRB

Each project and activity involving human subjects will be referred to the IRB, following the procedures outlined below. In case of full reviews, the research proposal will be reviewed by the IRB at the scheduled meeting closest to the time the proposal is received.

Except when a project is exempt from review or when an expedited review procedure is used, the IRB shall review proposed research at convened meetings at which a majority of the members are present. Decisions of the IRB are rendered by a majority of all members present. Where any questions of significance arise, Board members absent from a meeting will be apprised and their views solicited so that participation to the fullest degree is possible. Minutes of each IRB meeting are circulated to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, to all IRB members, and are on file in the office of the IRB Chair.

The STCC IRB will review proposals from the perspective of assessment of risks and anticipated benefits and, in its analysis, will work to: (1) identify the risks associated with the research; (2) determine that the risks will be minimized to the extent possible; (3) identify the probable benefits to be derived from the research; (4) determine that the risks are reasonable in relation to benefits, if any, and the importance of the knowledge to be gained; (5) assure that potential subjects will be provided with an accurate and fair description of the risks or discomforts and the anticipated benefits; and (6) determine intervals of periodic review, and, where appropriate, determine that adequate provisions are in place for monitoring the data collected. In addition, IRBs should determine the adequacy of the provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of the data, and, where the subjects are likely to be members of a vulnerable population (e.g., mentally disabled), determine that appropriate additional safeguards are in place to protect the rights and welfare of these subjects.

In reviewing research associated with the College, the STCC IRB has the authority to make decisions involving projects or activities that involve human subjects including:

- A. determination of whether the project is exempt from IRB review.
- B. determination of whether the project is eligible for expedited review.
- C. approval of the project or activity and procedures as submitted
- E. specification of modifications in the protocol necessary to obtain IRB approval
- F. disapproval of the project or activity; or suspension or termination of IRB approval of research that is not being conducted in accordance with the IRB's requirements or that has been associated with unexpected or serious harm to subjects.

Application to the various categories of review shall be made on the form developed by the STCC IRB. There are three categories of IRB review of proposed studies:

- A. **Exempt Review:** Certain projects, such as those that involve only survey, questionnaire or interview procedures and anonymous participation, may be categorized as no risk and may be exempt from the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Research Subjects. The IRB Chairperson will determine if the checklist application meets the exempt criteria. No research with participants under age 18 can be exempt.
- B. **Expedited Review:** Applications that involve no more than minimal risk to human subjects may be eligible for an expedited review by the Chairperson of the IRB. If you want to be considered for an expedited review, initial the "Expedited Review Line" on the IRB Application Cover Sheet form.
- C. **Full Review:** Applications that involve more than minimal risks or those in which the identity of participants is at risk require a full IRB review.

The IRB shall notify investigators in writing, within a week of the meeting in which the proposed research is considered, of its decision to approve or disapprove the research, or of modifications required to secure its approval. If the IRB decides to disapprove a research project or activity, it shall include in its written notification a statement of the reasons for its decision and give the investigator an opportunity to respond in person or in writing.

All research projects and activities approved by the IRB shall be subject to continuing review at appropriate intervals. Research that is conducted, supported or otherwise subject to regulation by any federal department or agency shall be reviewed at least annually.

5. Projects Exempt from Formal Review

In general most social, economic and educational research is exempt if the only involvement of human subjects is in one or more of the following categories: the use of survey and interview

procedures; the observation of public behavior; or the study of existing data, documents, records, or specimens.

Specifically, the following categories of research are exempt from review:

Research in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories:

- A. Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (a) research on regular and special education instructional strategies; or (b) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
- B. Research involving survey procedures, interview procedures, educational testing, or observation of public behavior unless: (a) information obtained will be recorded in such a manner that the human subjects can be identified, either directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, and (b) the subject's responses, if they became known outside the research, could reasonably place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subject's financial standing, employability, or reputation (e.g. when the research deals with the subject's own behavior, such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior, or use of alcohol).
- C. Research involving survey procedures, interview procedures, educational testing, or observation of public behavior, and the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office, or when federal statutes require without exception maintenance of confidentiality of personally identifiable information, throughout the research and thereafter.
- D. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available, or if the information will be recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

An investigator who believes that his/her project qualifies for exemption must submit one hard copy and one electronic copy of the IRB application form to the IRB Chair, describing the project and explaining why the investigator believes the proposed project qualifies for exemption.

6. Research Qualifying for Expedited Review

Research activities qualify for expedited review if they involve no more than minimal risk, as defined above, AND are included in the categories suitable for expedited review as determined by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), listed below. In addition, minor changes to a previously approved research protocol may be acceptable for expedited review during the period for which approval is authorized.

Although the list may change from time to time, the following categories of research are currently determined by DHHS to be eligible for expedited review, as provided in Federal Register Volume 63, Number 216 (November 9, 1998):

- A. Clinical studies of drugs and medical devices, only when a) the research is on drugs for which an investigational new drug application is not required, or b) the research is on medical devices for which an investigational device exemption application is not required or the medical device is cleared/approved for marketing and the medical device is being used in accordance with its cleared/approved labeling;
- B. Collections of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick or venipuncture, under the conditions described by DHHS;
- C. Prospective collection of biological specimens for research by noninvasive means (e.g. hair and nail clippings, teeth, saliva);
- D. Collection of data through noninvasive procedures routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves (e.g. physical sensors, muscular strength testing);
- E. Research involving materials (data, documents, records or specimens) that have been collected or will be collected solely for non-research purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis);
- F. Collection of data from voice, video, digital or image recordings made for research purposes;
- G. Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (such as studies of perception, cognition, motivation, communication, social behavior, or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies);
- H. Continuing review of research previously approved by the convened IRB, where the research is permanently closed to the enrollment of new subjects, all subjects have completed all research-related interventions and the research remains active only for long-term follow-up of subjects; or where no subjects have been enrolled and no additional risks have been identified; or where the remaining research activities are limited to data analysis.

Investigators who believe that their projects qualify for expedited review must submit to the IRB Chair one hard copy and one electronic copy of the IRB application form. The forms will be reviewed by the Chair or an IRB member designated by the Chair. At their discretion, the investigator may be required to discuss the project with the Chair or the designated member.

The Chair will notify the investigator within one week whether the proposed research qualifies for expedited review. If the proposal does not qualify, the Chair will advise the investigator in writing

concerning the submission of the appropriate forms for request for full review. If the proposal qualifies and is approved, the Chair will notify the investigator and file the signed copy of the form. The remaining members of the Board will be advised of research proposals that have been approved under the expedited procedure.

7. Research that Requires Full IRB Review

All projects that are not subject to exemption or expedited review are subject to full IRB review. The investigator must submit one hard copy and one electronic copy of the IRB application form and a copy of his/her project or activity proposal. In order to approve the project, the IRB must determine that all of the following requirements are satisfied:

- A. Risks to subjects are minimized (1) by using procedures that are consistent with sound research design and which do not unnecessarily expose subjects to risk, and (2) whenever appropriate, by using procedures already being performed on the subjects for diagnostic or treatment purposes;
- B. Risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits, if any, to subjects, and the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result;
- C. Selection of subjects is equitable, taking into account the purpose of the research and the setting in which the research will be conducted;
- D. Informed consent will be obtained from each prospective subject or the subject's legally authorized representative, according to the Guidelines for Consent in VIII below, and will be appropriately documented. The prospective subject or representative must be given sufficient opportunity to consider whether or not to participate. Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provision for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of subjects.
- E. Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of data.
- F. Where some or all of the subjects are likely to be vulnerable to coercion or undue influence, such as persons with acute or severe physical or mental illness, children, prisoners, pregnant women, mentally disabled persons, or economically or educationally disadvantaged persons, appropriate additional safeguards have been included in the study to protect the rights and welfare of these subjects.

In each case, the IRB requires that the research activity be performed by scientifically or otherwise qualified persons with adequate supervision by professional personnel and that the general procedures employed are legal and acceptable by both national and local standards of

practice.

Upon submission of the IRB application forms and other appropriate documentation, the Chair assesses the completeness and compliance of the application with these regulations and policies. After this initial review, the forms may be returned to the investigator with a request for more details or suggestions for change. Upon acceptance by the Chair, the application is put on the agenda for the next scheduled IRB meeting. In certain cases, the investigator may be requested to attend the meeting to clarify the proposal and to respond to questions by members of the IRB.

If the proposal is approved, the Chair will notify the investigator and the original of IRB form will be signed by three members of the IRB. If the proposal is not approved, reasons for denial will be provided in writing to the researcher. All records of review are public information once the IRB has ascertained that no data pertaining to individual subjects is present in those records.

8. Investigator Training

Investigators presenting human subject research proposals to the IRB will also present documentation that they have completed some form of formal training in the use of human subjects in research. Acceptable documentation would be from the NIH web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants" (<http://phrp.nihtraining.com>) although other forms demonstrating a similar depth of training would be acceptable.

9. Guidelines for Consent

The requirements for informed consent, or its waiver, alteration, or exception apply regardless of the type of review—expedited or full—utilized by the IRB.

The investigator must provide the IRB with assurance that truly informed and free consent of subjects at risk will be obtained by methods that are adequate and appropriate, and that carry the least possibility of coercion, undue influence, omission, error, or misunderstanding. The informed consent procedure and documents employed for this purpose shall contain no exculpatory language through which the subject or the subject's legally authorized representative is made to waive or appear to waive any of his or her legal rights, or to release or appear to release the researcher, STCC or any of its personnel from any liability for negligence.

In many cases, research may involve children, persons with restricted educational backgrounds, or persons for whom English is not their native tongue. Consent is not "informed" if the person concerned cannot understand the consent form. The language used in the consent form must be appropriate for the age, education and intellectual levels of the persons who are to be subjects.

To obtain informed consent, the investigator must provide prospective subjects with the

following information (45 CFR 46.116):

- A. A statement that the study involves research, an explanation of the purposes of the research and the expected duration of the subject's participation, a description of the procedures to be followed, and identification of any procedures that are experimental. **NOTE: This statement may be provided to the subject following the research project in cases where the "deception" is a material part of the project.**
- B. A description of any reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts to the subject.
- C. A description of any benefits to the subject or to others which may reasonably be expected from the research.
- D. A disclosure of appropriate alternative procedures or courses of treatment, if any, that might be advantageous to the subject.
- E. A statement describing the extent, if any, to which confidentiality of records identifying the subject will be maintained.
- F. For research involving more than minimal risk, an explanation as to treatments that are available if injury occurs and, if so, what they consist of, or where further information may be obtained.
- G. An explanation of whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions about the research and research subjects' rights, and whom to contact in the event of a research related injury to the subject.
- H. A statement that participation is voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled, and the subject may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled.
- I. A statement informing participants of their right to withdraw any consent given and, at the point of withdrawal, to require that their own data, including records, be eliminated from use after withdrawal.

When appropriate, the investigator must also provide prospective subjects with one or more of the following:

- A. A statement that the particular treatment or procedure may involve risks to the subject (or to the embryo or fetus, if the subject is or may become pregnant) that are currently unforeseeable.
- B. Anticipated circumstances under which the subject's participation may be terminated by the investigator without regard to the subject's consent.
- C. Any additional costs to the subject that may result from participation in the research.
- D. The potential consequences of a subject's decision to withdraw from the research and procedures for orderly termination of participation by the subject.

- E. A statement that significant new findings developed during the course of the research which may relate to the subject's willingness to continue participation will be provided to the subject.
- F. The approximate number of subjects involved in the study.
- G. Plans for protecting the confidentiality of personally identifiable information. *[NOTE: These requirements for informed consent are not intended to preempt any applicable federal, state, or local laws.]* In most cases, the investigator should document informed consent by use of a written document that incorporates appropriate parts of the above requirements. This document must be approved by the IRB. The form may be read to or read by subjects or their legally authorized representatives, and must be signed by the subject or the representative. The person signing the form must be given a copy of it. Under certain limited circumstances (as defined in 45 CFR 46.117(c)) the IRB may waive the requirement for a signed consent form.
- H. In no case shall an investigator propose, or the IRB approve, an informed consent procedure in which any possible or potential risk is knowingly or purposely minimized, misrepresented, or otherwise distorted.
- I. All approved consent procedures will be retained by the IRB Chair, and all signed consent forms will be retained by the principal researcher.

10. Confidentiality

All personnel associated with each project or activity involving the use of human subjects will ensure that confidentiality will be maintained with respect to individuals in the collection, storage, security, use, and ultimate destruction of all primary data.

Measures taken to assure confidentiality should be described to the IRB in writing by the investigator in each case, regardless of risks to subjects involved or of consent procedures used.

Exceptions to the confidentiality of data associated with individual human subjects are made only when disclosure is required by statutory or judicial authority or when the subject has given prior written approval for disclosure.

General information such as descriptions of consent procedures and outcomes of the review process and minutes of IRB meetings are public information.

11. IRB Records

The IRB shall prepare and retain documentation of its activities, including the following:

- A. Copies of all research proposals reviewed, scientific evaluations, if any, that

accompany the proposals, approved sample consent documents, progress reports submitted by investigators, and reports of injuries to subjects.

- B. Minutes of IRB meetings which shall be in sufficient detail to show attendance at the meetings; actions taken by the IRB; the vote on these actions including the number of members voting for, against, and abstaining the basis for requiring changes in or disapproving research; and a written summary of the discussion of disputed issues and their resolution.
- C. Records of continuing review activities
- D. Copies of all correspondence between the IRB and investigators.
- E. A list of IRB members, including name, earned degrees, representative capacity, indications of experience sufficient to describe anticipated contributions to IRB deliberations, and any employment or other relationship with the College.

All such records and minutes shall be retained for at least three years after completion of the research, and the records shall be accessible for inspection and copying by authorized persons, including representatives of the Department of Health and Human Services, at a reasonable time, place and manner.

12. Proposed Changes to the Project

In the event an investigator proposes to make changes to an IRB-approved research project or activity, the changes may not be initiated without IRB review and approval except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects. Investigators proposing changes should submit a detailed description in writing of any substantive changes to the project as well as those modifications that change the risk to the subject, referring specifically to appropriate sections of the Research Proposal submitted on the IRB application form. Such reviews by the IRB will be undertaken at the closest scheduled meeting of the IRB.

13. Procedure for Reporting Unanticipated Problems Involving Risks

In the event of any unanticipated problems or serious noncompliance with protocols that involve risks to human subjects or others, the investigator or research subject must promptly report the matter to the IRB.

14. Special Categories of Human Subject Research

The federal regulations dealing with research involving prisoners, pregnant women, fetuses, neonates and children are complex. Before submitting a proposal, investigators considering research involving these populations should obtain a copy of the most recent regulations, which may be obtained from the DHHS website.

15. Additional Issues

Longitudinal RESEARCH: The IRB may request the investigator in any project or activity extending over a period of time exceeding one year to obtain consent from subjects on a yearly basis.

CONCEALMENT OR DECEPTION: The IRB recognizes that it may be impossible to study some psychological processes without withholding information about the true object of the study or deliberately misleading the participants. However, for any research project or activity that involves the use of deception or concealment, the investigator must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the IRB that:

- A. The potential benefits of the experiment exceed the risks to the subjects of using deception or concealment.
- B. Alternative procedures avoiding concealment or deception are not available.
- C. And the investigator has considered the effects on the subjects of the way that withholding of information or deliberate deception will be received.

Normally, it is expected that those who have been subjects in a project involving concealment or deception be so informed at the completion of the subject's participation in the study. In studies where the subjects are aware that they have taken part in an investigation in which the data have been collected using concealment or deception, the IRB may require the investigator to:

- A. provide the subjects with any necessary information to complete their understanding of the nature of the research; and
- B. discuss with the subjects their experience of the research in order to monitor any unforeseen negative effects or misconceptions.

OBSERVATIONAL RESEARCH: Studies based upon observation must respect the privacy and psychological well-being of the individuals studied. The IRB may require that those observed give their consent to being observed and be made aware that they may be observed by strangers (unless the research project entails deception or concealment as a material condition of the project, in which case the investigator is required to comply with the guidelines set forth above).

Additionally, the IRB may require assurance that particular account is taken of local cultural values and of the possibility of intruding upon the privacy of individuals who, even while in a normally public space, may believe they are unobserved.

16. Audio and Video Recording

Audio and video recording of human subjects is a form of research that does not protect the anonymity of the subject. Therefore, certain precautions must be taken whether or not the project is exempted from review under Section 5:

- A. Subjects should be informed that they will be audio or video recorded for research purposes only. That is, the investigator and/or department may not use these records for purposes other than those specified in the research project.
- B. The investigator is limited to one original recording and one copy of the recording. No other copies may be made.
- C. Only the investigator and, where appropriate, the investigator's advisor(s) or supervisor(s) may listen to or view the recordings.
- D. After the research activity or project is completed, the recording (and the copy if applicable) must be destroyed or erased.

17. Reporting to the IRB

Each approved study is expected to submit a brief report annually to the IRB (unless a more frequent renewal cycle is required). The report should summarize all procedures and interactions with human subjects in the study during the year.

Principal Investigators must promptly report to the IRB and to appropriate institutional officials any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

Changes in approved research protocols must be reported promptly to the IRB, and the changes may not be initiated without IRB review and approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subject(s).

REVIEW

This policy will be reviewed annually by the Vice President of Academic Affairs or the vice president's designee.