IRB Meeting Minutes  
University of Wisconsin-Platteville  
January 22, 2014, 3:00-3:35, Gardner 156

Members present: Barb Barnet (Chair), Aric Dutelle (Ex Officio), Joan Riedle, Sean Shiverick, Yuanyuan Hu, Chanaka Mendis, Vikie Dreessens, Michael Short

Guests present: None

The meeting was convened for the purpose of conducting a Full Board Review of a protocol submitted by Danielle Dieckman. Danielle is a graduate student in Education and her faculty sponsor is Karen Stinson. The review was to be conducted via conference call; unfortunately the overseas call could not be completed.

The committee discussed the protocol and requested the following materials and protocol revisions, prior to meeting again for the review. Once that material is received, we will schedule a second full board meeting and ask that Dr. Stinson attend and present the project.

I. A letter is needed from the principal of the International School of Ouagadougou, at which the study will be conducted. It should be on school letterhead and clarify that the principal has given approval for Danielle to conduct the study.

II. We also would like clarification as to why a formal consent procedure (written consent from parents and written assent from the students) is not practicable. Ideally that information would also be included in the letter from the principal.

III. If written consent is not practicable, then the parents still need to be informed about the project and have an opportunity to decline to allow their children’s participation. A copy of that letter needs to be part of the protocol.

IV. Given the student participants are teenagers, they should be given the option to assent to their participation or to decline participation. This applies to both the experimental and control participants. That procedure should be explained and, if it involves a written assent form, a copy of the form should be included in the protocol.

V. Several revisions to the protocol were requested.
   a. The research question should include an overview of the project. For example, in what type of service activities do the students engage? The manipulation should also be mentioned.
   b. We’d like a more complete description of the student body. For example, are the students native or international and are any students disabled (so needed protection beyond that extended to minors)?
   c. More detail is needed on the selection procedure for experimental and control participants. How would a truly random selection process be implemented? Does it matter that the members of the experimental and control groups engaged in the same type of service activities, are balanced by gender, are of the same age?
   d. Given the response structure of the 6 questions being asked (i.e., rate on a scale), will there actually be an interview or will a written survey be administered? Who will conduct the interview/survey? (Is Danielle the teacher?) If it is an interview, will the students’ verbal responses/explanations/elaborations also be recorded? If it is an interview, will the interviews be conducted individually or in a group setting? (This choice could affect student responses.) Finally, the fifth question, “how useful did you feel”, seems too open-ended.

Submitted by Joan Riedle.