

REQUESTOR	DATE REQUESTED	TITLE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION/PURPOSE	STATUS	COMMENTS
Blue Brazelton	7/23/12	Adult Learners and Social Media: Community College Classroom Experiences	The project seeks to examine the experiences of adult learners over the age of 30 and their experiences with social media in the classroom within community college contexts. The project will seek to examine the question “is social media a burden or opportunity for adult learners in their classroom experiences?”	Approved	<p>7/23/12 Hi All:</p> <p>Here are my comments and questions about this research proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- Confidentiality: It is stated that "... interview data will be stored in secure ways." This is vague and further explanation is needed. A "... personal secured server" is noted for storage of digital materials. Will files will be used on desktop or laptop computers and will those files or computers be password-protected?</li> <li>-- Regarding the Consent Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the part about age 18 is confusing. I understood from the proposal that subjects would be over the age of 27. This raises the question of how participants age and any other inclusion criteria will be verified?</li> <li>- There is no statement that subjects are free to withdraw from participation at any time, without penalty.</li> <li>- There is no statement of expected benefits, or lack thereof.</li> <li>- There is no offer to provide a summary of the research results.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

				<p>--Bob</p> <p>7/25/12 The nature of the study certainly has a credible intent. However, I agree w/ Bob's comments about the shifting target audience. The survey consent form is 18, the survey questions are directed to those over 30 and the IRB app is for those over 27. In addition, the sample size of 4-6 seems very small to have it have merit. Overall, the proposal does not seem robust on a number of quality levels. Laurie</p> <p>7/25/12 I agree with Laurie's comment on the "...lack of robustness on a number of quality levels." --Bob</p> <p>7/25/12 Team,</p> <p>While I think that the materials provided to us for review are poorly written/prepared, I think that the research is exempt nonetheless as the study seeks adult participant volunteers who will be asked to sign a consent form and respond to non-invasive questions.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>However, I agree with Bob that the following clarifications are needed prior to approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Clarification that digital files will be password protected.</li><li>- Clarification on the consent form that participation can be withdrawn at any time without penalty.</li></ul> <p>Thanks, Lisa</p> <p>Jul 24, 2012 at 1:38 PM, Donna Kragt &lt;<a href="mailto:dkragt@grcc.edu">dkragt@grcc.edu</a>&gt; wrote: Hi Blue Can you respond to the questions raised below by one of our IRB members? THANKS</p> <p>Here are my comments and questions about this research proposal:</p> <p>-- Confidentiality: It is stated that "... interview data will be stored in secure ways." This is vague and further explanation is needed. A "... personal secured server" is noted for storage of digital materials. Will files will be used on desktop or laptop computers and will those files or</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>computers be password-protected?</p> <p>-- Regarding the Consent Form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the part about age 18 is confusing. I understood from the proposal that subjects would be over the age of 27. This raises the question of how participants age and any other inclusion criteria will be verified?</li><li>- There is no statement that subjects are free to withdraw from participation at any time, without penalty.</li><li>- There is no statement of expected benefits, or lack thereof.</li><li>- There is no offer to provide a summary of the research results.</li></ul> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Blue Brazelton &lt;blue.brazelton@gmail.com&gt; 7/26/2012 1:51 PM &gt;&gt;&gt; Donna,</p> <p>Thank you for the quick response. I have heard that GRCC was a great institution to work with and now I understand my colleague's recommendations.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>The first question: I apologize for the vague answer, I was trying to use that sentence as a segue into the specific measures I would use to protect the data. Specifically all paper copies of data will be locked in my file cabinet in my home office, and digital data will be stored on my personal secure server space that is password protected and encrypted. While the data is being used, it will be on my personal laptop, which requires a password for both the computer boot process.</p> <p>Concerning the consent form:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) MSU requires this statement about the possibility of minors. I will remove it for the GRCC participants.</li><li>2) I added clarification about withdrawing from the study</li><li>3) This might be based on different understanding of "benefit" but for this study I am not offering any tangible benefits (gift cards, etc...). If the IRB member is referring to a</li></ol>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>statement about the impact of participation on the study and research, I offered a brief statement of that benefit in the first paragraph which I have elaborated in the amended consent form.</p> <p>4) I have added a statement about the summary of findings.</p> <p>Thanks again, I have attached the amended consent form and appreciate the feedback I've received so far on my materials.</p> <p>~Blue</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Donna Kragt 07/26/12 1:49 PM &gt;&gt;&gt; See response from Mr. Brazelton</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Robert Leunk 7/27/2012 8:02 AM &gt;&gt;&gt; With the clarifications provided, I am comfortable with the confidentiality measures and consent form. I would consider this research exempt. –Bob</p> <p>7/27/12 consider it exempt as well.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Thanks, Lisa</p> <p>7/27/12 I concur that it is exempt. Patti</p> <p>7/27/12 I have no concerns about this proposed research, although I agree that language should be added to the consent form making it clear that participants can withdraw at any time without penalty. Susan</p>
Jan Karazim	8/13/12	QUALITATIVE INSIGHTS ON THE PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF A MICHIGAN INTERCOLLEGIATE CONSORTIA FOR MRI PROGRAM DELIVERY	This study will focus on the topic of intercollegiate collaboration as a means of offering cost-effective associate degree and certificate programming at community colleges. The catalyst of the study is the Michigan Radiologic and Imaging Science (MiRIS) Consortia model formed through the efforts of five community colleges and one university with the purpose of delivering a magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) program. Assuming a qualitative approach by	Approved	<p>8/15/12 - Hi Donna:</p> <p>With the responses from Ms. Karazim, I would consider her proposed research to be exempt and have no concerns with her proposal. (I do hope that "secured file container" means locked file cabinet.)</p> <p>--Bob</p> <p>8/14/12 – I agree with Ferris that this is exempt. It seems very much to be program evaluation research. The one thing I wondered is whether or</p>

			<p>conducting interviews with key individuals of each participating institution during the summer of 2012, the following areas of inquiry will be explored; founding motivation, lessons learned, future growth and sustainability, and model replication to other occupational disciplines.</p>	<p>not there was another program evaluation planned for this MRI program. That wouldn't affect the exempt nature of this research - just might make it a duplicative effort.</p> <p>Patti</p> <p>8/17/12</p> <p>Although the email inviting participation does state that their personal names would not be used, I would have liked to have seen this explicitly stated on the signed consent form. Having said that, since the consent form does acknowledge the potential for being personally identified, I have to agree that this research proposal complies with IRB standards.</p> <p>Susan</p> <p>8/20/12</p> <p>I think this is exempt.</p> <p>Patti</p> <p>8/23/12 – Approved</p> <p>Donna</p>
--	--	--	--	---



Cheryl Hawkins	8/13/12	An Examination of Mid-level Administrators and Faculty Leaders' Skills, Responsibilities, and Professional Development as Preparation for Senior-level Leadership Positions	The purpose of this qualitative multisite case study is to examine the leadership preparatory activities of mid-level administrators and faculty leaders working within mid-west community colleges, to develop an understanding of their proficiency in the American Association of Community College (AACC) 2005 Competencies for Community College Leaders.	Approved	<p>8/13 - Hi Donna: I would consider Ms. Hawkins research to be exempt. I have no concerns with the research. -- Bob Leunk</p> <p>8/14 - Team,</p> <p>I agree with Bob that this research is exempt.</p> <p>Thanks, Lisa</p> <p>8/17/12 Donna - I don't think I responded to this, but I don't see any risk/liability concerns with this, or the research proposed by Jan Karazim.</p> <p>Jim P.</p> <p>8/14/12 –</p> <p>I agree that this research is exempt. Patti</p> <p>8/17/12 – I have no concerns with this proposed study. The research and consent forms seem appropriate and adequately protect participants. Susan</p> <p>8/20/12</p>
----------------	---------	---	--	----------	--

					<p>I think this is exempt. Patti</p> <p>8/24/12- I also think this project is exempt.</p> <p>Deb Schultz, RDH,PhD</p>
Lily Anderson	9/11/12	The Effect of a First Year Experience Course Curriculum on Persistence at Grand Rapids Community College	The purpose of this study is to acquire student and faculty perceptions on the curriculum of a first year experience course, College Learning Studies (CLS100) that contributed to students being retained by a single institution, Grand Rapids Community College in the State of Michigan.	Approved	<p>9/11/12 - I believe this is exempt and will be valuable for us as a college. Patti</p> <p>9/11/12 - Everything looks in good order to me. No questions or concerns. Susan</p> <p>9/11/12 - I have no concerns with this...</p> <p>Jim P.</p> <p>9/11/12 I concur about the exempt status of this research.</p> <p>9/11/12 I concur this proposal is exempt. I have no questions or concerns. -Bob</p> <p>9/13/12 I agree, everything look good. Deb</p>

<p>Mary Clifton</p>	<p>9/18/12</p>	<p>GRCC Cafeteria Study</p>	<p>To determine if the addition of a plant-based option in the daily menu of on-site cafeteria results in increased consumption of plant-based foods by the college students.</p>	<p>Approved</p>	<p>9/18/12 – Donna,  I have no concerns. Susan  9/18/12 – Donna,  I have no concerns. It looks like a very interesting study!  Lisa  9/18/12 – Donna - I have no concerns and think this is a great idea. I just wonder, are they going to survey the general cafeteria clientele or just those who opt for the plant-based offerings? If the latter, they will likely get a biased result. Just curious....maybe I missed it in the proposal.  Thanks, Jim P.  9/18/12 I agree that this study is exempt. Thanks, Deb  9/18/12 I have no concerns about this research.  I do think it's funny that she's</p>
---------------------	----------------	-----------------------------	---	-----------------	---

					renamed The Quiet Cafe, The Silent Cafe - sounds rather grim.)  Patti
Christine Davis	9/19/12	New Hire Mentoring at Grand Rapids Community College	The purpose of this research project is to analyze the effectiveness of the new hire mentoring program and make recommendations for improving the new hire mentoring program at Grand Rapids Community College.	Approved	9/20/12 – Hi Donna,  I agree that this research is exempt.  Thanks, Lisa  9/20/12 –  OK from me  James Peterson  9/20/12 –  I agree that this project should be exempt. Deb  9/20/12 –  I have no concerns. Susan

					<p>9/26 – Yes</p> <p>Donna</p>
9/26/12	Jessica Berens	An Examination of Grand Rapids Community College Performance Evaluation Effectiveness	The purpose of the reasearch is to determine the effectiveness of the performance evaluation process for Meet and Confer, ESP, CEBA, and Campus Police.	Approved	<p>9/26/12</p> <p>No concerns from a risk/insurance standpoint.</p> <p>Jim P.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Jessica Berens 9/27/2012 8:29 PM &gt;&gt;&gt;</p> <p>Hi Donna,</p> <p>Below are my responses in bold.</p> <p>Thank you Jessica</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Donna Kragt 09/27/12 8:07 AM &gt;&gt;&gt;</p> <p>Hi Jessica Can you respond to this request from an IRB member?</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Robert Leunk 9/26/2012 8:33 PM &gt;&gt;&gt;</p>

					<p>Hi Donna:</p> <p>I have some questions about the Research proposal submitted by Ms Berens.</p> <p>-- What is the relationship between this survey (and its results) and GRCC?</p> <p>The survey will allow the researcher to gather feedback data from those that participate in the current performance evaluation process at GRCC. The feedback data will be compiled to identify employees perception around the research question and subset questions (i.e. effectiveness of evaluation in providing feedback, opportunities for improvement, etc.).</p> <p>-- What is the potential for benefit from this research project to the subjects who participate in the research?</p> <p>The survey results will help the researcher answer the research question and subset questions in order to determine effectiveness of the performance evaluation. The subset questions (do the performance evaluations correlate to the mission of GRCC, are managers conducting the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>evaluations trained to provide proper feedback, does the performance evaluation process provide the employee proper feedback, does the process identify steps to take if performance is not effective) have also been discussed in the literature review and supported by past research that these factors can have a connection to the effectiveness of performance evaluations. The findings of the research will be communicated to HR Leadership. Strengths and opportunities will be identified from all data collected including the survey data. Opportunities will also include recommendations for improvement which will be a benefit to the participants. It will also be important for HR Leadership to be aware of strengths to the evaluation process so that those items can be continued.</p> <p>Question 18 on the IRB application asks for a discussion of risks and benefits. Risks are discussed; benefits discussion is missing. I think it's important for those who participate in the research to understand whether</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>there is connection to GRCC (especially since it's being lead by an employee, but as part of her education), whether results of the research will/will not be shared with GRCC, and whether actual benefit might be expected (in terms of an improved performance system) for those who participate. The "Dear Participant" letter is potentially misleading in paragraph 3 sentence 2, which may imply that there will be a benefit in terms of an improved performance evaluation system. Overall, clarity is needed on how this research is/is not connected to GRCC and whether employees who participate have a reasonable expectation that anything might change, or not.</p> <p>The intent behind the survey is to help answer the research question and subset questions. The expectation will be that strengths and opportunities will be identified based on all data collected (including feedback from the survey) and a recommendation will be made to leadership. I am willing to modify sentence 2 in paragraph 3 of the "Dear Participant" letter to</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>language that isn't misleading. Currently it reads. "The data collected will provide useful information regarding effectiveness of the performance evaluation process and the employee's satisfaction with the feedback during the process." I can change it to read, "The feedback from this survey questionnaire will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of GRCC's current performance evaluation process. Recommendations will then be made to GRCC Human Resources Leadership."</p> <p>Thanks very much. -Bob</p> <p>10/5/12 I have no concerns about this research.</p> <p>Thanks, Lisa</p> <p>10/8/12 I have no concerns about this research and would support expedited approval. Susan</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>10/8/12 Donna - from a risk standpoint, I don't have any concerns with her proposal. Jim</p> <p>10/11/12 Good clarification from Jessica - I support this research as being exempt. Patti</p> <p>10/11/12 Thanks, Donna. I appreciate your doing that. I think it will be helpful to those responding to the survey to have it positioned clearly and accurately. This will frame the potential for benefit. I consider the research exempt. I think your conversation with Jessica is helpful to position the potential risks (minimal to none) and benefits of the proposed research. Thanks. –Bob</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

11/1/12	James Hess	Examining the Impact of Organizational and Team Dynamics on the Implementation of AQIP Team Outcomes in Community Colleges	The purpose of this exploratory study is to link both success and failure in the implementation of AQIP team outcomes in community colleges to the presence or absence of specific team and organizational dynamics.	Approve	<p>11/2 - Hi Donna: I have no concerns with the proposed research and consider it to be exempt. One must consider whether the researcher's use of the AQIP director (at each community college) to solicit participants introduces unnecessary coercion to participate. Yet the Informed Consent is quite clear that participation is voluntary and the process provides ample opportunity to opt out. The researcher has noted that the research design or methods may change as the study progresses. I am assuming that usual IRB statements will be provided to the researcher noting that any change in the research must be approved by the IRB. Thanks. --Bob</p> <p>11/2 I agree with the other team members that this is exempt.</p> <p>Thanks, Lisa</p> <p>11/2 This research seems to me to be exempt. Patti</p>
---------	------------	--	--	---------	---

					<p>11/8 I have no concerns and support expedited approval of this study.</p> <p>Susan (Sorry for the delay!)</p> <p>11/8 – Approved – Donna 11/9 - I have no concerns from a risk management standpoint. Jim P. 11/12- &gt;&gt;&gt; Debra SCHULTZ 11/12/2012 10:47 AM &gt;&gt;&gt; I concur. Deb Schultz</p>
11/20/12	Tina Hoxie	The Effects of the Mandatory Academic Standing Probation Interventions on Student Persistence at Grand Rapid Community College	<p>The purpose of this study is to explore the student variables and student perceived factors that contribute to academic probation status and student persistence by participating in the mandatory academic standing intervention at Grand Rapids Community College.</p> <p>2/7/13 Please consider this additional request from Tina.</p>	Approved	<p>11/23 – The study seems thorough and per our charge, appears exempt. Apart from that, I think it will be unlikely to see students utilize their e-mail invitation so small sample size may create some challenges. Perhaps consideration of other ways to reach out would be more valuable. I also am unfamiliar with the guidelines around privacy when asked to share/pass in a small group forum. Even if entirely</p>

		<p>She will not ask students to give any identifying information.</p> <p>As part of my Doctoral program and IRB, I would like to send out a brief 5 question survey to student employees. This can be done through the Student Employment Office in a designated Bb group. It will be a link to a survey will ask students for Student Success Communication Ideas.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are 3 words that come to mind when consider your academic success at GRCC?</li> <li>2. What advice you would give to a new student on ways to be a successful student?</li> <li>3. What support services have you found helpful to your academic success?</li> <li>4. What is the number one method you would recommend to communicate student support service reminders?</li> </ol> <p>email txt</p>	<p>acceptable, the study may have inherent resistance to disclose core issues that these learners face if they are unwilling or unable to reveal in these arranged settings.</p> <p>My 2 cents. :)</p> <p>Laurie</p> <p>11/23</p> <p>Hi Donna:</p> <p>I have no issues with the proposed research and would consider it exempt.</p> <p>My only question is: What is in Appendix A? (This was missing from the attachments.)</p> <p>While the subject that students will discuss, academic difficulties, could potentially create personal discomfort, I feel this is adequately considered and accommodated with optional participation, confidentiality, and ability to withdraw at any time. Also, most student participants will have been in academic workshop groups with similar students, which might increase</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>mail Bb Student Center</p>	<p>their comfort in discussing this matter with a small group of students in a similar situation.</p> <p>As the doctoral student researcher also holds a position of authority at GRCC, I liked it that doctoral student contact information was used and will always be referenced in contacts with participants, that a trained interviewer will be used to lead the focus groups, and that the researcher's involvement with academic workshops will be observational only. I believe these measures will appropriately position the researcher as a doctoral student, without creating undue duress or discomfort for participants.</p> <p>--Bob</p> <p>11/26 No risk concerns with this proposal. Jim</p> <p>11/26 Donna,</p> <p>As written, I <b>do not</b> think this</p>
--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--

				<p>study is exempt, nor can it receive expedited approval, because the potential exists for minors (students under age 18) to be included as participants. A simple screening question in the email invitation to participate as well as a qualifier point on the consent form could easily address this concern.</p> <p>The researcher may also want to make the following (minor) corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Although response to question 19 on the application and the participant consent form clearly describe how student identity will be protected, page 4 of the application states "Only first names will be used in the study." This statement should be clarified or stricken.</li><li>• There is a typo on Attachment C: "You have been identified as a potential participant</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>in this study, as you have participated in the mandatory academic success workshop and have successfully <b>persistent (persisted)</b> at GRCC following an academic probation period."</p> <p>best, Susan</p> <p>11/28 Hi Donna,</p> <p>I have no concerns about this research and think it should be approved.</p> <p>Lisa</p> <p>2/7 This seems ok to me. Patti</p> <p>2/7 I understand this as an addition to Tina Hoxie's previously approved research proposal. As I understand the description below, the survey responses will</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---



					<p>be anonymous and will not be connected to individual names, because responses will be collected via a survey tool. Assuming all that's correct, I would consider this exempt and see no problems with this proposed addition. --Bob Leunk</p> <p>2/7 You are correct. Thanks, Bob.</p> <p>2/7 This looks fine to me as well. Tina</p> <p>2/8 I agree with Robert. Debra</p>
Ann Alexander	1/22/13	Differences between full-time and adjunct (part-time) community college faculty in the relationships among student evaluations, course completion, and teaching practice	The purpose of this study is to compare the instruction of both adjunct and full-time faculty, as measured by student evaluations, successful course completion, and teaching practice; and to compare the relationships between student evaluations and successful course completion, student evaluations and teaching practice, and successful course completion and teaching	Withdrawn	<p>1/24/13</p> <p>Hi Donna: I have the following comments/questions on the research proposal from Ann Alexander.</p> <p>1) Under item 19, confidentiality and anonymity methods, it is clearly stated that individually identifiable results will not be reported. Yet data files provided by IRP as part of this research will provide student evaluation scores for individual faculty</p>

			practice, for adjunct and full-time faculty		members, and these may be associated with individually identifiable information (e.g., name of faculty member or course number of a single section course). What methods will be used to maintain security and confidentiality of the research files used in this study? 2) Under item 21, the e-mail notification of survey availability, it states that "Your participation in this study indicates that you have given informed consent." This statement is found under the "Risks and Discomforts" heading and seems out of place there. I would strongly suggest this statement is better placed closer to the end of the message, under the "Voluntary Participation" heading. In this case, participants will be more fully informed when they encounter this statement, i.e., they will have been informed about the benefits and their overall voluntary participation in the study. I do believe that, having read this statement at the end of the message, a
--	--	--	---	--	---

				<p>participant who voluntarily clicks to enter the survey is providing sufficient indication of their willingness to opt-in to participate in the research .</p> <p>3) Please clarify this statement under item 21</p> <p>Benefits/Results: You will receive no remuneration for my participation, .....</p> <p>[Should that not read: You will receive no remuneration for your participation....?]</p> <p>4) Please clarify sentence 2 under item 21 Voluntary Participation: You may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss to which you are otherwise entitled if you had completed your participation in the research.</p> <p>I don't understand what this means. [What penalty or loss is the participant otherwise entitled to? ]</p> <p>Bob</p> <p>1/25/13</p> <p>Hi Donna,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>The only comment I have about this research is that it seems that (although perhaps very minimal), a risk might be the reduced use of adjuncts in general if the study revealed their teaching practices to be less effective at producing student success. Not sure if this would be worth mentioning under the risk category?</p> <p>Thanks, Lisa</p> <p>1/25/13</p> <p>Hi Donna: Lisa raises an interesting point! Might it also be possible that, if no difference is found between full-time and part-time instructors, that GRCC might choose to hire only part-time faculty moving forward?? Will results of this study be shared with GRCC administration? Will results be published in a journal? If so, perhaps a generic statement would be sufficient</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>about results of the research study potentially influencing views on the relative effectiveness of full-time &amp; part-time community college faculty. --Bob Leunk</p> <p>1/28/13</p> <p>Donna (and others),</p> <p>This study does not make sense to me. How can the identity of faculty members remain confidential and how can the analysis only be done at the "course and department level" when the survey only gathers instructor-level data and does not gather course-specific data...?</p> <p>I do not recommend approval</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>of this study.</p> <p>Susan</p> <p>1/29/13</p> <p>Hi All:</p> <p>At the same time I sent Ann's request to you all, I had Denyse in my office take a look as well. I was concerned that we might not have the ability to provide Ann the data she was requesting. Denyse confirmed yesterday that the information from student evaluations is stored in a single file record for each individual. The data record does not include part time/full time status of the instructor. It is also not possible to aggregate these records together within a department or across multiple semesters. The individual data record system was set up at the original request of JEET.</p> <p>I let Ann know this morning that we would not be able to provide the data she was requesting in the application. She plans to resubmit her application at a later date to include a different data request.</p> <p>THANKS</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Donna
Eden Dahlstrom	1/29/13	ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Technology, 2012 Research Prospectus	The 2012 student study explores technology ownership, use patterns and perceptions of technology among undergraduate student's.	Approved	1/29/13  >>> Donna Kragt 1/28/2013 3:18 PM >>> Hi GRCC IRB: This IRB request is a little different since this is a project we have participated with in the past successfully. However, they are now required to go back and get IRB approval as per Federal law. Basically, we draw a random sample of 30% of our students taking on-line courses and send them the link to the ECAR survey regarding on-line instruction. Its the same methodology used in the past. Eric Kunnen has found the results of the study very useful as we plan improvements to our on line offerings. Attached is the research prospectus. I would like to be able to send them a letter approving that we continue our participation in their project. Is that okay?

				<p>THANKS</p> <p>ECAR suggests the research as exempt as follows:</p> <p>IRB Exemption Option</p> <p>If your institution opts out of the ECAR incentive program (awarding \$50 or \$100 Amazon.com gift cards to randomly selected survey participants), we advise you to apply for an IRB Exemption because this research poses no more than minimal risk to subjects and all student responses will be anonymous. Per Title 45, §46.101(b)(2) "Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects..." is eligible for exemption from full IRB review. Regarding the anonymity of data, though some demographic data will be collected from students, it is highly unlikely that the researchers will be able extrapolate an individual</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>subject's responses by reviewing strings of unitary-level data. Furthermore, the nature of the data collected for this study are benign, with the data collected being limited to students' opinions about—and self-reported behavior with—technology in the academic environment.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Laurie Foster 1/28/2013 3:28 PM &gt;&gt;&gt; I too have found the student feedback so valuable! A renewed approval seems perfectly fitting. Laurie</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Lisa Dopke 1/28/2013 3:44 PM &gt;&gt;&gt; I agree -- I think this all looks fine.  Lisa</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Patti Trepkowski 1/28/2013 7:37 PM &gt;&gt;&gt; I agree that we should approve this.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>HI Lakenya With my approved this makes 5 yes votes. Donna</p> <p>1/29/13</p> <p>Donna - I agree that approval of our continued participation be granted. Thanks, Jim P.</p> <p>1/30/13</p> <p>I also approve of this study. Deb Schultz</p>
Jennifer Batten	4/9/13	Measuring the impact of a Forensic Science Chemistry Summer Camp on high school student's understanding of forensic science and instrumentation use	This proposal is part of a larger study at GRCC, funded by the National Science Foundation-Division of Undergraduate Education. IRB approval has been granted for this project [Batten2012 – exempt], as required by the NSF. The overall goals of this project include increased student knowledge of gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) by adding hands-on laboratory	Approved	<p>4/10/13</p> <p>This is a well-drafted IRB application. I have no concerns about the research and recommend it for expedited approval. Susan</p> <p>4/10/13</p> <p>I have no concerns with the research and recommend</p>

			<p>experiences to chemistry courses and independent study projects at Grand Rapids Community College, development of GC-MS expertise for community college and high school faculty, and to provide instrumentation experiences for high school students. Data will be collected from assorted stakeholders (undergraduate students enrolled in classes and in independent studies, community college faculty, high school teachers, and high school students). The overarching research questions are: (1) how to best increase community college and high school student content knowledge and interest in GC-MS via course or summer camp delivery and (2) how to best develop community college faculty and high school teacher content knowledge and interest in GC-MS and its applications via summer camp and professional development opportunities</p>	<p>approval. Deb Schultz</p> <p>4/11/13</p> <p>Hi Donna: I have no concerns with the proposed research. -- Bob Leunk</p> <p>4/11/13</p> <p>I see no problems with this - great example of qualitative learning outcomes assessment! Patti</p> <p>4/15/13</p> <p>Sorry Donna, I accidentally deleted this one. I see no issues from a risk standpoint.</p> <p>4/15/13</p> <p>I have no concerns with this one.</p> <p>4/15/13</p> <p>Exempt status. No risk to students and a very intriguing study from a personal vested</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>interest!</p> <p>4/15/13</p> <p>I think this makes a majority! Can you prepare a letter for Jennifer?</p>
Ann Alexander	4/11/13	Differences between full-time and adjunct (part-time) community college faculty in the relationships between course completion and teaching practice	The purpose of this study is to compare the instruction of both adjunct and full-time faculty, as measured by successful course completion and teaching practice; and to compare the relationships between successful course completion and teaching practice, for adjunct and full-time faculty.	Approved 4/30	<p>4/18/13</p> <p>Hi Donna: I have 2 comments on the resubmitted IRB application from Ann Alexander. It appears in the IRB application that, for Item 10 about risk, the "Yes" box is checked. (This might be related to misalignment of the checkboxes and questions.) Yet in item 18, it states that respondents will not be exposed to any stress, etc. This should be clarified. In the IRB application Item 12, it states this is a revised submission. Yet it appears the "New" box is checked for this item. This should be clarified. Thanks. --Bob Leunk</p> <p>4/25/13</p> <p>I agree with other IRB panel</p>

				<p>members that sufficient protection for the anonymity of faculty and adjunct faculty has not yet been demonstrated. Without this assurance, this research could cause social and economic harm to participants. Susan</p> <p>4/26/13</p> <p>Hi Donna: Thanks for those clarifications. I have no further questions about Ann's proposal and I would concur that it is exempt. Thanks. -- Bob</p> <p>4/25/13</p> <p>Yes. :)</p> <p>Lisa</p> <p>Unless I missed something, I think it reads as acceptable. Deb</p> <p>4/29</p> <p>Donna - Ok from me. No RM concerns. Jim P.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Caroline Peltz	4/21/13	Mentoring as it Relates to Persistence in Associate Degree Nursing Students	The purpose of this study is to provide useful information for nursing educators about mentoring as it relates to associate degree nursing students. Mentoring is relationship that teaches an individual or allows him or her to grow. Mentoring is a nurturing process in which a more skilled or experienced person, serving as a role model, teaches, sponsors, encourages, counsels and assists a less skilled or less experienced person for the purpose of promoting personal and professional development.	Approved 4/30	<p>4/25/13</p> <p>I have no concerns about this research. Thanks, Lisa</p> <p>4/26/13</p> <p>Hi Donna: I have a couple questions about the research proposal submitted by Caroline Peltz:</p> <p>1) The proposed sample size is 220 individuals. How many schools or nursing programs will be asked to participate in this survey? How will the schools/programs be referred to in any written summaries/publications/presentations of this work? Will they be referred to by name?</p> <p>2) Is it possible to click (or proceed) into the survey without</p>

				<p>ticking the "I agree..." or "I do not agree...." boxes at the end of the informed consent? Thanks. --Bob Leunk</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Patti Trepkowski 4/26/2013 12:58 PM &gt;&gt;&gt; I support approving this project. ( Thanks for resending the documents, Donna.) Patti</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Debra SCHULTZ 4/28/2013 3:08 PM &gt;&gt;&gt; I approve of this project. Deb S</p> <p>4/29/13</p> <p>Donna,</p> <p>I have no concerns with regard to this study and agree with others that it qualifies for expedited IRB approval. Susan</p> <p>4/26/13 Hi Donna: I am comfortable with the confidentiality and anonymity provisions of this study. I</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>agree that the risk is minimal. I'm fine with the responses to the questions. I would consider this research proposal to be exempt. --Bob</p> <p>4/29</p> <p>Sorry -- I thought I had replied. I have no concerns about this research. Thanks, Lisa 4/29</p> <p>Donna,</p> <p>I have no concerns with regard to this study and agree with others that it qualifies for expedited IRB approval. Susan</p>
--	--	--	--	---