

Jacksonville State University

Institutional Review Board

2005 Annual Report

I. General Information

a. Name. The name of this committee is Jacksonville State University Institutional Review Board (IRB).

b. Purpose and Scope. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) is a committee that reviews all JSU research involving human participants and is responsible to the President. The purpose of the IRB is to assure that research is conducted in an ethical manner, specifically in accordance with Department of Health and Human Services regulations (45 CFR 46 Protection of Human Subjects). This includes ensuring that risks to participants are minimized, the selection of participants, is equitable and participants are informed fully of what their participation will entail.

The policy on the use of human subjects in research applies to any activity deemed to be research at Jacksonville State University. The applicability of this policy is to all entities of the university: faculty, administration, staff, students and contracted consultants. This policy applies to any research activity using human subjects that is directly or indirectly supported by the university.

The full text of JSU's "Policy on Use of Human Subjects in Research" is available on the Academic Affairs web site at <http://www.jsu.edu/depart/avpasa/humansubjects.html> and is reviewed and updated annually.

c. Membership. For 2004-2005, the committee consisted of the following membership:

Dr. Joe Delap, Secretary (Ex Officio)  
Dr. Joann Williams, Chair  
Dr. Jennifer Gross  
Dr. Bob Hymer  
Dr. Martha Merrill  
Dr. Michael Clayton  
Dr. Kay Williams  
Dr. Laura Weinkauff

d. Records. Committee Records are maintained by the Secretary and housed in the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, 201 Bibb Graves Hall.

II. Activities and Significant Accomplishments

a. Applications. The IRB reviewed 40 research proposals during the academic year 2004-2005 (as of date of report submission). Of these, 33 were exempt, 3 were expedited and 4 were fully reviewed. Minutes of fully reviewed applications are included in III.a. The names of all applicants and projects are attached in III.b. All applications were eventually approved.

b. FWA. In November of 2003, with the generous support of the President's Office and others, JSU applied for and was awarded the FWA. The Office of the AVPAA continues to sustain the university's FWA through careful record keeping and reporting.

### III. Appendix

#### a. Minutes of IRB Meetings 2004-2005

**Institutional Review Board (IRB) meetings** (Meetings were conducted by electronic mail).

#### **Meeting of 10/01/4, Renewal of Anniston Health Registry**

This request is for the continuation of the approved IRB protocol (January 9, 2004) for the Anniston Health Registry. Currently there are over 2,100 individuals enrolled in the registry with more participants joining the registry weekly. Due to the litigious environment in the Anniston community, the registry process has required more time for adequate participation than originally anticipated. In order to keep the study on track, a continuation of the registry is requested thru (sic) December 31, 2004.

There are no changes to the registry process, other than those indicated in the February 2004 approved revision.

IRB Member responses follow.

Based on the report, a continuation is fine with me. Laura Weinkauff

No problem here. Joann Williams

Approve Continuation. Michael Clayton

I've looked over the information you included. It looks fine to me. It appears they went through a more intensive process with us previously (Feb 2004) and are simply asking for more time. Jennifer Gross

I favor a continuation of the Anniston Health Registry project. Robert Hymer

It is fine with me. Kay Williams

The application was approved and signed by the IRB Chair.

#### **Meeting of 2/24/05, For Your Life!**

I assume that the reason that the IRB needs to review this application is that a JSU professor is listed as one of the investigators. However, after reading the material I am not sure just how the JSU involvement will be implemented. Nevertheless, I see no reason why the board should not approve the application. I vote favorably. Robert Hymer

Has parental consent form  
Appears to be a very beneficial research project  
Contains a very detailed survey instrument  
Principal investigator has a long history of funded grants  
Grant has already been funded  
I have no concerns about the research project. Martha Merrill

Questions from Joann Williams and PI responses:

Question: The last sentence on page 2 of the informed consent states that JSU IRB board will have access to the unique identifier and records. Does JSU IRB need this access?

Response: JSU's IRB does not necessarily "need" access to the unique identifier and records. However, as the IRB official, you would have access to the identifier and records should you desire to inspect the records for any reason. Because you would have access, the participant must know that you have the access.

Question: End of the first paragraph on page 3 of the informed consent states that the surveys will be kept in a locked office, etc. For how long? Once they are no longer needed how will they be disposed of?

Response: There are federal records retention requirements and we (WAF) have records retention policies as a non-profit.

Federal grant requirements: The project period is three years. Federal grants require retention of all grant-related documents for 3 years after the submission of the final financial report.

Agency-specific records retention requirements: Direct Charges to Contracts and Grants: Financial records, supporting documents, statistical records and all records pertinent to a contract or grant's activity must be retained for at least seven years, unless a litigation claim or audit is started before the expiration of this period. In these cases, records need to be retained until seven years after all litigation, claims or audit findings are resolved. All Other Business Transaction Records Not Included in Contracts, Grants or the Indirect Cost Rate: Records must be retained for six years following the end of the fiscal year.

To meet both the federal and agency-specific requirements: All records will be maintained for seven (7) years following the end of the fiscal year, including all records pertaining to the For Your Life! project. Records are disposed of by shredding and trashing/recycling.

Question: Under significant new findings on page 3 of the informed consent, what might constitute a "significant" finding and how will the individuals be notified?

Response: "Significant findings" would include information gained by any member of the research team that may benefit the study participant. For example, any "new" information about diabetes self-

management, and/or any “new” information about healthy eating for diabetics, etc. would be provided to the participants. Since this study does not involve a clinical trial or treatment, “significant findings” does not include medication or any treatment device.

Question: On page 4 of the informed consent, it states that you may contact the Chair of the JSU IRB. Is this required because of the funding received?

Response: The “Questions” section has been modified to read, “If you have any questions about the research or a research related injury, Charity M. Richey-Bentley will be glad to answer them. Ms. Richey-Bentley’s number is (256)-238-9925. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Principal Investigators listed on page 1 of the Informed Consent form.”

Question: I am confused about who will be involved in this study. The signature form discusses children under age 7 yet the questionnaire only asks if the child is 9 or older. If there are no children under the age of 7 to be involved in this study, the following question is not applicable to this study. If they enroll a child in this study who is under 7, how will they verify they have an existing child assent once they reach age 7? Note: They will need to know exact birth date and follow-up and that is not indicated in this study.

Response: Following additional meetings among the Principal Investigators and project staff, the team has decided to enroll participants who are twelve (12) or older. The Informed Consent form and the For Your Life Community Survey have been modified to reflect this change.

Page 6 of the Informed Consent form is for instructional purposes only. Because enrollment of children is such a complex component of research, the PIs want this information accessible to every survey administrator at all times. This verbiage has been changed to reflect enrollment of persons twelve (12) or older.

No person under 12 years old will be included in the study.

Question: I do not like the statement regarding "how will my health information be protected once it is give to others?" This statement is found on page 8 of the informed consent. To me, this statement negates ALL other statements regarding protection of privacy and confidentiality. In short, they study administrators are saying that they cannot protect their data. I would never release data information that would identify the individual or the company. Additionally, who are these parties that they would share this information with?

Response: This verbiage on page 8 was not originally included to release any project team member from accountability or their responsibility to protect participants’ confidentiality. Instead, the verbiage is used in order to comply with the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Public Welfare, Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, Office for Protection from Research Risks, Part 46 – Protection of Human Subjects. Page 8 is not meant to imply that the IRB or study administrators will be releasing any health information, but to comply with the federal regulations, the participants must be told that we can give the sponsor data, but we cannot regulate the sponsor’s release of the data. Page 8 has been modified and does not include the JSU IRB as a point of contact for

questions, or as an entity who will use or disclose the information, or as the reference entity for cancellation of the authorization.

The two modified sections now read as: Who will disclose, use and/or receive my health information? The physicians, project team members and staff working on the research protocol, and the sponsor of the research and its employees.

Can I cancel the Authorization? You may cancel this Authorization at any time by notifying the Principal Investigator(s) in writing, and referencing the Research Protocol and IRB Protocol Number. If you cancel this Authorization, the study doctor and staff will not use any new health information for research. However, researchers may continue to use the health information that was provided before you cancelled your authorization.

Question: On this same page, there is a statement about canceling authorization. Why is JSU IRB so heavily involved in this study (see earlier notes)? Is this a function of the grant supporting this application? If not, why are the study administrators diminishing their level of accountability regarding the protection of subjects' rights?

Response: Please see above.

Question: My final comment deals with the unique identifier. This method opens itself up to duplication of identifier information. How will they prevent this duplication?

Response: Duplication of identifier information will be prevented by use of a computer generated algorithm. Each unique identifier will be entered into a database. A batch file will "pull" each record's identifier and check it against all other identifiers for duplication. If duplication is found, the record entered last will be modified to become a unique identifier. This procedure will be run each time records are entered.

There was also a question of why the study would be exempt from HIPAA, as this is a federal mandated privacy law regarding medical data. Researchers who collect medical data are NOT except from this law. Yet, the statement regarding "how my health information will be protected" on page 8 of the consent form basically states that they are except form this law. Could you please explain this discrepancy?

Response: None of the study researchers are exempt from HIPAA. However, we must tell the participant that we release the data/information to the study sponsor and we cannot regulate their (sponsor's) use/release of the data/information.

Questions from Jennifer Gross/ Kay Williams and PI responses:

Question: Page 3 of the description section of the application says that participants will receive up to \$10 in value for participating in the study. It then says you receive a free T-shirt. Does this mean the T-shirt is worth \$10. I think this may be a little deceptive for the potential participant. Someone might expect to receive \$10 and then get just a T-shirt instead. This might make them less likely to honestly participate.

Response: This section has been revised to read:

“You will receive a free tee-shirt for participation in this study. Participation in this study includes: 1) Completing a For Your Life! Community Health Survey; 2) Getting screened for diabetes; and 3) Getting screened for obesity/overweight. Should you withdraw from the study following completion of the initial Community Health Survey, you will still receive the free project tee-shirt”.

Question: I'm also curious about the referrals. The application says the participants will be referred to someone if they have diabetes, etc., but I couldn't find anything about how doctors would be selected. Did I overlook it? Or is it unimportant for our purposes of review? Jennifer

Response: Because referrals can only be made by physicians, the health educators will not be making referrals. Instead, the health educators will be providing a list of existing healthcare providers who provide care specific to diabetes and/or obesity/overweight.

The statement in the Informed Consent form that made reference to referrals (Page 1) has been modified to read, “The For Your Life! project integrates community-based educational screening and outreach activities and includes linkage information for access and treatment to minorities in high-risk, low-income communities.”

Here are the final two concerns from the committee, as presented by Joann Williams:

1) The members seem to feel that, for the greater protection of the participants, the IRB should waive its access to the unique identifiers and records.

Response from the PI: That is fine. I have revised the Informed Consent form to reflect that JSU IRB is waiving its access to the unique identifiers and records. Please take a look at the “Confidentiality” section on Page 2 (continuing onto page 3) of the attached revised Informed Consent form which reflects this change (JSU IRB removed). Is this OK...I can also leave the statement in, but indicate that you are waiving your access. I thought it may be best for the participant if it isn't in at all. And

2) There is also lingering concern about the study being exempt from HIPAA regulations. Could you explain in a couple of sentences why this is allowed to be so? We are not aware of any study that involves patients' medical details being exempt.

Response from the PI: The study is not exempt from HIPAA. I have changed the “\*How will my health information be protected once it is given to others?” to read:

“Institutional policies and federal privacy laws require that private information about you be protected. This is especially true of your personal health information. Your health information that is given to the study sponsor will remain private to the extent possible by law. The project team will release data only by the unique identifier.”

Please see the attached \*\_revised\_\* Informed Consent form that reflects this change.

The application was approved and signed by the IRB Chair.

**Meeting of 6/12/05, Healthy B.O.N.E.S.**

I've looked at the proposal for Healthy B.O.N.E.S. and don't see a problem with it. Laura Weinkauf

I vote favorably on the Healthy B.O.N.E.S. application. Robert Hymer

I think the proposal is fine. This study does not impose any harm. Kay Williams

I have three recommendations: 1. Simplify medical jargon in consent form 2. Add a summary statement of the results that interprets the results for the parents. 3. Supply the families with information stating the data will be stored in the CNHS in a secured area until the children have reached 18 years of age and will be destroyed 12 months following that date. I see no harm in this study-could have embarrassment/self-image impacting issues that were not addressed. Kay Williams

In reference to a question from Joann Williams regarding collection of data on children, the graduate nursing students plan to collect the data. The response that I received from my inquiry is as follows:

Per Shari Payne (co-PI):

"We were planning on performing the measurements. We were trying to avoid placing additional requirements on the school staff, thinking that the school would be more likely to accept our program. This is my opinion, but after talking with different teachers I do not know if they would be willing to obtain the data. A common theme among teachers has been limited time and extra requirements placed on them."

Please let me know if additional information is needed. I appreciate your assistance. Thanks!  
Beth Hembree (PI)

The application was approved and signed by the IRB Chair.

### **Meeting of 7/1/05, Treatment of an In-Residence Adjudicated Juvenile Male Population**

The latest IRB review request looked ok to me. Laura Weinkauf

I have a question that stems from my lack of experience with this particular type of research. Namely, would it be advisable to have additional supervision of the study by a medical doctor? Further, inasmuch as the proposal indicates that the research will involve the application of cranial stimulation to juvenile residents of the Coosa Valley Youth Services, it would seem that the following regulations in the "Code of Federal Regulations: Title 45" would be among those that MIGHT apply:

Subpart C - Additional DHHS Protections Pertaining to Biomedical and Behavioral Research Involving Prisoners as Subjects.

Subpart D - Additional DHHS Protections for Children Involved as Subjects in Research.

Assuming that the above question is resolved and the regulations are met (or do not apply) I have no objection to the approval of the study. Robert Hymer

I have reviewed the new application and have researched the CES. It is a low level of electrical stimulation and is similar to a device patients wear for pain called a TENS unit. The application is not the best job I have ever seen (review of literature summarized instead of attaching abstracts for us to read) and the consent form needs work. I have suggestions for her:

Title the consent form as such-----Consent Form

Have an introductory paragraph that explains what you are asking them to consent to:

This form is a consent form stating that I agree to be a voluntary participant in a research study entitled: The Treatment of an In-Residence Adjudicated Male Population Using Alpha Stimulation by Margo Saltz. The purpose of the study is to determine if the use of Alpha Stimulation can help reduce anxiety, improve your behavior and interpersonal relationships.....

As a participant, you will complete a few questionnaires about your anxiety level and receive 12 (20-minute) sessions of cranial electrical stimulation (CES). This is done by wearing two electrodes on your earlobes and a .....sensation will be felt. The electrical current is very low (8-12 Hz). This current will stimulate your brain's natural electrical currents alpha waves. These alpha waves regulate..... Therefore, the previous research has shown this to be an effective therapy in reducing anxiety and controlling behavior.

As with anything, side effects could occur. Previous studies indicated the occurrence of side effects as rare. Side effects from CES are: headache, dizziness, nausea, sleeplessness, and flu-like symptoms. If you have a history of migraines, seizures, fainting spells, insomnia (sleeplessness) or take medication for high blood pressure, we need to discuss your increased risk of side effects. If any symptoms or side effects occur during or following a session, please notify Ms. Margo Saltz, Dr. Ron Mellen, or the Coosa Valley Youth Authority nurse. An evaluation will be made and treatment provided through the nurse. Example: Acetamenophen (Tylenol) may be given for the headache.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. My residency at the Coosa Valley Youth Authority will not be affected by my participation or refusal. I will continue to receive the standard rehabilitation services offered here. However, my participation good produce added benefits in reducing anxiety and improving my behavior and interpersonal relationship skills.

Because the side effects can occur 3-weeks following the last treatment, I want a follow-up plan at that point to be sure no side effects have occurred.

The data need to stored on the JSU campus until 1-year following the youngest participants 18th birthday for liability reasons.

The nurse needs to be notified of the treatments each time and aware that a medical need could occur.

Otherwise, I believe the risk is now acceptable. Kay Williams

I have worked my way through the material that Ms. Saltz forwarded to the committee.

I believe that Ms. Saltz has done an good job of explaining the Alpha Stimulation and general procedure. I like the new consent form but I still have concerns.

1. 15-17 year olds according to Human subject regulations are minors and parental or legal guardian consent is necessary. Therefore, I would like to see a more detail consent form for these individuals. Specifically, what exactly is the information that they will be reading? In other words, we need a type copy of the information that they will read or have read to them regarding this procedure.
2. While the subject consent form states they can withdraw, I do not see any clear procedures regarding how they will go about it.
3. Ms. Saltz explains that she has access to two knowledgeable individuals regarding medical treatment (Father and Brother). Yet these individuals will not be present during treatment. We need a clear understanding of procedures that will occur due to side affect. for example, will this individual be monitored during treatment or are they in a room alone. (The individual needs to be monitored). While she has stated who has assistance with medical concerns, the procedures are not clear.
4. In this proposal, Ms. Saltz has now informed us that she will have access to medical records. She has also informed us that she will not longer be using the Beck Instrument. What data does she plan to collect? I am not sure because items have changed as she addresses our concerns.

At this time, I believe that Ms. Saltz has address most if not all of the concerns. Yet, this is difficult to determine because of the volume of information and the format that it has been delivered to us.

My best advice to Ms. Saltz is for her to step back from this proposal and submit a "BRAND NEW" proposal incorporating everything she has learned from this process and addressing the various issues that were raised in a single cohesive format. This format will follow the basic format that I e-mail in April. This format includes a comprehensive procedure section from subject selection to data collection and debriefing with attachments that provide the description of the Instrument, letter from Dr. Chargois consent letters and forms, data collection instruments, etc. This proposal will not include all of the articles and internet pages. Ms. Saltz needs to provide a review of this material in the proposal.

This new proposal will serve several purposes. Primarily it will provide us with a clear comprehensive document for the board to review as well as for our files.

Again, I believe that she has addressed everything through her multiple submissions but we need a single cohesive proposal to verify this. Joann Williams

The application was approved and signed by the IRB Chair.

b. IRB Application Report 2004-2005

FACULTY NAME	DEPT.	TITLE OF PROJECT	NEW	RENEW	DATE REC'D.	ACTION REQUESTED	APPROVED
Harper, Cynthia	CEDP	Highly Qualified Teacher Status and Collaborative Efforts Among Early Childhood and Special Education	X		09/10/04	Exempt	Exempt 09/10/04
Simpson, Cathy	PSY	Program Evaluation of Targeted Capacity Expansion for HIV	X		09/15/04	Expedited Review	Expedited Review 9/15/4
Brown, Kasey	Math	Relationship between lunar cycle and number of births	X		10/1/4	Exempt	Exempt 10/1/4
Cash Jane	NUR	Anniston Health Registry		X	10/01/4	Full Board Review	Approved 10/1/4
Archuleta, Frances	PSY	The Use of the Performance Diagnostic Checklist to Guide Intervention Selection in an Independently Owned Restaurant	X		10/4/4	Exempt	Exempt 10/4/4
Borstorff, Patricia	MGT/M KT	M-Commerce: Perceptions of a World minus Wires and Tethers	X		10/19/04	Exempt	Exempt 10/19/04
Baucom, Thomas	PHES	JSU Geographic Student Market Area Study	X		10/21/04	Exempt	Exempt 10/21/04
Evans, Robert	CJ	A study of the personality profiles of Criminal Justice Students	X		10/26/04	Expedited Review	Exempt 10/26/04
Thomas, James	MGT/M KT	Making a Case for Calhoun County	X		01/04/05	Exempt	Exempt 01/04/05
Thomas, James	MGT/M KT	Employability Skills: JSU Students' Perceptions	X		01/05/05	Exempt	Exempt 01/05/05

FACULTY NAME	DEPT.	TITLE OF PROJECT	NEW	RENEW	DATE REC'D.	ACTION REQUESTED	APPROVED
Charnigo, Laurie	LIB	From Bibliographic Instruction to Finished Paper: Tracking Education Students' Awareness & Use of Information Services	X		01/14/05	Expedited Review	Exempt 1/14/05
Davis, Karen	Human Res.	Employee Assistance Program	X		01/24/05	Exempt	Exempt 01/24/05
Bryson, Jeff	PSY	New Methods for Teaching Dreaming	X		02/04/05	Exempt	Exempt 02/04/05
Shelton, Christie	PCB	Anniston-Calhoun PCB Study	X		2/7/5	Exempt Review by UA	Exempt 2/7/05
Newton, Maureen	SYSW	Juvenile Diversion Progrma Evaluation-Calhoun County, AL	X		2/9/5	Exempt	Exempt 2/9/5
Borstorff, Pat	Mgt, Mkt	Applicants' Perceptions of Mandatory Arbitration	X		2/22/5	Exempt	Exempt 2/22/5
Fielding, Bill	CCBA	JSU Economic Impact Analysis	X		2/22/5	Exempt	Exempt 2/22/5
Richey-Bentley, Charity	West Anniston Foundation	For Your Life! (Community Programs to Improve Minority Health	X		2/24/05	Full Review Board	Approved 2/24/05
Harbor, Kingsley	COM	Persistence Subcommittee's Teaching-Hour Survey	X		2/28/5	Exempt	Exempt 2/28/5
Thomas, James	MGT/MKT	Determining How JSU Rates Relative to Our Immediate Competition	X		2/28/5	Exempt	Exempt 2/28/5
Skaggs, Bethany	LIB	LibQUAL+	X		3/16/5	Exempt	Exempt 3/16/5

FACULTY NAME	DEPT.	TITLE OF PROJECT	NEW	RENEW	DATE REC'D.	ACTION REQUESTED	APPROVED
Ellis, Paula Barnett	LIB	Houston Cole Library Nursing Student Usage Study	X		3/18/05	Exempt	Exempt 3/18/5
Schneider, Terry	UPD	JSU Substance Abuse Committee Resource Survey	X		3/29/05	Exempt	Exempt 3/31/05
Harbor, Kingsley	COM	New vs. Traditional Media: Students Perceptions of Both	X		3/31/5	Exempt	Exempt 3/31/5
Casey, Linda	SEC	Academic or Recreational: What are Middle School Students Reading	X		5/25/5	Expedited Review	Expedited Review 5/25/5
Roberts, Michael	SEC	Reading Attitudes of Fourth-Grade Students Taught Using Direct Instruction	X		5/25/5	Expedited Review	Expedited Review 5/25/5
Poe, Jodi	LIB	How the JSU Nursing Program Utilizes Electronic Reserves	X		5/25/5	Exempt	Exempt 5/26/5
Poe, Jodi	LIB	A Comparison of an Online and a CD-ROM Library Tutorial	X		6/22/5	Exempt	Exempt 6/22/5
Restauri, Sherri	DE	Gender as a Factor in Online Education: Is Self-Selection a Determining Factor in Enrollment and Successful Student Outcomes	X		7/5/5	Exempt	Exempt 7/5/5
Killingsworth, Don	AA	The Effects of Orientation on Retention When Students and Parents Attend a Regional Institution's Orientation	X		7/13/5	Exempt	Exempt 7/13/5
Gulledge, Elizabeth	NU	Education Pertaining to Mental Health and Substance Abuse in Middle School Population	X		7/13/5	Exempt	Exempt 7/13/5

FACULTY NAME	DEPT.	TITLE OF PROJECT	NEW	RENEW	DATE REC'D.	ACTION REQUESTED	APPROVED
Restauri, Sherri	Dist Ed.	Faculty-Student Interaction Components in Online Education	X		7/13/5	Exempt	Exempt 7/13/5
Turner, Rebecca	VPASA	Are Doctoral Progrmas in Social Work Preparing Undergraduate Social Work Educators.	X		8/9/5	Exempt	Exempt 8/9/5
Payne, Shari	NU	Healthy B.O.N.E.S. (Building on Nutrition and Exercise in Schools)	X		6/12/5	Full Review	Approved 8/29/5
Saltz, Margo	CJ	The Treatment of an In-Residence Adjudicated Juvenile Male Population	X		7/1/5	Full Review	Approved 8/29/5
Thomas, James	MGT/MKT	Skills Required of Recent College Graduates by Employers	X		8/31/5	Exempt	Exempt 8/31/5
Thomas, James	MGT/MKT	Very Light Jets: Impact on the Air Travel Equation	X		9/7/5	Exempt	Exempt Review 9/7/5
Simmons, Alicia	Inst. Research	Jacksonville State University Core Value Survey	X		9/16/5	Exempt	Exempt Review 9/16/5
Barnett-Ellis, Paula	LIB	Nursing Student Library Research Survey & Pre-test	X		9/16/5	Exempt	Exempt Review 9/16/5
Barnett-Ellis, Paula	LIB	Nursing Student Library Research Survey & Post Test	X		9/23/5	Exempt	Exempt Review 9/23/5

Submitted 1 July 2005 by Joe Delap, Executive Secretary, JSU IRB