

Faculty Senate  
McCormick Room, Collins Library  
Minutes of the August 28, 2017 meeting

**Present:**

Kena Fox-Dobbs, Pierre Ly, Tiffany MacBain, Jung Kim, Sarah Walling-Bell, Rachael Laitila, Kris Bartanen, Lynda Livingston, Gwynne Brown, Robin Jacobson, Peter Wimberger, Kristin Johnson, Sunil Kukreja, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Paula Wilson, Alisa Kessel

**Guests:** George Tomlin

**1. The meeting was called to order at 12:00pm**

**2. No announcements**

**3. Confirmation of Vice Chair and Secretary of the Senate**

At the May 8, 2017 meeting the Senate voted on temporary positions for Senate Vice Chair and Secretary. M/S/P to confirm Gwynne Brown as Vice Chair, and Pierre Ly as Secretary.

**4. M/S/P to approve the minutes of May 8, 2017**

During discussion Kessel reiterated that all senators need to read/review the minutes from the previous meeting once they are posted, and use track changes to make edits.

**5. No updates from ASUPS or Staff Senate**

**6. Discussion of charges to standing committees for 2017-18 (LMIS, ASC, and IRB)**

***LMIS***

One charge was approved for the committee:

*In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the LMIS Committee to work with Institutional Research and Technology Services to identify which of the existing data use policies concerning the appropriate use of institutional data on campus are most relevant to faculty, and develop and distribute informational resources to help faculty understand and comply with these policies.*

The LMIS is encouraged to provide the Senate with a report from their review of the library collection this year (as part of their standing charges). Fox-Dobbs will communicate this request at the first meeting of the LMIS.

***ASC***

No charges were given to the committee.

Committee work related to the transfer of AP and Running Start credits was mentioned in the ASC end of the year report, and Wilson and Beardsley feel that this work fits into the standing charges. Wilson agreed to highlight this at the first meeting, and will determine if a separate charge is needed.

## ***IRB***

Three charges were approved for the committee:

1. *In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the IRB Committee to identify appropriate modules from CITI for training of faculty.*

This charge was approved with no discussion.

2. *In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the IRB Committee to develop a policy for the uniform assessment of international research conducted by Puget Sound faculty/students/staff.*

This charge was approved with some discussion.

3. *In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the IRB Committee to review the Common Rule in our policies to see where our policies are more stringent than federal guidelines, and to determine whether and when such requirements are justified.*

This charge was approved with some discussion.

Ramakrishnan proposed one additional charge that was requested by the IRB in their 2017 end of year report: *Formulate a policy for recruitment of staff/faculty for surveys and interviews.*

This charge generated substantial discussion. This charge was tabled, pending Ramakrishnan's conversation with Tim Beyer for additional clarification about relative roles of the Office of Institutional Research and IRB, and whether the issue this charge addresses is the frequency or redundancy of surveys and interviews.

## **7. Discussion of reports from faculty survey and focus groups on code language regarding promotion to (full) professor**

Kessel provided background on this topic, including how and what data were collected last year by the OIR. Discussion then revolved around how these data should be used in terms of future policy change, who should be responsible for writing the policy (models), and what should be the process for moving forward with policy changes. For example, Kessel clarified the need to disentangle the language in the existing policy regarding what is considered service, and what level of service is required (how much, how well, growth over time). Bartanen highlighted the word "sustained" in the current policy, and the potential for debate about whether this means maintenance or growth (during file review time period). Also, Bartanen provided the historical perspective that the current policy language is a legacy from when the law school joined the college, and there was no discussion or rationale in the minutes from the meetings where the language was formulated.

Kessel asked for volunteers for a group to think more about ways to move forward with policy change (informed by the survey and focus group data), and to then bring a motion to the Senate. Volunteers included MacBain, Livingston, Jacobson, Wilson, Kukreja, and Kessel.

**8. M/S/P to adjourn at 1:20pm.**

Minutes prepared by Kena Fox-Dobbs.

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Ly, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

To: Faculty Senate  
From: James Bernhard, Chairperson LMIS  
Concerning: Report LMIS Charges 2016-17  
Date: March 31, 2017

Dear Colleagues:

The following is a summary of our responses to the Faculty Senate Charges. For further information, I encourage you also to consult the LMIS minutes posted on SoundNet.

Because of the many changes in Technology Services during the past couple of years, this year LMIS has focused primarily on getting updated on those changes and fostering the opportunities that the changes have enabled. The Fall 2016 semester was devoted almost exclusively to updates, and in the Spring 2017 semester we have begun to explore the opportunities that have been created. More specifically, our work on the committee's charges has been as follows.

1. *To develop general policies, procedures and plans in collaboration with the Library Director and the Chief Technology Officer.* Much of the Fall 2016 semester was devoted to this. We did not develop new policies, but we have laid the groundwork to be able to do so. This preliminary work has been necessary because of all the major changes in technology-related positions on campus.

On 9-20-2016, CIO Jeremy Cucco updated LMIS on three major technology areas: infrastructure, v-Desk, and printing. On 10-11-2016, he updated the committee on ERP (PeopleSoft). On 11-08-2016, he updated the committee on the Service Desk. In this discussion, he mentioned that technology services is working to develop a technology standards document that clearly explains what technology (both hardware and software) is supported by the university. This would be very useful to incoming students, departments buying equipment, and others. On 12-06-2016, Jeremy Cucco updated LMIS on analytics, and on some other areas that had changed since his previous updates. On 1-31-2017, Jeremy Cucco led a discussion on cloud computing and the role that it may or may not play on campus in the future. On 2-14-2017, he led a discussion on computer and network security. In this, he emphasized that for any institution, the question is not whether a breach will occur, but rather how well it can be contained or limited when it occurs.

This update concluded what was well over a full semester of much-needed updates. Jeremy Cucco's presentations have helped greatly in forging solid, fruitful communication channels between faculty and technology staff on campus, and he

should be commended for all his hard work in this regard. Because of it, LMIS is now in a much better position to be able to develop the policies and plans referred to in this charge.

2. *To provide recommendations and advice to all parts of the University community on the role of the library, media and information systems in support of the academic program.* On 10-11-2016, following a campus visit by Nicole Allen of SPARC, the committee discussed the role that open educational resources might play in our teaching. Jane Carlin expressed the library's enthusiasm for this, and we discussed ways in which the library might work with faculty to encourage use and development of open educational resources.

3. *To review periodically the mission and objectives of the library and information systems and to recommend such changes as are needed.* On 2-28-2017, Jane Carlin and guest Lori Ricigliano updated LMIS on happenings in the library. This included an overview of the LIBQUAL survey results and a discussion of short- and long-term plans for how to use library space.

4. *To review periodically the collection development plan for the library to ensure that a balanced collection is maintained for effective support of the academic program.* Since we have been very busy with the other charges (especially Charge 1), we have not had a chance to address this charge yet. However, we are scheduled to have such a review during our next meeting (on 4-4-2017).

5. *Such other duties as may be assigned to it by the Faculty Senate.* No additional duties were assigned.

6. *In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws (Items 1-5), the Faculty Senate charges the LMIS Committee to work with Institutional Research and Technology Services to review existing and, if needed, develop policies concerning the appropriate use of institutional data on campus.* On 3-21-2017, LMIS and guests Ellen Peters and Brad Tom have discussed data use policies. In this discussion, we learned that there are complicated data use policies in place, as well as plans to develop those policies further as need be. However, since faculty are generally unaware of the details of those policies or how to implement them, there is great need for information about *what faculty should and should not do to comply with these policies*. We began to discuss how such information might be compiled and presented to faculty but did not arrive at any definite plans. There is much more to be done in this regard.

**Requests for future charges:**

We have no requests for additional future charges at this point. However, in the current charges, perhaps references to the Chief Technology Officer should be changed to Chief Information Officer in keeping with the current title for the position.

**Committee size and workload:**

The committee seemed to have a suitable number of members for its workload. LMIS needs enough members to fuel discussions, but it does not have a lot of regular subcommittee work that needs to be divided among its members, so more members are not needed.

**Additional comments:**

One of my goals for LMIS year has been to develop good lines of communication with the many recent technology-related hires, and I think that we have been successful in that.

**Academic Standards Committee  
2016-2017 Year End Report  
prepared by Johanna Crane, Chair**

Faculty members on the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) are organized into 2 groups with individuals serving on the policy or petition subcommittee one semester and then switching groups the following semester. This report contains a summary of each subcommittee's activities during the 2016-2017 academic year.

The policy subcommittee worked on charges from the Faculty Senate or issues brought to the attention of the committee via the Registrar. In most cases, we invited representatives to come to our meetings to provide the background and their concerns so that we (the committee and the representative(s)) could work together through the issues. It was quite informal, but the subcommittee was rather productive with this collaborative process.

**1. Final Exams and SAA**

**Background:** Brad Tomhave and Landon Wade brought to the attention of the subcommittee that the current wording of the final exam policy didn't include how to negotiate the extended time for final exams provided by the SAA. The Director of the Office of Student Accessibility and Accommodations, Peggy Perno, was invited to a meeting to provide the committee with a better understanding of the scheduling conflicts that she and her staff have encountered during finals. The following Final Exam Policy was rewritten to allow the SAA the ability to work with instructors so that students with accommodations can have reasonable exam schedules.

**Final Exam Policy—accepted by ASC 12/2/2016**

The Office of the Registrar schedules final examinations as an integral part of each semester and lists final examination dates and times on student class schedules and on instructor class lists. As there are three standard final examination time periods for each day of the final examination week, students may have up to three examinations in a single day.

In all classes in which a final examination is given, the final examination must be given during the time period assigned by the Registrar's Office, and instructors may not grant exceptions to this policy. Students allowed a final examination accommodation by the Office of Student Accessibility and Accommodations (SAA) may have their final examinations scheduled by SAA in consultation with the instructor.

In summer classes, as well as in classes scheduled during the first session of a semester, any final examination is to be given on the last day of the class.

Requests to waive any part of this final examination policy must be submitted in writing by the instructor to the Dean of the University.

## **2. Religious Observances Policy**

**Background:** Unlike many of its peer institutions, Puget Sound had no formal accommodation policy for religious observances. The subcommittee reviewed statements from our peer institutions and met with the University Chaplain, Dave Wright, in November. The committee decided to address religious accommodations related to course schedules and due dates and we did NOT attempt to address accommodations related to course content (e.g. A student unable to read an assigned text due to religious reasons).

### **Religious Observances Policy—accepted by ASC 2/17/2017**

The University of Puget Sound values the rich diversity of religious traditions, observances and beliefs represented in our campus community and supports the rights of students to practice their faiths. The university recognizes that in some instances a student's religious observances may conflict with the student's academic schedule. In such cases, the university endorses reasonable schedule flexibility, unless such an accommodation would create an undue burden on the student, other students, the instructor, or the college. Students shall consult with their instructor directly and in a timely manner to discuss an accommodation. The university chaplain is available to consult with students who wish to make such requests. The instructor may consult with the university chaplain or the Office of the Dean of the University for assistance as needed.

## **3. Running Start Credit**

The ASC was charged to review the policy of the university for the transfer of running start credits as articulated by the offices of the registrar and admissions. The committee spent a lot of time reviewing the "sources" of misunderstandings /discrepancies between the "promised" college credit from the Running Start program and the university's standard that distinguishes high school requirements from those for university credit. We believe that the key to minimizing these discrepancies is to have the admission and transfer policies be similar such that transfer as college credit is more consistently awarded to Running Start participants. The committee **proposed** changes (2/3/2017 minutes) to the recommended high school course preparation for admission (in the Bulletin). These proposed changes should serve as the basis of discussion with the VP of Enrollment, Laura Martin-Fedich, and her staff next fall.



#### **4. Proposed Liberal Studies Major**

**Background:** A proposed Liberal Studies Major offered through the Freedom of Education Project Puget Sound (FEPPS) program was brought to the committee's attention by Professor Seth Weinberger. The committee was asked to review and comment on the proposal in terms of academic standards and its policies.

**Status:** No formal action was required.

#### **5. Advanced Placement**

**Background:** During its curriculum review, German Studies proposed changes to what the Advanced Placement (AP) scores would fulfill in terms of Foreign Language graduation requirement and the major. The curriculum committee forwarded this proposal to the ASC since it would represent a break with university policy regarding AP credit in the following ways: a) "the standard minimum Advanced Placement score is 4" and b) "there is no policy allowing different credit for different scores on the same exam."

**Status:** In progress and the discussion should be continued next year. Brad Tomhave is gathering data (from Admissions and the Registrar's offices) tracking AP scores for next year's committee.

#### **6. Policy on Assignments**

**Background:** Brad Tomhave asked the committee to consider a change to the policy on Assignments in the section of the Academic Handbook addressing Course Requirements. The change in wording was to clarify the policy.

##### **Accepted by ASC 4/28/2017**

It is recommended that each instructor within the first week of class outline assignments, readings, examinations, term papers, due dates, bases for evaluation, attendance policy, and the likelihood of examinations during the week preceding finals. An instructor will not have to accept work received after the last day of classes unless the work has a scheduled due date during final exam week or an incomplete grade has been authorized by the instructor. After permanent grades have been assigned, an instructor may not accept late or additional work in order to reassess or change the final grade.

## **7. Petitions Sub Committee summary prepared by Brad Tomhave**

At the September 9, 2016, meeting of the Academic Standards Committee, the Registrar was delegated the authority to convene a Petition Preview Team of Associate Dean Sunil Kukreja and Academic Advising Director Landon Wade to review and possibly approve petitions submitted by students. Approval authority is extended to the Preview Team based on approvals of the Petitions Sub-Committee in similar circumstances. Additionally, authority to deny schedule conflict petitions was delegated this year as was the authority to assign or to repeal Academic Warning or Probation sanctions based on a grade correction or the receipt of a final grade in place of a missing, Incomplete, or In-Progress grade. Delegating authority relieves the Petitions Sub-Committee of work on ordinary issues.

The year-end petitions report for 2015-16 included petitions acted upon from September 4, 2015, to April 14, 2016. Petitions activity for the year continued during the period of April 15, 2016, to September 1, 2016. During the April to September period, 81 petitions were acted upon with 76 approved and 5 denied.

The complete report for 2015-16 covers petition actions from September 4, 2015, to September 1, 2016: 276 total petitions were acted upon with 257 approved and 19 denied. More than three quarters of the petitions involved the following actions:

- 62 Registrations with a Schedule Conflict
- 43 Readmissions or Reinstatements from Dismissal or Suspension
- 38 Medical Withdrawals
- 22 Late Registrations
- 26 Acceptance of Transfer Credit during the Senior Year
- 21 Withdrawal with a W Grade
- 16 Re-enrollment from a Medical Withdrawal

---

232 Total (84%)

The fall to spring petitions report for 2016-17 covers September 2, 2016, to April 27, 2017, with 198 petitions were acted upon: 178 approved and 25 denied. Of these 198 petitions, more than three quarters involved the following 7 actions:

- 62 Registrations with a Schedule Conflict
- 30 Medical Withdrawals
- 20 Readmissions or Reinstatements from Dismissal or Suspension
- 15 Late Registrations
- 14 Re-enrollment from a Medical Withdrawal
- 10 Acceptance of Transfer Credit during the Senior Year
- 9 Withdrawals Late in Semester with W Grade

---

160 Total (81%)

Institutional Review Board  
Report to the Faculty Senate  
AY 2016-2017

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) exists for the purpose of protecting the rights, health, and well-being of human beings solicited and volunteering for participation as research subjects. In the context of reviewing proposed research studies involving human subjects, the IRB attends to issues such as potential risks to participants, protection of participants' identities and disclosed sensitive information, safety, ethical recruitment practices, and the accessibility and adequacy of informed consent. This is a report to the University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate regarding activities of the IRB during the 2016-2017 academic year.

2016-17 IRB membership: Tim Beyer (chair); Tatiana Kaminsky (secretary); Kris Bartanen (ex-officio); Joel Elliott, Mita Mahato (Fall), Sarah Moore, Geoff Proehl, Sara Protasi (Spring), Brad Richards, Andreas Udbye, Barbara Warren; Jan Wolfe (community representative).

To date, the Institutional Review Board has reviewed 130 proposals this academic year. Of these 12 were full board (2 approved, 7 pending, 1 denied, 2 withdrawn), 103 were expedited (96 approved, 6 pending), and 9 were exempt (7 approved, 2 pending), and 6 modifications (5 approved, 1 pending).

In addition, the board focused on addressing the following formal charges from the Senate:

**1) Make recommendations on how the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) fits into the IRB structure**

The current bylaws state that non-human animal research falls under the jurisdiction of the IRB. Currently, the IRB is not set up to review, approve, or monitor research involving non-human animals; rather these processes have been handled by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). Currently, the IACUC does not report to the IRB. For these reasons, the IRB was tasked to make a recommendation on how the IACUC fits into the current IRB structure.

In Fall 2016, Elliott and Warren met with Alyce DeMarais, chair of the IACUC. Based on this discussion, it became clear that the IACUC utilizes significantly different review, approval, and monitoring processes than the IRB as Federal Guidelines for non-human and human research differ substantially (see outline in Appendix A). Thus, in agreement with Alyce DeMarais, the IRB full board voted to amend the university bylaws to make the IACUC a separate entity from the IRB and also suggested modifications to the bylaws (see Appendix A). Beyer communicated this recommendation and suggested modifications in Fall 2016 with Ramakrishnan, the IRB Senate liaison, to share with the senate.

**2) Develop training for new IRB members including procedures for follow-up/transition of protocols and regular reviews of Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs)**

In Fall 2016, Proehl and Udbye, both new to the IRB, and Beyer created a training packet designed to provide consistent and systematic training on internal IRB review processes, review of MOUs, and support from an IRB mentor. Protasi, who joined the IRB in Spring 2017, used this packet for training, and after providing feedback, the training packet was further refined. The most updated training packet is found in Appendix B.

Highlights of the training packet include:

- An IRB mentor, who is a more veteran IRB member, will meet with a new member and aid in the review of the first few protocols assigned to the new member. This will increase consistency in review.
- A timeline, which outlines when the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) training for IRB members, review of internal IRB review procedures and MOUs, and meetings with the assigned mentor and chair should occur. The timeline allows new IRB members to complete the training within the first four weeks of a given term, before protocols are typically received for review.
- A sample protocol, which demonstrates several consistent issues IRB reviewers encounter and how to respond to these. We hope that sample protocols such as this will increase consistency in review.

**3) Formulate practices for outside researchers to conduct research with members of our campus community**

At the start of AY 16-17, the IRB did not have a policy for how outside researchers could apply for Puget Sound IRB approval and requests by outside researchers were handled on a case-by-case basis. In order to further standardize application procedures, Kaminsky and Mahato reviewed the policies governing outside research from our peer institutions in Fall 2016 and presented their findings to the full board. Based on these findings, the full board agreed that outside research must go through the typical Puget Sound approval process and that outside researchers must motivate, in writing, why Puget Sound is necessary to complete their research. In addition, outside researchers must identify a member of the campus community to be listed on the coversheet of their protocol.

Due to outstanding legal questions (e.g., whether outside protocols and consent forms could be approved by the Puget Sound IRB), Kaminsky and Beyer worked with Bartanen, who consulted with the university legal team, in Spring 2017. Based on this feedback, Kaminsky drafted a policy for outside researchers, which was approved by the full board in Spring 2017, and can be found in Appendix C. The policy is also now live on the IRB website and has already been used twice since mid-March 2017.

In addition to the formal Senate charges, the board worked on the following self-charges:

**1) Follow-up on CITI student training module now required for all student research protocols**

Starting AY 16-17, all student researchers were required to complete the *Student Module* of CITI training. This requirement was implemented to further educate student researchers on the purpose of the IRB and to increase the consistency and quality of proposals submitted for IRB review. In order to assess whether these goals were met, qualitative feedback was sought from (a) chairs/faculty who teach methods courses, and (b) IRB members and Jimmy McMichael. This is outlined below:

- a. Feedback from chairs/faculty who teach methods courses:** In Spring 2017, Elliott communicated with the chairs/faculty of the main departments/schools which submit protocols for review. These included Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, Business and Leadership, Physical Therapy, and Occupational Therapy. Overall, department chairs report that the CITI training was relatively easy for students to complete, especially after updated instructions were posted on the IRB website. Faculty found that the training was useful for students but did not appear to have a significant impact on protocol writing.
- b. Feedback from IRB members and Jimmy McMichael:** In Spring 2017, Beyer solicited feedback from IRB members and Jimmy McMichael. In general, IRB members commented that while the proposals in general appeared to be better quality this year, it is not clear whether it was due directly to the CITI training or other changes aimed to standardize submission and review of protocols. However, most IRB members noted that CITI training likely served to increase students' level of awareness of ethics in research more broadly (i.e., beyond information that may be covered in a discipline-specific methods class) and that the IRB is not idiosyncratic to Puget Sound, but rather is part of a national/international effort to ensure the well-being of research participants. As such, CITI provides an important educational experience for students. Jimmy McMichael received no student questions about CITI training in Spring 2017 (he had received a few in Fall 2016) and reported no issues in tracking CITI training for students.
- c. Updated Instructions:** Based on instructor and student feedback in Fall 2016, the initial instructions on how to create a CITI account were unclear. In response to this, Richards created instructions with screen shots and detailed written instructions which can be found in Appendix D and are now published available on the IRB website. There have been no issues reported after these new instructions were created.

**2) Work on standardizing IRB procedures**

In an on-going effort to standardize IRB procedures and make them more transparent, the full board has completed the following tasks this academic year:

- a. Standardized and updated e-mail correspondence:** E-mail correspondence to be used with student researchers during the review process has been standardized to include (a) request for reply within one week for in-progress protocols, (b) notification that approval is good for one year from the approval date, (c) reference to the Informational Follow-up Form (see Point 3 below), and (d) instructions to bring both a hard-copy of the consent form and approval documentation to the Associate Dean's Office when stamping consent forms. Please see updated e-mail correspondence in Appendix E.
- b. Updated review procedures:** In order to streamline internal review procedures, the committee will now only use the "Protocol Decision Document" to document final approval/disapproval, not intermediary steps (e.g., asking for changes to the protocol before approval). This small change will simplify our internal review procedures tremendously due to streamlining how feedback is given to researchers. The updated Protocol Decision Document is attached in Appendix F.
- c. Standardized tracking and storage of verbal consent:** Prior to AY 16-17, there was no systematic way in which verbal consent was tracked or stored. (Verbal consent is typically used in ethnographic research methods and oral histories.) Thus, in the case of an adverse event, the IRB could not verify that verbal consent was obtained from participants. To address this, Moore, Richards, Udbye, and Beyer, in consultation with Monica DeHart (chair of Sociology and Anthropology) and Andrew Gardner developed a documentation process for verbal consent. Here, researchers simply complete a document which lists the participant's pseudonym, whether verbal consent was obtained (Yes/No), and the initials by the researchers. At the end of data collection, this document is e-mailed to the IRB for record keeping. This procedure will be used across all SOAN courses, which produce the largest number of protocols that utilize verbal consent. Please see Appendix G for the verbal consent document crafted by DeHart and Gardner.
- d. Updated protocol template and checklist:** The current protocol template and checklist available on the IRB website do not show a one-to-one correspondence. In addition, the protocol template itself is not very user-friendly in its instructions. For these reasons, it may be that the protocols received are not always uniform in how information is presented. In order to increase transparency in what information the IRB needs to review protocols, in Spring 2017, Warren, in collaboration with Proehl and Beyer, updated the protocol template and checklist. In particular, because many protocols do not have the appropriate level of detail for methods and materials, which can impact the review process, the updated protocol template now contains more detailed questions for this section. Moreover, researchers are now asked to provide an explicit statement of purpose and provide qualifications for

carrying out the research. These updated documents are found in Appendix H and will aid in creating more uniform protocols.

**3) Work on standardizing the storage of consent documentation and Informational Follow-up Forms as required by Federal Guidelines**

Although the current IRB processes are generally aligned with Federal Guidelines, two major issues remain: how consent documentation is stored and the lack of providing study closure information via Informational Follow-up Forms.

- a. Currently, consent forms are stored as hard copies in the department from which that associated protocol originated. Although Federal Guidelines specify how long consent forms are to be stored, there is currently no University-wide IRB policy governing what happens with stored consent forms, including when and how they are to be destroyed. Thus, individual departments differ in how consent forms are stored and destroyed. Currently, there exists no University-wide IRB policy on how verbal consent information is tracked and stored (Point 2 c above is the first step to establish this).
- b. Upon completion of data collection, the researcher must alert the IRB that the data collection phase has ended so that the IRB can close that particular study. Although this information is requested by the IRB, the necessary “Informational Follow-up Form” is not submitted to the IRB by the researchers listed on the protocol.

In order to address both issues, Beyer, Moore, Richards, and Udbye worked to create a new policy in Spring 2017. Instead of simply providing the administrative assistant of a department with consent forms, researchers will be asked to provide consent forms and a completed Informational Follow-up Form. Much like student evaluations for faculty, the administrative assistant would be asked to scan the consent forms and Informational Follow-up Form and e-mail this scanned document to the IRB. The IRB can then store the consent documentation and Informational Follow-up Form with the approved protocol. In this way, Puget Sound IRB practices will be in line with Federal Guidelines. The verbal consent document described in point 2c above would be scanned and e-mailed to the IRB along with an Informational Follow-up Form. The new policy, as well as changes to the Consent Form and Informational Follow-up Form, are found in Appendix I. The IRB would like to implement these changes in Fall 2017, and is in communication with Dean Bartanen to assess feasibility.

The IRB has identified the following issues that should be addressed in 2017-2018:

**1) Formulate a policy for how staff/faculty are used for surveys and interviews**

It is unclear how many protocols the IRB reviews and approves use staff and faculty as research subjects. Here, the IRB should work with Sherry Mondou (Vice President for Finance and Administration) and Ellen Peters (Director of Institutional Research and Retention) to ensure that student researchers are:

- a. Using the appropriate channels to recruit,
- b. Not overloading faculty and staff with research requests, and
- c. Not replicating existing research conducted through Office of Institutional Research and Retention

In addition, the sunset clause for the MOU with Institutional Research and Retention is expiring. It is therefore suggested that this new policy for staff/faculty who are used in research should be incorporated when the existing MOU is reviewed next AY.

**2) Develop policy for international research**

Currently, there is no official policy for international research. It is suggested that the IRB develop a policy for the uniform assessment of international research. In particular, the IRB must standardize requirements and resources for back-translation (the main method used to ensure linguistic equivalence when research is not conducted in English), identify how international laws apply to data collection and storage, and how consent forms/oral consent documentation are safely maintained while abroad.

**3) Explore the utility of registering the IRB and applying for a Federalwide Assurance (FWA) number**

In order to further align with Federal Guidelines, it is suggested that the Puget Sound IRB is registered federally. Moreover, the IRB should explore whether applying for a FWA number would be a useful long-term option. A FWA number would allow easy approval from other institutions that have a FWA number, making it easier to approve outside research at Puget Sound (and having Puget Sound research be approved at other institutions). However, applying for a FWA number can be costly; the benefits of a FWA should be weighed against the application cost.

**4) Review updated Common Rule and incorporate changes**

The Common Rule, which outlines IRB functions, operations, record keeping, and so on, was updated in January 2017 at the Federal level. The IRB must review the main changes to the Common Rule to ensure that our procedures are in line with changing Federal Guidelines. For example, oral histories are now considered to be fully exempt from IRB oversight; however, our policies request that oral histories submit a full protocol for IRB review. While our IRB policies can be more stringent than Federal Guidelines, the IRB should review such cases to ensure that it is not unnecessarily so (as may be the case with oral histories, for example).



**5) CITI training for faculty**

In order to further standardize IRB procedures, it is suggested that the IRB explore whether CITI training for faculty researchers should be required. CITI training for faculty is valid for three years and would require faculty to continually update their understanding of how changing Federal Guidelines impact research procedures. It is suggested that the IRB identify possible modules for faculty researchers to complete.

**6) Meet the Federal Guidelines requiring a representative board**

Current Federal Guidelines specify that the board must consist of scientists and non-scientists as well as a community member who is not part of the university. Our current board meets these criteria. In addition, Federal Guidelines state that the board must also be diverse in terms of race and ethnicity. Our current board does not meet this criterion. With the understanding that we are a small faculty with many service assignments, the IRB requests that extra attention, when possible, is taken to meet the Federal Guidelines to create a representative, diverse board.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Tim Beyer, PhD  
IRB Chair AY 2016-17

Appendices:

A: Recommendation for IACUC and IRB distinction

B: Training packet for new members

C: Policy for outside researchers

D: Updated instructions for student researchers

F: Standardized e-mail responses and review flowchart

G: Verbal consent document

H: Updated protocol template and checklist

I: Recommendation for storing consent documentation and Informational Follow-up Forms

## Appendix A: Recommendation for IACUC and IRB Distinction

### IACUC workgroup: Make recommendations on how the IACUC fits into the IRB structure.

- 1) Members: Joel Elliott and Barbara Warren
  - 2) Contact Alyce DeMarais to collect information on the general function of the IACUC.
    - We met with Alyce on 9/28/2016 and she provided an overview of the IACUC.
    - The IACUC is governed by policies and laws of the Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW). Kristine Bartanen is the named Institutional Official for animal care at the University of Puget Sound, and provides assurance that the institution complies with Public Health Service Policy on Human Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. The IACUC is mandated to report directly to the Institutional Official.
    - The IACUC has a website that outlines its mission and procedures:  
<http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-animal-care-use/>
- a. How many protocols are typically reviewed per academic year?
    - There were 9 faculty or student research protocols reviewed in 2014, 3 in 2015, and 9 so far in 2016. In addition, there were 2 student independent class project protocols reviewed in 2014, 14 in 2015, and one so far in 2016.
  - b. How is the review process structured? Who sits on the committee?
    - The IACUC follows the review process in accordance with the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals and the Animal Welfare Act and Animal Welfare Regulations. The IACUC website has Faculty and Student Research Animal Use Protocol Forms and Student Class Project Animal Use Protocol Forms.
    - The IACUC committee prepares biannual reports that are sent directly to the Institutional Official who submits the reports to Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare (OLAW) as mandated by federal policy.
    - There are nine members on the committee, and they include faculty, staff, a community member, and a veterinarian. See website for names of present members.
  - c. What else falls under their purview (e.g., walk through of non-human animal facilities, lab safety issues, etc.)
    - As stated on the IACUC website: To fulfill its mission, the IACUC will meet the following goals:
      - Review Puget Sound's program for humane care and use of animals at least once every six months;
      - Inspect all animal facilities at Puget Sound at least once every six months;
      - Report on the above evaluations to the Academic Vice President;
      - Review any concerns regarding the care and use of animals at Puget Sound;
      - Make written recommendation to the Academic Vice President regarding any aspect of Puget Sound's animal program, facilities,

- or personnel training; and
  - Review protocols for activities related to the care and use of animals at Puget
  - Sound.
- 3) Make recommendation re charge; Alyce DeMarais suggested that the IACUC should be separate and that the bylaws ought to be changed.

- We concur with Alyce that the IACUC should be a separate entity from the IRB, and suggest the following changes to the Faculty Bylaws covering the Institutional Review Board (page 11).

#### I. Institutional Review Board.

- a. The Board shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio) and no fewer than four appointed members of the faculty. Members may be added or chosen so that the composition of the committee is in compliance with current federal regulations.
  - b. The duties of the Institutional Review Board shall be:
    1. To apply the University's policies on the protection of human and animal subjects to the board's review of faculty, student, and staff proposals for research involving human ~~and animal~~ subjects and to proposals from persons outside the University planning research involving University employees or students.
    2. To carry primary responsibility for ensuring that the University's policies and procedures and its *Protection of Human Subjects and Protection of Animal Subjects* documents are consistent with the will of the University and that they comply with regulatory requirements governing the protection of human ~~and animal~~ subjects in research.
    3. To establish definitions, procedures, and dates for the review of research involving human or animal subjects.
    4. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.
- 4) Recommendation possible by 10/12?
- We recommend that a motion be made for the faculty bylaws to be changed as stated above at a future faculty senate meeting.

## **Appendix B: Training Packet for New Members**

### **Welcome to the Institutional Review Board (IRB)!**

The IRB is charged with approving, monitoring, and reviewing research involving humans. As a member of the IRB, your role is to support the IRB in carrying out these charges. A main consideration in reviewing research involving humans is conducting a risk-benefit analysis in order to determine whether research can be approved. You will be asked to do this individually (for research protocols with only minimal risk) and contribute to decisions made by the full board (for research protocols with greater than minimal risk). Thus, you will serve as the reviewer of protocols that are submitted by the Principal Investigator (PI) responsible for carrying out the research project.

This document outlines the *training components* to allow you to successfully review and approve research using the standardized process of the Puget Sound IRB.

**New IRB Members:** Please utilize the resources and timeline provided on the next page to complete the training necessary to begin reviewing protocols.

**IRB Mentor:** Every member new to the IRB will be paired with a more veteran member who will serve as the new member's mentor. The mentor's role is to:

- 1) Meet individually to go over internal training materials and familiarize you with the IRB share drive (see specifics on the *Timeline* on the next page);
- 2) Be a direct resource during the first (and second, if needed) individual review of a research protocol and debrief after the first (and second) review; and
- 3) Remain a consistent resource as needed over the course of subsequent reviews.

Thus, the mentor should provide a consistent contact person for the new member and aid in standardizing the review process. In addition to the official mentor, new members are encouraged to contact the current IRB chair or other members of the committee as questions or issues arise.

### Training for New Committee Members: Timeline

Order	Task	Resources	Timeline
1	<b>Welcome and Introduction to IRB</b> document and familiarize with <b>University website</b>	IRB/Resources for IRB Members/Training and <a href="http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/irb-member-information">http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/irb-member-information</a>	As early as possible, but prior to first full board IRB meeting of the term
2	Complete <b>institutional CITI training</b> (you should anticipate 5-15 hours to complete the training)	Instructions found on IRB/Resources for IRB Members/Training/CITI training instructions.pdf	Must complete before second full board meeting of the term
3	Review the following <b>internal training materials</b> a) Protocol Flowchart.pdf b) Level of Risk.pdf c) Level of Review Guide.pdf d) Sample training protocols	All materials found under IRB/Resources for IRB Members/Training	Complete prior to meeting with IRB mentor
4	<b>Meet with assigned IRB mentor</b> to go over internal training materials, preview share drive, and discuss protocol flowchart and review process	TBD	By 2 <sup>nd</sup> week of the term
5	Review the following <b>documents</b> : a) Protocol Decision Document b) Standardized e-mail responses c) Memorandum of Understanding	Documents found under: a) IRB/Resources for IRB Members/Forms/Protocol Decision Document.docx b) IRB/Resources for IRB Members/Training/Standardized E-mail Responses.docx c) IRB/Resources for IRB Members/Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs)	Prior to reviewing protocols
6	<b>Meet with chair</b> to review documents used for review and process	TBD	By 3 <sup>rd</sup> week of the term
7	<b>Ongoing review</b> of materials: a) Familiarize with IRB Handbook b) Ethical considerations	Materials found under: a) IRB/Resources for New Members/Training/Handbook.pdf b) IRB/Resources for IRB Members/Training/Keyton – Research Ethics.pdf	Ongoing

### **Instructions to complete CITI training:**

Institutional training is completed through the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI). To complete the training, navigate to:

<https://www.citiprogram.org/>

Next, create a new account affiliated with the University of Puget Sound (be sure to type this into the affiliation and/or select it from the possible responses you get). You'll be asked some background questions in order to associate your account with the correct modules. Please be sure to select the following responses for these questions:

- a) *Human Subjects Research*, select "*IRB Member*"
- b) For *Responsible Conduct of Research*, select "*Social and Behavioral Science Researchers (includes Education and Business)*"

\*\*\*\*\*You can select a different branch (e.g., Humanities) once you have completed the "Social and Behavioral Science Researchers" one. To do so, under "My Learner Tools for University of Puget Sound" select "Add a Course" and select a different branch

- c) For *Conflict of Interest*, select "*Yes*"
- d) For *IACUC*, select "*No*"

Once you've created an account associated with IRB Members, you must complete all required modules in the following three courses: "Conflicts of Interest"; "IRB Members"; and "Social and behavioral science researchers." You can complete the "optional" modules based on your time and interest. All modules have a test at the end; you must achieve a passing score across all required modules before the system will recognize that you have "passed" the training for IRB members.

## Protocol Flowchart (updated 2/2017)

- 1) The principal investigator (PI) submits their protocol to Jimmy McMichael as:
  - a. A hardcopy in Jones 212 (CMB 1020); and
  - b. An electronic copy ([irb@pugetsound.edu](mailto:irb@pugetsound.edu))
- 2) Upon receipt, Jimmy logs the details of the protocol into our database. Using the level of review identified by the PI, Jimmy will either assign a *single reviewer* (for protocols marked exempt/expedited) or send the protocol to the *full board* (for protocols marked full board).
- 3) For exempt/expedited protocols:
  - a. Jimmy will notify you via e-mail when a protocol has been assigned to you. The protocol will be attached in the e-mail. You can also access this protocol via the shared IRB drive (`//merlin2/irb/`). Once logged in, the folder *Protocols* contains sub-folders with the protocol number that has been assigned to you. You will find the protocol in that folder.
  - b. Confirm that the PI has identified the correct level of review (see “Levels of Review Checklist”)
    - i. If correctly identified as exempt/expedited, please review protocol.
    - ii. If incorrectly identified as exempt/expedited, please e-mail Jimmy to alert him that this protocol requires full board review and must be sent to the full committee.
- 4) Review of exempt/expedited protocols:
  - a. *If revisions are required* before the protocol can be approved, the required changes must be communicated with the PI via e-mail. The PI must resubmit the revised document(s) to the reviewer via e-mail. All requested revisions must be satisfied before the reviewer can approve the protocol.
    - i. Considerations during the review process:
      1. The reviewer should communicate with the PI within 3 business days of receipt of a protocol or resubmission.
      2. Use the standardized e-mail responses found on the share drive (under *Resources for IRB Members/ Training/ Standardized E-mail Responses*) for all *student protocols*. You can amend these responses for non-student protocols.
      3. If the PI is a student, include the student’s advisor on all correspondence. The advisor’s name is on the coversheet.
  - b. *Once the protocol can be approved*, communicate this decision with the PI by using the Protocol Decision Document, found on the share drive under *Resources for IRB Members/Forms*.
    - i. Upload the following into the appropriate protocol folder on the share drive:
      1. Protocol Decision Document
      2. All revised documents

- ii. Bring the list of protocols you reviewed since the last full board IRB meeting. We will collect protocol numbers and status (approved, revisions required, rejected).
- c. All written communication between the reviewer and the PI *must* be retained. Thus, please cc [irb@pugetsound.edu](mailto:irb@pugetsound.edu) on all e-mail correspondence

\*\*\*\*Once review of an expedited/exempt protocol is complete, each folder on the IRB share drive *must* contain the following:

- a. Original protocol (uploaded by Jimmy)
- b. Revised protocol (if any revisions were requested by the reviewer)
- c. Protocol Decision Document

If a protocol requires full board review, Jimmy will make the protocol available to the full committee. We will discuss the protocol at the next full board meeting. The IRB chair will communicate decisions, including if revisions are required, with the PI.

On the following pages, you will find the necessary documentation to assess level of review as well as some department specific information and consideration. These documents can also be found on the share drive, as indicated on the Timeline on pg. 2 of this document.



## Levels of Review Checklist

### Does my project need IRB review?

Your project needs to be reviewed by the IRB if it meets **both** of the criteria below

- A. The project meets the federal definition of research: systematic investigation intended to produce generalizable knowledge. [45 CFR 46.102(d)]
- B. Human participants are involved. Human participants are living individuals about whom you are conducting research and gathering
  1. data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or
  2. identifiable private information. [45 CFR 46.102(f)]

If your project meets **either** criterion A **or** B, but not both, your project does not need IRB review. If your project meets **both** criteria, you need IRB approval before beginning your research. Generalizable knowledge refers to the planned dissemination of results in a public forum or academic publication. Classroom projects, for which such dissemination is beyond the scope of the course, are not research according to this definition.

### What are the types of IRB review?

The federal government has established different levels of review, depending on the method and content of your research.

1. Full Board: must be reviewed by the full committee, requires IRB oversight and follow-up.
2. Exempt: requires no further IRB oversight or follow-up
3. Expedited: may be reviewed by one member on behalf of the full IRB, but requires IRB oversight and follow-up

When you prepare your protocol, you will see that the Puget Sound cover sheet asks you to give your best estimate of the appropriate level of review for your project. However, the final decision about types of review rests with the IRB. In order to determine the level of risk to participants, please refer to the **Level of Risk** document available on the IRB website. You can use the following checklist to estimate the level of review for your project.

### **1) Full IRB Review.**

If your project meets **ANY** of the following criteria, then it will require review by the full IRB committee:

- \_\_\_\_\_ receives support from non-university sources that require full IRB approval
- \_\_\_\_\_ involves greater than minimal risk (e.g., physical, psychological or emotional, legal, social or economic, etc.) to participants than they would likely encounter every day
- \_\_\_\_\_ involves personality tests, inventories or questionnaires of a personal and sensitive nature where participants' identities will not be anonymous to the researcher and/or where the information you collect can be connected back to individual study participants
- \_\_\_\_\_ involves sensitive aspects of a participant's behavior that could reasonably place a participant at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to a participant's financial standing or employability
- \_\_\_\_\_ involves sensitive aspects of a participant's behavior such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior, or use of alcohol
- \_\_\_\_\_ involves active deception or procedures that are not known to the participant (e.g., the participant will not be fully informed)
- \_\_\_\_\_ involves health care procedures that are not conducted for the primary benefit of the participants
- \_\_\_\_\_ includes diagnostic or therapeutic assessments, interventions, or measures that are not standard, generally acceptable, or common practice
- \_\_\_\_\_ involves special populations (e.g., prisoners, pregnant women, or individuals who are mentally or psychologically ill, or incompetent)
- \_\_\_\_\_ involves subjects under 18 years of age and involves more than minimal risk
- \_\_\_\_\_ involves collection of blood samples or other body fluids in any amount

If any of these apply to your research, your project will need approval from the full Board before you begin your research. Your next step is to prepare a research protocol and submit it to the IRB for review. If none of these apply, then go to (2) below.

**2) Exempt Review.** If your research did not meet **any** of the criteria for full review, it will qualify for either exempt or expedited review. Examples of exempt research may include:

- \_\_\_\_\_ surveys or interviews in which responses will be recorded in such a manner that a participant **CANNOT** be identified directly or through identifiers linked to a participant **AND** any disclosure of participants' responses outside the research will **NOT** place the participants at risk of civil or criminal liability, or be damaging to the participants' financial standing, employability, or social standing.
- \_\_\_\_\_ investigations of commonly accepted educational practices in established or commonly accepted settings.
- \_\_\_\_\_ observations of public behavior.
- \_\_\_\_\_ collection or study of publicly available existing data, documents, records or specimens.
- \_\_\_\_\_ collection or study of existing data, documents, records or specimens in which information will be recorded in such a manner that a participant cannot be identified directly or through identifiers linked to a participant.
- \_\_\_\_\_ research or demonstration project conducted by or subject to approval of the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services for the purpose of studying procedures, benefits, changes, and payments of entitlement programs.
- \_\_\_\_\_ analysis of information from educational tests that will be recorded in such a manner that participants cannot be identified.

If you checked **any** of the descriptors in (2) above and **no** descriptors from category (1), your research project probably meets the criteria for **Exempt Review**. Your next step is to prepare a research protocol and submit it to the IRB for review. Your protocol likely can be reviewed by one IRB member on behalf of the full Board and, if it is approved for **Exempt** status, will require *no further oversight or follow-up from the IRB*. If you checked no descriptors in (1) or (2), go to (3) below.

### **3) Expedited Review**

The third category allows for expedited review. Does your research project:

- involve only minimal risk (e.g., physical, psychological or emotional, legal, social or economic, etc.) to participants, or only as they would likely encounter every day?
- involve participants under 18 years of age with at most minimal risk to subjects
- involve recording data from participants 18 years of age or older using noninvasive procedures routinely employed in clinical practice?
- involve analysis of voice recordings made for research purposes?
- involve moderate exercise by healthy volunteers?
- involve the collection or study of existing data, documents, records or specimens?
- involve research on individual or group behavior, or characteristics of individuals, without manipulation of a participant's behavior and in a manner that does not cause stress to participants that is greater than they would encounter in everyday life?

If you checked any of the descriptors above, and none in (1) or (2), your project probably meets the criteria for **Expedited Review**. Your next step is to prepare a research protocol and submit it to the IRB for review. Your protocol likely can be reviewed by one IRB member on behalf of the full Board. If it is approved with **Expedited** status, your project will be subject to continued oversight and follow-up with the IRB and you will be required to submit requests for modification to methods, sampling, etc. should the need arise.

## **Department/Discipline Specific Recruitment Methods, Methodologies, and Ethical Considerations**

**Psychology:** Many of the protocols from the Department of Psychology use the Subject Pool to recruit participants. Here, students enrolled in lower division Psychology classes must fulfill a research participation requirement. This requirement can be fulfilled by participating in research studies (where 30 minutes of participation equals 1 participation credit) or by completing a written assignment (which is equivalent in terms of time as participating in studies). Thus, protocols from Psychology may make reference to research credits or units; these refer to compensation from the Subject Pool.

*Ethical considerations:* Because participants volunteer their time, participants must receive their research credits *even if they withdraw from the study*. This should be explicitly stated in the Project Description and/or the consent form in all protocols that use the Psychology Department Subject Pool.

**Ethnographic Research Methods:** Many of the protocols from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (SOAN) use ethnographic methods which include recording interviews with their participants. Because of this, these protocols typically use a verbal, not written, consent form. (More details are found in the Memorandum of Understanding with SOAN on the IRB share drive.)

*Ethical considerations:* Some topics covered in protocols are sensitive in nature, and although the researcher may not directly ask about illegal activities and behaviors (e.g., drug use, criminal activities, given a topic, a participant may inadvertently report on their own (or other's) illegal activities and behaviors. If the research topic is such that a participant may report on illegal activities and behaviors, the project description must clearly state that the researcher will stop recording, redirect the participant, and only start recording again once the participant has ceased talking about illegal activities and behaviors.

UPS IRB PROTOCOL #

**University of Puget Sound INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**Application for Approval of Research Involving Human Subjects**  
(Cover Sheet)

(Protocols meeting Full Board Review must be submitted two weeks prior to the date of the IRB meeting on which the review is to occur.)

Please Check One:  New Project  Renewal  Modification (Attach Renewal/Modification Form)

Date of Submission: October 11, 2016

Protocol Title: Tattoos and the Workforce

Principal Investigator: Typed name: Jane Doe  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department or School: Department of Sociology and Anthropology  
Email: [jdoe@pugetsound.edu](mailto:jdoe@pugetsound.edu)  
Telephone number: (123) 456-7890

Co-Investigator: Typed Name: Joe Doe  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: [jdoe2@pugetsound.edu](mailto:jdoe2@pugetsound.edu)

Co-Investigator: Typed Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Co-Investigator: Typed Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**Faculty Advisor's Statement** (student projects only): I, George Doe am the advisor for the above named students. My signature below indicates that I have read the attached protocol and have checked the contents with the IRB Guidelines. I thereby recommend this protocol as:  
Exempt Review  Expedited Review  Full Board Review   
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: [gdoe@pugetsound.edu](mailto:gdoe@pugetsound.edu)

Source of Support (if any):

Level of Risk to Human Participants:  Minimal  Greater than minimal

Number of Participants: 15

\*Normal participants are (a) over the age of 18 (b) able to make independent decisions with full mental capacity. Children are minors under the age of 18.

Are vulnerable populations involved?\*  yes  no Are children involved?\*  yes  no

Has this proposal been or will it be submitted to other Human Subjects Review Boards, departmental committees, or community agencies for review and approval?  
 Yes (attach approval letters)  No

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 8:32 AM

**Comment [1]:** Title must be consistent throughout the entire document.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 8:33 AM

**Comment [2]:** Department should be listed unless the researcher belongs to the School of Education, Physical Therapy, or Occupational Therapy.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 8:33 AM

**Comment [3]:** All co-investigators must be listed.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 8:35 AM

**Comment [4]:** Faculty advisor statement must be completed. Ensure that faculty advisor's name and e-mail are present and a level of review (exempt, expedited, full board) has been checked. After reviewing the protocol, you must confirm that the appropriate level of review has been selected.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 8:36 AM

**Comment [5]:** Exempt and expedited levels of review correspond to "minimal" risk. If "greater than minimal" risk is selected, the protocol must be reviewed by the full board.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 8:38 AM

**Comment [6]:** Double-check that all boxes are checked and are appropriate for project and level of review; e.g., if "yes" is selected for "vulnerable populations" it is likely that full board review is necessary.

## Careful Considerations: Tattoos and the Workforce

- (A) **Project Description:** *Describe the purpose of the research, the methods to be used including data collection procedures and any features of the research design that may involve special conditions or procedures for the subjects. Identify any risks to which subjects may be exposed.*

In my research I will be trying to determine how aspirations about future employment shape and reflect tattoo considerations for undergraduate students at the University of Puget Sound. Much of the literature on the subject of tattoos in the workplace suggests that people with tattoos are considered to be untrustworthy, unmotivated, unprofessional and less approached than their un-tattooed counterparts. This stigma against tattooed people can make it harder for them to secure a job. Upon completing this research, I hope to gain an understanding of the extent to which students who have tattoos on this campus have considered this potential challenge as they plan for their lives after college, and the ways their professional aspirations have shaped and been reflected by their tattoos. I also hope to address whether or not college students see tattoos as a deviant act, or if they perceive tattoos as now a part of mainstream culture and foresee the biases against tattoos becoming obsolete.

In my audiotaped (consent to record will be obtained before interviewing begins) semi structured interviews I will try to get a sense of how students think about tattoos. Interviews will be conducted in person and one-on-one, location to be determined on a case-by-case basis.

- (B) **Subject Recruitment:**

1. *Identify the number of subjects to be recruited for the research. Identify how and where subjects are recruited and the criteria used to select and exclude subjects.*
2. *Describe the characteristics of the subjects with regard to age, sex, race, special affiliations which cause them to be included in the study population, institution status (i.e., patients or prisoners), and their general state of mental and physical health. Explain why it is necessary to use any particular population subgroups or special populations.*

I will recruit 15 subjects, starting with a list of acquaintances known to have tattoos and then using the chain referral method to ask respondents for the names of other people who fit the criteria and might be willing to participate in my research. Respondents must be undergraduate students at the University of Puget Sound, they must have at least one tattoo (visible or not) and they must be older than 18 years old. For the purpose of this study I will not limit my respondent pool to exclude any gender, sexual, or racial identities and will allow respondents within any mental or physical health as long as participation does not put them at risk of emotional or physical harm. The subject population will resemble the subject pool at the University of Puget Sound in terms of age, ethnicity, and gender.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:24 AM

**Comment [7]:** Title does not match the title on the coversheet. One, consistent title must be used throughout.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:01 AM

**Comment [8]:** Should have citations to support writing.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:05 AM

**Comment [9]:** Ensure that there is a clear "purpose of the study" statement in the project description. If not, then request a clear statement from the researchers before approval.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:02 AM

**Comment [10]:** As per the MOU with SOAN, ethnographic research methods which employ semi-structured interviews must include an interview guide. This is not included and must be requested before approval.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:04 AM

**Comment [11]:** Reviewer should indicate how long the interviews will take, on average. In addition, any potential risk is not identified in this section.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:07 AM

**Comment [12]:** How will the researchers assess this? If the researchers believe that certain mental/physical health differences will impact participation negatively, then they must outline what these are and how participants may be screened out. This must be clarified before approval.

(C) **Confidentiality of Data:** *Explain how data will be secured to safeguard identifiable records of individuals.*

The names of participants will not appear on any materials containing their responses. All identifying materials such as consent forms will be kept in a locked file in the Sociology and Anthropology Department at the University of Puget Sound. That said, I will be researching tattoos which are unique in tier design and placement so there is some danger of the identify of the person being discernable through a description of their tattoo(s). To minimize this concern I will leave out any descriptive information that is not pertinent to the findings. I will also include a statement in the consent form saying that any respondent will be granted the option to have descriptions of tattoos left out of the final paper when they are identifiable. Digital and audio files will be kept on a password protected personal computer. All files will be destroyed within six months of the end of the study unless otherwise stipulated by the subjects.

(D) **Risks to Subjects:** *Describe in detail any immediate or long range risks to subjects that may arise from the procedures used in the study. (Risks may be physical, psychological, social, legal, or economic.) Describe the precautions you have taken to minimize these risks.*

There are minimal risks associated with this study and I will be careful to minimize potential risk wherever possible. I will avoid sensitive subject matter in my interview by asking only about the respondent's tattoos in relations to their potential future jobs, and I will protect their identities as thoroughly as possible as mentioned in the above section.

(E) **Benefits:** *Describe the anticipated benefits to subjects, science, and/or society, that may occur as a result of this study.*

Subjects do not receive benefits for participating, but I hope that this study will contribute to the academic discourse of tattoos in the workplace and provide the participants an opportunity to consider how best to proceed as they enter into the workforce.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:11 AM

**Comment [13]:** This is a good safeguard by the researchers. Ensure that this statement appears on the consent form and is readily understandable by the reader.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:14 AM

**Comment [14]:** It is typical that audio files are destroyed immediately after transcription is complete. In addition, transcription should remove any identifying information. This should be specified by the researcher.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:17 AM

**Comment [15]:** This is unclear; does this mean that files can be destroyed sooner? Later? The researchers must specify what is meant here before approval.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:19 AM

**Comment [16]:** The researcher can be asked to specify this is in more detail if the reviewer feels that there are some risks inherent in the project that the researchers have not yet identified.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:20 AM

**Comment [17]:** This cannot be assessed as an interview guide has not been submitted with the project. This must be requested before approval can be granted.



## Consent to Act as a Subject in a Research Study

TITLE: Careful Considerations: Tattooed Students Joining the Workforce

INVESTIGATORS: Jane Doe (123) 456-7890 Joe Doe (123) 456-7899

SUPERVISOR: George Doe DEPARTMENT: Sociology and Anthropology PHONE: 253 879-1234

DESCRIPTION: This project seeks to examine the ways future employment aspirations shape and reflect tattoo considerations among students at the University of Puget Sound. Students will be recruited based on referrals from their peers, using the snowball method. The purpose of this study is to gauge student's perspective on workplace discrimination against people with tattoos, and how they plan on mitigating any potential impact their tattoos might cause as they enter the workforce. The goal is to garner an understanding of the general perceptions of anti-tattoo stigma in the chose field of UPS students, and to observe any trends relating to fiends that are though to be more or less discriminatory. The study will include approximately ten (15) students, each of whom will participant in one-hour long initial audiotaped interviews, with the possibility of short follow-up interviews.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: I understand that there are no anticipated risks associated with my participation in this research.

COSTS AND PAYMENTS: I understand that I will incur no costs as a result of my participation in this project; all project costs will be born by the principal investigator. Likewise, I will receive no monetary compensation for my participation.

\*\*\*\*\*  
CONFIDENTIALITY: To ensure confidentiality of the participant, the primary researcher will use pseudonyms to refer to all interviewees in the final report. I understand that any information about me obtained from this research, including answers to questionnaires, laboratory data, or audio or videotapes will be kept strictly confidential. Information that will carry personal identifying information will be kept in locked files in the SOAN department at the University of Puget Sound OR will be kept on a password-protected personal computer that will remain in my possession. I understand that I have the right to request that identifiable descriptions of my tattoos will be omitted from the final report to protect my identity. I do understand that my research records, just like hospital records, may be subpoenaed by court order. It has been explained to me that my identity will not be revealed in any description or publication of this research. Therefore, I consent to such publication for scientific purposes.

RIGHT TO REFUSE OR END PARTICIPATION: I understand that I am free to refuse to participate in this study or to end my participation at any time and that my decision will not adversely affect my care at this institution or cause a loss of benefits to which I might be otherwise entitled.

Tim Beyer 4/13/2017 10:51 AM

**Comment [18]:** Consent form needs to be on Puget Sound letterhead.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:27 AM

**Comment [19]:** Title is not consistent with the coversheet. One consistent title must be used throughout.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:40 AM

**Comment [20]:** There may be no spelling or grammar issues on the materials that the participant sees, including consent forms. The reading level of a consent form should be 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:41 AM

**Comment [21]:** Any inconsistencies on the consent form and between the protocol and the consent form must be rectified.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 9:44 AM

**Comment [22]:** All sections above the "asterisks" on the consent form must be in the third person, not first person. Moreover, the potential risks are not described (refer the researcher back to the "Risks" section in the protocol). In addition, benefits are not described (again, refer the researchers back to the "Benefits" section in the protocol). The consent form should be an accurate reflection of what is covered in the protocol.

Tim Beyer 4/13/2017 10:51 AM

**Comment [23]:** This section should also be written in the third person.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 10:10 AM

**Comment [24]:** This should be spelled out.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 10:11 AM

**Comment [25]:** This is unclear; audio files should be erased after transcription and transcription should remove identifying information. Ask researchers to clarify intended meaning.

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 10:12 AM

**Comment [26]:** When a consent form is longer than two pages, there must be a space to initial on every page that does not have the signature line. This must be added before approval can be granted.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT: I certify that I have read the preceding or it has been read to me and that I understand its contents. Any questions I have pertaining to the research have and will be answered by Jane Doe. Any questions or concerns I have regarding my rights as a research subject will be answered by the Office of the Associate Dean (253-879-3207). A copy of this consent form will be given to me. My signature below means that I have freely agreed to participate in this study.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Participant's signature

INVESTIGATOR'S CERTIFICATION: I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature, potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Investigator's signature

Tim Beyer 4/10/2017 10:17 AM

**Comment [27]:** Ensure that this contact information is included in the consent form.

## Appendix C: Policy for Outside Researchers

Thank you for your interest in conducting research at the University of Puget Sound. Outside research, conducted by anyone who is not a student of or employed by the university, is permitted, after the following process is completed.

This process applies to you if:

- Members of the student body are used as research subjects, and/or
- On-campus resources (physical or virtual) are used for recruitment or data collection

Examples include recruitment of research subjects through on-campus email distribution lists, through flyers posted on campus, or through the on-campus physical and/or occupational therapy clinics.

The following requirements must be satisfied before research is conducted by outside researchers:

- You must have IRB approval from your home institution and provide documentation to the University of Puget Sound Institutional Review Board (PS-IRB).
- You must follow the same procedures for submission of protocols as on-campus researchers (completion of cover sheets, articulating the risks and benefits of the study, recruitment methods, consent forms, etc.) For further information about the requirements for submission, visit <https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>
- When your protocol is submitted for PS-IRB review, you need to articulate why the Puget Sound campus community is needed and how members of the Puget Sound community may benefit from the research.
- You need to partner with an on-campus faculty or staff member. The on-campus member must be actively involved in the research. That person should be listed on the consent form and cover sheet.
- You need to complete the CITI training modules associated with “Social and Behavioral Science Researchers.”
  - If you *do not* already have a CITI account, navigate to [www.citiprogram.org](http://www.citiprogram.org) and create a new account:
    - Select “University of Puget Sound” as the home institution.
    - After entering the requested demographic information, select:
      - “Researchers” (Question 1).
      - “Social and Behavioral Science Researchers (includes Education and Business” (Question 2).
      - “No” (Question 3).

- “No” (Question 4).
  - Complete the nine associated modules and submit your certificate of completion with your protocol.
- If you already have a CITI account, but have not completed the training modules associated with “Social and Behavioral Science Researchers,” please:
  - Select “Add a course” from “My Learner Tools”.
  - Input the information listed above for Questions 1-4.
  - Complete the nine associated modules and submit your certificate of completion with your protocol.
- If you already have a CITI account and have completed the training modules associated with “Social and Behavioral Science Researchers” simply submit your certificate of completion with your protocol.

You may direct questions about this process to the current chair of the PS-IRB. The name of the chair may be found here:

[https://cascade.pugetsound.edu/cascade/faculty.committee\\_list?p\\_committee\\_id=5](https://cascade.pugetsound.edu/cascade/faculty.committee_list?p_committee_id=5)

## Appendix D: Updated Instructions for Student Researchers

# CITI Account Creation Instructions for Students

Before you can start CITI training, you must first create an account at the CITI site. Start by going to [citiprogram.org](http://citiprogram.org) and click on the “Register” button in the “Create an account” box. It should take you to a page like the one shown on the right. Enter “University of Puget Sound” and click the box to agree to their terms of service (after reading them, of course). Then click the “Continue to Step 2” button

USA - English Text Size: A A Log In | Register | Help

**CITI PROGRAM** Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative Search Knowledge Base

Home About Us Subscribing Online Courses CMEs/CEUs News Contact Us

**CITI - Learner Registration**

Steps: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

You must make a selection below.

**Select Your Organization Affiliation**

Search for organization: Enter full or partial name

University of Puget Sound Can't find your institution? It may use Single Sign On. Check here.

To find your organization, enter its name in the box above, then pick from the list of choices provided. If the selection is correct, click the "Continue to Step 2" button immediately below. To clear your selection and try again, click the "Search Again" button.

I AGREE to the Terms of Service for accessing CITI Program materials.

Continue to Step 2 Search Again

**Independent Learner Registration**

Use this option if you are paying for your courses. Click the button "Continue as Independent Learner" to affiliate as an Independent Learner. This option is for persons not affiliated with a CITI Program subscriber organization, or who require content that their organization does not provide. Fees apply. Credit card payment with American Express, Discover, MasterCard or Visa is required. Checks are not accepted.

I AGREE to the Terms of Service for accessing CITI Program materials.

I have confirmed that my organization is not a subscriber to CITI Program for the course/series that I am purchasing as an Independent Learner. NOTE: We are unable to issue refunds for a purchased course/series if you find out that you have access to it via your organization and have started the course/series.

Continue as Independent Learner (Fees Apply)

Step 2 asks for your name and email address. Use your @pugetsound address here, and Continue to Step 3.

USA - English Text Size: A A Log In | Register | Help

**CITI PROGRAM** Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative Search Knowledge Base

Home About Us Subscribing Online Courses CMEs/CEUs News Contact Us

CITI - Learner Registration - University of Puget Sound

Steps: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Personal Information**

\* indicates a required field.

* First Name Jane	* Last Name Doe
* Email Address jndoe@pugetsound.edu	* Verify email address jndoe@pugetsound.edu

We urge you to provide a second email address, if you have one, in case messages are blocked or you lose the ability to access the first one. If you forget your username or password, you can recover that information using either email address.

Secondary email address  
Verify secondary email address

Continue to Step 3

**SITE NAVIGATION**  
Home CMEs/CEUs Accessibility

**CONTACT INFORMATION**  
CITI Program, a Division of BRANY  
1091 Mosses Avenue, Suite 200

Pick a user name that's not already taken and create a password for your account. Then set up a security question for yourself before you Continue to Step 4.

USA - English Text Size: A A Log In | Register | Help

**CITI PROGRAM** Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative Search Knowledge Base

Home About Us Subscribing Online Courses CMEs/CEUs News Contact Us

CITI - Learner Registration - University of Puget Sound

Steps: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

### Create your Username and Password

\* indicates a required field.

Your username should consist of 4 to 50 characters. Your username is not case sensitive; "A12B34CD" is the same as "a12b34cd". Once created, your username will be part of the completion report.

\* User Name  
jndoe

Your password should consist of 8 to 50 characters. Your password is case sensitive; "A12B34CD" is not the same as "a12b34cd".

\* Password  
\*\*\*\*\*

\* Verify Password  
\*\*\*\*\*

Please choose a security question and provide an answer that you will remember. NOTE: if you forget your login information, you will have to provide this answer to the security question in order to access your account.

\* Security Question  
What color was your first car?

\* Security Answer  
Yellow

Continue to Step 4

Your country of residence will be the United States, even if that's not your home country.

USA - English Text Size: A A Log In | Register | Help

**CITI PROGRAM** Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative Search Knowledge Base

Home About Us Subscribing Online Courses CMEs/CEUs News Contact Us

CITI - Learner Registration - University of Puget Sound

Steps: 1 2 3 **4** 5 6 7

\* Indicates a required field.

**\* Country of Residence**

Search for country: Enter full or partial name (e.g., "United States") OR your country's two or three character abbreviation (e.g., "US", "USA"), then pick from the list of choices provided.

United States

Continue to Step 5

**SITE NAVIGATION**

Home	CMEs/CEUs	Accessibility
About	News	Copyright
Subscribing	Contact Us	Privacy Notice
Online Courses		Terms of Service

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

CITI Program, a Division of BRANY  
1981 Marcus Avenue, Suite 210  
Lake Success, NY 11042  
888-529-5929 (U.S. toll free)  
+1-305-907-3100 (Outside U.S.)  
support@citiiprogram.org



Unless you *want* to pay money to take your training courses, make sure you select “No” when asked if you want Continuing Education Unit credit. Decide whether CITI can contact you for research purposes, and Continue to Step 6.

**\* Are you interested in the option of receiving Continuing Education Unit (CEU) credit for completed CITI Program courses?**

CITI is pleased to offer CE credits and units for purchase to learners qualifying for CE eligibility while concurrently meeting their institutions training requirements.

CE credits/units for physicians, psychologists, nurses, social workers and other professions allowed to use AMA PRA Category 1 credits for re-certification are available for many CITI courses – with that availability indicated on course and module listings. **Please register your interest for CE credits below** by checking the “YES” or “NO” dots, and, when applicable, types of credits you wish to earn at bottom of page. Please read texts entered for each option carefully.

**Yes**

At the start of your course, you will be prompted to click on a “CE Information” page link located at the top of your grade book and to VIEW and ACKNOWLEDGE accreditation and credit designation statements, learning objectives, faculty disclosures, types, number and costs of credits available for your course.

Yes

**No**

The CE functionality will not be activated for your course. Credits and units will therefore not be available to you for purchase after you start your course. You can change your preference to “YES” before such time however by clicking on the “CE Credit Status” tab located at the top of your grad book page.

No

**If you picked “YES”, please check below the one type of credit you would like to earn**

MDs, DOs, PAs - AMA PRA Category 1 Credits TM

Psychologists – APA Credits

Nurses – ANCC CNE

Other Participants – Certificates of Participation

Social Workers – Florida Board of Clinical Social Work, Marriage & Family Therapy and Mental Health Counseling

**\* Can CITI Program contact you at a later date regarding participation in research surveys?**

Yes

No

Not sure. Ask me later

[Continue to Step 6](#)

Enter your email address and the department in which you're doing your research. Select "Student Researcher – Undergraduate" from the drop-down menu, then Continue to Step 7.

USA - English Text Size: A A Log In | Register | Help

**CITI PROGRAM** Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative Search Knowledge Base

Home About Us Subscribing Online Courses CMEs/CEUs News Contact Us

CITI - Learner Registration - University of Puget Sound

Steps: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please provide the following information requested by University of Puget Sound

\* indicates a required field.

\* Institutional email address  
jdoe@pugetsound.edu

\* Department  
Psychology

\* Role in research  
Student Researcher - Undergraduate

Continue to Step 7

**SITE NAVIGATION**  
Home  
About  
Subscribing  
Online Courses

CMEs/CEUs  
News  
Contact Us

Accessibility  
Copyright  
Privacy Notice  
Terms of Service

**CONTACT INFORMATION**  
CITI Program, a Division of BRANY  
1981 Marcus Avenue, Suite 210  
Lake Success, NY 11042  
888-529-5929 (U.S. toll free)  
+1-305-907-3100 (Outside U.S.)  
support@citi-program.org

Despite the fact that you just identified yourself as a student researcher, you need to select “Student” here rather than “Researcher” for your role, otherwise CITI will make you do extra training courses! You can opt out of the Responsible Conduct of Research, Conflicts of Interest, and IACUC sections as well. IACUC stands for Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and this training is required for some research projects using non-human animals; please check with your instructor. Click “Complete Registration” when you’re finished.

USA - English Text Size: A A Log In | Register | Help

**CITI PROGRAM** Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative Search Knowledge Base

Home About Us Subscribing Online Courses CMEs/CEUs News Contact Us

CITI - Learner Registration - University of Puget Sound

Steps: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

### Select Curriculum

\* indicates a required field.

You will be provided a series of enrollment questions. Your responses will determine the curriculum for the courses you are going to take. Please read the questions carefully. Please read the responses carefully to make the best choice. Click [here](#) to review the University of Puget Sound instructions page.

#### Question 1

##### Human Subjects Research

Please choose one learner group below based on your role and the type of human subjects activities you will conduct. You will be enrolled in the Basic Course for that group.

Choose one answer

- Researchers
- Students
- IRB Members
- IRB Chair

#### Question 2

##### Responsible Conduct of Research

Please make your selection below to receive the courses in the Responsible Conduct of Research.

Choose one answer

- Biology and biomedical researchers
- Humanities researchers
- Physical science researchers
- Social and behavioral science researchers (includes Education and Business)
- Not at this time.

#### \* Question 3

##### Conflicts of Interest

Would you like to take the Conflicts of Interest course?

Choose one answer

- Yes
- No

#### Question 4

##### IACUC

Would you like to take the IACUC course?

Choose one answer

- Yes
- No

Ok, you *thought* you were done, but now you have to *finalize* your registration by clicking on the link.

The screenshot shows the CITI Program website interface. At the top, there is a header with the CITI PROGRAM logo and the text 'Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative'. To the right of the logo is a search bar labeled 'Search Knowledge Base'. Below the header is a navigation menu with links for Home, About Us, Subscribing, Online Courses, CMEs/CEUs, News, and Contact Us. The main content area features a blue box titled 'CITI - Learner Registration' containing the text: 'Welcome to the CITI Program. Your registration with University of Puget Sound is complete.' Below this text is a blue link labeled 'Finalize registration', which is circled in red. At the bottom of the page is a dark blue footer with three columns of text: 'SITE NAVIGATION' (Home, About, Subscribing, Online Courses), 'CMEs/CEUs' (News, Contact Us), and 'CONTACT INFORMATION' (CITI Program, a Division of BRANY, 1981 Marcus Avenue, Suite 210, Lake Success, NY 11042, 888-529-5929 (U.S. toll free), +1-305-907-3100 (Outside U.S.), support@citiiprogram.org).

After completing the registration, you're shown the page on the right, which lists all of the courses you are expected to take. If you selected properly in the earlier stages of registration, it should just have "Students" in the "Course" column. Click on "Students" to go to the full list of modules you're expected to complete as a student.

The screenshot shows the CITI PROGRAM website interface. At the top, there is a header with the logo, the text "Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative", and a search bar. Below the header, there is a navigation menu with links for "Main Menu", "My Profiles", "My CEUs", "My Reports", and "Support". A green checkmark icon indicates a successful registration: "Your registration has been completed successfully." Below this, there is a section titled "University of Puget Sound Courses" with a table. The table has columns for "Course", "Status", "Completion Report", and "Survey". The "Students" entry in the "Course" column is circled in red. Below the table, there is a section titled "My Learner Tools for University of Puget Sound" with a list of links: "Add a Course", "Remove a Course", "View Previously Completed Coursework", "Update Institution Profile", "View Instructions page", and "Remove Affiliation". At the bottom, there are two blue buttons: "Click here to affiliate with another institution" and "Affiliate as an Independent Learner". The footer contains links for "Accessibility", "Copyright", "Privacy Notice", "Terms of Service", and "Contact Us".

Course	Status	Completion Report	Survey
Students	Not Started	Not Earned	

- Add a Course
- Remove a Course
- View Previously Completed Coursework
- Update Institution Profile
- View Instructions page
- Remove Affiliation

Click here to affiliate with another institution

Affiliate as an Independent Learner

Here you see the pair of required “Modules”, “Students in Research” and “University of Puget Sound”. This page is sneaky though. You’re not allowed to click on those links and start the modules until you first click on the link circled on the right.

English    Text size: A A    Jane Doe ID: 5966986 | Log Out | Help

**CITI PROGRAM** Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative    Search Knowledge Base

Main Menu | My Profiles | My CEUs | My Reports | Support

Main Menu > Course Students

### Students - Basic Stage

To pass this course you must:

- Complete all 2 required modules
- Achieve an average score of at least 80% on all quizzes associated with this course's module requirements
- Supplemental modules, if provided, are optional and do not count towards passing the course or the overall score

Your Current Score: **0%**

You have unfinished required or elective modules remaining

[Complete The Integrity Assurance Statement before beginning the course](#)

#### Required Modules

	Date Completed	Score
Students in Research (ID: 1321)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
University of Puget Sound (ID: 16686)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)

#### Supplemental Modules

	Date Completed	Score
NOTE: Supplemental modules are provided for general interest only. You DO NOT receive credit for completing these modules		
Internet-Based Research - SBE (ID: 510)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
International Research - SBE (ID: 509)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
Avoiding Group Harms - International Research Perspectives (ID: 14081)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
Avoiding Group Harms - U.S. Research Perspectives (ID: 14080)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
Research with Children - CBE (ID: 507)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)

Clicking the previous link brings you to this page. Read the summary of the Terms of Service and, if you agree to honor them, check the “I AGREE” box and Submit.

English Text size: A A Jane Doe ID: 5966986 | Log Out | Help

**CITI PROGRAM** Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative Search Knowledge Base

Main Menu | My Profiles | My CEUs | My Reports | Support

Main Menu > Assurance Statement

### Assurance Statement

**Jane Doe:**

CITI Program **Terms of Service** include the following provisions. Please read them carefully.

**No Account Sharing:** I will not share my username and password with anyone. I will contact the CITI Program Help Desk if I believe my account has been compromised.

**Do My Own Work:** I will complete all required quizzes and any other assessments by myself, using only my own work.

**No Quiz Sharing:** I will not share CITI Program quiz questions or answers on any website, via email, photocopying, or any other means.

**No Cheating:** I will not engage in any activities that would dishonestly improve my results, or improve or hurt the results of other learners.

**My Actions Are Logged:** I understand that CITI Program keeps account activity logs, including computer IP addresses, time spent in each content area, number of quiz attempts and scores. Allegations of inappropriate use will be investigated, and the results reported to my institution.

Check the box to accept, then click the Submit button:

I AGREE to the above and the other **Terms of Service** for accessing CITI Program materials.

Submit

Accessibility Copyright Privacy Notice Terms of Service Contact Us

You'll be taken back to this page again, but now the "Students in Research" module is a link that you can click on to begin your training. Congratulations!

To pass this course you must:

- Complete all 2 required modules
- Achieve an average score of at least 80% on all quizzes associated with this course's module requirements
- Supplemental modules, if provided, are optional and do not count towards passing the course or the overall score

Your Current Score

0%

You have unfinished required or elective modules remaining

#### Required Modules

	Date Completed	Score
Students in Research (ID: 1321)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
University of Puget Sound (ID: 16686)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)

#### Supplemental Modules

	Date Completed	Score
NOTE: Supplemental modules are provided for general interest only. You DO NOT receive credit for completing these modules		
Internet-Based Research - SBE (ID: 510)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
International Research - SBE (ID: 509)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
Avoiding Group Harms - International Research Perspectives (ID: 14081)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
Avoiding Group Harms - U.S. Research Perspectives (ID: 14080)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
Research with Children - SBE (ID: 507)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - SBE (ID: 508)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Workers/Employees (ID: 483)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)
Research with Prisoners - SBE (ID: 506)	Incomplete	0/0 (0%)



## Appendix F: Standardized E-mail Responses and Review Flowchart

### Standardized E-mail Responses for Student Protocols

Below, please find standardized language for e-mail responses for student protocols. There are four responses, corresponding the different outcomes of review. Please note that the responses differ by *Expedited* protocols (which require continued IRB oversight) and *Exempt* protocols (which do not require continued IRB oversight). Please be sure to use the appropriate response for the level of review.

For **Expedited** Protocols:

1) For **approval**:

- a. *If the first protocol that was submitted can be approved*, use this standardized language:

Dear (*Investigator's Name*),

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “(*Enter Protocol Title*)”. It meets the criteria for *expedited* review and has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

As indicated on the *Protocol Decision Document* your protocol is now approved. Please keep the attached document for your records.

Please note that your study is approved for **one year from the date marked on the *Protocol Decision Document***. If you finish data collection before this date, please complete the required *Informational Follow-up Form* (found under *Additional Forms* on <http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>). If your data collection will continue past the year date, be sure to submit the required *Renewal/Modification Form* (found under *Additional Forms* on <http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>)

\*\*\*\*\*For studies that require consent forms, please add:

Please note that you must get your consent forms stamped before you may start collecting any data. To get your consent form stamped, please bring a hard copy of your (1) approval document/e-mail, and (2) consent form to Jimmy McMichael (Jones 212).

Good luck with your research!

(*Your name*)

- b. *If a resubmitted protocol can be approved, use this standardized language:*

Dear (*Investigator's Name*),

Thank you for resubmitting your protocol (“Enter protocol number *xxxx-xxx*”) and incorporating the requested changes and/or clarifications. As indicated on the *Protocol Decision Document* your protocol is now approved. Please keep the attached document for your records.

Please note that your study is approved for **one year from the date marked on the *Protocol Decision Document***. If you finish data collection before this date, please complete the required *Informational Follow-up Form* (found under *Additional Forms* on <http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>). If your data collection will continue past the year date, be sure to submit the required *Renewal/Modification Form* (found under *Additional Forms* on <http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>)

\*\*\*\*\*For studies that require consent forms, please add:

Please note that you must get your consent forms stamped before you may start collecting any data. To get your consent form stamped, please bring a hard copy of your (1) approval document/e-mail, and (2) consent form to Jimmy McMichael (Jones 212).

Good luck with your research!

(*Your name*)

- 2) To request **minor corrections or clarifications:**

Dear (*Investigator's Name*),

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “(*Enter Protocol Title*)”. It meets the criteria for *expedited* review and has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Minor changes and/or clarifications are necessary before this protocol can be approved. The required changes and/or clarifications are outlined at the end of this e-mail. Once you have made the requested changes and/or clarifications to the protocol, please resubmit your protocol for approval.

Please respond with your revised protocol within *one week* of this e-mail. If you cannot complete the revisions within one week, please let me know by what date you intend to submit your revisions.

Please note that ***no data collection may occur until you have secured IRB approval.***

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

*(Your Name)*

3) For **reconsideration after investigator corresponds to identified concerns:**

Dear *(Investigator's Name)*,

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled "*(Enter Protocol Title)*". It meets the criteria for *expedited* review and has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Unfortunately, I cannot approve the protocol in its current form. There are serious concerns that must be addressed before approval is possible. These concerns are outlined at the end of this e-mail.

Please seriously reflect on the concerns raised. If the concerns can be addressed, please respond with your revised protocol within *one week* of this e-mail. If you cannot complete the revisions within one week, please let me know by what date you intend to submit your revisions.

Please note that ***no data collection may occur until you have secured IRB approval.***

If you have any questions or concerns about your protocol or this decision, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

*(Your Name)*

4) For **disapproval:**

Dear *(Investigator's Name)*,

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “*(Enter Protocol Title)*”. It has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Unfortunately, this protocol cannot be approved in its current form. **Please understand that this means you may not collect data for your project.** Specific reasons for this decision are outlined in the attached “Protocol Decision Document”. If you have any questions or concerns about your protocol or this decision, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

*(Your Name)*

For **Exempt** Protocols:

1) For **approval**:

- a. *If the first protocol that was submitted can be approved*, use this standardized language:

Dear *(Investigator’s Name)*,

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “*(Enter Protocol Title)*”. It meets the criteria for *exempt* review and has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

As indicated on the *Protocol Decision Document* your protocol is now approved. Please keep the attached document for your records.

\*\*\*\*\*For studies that require consent forms, please add:

Please note that you must get your consent forms stamped before you may start collecting any data. To get your consent form stamped, please bring a hard copy of your (1) approval document/e-mail, and (2) consent form to Jimmy McMichael (Jones 212).

Good luck with your research!

*(Your name)*

- b. *If a resubmitted protocol can be approved*, use this standardized language:

Dear *(Investigator’s Name)*,

Thank you for resubmitting your protocol (“Enter protocol number xxxx-xxx”) and incorporating the requested changes and/or clarifications. As indicated on the *Protocol Decision Document* your protocol is now approved. Please keep the attached document for your records.

\*\*\*\*\*For studies that require consent forms, please add:  
Please note that you must get your consent forms stamped before you may start collecting any data. To get your consent form stamped, please bring a hard copy of your (1) approval document/e-mail, and (2) consent form to Jimmy McMichael (Jones 212).

Good luck with your research!

*(Your name)*

2) To request **minor corrections or clarifications**:

Dear *(Investigator’s Name)*,

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “*(Enter Protocol Title)*”. It meets the criteria for *exempt* review and has been assigned the protocol number xxxx-xxx. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Minor changes and/or clarifications are necessary before this protocol can be approved. The required changes and/or clarifications are outlined at the end of this e-mail. Once you have made the requested changes and/or clarifications to the protocol, please resubmit your protocol for approval.

Please respond with your revised protocol within *one week* of this e-mail. If you cannot complete the revisions within one week, please let me know by what date you intend to submit your revisions.

Please note that ***no data collection may occur until you have secured IRB approval.***

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

*(Your Name)*

3) For **reconsideration after investigator corresponds to identified concerns:**

Dear (*Investigator's Name*),

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “(*Enter Protocol Title*)”. It meets the criteria for *exempt* review and has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Unfortunately, I cannot approve the protocol in its current form. There are serious concerns that must be addressed before approval is possible. These concerns are outlined at the end of this e-mail.

Please seriously reflect on the concerns raised. If the concerns can be addressed, please respond with your revised protocol within *one week* of this e-mail. If you cannot complete the revisions within one week, please let me know by what date you intend to submit your revisions.

Please note that ***no data collection may occur until you have secured IRB approval.***

If you have any questions or concerns about your protocol or this decision, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

(*Your Name*)

4) For **disapproval:**

Dear (*Investigator's Name*),

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “(*Enter Protocol Title*)”. It has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Unfortunately, this protocol cannot be approved in its current form. **Please understand that this means you may not collect data for your project.** Specific reasons for this decision are outlined in the attached “Protocol Decision Document”. If you have any questions or concerns about your protocol or this decision, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

(*Your Name*)

## Protocol Flowchart (updated 2/2017)

- 1) The principal investigator (PI) submits their protocol to Jimmy McMichael as:
  - a. A hardcopy in Jones 212 (CMB 1020); and
  - b. An electronic copy ([irb@pugetsound.edu](mailto:irb@pugetsound.edu))
  
- 1) Upon receipt, Jimmy logs the details of the protocol into our database. Using the level of review identified by the PI, Jimmy will either assign a *single reviewer* (for protocols marked exempt/expedited) or send the protocol to the *full board* (for protocols marked full board).
  
- 2) For exempt/expedited protocols:
  - a. Jimmy will notify you via e-mail when a protocol has been assigned to you. The protocol will be attached in the e-mail. You can also access this protocol via the shared IRB drive (`//merlin2/irb/`). Once logged in, the folder *Protocols* contains sub-folders with the protocol number that has been assigned to you. You will find the protocol in that folder.
  - b. Confirm that the PI has identified the correct level of review (see “Levels of Review Checklist”)
    - i. If correctly identified as exempt/expedited, please review protocol.
    - ii. If incorrectly identified as exempt/expedited, please e-mail Jimmy to alert him that this protocol requires full board review and must be sent to the full committee.
  
- 3) Review of exempt/expedited protocols:
  - a. *If revisions are required* before the protocol can be approved, the required changes must be communicated with the PI via e-mail. The PI must resubmit the revised document(s) to the reviewer via e-mail. All requested revisions must be satisfied before the reviewer can approve the protocol.
    - i. Considerations during the review process:
      1. The reviewer should communicate with the PI within 3 business days of receipt of a protocol or resubmission.
      2. Use the standardized e-mail responses found on the share drive (under *Resources for IRB Members/ Training/ Standardized E-mail Responses*) for all *student protocols*. You can amend these responses for non-student protocols.
      3. If the PI is a student, include the student’s advisor on all correspondence. The advisor’s name is on the coversheet.
  - b. *Once the protocol can be approved*, communicate this decision with the PI by using the Protocol Decision Document, found on the share drive under *Resources for IRB Members/Forms*.
    - i. Upload the following into the appropriate protocol folder on the share drive:
      1. Protocol Decision Document
      2. All revised documents

- ii. Bring the list of protocols you reviewed since the last full board IRB meeting. We will collect protocol numbers and status (approved, revisions required, rejected).
- c. All written communication between the reviewer and the PI *must* be retained. Thus, please cc [irb@pugetsound.edu](mailto:irb@pugetsound.edu) on all e-mail correspondence

\*\*\*\*Once review of an expedited/exempt protocol is complete, each folder on the IRB share drive *must* contain the following:

- d. Original protocol (uploaded by Jimmy)
- e. Revised protocol (if any revisions were requested by the reviewer)
- f. Protocol Decision Document

If a protocol requires full board review, Jimmy will make the protocol available to the full committee. We will discuss the protocol at the next full board meeting. The IRB chair will communicate decisions, including if revisions are required, with the PI.



**Appendix G: Verbal Consent Documentation**

**Consent Confirmation\***

**IRB PROTOCOL#** \_\_\_\_\_

**Principal Investigator** \_\_\_\_\_

	SUBJECT PSEUDONYM/CODE	DATE OF INTERVIEW	VERBAL CONSENT Y/N	INVESTIGATOR CONFIRMATION (Please initial)
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				

\*This form is to be attached to submitted to \_\_\_\_\_ along with your finalized Informational Follow-up Form for scanning and submission to IRB. It will be archived with your IRB protocol.

## Appendix H: Updated Protocol Template and Checklist

### (A) **PROTOCOL DESCRIPTION:**

1. **Introduction:** briefly introduce the topic of your research with appropriate background information and citations.
2. **Purpose:** clearly state the purpose of the study.
3. **References:** provide a list of the references you have used in providing background information for your study (include this section only if applicable).

### (B) **METHOD AND MATERIALS:** for each of the following subheadings explain how you will conduct your research.

#### 1. **Subject recruitment:**

- a. number of subjects
- b. how and where subjects will be recruited (word of mouth, posters on campus emails, etc.)
- c. criteria by which subjects will be included or excluded (gender, athletes, age, race, etc.).  
(If the study involves students from the University of Puget Sound the following standard statement may be used: The subject population will resemble the \_\_\_\_\_ Department subject pool at the University of Puget Sound in terms of age, ethnicity, and gender.)
- d. explain the method of obtaining informed consent.
- e. explain any special conditions or procedures that will be necessary for the project. (write "N/A" if not applicable)
- f. all studies carry at least minimal risk; explain the nature of risks that might occur to the subjects from participating in this study (physical, psychological, social, legal, or economic; see the IRB website for additional information on how to classify risk:  
<https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>)
- g. describe the precautions you have taken to minimize risks

#### 2. **Instrumentation:** describe any equipment, surveys, software, etc. that will be used in the study, and include validity and reliability of the instrumentation if relevant.

#### 3. **Data collection:** procedures of data collection need to be clearly described. (e.g. how many times the subject must be tested, how long will the testing session last, what is the subject to actually do during the testing session, are there treatments/interventions, for ethnographic research methods specify interview type (structured, semi-structured, unstructured) along with questions and/or interview guide, etc.)

4. **Data Analysis:** explain clearly how the data will be analyzed (e.g. qualitative research themes, ANOVA, t-tests, etc.) and the level of significance, if relevant.
- (C) **CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA:** Explain how data will be secured to safeguard identifiable records of individuals. This might include how and where the data will be housed, how the data were recorded (audio or visual tapes, paper pencil, etc.), how long the data will be kept, how it will be disposed of, who will have access to the data, etc. Also, in certain studies that require deception and/or assent may need to be addressed.
- (Standard statement: The names of participants will not appear on materials containing their responses. All identifying materials such as the consent forms will be scanned and stored on the secure University computer system. Hard copies of scanned consent forms will be destroyed immediately; scanned consent forms will be deleted after seven years.)
- (D) **BENEFITS:** Describe the anticipated benefits to subjects, science, and/or society, that may occur as a result of this study.
- (E) **QUALIFICATIONS OF INVESTIGATOR(S):**
1. If a faculty member is involved please summarize their qualifications
    - a. e.g. Jim Jensen is an associate professor in the Department of Psychology and has conducted and published many research studies dealing with Social and Cross-Cultural Psychology.
  2. If students are involved, please indicate why you are qualified to conduct the research
    - b. e.g. Joe Johnson is a senior in the Department of Psychology and has taken the following classes which provide him the skills to conduct this research: Developmental Psychology, Applied Psychological Measurement, Cross-Cultural Psychology and Social Psychology.
- (F) **CONSENT FORMS:** Consent forms are required for human research. Please see the instructions for consent forms in the Principles and Procedures Governing the Use of Human Subjects Document found on the University of Puget Sound Website. <https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>

Please use this checklist to ensure that your protocol meets IRB requirements.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Submit application for full board review before the deadline indicated on the IRB website <https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>**

**Applications for exempt and expedited review may be submitted at any time**

### **COVERSHEET**

\_\_\_\_\_ Completed  
\_\_\_\_\_ Typed  
\_\_\_\_\_ Signed (investigators, and if appropriate, faculty advisor)  
\_\_\_\_\_ CITI Training Certificate of Completion attached

### **PROTOCOL (5 pages maximum)**

\_\_\_\_\_ Pages numbered throughout

#### **(A) Protocol Description**

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Introduction and brief background  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Purpose of the Study  
\_\_\_\_\_ 3. References

#### **(B) Method and Materials**

##### **1. Subject Recruitment**

\_\_\_\_\_ a. Number of subjects  
\_\_\_\_\_ b. How and where subjects are recruited  
\_\_\_\_\_ c. Criteria for inclusion and exclusion  
\_\_\_\_\_ d. Method of obtaining informed consent  
\_\_\_\_\_ e. Special conditions or procedures  
\_\_\_\_\_ f. Risks to subjects  
\_\_\_\_\_ g. Precautions to minimize risks  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Instrumentation description  
\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Data collection procedures  
\_\_\_\_\_ 4. Data analysis

#### **(C) CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Procedure used to protect confidentiality  
\_\_\_\_\_ Manner of recording information  
\_\_\_\_\_ Use of audio and visual tapes and their disposition  
\_\_\_\_\_ How long identifying information will be kept  
\_\_\_\_\_ Deception or assent (if applicable)

#### **(D) BENEFITS**

\_\_\_\_\_ Benefits of the research

**(E) QUALIFICATIONS OF INVESTIGATOR(S)**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty: Qualifications for conducting the research  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Student: Qualifications for conducting the research

**(F) CONSENT FORMS**

Procedural Details:

- \_\_\_\_\_  
a. Page 1 is on appropriate institution letterhead
- \_\_\_\_\_  
b. Title (consent form title and project title are the same)
- \_\_\_\_\_  
c. Pages numbered (protocol and consent form numbered separately).
- \_\_\_\_\_  
d. list all investigators, email addresses, and business telephone numbers
- \_\_\_\_\_  
e. Blank for subjects' initials in lower right corner of each page of consent form.
- \_\_\_\_\_  
f. Signature line for subject, witness, parent, corroborator.

Separate Consent Forms for:

- \_\_\_\_\_  
a. adults in treatment group
- \_\_\_\_\_  
b. control group
- \_\_\_\_\_  
c. children
- \_\_\_\_\_  
d. parent or guardian
- \_\_\_\_\_  
e. other

**CONTENT**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Description of study written in non-technical language no greater than 8<sup>th</sup>  
grade  
reading level  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Risks/benefits  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alternative treatments, if applicable  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Costs and payments, if applicable  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Confidentiality and use of protected health information  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean's phone number  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Right to refuse or end participation  
\_\_\_\_\_  
No compensation for injury, if applicable  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Voluntary consent  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Acknowledgment of parent, if applicable  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Investigator's certification

## Appendix I: Recommendation for Storing Consent Documentation and Informational Follow-up Forms

### Instructions for submitting consent documentation and study closure form (Informational Follow-up Form)

- Upon completion of a study, the PI:
  - Completes the *Informational Follow-up Form* found on the IRB website (<https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>)
  - Gives the completed *Informational Follow-up Form* and *all consent documentation* (all signed consent OR or list of participants who provided verbal consent) to your department's/school's administrative/work study staff and/or course instructor
  
- Upon receipt of completed *Informational Follow-up Form* and *consent documentation*, the administrative assistant, work study staff, or course instructor will:
  - Ensure that the *Informational Follow-up Form* is completed and associated consent documentation is attached
  - Scan the *Informational Follow-up* form and associated consent information
  - Save the scanned document as a .pdf file and name the resulting file using the following convention:
    - Protocol number associated with project listed first, followed by “Closure and Consent”
    - E.g., "1617-017 Closure and Consent.pdf"
    - This will result in one .pdf file for *each* completed study which must be retained for one year and then deleted
  - E-mail the .pdf files to [irb@pugetound.edu](mailto:irb@pugetound.edu) for storage and record keeping
  - Shred all hard copies of consent documentation that has been successfully scanned and e-mailed
  - All .pdf files should be e-mailed by the end of the term during which the *Informational Follow-up Form* and *consent documentation* were received

**Informational Follow-up**  
IRB Approved Research Project

The fundamental charge of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) is to protect human research subjects. Approval by the IRB is for a period of one-year and researchers are to notify the IRB within 90 days of termination of an approved project. An annual report to the IRB is required of all approved protocols. To help simplify this process, please respond to the following questions pertaining to the status of your approved research project. The purpose of this follow-up form is not to have researchers provide self-incriminating documentation in the event of an unanticipated occurrence during the study, it is merely to inform the IRB of the status of the project and report on any modifications made to the originally proposed protocol.

IRB Protocol #: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator(s): \_\_\_\_\_

email: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Project status (please check one):

- Complete \_\_\_\_\_ completion date \_\_\_\_\_
- Ongoing \_\_\_\_\_ estimated completion date \_\_\_\_\_
- Discontinued

On a separate page, please state why the study was discontinued.

2. During the course of conducting a research project it sometimes becomes necessary and/or prudent to alter experimental protocols. Did any circumstances require significant modification for this protocol?

- no  yes

If yes, what changes were made and why (use a separate page if necessary)?

3. During the course of conducting the research project did any event occur that may have placed a human subject(s) at risk or caused any human subject to be harmed?

- no  yes

If yes,

a. please describe the situation (use a separate page if necessary).

b. please describe efforts undertaken to minimize harm to the subject or modify the protocol to reduce the probability of similar harm occurring to future subjects (use a separate page if necessary).

# UNIVERSITY *of* PUGET SOUND

Est. 1888

## Consent to Act as a Subject in a Research Study

TITLE: XXXXX

INVESTIGATORS:   Principal Investigator   Co-investigator 1   Co-investigator 2   Co-investigator 3  
(University Phone)

SUPERVISOR:       Faculty Member's Name       DEPARTMENT: XXXXX       PHONE: 253 879-XXXX

DESCRIPTION: (Describe the general purpose of the study if possible. Describe the nature of procedures and the general content of specific measures. Include a statement about length such as: Participation will take no longer than 30 minutes. The content of the consent form should not exceed an 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading level.)

RISKS AND BENEFITS: (Sample statement: Participation in this study involves minimal risk, such as.... Student participants benefit by gaining experience and familiarity with the process of conducting research in psychology.)

COSTS AND PAYMENTS: (Describe any costs and payments associated with this study.)

\*\*\*\*\*

CONFIDENTIALITY: I understand that any information about me obtained from this research, including answers to questionnaires, laboratory data, or audio or videotapes will be kept strictly confidential. Information that will carry personal identifying information, such as consent forms, will be scanned and stored on the secure University computer system. Hard copies of scanned consent forms will be destroyed immediately; scanned consent forms will be deleted after seven years. I do understand that my research records, just like hospital records, may be subpoenaed by court order. It has been explained to me that my identity will not be revealed in any description or publication of this research. Therefore, I consent to such publication for scientific purposes.

RIGHT TO REFUSE OR END PARTICIPATION: I understand that I am free to refuse to participate in this study or to end my participation at any time and that my decision will not adversely affect my care at this institution or cause a loss of benefits to which I might be otherwise entitled.

RIGHT TO REFUSE OR END PARTICIPATION: I understand that I am free to refuse to participate in this study or to end my participation at any time and that my decision will not adversely affect my care at this institution or cause a loss of benefits to which I might be otherwise entitled. Additionally, I may refuse to answer any question or set of questions contained in the questionnaires if I choose to do so, without any adverse impact on my participation in this study.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT: I certify that I have read the preceding or it has been read to me and that I understand its contents. Any questions I have pertaining to the research will be answered by the above named investigators. Any questions or concerns I have regarding my rights as a research subject will be answered by the Office of the Associate Dean (253-879-3207). A copy of this consent form will be given to me. My signature below means that I have freely agreed to participate in this study.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Participant's signature

INVESTIGATOR'S CERTIFICATION: I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature, potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Investigator's signature



## **Updates to Protocol for Confidentiality Statement:**

The current Confidentiality Statement reads:

**(C) CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA:** *Explain how data will be secured to safeguard identifiable records of individuals.* This might include how and where the data will be housed, how the data were recorded (audio or visual tapes, paper pencil, etc.), how long the data will be kept, how it will be disposed of, who will have access to the data, etc. Also, in certain studies that require deception and/or assent may need to be addressed.

(Standard statement: The names of participants will not appear on materials containing their responses. All identifying materials such as the consent forms will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the Department of Psychology at the University of Puget Sound.)

The **Standard Statement** needs to be updated to something like:

The names of participants will not appear on materials containing their responses. All identifying materials such as the consent forms will be scanned and stored on the secure University computer system. Hard copies of scanned consent forms will be destroyed immediately; scanned consent forms will be deleted after seven years.

## Themed Summary of Faculty Code Survey Results

**Winter 2016/2017**

### What accomplishments should be achieved in order to earn promotion to full professor?

Overall, faculty thought that promotion to full professor needed to meet high standards in teaching, scholarship/work within one’s field, and some level of service. The order and priority of these elements, however were quite mixed among the responses. The service element was valued by some as commitment to the university/department specifically, while others thought that this service should be to the community or larger academic field. Additionally, some respondents noted that they would like to see a more rigorous assessment of professional development/scholarship that required recognition or achievement within the larger academic community of one’s field. Some respondents also noted that there should be a specific expectation around mentoring and advising, and some thought that there needed to be a great deal of flexibility to tailor accomplishments by department.

In general, responses echoed the current criteria for promotion to full professor, but the majority of responses provided more specific feedback on their concerns with how these accomplishments should be prioritized and/or assessed. This major sentiment is reflected in one response:

*“Assuming the order for tenure remains teaching, professional growth, and then service, we should clearly prioritize promotion in the same order. I understand we technically do so, but it does not feel like that. The one-time departure to "distinguished service" is not only incongruous, but nobody knows what that means. What is clear is that we suddenly end up with a great deal more "service" discussion, while it remains the lowest tiered consideration. We pride ourselves on being a teaching school and, at no other point, is service so elevated.”*

Total Responses: 110

<b>Elements in responses</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Example</b>
Growth/quality/innovation of <b>teaching</b>	88	<i>Sustained high-quality teaching with evidence of continued innovation.</i>
Professional development/ <b>scholarship</b> /work in their field/research/scholarly engagement	88	<i>Meaningful scholarship, with particular expectations possibly set by the department given the issues discussed below about the difficulty of deriving meaningful assessment metrics of scholarly productivity that apply across all academic disciplines.</i>
<b>Recognition by field/</b> outside UPS	10	<i>Important scholarly accomplishments recognized by the field.</i>
<b>Service/leadership to university</b> (committees etc)	51	<i>Significant leadership in service to Puget Sound.</i>
<b>Service</b> to university and/or larger community/academic community	31	<i>Continued excellence in service to the University and Community. I believe that sustained and substantial service should extend beyond one's department, and should be at a level beyond the minimum of regular committee assignment.</i>

<b>Mentorship/advising</b>	13	<i>Mentorship, as evidenced by directing published student research, scholarship, or the equivalent.</i>
<b>Multiple paths to full professorship/criteria fully set per department</b>	9	<i>I think this would have to vary department to department. There is so much variance across professions that I think it would be very difficult to make universally "fair" criteria.</i>
Did not answer (Felt answering in summarized survey response format was not productive to restructuring.)	3	<i>I think we should have a discussion in faculty meeting of this whole issue, framed by the Senate without aid of another survey.</i>
Increased <b>time</b> minimum before promotion	2	<i>At least five years AFTER tenure (yes tenure not promotion to assoc.) excellence in teaching, professional growth, and service.</i>

**How should accomplishments for promotion to tenured full professor differ from those for promotion to tenured associate professor?**

The majority want teaching, scholarship, and service to all be elements for evaluation but only differ in level of achievement, and not in priority of importance. Some acknowledged that though they believe this to be the current written policy, they felt that this was in line with current/recent promotions to full professor. Many felt that a level of service or commitment to the university was important for promotion to full in a greater way than for granting tenure. However, there was a tension between respondents wanting higher expectations of service (leading not just serving on a committee, etc.) and those who felt that asking for more in this area would result in faculty having to trade off for a lower quality of teaching or scholarship in order to achieve this sort of service expectation.

Many faculty also felt that for promotion to full, and after receiving tenure, research and professional development become of a greater importance, and so should be weighted more heavily in promotion to full. Some faculty also felt that for promotion to full, faculty need to have not only have a publishing record but have made a significant impact to their field or have gained some level of recognition from their peers in the field. Others thought this level of recognition needs to be on a national level, and noted that this is common criteria amongst our peer schools, and so they felt Puget Sound's criteria were below par.

Total Responses: 104

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Example</b>
Not different criteria but <b>sustained excellence/growth from time of tenure</b> (Reflecting this order of importance: 1. Teaching 2. Scholarship 3. Service)	44	<i>I think the fundamental distinction is that promotion to tenured associate professor involves looking at the candidate's file and seeing whether there is strong evidence for a trajectory that will lead to a strong career in all of the areas of assessment. Whereas for the full professor, this should be already fully established.</i>
Stand out influence/ <b>recognition by their academic field</b>	15	<i>Promotion to full should be reserved for those who rise above the pack and stand out by virtue of their influence on their academic discipline and on the University.</i>

Sustained teaching and scholarship but <b>higher expectation of commitment/service to university.</b>	25	<i>I believe that the rank of Full Professor should reflect an extraordinary commitment to the university, but that commitment may be manifested in a variety of different ways.</i>
Similar to tenure criteria but <b>greater emphasis on scholarship/professional development</b>	17	<i>Work for full professor should be greater in quantity and quality AND should evince a clearer agenda of scholarship or research than work for associate professor need do.</i>
Should <b>vary by department</b> /be flexible	4	<i>...departments given freedom to set guidelines and parameters for above</i>
Question not addressed	3	

**Please share your thoughts about the current criteria (as you understand them) upon which promotion to full professor is based.**

Overall there was a large concern from the faculty that the criteria for promotion to full professor are incredibly vague. Many acknowledged that this gives important flexibility for different department standards, but that ultimately the language in the criteria are subject to a wide range of interpretations. In particular, the majority of responses cited the language of “distinguished service.” Even within the survey responses that did not mention ambiguity, this criteria was interpreted in vastly different ways between responses. There was also a clear non-consensus between responses as to the required standard of teaching, necessity of continued professional growth, and what qualified as service (University leadership, research in field, work outside the university etc.). It was clear that disagreements between faculty members on the interpretations of the criteria language are common. Nineteen responses used the question to clarify their own understanding of the criteria rather than their thoughts/concerns on the criteria.

There was also a large concern among faculty that the importance placed on service for the promotion to full professorship hindered the quality of and dedication to professional development, scholarship and effective teaching. Many responses interpreted this dedication to service as either requiring a reallocation of their time and energy away from teaching and scholarship and into leadership, or that adding this additional aspect created an unhealthy work/life balance. Some faculty also felt that promotion to full is not a very rigorous process in comparison to the process at peer institutions and that this minimized the meaning behind the position of full professor at Puget Sound and the University’s reputation in the larger academic community.

Total Question Responses: 100

Theme	Count	Example
Criterion are <b>too vague</b> and/or can be interpreted in vastly different ways. (In particular with regard to “distinguished service”.)	53	<i>The current criteria are not clearly specified, which has the benefit of allowing flexibility of interpretation. The cost is vagueness and uncertainty, especially in determining the scope of the phrase "evidence of distinguished service."</i>  <i>It leaves room for a lot of different interpretations. This is a good thing given the diversity of faculty work on campus. Some people focus more on service than research and vice versa. That seems fine to me. However, I understand the need to provide clearer guidance to interpret this diversity of work at the level of the FAC.</i>

		<i>...excellence in teaching looks quite different when you are teaching a third of your load in SSI every year with a complement of advisees than in teaching senior seminars and writing letters for students who will go to graduate school. It is simply different teaching, and the latter receives fewer accolades at the University.</i>
<b>Disproportionately focused on service</b> rather than teaching and professional development.	26	<i>Incentivizing (only) "distinguished service" leads people away from what they were trained to do, and away from efforts at sustaining intellectual and professional development that are critical for the trajectories of peoples' careers.</i>  <i>There is too much emphasis on "distinguished service," which becomes a means to compensate for the other areas (such as scholarship and teaching).</i>
<b>Clarified their interpretation</b> of the criteria but did not provide their thoughts on it.	19	<i>In my six years at the university, I have always understood the current criteria of "distinguished service" to signify a leadership role in department or university service.</i>
Thought that the criteria are <b>not very demanding</b> of faculty/ that full prof. does not mean as much at UPS as our peers.	9	<i>Going up for full, however, should be a decision made, not by a clock, but by a colleague's being ready and having (scholarly) accomplishments. [...] If folks go up when they have scholarly accomplishments and the support of folks in the field outside our campus, they will get it</i>  <i>Maybe the question should be, if one of us were to move to a different institution (which is similar), will we be qualified for full professorship? My main worry is we will become complacent in mediocrity.</i>
Thought current criteria were <b>fine</b> .	7	<i>They seem perfectly reasonable to me.</i>
Criteria could better respect/reflect <b>the diversity of academic paths</b> .	3	<i>I feel that there's a lack of understanding about how those of us who teach in the Arts fit into the model for evaluating professional development.</i>
Other/No comment	2	

**“Please share any other thoughts you have about promotion to full professor.”**

Faculty had various concerns that they wanted to make sure will be addressed. In particular, responses raised two major concerns:

1. Promotion to full seemed to be a function of time rather than achievement or merit
2. Promotion to full should consider ways to be flexible by discipline and role that faculty play in their community.

Faculty also wanted clarification of language in the current criteria to reflect what's expected. They shared concerns about how the current pay scale effects the weight of promotion to full versus tenure, and how it compares to peer institutions. Overall, faculty appreciate that changes are being considered for this promotion, but they have a wide variety of in-depth concerns and further discussion may be necessary to clarify the goals of the promotion to full professor.

Total Responses: 76

Theme	Count	Example
Thought to many promotions to full/criteria too lax/too early	19	<i>Promotion to Full is not an entitlement one receives for having served for X number of years. Promotion to Full should be earned based on a record of accomplishment.</i>
Concerns about criteria flexibility	10	<i>The fundamental challenge, as alluded to above, is the vast differences in what constitutes sufficient academic productivity in different disciplines. I am unsure how we come up with language that is universally relevant yet still sufficiently prescriptive to be of practical value in assessing promotion packages.</i>
Salary Scale	8	<i>I think that the salary scale jumps that go along with promotion are misaligned, and more emphasis should be placed on getting promoted to associate professor and less on full professor. It seems strange that the increase in salary for receiving tenure is less than 10% and the increase to full is over 15%. I would think that the university would want to place more emphasis on tenure promotion than on being promoted to full.</i>
Want clarification	8	<i>I happen to be on a committee that does not have a named chair, and thus I don't have an opportunity to be the "chair." I worry that it's not going to be enough to get full given that I can't list a leadership position on this committee, and yet I feel my contribution is substantive and important. I don't like not knowing if I'm doing "enough" or not.</i>
Concerns about faculty work load	7	<i>At a place like UPS where research collaboration with students is encouraged, I think we need to sort out the role that student collaboration plays in promotion. If someone spends a lot of time working on student projects, and because of this doesn't have as much time for their own scholarship, what do we do with that? People only have so many hours in the day,</i>

		<i>and we need to think carefully about mixed messages that we send, or ways that we set people up to not achieve professional goals because of other expectations we may have or things we may reward.</i>
Concerned about limiting the promotions	7	<i>It seems the university is interested in narrowing the passage for promotion to full professor primarily as a cost-saving strategy. This strikes me as highly disadvantageous to the faculty as a whole. I hope the faculty senate isn't planning to help beat the drum for a higher rate of non-promotion out of a misguided commitment to prestige.</i>
Focus of evaluation should be broad not narrow/more similar to tenure	6	<i>Full professor should be consistent with the previous promotion criteria--continued excellence in teaching and scholarship and on-going service. Thank you for re-evaluating the current criteria.</i>
Glad that the senate is addressing this criteria.	5	<i>I'm delighted that the senate is taking on this topic. It clearly requires attention, and I welcome change to the current language.</i>
Concerned about making sudden changes to expectations for those not yet promoted to full	3	<i>If we want to significantly change the expectations of promotion to full, it will be necessary to do so gradually. If we abruptly make it harder to achieve promotion to full, it will have the feeling of those who have made it pulling the ladder up behind them. It will feel very unfair to junior faculty. That said, it is important to maintain high standards, but I think it should be the responsibility of departments to establish those standards and hold our colleagues to them.</i>
Want to make sure the service element stays	3	<i>...also think that keeping the good parts of what we get by looking to reward "distinguished service" would be advisable.</i>
Other	4	
No clear point made	6	

## Faculty Promotion Discussion Group Report

### Background and Methodology

In the spring of 2017, as a service to the Faculty Senate, the Office of Institutional Research collected and analyzed data regarding promotion to full professor at the University of Puget Sound. A pilot version of the discussion group was held with eight members of the Faculty Senate in order to determine the effectiveness of questions.

The purpose of the discussion groups was to gauge faculty members understanding of language used in the code for the promotion requirements, specifically the language surrounding the five current criteria which is as follows:

“Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. Specifically, decisions whether to promote shall be based upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance: (1) teaching; (2) professional growth; (3) advising students; (4) participation in university service; and (5) community service related to professional interests and expertise. Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. In addition, appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral, or other equivalent terminal degree. Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas.” (Faculty Code, Chapter 3 section 3 e)

The discussion groups were also held to learn what a faculty member at the full professor level looks like, and to explore other options for promotion requirements.

This data was collected by facilitating three discussion groups with faculty at the assistant, associate, and full professor rank. Each group was comprised of only one faculty rank type. An email invitation to participate in the focus group was sent out to available faculty, resulting in three discussion groups with a total of 27 faculty. The interview protocol, describing the role of the facilitators and the interview questions, is detailed in Appendix I. These discussion groups allowed for depth of qualitative information from a smaller group of faculty.

### Themes

During the three faculty discussion groups, the following topics emerged as themes and garnered questions.

#### *Teaching*

Faculty agreed that teaching is, and should always be, the highest priority for Puget Sound professors. It became clear that defining some of the language regarding promotion is necessary.

While there is agreement on teaching as a priority, the following questions emerged from the groups:

- Should teaching be broadly defined to include some of the out-of-classroom experiences?
- Should advising be included under the teaching umbrella; not just advising of the general population but also with Posse students and minoritized students?
- Should overseeing independent study as well as supervising student research be included?
- Should/how can the university find ways to protect our minoritized faculty as they often take on additional invisible labor? How do we honor that value which they are adding?



## *Leadership*

Faculty agreed that leadership should also be a key expectation for full professors. It was suggested that some ways in which leadership could take place might include: bringing new things to campus, revamping a program, redefining core courses, being involved in RPI, being involved in career fairs, etc. Faculty felt that these leadership contributions should be documented as to how they are impactful and meaningful to campus. Full professors should be expected to provide mentorship to assistant and associate professors. Currently, assistant professors are asked or volunteer to do things (sometimes in response to an assumed expectation or absence of senior faculty volunteers), which add burden. It was also expressed that senior faculty would need to take on administrative work in order to reduce this burden on junior faculty.

While there is agreement that leadership be included in the expectations, the following questions emerged from the groups:

- Should full professors be expected to take on leadership within their department and also at the university as a whole?
- Does there need to be a culture shift where junior faculty no longer feel like they need to join every committee?

## *Fulfilling the five*

There wasn't complete agreement on fulfilling the five, or even keeping the criteria at five categories. What did become clear was the need for development of definitions for whatever the criteria end up being. The following questions emerged:

- Should there be an established minimum for all the categories (currently: teaching, professional growth, advising students, participation in university service, and community service) where the university allows faculty to expand and shrink effort in areas as needed while maintaining excellence in teaching, whatever that is defined to be?
- Would allowing more flexibility in fulfilling the five areas enable the faculty to provide something more meaningful to the institution?

Some faculty felt that permitting this flexibility in fulfilling the five categories could allow for situations such as: the ability to focus on different areas during different points in their career and not penalizing them for it at a junior level, or the ability to be more creative and experiment with different things that might not pan out without penalty. Other faculty felt that promotion to full professor should be contingent on excellence in all five categories. Faculty in one group indicated that promotion to full should be automatic; that the criteria to reach Associate are stringent enough.

## **Other findings**

From the discussion groups also emerged some other topics of note. They are as follows:

### *Professional development*

In one of the groups, many of the faculty liked the language of "a substantial professional achievement since becoming an associate" to define professional growth. They stated that this would need to be something beyond a person's dissertation work. This language could be used as a clarifier for the professional development category that is currently required for promotion.

### *Maintenance versus growth*

There was some debate over whether the expectation should be that you continue to “maintain” what you are doing once you have earned tenure in order to be promoted to full professor versus needing to demonstrate some sort of growth, change, creativity, or exploration. Some felt that you needed to show that you were striving to be better than you were previously, while others felt like they were already working at maximum capacity, so reaching higher (though desired) felt impossible, and maintaining current levels was acceptable. The group who discussed this seemed to agree that if you were maintaining a level that was subpar, it would not be grounds for promotion, but if you were maintaining a level of excellence, it would be a grounds for promotion.

### *Time*

Some of the faculty got into a discussion about the way in which you go up for promotion. Some thought that instead of having everyone go up at a certain time that faculty should be able to decide when to go for promotion based on feeling they have gathered enough material and evidence to receive promotion.

The concern was brought up that this may lead to higher expectations for promotion. Faculty felt they were all already over-extended, so they would be hesitant to make any requirement(s) more difficult/unrealistic. They feel that the culture here produces great teachers that are highly productive and that if we were to make it even higher pressure, the culture would likely change, and there would be increased burnout.

### *Service*

Faculty seemed to think that service should continue to be expected for promotion to full professor so that faculty have a voice in how the institution is run. They think that if service is not included in promotion guidelines that faculty will not step up and do it.

### **Suggested models**

Over the three discussion groups, a few different suggested models for promotion came up.

- Shifting down to three categories and defining them well (service, teaching, and professional growth)
- Requiring the same level of “excellence” that is expected of teaching to be expected for both service and scholarship
- Requiring a demonstration of sustained growth in both service and scholarship, with excellent teaching
- Requiring that each of the five categories is exhibited but allowing for different areas of strength and/or allowing for the area of focus/greatest excellence to change at certain points throughout the years, with excellent teaching
- To simply promote faculty after X years of service to the university
- Determining a “floor” for each of the five categories and then requiring that all five categories’ floors be met

Discussion Group Interview Protocol  
Faculty Promotion, Spring 2017

Background

---

We hope to use the focus groups to explore the following:

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Gauge faculty members understanding of language used in the code for the promotion requirements.</li><li>2. Learn what a faculty member at the associate professor level looks like.</li><li>3. Learn what a faculty member at the full professor level looks like.</li><li>4. What attributes of a faculty member at various levels are most important.</li></ol> |
|---|

Discussion Facilitators.

<i>Role</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>Responsibilities</i>
Staff facilitator	Ellen Peters	Welcome and introduction (set the ground rules). Introduce the topics and enforce the rules. Keep discussion on topic and make transitions to new questions. Close the discussion.
Staff facilitator/ Recorder	Alanna Johnson	Operate digital recorder. Make lists of discussion points. Provide synopsis after each discussion and produce final report. Assist with logistics and flow of the discussion.

**The Setting and the Group.** Facilitators should arrive early to assure the room is ready, set up food, materials are available, and equipment is functioning.

There will be three groups, one for each rank (Assistant, Associate, Full)

Spring 2017 dates:

April 10, 2017 2:30pm Tahoma – Full Professors

April 11, 2017 11:30am McCormick – Assistant Professors

April 13, 2017 11:30am Tahoma – Associate Professors

Greet the participants and seat them for the discussion. Ask them to review the handout at their seat as they are getting settled. In each group, there will be 8-10 faculty members. The groups will be divided up by faculty rank. Each participant will have a name card (first name only). Each focus group will be scheduled for 90 minutes. During this time, participants will be provided food and beverage.

## The Interview Protocol

### Opening

---

About 5 minutes to provide the context for the discussion, establish expectations, set the tone, and obtain the involvement and support of the participants.

Thank you for taking the time to join this discussion on faculty promotion. I'm Ellen Peters, and I am the Director of Institutional Research and Retention here. We are collaborating with the Faculty Senate on this project to better understand faculty perspectives regarding promotion to full professor.

We hope this discussion provides an opportunity for reflection and discussion about faculty promotion at Puget Sound. Currently promotion is based on five categories listed in the Faculty Code as: (1) teaching; (2) professional growth; (3) advising students; (4) participation in university service; and (5) community service related to professional interests and expertise.

Alanna Johnson is the Assistant Director for Assessment in the Office of Institutional Research and she is also here tonight, serving in the role of the recorder. She will help us throughout the session by summarizing the discussion to make sure we have caught major themes. We will summarize findings in a report to the Faculty Senate. Throughout the discussion, please share your honest opinions; it is the dialogue, along with different points of view, differences, and similarities, that will provide insight.

Before we begin, I want to let you know that we are recording the session so that we won't miss any of the comments that are made. We will not be transcribing the sessions; we will use the recordings to assure that we accurately capture themes and ideas from these discussions. We will be on a first-name only basis during the discussion, and in the report, no names will be attached to comments. Specific comments may be quoted, but only as "a faculty member said..."

Our role here is to ask questions and to listen. We won't be participating in the conversation, and we want you to feel free to talk to one another. I'll be asking questions and facilitating activities. I may occasionally have to move us along in order to ensure that we get through the activities and questions. We will start with introductions, but before we do, does anyone have any questions?

## Questions

As participants arrive, they will have at their seat a handout describing the standards for promotion at our 4 PNW5 peer institutions (also available at the end of this protocol).

As I've mentioned, we will be discussing the criteria for promotion. We will start with introductions and we will go around in a circle. After that, please feel free to participate freely, not in any order.

1. Please introduce yourself by telling us all your first name, your department, and any observation you have regarding the handout.
2. Our goal here is two-fold: 1) to gain some clarity on the standard for promotion to full professor, and 2) to consider what faculty expect of themselves in terms of promotion to full professor. We will engage in two activities to attempt a fruitful discussion.
  - a. Compare and contrast the standards for promotion at Puget Sound and a small set of peer institutions.
    - i. In looking at the standards for these other institutions, what resonates, and why?
    - ii. In what ways do these standards provide a model that might be helpful for Puget Sound?
  - b. Consider a set of cases that lay out different pathways to promotion, and the ways in which those cases meet expectations for promotion to full professor.
    - i. Provide five cases:
      1. Evidence in all areas, but none that are stellar
        - a. Faculty member one has received average teaching evaluations, has published an article recently, has served on a low level university committee, and has done some advising.
      2. Excellent teaching, minimal in all other areas
        - a. Faculty member two has received excellent teaching evaluations, has no publications, has served on a low level university committee, and has done some advising.
      3. Excellent teaching and professional growth, minimal in all other areas
        - a. Faculty member three has received excellent teaching evaluations, has both recent book and article publications, has done some sporadic low level committee work at the university, and has done some advising.
      4. Excellent teaching and university service, minimal in all other areas
        - a. Faculty member four has received excellent teaching evaluations, has no publications, has served as chair for high level committee, and has done some advising.
      5. Excellent university service, community service, and advising, satisfactory teaching and minimal professional growth.
        - a. Faculty member five has received average teaching evaluations, is highly involved in a Tacoma community organization, has served as chair for a high level university committee, continues to advise several students with positive feedback, and published one brief article two years ago.

- ii. Discuss each of these pathways, and how they reflect your expectations for your colleagues in promotion to full professor.
3. Any last thoughts on the promotion process that you want to make sure we capture as part of this discussion? We will also stay after for a few minutes if there is something you want to share.

### **Closing**

Five to ten minutes to provide closure, acknowledge participants' contributions, and obtain feedback on the process. In the facilitator's own words, the closing should cover:

- ***Acknowledge the participant's contributions***  
Summarize what has been accomplished and thank them for their input.
- ***"Does anyone have questions?"***  
Project's next steps, how the information will be used, where to get information later.

### **Post Focus Group Activities**

---

The facilitators and recorder will collect and document the meeting notes, and discuss the process and outcomes. The discussion should address:

- What were the major themes?
- How did this group compare to others?
- Were there any surprises?
- Did we achieve our objectives?
- What could be improved, and how can that be achieved?
- Did a student's major appear to be a factor in their opinions and experiences?

A summary of each group meeting should be produced as soon as possible. The Office of Institutional Research will provide a final report describing the results from all three groups.

## COLLEGE A

Excellence in teaching is the most important criterion for faculty excellence, necessary but not in itself sufficient for retention and advancement. Excellence in teaching should be consistently apparent with successive appointments and be clearly evident at such key points as the granting of tenure and promotion to the rank of professor. Excellence in professional activity and growth ranks second to excellence in teaching in the evaluation of faculty. Progress in professional activity should be consistently apparent with successive appointments. Service to the college outside of classroom-related activities and professional activity is essential. Significant contributions to college service, as defined below, are expected for promotion to the rank of professor. Community service, while not a substitute for college service, will also be considered if deemed appropriate by the committee.

## COLLEGE B

In its assessment of a candidate's case for promotion, the committee considers the same three areas as it considers in tenure reviews: teaching, scholarship and/or creative work, and service. To receive a recommendation in favor of promotion, a candidate must demonstrate excellence in teaching, excellence in scholarly and/or creative activity, and a high level of service to the college and the professional community.

Excellence in both teaching and scholarship and/or creative activity is necessary for a recommendation in favor of promotion; a superlative performance in one area cannot substitute for lack of excellence in the other area.

A candidate for promotion must demonstrate excellence in teaching during the post-tenure period. A candidate for promotion must demonstrate continued scholarly and/or creative activity of recognized high quality. A candidate for promotion must demonstrate a more substantial contribution of service to the College and their professional community than that expected at the time of tenure.

## COLLEGE C

The criteria for academic faculty appointment and advancement are listed below, in rank order of importance.

1. Effectiveness of teaching, including, as appropriate, conference leadership, lecturing, laboratory teaching, studio teaching, curriculum development, thesis advising and general academic advising.
2. Scholarship, defined as knowledge and understanding of, and active engagement with, the materials of one's discipline and, where appropriate, of related disciplines.
3. Service to the college community (and to external communities where relevant) through department and committee work, or through activity that fosters and enhances the quality of the intellectual community.

## COLLEGE D

The criteria for retention, promotion, tenure and step increases shall be (1) teaching effectiveness, (2) professional development, and (3) University and community service. Although faculty members are expected to make contributions in all three areas, effective teaching is of paramount importance; poor

teaching cannot be redeemed in the other two areas. In order to be promoted to Professor, an Associate Professor must have demonstrated consistently effective teaching, significant and continuing accomplishments in professional development and University and community service. The person must have additionally demonstrated personal and professional traits which are important in performing a leadership role as an active and effective member of the faculty.