ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
March 18, 2010
3:00 p.m. – SSV 151

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

4. PRESENTATION
- a. AVC Foundation – B. Razo

5. REPORT
- a. AP&P – Maria Clinton

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- a. March 4, 2010 (attachment)

7. ACTION ITEMS
- a. Communications Studies Equivalency (attachment)

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS
- a. Institutional Review Board (attachments)
- b. Adjunct Web Page
- c. Equivalency List by Division (attachment)

9. SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS
- a. Academic Ranking
  - Diane Jewell – Adjunct Assistant Professor
- b. Announcements
  - 2010 Accreditation Institute – March 19 – 20, 2010 (Newport Beach, CA)
  - Statewide Senate Spring Plenary Session – April 15 – 17, 2010 (Millbrae, CA)
  - 2010 Leadership Institute – June 17 – 19, 2010 (San Diego, CA)
  - 2010 Curriculum Institute – July 8 – 10, 2010 (Santa Clara, CA)

10. ADJOURNMENT

Upon request, this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with disabilities, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct such request to Mr. Christos Valiotis, Academic Senate President, at (661) 722-6306 (weekdays between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.) at least 48 hours before the meeting, if possible. Public records related to agenda items for open session are available for public inspection 72 hours prior to each regular meeting at the Antelope Valley College Academic Senate's Office, Administration Building, 3041 West Avenue K, Lancaster, California 93536.

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
March 18, 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mr. Christos Valiotis, Senate President, called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

- Faculty Union Update – budget discussions dominate the negotiation process. Specific budget questions are being asked at the negotiation table in efforts to obtain a clear understanding of the current fiscal situation of the district. The district is in much better shape than other districts and budget questions are necessary to determine what can and should be negotiable items.
- Enrollment Management Committee members approved the addition of ten late start classes to be offered in Palmdale. In efforts to increase FTES at the Palmdale site a movement to offer hybrid courses has been established since room availability is an issue. This is one solution to the space and FTES issue.
- Similar to the current status of the GED program, the men's golf and women's tennis teams are being suspended due to budget constraints.
- Mr. Valiotis reported the statistical data obtained by the Institutional Research Office indicated the rate of students successfully passing the GED exam was low.
- The Chancellor's Office distributed information on specific language that should be included on campus websites regarding textbooks.
- Senators were encouraged to communicate to discipline faculty the importance of responding to the Bookstore's request for textbook information because it is a federal mandate which must be addressed. The federal government is trying to reduce the costs of textbooks and acquiring textbook information earlier than what was once experienced is one way to allow students to research alternate sources to purchase books at a cheaper price. Faculty were encouraged to provide ISBN numbers to avoid any problem with acquiring the proper edition. Textbook information is supposed to be publicized in the class schedule before registration begins.
- Mr. Valiotis announced that Ms. Maria Clinton, AP&P Faculty Co-Chair was not going to be present at the meeting due to illness. There are two changes being made to current catalog language: 1) attendance policy; 2) guidelines for work experience classes. More information will be provided at the April 1, 2010 Senate meeting in the AP&P report.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

- Dr. Lee Grishman stated the minutes for the March 4, 2010 Senate Meeting indicate Senators are to be acquiring feedback on the Board Policy draft on Consensual Amorous Relationships to report at the current meeting, but the Senate Agenda does not include this item as a discussion item. Mr. Valiotis indicated he was hoping to have obtained further information on the conflict interest policy so that all items could be taken into consideration when feedback was reported. Until the additional documents can be distributed for review and all items can be considered simultaneously, the Amorous Relationship feedback will be postponed to a future date.
- Ms. Dorothy Williams provided a detailed rebuttal to the statistical data regarding the GED program success rates. She provided a lengthy statement to refute the statement reported in the Academic Senate Minutes and detailed how the data collected was inherently flawed. The statement made by Ms. Williams can be viewed in its entirety directly after the minutes. Mr. Valiotis responded saying that we cannot verify the success data coming from the high school, so the bottom line of this issue is whether offering the GED Program is fiscally possible because it is not a self sustaining program.

4. PRESENTATION

a. AVC Foundation – Bridget Razo

Ms. Bridget Razo provided a brief report on an upcoming Foundation opportunity for the campus community to participate and an overview of the function of the Foundation Office. The Foundation Office provides an opportunity for the campus to leverage community support for campus programs with 160 different line items available for the community to make contributions. One of the major

upcoming events is AVC's 80th Anniversary Gala scheduled for Saturday, April 17, 2010 in the Poppy Pavilion at the Antelope Valley Fairgrounds. She encouraged faculty to participate in this event. The gala is an opportunity for faculty to interact with community members and showcase faculty/staff efforts on campus. Tables are being seated with eight people and if an attendee desires to sit with a particular person/group they can make a request with the Foundation Office. The office will make efforts to accommodate all requests if possible. Employees can purchase discounted event tickets for $60.00. There is a payment plan opportunity for employees to contribute to the foundation. If desired employees can sign up for a payment option where three equal payroll deductions are coordinated to pay for gala tickets. Mr. Christos Valiotis stated the Math, Science and Engineering Division is considering purchasing a table and challenges other divisions and the Senate to consider doing the same. The gala will be a time to celebrate the accomplishments of faculty/staff, and take some time to relax with colleagues and friends during this difficult fiscal time. Ms. Razo stated that there is a misconception that the gala is funded with district monies, which is completely false. The gala is funded with monies contributed by community organizations/donors. Dr. Susan Lowry stated that the campus cannot solely rely on the AV Press to market AVC events and programs. AVC faculty and staff need to be marketing campus programs and events. Marketing posters and postcards were made available for Senators to take back to their divisions and community locations for posting and distribution. A question was posed regarding the rumored dress code being white tie only. Ms. Razo indicated the event will be coordinated around a Casablanca theme and the dress code is black tie optional or Casablanca theme. The dress code is not a requirement to participate in the event. Everyone is welcomed and encouraged to attend.

5. REPORT

a. AP&P – Maria Clinton

The AP&P report was be postponed to the April 1, 2010 Senate Meeting due to the Ms. Clinton being ill.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. March 4, 2010

A motion was made and seconded to approve the March 4, 2010 Academic Senate Meeting minutes. Motion carried.

7. ACTION ITEMS

a. Communication Studies Equivalency (attachment)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Communication Studies equivalency request. Motion carried.

8. DISCUSSION

a. Institutional Review Board (attachment)

Mr. Valiotis stated the more he considers implementing an Institutional Review Board (IRB) the more he comes to realize the necessity to establish a campus IRB. A brief overview of the federal regulations, purpose and use, exemption status, naming and composition was provided. Mr. Valiotis reviewed what this means for AVC, and pertinent questions regarding IRB composition, meeting frequency, development of Board Policy/Administrative Policy, and development of forms. If the Senate moves forward to establish an IRB, all members of the campus IRB committee must be formally trained at the expense of the district. A brief discussion ensued among Senators regarding the reviewed materials. As previously reported, IRBs are required to perform human studies on campus and to obtain federal grant funding. It is the only way the college can legally support campus employees in the event of a lawsuit. It was proposed to collaborate with other colleges and begin a consortium to address IRB regulations. Mr. Valiotis indicated that he would discuss the matter at the upcoming Statewide Senate Spring Plenary Session to determine if there is a trend of establishing IRBs. If the majority of colleges are establishing or have established IRBs then Mr. Valiotis would like to recommend forming an exploratory IRB. He will bring back information obtained from the upcoming Statewide Senate Plenary Session.

b. Adjunct Web Page

Mr. Valiotis reported last semester the Senate engaged in discussion regarding establishing an adjunct faculty web page. The web page would include links that are specific to adjunct faculty needs. Currently, the project has not progressed as quickly as he had hoped. In efforts to progress this effort further he suggested forming a workgroup to solicit adjunct faculty needs. Ms. Preschler indicated creating a workgroup to research adjunct faculty needs may be unnecessarily duplicating work. The Adjunct Faculty Handbook assembled by the Adjunct Faculty Union representative is posted to the Union web site and includes pertinent adjunct faculty information. Mr. Valiotis stated he would review the handbook and is open to additional suggestions on how to proceed and address adjunct faculty issues.

c. Equivalency List by Division (attachment)

Mr. Valiotis reported the Senate Office is working on acquiring the necessary documentation needed for those disciplines identified on the equivalency list by division as needing to be updated. Ms. Gloria Kastner stated that in efforts to comply with the approved Equivalency Procedure all disciplines are required to complete the Minimum Qualification (MQ) and Equivalency Review Form indicating discipline faculty agree that an equivalency is not needed because the MQ is sufficient, or decide to collaboratively construct an equivalency in addition to the MQ. An email will be distributed to Senators indicating which disciplines need updated forms. Senators were encouraged to acquire the necessary completed paperwork from discipline faculty for formal approval by the Senate no later than the May 20th meeting.

9. SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

a. Academic Ranking

- Diane Jewell – Adjunct Assistant Professor

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Academic Ranking of Adjunct Assistant Professor to Diane Jewell. Motion carried.

b. Announcements

- Statewide Senate Spring Plenary Session – April 15 – 17, 2010 (Millbrae, CA)
- 2010 Leadership Institute – June 17 – 19, 2010 (San Diego, CA)
- 2010 Curriculum Institute – July 8 – 10, 2010 (Santa Clara, CA)

10. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the March 18, 2010 Senate meeting at 4:17 p.m. Motion carried.

MEMBERS PRESENT		
Paul Ahad	Jack Halliday	Casey Scudmore
Carolyn Burrell	Susan Lowry	Ken Shafer
Carol Eastin (proxy)	Candace Martin	Justin Shores
Claude Gratton	Kathy Moore	John Taylor
Lee Grishman	Berkeley Price	Christos Valiotis
Jennifer Gross (proxy)	Terry Rezek	Alex Webster
Glenn Haller	Sandra Robinson	

MEMBERS ABSENT		GUEST PRESENT
Counseling Rep. Vacancy	Susan Knapp	Heidi Preschler
Debra Feickert	Sheronda Myers	Dorothy Williams
MaryAnne Holcomb	Harish Rao	
Sandra Hughes		

To: the AVC Academic Senate
From: Dorothy Williams
Re: inaccuracy in the senate minutes
Date: March 18, 2010

Last December, Senate president Christos Valiotis took issue with the belief that the methodology for program evaluation of the GED program was flawed. However, minutes of the February 18, 2010 meeting show comments from the president concerning the GED data as follows:

"Data collected from the 2006-2007 academic year show that there were 170 students enrolled in the program of whom 24 took the GED test by fall of 2009 and 18 of them were successful."

Respectfully, I need to point out that the methodology for GED program evaluation is flawed and that this data is not being accurately reported and/or interpreted for the following reasons:

1. We have no idea, nor will we ever know, how many AVC GED students take and pass the GED exam because that information is confidential. We were cautioned by the Adult School that they cannot release complete data because of student confidentiality issues. I believe Mr. Younglove has also cautioned us about this. One of our researchers (for whom I have the utmost respect) has described this data as "garbage." Why? Because when you are attempting to collect pre and post data and you know that you do not have access to all the post data, then you cannot make any kind of conclusion about that data with any level of confidence.
2. Many of the former GED students decided not to take the GED. After a time here, they expressed a certain comfort level with AVC and moved into the regular curriculum towards an associate degree when they realized they could do so without the GED. Students who wished to go into the nursing program (one of which will be graduating this semester with her ASN) were the exception, since high school graduation or a GED is a requirement. However, there are others who chose to enter into vocational or transfer programs without the GED. I don't consider this a failure of the program. However, that is my interpretation. Looking at how many of the students in the core GED courses enter the regular curriculum would be an interesting study.
3. Dr Igor Marder, who coordinated the program, was the faculty member who would inform the GED student when he or she was ready to take the exam. However, some students took the exam against his advice. This is the equivalent of an English 95 student enrolling in English 101 the next semester. Unfortunately, we have no control over when students choose to take the GED. Dr Marder reports that in the 10 years that he coordinated the program, he can never recall the failure of a student for whom he gave the ok to take the GED. Of course his data is anecdotal, since he could not confirm the data with the Adult School because the information is confidential. Perhaps we could look at "GED readiness" in the same was we look at "transfer readiness"?
4. It is unclear how many of the original 170 students from the 2006-2007 academic year persisted in the program. The program was designed to have a series of entry points or late start / short term courses throughout the semester that served as place holders (for students who came to us in October after the start of the core GED courses, for example) One was an orientation course, others were courses such as "Basic use of the Dictionary and Thesaurus" and "The Use of Calculators for the GED and Real Life Situations." While these courses had value, they were not really a part of the core curriculum, yet they were included in the data. Some students became impatient with these one unit courses and dropped out early. Some students who took the orientation course and discovered the rigor of the core program dropped out because they didn't want to work that hard.

Retention would also be an interesting study to conduct. Also the persistence and success rates of the students in the core courses.

5. In terms of the cost of the program, productivity numbers would be useful. I assume that faculty productivity in many of our AVC courses and programs will be examined more and more during these times of financial stress. If the GED program is too expensive to offer now, then that is a reasonable conclusion, if the productivity or cost/benefit analysis suggests it.
6. The GED program is a basic skills program. Therefore is seems reasonable to evaluate the efficacy of the program in the same way we evaluate the efficacy of the math or English basic skills sequence of courses. How soon after taking their first Math 50 course are students taking their first transfer level Math course? How many of the Math 50 students do we retain? How does this compare with the Math 1 for the GED course? This would be a valid comparison. I believe that through the Basic Skills Initiative there were rubrics created to help campuses make accurate ARC reports for the GED, ABE courses. Perhaps those rubrics would be helpful.
7. More philosophically, AVC needs to decide whether serving these students is a part of our basic skills mission. Juan Cruz, of the Chancellor's office says that it is a decision that faculty at each campus must make.

I sent a draft of these observations to Dr. Marder and to the researchers in the Office of Institutional Research to verify that my interpretations were accurate. They concurred. One researcher sent me the following email:

Your interpretation is sound and I would definitely be willing to back your statements regarding the research that was conducted for the GED program. It is concerning to me that more questions were not asked regarding the method and results of this analysis as so many were willing to take these results at face value. Thank you for your interest in getting a candid opinion from a researcher's perspective. Often we are asked to provide numbers, through a predefined method, and there is little interest in the assumptions that must be made until someone questions those findings.

Thanks again,

My concern goes beyond what AVC decides to do about community members who wish a GED. While we assert that we are moving to fact based decision making, we need to be more careful that we ask the right questions and we interpret the results accurately.

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
Academic Senate

MQ and Equivalency Review Form

The discipline faculty in the Language Arts division/area have reviewed the most current (2008) Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges for the following discipline: Communication Studies.

The discipline faculty agree that: (Select only one)

☐ **an equivalency for this discipline is not needed.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline contains a broad range of degree requirements for all those who are prepared to teach within the discipline.*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency does not need revision.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline have not changed.*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The minimum qualifications for the designated discipline have changed (attach revised equivalency proposal for Senate review).*

☑ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The approved equivalency is below the Education Code Section 87359 that requires that individuals employed by the district possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable Minimum Qualifications* ***or*** *no longer meets the criteria set forth by the AVC Academic Senate Equivalency Procedure and, therefore, needs revision (attach revised equivalency proposal for Senate review).*

Date: 3/9/10

Academic Senate Representatives

Discipline Faculty:

Equivalency Procedure approved 05-31-07
September 6, 2007

Equivalency Committee Approval:

Equivalency Committee Chair — *Date* 3/12/10

Sharon A Lowery

Antelope Valley College

Memo

To: Equivalency Committee of the Academic Senate

From: Tina McDermott, Communication Studies, Language Arts

CC:

Date: March 1, 2010

Re: Communication Studies Equivalency

To the Members of the Equivalency Committee:

The faculty members of the Communication Studies Department have met several times to revise criteria for equivalency to the State of California Chancellor's minimum qualifications for hiring in our discipline. Upon requests for revisions from the committee and input from Dr. Lee Grishman, we are presenting a final proposal of the equivalency for your approval.

The State Chancellor's office minimum qualifications for Communication Studies (aka Speech Communication) are:

> "Master's in speech, speech broadcasting, telecommunications, rhetoric, communication, communication studies, speech communication, or organizational communication OR Bachelor's in any of the above AND Master's in drama/theater arts, mass communication, or English OR The equivalent."

Our equivalent language is:

> Any combination of a bachelor's degree in the following: film, drama/theater arts, linguistics, rhetoric, mass communication, communications, journalism, broadcasting, television, film, media studies, English, literature, composition, marketing, public relations, business, telecommunication(s), and a master's degree in one of the listed fields to include 24 semester units of Communication Studies courses with 18 of those units at the upper division level.

Thank you for your input and your attention to this matter.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

OVERVIEW

Federal Regulations

In the United States, IRBs are governed by Title 45 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) Part 46. This National Research Act of 1974 defines IRBs and requires them for all research that receives funding, directly or indirectly, from what was the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the time, and is now the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). IRBs are themselves regulated by the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) within HHS. IRBs were developed in direct response to research abuses earlier in the twentieth century. Two of the most notorious of these abuses were the experiments of Nazi physicians that became a focus of the post-World War II Doctors' Trial, and the Tuskegee Syphilis Study, a project conducted between 1932 and 1972 by the U.S. Public Health Service on black men in rural Alabama. Title 21 part 56 has additional requirements for IRBs that oversee clinical trials of drugs involved in New drug applications.

IRB's were a direct outgrowth of the 1979 Belmont Report commissioned by the federal government in order to define what is ethical in research involving human subjects.

The three fundamental ethical principles for using any human subjects for research, as identified in the Belmont Report, are:

- (1) respect for persons: protecting the autonomy of all people and treating them with courtesy and respect and allowing for informed consent;
- (2) beneficence: maximizing benefits for the research project while minimizing risks to the research subjects; and
- (3) justice: ensuring reasonable, non-exploitative, and well-considered procedures are administered fairly (the fair distribution of costs and benefits to *potential* research participants.)

Exemptions

While IRBs can be more inclusive or restrictive, under the statute, exemptions to IRB approval include research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories:

1. Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as

1. research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or
2. research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

2. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:

1. information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
2. any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

3. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, if:

1. the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office;
2. federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

4. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

5. Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine:

1. public benefit or service programs;
2. procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs;
3. possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or
4. possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

6. Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Naming and composition

Although "IRB" is a generic term used by the FDA and HHS, each institution that establishes an IRB may use whatever name it chooses. Regardless of the name chosen, the IRB is subject to the FDA's IRB regulations when studies of FDA-regulated products are reviewed and approved.

Originally, IRBs were committees at academic institutions and medical facilities to monitor research studies involving human participants, primarily to minimize or avoid ethical problems.

Today some IRB reviews are conducted by for-profit organizations known as *independent* or *commercial* IRBs. The responsibilities of these IRBs are identical to those based at academic or medical institutions, and they are governed by the same federal regulations. The composition of an IRB for the FDA's requirements is set in 21 CFR 56.107.

> (a)1 The IRB must have at least five members.
> (a)2 The members must have enough experience, expertise, and diversity to make an informed decision on whether the research is ethical, informed consent is sufficient, and appropriate safeguards have been put in place.
> (a)3 If the IRB works with studies that include vulnerable populations, the IRB should have members who are familiar with these groups. It is common for an IRB to include an advocate for prisoners when considering research that involves them.
> (b)1 The IRB should include both men and women, as long as they aren't chosen specifically for their gender.
> (b)2 The members of the IRB must not be all of the same profession.
> (c) The IRB must include at least one scientist and at least one non-scientist. These terms are not defined in the regulations.
> (d) The IRB must include at least one person who is not affiliated with the institution or in the immediate family of a person affiliated with the institution. These are commonly called "Community Members."
> (e) IRB members may not vote on their own projects.
> (f) The IRB may include consultants in their discussions to meet requirements for expertise or diversity, but only actual IRB members may vote.

In order to vote on a proposal, more than half of the members of the board must be present and there must be a non-scientist present. There are exceptions for expedited review, where only the chair of the committee or a designee reviews research, but these are relatively narrow.

Purpose and use

IRBs are most commonly used for studies in the fields of health and the social sciences, including anthropology, sociology, and psychology. Such studies may be *clinical trials* of new drugs or devices, they may be studies of personal or social behavior, opinions or attitudes, or they may be studies of how health care is delivered and might be improved.

The purpose of an IRB review is to assure, both in advance and by periodic review, that appropriate steps are taken to protect the rights and welfare of humans participating as subjects in a research study. To accomplish this purpose, IRBs review research protocols and related materials (e.g., informed consent documents and investigator brochures) to ensure protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects of research. The chief objectives of every IRB protocol review are to assess the ethics of the research and its methods, to promote fully informed and voluntary participation by prospective subjects who are themselves capable of making such

choices (or, if that is not possible, informed permission given by a suitable proxy) and to maximize the safety of subjects once they are enrolled in the project.

What Does All this Mean for AVC?

The Federal interpretation of what qualifies as "human subjects research" is expanding, while compliance enforcement is tightening.

Most colleges stipulate that any individual *(inside or outside the College, including administrators, faculty, staff, or students)* who desires to conduct any systematic investigation that involves obtaining any information about college students or employees and plans to use that information as generalizable* knowledge must obtain official Institutional Review Board *(IRB)* clearance. There are three types of IRB review processes – exempt from review, expedited review, and full review – where research protocols are subjected to different degrees of scrutiny.

It is the investigator who self-determines whether his/her project qualifies as human subjects research, and whether an application should be submitted to the IRB.

Most colleges elect to develop board policies about the use of IRB. Usually in the policies it is stated clearly that **any investigator who elects not to apply for and receive a formal IRB determination from the IRB is non-compliant with College procedures. This means that the investigator's research will not be protected from any risk or liability that IRB approval might have provided.**

*generalizable - research data gathered by systematic investigation to be used in materials including but not limited to dissertations and theses, articles for publication and conference presentations

Sources:

Food And Drug Administration website.

Valencia Community College.

CUNY Research Office.

Wikipedia

Checklist for the Informed Consent Form (cover letter, email, etc): Basic information that must be included

Project Description

	Is the project title identified?
	Is it stated that the study involves research?
	Purpose of the research?
	How long will it take to participate?
	Why participant was selected?
	Is the age of participant stated (under 19 needs parental consent)?
	Are procedures described?
	Where will it take place?
	Are experimental procedures identified? (include if applicable)

Risks, Benefits, and Alternatives

	Are risks and discomforts to participants explained? If no risks, does it say no known risks?
	If there are risks, what will be done to minimize the risks? Referrals?
	Are benefits to participants and to others that might be expected from the research explained?
	Are alternative procedures or course of treatment that might be advantageous to the participant identified?
	If the study offers course credit, are alternative ways to earn the credit explained?

Confidentiality

	Will confidentiality of records identifying participant be maintained?
	How will data be reported: scientific journal, professional meeting, aggregated data?

Compensation

	Is compensation offered?
	Are medical treatments available if injury occurs?
	Who will pay for treatments (participant or department)?
	What conditions would exclude participant from participating?

Right to Ask Questions

	Is it stated that participants have a right to ask questions and to have those questions answered?
	Are the names & phone numbers of persons to contact for answers to questions about the research provided?
	Does it state who to contact concerning questions about research participants' rights, "Sometimes study participants have questions or concerns about their rights. In that case you should call the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6965."

Freedom to Withdraw

	Does it state, "You are free to decide not to participate in this study. You can also withdraw at any time without harming your relationship with the researchers or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln."
	Does it state participation is voluntary?

Institutional Review Board at AVC

Questions for discussion

1.) Number of members?

2.) Qualifications of the members?

3.) Federal guidelines for board membership

The Federal DHHS dictates that every IRB should include one scientist, one non-scientist, and a non college affiliated member. Individuals qualify as "nonscientific" if their training and/or degree is in a nonscientific area (for example, law, business, or humanities) or if their primary occupation is nonscientific (for example, clergy, business, arts, or social service). A "non-affiliated" person is someone not related to any person employed by a college or not taking any credit/non-credit courses.

4.) Frequency of meetings

5.) Development of Board Policy and Administrative Policy

a) Meeting schedule

b) Submission procedure and feedback mechanism

c) Criteria for review

d) CITI training (www.citiprogram.org) (Costs $1750/year/per institution/unlimited access)

6.) Development of forms and informational website.

INFORMATION NEEDED ON CONSENT FORMS
Must be on Antelope Valley College letterhead
Italics indicates the information needed for a consent form and does not need to be typed on the informed consent form.

INFORMED CONSENT FORM (Minors)

IRB#_____
(Labeled by IRB)

Identification of Project:
Title of Project

Example: A Comparison of Different Types of Instruction.

Purpose of the Research:
This should inform the subject that: this is a research project, purpose of the research, how long it will take to complete the project, why the subject was selected, age range of subjects (under 19 needs parental consent), and identification of any procedures that are experimental.

Example: This is a research project that will compare the effectiveness of, and student preference for computerized assisted instruction (CAI) vs. lecture as a teaching technique. You must be 19 years of age or older to participate. You are invited to participate in this study because you are a student in Biology 102.

Procedures:
Explain what you expect the research participant to do in this research, how long it will take the subject to complete the tasks, describe the procedures that the subject will be expected to complete, and where the research will take place.

Example: Participation in this study will require approximately 90 minutes of your time, and is not considered as part of Biology 102. First you will take a pre-test consisting of 20 multiple choice questions. Next you will be randomly assigned (similar to a flip of a coin) to either Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) or a 50-minute lecture on the morphology (structure) of the cell. Both the TMI and the lecture have the same educational objectives and will cover the same material. At the end of the TMI or the lecture you will be asked to complete a post-test consisting of 20 multiple-choice questions. Finally, we would like to conduct a short interview with you about your educational experience in this research. This interview will be audio taped with your permission.

Your performance on the test will be correlated with your SAT scores. Therefore, we ask your permission to obtain your SAT scores from your admissions file.

Risks and/or Discomforts:
Inform the subject of any risks or discomforts that may result from being a participant in this research. Also inform them of treatments or help that will be available if adverse reactions occur.

Example: There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. In the event of problems resulting from participation in the study, participants may request psychological treatment free of charge by contacting (661) xxx-xxxx.

Benefits:
Describe the benefits to the subject or others which may be expected as a result of this research. Do not make unreasonable claims expected from the result. If there are no direct benefits to participation, just state that fact.

Example: You many find the learning experience enjoyable and the information may be helpful to you when you study the cell in Biology 102. The information gained from this study may help us to better understand the effectiveness of TMI vs lecture as a teaching technique and learning style preference.

Initials_____

Alternatives:

For a project of more than minimal risk, a statement needs to be included describing appropriate alternative procedures or course of treatment, if any, that might be advantageous to the subject.
Example: If a superior treatment method is found as a result of this research, you will be informed of that treatment.

Confidentiality:

Explain to the research subject how confidentiality will be maintained, who will have access to the data, how data will be reported in order to maintain individual confidentiality, and where or how the data will be published or reported. If confidentiality will not be maintained, this must be explained to participants.

Example: Any information obtained during this study which could identify you will be kept strictly confidential. The data will be stored in a locked cabinet in the investigator's office and will only be seen by the investigator during the study and for three years after the study is complete. The information obtained in this study may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings but the data will be reported as aggregated data. The audiotapes will be erased after transcription.

Compensation:

In research involving more than minimal risk, an explanation as to whether any compensation is offered for being involved in the research. Also explain if any medical treatments are available if injury occurs and if so, what they consist of or where further information may be obtained. Note whether there are class credits given for participating in this research and other options that may be available.

Example: You will receive two hours of research credit for participating in this project. Or, there will be no compensation for participating in this research.

Opportunity to Ask Questions:

Explain to the research subjects that they have a right to ask questions and have those questions answered before starting the research. List the names and phone numbers of persons to contact for answers to questions about the research.

Example: You may ask any questions concerning this research and have those questions answered before agreeing to participate in or during the study. Or you may call the investigator at any time, office phone, (661) 722-xxxx, or after hours (xxx) xxx-xxxx. If you have questions concerning your rights as a research subject that have not been answered by the investigator or to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the Antelope Valley College Institutional Review Board, at (661) xxx-xxxxx.

Freedom to Withdraw:
Explain to the research subjects that participation is voluntary and they are free to withdraw from the research at any time without adversely affecting their relationship with the investigators, the University of Nebraska (or other institutions or organizations).

Example: You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators, or Antelope Valley College. Your decision will not result in any loss or benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Initials_____

Consent, Right to Receive a Copy:

Example: You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Your signature certifies that you have decided to participate having read and understood the information presented. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

_____ Check if you agree to be audio taped during the interview.

Signature of Participant:

_____ _____

Signature of Research Participant *Date*

Name and Phone number of investigator(s)

_____, *Principal Investigator* *Office: (661) xxx-xxxx*

_____, *Secondary Investigator* *Office: (661) xxx-xxxx*

What Signing This Form Means:

Parent's Permission: I have read this consent form and understand the purpose, procedures to be used, and the potential risks and benefits of my child's participation. I freely and voluntarily give permission for my child to participate. I understand that my child may discontinue participation at any time. I will be given a copy of this consent form.

Parent's Name (printed) _____

Parent's Signature: _____ Date _____

Child's Assent: I have read this consent document (or: "had this consent document read to me") and understand what I am being asked to do. I freely and voluntarily agree to be in the study. I understand that I may drop out of the study at any time.

Child's Name (printed)_____ Date _____

Informed consent is one of the primary ethical requirements of research with human subjects. It is essential that researchers think of informed consent as an educational process that takes place between the investigator and the prospective research participant.

The important thing is to let the research subject know exactly what your expectations are during the research process.

Initials_____

INFORMATION NEEDED ON CONSENT FORMS
Must be on Antelope Valley College letterhead
Italics indicates the information needed for a consent form and does not need to be typed on the informed consent form.

INFORMED CONSENT FORM (Adults)

IRB#_____
(Labeled by IRB)

Identification of Project:
Title of Project

Example: A Comparison of Different Types of Instruction.

Purpose of the Research:
This should inform the subject that: this is a research project, purpose of the research, how long it will take to complete the project, why the subject was selected, age range of subjects (under 19 needs parental consent), and identification of any procedures that are experimental.

Example: This is a research project that will compare the effectiveness of, and student preference for computerized assisted instruction (CAI) vs. lecture as a teaching technique. You must be 19 years of age or older to participate. You are invited to participate in this study because you are a student in Biology 102.

Procedures:
Explain what you expect the research participant to do in this research, how long it will take the subject to complete the tasks, describe the procedures that the subject will be expected to complete, and where the research will take place.

Example: Participation in this study will require approximately 90 minutes of your time, and is not considered as part of Biology 102. First you will take a pre-test consisting of 20 multiple choice questions. Next you will be randomly assigned (similar to a flip of a coin) to either Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) or a 50-minute lecture on the morphology (structure) of the cell. Both the TMI and the lecture have the same educational objectives and will cover the same material. At the end of the TMI or the lecture you will be asked to complete a post-test consisting of 20 multiple-choice questions. Finally, we would like to conduct a short interview with you about your educational experience in this research. This interview will be audio taped with your permission.

Your performance on the test will be correlated with your SAT scores. Therefore, we ask your permission to obtain your SAT scores from your admissions file.

Risks and/or Discomforts:
Inform the subject of any risks or discomforts that may result from being a participant in this research. Also inform them of treatments or help that will be available if adverse reactions occur.

Example: There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. In the event of problems resulting from participation in the study, participants may request psychological treatment free of charge by contacting (661) xxx-xxxx.

Benefits:
Describe the benefits to the subject or others which may be expected as a result of this research. Do not make unreasonable claims expected from the result. If there are no direct benefits to participation, just state that fact.

Example: You many find the learning experience enjoyable and the information may be helpful to you when you study the cell in Biology 102. The information gained from this study may help us to better understand the effectiveness of TMI vs lecture as a teaching technique and learning style preference.

Initials_____

Alternatives:

For a project of more than minimal risk, a statement needs to be included describing appropriate alternative procedures or course of treatment, if any, that might be advantageous to the subject.
Example: If a superior treatment method is found as a result of this research, you will be informed of that treatment.

Confidentiality:

Explain to the research subject how confidentiality will be maintained, who will have access to the data, how data will be reported in order to maintain individual confidentiality, and where or how the data will be published or reported. If confidentiality will not be maintained, this must be explained to participants.

Example: Any information obtained during this study which could identify you will be kept strictly confidential. The data will be stored in a locked cabinet in the investigator's office and will only be seen by the investigator during the study and for three years after the study is complete. The information obtained in this study may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings but the data will be reported as aggregated data. The audiotapes will be erased after transcription.

Compensation:

In research involving more than minimal risk, an explanation as to whether any compensation is offered for being involved in the research. Also explain if any medical treatments are available if injury occurs and if so, what they consist of or where further information may be obtained. Note whether there are class credits given for participating in this research and other options that may be available.

Example: You will receive two hours of research credit for participating in this project. Or, there will be no compensation for participating in this research.

Opportunity to Ask Questions:

Explain to the research subjects that they have a right to ask questions and have those questions answered before starting the research. List the names and phone numbers of persons to contact for answers to questions about the research.

Example: You may ask any questions concerning this research and have those questions answered before agreeing to participate in or during the study. Or you may call the investigator at any time, office phone, (661) 722-xxxx, or after hours (xxx) xxx-xxxx. If you have questions concerning your rights as a research subject that have not been answered by the investigator or to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the Antelope Valley College Institutional Review Board, at (661) xxx-xxxxx.

Freedom to Withdraw:
Explain to the research subjects that participation is voluntary and they are free to withdraw from the research at any time without adversely affecting their relationship with the investigators, the University of Nebraska (or other institutions or organizations).

Example: You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators, or Antelope Valley College. Your decision will not result in any loss or benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Initials_____

Consent, Right to Receive a Copy:

Example: You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Your signature certifies that you have decided to participate having read and understood the information presented. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

_____ Check if you agree to be audio taped during the interview.

Signature of Participant:

_____ _____

Signature of Research Participant *Date*

Name and Phone number of investigator(s)

_____, *Principal Investigator* *Office: (661) xxx-xxxx*

_____, *Secondary Investigator* *Office: (661) xxx-xxxx*

Informed consent is one of the primary ethical requirements of research with human subjects. It is essential that researchers think of informed consent as an educational process that takes place between the investigator and the prospective research participant.

The important thing is to let the research subject know exactly what your expectations are during the research process.

Initials_____

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE	Antelope Valley College District Institutional Review Board (IRB) 3041 West Avenue K Lancaster, CA 93536 (661) 722-xxxx Fax (661) 722-xxxx irb@avc.edu(???)	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY IRB#_____ Date Approved:_____ Date Received:_____ Code #:_____

IRB NEW PROTOCOL SUBMISSION

Project Title:	

Investigator Information:

Principal Investigator:		Secondary Investigator or Project Supervisor*:	
Department:		Department:	
Department Phone:		Department Phone:	
Contact Phone:		Contact Phone:	
Contact Address:		Contact Address:	
City/State/Zip:		City/State/Zip:	
E-Mail Address:		E-Mail Address:	

* Student projects must be submitted with a faculty member listed as Secondary Investigator or Project Supervisor.

Principal Investigator is:

	Faculty		Staff		Post Doctoral Student
	Graduate Student		Undergraduate Student		Other

Type of Project:

	Research		Demonstration		Class Project
	Independent Study		Other		

Does the research involve an outside institution/agency other than AVC*?	Yes ☐ No ☐

* Note: Research can only begin at each institution after the IRB receives the institutional approval letter

If yes, please list the institutions/agencies.	
Where will participation take place (e.g., AVC, at home, in a community building, etc)	

Project Information:

Present/Proposed Source of Funding:			
Project Start Date:		Project End Date:	

*Please attach a copy of the funding application.

Type of Review Requested: Please check either exempt, expedited, or full board. Please refer to the investigator manual, accessible on our website: http://www.avc.edu/??????????, to determine which type of review is appropriate. **Final review determination will be made by the IRB.**

Please check your response to each question.

	Yes		No	1. Does the research involve prisoners?
	Yes		No	2. Does the research involve using survey or interview procedures with children (under 19 years of age) that is not conducted in an educational setting utilizing normal educational practices?
	Yes		No	3. Does the research involve the observation of children in settings where the investigator will participate in the activities being observed?
	Yes		No	4. Will videotaping or audio tape recording be used?
	Yes		No	5. Will the participants be asked to perform physical tasks?
	Yes		No	6. Does the research attempt to influence or change participants' behavior, perception, or cognition?
	Yes		No	7. Will data collection include collecting sensitive data (illegal activities, sensitive topics such as sexual orientation or behavior, undesirable work behavior, or other data that may be painful or embarrassing to reveal)?
	Yes		No	8. For research using existing or archived data, documents, records or specimens, will any data, documents, records, or specimens be collected from subjects after the submission of this application?
	Yes		No	8a. Can subjects be identified, either directly or indirectly, from the data, documents, records, or specimens?

☐ **Exempt** ☐ **Expedited** ☐ **Full Board**

Description of Subjects:

Total number of participants (include 'controls'):	

Will participants of both sexes/genders be recruited? Yes ☐ No ☐
If "No" was selected, please include justification/rationale.

Will participation be limited to certain racial or ethic groups? Yes ☐ No ☐
If "Yes" was selected, please include justification/rationale.

What are the participants' characteristics?

Type of Participant: (Check all appropriate blanks for participant population)

	Adults, Non Students		Pregnant Women		Persons with Psychological

					Impairment
	AVC Students		Fetuses		Persons with Neurological Impairment
	Minors (under age 19)		Persons with Limited Civil Freedom		Persons with Mental Retardation
	Victims		Adults with Legal Representatives		Persons with HIV/AIDS
	Other (Explain):				

Special Considerations: Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please check all appropriate blanks below.

	Audio taping		Videotaping		Archival/Secondary Data Analysis		Genetic Data/Samples
	Photography		Web-based research		Biological Samples		Protected Health Information

Project Personnel List:

Please list the names of all personnel working on this project, starting with the principal investigator and the secondary investigator/project advisor. Research assistants, students, data entry staff and other research project staff should also be included. For a complete explanation of training and project staff please go to http://www.unl.edu/research/ReComp1/compliance.shtml

Name of Individual:	Project Role:	AVC Status*	Involved in Project Design/Supervision? Yes/No	Collect Data? Yes/No

*Faculty, Staff, Graduate Student, Undergraduate Student, Unaffiliated, Other

Required Signatures:

Principal Investigator:		Date:	
Secondary Investigator/Project Advisor:		Date:	
Unit Review Committee:		Date:	

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
PROTOCOL:
DATE APPROVED:

1. Describe the significance of the project.

What is the significance/purpose of the study? (Please provide a brief 1-2 paragraph explanation in lay terms.)

2. Describe the methods and procedures.

Describe the data collection procedures and what participants will have to do.

How long will this take participants to complete?

Will follow-ups or reminders be sent? If so, explain.

3. Describe recruiting procedures.

How will the names and contact information for participants be obtained?

How will participants be approached about participating in the study?

****Please submit copies of recruitment flyers, ads, phone scripts, emails, etc.**

4. Describe Benefits and Risks.

Explain the benefits to participants or to others.

Explain the risks to participants. What will be done to minimize the risks? If there are no known risks, this should be stated.

5. Describe Compensation.

Will compensation be provided to participants? Yes ☐ No ☐

If 'Yes', please describe amount and type of compensation, including money, gift certificates, extra credit, etc.

6. Informed Consent

How will informed consent/assent be obtained?

****Please attach copies of informed consent forms, emails, and/or letters. Please refer to the last page for a checklist of the information that needs to be included in the informed consent document.**

7. Describe how confidentiality will be maintained.

How will confidentiality of records be maintained?

Will individuals be identified?

How long will records be kept?

Where will records be stored?

Who has access to the records/data?

How will data be reported?

For web based studies, how will the data be handled? Will the data be sent to a secure server? Will the data be encrypted while in transit? Will you be collecting IP addresses?

If transcriptions are required, how will transcriptions be handled? Who is doing the transcriptions? Please attach a copy of the confidentiality agreement that transcriptionists will sign.

** For studies utilizing Protected Health Information (PHI; e.g., information obtained from a hospital, clinic, or treatment facility), how will this PHI data be obtained and safeguarded? Please provide a copy of the release of authorization that will be used to obtain permission from the participant for the agency/institution to release protected health information for project purposes or a letter from the agency/institution documenting agreement to provide protected health information for project purposes.*

**For studies involving genetic data/sampling/analysis, illegal drug use, or criminal activity that places the participant at risk for legal action, how will confidentiality be maintained? Will a Certificate of Confidentiality be obtained to protect the compelled disclosure of this information?*

8. Copies of questionnaires, survey, or testing instruments.

Please list all questionnaires, surveys, and/or assessment instruments/measures used in the project..

Please submit copies of all instruments/measures..

Equivalency List by Division

Business, Computer Studies, and Economic Development

Discipline	Expiration Date
Accounting	10/16/2011
Business	11/19/2012
Office Technologies	10/16/2011
Real Estate	5/1/2011

Updated Equivalency Needed

Computer Information Systems
Management
Marketing

Health Sciences

Discipline	Expiration Date
Culinary Arts	5/3/2010
Emergency Medical Technologies	6/4/2012
Licensed Vocational Nursing	4/16/2012
Nursing Science/Clinical Practice	6/4/2012
Radiological Technology	4/19/2010

Updated Equivalency Needed

Child Development/Early Childhood Education
Health Care Ancillaries: Home Health Aide
Health Care Ancillaries: Medical Office Assistant
Health Care Ancillaries: Nurse Aide
Nutritional Science/Dietetics
Respiratory Therapy

Language Arts

Discipline	Expiration Date
Communication Arts	2/7/2011
Foreign Language: Chinese	9/6/2010
Foreign Language: Spanish	11/19/2012
Sign Language, American Sign Language/English Interpreting	11/15/2010

Updated Equivalency Needed

English
ESL
Foreign Language: French
Foreign Language: German
Foreign Language: Latin
Journalism
Reading

Instructional Resources/Extended Services

Updated 12/18/2009

Discipline	Expiration Date
Library Science	9/4/2011
Learning Assistance Instructors or Learning Skills Coordinators or Instructors, or Tutoring Coordinators	4/2/2012

Updated Equivalency Needed

Non Credit Courses

Math, Science, and Engineering

Discipline	Expiration Date
Biological Sciences	2/7/2011
Mathematics	6/4/2012

Updated Equivalency Needed

Chemistry
Drafting
Earth Science
Engineering
Geography
Physical Science
Physics/Astronomy

Physical Education and Athletics

Updated Equivalency Needed

Discipline
Athletic Training
Dance
Health
Physical Education

Social and Behavioral Sciences

Discipline	Expiration Date
Psychology	2/7/2011
Sociology	9/7/2012

Updated Equivalency Needed

Anthropology
Economics
Education
History
Philosophy
Political Science

Student Services

Updated 12/18/2009

Discipline	Expiration Date
Counseling	5/7/2012

Updated Equivalency Needed

CalWorks
Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS)
Extended Opportunity Program and Services Counselor
General Education Development (GED)

Technical Education

Discipline	Expiration Date
Administration of Justice	5/31/2010
Aeronautics	12/6/2010
Air Conditioning, Refrigeration, Heating	5/1/2011
Auto Body Technology	12/6/2010
Automotive Technology	12/6/2010
Electricity	5/1/2011
Electronic Technology	5/1/2011
Fashion and Related Technologies	2/7/2011
Fire Technology	5/1/2011
Interior Design	5/1/2011
Ornamental Horticulture	5/1/2011
Welding	5/15/2011

Updated Equivalency Needed

Agriculture/Landscaping

Visual and Performing Arts

Discipline	Expiration Date
Commercial Music	3/6/2011

Updated Equivalency Needed

Art
Film Studies
Graphic Arts
Multimedia
Music
Photography
Drama/Theatre Arts