

Faculty Senate Minutes

May 13, 2013

McCormick Room

Faculty Senate Members Present:

Kris Bartanen, Bradford Dillman (chair), Andrew Gardner, Kathryn Ginsberg, Eric Hopfenbeck, Zaixin Hong, Judith Kay, Alisa Kessel, Amanda Mifflin, Elise Richman, Maria Sampen, Shirley Skeel, Amy Spivey, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese.

Guests:

Don Share, Garrett Milam.

Call to order: Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm.

Chair Dillman welcomed Eric Hopfenbeck, new president of the ASUPS, to join the Faculty Senate meeting.

Approval of the minutes:

M/S/P to accept minutes from May 6th with minor changes.

Announcements:

Skeel reported that the Staff Senate raised \$ 770 at the Spring Gift Basket Raffle. The money goes to benefit scholarships for UPS staff and their spouses, partners, or dependents.

Dillman mentioned that Final Grading is available in *PeopleSoft*, part of Optimize Puget Sound. In getting accustomed with the new system, Faculty can email their concerns and suggestions to optimize@ups.edu.

Academic Standards Committee (ASC) Final Report:

Don Share, the ASC Chair, presented the final report (see attachment). Instead of repeating the issues highlighted in the report, he opened the floor to answer questions.

Dillman wanted to know where we stand concerning the formal charge from the Faculty Senate to the ASC to “research and present options for course schedule framework revisions.” Share said that there is not yet a consensus about it because the transition to *PeopleSoft* complicated the ASC’s attempt to collect the needed data. Whether alternative

scheduling options can really work will depend on that information. The Senate is recommended to include the information gathering on its charges to the ASC next year.

Dillman asked about the policy change of Warnings for Academic Performance. Share explained that following Debbie Chee's suggestion the ASC considered changes to the way we currently sanction students who are struggling academically. Such a change will allow the ASC to issue warning signs earlier and more easily, in order to avoid situations in which students narrowly avoid warnings over multiple semesters. During its deliberations the ASC considered whether such warnings would intimidate struggling students, or whether the more proactive approach might improve their academic performance. Share said that as part of the proposed policy the ASC can tailor warning letters to be less harsh on a case by case basis. Bartanen pointed out parents will welcome the proposed policy, since it provides an earlier indicator of potential academic problems.

Share noted that the new policy will require "borderline students" to develop an academic improvement plan in consultation with their advisors, creating a more complete "paper" record of the University's effort to intervene.

Richman asked whether there is a threshold for warning students. Share explained that the new policy will apply to students formerly in the "close group", whose term average GPA is below 2.0.

Mifflin questioned the role of academic advisors with their advisees concerning academic warnings. Share said that the new policy will let advisees learn from the warnings that the University is aware of their struggle, and that continued problems could lead to sanctions. So, such warnings are to help improve their academic performance in a clear but gentle way. Share confirmed that the warnings only go to students, not to their parents.

Sampen asked about the language, whether the warning is given to a student in any given semester whose term average GPA is "below 2.0". Share confirmed that students in the "close group" will get the warning. Share explained that this term average "below 2.0" is computer generated.

Kay favored the new policy.

In explaining the meaning of "excessive absences", Share pointed out that it is very difficult to define it. One student complained to Associate Dean Moore about a professor's adherence to an "excessive absences" policy in the case of death in the family. As a result, the Senate and ASUPS endorsed the ASC's drafted bereavement policy for students.

In response to a separate student complaint about the lack of a University policy on "excessive absences," the ASC concluded that a policy to define "excessive absences" was neither necessary nor desirable.

Sampen asked about the term “credit hour policy”. Share explained that credit hour policy was drafted to facilitate the accreditation process, defining time frames within the 15-week semester. Bartanen added that the federal government requires that certain hours are secured for a unit offered over a 15-week semester and Puget Sound now has a formal “credit hour policy”.

M/S/P to receive the report. Received unanimously with no objections.

ASC Change to Academic Warning Sanction:

Chair Dillman then turned to a request from the ASC asking the Senate to approve or disapprove the committee’s change to the Academic Warning Sanction. He observed that the wording change in the document is not that significant.

Spivey made a motion to approve the ASC change. Motion was passed unanimously. The Senate approved the ASC change to Academic Warning Sanction.

Other business:

Vice Chair Kessel updated issues of quiet hours on campus during the summer time. In consultation with John Hickey, Executive Director of Community Engagement, and Amy Hackett, Director of Athletics, the ad-hoc committee defined the quiet hours when loudspeakers will be used for events such as cheerleading camps, Little Loggers All-Sports Camp, etc. Hickey's office will help generate a calendar to indicate the related policy in the designated places. Kessel will later share these details with the faculty.

Institutional Review Board Final Report:

Garrett Milam, the IRB Chair, presented the final report (see attachment).

Milam stated that the role of IRB, by federal standards, is to protect the rights, health, and well-being of human beings as research subjects. He reported that the committee did not receive any formal Senate charges this academic year, so it focused on three standing charges. In the beginning of the year, Associate Dean Lisa Ferrari attended a workshop on the rearrangement of the departmental designate system at Washington University in St. Louis, so much of IRB’s attention was directed towards the same issue and a replacement of the current process for review of exempt and expedited protocols.

Milam reported actions taken by the IRB in response to the first standing charge. 136 research protocols were reviewed at the departmental IRB designate level, among which 125 were characterized by the appropriate designate as qualified for “expedited” status. The IRB has seven standing members, who individually identified the certain population in the systems applied by many universities. Following federal and university standards, they reviewed protocols particularly related to minors and vulnerable populations,

including certain issues such as domestic violence. Thirteen protocols were reviewed by the full Board and of those, eleven were approved.

Milam then reported the IRB's actions concerning its second standing charge. According to the workshop that Ferrari attended at WU in St. Louis, the person who reviews protocols must be a member of the IRB committee, yet the departmental designate does not belong to the committee. Seven members of the IRB are not enough. Last year 150+ research protocols with human subjects came mostly from the departments of psychology, comparative sociology, and OT/PT, including some student research projects. The Psychology Department agreed to cut down the number of protocols, to provide generalizable research, to offer a couple of classes with the designation, and to add two members to the committee. The IRB does not have additional members from the Psychology Department to share the workload and to designate at the full board meeting. The Department of Comparative Sociology changed the protocol and adopted a different style since large number of their students will be heading to graduate school, and thus they will continue dealing with similar issues. But the department will not add a new member to the IRB. OT/PT is in the same situation. The department has many protocols, including a more clinical part on campus, which increases the size of the Board. After more consultation with these departments in the next year, the IRB will have more board members to handle the issue. The subcommittee meets twice a month. The full committee meets monthly, depending on the subcommittee's protocol review, among other things. Milam described the routine work of both the IRB subcommittee and full committee. Following the same procedures, several departments that have heavy burden shall get service credit, so the IRB can decrease its workload, effectively review the protocols, and do their administrative duty.

Milam briefly described the IRB's work in regard to the third standing charge. The modification of the IRB website has been a continuous work for a few years considering the major changes to the committee's procedures. In the next year the website will be reconstructed.

Kessel asked how many additional members the IRB needs. Milam said that the IRB needs two more to be added to the existing seven members.

Kay asked about the frequency of the committee meetings, whether some protocol reviews will be running late on a monthly meeting schedule. Milam explained that subcommittee meetings do these reviews.

Spivey noted with surprise that the report found no formal charges from the Senate, but the Senate did have formal charges as recorded in its minutes. Milam observed that Ross Singleton was at the IRB meeting with seven charges and Ann Putnam was the liaison as indicated in the Senate minutes last September.

Kessel asked about compliance, and whether it was necessary to develop a formal charge. Milam answered that the designate system does not change the federal system. Two years

ago, social research protocols changed our procedures, and it takes a long time to implement the federal regulations.

Gardner pointed out that things are complicated. The federal system is not equivalent to the federal funded projects. The evaluation of these projects is made according to the different interests of research. Milam said that the federal system goes strictly with the students who are going to graduate school. As a matter of practice, the system helps protect human research projects from falling into any unethical procedures. Kay observed that in the past the role of the department designate was educational, a person who answered relevant IRB related questions, later on the role evolved to approve the research protocols.

M/S/P to receive the report. Received unanimously with no objections.

Right before the adjournment, Chair Dillman thanked all the senators, particularly to those outgoing members, for their hard work during the whole year.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Zaixin Hong

Academic Standards Committee
2012-2013 Year-End Report

I. Membership and meetings of the Academic Standards Committee:

The members of the 2012-2013 Academic Standards Committee were: Bob Boyles, Dan Burgard, Kenneth Clark, Greg Elliott, Karl Fields, Duane Hulbert, Robin Jacobson (F), James Jasinski, Kristin Johnson (F), Jan Leuchtenberger, Martins Linauts, Jill Nealey-Moore (S), Lori Ricigliano, Don Share, Ann Wilson (F), and Bianca Wolf. Student representatives on the ASC were Isaac Olson and Daniel Laesch. Ex-Officio members were Debbie Chee, Sarah Moore, Brad Tomhave, and Landon Wade. Kristin Johnson chaired the ASC during Fall 2012, and Don Share chaired the committee during Spring 2013.

The ASC petitions subcommittee normally met every week and the ASC policy subcommittee normally met every other week.

II. Summary of Work on the Formal Charges from the Faculty Senate to the ASC:

1. *Research and present options for course schedule framework revisions with the goals of meeting the faculty's teaching needs (e.g., rethinking balance of 2, 3, and 4 day per week scheduling options), using available campus spaces more efficiently, maintaining commitment to 4:00-6:00 p.m. curricular and co-curricular program offerings, and locating a "common hour."*

The ASC addressed this issue at its meetings of October 18, 2012, December 6, 2012, and January 30, 2013. The ASC administered a survey of department chairs and discussed those results on December 6, 2012. Based on those results, at the ASC meeting of January 30, 2013 Sarah Moore presented a mock schedule (based on an earlier proposal by Bill Breitenbach) that would provide more scheduling options and would create space for a common hour. The ASC decided to defer discussion of this proposal to 2013-2014 because the transition to PeopleSoft complicated its attempt to collect the needed data. The ASC recommends that the Senate include this item on its charges to the ASC next year.

2. *Review and, if appropriate, recommend **changes to the Integrity Code** in light of data generated by the 2012 Spring Survey and concerns about the impact of the Internet on the issue of academic integrity.*

The results of the 2012 Spring Survey were discussed at meeting of December 6, 2012. While the ASC identified some potential issues regarding academic integrity, no obvious policy changes were apparent.

The ASC also discussed the results of the 2012 Academic Integrity Tutorial which all first year students are asked to complete before they arrive on campus. To support the university's commitment to academic integrity, Collins Library developed a tutorial and quiz covering these three areas:

- Basic concepts of academic integrity
- University policies about academic integrity
- Citing and documenting sources

A link to the self-paced tutorial is posted on the Admissions Welcome page and students are expected to complete it prior to their arrival on campus. In 2012 there was a 94% participation rate, an increase of 5% from the previous year. The average score was 89%, indicating that first year students were successful in understanding most of the concepts presented in the tutorial. The question with the most incorrect response was recognizing the difference between paraphrasing and summarizing. As a follow up, faculty may wish to discuss this issue in class.

The ASC has been charged with considering this issue for a number of years, and if the Senate wishes the ASC to continue discussion of this charge next year, it would be helpful to have some more clarification with respect to the problem the Senate wishes the ASC to resolve or address .

3. Review the wisdom of a policy change in consultation with the curriculum committee, that would permit students permit students to earn two Baccalaureate degrees concurrently.”

This issue came to the ASC from its petitions subcommittee, which has seen an increase in petitions to allow concurrent Baccalaureate degrees. At its meeting of January 30, 2013 the ASC decided to gather information regarding a possible change that would allow students to earn concurrent Baccalaureate degrees. The ASC subsequently requested and received input from Maggie Mittuch about the potential financial implications of such a change. More information was requested from Ellen Peters and Brad Tomhave. Due to the PeopleSoft transition, it was decided to postpone this discussion until Fall 2013 to allow time for data collection and analysis. We recommend that the Senate add this issue to the ASC’s charges next year.

III. Summary of other issues addressed by the ASC in 2012-2013

- As has become the norm, at the start of the academic year (at the ASC’s August 31 2012 meeting) the committee gave the Registrar the authority to convene a “Petition Review Team” asking the Associate Academic Dean who serves on the Academic Standards Committee and the Director of Academic Advising to join in a review of petitions submitted by students to the Academic Standards Committee. If the Preview Team unanimously finds that it is reasonable to expect that the Petitions Sub-Committee would approve a particular petition and that the Sub-Committee would not object to the Preview Team doing so, then the Preview Team may approve that petition. (The Preview Team’s primary task is to relieve the Petitions Sub-Committee of work on ordinary issues for which the Sub-Committee has a history of approval.)

- *Student Bereavement Policy.* This issue was brought to the ASC by Sarah Moore, as the result of a student complaint. In December 2012 the Senate and ASUPS endorsed ASC plans to draft a bereavement policy for students. The ASC deliberated on the content of the policy at its meetings of February 13, February 27, and March 13, 2013. A policy was approved by the ASC on March 13, 2013, and was subsequently approved by the Senate
- *Warnings for Academic Performance:* At the February 13, 2013 meeting, Debbie Chee suggested that the ASC consider changes to the way we currently sanction students who are struggling academically. The goal of such a change would be to give the ASC the ability to warn struggling students earlier, and to avoid situations in which students narrowly avoid warnings over multiple semesters. A revised policy on such warnings was discussed at the ASC meetings on March 13, 2013 and April 10, 2013. Brad Tomhave was charged with drafting the language of the new policy, and the policy was approved by the ASC on April 24, 2013, and was sent to the Senate for approval (pending approval).
- *Credit Hour Policy:* At the request of Sarah Moore, at the February 27, 2013 meeting of the ASC the committee approved a Credit Hour Policy, based on existing practices, in order to facilitate the accreditation process. The Senate adopted that policy, and it has been added to the Academic Handbook.
- *Excessive Absences Policy:* At the February 13, 2013 meeting, Sarah Moore brought to the ASC the issue of a possible policy on excessive absences, based on a student complaint. The question raised was whether it would be useful to have a campus policy defining “excessive absences.” The matter was discussed at the ASC meeting of April 10, 2013. The committee concluded that such a policy was not necessary or desirable.
- *Possible clarification of the withdrawal policy requirements.* At the April 25, 2013 meeting, the ASC discussed a case that was brought to the committee by Sarah Moore. The Academic Handbook currently gives faculty the discretion to determine whether students receive a W or a WF, when students withdraw in weeks 7-12 of a fall or spring semester. Faculty make that determination based on their determination that there have been “exceptional circumstances beyond the student’s control, in which case the student must demonstrate in writing to the satisfaction of the instructor that exceptional circumstances exist . . .” In some cases a student’s need to document such “exceptional circumstances” could come into conflict with a student’s right to privacy, specifically in the case of health or disability-related issues. We recommend that the ASC be charged with examining this issue (and amending current policies if necessary) next year.

IV. Summary of Petitions and Hearing Boards.

The year-end report for 2011-12 included petitions acted upon from September 1, 2011, to April 24, 2012. However, petitions activity continued during the period of April 25 to

August 29, 2012. During this time, 73 petitions were acted upon during with 59 approved and 14 denied.

To complete the report for 2011-2012, 263 total petitions were acted upon with 209 approved and 54 denied. Of these 263 petitions, more than half involved the following 4 actions:

59 Late Registrations
44 Registrations with a Schedule Conflict
30 Readmissions or Reinstatements from Dismissal or Suspension
28 Medical Withdrawals
161 Total (61%)

The year-end petitions report for 2012-13 covers the period from August 30, 2012, to April 17, 2013. During this time, 209 petitions were acted upon with 182 approved and 27 denied. Of these 209 petitions, more than half involved the following 4 actions:

65 Registrations with a Schedule Conflict
36 Late Registrations
27 Medical Withdrawals
17 Readmissions or Reinstatements from Dismissal or Suspension
145 Total (69%)

Hearing Boards:

On behalf of the ASC, Sarah Moore convened hearing boards during the period May 2012 – April 2013 to review the following:

- Four cases of academic dishonesty, second report
- One case of academic dishonesty, third report
- One grade dispute
-

Three students who had been dismissed for academic dishonesty by Hearing Boards in late spring or summer 2012 were asked to come before the ASC as part of their reinstatement process. Of these three, two students were reinstated, and one failed to come forward in the timeframe specified in the Hearing Board's sanction letter. Sarah also met with four additional students who were considering disputing grades via the hearing board process. Of these, three were dropped by the students and one was found to be a faculty grading error and corrected.

Submitted by Don Share for the Academic Standards Committee
May 2, 2013

Institutional Review Board
Report to the Faculty Senate

AY 2012-2013

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 gives very careful attention to issues such as potential risks to participants, protection of participants' identities and disclosed information of a sensitive nature, 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 2012-2013 academic year.

2012-13 IRB membership: Garrett Milam, (Chair); Lisa Ferrari, Andrew Gardner, Anne B. James (sabbatical Spring 2013), Eda Gurel-Atay (family leave Spring 2013), Kirsten Wilbur, Mita Mahato, Andrew Rife (community representative), Katie Hall (undergraduate student member), Kimberly Faucett (graduate student member).

The Institutional Review Board did not receive any formal Senate charges this academic year, hence we focused on charges from the 2011-12 academic year which remained outstanding in addition to the self-charges described below. By and large, apart from reviewing research protocols, much of our attention was directed towards replacement of the departmental designate system and a replacement for review of exempt and expedited protocols.

Self-charges for the IRB AY 2012-13:

The Board focused this year on the following self-charges.

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.
2. Develop recommendations for the replacement of the departmental designate system for preliminary review of all protocols and complete review of exempt and expedited protocols. (These recommendations and the need for the changes are discussed in detail below.)
3. Continue progress on revisions to the IRB website, including a revision of the handbook documents.

The following actions were taken by the IRB in response to these charges:

1. the IRB engaged in the review and monitoring of research protocols involving human subjects throughout the 2012-13 academic year. In line with the IRB designate structure

and consistent with past history of review, the majority of research protocols were reviewed at the departmental IRB designate level due to their characterization by the appropriate designate as qualifying for 'exempt' or 'expedited' status – meaning that the study procedures, level of risk, sampling methods, or nature of participant population did not fit the criteria established by federal and university standards for full Board review. One additional element of review which follows from a policy change in 2010-11 involves a requirement that a full member of the standing IRB committee, most often the Chair, review protocols, regardless of their standing, which involve research abroad prior to final approval.

Thirteen protocols were reviewed by the full Board and of those eleven were approved. Two have been granted approval contingent upon minor revisions not yet received by the Board. In this academic year, a total of 2 protocols were classified as 'exempt' and 122 were approved by an IRB departmental designate under the 'expedited' classification. (Note: these numbers exclude protocols for Comparative Sociology, who did not submit a year-end report to the IRB.) Of these, two required review by the IRB Chair due to a proposal of research to be conducted outside of the United States.

2. Throughout the semester the IRB worked on developing recommendations for the replacement of the departmental designate system in order to bring our procedures into compliance with federal regulations. This included consulting with departments which historically generated a large share of protocols for IRB review, particularly at the expedited or exempt level of review most directly impacted by the required changes. The complete recommendations are described in detail in an appendix but the IRB recommends that two additional faculty members be placed on the full IRB in order to help absorb the additional workload. Further, we recommend that one of those members be a member of the Psychology Department.

3. The IRB discussed changes to the website which represents the campus community's primary resource for information regarding human subjects research. Several improvements to this website are essentially ready to be implemented but we made the decision to wait until the decision was made regarding how the departmental designate system was made prior to rolling out any changes.

Self-charges for the IRB for the 2013-14 AY:

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.
2. Implement and inform the campus community regarding changes to the IRB review process resulting from the elimination of the departmental designate system.
3. Finalize the implementation of a memorandum of understanding with the Office of Institutional Research regarding IRB oversight of OIR work.

4. Monitor changes at the federal level regarding regulations and requirements related to human subjects research.

Respectfully Submitted,
Garrett Milam, PhD
IRB Chair AY 2012-13

Attachments (7): Detailed recommendation regarding designate replacement, Designate reports for Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Psychology, Exercise Science, School of Business and Leadership, Office of the Associate Deans.

Appendix A: Recommendations Regarding IRB Designate Replacement

The institutional review board (IRB) has identified a serious issue relating to the current system of using faculty designates from individual departments for preliminary evaluation of research protocols involving human subjects and full evaluation of protocols identified as qualifying for expedited review or as exempt from IRB oversight. New information has been brought to the attention of the board regarding a requirement that review and approval of protocols, even if they qualify for expedited or exempt status, must be completed by a full member of the IRB. Given the large number of protocols submitted for IRB review each academic year, simply eliminating the departmental designates and shifting review of research protocols to the existing eight member IRB does not appear to be a feasible solution. Below, we outline a plan for expanding the membership of the IRB in order to correct our review system in a manner that minimizes the impact on faculty service obligations.

In order to bring our IRB review procedures into compliance, we must ensure that review of research protocols involving human subject is completed by at least one full board member. Research protocols involving human subjects are divided into three categories, specifying the required level of review. Protocols which are identified as qualifying for expedited or exempt review if they involve no more than minimal risk to subjects, utilize common practices and safeguards, and do not involve sensitive populations or research topics. Any protocols falling outside of these categories must be reviewed by the full IRB. Expedited or exempt protocols may be reviewed by a single reviewer and under the current system at Puget Sound, this individual has been a faculty member within the department of origin tasked with such review, the departmental designate. However, as noted above, federal regulations require that review must be completed by individuals with full membership on the IRB.

A review of year-end departmental designate reports from recent years shows that the bulk of protocols submitted for review come from a relatively small number of academic departments: psychology, comparative sociology, occupational therapy, and physical therapy. Less than fifteen percent, on average, of these protocols move to full board review as they qualify as expedited or exempt. A large proportion of protocols reviewed by these departmental designates arise from student projects. These student projects fall into something of a grey area as they do not fit the federal definition of 'research' requiring IRB review unless they intend to create 'generalized knowledge.' This distinction is generally interpreted to be work which will be presented in some form to the general public, either through publication or presentation outside of the confines of the classroom or campus community.

Discussions within the IRB regarding the best way to eliminate the system of departmental designates and replace it with review by IRB members without imposing an undue burden in terms of faculty service resulted in the following recommendations.

- Expand the IRB by two members, one of which should come from Psychology, who will become part of a subcommittee tasked with review of exempt and

expedited protocols. (Replacing the current designate system.)

- Receive all IRB protocols at the office of the Associate Dean which will direct them to an IRB member tasked with determining the appropriate categorization of exempt, expedited, or full-board review.
 - Protocols categorized as expedited or exempt will be passed along to a member of the subcommittee named above for review.
 - Protocols requiring full-board review will continue to use the existing full-board procedures.
- IRB Meetings of the full board will be reduced from the current schedule of every two weeks to a monthly meeting, at which the primary order of business will be discussion of full-board protocol reviews. Other business will be directed to subcommittees which meet more frequently and report to the full board in order to inform votes on such charges.

These recommendations have been developed and refined in direct consultation with the high volume departments mentioned above. Several recent developments, either independent of or in response to the plan to eliminate departmental designates, within these departments should reduce the number of student research protocols coming to the IRB. Both the Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy departments have recently changed their research curriculum to encourage more students to do systematic reviews vs. original research. Comparative Sociology (CSOC) has recently taken a similar approach in regard to their senior thesis projects. In addition, CSOC has indicated that they will only direct students deemed by their faculty advisors to be likely to extend their research beyond the classroom to the IRB review process. Finally, Psychology intends to take a similar approach with their Experimental Methodology and Applied Statistics I course (their lower-division research methods course), reducing the source of student projects to their two upper-division methods courses.

The original plan for expansion of the IRB involved conversion of the existing departmental designate roles from the four departments listed above into full IRB positions. Under such a system, little would change in practice for individuals in these positions apart from the additional responsibilities of attending full-IRB meetings and contributing to review of the 10-15 full-board protocols per academic year. Given the abovementioned developments which should shrink the volume of expedited and exempt protocols, only Psychology is predicted to generate enough protocols to justify integrating their existing designate into the full board.¹ Beyond this, the number of expedited and exempt protocols generated elsewhere in the University is expected to justify a second additional member for the IRB.

¹ It should be noted that in meetings between the IRB Chair and the Psychology Department, the department advocated rather strongly in favor of having two members of their department join the IRB in order to ensure that expedited or exempt protocols from Psychology students be reviewed by these members. Though the IRB acknowledges the desire of the Psychology Department to maintain a consistent IRB review experience for their students, the IRB determined that review was more likely to be balanced and consistent with its mandate should such review be more evenly distributed.

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
DEPARTMENT DESIGNATES
ANNUAL REPORT**

The following report reflects the Institutional Review Board Protocols which met the criteria for either expedited or exempt review that were reviewed and approved by the Department Designate to the IRB from the Psychology Department for the 2012-2013 Academic Year.

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Consents, Follow-up
1213-01	Mackenzie Hepker	Effect of Intergroup Exposure on Mirror Neuron Activation	Exp	7/10/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-02	Logan Jones	EEG of Scrambled Images	Exp	10/4/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-03	Lace Alexander, Haley Andres, Jeff Kers, Erin Mahoney	Creative thinking and Mental Rotation	Exp	10/19/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-04	Bailey Bartelt, Stacia Wetter, Teale Kitson, Larissa Ogawa	Art Creation and Well-Being	Exp	10/19/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-05	Sadie Boyers, Vishakha Gupta	Does Personality Affect Preference for Liberal Arts Education?	Exp	10/22/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-06	Hannah Smookler, Kristine Miller, Maggie Rowe, Melissa Walker	Athletes' Mental Responses to Stimuli	Exp	10/22/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-07	Catherine Robb, Lyanna Diaz, Jennifer Nibel, Rebecca Belvin	Effects of Methods of Stimulus Presentation on Mental Tasks	Exp	10/22/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-08	Taylor Jones, Shannon Reed	Physiological Measures During Memory Recall Tasks	Exp	10/24/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-09	Abigail Mattson, Leo Dworkin, Clare Robeck, MacKenzie Ganz	Cognition and Thinking	Exp	10/24/2012	Consents, Follow-up

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Consents, Follow-up
1213-10	Kayleigh O'Donnell, Anna Hume, Karly Edwards, Sophia Ropers	The effects of strategy and Individual Differences on Puzzle Solving Performance	Exp	10/24/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-11	Elizabeth Blonden, Blake Erickson, Kayla Butler, Emily Brothers	Human Attraction	Exp	10/24/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-12	Ashley Atkinson, Natasha Breidenbach, Grace Sun	Social Judgement	Exp	10/24/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-13	Hope Wiedenhoefer, Soniz Zelezny, Lauren Groulik	Comprehension of Behavior	Exp	10/26/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-14	Aaron Pomerantz, Nick Baldridge, Clara Morrissey, Taylor Goullaud	Social Perception	Exp	10/28/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-15	David Adler, Daniel Kassenbrook, Lauren Hamilton, Beth Anderson, Kara Klepinger	Working Memory	Exp	10/29/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-16	Will Bergstrom, Melissa Cachopo, Nick Corcoran, Brian Van Gundy	Scenario-based Reactions	Exp	10/30/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-17	Nick McGee, Reagan Guarriello, Vince McCluskey	Behavior in Context	Exp	10/31/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-18	Brian Cross, Theo Kontos, Aiyana Wain Hirschberg, Lauren Stuck	Hiring Decisions	Exp	10/26/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-19	Tara Patel, Jen Sibley, Colin McIntosh, Marina Popkov	Family Dynamics	Exp	10/31/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-20	Claire Fransen, Lindsay Maggard, Paul Goldner	Visual Stimuli	Exp	10/31/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-21	Kimberly Lowell, Genell Britton, Liz Berg, Vince Mijares	Academic Presentation and Learning	Exp	10/31/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-22	Tess Kearney, Rachel Bates, Cecilia Bohm	Selective Attention and Dichotic Listening Tasks	Exp	10/31/2012	Consents, Follow-up

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Consents, Follow-up
1213-23	Stephan Baum, Allison Seligman, Chelsea Lindroth, Khai Ayers	The Effect of Video Clips on Individuals	Exp	11/2/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-24	Daniel Aldridge	Death Attitudes and Life Success: A Scale Development Study	Exp	11/5/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-25	Renee Pierce	Developing a Adaptive Defense Mechanisms Scale	Exp	11/5/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-26	Jessica Ruiz	Development of a Social Avoidance Scale	Exp	11/5/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-27	Andrew Fox	Development and Validation of the College Facebook Self-Disclosure Scale	Exp	11/5/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-28	Lydia Oh	Foreign Language Comfort: A Scale Development Study	Exp	11/5/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-29	Shaena Brainard	Perceived Pet Effects on Coping: A Scale Development Study	Exp	11/5/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-30	Jennifer Onaga, Haile Canton, Carly Fox	Study Breaks	Exp	11/6/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-31	Gabrielle Duhl	Attitudes Towards Confronting Racism: A Scale Development Study	Exp	11/7/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-32	Danielle Armstrong	Students' Future Expectations of Work and Family Balance Scale	Exp	11/7/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-33	Abigail I Mattson	Development of an Emotional Understanding Scale	Exp	11/7/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-34	Rachel Bregman	Development of Narrative Empathy Measure	Exp	11/7/2012	Consents, Follow-up

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Consents, Follow-up
1213-35	David Andresen and David R Moore	Development of a Research Methods Assessment-Focus Groups	Exp	11/7/2012	No Consents Curricula Assessment Study
1213-36	Rebecca Palter	Development of an Acclimation to College Measure	Exp	11/7/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-37	Hannah Kinnebrew, Sarah Moore	Perseverance in Physical Activity: A Scale Development Study	Exp	11/7/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-38	Chris Morrison	Development of a Weather Sensitivity Scale	Exp	11/7/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-39	Brittany Walker, Chris Shaw, Graham Ashby, Megan Davis, Katrina Buesch	Hiring Decisions	Exp	11/9/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-40	Ashley Q Hall	Perceptions of Sexual Behaviors: A Scale Development Study	Exp	11/8/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-41	Kevin Kates, Kathryn Endler, Marissa Jeffers, Trisha Martin	Responses to Video Clips	Exp	11/8/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-42	Lauren Petersen	Attitudes and Expectations Concerning Life after College: A Scale Development Study	Exp	11/9/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-43	Michael Aiyar	Development of Heteronormative Attitudes Scale (HAS)	Exp	11/12/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-44	Shelby Mills	Development of a Measure of Attitudes Toward People with Speech Disabilities	Exp	11/12/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-45	Matthew Robert Puntel	College Academic Self-Efficacy Scale: A Measurement Development Project	Exp	11/12/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-46	Hanako Tonozuka	Job-School Congruence Survey: A scale development project	Exp	11/12/2012	Consents, Follow-up

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Consents, Follow-up
1213-47	Madeline Isaacson	Developing a Measurement of Attitudes Towards Adolescents from Low Socioeconomic Groups	Exp	11/12/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-48	Nathaniel Meskel	I am Facebook: Development of a Social Networking Influence Measure	Exp	11/12/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-49	Emma Bryant and Sarah Moore	First Impressions Based on Facial Cosmetic Appearance: Scale Development	Exp	11/14/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-50	Jason Kelly, Jon Pearl, Deborah Sevigny-Resetco	The Effect of Teaching Method on Spatial-Motor Tasks	Exp	11/15/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-51	Taylor Wong	Development of a College Student Stress Scale	Exp	11/16/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-52	Poonum Sandhu	Validity of Day-to-Day Color-Blind Scale	Exp	11/16/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-53	Sydney Wager	Self-Management and College Students: A Scale Development Study	Exp	11/16/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-54	Benjamin Kastenbaum	Development of an Emotional Understanding Measure	Exp	11/19/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-55	Brooke Stelzner	Learning & Development Through Sibling Interactive Play	Exp	8/2/2012	Consents, Follow-up
1213-56	Brian Cross, Aiyana Wain Hirschberg, and Lauren Stuck	Hiring Decisions	Exp	1/24/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-57	Tim Beyer	Language Perception, Production, and Comprehension	Exp	1/31/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-58	Tim Beyer	(New) Language Perception, Production, and Comprehension	Exp	3/26/2013	Continued Through Summer 2013
1213-59	Sandy Sergeant, Brittany Walker, Beth Anderson, David Adler	Social Perceptions	Exp	4/2/2013	Consents, Follow-up

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Consents, Follow-up
1213-60	Dylan Russom, Kara Klepinger, Lauren Stuck, Taylor Goullaud, and Aaron Pomerantz	Test Performance	Exp	4/3/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-61	Alex Arneson, Kimberly Lowell, Lauren Groulik, and Kirsten Fahlbusch	Food for Thought	Exp	4/3/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-62	Kerry Egger, Caitlin Fuller, Kartar Khalsa, William Krolik	Decision Making	Exp	4/3/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-63	Allie Jones, Tara Patel, Colin McIntosh, and Sonia Zeleznv, Theo Kontos	Facial Recognition	Exp	4/3/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-64	Alyson Bothman, Hannah Huntoon, Julia Howard	Sex Education and Communication	Exp	4/5/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-65	Rachel Lee, Madison Market, Shona Maher	Personality Traits in College Students	Exp	4/8/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-66	Mara Gartzke, Marissa Lown-Klein	Impact of Interruption on Performance	Exp	4/8/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-67	Rachel Adler, Christie Smith, Dot Gasner	Effects of Perceptions of Others' Behavior on Intended Habits	Exp	4/8/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-68	Dylan Richmond, Robin Vieira, Julia Owens	The effect of Noise Level on Cognitive Performance in Undergraduate Students	Exp	4/8/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-69	Nicky Reed and Faithlina Chan	Background Noise and Concentration	Exp	4/7/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-70	Veronica Herren, Jen Sibley, Marina Popkov, Vince Mijares	Scenarios	Exp	4/8/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-71	Jennifer Henry and Anissa Cohen	The effects of study habits on Narrative Memory Recall	Exp	4/9/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-72	Katelyn Hart and Laurel Olfson	College Students' Perception of Celebrities	Exp	4/9/2013	Consents, Follow-up

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Consents, Follow-up
1213-73	Brian Cross, Aiyana Wain Hirschberg, and Lauren Stuck	Hiring Decisions 2	Exp	4/11/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-74	Cooley Cody, Margot Turek, Rebecca Goldman, and Max Neidhardt	Relationship Between Individuals' Characteristics and Music Video Preferences	Exp	4/15/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-75	Jason Kelly	Stimuli Attractiveness Norming	Exp	4/23/2013	Consents, Follow-up
1213-76	Jason Kelly	Effect of Facial Differences on Mirror Neuron Activation	Exp	5/13/2013	Continued Through Summer 2013

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
DEPARTMENT DESIGNATE
ANNUAL REPORT**

The following report reflects the Institutional Review Board Protocols which met the criteria for either expedited or exempt review that were reviewed and approved by the Department Designate to the IRB from the Physical Therapy Department for the 2012-2013 Academic Year.

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Final Report
PT1112-001	Hastings, Baniewicz, Dickson, Levine, McLennan	Investigation of a non-surgical option to correct neuromuscular scoliosis in adult hemiplegia: a case review	Exempt	3-19-12	TBD
PT1112-002	Sandoval, Schweer, Wilson	Examination of the relationship between different presentations and orientations of a self-report visual analog scale for individuals with musculoskeletal pain	Expedited	4-10-12	TBD
PT1112-003	Clark, Allen	Investigating the temporal relationship between daily stress and perceived pain in patients with chronic headache pain	Expedited	4-2-12	12-1-12
PT1112-003	Boyles, Simon, Adams	Validity and test-retest reliability of the iPod touch inclinometer application measuring cervical neck range of motion	Expedited	10-24-11	12-1-12
PT1213-001	Boyles, Hagerup, Johnson	Validity and test-retest reliability of the iPod touch inclinometer application measuring lumbar spine range of motion	Expedited	10-25-12	tbd

Submitted by: Ann Wilson, PT Department Designate

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
DEPARTMENT DESIGNATE
ANNUAL REPORT**

The following report reflects the Institutional Review Board Protocols which met the criteria for either expedited or exempt review that were reviewed and approved by the Department Designate to the IRB from the **Occupational Therapy** Department for the 2012-2013 Academic Year. The acting designate this academic year was Tatiana Kaminsky and unless otherwise noted, she completed the reviews. Outstanding protocols from the 2011-2012 Academic Year are also included.

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Final Report
OT 1213-001	Richardson (Swinth)	School Based Occupational Therapists Report on Collaboration with Parents of Students who are Beginning Occupational Therapy Services in Public Schools	Expedited	12-06-12	05-31-13
OT 1213-002	Lee (Tanta)	Clinical Judgment of Occupational and Physical Therapists and the Use of the Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development III for Assessing Development in Infants in NICU Follow-Up: Predictive Value of Need for Treatment for Specific Age Groups	Expedited	12-10-12	05-31-13
OT 1213-003	Keeley, Faucett (Wilbur) ¹	Current Practices, Protocols, and Rationales of Diathermy Use by Occupational Therapists in Skilled Nursing Facilities	Expedited	12-03-12	05-31-13
OT 1213-004	Ikard, Griesse (Tanta)	Teachers' Perceptions of the Wiggle Whomper Kit: Improving Sensory Regulation in the General Education Classroom	Expedited	12-03-12	05-31-13
OT 1213-005	Ashe, Cunningham (Luthman)	Modifications of the Home Environment and the Routines in Families of Children Diagnosed with an Autism Spectrum Disorder	Expedited	12-06-12	05-31-13

OT 1213-006	Fisher (Wilbur)	Culturally Adapted Practices Among Occupational Therapists in Work Rehabilitation Settings	Expedited	12-10-12	05-31-13
OT 1213-007	Toyama (Luthman)	Determining Alternative Sensory-Based Interventions Used by Occupational Therapists	Expedited	12-05-12	05-31-13
OT 1213-008	Thierry (Tomlin) ²	Safe Lifting Training for Mexican Mothers of Children with Disabilities	Expedited	12-21-12	05-31-13
OT 1213-009	Anderson-Connolly, Oyango (Kaminsky) ¹	Aging in Place: Older Adults' Current Practices and Future Desires	Expedited	12-03-12	05-31-13
OT 1213-010	Hunt (James)	The Learning Alliance Between Clinical Instructors and Students at the University of Puget Sound Campus Clinic	Expedited	12-18-12	05-31-13
OT 1213-011	Moore, Ernst (Tomlin)	Creativity in Occupational Therapy	Expedited	03-04-13	05-31-13
OT 1213-012	White (James)	Client Adherence to Discharge Home Program Recommendations from an Occupational Therapy Student Clinic: Purposeful Versus Non-purposeful Activities	Expedited Modified	01-28-13 03-04-13	05-31-13
OT 1213-013	James	Changes in Perceived Competency through Level I Fieldwork at a Campus-Based Occupational Therapy Clinic	Expedited	02-18-13	Ongoing
OT 1213-014	McCarthy (Linauts)	Therapists' Perception of Parental Reactions to the Diagnosis of ASD and Its Influence on the Formation of Therapist-Parent Relationship	Expedited	04-15-13	Ongoing

¹IRB review completed by George Tomlin.

²IRB review completed by Anne James and Garrett Milam

Outstanding protocols from the 2011-2012 Academic Year:

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Final Report
OT 1112-002	Ordos (Wilbur)	Transitioning to an Assisted Living Facility: Older Adults' Expectations and Experiences of Occupational Change	Expedited	11-29-11	10-15-12

In addition to the above protocols, UPS/IRB#OT0001-12, "Effective and Efficient OT Service Delivery in School-Based Settings," originally approved April 4, 2001, has been extended and continues, with Professor Yvonne Swinth as the principal investigator.

Respectfully submitted by: Tatiana Kaminsky, OT Department Designate

Date: 22 April 2013

Note: Final reports for protocols OT1112-002 (ended in fall 2012) and OT1213-001 through OT1213-012 are student projects. The IRB Final Report is a course requirement, due at semester's end, or at the completion of the project. OT1213-014 is also a student project and is anticipated to end by the end of July 2013. In the unlikely event that a student fails to turn in his or her Final IRB Report on or before the documented date above, an amended report will be submitted to the Chair of the IRB.

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
DEPARTMENT DESIGNATE
ANNUAL REPORT**

The following report reflects the Institutional Review Board Protocols which met the criteria for either expedited or exempt review that were reviewed and approved by the Department Designate to the IRB from the Associate Deans' Office for the 2012-2013 Academic Year.

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Final Report
1213-001AD	Roxbury, Tiese	NCAA Student-Athlete Needs Assessment Survey	EXPEDITED	08-06-2012	

Submitted by: Lisa Ferrari, Associate Dean

Institutional Review Board
School of Business and Leadership
Protocol Log

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved
2007SBL1	Renee Houston and Carolyn Weisz	Homelessness in Pierce County: The Road Home Project II	Expedited	6/23/07
2008SBL01	Nila Wiese	MNCs and Development: The Case of Honduras	Expedited	6/11/08
2009SBL01	Nila Wiese and Sue Schaeffer	A Public-Private Framework for Enabling Minority-Owned Small Businesses	Expedited	6/18/09
200909-02	Nila Wiese	The Feminine in Management: An Exploration of culture-Based Values, Leadership Styles and Organizational Culture	Expedited	10/5/09
SBL120901	Nila Wiese and Edward Park	A Public-Private Framework for Enabling Minority-Owned Small Businesses	Expedited	12/18/09
SBL111001	Shaila Nelson	The effects of internet use on the academic achievement of college students	Expedited	11/18/10
SBL111002	Nasser Kyobe	Facebook privacy setting study	Expedited	11/18/10
SBL111003	Caitlin Barrow	Facebook culture and expectancy violations amongst college students	Expedited	11/18/10
SBL111004	Zachary Spann	Social decision making and smartphone influence	Expedited	11/18/10
SBL111005	Darcy Nelson	Information Communication Technology Enabled Civic Participation	Expedited	11/19/10
SBL111006	Catherine Salthouse	Facebook Profile Picture Study	Expedited	11/19/10
SBL111007	Angel Johnson	Life Satisfaction and Popularity through Facebook	Expedited	11/19/10

SBL201101	Lynda Livingston and Spencer Kadas	Students, Small-Dollar Credit and Financial Empowerment	Exempt	9/29/11
SBL201111	Carolyn Weisz and Renee Houston	Diversity in the Workplace: The Road Home Project VII	Expedited	11/3/11
SBL022312	Kelly Jack, Uyen Nguyen, Harry Woolson, Luke Englert	College Students Donating to Non-Profit Organizations through Social Media	Expedited	2/23/12
SBL022412	Brandon Foster, Marissa Price, Cherise Aoki, Cailin Fuller	The Viability of Non-Profits using Social Media to Market to Young Professionals	Exempt	2/24/12
SBL040412	Kelly Jack, Uyen Nguyen, Harry Woolson, Luke Englert	College Students Donating to Non-Profit Organizations through Social Media	Expedited	4/4/12
SBL040512	Brandon Foster, Marissa Price, Cherise Aoki, Cailin Fuller	The Viability of Non-Profits using Social Media to Market to Young Professionals	Expedited	4/5/12
SBL041012	Renee Houston	Developing Communications in a Technologically Driven Distributed Work Environment	Expedited	4/10/12
SBL100212-1	Cody Silva, Sae Rom Kim, Christina Chun, Riccardo Frisardi, Alysha McCloud	Understanding Consumer Behavior of College Students in Donating Time/Money to Local Non-Profit Organizations	Expedited	10/02/12
SBL100212-2	Adam Saltzer, Alex Wun, Matt Geverola, Margaret	Consumer Attitudes towards Green Consumption	Expedited	10/02/12

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
DEPARTMENT DESIGNATE
ANNUAL REPORT**

The following report reflects the Institutional Review Board Protocols which met the criteria for either expedited or exempt review that were reviewed and approved by the Department Designate to the IRB from the English Department for the 2008-2009 Academic Year.

Protocol Number	Investigator(s)	Title	Exempt or Expedited	Date Approved	Final Report
4002-002-2012	Ellen Freeman	Comparing the Cultural Tolerance of France and the United States toward Sexual Minorities	EXPEDITED	11/14/12	

Submitted by: Julie Nelson Christoph, English Department Designate