

**Institutional Review Board Minutes
October 15, 1997**

Joe Detorri, John Finney, Ernie Graham, Paul Hansen, Suzanne Holland, Melissa Weinman, Tom Wells.

Ann Ekes had called and informed John Finney that she would be unable to attend.

John Finney called the meeting to order.

Consideration of the revised IRB guidelines and discussion of the outreach survey was deferred.

Proposals:

9798-003

The question was raised regarding the impact / risks of inducing cheating on uninformed subjects. By inducing subjects to cheat would the subjects' self perception be impacted? One way this risk could occur was that the subjects who, after being informed that they had been observed cheating, may feel that it was possible that the observers, who are fellow students at UPS, would see them around campus and know that they had been identified as cheaters.

It was pointed out that the risk to the subjects was minimized by using material and testing format which is not commonly used in the college classroom.

There was an extended discussion of the level of risk that this type of deception induced.

It was the general feeling of the committee that the amount of risk needed to be considered in regards to the benefits of the study.

It was asked if it were conformity or cheating which was being assessed in the experiment. Specifically, the purpose of the experiment stated that it was conformity that was being assessed. If this is true it was asked why the subjects were being induced to do the potentially risky behavior of cheating.

Vote: Yes-3, No-4

9798-004

General discussion about the project which did not identify specific risks

Vote: Yes-7, No-0

9798-005

No risks identified

Vote: Yes-7, No-0

9798-006

No risks identified

Vote: Yes-7, No-0

9798-007

Amendments regarding the exclusion of subjects in response to the projects questionnaire answers as emailed by the researcher to the committee were submitted

It was asked that a sentence which stated that CPR and First Aid trained personnel would be present during the running of subjects be included in the proposal. A sentence from the Procedure section of proposal 9798-08 was put forward as an example.

It was asked if there were any other questions in the screening questionnaire which would more thoroughly select subjects at low risk.

It was pointed out that the risk of cardiac problems was so small with this questionnaire that at least one professional society had recommended lowering this standard to allow even more patients to participate in physical activity.

Vote: Yes-5, No-0, 1-abstention

9798--08

No risks identified
Vote: Yes-6, No-0

Amendment to proposal 9697-022
No risks identified
Vote: Yes 6

John Finney adjourned the meeting

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Hansen