

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

**MIDWAY COLLEGE  
RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD**

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES  
Effective March, 1998  
Revised June 2006**

**Overview**

The Research Ethics Review Board was created to ensure that research involving human participants complies with ethical standards set by the federal Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR), which operates within the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Proposals for biomedical or behavioral research to be conducted at or supported by Midway College are subject to review by the Board and such research may not be conducted without Board approval. In the event that this policies and procedures document does not cover a specific aspect of the review process, the Board will follow the guidelines found in OPRR Reports: The Belmont Report (1979) or OPRR Reports: Protection of Human Subjects, Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46 (1991).

**Rationale for a College Policy**

The Review Board exists for several reasons. First, a college-wide policy will reflect Midway College's commitment to basic ethical principles and will provide a consistent application of those principles across disciplines involved in behavioral or biomedical research. Second, this policy provides an environment in which students directly learn and apply ethical principles. Third, federal funding agencies require that all grant applications be reviewed and approved by an institutional Review Board that ensures ethical compliance.

**Creation of the Review Board**

The Midway College Research Ethics Review Board was created as an administrative committee under the auspices of the Vice President and Dean of the Women's College, who appoints the Board members. The chair of the Review Board reports to the Dean, but the Dean is not a voting member of the Board.

**Composition and Tenure of the Review Board**

In accordance with OPRR requirements, the board is composed of five members. It will include at minimum one male member, one female member, one member from the scientific disciplines, one member from the nonscientific disciplines, and one member who is not otherwise affiliated with the institution and who is not an immediate family member of a person affiliated with the institution. No member of the Review Board may participate in the review of a study in which the member has a conflicting interest, except to provide information to the Review Board. Members who recuse themselves for a specific review will not be replaced; the

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

## Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}



review will be carried out by the remaining members. If the recused member is the chair, a temporary chair will be appointed for that specific review. The Review Board will also be sensitive to the issue of cultural diversity by including members of different racial or ethnic groups whenever possible. In addition, the Review Board may invite individuals with competence in special areas to assist in the review process. (OPRR 46.107)

Review Board members will be appointed by the Vice President and Dean of the Women's College for staggered five year terms, with one member rotating off the Board each year, to be replaced by a new appointee. With the approval of the Dean and the other members of the Board, a member may serve continuous terms. The chair of the Review Board will be selected by the Dean in consultation with the Board members.

### The Policy

**Function of the Board:** The Review Board has the authority to approve, require modification in, or disapprove all behavioral or biomedical research conducted under the auspices of Midway College including:

1. Research funded externally by way of grant, contract, or similar agreement between the sponsor (public or private) and the College.
2. Research funded internally by the College by way of grant, contract, or similar agreement
3. Research conducted upon assignment by the College
4. Research actively assisted by the use of College facilities, resources, supplies, equipment, or personnel.

**Review Procedure:** All principal investigators (P.I.) must submit a completed review application and request either Exempt, Expedited, or Full Review. The Review Board will act upon a research proposal within fourteen (14) days of the date the proposal was submitted or resubmitted to the Midway College Office of Corporate & Foundation Relations, Grants, & Contracts. The P.I. will be informed, in writing, of the Board's decision within seven (7) days of the date that the decision is made. (OPRR 46. 108, 46.109)

**Review Categories:** (See Appendix 1 for full definitions).

1. **Exempt:** Research that involves no or minimal risk to participants under specified circumstances listed in Appendix 1. Upon agreement by the chair and one other member of the Board that the research meets the criteria for the Exempt category, the review application will be approved. The chair and member agreeing to the Exempt categorization must do so in writing and accompany any comments with their signatures.
2. **Expedited Review:** Research that involves minimal risk to participants under specified circumstances listed in Appendix 1, or involves minor changes in previously approved research during the time for which approval is authorized. Review decisions will be based on the approval of a majority of Board members. Comments and/or recommendations of individual Board members must be made in writing and signed by the member. It is the decision of the chair to convene the Board for an Expedited Review.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

**3. Full Review:** Research that involves more than minimal risk to participants, including research that utilizes deception, as listed in Appendix 1. Any member of the Board may request a Full Review of a research application. The Board will convene a meeting and the decision will be based on the approval of a majority of members. Individual members' comments and/or recommendations must be submitted in writing and signed by the member. Research applications may be disapproved only after a Full Review.

**Criteria for Approval of Research (OPRR 46.111):**

- a. Risks to participants are minimized by using sound research design and when possible, procedures that have already been tested and have been or are currently being used in other reputable studies.
- b. Risks to participants are reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits to participants and the importance of the knowledge expected to result from the study.
- c. Selection of participants is equitable. Particular care must be taken with vulnerable populations such as children, mentally disabled persons, or economically or educationally disadvantaged people.
- d. The informed consent of the participant or his/her legal guardian is obtained and documented. Assent from minors or other persons who are legally incapable of giving informed consent is recommended.

**Reapproval or Continuation of Approval:** All on-going research involving human participants must be reviewed annually to maintain approved status.

**Exceptions to the Review Process:** The only exceptions to the review procedure are “minor” research studies conducted by students as part of class work. (See Appendix 2 for the criteria for this type of research). Student projects that fulfill a thesis or senior seminar requirement do not meet the criteria of “minor” research studies; these projects must go through the review process.

**Suspension or Termination of Approval:** The Review Board has the authority to suspend or terminate approval of research that is not being conducted in accordance with the Board's requirements or that has been associated with unexpected serious harm to participants. Any suspension or termination of approval shall include a written statement of the reasons for the Board's action and shall be reported promptly to the P.I. and to the Dean of the Faculty. (OPRR 46.113)

**Compliance:** Anyone who conducts the types of behavioral or biomedical research covered by this policy without first obtaining Review Board approval may be personally responsible for legal or other liabilities that may subsequently arise. In addition, the researcher may be subject to disciplinary action by the College.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

**Further Review by Midway College:** Research that has been approved by the Review Board may be subject to further appropriate review by officials of Midway College. However, those officials may not approve the research if it has not been approved by the Review Board. (OPRR 46.112)

**Review Board Records:** The Review Board will maintain a file for each review request containing copies of the research proposal and progress reports submitted by the P.I. as well as a copy of the policies and procedures document in force at the time of the review. Minutes of Review Board meetings, including attendance, discussion, and actions taken by the Board as well as any correspondence between the Board and individual investigators will be kept on file. The Board will also maintain a copy of the approved policies and procedures document. All records relating to research proposals will be retained for 3 years following the date of the Review Board's final review decision. (OPRR 45.115)

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

**MIDWAY COLLEGE  
RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD  
REVIEW PROCEDURE  
Effective March, 1998**

**New Research**

1. The Principal Investigator (P.I.) must complete the “Application to the Research Ethics Review Board” available in the Office of Corporate & Foundation Relations, Grants, & Contracts (Marrs Lower Level) and return the requested number of copies (indicated below for each category of research) to that office. The P.I. may seek review under one of the following categories, which are fully defined in Appendix 1:
  - a. Exempt Review: research that involves no risk to the participants. Submit three (3) copies of the application form.
  - b. Expedited Review: research that involves no more than minimal risk to participants, or that involves minimal changes to previously approved research during the period of one year or less from the approval date. Submit six (6) copies of the application form.
  - c. Full Review: research that involves more than minimal risk to participants, including research that uses deception of participants. Submit six (6) copies of the application form.

Exceptions: The only exceptions to the review procedure are “minor” research studies conducted by students as part of class work. (See Appendix 2 for the criteria for this type of research). Student projects that fulfill a thesis or senior seminar requirement are not considered “minor” research studies; these research projects must go through the review process.

2. Applications are distributed to the Board members for individual review. Applications are considered to be confidential documents and are not to be openly discussed by Board members with others outside the Board, with the exception of the Dean of the Faculty.
3. The Board completes its review within fourteen (14) days of the date the application was submitted. The chair of the Board communicates this decision to the P.I. within seven (7) days
  - a. For Exempt or Expedited review, Board members submit their written and signed comments to the chair who then determines Board action. The chair may consult Board members for clarification of their comments or further discussion.
  - b. For Full review, the Board will convene to discuss the application. Any action must be passed by a majority vote of the members present. Research proposals may be disapproved only after a Full Review.
  - c. The P.I. may request clarification of the Board’s decision or submit the modifications requested by the Board at any time following the initial Board decision. Modified proposals will be acted upon by the Board and the decision communicated to the P.I. within fourteen (14) days of receipt.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

## Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}



- \* Please note: The Board will make every attempt to deliver timely reviews. However, the 14 and 7 day time limits are only applicable when the College is in regular session for fall and spring semesters and excludes official College holidays, spring and fall breaks, and intersession and summer session.

### **On-going Research**

Review Board approval lasts for one calendar year from the date on the approval form. Research that is not completed in that year must undergo review before the approval expiration date. If there have been no changes to the original research protocol, the P.I. should fill out a new application form, request Expedited Review, and submit the requested number of copies to the Office of Corporate & Foundation Relations, Grants, & Contracts. If changes have been made in the research protocol, the P.I. must treat the application as a new request.

### **ETHICAL GUIDELINES**

Research should follow the American Psychological Association's ethical principles which can be found in Ethical Principles In the Conduct of Research With Human Participants, published by the APA, 1982. The Review Board requires adherence to these guidelines in each of the following areas:

#### **Informed Consent**

1. Informed consent must be documented by use of a written consent form approved by the Review Board. Researchers must use language that is reasonably understandable to participants in obtaining their informed consent.
  - a. For Exempt Review, informed consent may be oral but a written copy of the oral script must be approved by the Board. A statement must be placed at the head of any questionnaires or written materials that will be completed by participants that informs participants that by filling out the materials, she or he is consenting to participation.
  - b. Expedited or Full Review requires written informed consent. The consent form must be signed by the participant or the participant's legal representative and a copy of the form must be given to the person signing that form. The P.I. is responsible for keeping the original document in a secure file separate from any data collected from the participant.
2. Elements of informed consent:
  - a. Purpose, Duration, & Procedures: a statement that the study involves research, a fair explanation of the purposes of the research and the expected duration of participation, a description of the procedures to be followed and identification of any procedures which are experimental;
  - b. Discomforts & Risks: A description of any reasonable foreseeable discomforts and risks to the participant;
  - c. Potential Benefits: A description of any benefits to the participant which reasonable might be expected as a result of doing the study;

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

## Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}



- d. Alternative Procedures: A disclosure of any appropriate alternative procedures to course of treatment which might be advantageous for the participant;
- e. Confidentiality of Records: A statement describing the extent to which confidentiality of records identifying the participant will be maintained;
- f. Compensation and Treatment: For research involving more than minimal risk, an explanation as to whether any compensation and/or any medical treatments are available if injury occurs, and if so, what they consist of or where further information may be obtained.
- g. Contact Person on Research, Rights, & Treatment: An explanation of whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions about the research, procedures and research participant's rights, and whom to contact in the event of a research-related injury.
- h. Voluntary Nature of Participation & Withdrawal: A statement that participation is voluntary and that the participant is free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.

### Post-Participation Debriefing/Feedback

Investigators must provide a prompt opportunity for participants to obtain appropriate information about the purpose, results, and conclusions of the research study, and to attempt to correct any misconceptions that participants may have about their responses during the study. It is recommended that feedback be provided to participants immediately following their participation. In cases where the design of the study prevents immediate feedback, delayed feedback must be provided as soon as practical, and within six (6) months of completion of the study. If scientific or humane values justify delaying or withholding feedback, the researcher must take reasonable measures to reduce the risk of harm to participants.

For Exempt or Expedited Review, debriefing may be incorporated into the informed consent form or script. Full Review requires a written debriefing statement that is also presented orally to participants.

### The Use of Deception in Research

Research involving deception may not be conducted unless the P.I. provides adequate rationale that the use of deceptive techniques is justified by the study's prospective educational, scientific, or applied value and that equally effective alternative procedures that do not use deception are not feasible. The P.I. must complete Attachment 1 and submit it with the Application for Review.

Researchers may not deceive participants about significant aspects that would affect their willingness to take part in the study, such as physical risks, discomfort, or unpleasant emotional experiences.

Any deception that is an integral feature of the research design or procedure must be explained to participants as early as is feasible, preferably at the conclusion of their participation, but no later than at the conclusion of the research study.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit  
**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

**MIDWAY COLLEGE  
APPLICATION TO THE RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD**

Primary Investigator (P.I.) \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Advisor (if student P.I.) \_\_\_\_\_

Program \_\_\_\_\_ Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Project \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Project start date \_\_\_\_\_ Expected end date \_\_\_\_\_

Review requested (select one) Exempt \_\_\_\_\_ Expedited \_\_\_\_\_ Full \_\_\_\_\_  
\* See Appendix 1 for full definitions of the review categories.

Project type: Non-funded (or student) research \_\_\_\_\_ Externally funded \_\_\_\_\_

Supporting agency (if any) \_\_\_\_\_

Submission date \_\_\_\_\_

The project is: New \_\_\_\_\_ Continuing \_\_\_\_\_

- \* To maintain continuous approval for projects that last more than one year, submit a continuing application at least one month prior to the yearly expiration date.
- \* The P.I. will receive written notification of the Review Board's decision within three (3) weeks of receipt of this application.
- \* If you have questions regarding this application, notify the Chair, Research Ethics Review Board.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of P.I.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

INDICATE THE REVIEW CATEGORY FOR WHICH YOU ARE APPLYING.

I am applying for **exempt review** based on the following category(ies): (Check all that apply.) . Submit three (3) copies of all application materials to Midway College Office of Corporate & Foundation Relations, Grants, & Contracts.

- \_\_\_\_\_  Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings and involving normal educational practices.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Research involving the use of educational tests, if information from these sources cannot be linked to the participant.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Research involving survey or questionnaire procedures where responses are not linked to the participant.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Research involving observation of public behavior where the participant's behavior is not linked to their identity.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, where these sources are publicly available and data cannot be linked to the participant.

I am applying for **expedited review**, based on the following category(ies): (Check all that apply). Submit six (6) copies of all application materials to Midway College Office of Corporate & Foundation Relations, Grants, & Contracts.

- \_\_\_\_\_  Collection of hair, nail clippings, teeth in a nondisfiguring manner.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Collection of excreta, saliva, placenta removed at delivery, and amniotic fluid at time of rupture prior to or during labor.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Recording of data from adult participants (18+ years of age) using noninvasive procedures routinely used in clinical practice.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Collection of moderate blood samples from adult participants (18+ years of age) who are in good health and not pregnant.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Collection of supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus in a routine manner.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Voice recordings made for research purposes.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Moderate exercise by healthy volunteers
- \_\_\_\_\_  Study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Nonmanipulative, nonstressful research on group or individual behavior or characteristics.
- \_\_\_\_\_  Research on drugs or devices not requiring investigational exemptions.

I am applying for **full review**. Submit six (6) copies of all application materials to Midway College Office of Corporate & Foundation Relations, Grants, & Contracts.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

P.I. last name \_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS: Please type your responses. If needed, continue each response on additional pages. After completion submit the required number of copies to College Relations and Development of Midway College.

**1. Purpose and objectives of the research:**

2. **Participants:** Include a discussion of the characteristics, number and any remuneration of participants. Explain the participants' selection process and the procedure for initial contact with potential participants. If you will be working with participants from another institution or organization, attach documentation of their permission for you to do so and any pertinent regulations from those agencies. If minor children are to take part in the research, attach a parent information letter.

3. **Methods or Procedures:** Describe the way in which data will be collected, including where the study will take place, who will collect data, length of participation, what data will be recorded and how. List and describe any apparatus that will be used. Attach copies of any survey instrument or questionnaires to be used. If deception is used, provide a rationale.

4. **Assessment of risk:** Determine if participants are at more than minimal risk for physical, psychological, social, financial, legal, or political harm. (This includes research involving DECEPTION of participants). Describe procedures that will be used to minimize potential risks to participants. If participants are at greater than minimal risk, responses to Attachment 1 must be included in this application.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**

---



P.I. last name \_\_\_\_\_

5. **Risk-benefit ratio:** Research involving human participants can be approved only if expected benefits outweigh potential risks. Describe possible benefits to the participants, a class of participants, society in general, or the advancement of science. State your reasons for believing that the benefits of the proposed study outweigh potential risks.
  
6. **Methods of obtaining informed consent from participants:** Who will obtain informed consent? Where will informed consent forms be stored? Attach a copy of the script for oral informed consent (Exempt Review) or the full written informed consent form (Expedited or Full Review).
  
7. **Confidentiality:** Describe procedures to be used to maintain confidentiality including who will have access to identifying information, where data will be stored, when data will be destroyed, and in the event that findings are published or made public, how participants' identities will be masked.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

**MIDWAY COLLEGE  
RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD**

**Appendix 1: Definitions of Review Categories**

Exempt Review: Research involving no or minimal risk and in which the only involvement of human participants will be in one or more of the following categories:

1. Research conducted in established educational settings, such as that measuring the effectiveness of teaching techniques or involving educational tests (cognitive, aptitude, diagnostic, achievement) if the information cannot be linked to the participant.
2. Research using survey or questionnaire procedures providing the responses are not linked to the participant, and responses do not place the participant at risk of criminal or civil liability or constitute damage to the participant's reputation or employability.
3. Research involving observation of public behavior, provided that the participant's behavior is not linked to their identity, and that these observations do not place the participant at risk of criminal or civil liability or constitute damage to the participant's reputation or employability.
4. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, provided these sources are publicly available and the data is recorded in such a manner that the participants cannot be identified.

Expedited Review: Research involving no more than minimal risk and in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories:

1. Collection of hair and nail clippings, in a nondisfiguring manner; deciduous teeth, and permanent teeth if patient care indicates a need for extraction.
2. Collection of excreta and saliva including sweat, uncannulated saliva, placenta removed at delivery, and amniotic fluid at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor.
3. Recording of data from participants 18 years or older using noninvasive procedures routinely used in clinical practice. This includes the use of physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of matter or significant amounts of energy into the participant or an invasion of the participant's privacy. Also included are procedures such as weighing, testing sensory acuity, electrocardiography, electroencephalography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, diagnostic echography, and electroretinography. It does not include exposure to electromagnetic radiation outside the visible range (e.g., x-rays, microwaves).
4. Collection of blood samples by venipuncture, in amounts not exceeding 450 milliliters in an eight-week period and no more often than two times per week, from participants 18 years of age or older and who are in good health and not pregnant.
5. Collection of both supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



- 
6. Voice recordings made for research purposes such as investigations of speech defects.
  7. Moderate exercise by healthy volunteers
  8. The study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens that are not publicly available and the data from which may reveal the participants' identities.
  9. Research on individual or group behavior or characteristics of individuals, such as studies of perception, cognition, game theory, or test development, where the participant engages in observed or recorded activities (beyond completing questionnaires or surveys), and in which the investigator does not manipulate participants' behavior and the research will not involve stress to participants.
  10. Research on drugs or devices for which an investigational new drug exemption or an investigational device exemption is not required.

Full Review: Any research that involves more than minimal risk to participants.

1. Research that utilizes deception of participants.
2. Research that involves the manipulation of participants' behavior, with or without the participants' knowledge.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

**MIDWAY COLLEGE  
RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD**

**Appendix 2: “Minor” Studies Conducted by Students as a Part of Class Work**

In some courses, students collect data individually or in groups, as part of course requirements or to facilitate class discussion. The instructor in such a course has the responsibility to discuss ethics of research with the students who will be engaging in the research and must judge that the potential educational benefits from such research outweigh any risks to the participants. In such courses, the carrying out of the research process makes up a small portion of actual class work

This category **does not** include senior seminar or thesis courses in which the focus of the course is on original research designed and carried out by individual students.

With these considerations in mind, research is considered “minor” if all of the following conditions are met:

1. There is no expectation that data from the study will be included in any publication or presentation outside of class;
2. All participants are age 18 years or older;
3. The research does not involve participants from clinically or otherwise sensitive populations (e.g., delinquents);
4. Participants are not recruited through any agency or school, publication (including the student newspaper), public posting, or departmental research participant pool;
5. Funding is not sought for the research;
6. Participation in the research takes less than 30 minutes of the participant’s time;
7. The research does not involve deception;
8. No physically invasive procedures are used;
9. Privacy of participants is respected. No potentially self-incriminating, sensitive, or highly personal questions are asked, and participants’ identities are kept anonymous; and
10. Contact with participants is well scripted or standardized.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

**MIDWAY COLLEGE  
RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD**

**Appendix 3: Sample Informed Consent Form**

This study is concerned with individual differences in perception. With other participants, in a lab setting, you will be asked to watch a projection screen in a darkened room while a series of slides is briefly flashed on the screen. After each slide you will be asked to describe what you saw. This is an evaluation of what is called “preperceptual storage” and is not a test of intelligence or personality. There are no standards against which your responses will be measured. A tape recorder will be used to record your responses. The task requires considerable concentration on your part but should cause no physical, psychological or emotional discomfort. The task will take between 30 and 60 minutes.

Your responses will be identified with a code number and your anonymity is guaranteed both in responding and in later analysis of your responses. If you agree to participate, this form, with your signature, will be stored separately from your responses in (department/program/faculty member’s office).

You are not required to participate in this study. If you elect to participate, you are free to change your mind and withdraw from the study at any time during the experiment. If you are receiving course credit for participating, please fill out the participation slip prior to the start of the study. You will receive the credit even if you withdraw before the end of the study. After you have completed the task, a complete description of this research will be given to you. If you desire, you may receive the results of this study when it is completed.

Any inquiries concerning the procedures of this study can be discussed with the experimenter (insert name of P.I.). This study has been reviewed and approved by the Midway College Research Ethics Review Board as in compliance with ethical guidelines. Questions, reservations, or appeals regarding the procedures can be referred to (insert instructor’s name).

The results of this study are expected to be of considerable importance to psychologists and educators. Your cooperation is invaluable and greatly appreciated.

(Insert name of P.I.)

Midway College

I have read and understand the above statement and give my voluntary consent for participation in the study entitled: (insert name of study).

---

Signature of Participant



---

**MIDWAY COLLEGE  
RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD**

**Appendix 4: Sample Debriefing (Study Involving Deception)**

This experiment was designed to study the ways in which people evaluate themselves and others on the basis of their cognitive abilities. It is a study of social comparison theory, a theory that states everyone wants to evaluate him or herself on important personal qualities. This happens frequently in school, when students compare themselves according to the grades they receive. If we evaluate ourselves favorably compared to our classmates (for example, if we are at the top of the grade curve) then our self-esteem will be boosted. On the other hand, if we are at the bottom of the grading curve, then we will suffer from lowered self-esteem. In the experiment you just completed, we wanted to see how experiencing success or failure affected self-esteem and willingness to compare yourself to others.

It was necessary to withhold the true purpose of this experiment until after you had completed your participation so that you would not second-guess our goals and perhaps change your responses to our questions. Thus, the “Spatial-Verbal Manipulation Test you took in which you unscrambled letters to make words (an anagram problem) did not measure any kind of cognitive ability. In fact, your score on that test was determined ahead of time. One half of you received a test in which 12 of the 15 word puzzles were solvable and 3 were impossible to solve (they did not form real words). The other half of you received a test which contained only 3 solvable and 12 unsolvable puzzles. It was impossible for you to score any better than you actually did, and everyone in your group scored exactly as you did. Therefore, your score is not related to any ability on your part.

We included this anagram task so that one-half of the participants would be successful and one-half would be unsuccessful on this task. We will analyze your answers to our questionnaires and then study the effect of the test feedback on your responses. We predict that people who feel they have performed poorly will attempt to boost their self-esteem by comparing themselves against a group of people who are worse off.

It is important that you understand that the “Spatial-Verbal Manipulation Test” was created specifically for this study and is not related to your grades or to any cognitive ability. Since most college students think learning is important, we linked our fake test to cognitive abilities so that you would become personally involved in the task and try your best. But please be aware that your score on the test was determined by random chance at the start of the study and in no way reflects on your intelligence or abilities.

We ask that you please not discuss this experiment with anyone on campus, since other students may participate during the remainder of the semester. Study results will be made available during (insert Spring/Fall) semester; you may call (insert P.I./ faculty sponsor name) at (insert phone number) if you would like to know the outcome or would like to talk more about your participation in this study. Do you have any questions about the study that haven’t been answered?

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

**MIDWAY COLLEGE  
RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD**

**Attachment 1: Additional Information Required for Full Review of Research Involving More Than Minimal Risk to Participants**

Please answer the following questions for all appropriate categories involved in your research.

**Risk**

For research in which the possibility of injury is greater than minimal:

1. Identify and describe in detail the possible risks, including physiological, psychological, or social injury, to which participants may be exposed.
2. Explain why you believe the risks to the participant are so outweighed by the combined benefit to the participant or society at large and the importance of the knowledge to be gained as to warrant a decision to allow the participant to accept these risks. Discuss any alternative ways of conducting this research that would present fewer risks to the participant, and explain why the method you have chosen is superior.
3. Explain fully how the rights and welfare of participants at risk will be protected (e.g., equipment closely monitored, medical exam given prior to procedures, psychological screening of participants, etc.)

**Equipment**

For research in which the participants will be in contact with any mechanical, electronic, electrical, or other equipment which might put him/her at risk of accidental harm or injury, should there be a mechanical failure in the equipment.

1. Identify and describe in detail the equipment to be utilized and the exact location. Use manufacturer's name and serial numbers, and submit copies of manufacturer's literature on the equipment when available.
2. Identify and describe in detail how the participant will interact with the equipment.
3. Indicate the names and qualifications (with regard to the safe use of the equipment) for all individuals authorized to use the equipment.
4. Indicate in detail specific steps that will be taken to assure the proper operation and maintenance of the equipment.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

Psychological or Physiological Intervention

For research in which the participants will be exposed to any psychological intervention such as deception, contrived social situations, manipulation of the participant's attitudes, opinion or self-esteem, psychotherapeutic procedures, or other psychological influences, or in which the participant(s) will be exposed to any physiological treatments or interventions upon the body by mechanical, electronic, chemical, biological or any other means.

1. Identify and describe in detail the psychological intervention (or manipulation) and the means used to administer the intervention.
2. Identify and describe in detail the behavior expected of participant(s) and the behavior of the investigator during the administration of the intervention.
3. Describe how data resulting from this procedure will be gathered and recorded.
4. Identify anticipated and possible psychological, physiological, or social consequences of this procedure for the participant(s).
5. Indicate in detail specific steps that will be taken to assure the proper operation and maintenance of the means used to administer the intervention. For all equipment used, the questions regarding equipment above must be answered.
6. For research involving DECEPTION, explain in detail why deception is necessary to accomplish the goals of the research. Care should be taken to distinguish cases in which disclosure would invalidate the research from cases in which disclosure would simply inconvenience the investigator.
7. For research involving psychological intervention, describe in detail the plan for debriefing participants.
8. Indicate the investigator's competence and identify her/his qualifications, by training and experience, to conduct this procedure. Give name, title, academic affiliation and program, a address, and telephone number of the individual(s) who will supervise this procedure.

Refer to Section {F}  
{Faculty}Unit

**Procedure for {F 5 – Research Ethics Review Board (RERB)}**



---

**MIDWAY COLLEGE RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD  
REVIEW DECISION**

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Project number \_\_\_\_\_

Name of P.I. \_\_\_\_\_

Title of project \_\_\_\_\_

Board action: Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_ Pending \_\_\_\_\_

Modifications required? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ (If yes, attach copy of modifications)

Exempt \_\_\_\_\_ Expedited \_\_\_\_\_ Full Review \_\_\_\_\_ Next review date \_\_\_\_\_

Human Participants at: Minimal risk \_\_\_\_\_ More than minimal risk \_\_\_\_\_

Written informed consent approved? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Oral script for informed consent approved? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

---

Chair, Research Ethics Review Board

---

Date

3/98  
Revised 6/2006