

UNIVERSITY SENATE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

University Policies for
Research Involving Human Subjects

INTRODUCED BY: Council on Research

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT THE FOLLOWING BE ADOPTED:

-
- I. That the attached policies for research involving human subjects be approved.
- II. That the Council on Research and the Institutional Review Board be charged to implement the following by the end of the 1982 calendar year:
- (1) Insure that a handbook be published which describes current policies, procedures, and guidelines for developing acceptable human subjects research projects;
 - (2) Conduct a vigorous educational program to increase faculty awareness of the University's policies and procedures, especially the implications of recent changes;
 - (3) Appoint and charge a task force, composed of representatives from the IRB, the Council, and the School of Education, to study and develop policy options governing research on minors in school settings;
 - (4) Appraise emerging state and federal laws and recommend changes as allowed and appropriate for facilitating research involving human subjects; and
- III. That this resolution be referred to the President for his approval.

Attachment

Approved May 10, 1982

Rationale:

Research involving human subjects is governed by federal and state regulations as well as professional standards of ethical conduct. Since 1977, the University at Albany has complied with these regulations by requiring all human subjects research to receive prior review and approval through an institutional process involving a committee of faculty, student, and community representatives called an Institutional Review Board (IRB). In January 1981, changes to applicable federal regulations reduced the scope of research that must receive prior approval and gave more autonomy to institutions to design and implement more efficient and less burdensome review procedures. With the changes in federal regulations there remained some ambiguity concerning the applicability of state statutes. After considerable deliberation, the IRB and the Council on Research decided that the University's policies should go somewhat beyond the government's minimum standard. As a result, a policy statement was recommended which (1) continued to require all research involving human subjects to receive prior review; but that (2) instituted a revised set of procedures to provide for "expedited" review of approximately 60% of the research formerly considered by the entire Board.

In October 1981, the University Senate adopted this revised campus policy, to be effective for a provisional period of six months, after which the Council on Research was directed to report to the Senate on the impact of the new procedures. During the Spring 1982 semester the Council conducted a review of the campus' policy. The Council's report (attached) was informed by an examination of data from records of the campus' Institutional Review Board (IRB) as well as from a poll of faculty opinion regarding SUNY/Albany human subjects procedures.

From its review, the Council concluded that a majority of faculty who conduct research involving human subjects favor the campus' current procedures, even though they may not be mandated by state or federal law; however, a significant minority, 24% of respondents to the Council's poll, do not favor current policies and procedures. The Council determined that negative opinion centers mainly on the perception that a great deal of time and effort is required to obtain review and approval for routine and innocuous research; the perception that the University's IRB tends to intrude into areas which are inappropriate to its function; the perception that current review procedures unduly impede student research; and the perception that the Board requires more than is necessary for conducting research on minors in school settings.

The preceding Senate Resolution, which includes a revised policy statement and specific steps to be undertaken by the Council and the IRB during the next academic year, was developed as a result of discussions within the Council and between the Council and institutional officials and the University's IRB.

Policies:

UNIVERSITY POLICIES FOR RESEARCH
INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

- I. In accordance with state and federal regulations and professional standards of ethical conduct, it is the responsibility of the University reasonably to insure that, in research conducted under its auspices, the rights and welfare of human subjects are adequately protected. The primary responsibility for protecting human subjects, however, rests with each individual who initiates, directs or engages in research.
- II. In order for the University to fulfill its responsibility, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) is authorized to review and approve ALL research involving human subjects conducted under the auspices of the University, regardless of the source of funding. This includes student research involving subjects from outside the class.
 - A. "Human Subjects Research" is defined as a systematic investigation designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge, which involves the collection of data from or about living human beings. It does not include research utilizing published or publicly available documents or research on elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.
 - B. The members of the IRB are appointed by the Vice President for Research in consultation with the Council on Research. In addition to other requirements of state and federal regulations, the membership of the IRB shall be composed of individuals of varying backgrounds who are qualified through maturity, experience, expertise and the diversity of the members' racial and cultural backgrounds to assure complete and adequate review of activities commonly conducted under the University's auspices, and to insure respect for its advice and counsel for safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects. The IRB shall possess the professional competence necessary to ascertain the acceptability of proposals in terms of institutional commitment and regulations, applicable law, standards of professional conduct and practice, and community attitudes.
 - C. The determination regarding whether a given activity should be considered human subjects research must be made by the IRB or its designee.
 - D. Certain categories of research involving little or no risk to subjects need not be reviewed and approved by the full IRB, but, rather, may be eligible for less intensive review procedures. The IRB shall develop and promulgate appropriate categories of research eligible for these procedures.

III. The IRB, with approval by the Council on Research, shall adopt appropriate procedures to implement these policies.

IV. The Council on Research shall maintain oversight of the IRB.

A. At timely intervals, the Council shall review the operation of the IRB and shall report to the University Senate the results of that review.

B. When necessary, the Council shall recommend to the IRB appropriate changes in the review procedures within the constraints imposed by law and regulation.

Report to the University Senate

from the

Council on Research

HUMAN SUBJECTS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AT SUNY/ALBANY

A Review and Assessment

April 22, 1982

Prepared by:
William Hedberg
Jeffrey Cohen
Valerie Melburg

Section One: Highlights of Poll of Faculty Opinion Regarding
SUNY/Albany Human Subjects Policies

Background

In March 1982, a two-page questionnaire was sent to faculty members of selected academic units at SUNY/Albany to assess opinion regarding the campus' policies and procedures for obtaining required reviews and approvals of research involving humans as subjects (a copy of the questionnaire and transmittal letter is provided in Appendix A). A total of 414 questionnaires were distributed to all faculty in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the School of Education, the Graduate School of Public Affairs, the School of Criminal Justice, the School of Social Welfare, the School of Business, the School of Library and Information Science, the Department of Rhetoric and Communication, and the Department of Biological Sciences. As of April 1st, 147 questionnaires were completed and returned, providing a response rate of 36% (see Table I for frequency response by academic unit).

Table I: Frequency Response by Academic Unit

Academic Unit	Instruments Distributed	Frequency Response	"Experienced" IRB vs Survey	
Social & Behavioral Sciences	137	53	44	35
African & Afro-American	6	1	1	0
Anthropology	14	6	3	5
Economics	26	6	0	0
Geography	9	2	2	1
History	25	6	3	3
Psychology	32	19	23	16
Puerto Rican Studies	3	1	0	1
Sociology	22	12	12	9
Education	87	30	32	24
Counseling Psychology	15	10	9	9
Educational Administration	11	1	2	1
Ed Psychology & Statistics	19	7	6	4
Prog Development & Evaluation	13	4	6	3
Reading	7	3	5	3
Teacher Education	22	5	4	4
Rockefeller College	80	22	14	9
Political Science	22	5	2	1
Public Administration	16	6	1	1
Criminal Justice	16	3	1	3
Social Welfare	26	8	10	4
Business	50	10	3	2
Library & Information Science	15	7	0	3
Rhetoric & Communication	13	4	5	4
Biological Sciences	32	7	1	2
Unidentifiable	NA	14	NA	9
TOTALS	414	147 (36%)	100	87

Representativeness of the Response

Of the 147 respondents, 87 (59%) reported having submitted a protocol to the campus' Institutional Review Board (IRB) at least once. A review of IRB records over the past two and one-half years, checked against a current listing of faculty in relevant departments, yielded a total number of 100 faculty who have had contact with the Board.

Moreover, of the subset of 87 "experienced" respondents, 53 reported having submitted a protocol to the IRB since last September. This number also compares favorably with Board records, which show that 54 faculty have had contact with the IRB since last July, the beginning of the Board's record-keeping year.

Thus, it is believed that the poll successfully obtained responses from most faculty who have had contact with the IRB in recent years. Since most faculty responded to the survey anonymously, as requested, it is not possible to state more precisely the degree to which the responses received represent the views of faculty whose work is directly affected by the campus' human subjects policies. For purposes of comparison, percentage distributions for "experienced" and "inexperienced" respondents are presented in Appendix B.

Knowledge of Regulations and View of Procedures

As expected, respondents who reported "some" or "no" knowledge of either applicable regulations or the campus' review procedures were more likely to respond "no opinion," "don't know," "not applicable," or some other similar response to other questions on the survey instrument. Overall, the more knowledge a respondent reported having of the relevant regulations and procedures, the more likely he or she was to deliver an essentially favorable view of the policies and their operation; however, even among those with "some" or "considerable" knowledge of the campus' procedures, a sub-population of 128 respondents, 31 (24%) do not favor current policies if they are not required by law, 34 (27%) agree that the Board tends to be concerned with areas inappropriate to its function, and 29 (23%) agree that current review procedures have impeded student research.

Opinion Regarding Adherence to Strict Legal Minima

A plurality of all respondents (46.5%) favored the University's policies even though they may not be mandated by federal or state law; 22.9% voted negatively, 21.5% registered "no opinion," and 9.1% did not answer or provided some other response. Respondents who had never submitted a protocol to the Board were more likely to indicate "no opinion" on this item. Of the sub-population of 87 "experienced" respondents, 58.6% indicated they would favor the campus' policies, 24.1% said not, 8.0% reported "no opinion," and 5.7% provided other qualified responses.

The Negative Response: Its Size and Focus

An effort was made to identify a subgroup of the total number of respondents which, according to the most generous definition, registered a negative view of the campus' current policies and procedures. Respondents were included in the subgroup if they did not favor current campus policies beyond what is legally mandated, or if they "disagreed" with item 12, "agreed"

with items 13 through 17, or responded affirmatively to item 18. A subgroup of 59 respondents (40% of the total response) was thus created. Of this special population, 42 respondents reported having submitted a protocol to the IRB at least once. It is important to note that this subgroup is composed of persons holding varying degrees of negative opinion and that the design of the questionnaire provided no systematic means for determining the depth, basis, or precise nature of opinions. Tabulated responses for the subgroup to selected questionnaire items are provided in Table II.

Table II: Tabulations for Selected Items from Negative Subgroup
(numerator = "experienced" respondents; denominator = "inexperienced")

Questionnaire Item	Yes	No	No Opinion	Other
#8) Favor Human Subjects Policies Beyond Legal Minima	12/3	21/11	4/2	5/1
#12) Procedures Run Efficiently	31/5	10/4	1/5	0/3
#13) Unwarranted Intrusion	15/10	26/3	2/0	1/2
#14) Inappropriate Functions	29/8	9/2	2/4	2/3
#15) Unqualified Judgements	18/7	16/2	4/4	4/4
#16) Impedes Respondent's Research	19/5	19/6	1/1	3/5
#17) Impedes Student Research	23/8	12/4	2/3	5/2
#18) Abandoned Inquiry	11/2	29/11	0/1	2/3

The subgroup's concerns fall primarily in two areas: the first is a rather substantial view that the IRB gets into areas that are inappropriate to its function; the second is that the review procedures unduly impede student research. The subgroup generally agrees that the current procedures run with reasonable efficiency. Opinion is nearly divided on the issue of whether the procedures unduly impede their own research, as well as on the question of whether the Board makes judgements it is not qualified to make. The subgroup voted almost two-to-one against maintaining University policies which may not be mandated by state or federal law. Curiously, "experienced" respondents of the subgroup felt, by nearly a two-to-one margin, that the review procedures are not an unwarranted intrusion on an investigator's autonomy, while other respondents who have not had contact with campus procedures registered, by a vote of 10 to 3, a perception that the procedures are unwarranted and intrusive.

Significantly, 13 respondents indicated they have abandoned a line of inquiry because of the current policies and procedures. Descriptions of the nature of the abandoned investigation were not always provided. Of those that were, the list includes:

- studies involving deception, the use of electric shock, and pain;
- student directed research, including simple surveys and small routine studies, which faculty felt discouraged from assigning because of the perception that it takes too much time to gain required approvals;

- field studies and standard surveys because of the perception that the review and approval procedure is time-consuming, bureaucratic, and potentially problematic;
- routine research on minors in school settings; and
- surveys of attitudes towards homosexuality and other topics in sociology.

Respondent's Comments

Seventy four (50%) respondents provided comments of varying length in response to the poll. Table III presents tabulated frequencies for a classification scheme developed after reading all comments received.

Table III: Respondent's Comments

<u>Category of Comment</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Essentially Favorable Comments and Compliments Examples: "After going through the process once or twice it's no big deal." "Exempt categories are a major improvement."	15
Clarification of Little Knowledge and/or Impact Examples: "Since I have only been on campus for a few months I have had no occasion to be involved in review procedures nor have I had any dealings with the IRB." "Very limited impact because I do not in general work with human subjects."	8
Inconvenience Issues (e.g., time, bureaucracy, forms, costs) Examples: "Although the review procedures have not unduly impeded progress of my research, they have caused considerable inconvenience. Many questions asked are redundant and are not always applicable. Forms are very lengthy, especially for an involved study." "Totally discouraged our use of opinion surveys and some interviews. They would probably be approved, but the time and bother of clearance is discouraging."	12
Research Involving Minors (e.g., consent, "normal" classroom activity) Examples: "Insofar as the Board serves to prevent abuse of subjects it serves a useful purpose. It puts far too many additional constraints on researchers, especially in education. Especially when school-based research is approved by the participating teachers and administrators, the Board's involvement is superfluous at best." "There has been a substantial improvement in turnaround time and lessening of paperwork this past year. Since I deal primarily with human subjects who are minors and who are in public schools, the number of prior permissions sometimes severely hampers research. Since this kind of research is primarily instructional or curricular in nature, it is difficult to understand the necessity of some of the red tape."	5

Student Directed Research

7

Examples: " When questionnaires are routine and those we have used over a period of years, the time, effort and paperwork are unwarranted, particularly at the masters degree level. This is especially true when response is voluntary and confidential." "Student projects, except for doctoral dissertations, should not require University clearance."

Lines of Inquiry Abandoned

7

Examples: (see above).

Miscellaneous Comments

12

- Procedures for checking equipment were inefficient (1)
- Membership of the IRB is against research (2)
- Board's decisions are inconsistent over time (1)
- Faculty and students circumvent the procedures (2)
- Required consent procedures are unreasonable (2)
- Researcher's First Amendment rights are being violated (4)

Suggestions for Improvements

6

- Approve series of studies instead of each study separately (1)
- Prepare and distribute sample protocols (1)
- Provide clarification of definitions and applicability of regulations (3)
- Conduct more analyses of IRB past decisions (1)

Preliminary Conclusions

- (1) A majority of respondents feel that the current procedures run with reasonable efficiency.
- (2) Nonetheless, there exists a significant minority of researchers who registered some negative opinion with regard to the campus' current procedures.
- (3) Negative opinion appears to be clustered particularly around the following areas:
 - (a) the perception that a great deal of time and effort is required to obtain review and approval for routine and innocuous research (e.g., standard questionnaires and survey protocols);
 - (b) the perception that the Board tends to intrude into areas which are inappropriate to its function, including differences of opinion concerning the need to review "exempt" categories of research;
 - (c) the perception that current review procedures unduly impede student research; and
 - (d) the perception that the Board requires more than is necessary for conducting research on minors in school settings (e.g., parental permission).

Section Two: Highlights of the Activity of the IRB

IRB Activity in Recent Years

Table IV summarizes statistical data documenting the IRB's activities during the period 1 June 1981 - 11 March 1982, as compared to the previous academic year (1 June 1980 - 31 May 1981). It is projected that by 31 May 1982, the IRB will have reviewed approximately 280 proposals, which is somewhat less than the preceding year but consistent with average totals for the previous three years. Most proposals continue to be submitted by researchers in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the School of Education, and a large percentage (58.5%) continues to involve student researchers. The most common research methodology (about half of the protocols submitted) involves the use of surveys or interviews on normal adults without any psychological or physiological intervention. About 13% of the projects involve minors in school settings, and a small percentage (3%) involve other vulnerable populations. Over 90% of the research submitted was approved as involving no risk to subjects.

Impact of New Human Subjects Policies

In terms of IRB activity, the primary impact of the new human subjects policies has been the introduction of "expedited review," which allows some categories of research to be reviewed by one IRB member rather than the entire Board. Of the 200 projects reviewed since 1 June 1981, 129 (64.5%) were submitted for approval under this new procedure; twelve of these proposals were found not to be eligible for expedited review and were reviewed by the entire Board.

As a result of this new procedure it has been possible to reduce both the burden of paperwork required from a researcher and the time necessary to secure approval for nearly two-thirds of SUNY/A human subjects research. Under expedited review, a researcher is only required to submit one copy of a one-page form accompanied by a brief description of his/her research, as well as a copy of any data-gathering instrument. During the period under study, the average delay between submission and approval under expedited review was less than four days (range: 0 - 15 days, median: 3.57). In previous years, all proposals were reviewed by the full IRB at a regularly scheduled meeting (usually weekly), and eight copies of a much more extensive form were required to initiate the process.

Table IV: Statistical Summary of IRB Activity

	<u>6/81 - 3/82</u>	<u>6/80 - 5/81</u>
Total No. of Projects Reviewed	200	329
Total No. of Subjects	26,314 (160/proj.)	68,336 (207/proj.)
Projects Using Psych. 101 Pool	51 (25.1%)	60 (18.2%)
Subject Populations		
Adults	181 (90.5%)	289 (87.8%)
Minors	27 (13.5%)	35 (10.6%)
Mentally Ill	4 (2.0%)	13 (4.0%)
Physically Ill	1 (0.5%)	4 (1.2%)
Mentally Retarded	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)
Disabled	0 -	3 (0.9%)
Prisoners	0 -	2 (0.6%)
Other	0 -	8 (2.4%)
Departments		
Education	82 (41.0%)	98 (29.8%)
Counseling Psych.	24 (12.0%)	24 (7.3%)
Ed. Psych.	8 (4.0%)	21 (6.4%)
Other Education	50 (25.0%)	53 (16.1%)
Psychology	73 (36.5%)	118 (35.9%)
Sociology	9 (4.5%)	33 (10.1%)
Social Welfare	9 (4.5%)	14 (4.3%)
Rhetoric-Communication	6 (3.0%)	19 (5.8%)
Criminal Justice	4 (2.0%)	8 (2.4%)
Business	4 (2.0%)	5 (1.5%)
Library	3 (1.5%)	2 (0.6%)
Public Affairs	2 (1.0%)	8 (2.4%)
Administration	2 (1.0%)	2 (0.6%)
Counseling Center	2 (1.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Library Science	1 (0.5%)	5 (1.5%)
History	1 (0.5%)	4 (1.2%)
Biology	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)
Geography	0 -	5 (1.5%)
Anthropology	0 -	4 (1.2%)
Math	0 -	1 (0.3%)
Non-SUNYA	0 -	1 (0.3%)
Researchers		
Faculty/Staff	80 (40.0%)	139 (42.2%)
Grad. Students	81 (40.5%)	114 (34.6%)
Undergrad. Students	0 -	26 (7.9%)
Combination	36 (18.0%)	48 (14.6%)
Other	3 (1.5%)	2 (0.6%)
Sponsor		
No External Funding	176 (88.0%)	260 (76.0%)
Government	19 (9.5%)	53 (16.1%)
Private Foundations	2 (1.0%)	9 (2.7%)
Other	2 (1.0%)	20 (6.1%)

Site			
On Campus	118 (59.0%)	212 (64.4%)	
Off Campus	95 (47.5%)	162 (44.2%)	
School	25 (12.5%)	23 (7.0%)	
Data Gathering			
Questionnaire	121 (60.5%)	228 (69.3%)	
Task	57 (28.5%)	65 (19.8%)	
Interviews	43 (21.5%)	99 (30.1%)	
Test	27 (13.5%)	33 (10.0%)	
Observation	12 (6.0%)	46 (14.0%)	
Files	4 (2.0%)	15 (4.6%)	
Other	15 (7.5%)	29 (8.8%)	
Intervention			
Psychological	25 (12.5%)	60 (18.2%)	
Physiological	0 -	13 (4.0%)	
Both	9 (4.5%)	11 (3.3%)	
Deception	17 (8.5%)	29 (8.8%)	
Equipment	13 (6.5%)	20 (6.1%)	
Full Review	83	329	
Initial Decisions			
No Risk	50 (60.2%)*	200 (60.8%)	
At Risk	7 (8.4%)*	14 (4.3%)	
Not Hum. Subj Research	0 -	4 (1.2%)	
No Risk Pending	19 (22.9%)*	67 (20.4%)	
Time Until Final Approval:			
Range	1 - 7 weeks	1 - 20 weeks	
Average	1.5 weeks	2.9 weeks	
Tabled	7 (8.4%)*	38 (11.6%)	
Time Until Final Approval:			
Range	1 - 5 weeks	1 - 12 weeks	
Average	1.5 weeks	2.4 weeks	
Expedited Review	129	0 -	
Approved No Risk	117 (90.7%)		
Time Until Final Approval:			
Range	0 - 15 days		
Average	3.57 days		
Required Full Review	12 (9.3%)		
Final Decisions			
No Risk	193 (96.5%)	273 (83.0%)	
At Risk	7 (3.5%)	24 (7.3%)	
Not Human Subjects Research	0 -	4 (1.2%)	
Still Pending	N.A.	21 (6.4%)	
Not Done	N.A.	7 (2.1%)	

*Percentages in this section reflect a percent of those considered under full review.

Appendix A: Transmittal Letter and Questionnaire



STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY
1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y. 12203

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to request your cooperation and participation in assisting the Council on Research in its efforts to assess the impact of SUNY/Albany's policies on human subjects research. This assessment follows a directive from the University Senate, which approved changes to the campus' human subjects policies last October. These policies were approved for a trial period of six months, at which time the Council on Research will report to the Senate on the effects of the policies and a resolution to adopt them permanently will be debated and voted upon.

As you may know, federal and state regulations assign responsibility for reviewing and approving human subjects research conducted at or by the University to the SUNY/Albany Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is a campus-wide committee made up of faculty, students, administrators and community representatives. Last year federal regulations were revised and, instead of mandating all the IRB's policies and procedures, the government shifted more of the responsibility for insuring the protection of human subjects to individual institutions. In order to fulfill this responsibility, the University policies, as provisionally adopted, require IRB approval for all human subjects research but streamline the review process, reducing burdens and inconveniences to investigators.

A brief questionnaire, attached to this letter, has been prepared to poll faculty opinion regarding SUNY/Albany's human subjects policies and the impact of the review process on their work. You will note that, in addition to specific questions, we invite you to submit more extensive comments and suggestions for improvements. Your participation in this poll is voluntary and anonymous.

We believe that this effort is the first systematic attempt to poll faculty on this subject at any university in the country since 1976. Therefore, in addition to serving procedural and policy purposes at this campus, the data may also be disseminated to serve broader research and academic purposes.

We would be grateful for your time in completing this questionnaire, which is being sent to all faculty in academic units where research involving human subjects is conducted. Please return the questionnaire to the Council on Research in the attached envelope. We would deeply appreciate receiving your response by Monday, March 22nd.

Sincerely,

Professor Richard Alba
Department of Sociology
Chair, Council on Research

SUNY/ALBANY COUNCIL ON RESEARCH
POLL OF FACULTY OPINION CONCERNING THE CAMPUS' HUMAN SUBJECTS PROCEDURES

- 1) Please give us the name of your department/school: _____
- 2) Have you ever submitted a protocol to the campus' Institutional Review Board?
 ___ Yes ___ No
- 3) If so, how many protocols do you usually submit to the Board each year?
 ___ One To Three ___ More Than Three
- 4) Since last September how many protocols have you submitted?
 ___ None ___ One To Three ___ More Than Three
- 5) Have you ever supervised student research submitted to the Board?
 ___ Yes ___ No
- 6) Please give us a self-assessment of your knowledge of state and federal regulations governing human subjects research, including recent changes.
 ___ No Knowledge ___ Some Knowledge ___ Considerable Knowledge
- 7) Please give us a self-assessment of your knowledge of the campus' human subjects procedures.
 ___ No Knowledge ___ Some Knowledge ___ Considerable Knowledge
- 8) Do you favor the University's current human subjects policies, even though they may not be mandated by federal or state law?
 ___ Yes ___ No ___ No Opinion

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE:

- | | <u>Agree</u> | <u>Disagree</u> |
|---|--------------|-----------------|
| 9) The human subjects review procedures have protected the rights and welfare of human subjects at SUNY/Albany. | _____ | _____ |
| 10) The review procedures have helped to improve the quality of scientific research conducted at this campus. | _____ | _____ |
| 11) The review procedures have affected your attitudes and behaviors with regard to the human subjects involved in your research. | _____ | _____ |

(over)

- | | <u>Agree</u> | <u>Disagree</u> |
|---|--------------|-----------------|
| 12) The SUNY/Albany review procedure runs with reasonable efficiency. | _____ | _____ |
| 13) The review procedure is an unwarranted intrusion on an investigator's autonomy. | _____ | _____ |
| 14) The Institutional Review Board gets into areas which are not appropriate to its function. | _____ | _____ |
| 15) The Institutional Review Board makes judgements it is not qualified to make. | _____ | _____ |
| 16) The review procedures have unduly impeded the progress of your research. | _____ | _____ |
| 17) The review procedures have unduly impeded student research. | _____ | _____ |
| 18) Have you ever abandoned a line of inquiry or research question because you believed such studies would not be approved by the Institutional Review Board? | | |

____ Yes

____ No

If so, please describe briefly:

Finally, we would be grateful for your further comments and suggestions about the impact of the campus' procedures in this area on your research. Your suggestions about modifications to the procedures would be particularly helpful. Please use additional pages, if necessary, to record your views.

Please return your completed response to Professor Richard Alba, Chair, Council on Research, c/o Department of Sociology, SS 340, by Monday, March 22nd. Thank you for your assistance.

Appendix B: Percentage Distributions for "Experienced" (upper numbers) and "Inexperienced" (lower numbers) Respondents*

SUNY/ALBANY COUNCIL ON RESEARCH
POLL OF FACULTY OPINION CONCERNING THE CAMPUS' HUMAN SUBJECTS PROCEDURES

- 1) Please give us the name of your department/school: _____
- 2) Have you ever submitted a protocol to the campus' Institutional Review Board?
N=87 Yes N=60 No
- 3) If so, how many protocols do you usually submit to the Board each year?
65.5 27.6
1.8 One To Three 0.0 More Than Three
- 4) Since last September how many protocols have you submitted?
39.1 40.2 20.7
50.0 None 1.8 One To Three 0.0 More Than Three
- 5) Have you ever supervised student research submitted to the Board?
77.0 23.0
10.7 Yes 85.7 No
- 6) Please give us a self-assessment of your knowledge of state and federal regulations governing human subjects research, including recent changes.
8.0 67.8 24.1
21.4 No Knowledge 60.7 Some Knowledge 16.1 Considerable Knowledge
- 7) Please give us a self-assessment of your knowledge of the campus' human subjects procedures.
1.1 48.3 50.6
23.2 No Knowledge 60.7 Some Knowledge 14.3 Considerable Knowledge
- 8) Do you favor the University's current human subjects policies, even though they may not be mandated by federal or state law?
58.6 24.1 8.0 5.7 Qualified
28.6 Yes 19.6 No 42.9 No Opinion Response

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE:

	Don't Know	Agree	Disagree	Qualified Response
9) The human subjects review procedures have protected the rights and welfare of human subjects at SUNY/Albany.	9.2 19.6	77.0 50.0	9.2 7.1	2.3 5.4
10) The review procedures have helped to improve the quality of scientific research conducted at this campus.	13.8 19.6	29.9 28.6	49.4 30.4	0.0 1.8
11) The review procedures have affected your attitudes and behaviors with regard to the human subjects involved in your research.	1.1 10.7	34.3 30.4	63.2 25.0	1.1 1.8

(over)

*Note: percentages do not add up to 100 because non-responses are not shown.

	Don't Know	Agree	Disagree	Qualified Response
12) The SUNY/Albany review procedure runs with reasonable efficiency.	1.1 28.6	85.1 33.9	11.5 7.1	1.1 1.8
13) The review procedure is an unwarranted intrusion on an investigator's autonomy.	0.0 10.7	17.2 17.9	78.2 50.0	0.0 1.8
14) The Institutional Review Board gets into areas which are not appropriate to its function.	5.7 25.0	33.3 14.3	48.3 32.1	3.4 1.8
15) The Institutional Review Board makes judgements it is not qualified to make.	9.2 23.2	20.7 12.5	56.3 28.6	3.4 5.4
16) The review procedures have unduly impeded the progress of your research.	1.1 8.9	21.8 8.9	67.8 46.4	4.6 1.8
17) The review procedures have unduly impeded student research.	5.7 17.9	26.4 14.3	56.3 39.3	3.4 1.8

- 18) Have you ever abandoned a line of inquiry or research question because you believed such studies would not be approved by the Institutional Review Board?
- | | | | | | |
|---------|---------|-----|-----------|-----|-------|
| 12.6 | 82.8 | 2.3 | Qualified | 0.0 | Don't |
| 3.6 Yes | 75.0 No | 0.0 | Response | 1.8 | Know |

If so, please describe briefly:

Finally, we would be grateful for your further comments and suggestions about the impact of the campus' procedures in this area on your research. Your suggestions about modifications to the procedures would be particularly helpful. Please use additional pages, if necessary, to record your views.

Please return your completed response to Professor Richard Alba, Chair, Council on Research, c/o Department of Sociology, SS 340, by Monday, March 22nd. Thank you for your assistance.