



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

300 W. Adams Street • Suite 200 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

ICJIA Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Meeting Minutes

Thursday, February 18, 2016 – 1:00 P.M.
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA)
300 W. Adams Street, Suite 200
Chicago, Illinois 60606

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The IRB Chair, Dr. Rachel Johnston, called the meeting to order at 1:05 P.M. Simeon Kim, Associate General Counsel for ICJIA, called roll.

Member Name	Present	Absent	Telephone
Dr. Rachel Johnston, Chair	X		
Director John Maki, ICJIA		X	
Ms. Era Laudermilk	X		
Dr. LaDonna Long	X		
Dr. Evan Harrington	X		
Dr. Dan Cooper	X		
Ms. Maya Szilak	X		

Six members were present in person, and a quorum was established.

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes – October 8, 2015.

Dr. Johnston asked for any comments or questions regarding the meeting minutes of October 8, 2015. Dr. Harrington stated that page three, third paragraph, Revisions at the end of the paragraph, should read “minimal risk or more than minimal risk” instead of “some”. Saying that there is some risk does not capture it. Dr. Johnston agreed stating that the IRB should stick with categories. Dr. Johnston asked for a motion to approve the modified October 8, 2015 meeting minutes. Dr. Harrington moved to approve the meeting minutes. Ms. Szilak seconded the motion. The motion was approved, as modified, by a unanimous voice vote.

III. Full IRB Application Review

A. Sexual Assault Investigations in Rural Communities

Principal Investigator: Megan Alderden

Background: Law enforcement agencies serving rural communities face challenges that impact their ability to conduct sexual assault investigations, including the availability of trained and experienced investigators and other agency resources (e.g., evidence technicians). The purpose of the study is to learn more about the training needs, experiences, and challenges faced by police investigators charged with overseeing sexual assault investigations in rural communities. Researchers will conduct focus groups with investigators from local police and rape advocates.

Discussion: Dr. Johnston asked if anyone had any question, comments, or suggestions. Dr. Harrington made a suggestion that in the informed consents, where it states that everyone will be told not to repeat the information, it might be better to ask participants not to repeat the information, so that it is not so much a directive as it is a request.

Dr. Dan Cooper entered the room. Dr. Johnston asked that the record reflect that Dan Cooper had joined the meeting.

Vote: Dr. Johnston asked for a motion to approve the IRB application. Dr. Harrington moved to approve. Ms. Szilak seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

B. Illinois Department of Corrections Staff Survey

Principal Investigator: Jessica Reichert

Background: The study will examine prison correctional staff jobs. Researchers will analyze how various stressors, coping factors, and status characteristics influenced three types of stress: work stress, job dissatisfaction, and life stress. This study can aid in the understanding of correctional staff employment and offer recommendations to improve work quality and work conditions, to improve their work and home lives, increase productivity, and ensure safety of inmates.

Discussion: Dr. Johnston asked if there were any questions or concerns. Ms. Szilak asked if this should be run by AFSME, the correctional union, to see if they have any input. Ms. Reichert stated it did not come up when she talked to the Department of Corrections.

Ms. Lauder milk stated that not all DOC employees have access to computers or logins. She asked if this has been addressed. Ms. Reichert stated that according to IDOC, there is a place they could go to take the survey. Ms. Lauder milk stated that it could be helpful to know whether they are line staff versus supervisor versus officer personnel for research purposes.

Dr. Harrington stated that in the section “What are the benefits for the survey”, he has a problem with the use of the word “vital” because there is some level of psychological coercion. Replace the word “vital” with something like “will help to enhance.” Dr. Harrington stated that in the next sentence it sounds as if you will be making recommendations for each individual. That sentence should be revised so that it does not sound like the staff are getting personal feedback. It needs to be more general such as for future planning and safety.

Dr. Cooper asked if there is any risk of supervisors not looking favorably on those taking the time to take the survey. He suggested letting people know that you will reach out to supervisors to allow everyone to participate.

Vote: Dr. Johnston asked for a motion to approve. Ms. Szilak made a made a motion to approve. Dr. Cooper seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

C. Illinois Drug Threat Assessment Survey

Principal Investigator: Jessica Reichert

Brief Background: Researchers at ICJIA are collecting drug data from law enforcement (police chiefs and sheriffs) through an online survey. Data when combined with similar data collected statewide will be invaluable in learning about, and comparing, state and national drug trends.

Discussion: Dr. Johnston asked if this is redundant for any of the recipients of the survey, since the DEA sent out a similar survey. Ms. Reichert stated that it is possible, but she does not know, because the DEA will not provide her with a list of who filled it out.

Dr. Harrington questioned if this is even “research”. He stated that if it is research that needs informed consent, he recommends not using the word “vital” for the reasons discussed before.

Vote: Dr. Johnston asked for a motion to approve. Dr. Cooper made a motion to approve the IRB application. Ms. Szilak seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

IV. Amendment IRB Application Review

A. Study of mental health, PTSD, and trauma exposure in a sample of male jail detainees in drug treatment

Principal Investigator: Jessica Reichert

Amendment requested: Changing the number of subjects. In order to complete statistical analysis to make inferences about the statistical population (males in the criminal justice system), researchers want to have a larger sample size.

Discussion: Dr. Johnston asked if anyone had any questions or concerns. Dr. Harrington asked if there were there any adverse reactions so far from those who already participated. Ms. Reichert stated there were none.

Vote: Dr. Johnston asked for a motion to approve. Dr. Cooper made a motion to approve the Amendment IRB application. Dr. Long seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

B. Process Evaluation of the Don't Shoot Initiative Peoria

Principal Investigator: Megan Alderden; presented by Dr. Lynne Mock

Amendment requested: Protocol change. Component 1: Change from participant survey to participant interviews. Component 2: Add analyses of call-in videos. Consent procedure change. Component 1: There will be a hard copy consent form for subjects to sign. Component 2: We view these videos as administrative data and would like a waiver of consent for these data. Consent documents change. The

consent form will ask subjects to sign rather than click “agree” on an online form, reflect an interview rather than an online survey, and inform that the interview will be audio-recorded. Project sites or study participants change. Researchers cannot recruit from a large pool of prior program participants (with cell numbers). Researchers will recruit subjects who have followed up with services and can be provided with a flyer by the program in person. Researchers will recruit subjects immediately following a call-in session (face-to-face). A private space large enough to accommodate a small group will be used. The space will be in a neutral location that is relatively close to the participants’ home or work. Confidentiality, Privacy, or Security change. Audio recording – the interviews will be open-ended and longer and researchers do not want to miss anything.

Discussion: Ms. Szilak had concern over the consent form with regard to gang membership. Gang association could be used to violate a person’s parole. That could be a concern for some of the subjects. Dr. Mock said that the consent forms can make it clear that this information will not be shared with law enforcement or probation. Dr. Harrington asked if a certificate of confidentiality is needed. Ms. Reichert stated that the project is federally funded, so an extra certificate is not necessary. Dr. Johnston stated that any study that is federally funded is automatically covered by confidentiality laws.

Dr. Johnston asked if question #4, would you say you are in a gang, is necessary for the research. Ms. Reichert stated that the question verifies if they should even be in the call-in. Ms. Szilak stated that question is good; otherwise the identification is just based on the police. Ms. Laudermilk suggested changing the wording of questions six and seven to reflect their personal knowledge. Ms. Laudermilk asked if any red flags were raised by the \$50 gift cards being an undue influence for parolees having a hard time getting employment. Ms. Szilak thought the opposite. She feels that people should get more money for their time. Dr. Harrington agreed that \$50 is coercive, but this is an in-person interview and there are expenses in getting there and their time.

Vote: Dr. Johnston asked for a motion to approve. Ms. Laudermilk made a motion to approve. Dr. Harrington seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

Dr. Mock asked if the board wanted questions four and six to be modified. Dr. Johnston stated that Dr. Mock heard the recommendations and the discussion, but the board is not going to hold up approval.

C. Evaluation of the Illinois Family Violence Coordinating Council Protocol Training

Principal Investigator: Dr. Lynne Mock

Amendment requested: Protocol change. In order to enhance our evaluation of the Illinois Family Violence Coordinating Council’s (IFVCC) training protocols, we would like to add field observation-researchers will conduct field observations using a training observation checklist that will provide us with information about how the training was conducted, how much content was covered, and how conducive the environment was for the training. Project Sites or Study Participants change. We currently conduct assessments with training participants. We would like observe the training environment and to what extent trainers use the training materials available – or supplement them.

Discussion: Dr. Long wanted to know what Dr. Mock’s concerns were regarding the trainings. Dr. Mock stated that the exact address was not clear, there were loud random noises during the presentation, training materials were not always used, and the audio playback of 911 calls were not clear.

Vote: Dr. Johnston asked for a motion to approve. Dr. Long made a motion to approve. Ms. Szilak seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

V. Renewal IRB Application Review – Evaluation of St. Leonard’s Ministries Temporary Supportive Housing Programs

Principal Investigator: Jessica Reichert

Brief Background: St. Leonard’s Ministries (SLM) operated two temporary, supportive, residential programs. St. Leonard’s House (SLH) provided housing for adult men exiting prison and Grace House (GH) provides housing for adult women exiting prison. The goal of the study was to identify program components that are effective in contributing to successful resident outcomes, as well as learn about the programs’ residents and operations. This information will educate criminal justice professionals and the public about the potential benefit of a long-term, structured reentry program for formerly incarcerated men and women. 2 of 4 reports have been published. All data has been collected.

Discussion: Dr. Johnston asked if there were any questions or concerns. There was no discussion.

Vote: Dr. Johnston asked for a motion to approve. Ms. Szilak made a motion to approve. Dr. Cooper seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

VI. Expedited IRB Application Review – Juvenile Sex Offender Study

Principal Investigator: Erica Hughes

Brief Background: The purpose of this study is to examine administrative data to identify juvenile sex offender trends, characteristics of juvenile sex offenders, and their justice system involvement

Discussion: Dr. Johnston asked if there were any questions or concerns. Dr. Harrington then asked why this isn’t exempt rather than expedited. Dr. Johnston stated that the data is not completely de-identified because it has a state ID, and you can go back to where you got the original data to get the state ID key. Dr. Harrington stated that the data is de-identified in the sense that you only have numbers, but there is a key, that you don’t have direct access to, and you are going through all these steps to ensure that you cannot cross tabulate and reveal the identity of any individuals within the data. Why isn’t there any description of all these steps to assure that no one is identified, in the paper application? Ms. Hughes stated that by the time the data gets into her hands, most of those steps have been taken. Dr. Harrington replied that as a reviewer that is the biggest question that he had; how are you going to protect the identities of these juvenile sex offenders who may or may not be serious offenders? Will this information come back and haunt them later in life? He didn’t see, in this application, how you are going to protect them against this privacy risk. Ms. Reichert stated that this could be written up, and re-presented to the chair. Dr. Harrington suggested making a tentative motion to approve contingent on Ms. Hughes writing up what was presented, so that the approval is in motion.

Vote: Dr. Johnston asked for a motion to approve contingent on modifications submitted to the IRB chair. Dr. Harrington made the motion. Ms. Szilak seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

VII. Old Business

There was no old business.

VIII. New Business

Dr. Johnston thanked and welcomed all the new members.

IX. Adjourn

Dr. Johnston asked for a motion to adjourn. Ms. Laudermilk moved to adjourn. Dr. Cooper seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 3:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Simeon Kim
IRB Secretary/Associate General Counsel
ICJIA