Institutional Review Board
225 South 6th Street, 9th Floor ♦ Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

IRB Evaluation Form

Study Title:	Organizational Quality: A Phenomenological Study of the Communication Processes
Researcher's Name:	Daniel K. Dayton
Mentor's Name:	Dr. Linda Terry
School Affiliation:	School of Business and Technology
IRB Reviewer Name:	Dr. Cliff Butler
Review Date:	1-19-2011

Initial Assessment	
☒ Yes ☐ No	This study is ready for IRB Review. If **no** stop the review and select the reason(s) below: ☐ The application is complete, but lacks clarity and coherence such that it cannot be reviewed. ☐ There is serious lack of detail in the study procedures. ☐ The IRB application is seriously inconsistent with other documents (informed consent, proposal, supplemental forms, etc.) ☐ The research questions and/or hypotheses are not aligned with the research design, so that the proposed design is incapable of answering the proposed research questions. ☐ The research design is not aligned with the data collection and/or analysis procedures, so that the data collection and/or analysis is incapable of resulting in meaningful findings.
Reviewer's Rationale	

Version Date: 07/01/2010

IRB Review

Researchers:
Read through all comments and directions recorded on this **evaluation** and the **decision letter**. You must upload your revisions into IRBNet and also provide a summary of your revisions in the **Researcher's Summary of Revisions** sections of this form and upload it into IRBNet.

IRB Review Decision	
This study is:	**Approved**
This study meets the criteria for expedited category:	**Category 7**
This study will require a continuing review cycle of:	**12 Months**
If the approval period is granted for less than a year, please provide rationale for this decision:	

Consultations	
☐ Yes ☒ No	Did you consult with anyone on this review? **Name:** **Reason:**

Consultation Summary:

If you select no for any of the questions below, please provide feedback to the researcher.

Participant Perspective Assessment	
Informed Consent Form Document I believe the participants for this study will be able to:	
☒ Yes ☐ No	1. Read and understand the form.
☒ Yes ☐ No	2. Understand the language (terms) used within form.
☒ Yes ☐ No	3. Understand that this is a research study.
☒ Yes ☐ No	4. Understand the purpose of the research study.
☒ Yes ☐ No	5. Understand the procedures that will be followed.
☒ Yes ☐ No	6. Understand if any of the procedures are experimental.
☒ Yes ☐ No	7. Understand how much time is required to participate.
☒ Yes ☐ No	8. Understand what will happen to the data collected.
☒ Yes ☐ No	9. Identify who will have access to the data collected.
☒ Yes ☐ No	10. Understand how confidentiality of data collected will be maintained.
☒ Yes ☐ No	11. Identify and explain the risks involved.
☒ Yes ☐ No	12. Identify and explain the benefits of the research study.
☒ Yes ☐ No	13. Identify who to contact with questions about the research procedures.
☒ Yes ☐ No	14. Identify who to contact with concerns about the conduct of the research.
☒ Yes ☐ No	15. Identify who to contact when an injury or unanticipated problem occurs.
☒ Yes ☐ No	16. Understand that participation is voluntary and refusal to participate or discontinuing (withdrawing) will involve no penalties or loss of benefits to which a participant is entitled.

Reviewer Feedback

Researcher's Summary of Revisions

Recruitment Materials and Process

Identify the recruitment materials that were reviewed for this research study.

- ☐ **Flyer**
- ☐ **Ad (Web, Newspaper, etc.)**
- ☐ **Phone Script**
- ☐ **Radio or Media Script**
- ☒ **Recruitment e-mail or letter**
- ☐ **Announcement Script (i.e. announcement read during a meeting, class, etc.)**
- ☐ **Other:**

☒ Yes	☐ No	1. The recruitment materials accurately represent the proposed study.
☒ Yes	☐ No	2. The recruitment materials are easy to understand.
☒ Yes	☐ No	3. The recruitment materials are free of coercion (language, design, images, etc.).

Reviewer Feedback

Researcher's Summary of Revisions

Risk and Benefits Assessment	
☒Yes ☐No	1. Will the risks and benefits of this research study fulfill *The Belmont Report* principle Beneficence?
☒Yes ☐No	2. Are the risks to subjects minimized by using procedures, which are consistent with sound research design and which do not unnecessarily expose subjects to risk? If **no**, provide feedback.
☒Yes ☐No	3. Are the risks to subjects reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits, if any, to subjects, and the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result?

Reviewer Feedback

Researcher's Summary of Revisions

Selection of Participants	
☒Yes ☐No	1. Does the selection of participants in this research study fulfill *The Belmont Report* principle of Selection of Subjects?
☒Yes ☐No	2. Is the selection of subjects equitable (Consider the purpose and setting of the research, involvement of vulnerable subjects, selection criteria, and recruitment, enrollment, and payment procedures.)?
☒Yes ☐No	3. Has the researcher obtained the required permission from the research site(s)?

Reviewer Feedback

Researcher's Summary of Revisions

Informed Consent	
☒ Yes ☐ No	1. Does the informed consent form document and process fulfill *The Belmont Report* principle of Respect for Persons?
☒ Yes ☐ No	2. Does the informed consent form document and process meet the criteria set forth by 45 CFR 46.116[a](1-8) and if necessary 46.116[b](1-6)?
☐ Yes ☒ No	3. Is the researcher requesting a waiver to alter any elements required by 45 CFR 46.116? If **yes**, please select which regulation criteria the request meets. **Select Regulatory Criteria**
☒ Yes ☐ No	4. Will informed consent of participants be appropriately documented, in accordance with, and to the extent required by 45 CFR 46.117?
☐ Yes ☒ No	5. Is the researcher requesting a waiver of *documentation* of informed consent? If **yes**, please select which regulation criteria the request meets. **Select Regulatory Criteria**
☒ Yes ☐ No	6. Does the informed consent document provided embody all the required elements as required by Capella University?

Reviewer Feedback

Researcher's Summary of Revisions

Data Monitoring	
☒ Yes ☐ No	1. Are the data collection procedures appropriate (Consider the collection, handling, and storage of data.)?

Reviewer Feedback

Researcher's Summary of Revisions

Privacy and Confidentiality	
☒ Yes ☐ No	1. Are there adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects?
☒ Yes ☐ No	2. Are there adequate provisions to maintain the confidentiality of data?

Reviewer Feedback

Researcher's Summary of Revisions

Special Populations ☒ Does Not Apply to this Study	
☐ Yes ☐ No	1. Are there adequate provisions to protect this population?

Reviewer Feedback

Researcher's Summary of Revisions

Deception Assessment *If there is deception, the study must be referred to the full IRB Committee.* ☒ **Does Not Apply to this Study**	
☐ Yes ☐ No	1. If deception is utilized in this study, is it necessary for this research protocol?
☐ Yes ☐ No	2. If deception is necessary for this study, has the researcher developed appropriate debriefing measures?
☐ Yes ☐ No	3. If deception is necessary for this study, has the researcher developed appropriate post-informed consent procedures to allow participants (and their data) to opt-out of the research study?

Reviewer Feedback

Researcher's Summary of Revisions

Conflict of Interest Assessment ☒ Does Not Apply to this Study	
☐Yes ☐No	1. Has the researcher managed the potential conflict of interest, ensuring that the rights and welfare of participants are protected (i.e. disclosure of the conflict to participants, an independent data and safety monitoring committee, modification of role(s) of particular research staff, changes in location of research activities, elimination of the conflict of interest, etc.)?
☐Yes ☐No	2. Are there other actions necessary to minimize the risks to participants?
☐Yes ☐No	3. Should the informed consent process be revised to include information regarding the potential conflict of interest?

Reviewer Feedback

Researcher's Summary of Revisions

Research Proposal Assessment	
☒ Yes ☐ No	1. The research proposal reflects the same information provided in the IRB application and other forms. If **no**, the researcher must revise the documents.

Questions for the Researcher
What questions do you have for the researcher that could be answered prior to the next review?
Researcher's Answers