Date: 4-18-2023

IRB #: IRB-FY_____
Title: Autonomy, Solidarity, and Organizing Academic Labor
Creation Date: 10-8-2022
End Date:
Status: Approved
Principal Investigator: Name....

1- Getting Started

About West Chester University IRB Process

WCU is guided by the ethical principles regarding all research involving human subjects as set forth in the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research entitled, "Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research: The Belmont Report".

In addition, the requirements set forth in Title 45, Part 46 of the Code of Federal Regulations will be followed for all applicable Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) funded research and for all other research without regard to source of funding.

Initial review of your application will take place within three weeks of when the IRB reviewer receives your application. Your IRB reviewer may request edits and changes to your application, this can take an additional two to three weeks to complete. *Please plan ahead and allow at least one month for the entire review, revision, and approval process to be completed.*

The IRB does not provide retroactive approvals and cannot honor requests for a "quick turnaround" or reviews completed by a certain date

Getting Started

Throughout the submission, you will be required to provide the following:

- Detailed Study Information
- Informed Consent Forms
- Study Recruitment Materials
- Questionnaires, Surveys, Data Collection Tools

West Chester University IRB

- **You cannot begin data collection until a formal approval letter from the chair of the IRB has been received.**
- The IRB meets as needed during the regular academic year. Please submit the application as soon as possible.

Monitoring Application Status

- You can monitor the status of the application through your Cayuse Dashboard.
- *Please see the "My Studies" or "Submissions" tab to see where your application is in the review process.*
- If you cannot find it or have questions, please contact irb@wcupa.edu

Investigator Responsilibities:

I certify that I have read the West Chester University Human Subjects Research Policy and to the best of my knowledge the information presented herein is an accurate reflection of the proposed research project.

1. I certify that all information provided in this application is complete and correct.

2. I understand that, as Principal Investigator, I have ultimate responsibility for the conduct of this study, the ethical performance this project, the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects, and strict adherence to any stipulations imposed by the West Chester University IRB.
3. I certify that all individuals involved with the conduct of this project are qualified to carry out their specified roles and responsibilities and are in compliance with West Chester University policies regarding the collection and analysis of the research data.
4. I agree to comply with all West Chester policies and procedures, as well as with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of human subjects, including, but not limited to the following: a. Conducting the project by qualified personnel according to the approved protocol; b. Implementing no changes in the approved protocol or consent form without prior approval from the IRB; c. Obtaining the legally effective informed consent from each participant or their legally responsible representative prior to their participation in this project using only the currently approved, stamped consent form; d. Promptly reporting significant adverse events and/or effects to the IRB in writing within 5 working days of the occurrence.
5. If I will be unavailable to direct this research personally, I will arrange for a co-investigator to assume direct responsibility in my absence. This person has been named as co-investigator in this application, or I will advise the IRB, by letter, in advance of such arrangements.
6. I agree to conduct this study only during the period approved by West Chester University IRB.
7. I will prepare and submit a renewal request and supply all supporting documents to the IRB before the approval period has expired if it is necessary to continue the research project beyond the time period approved by the West Chester University IRB.
8. I will prepare and submit a final Closure Form upon completion of this research project.

Faculty Sponsor/Mentor Responsibilities:

---

1. As faculty advisor/sponsor on this research application, I certify that the student or guest investigator is knowledgeable about the regulations and policies governing research with human subjects and has sufficient training and experience to conduct this particular study in accord with the approved protocol.

2. I certify that the project will be performed by qualified personnel according to the approved protocol using conventional or experimental methodology.
3. I agree to meet with the investigator on a regular basis to monitor study progress.
4. Should problems arise during the course of the study, I agree to be available, to supervise the investigator in solving them.
5. I assure that the investigator will promptly report significant adverse events and/or effects to the IRB in writing within 5 working days of the occurrence.
6. If I will be unavailable, I will arrange for an alternate faculty sponsor to assume responsibility during my absence, and I will advise the IRB by letter of such arrangements. If the investigator is unable to fulfill requirements for submission of renewals, modifications or the final report, I will assume that responsibility.
7. I will have read the application in its entirety and affirm the content accuracy, clarity, and methodology.
8. I accept the responsibility for the conduct of this research, the supervision of human subjects, and maintenance of informed consent documentation as required by the IRB.
9. I understand that I should have full access to the data and be able to produce the data in the case of an audit

*required

I have read the information above and I am ready to begin my submission.

✓ Yes

Any questions regarding this application can be directed to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at irb@wcupa.edu or (610)436-3557

2- Submission Information

*required

Please select a submission review category for your application

- [ ] Exempt
- [x] Expedited
- [ ] Full Board

*required

What type of activity is this submission for?

- [x] Research Study
- [ ] Clinical Trial
- [ ] Activities Without a Plan to Conduct Research (Case Report or Quality Improvement project)

*required

Is this a multi-institutional study?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

3- Study Information

*required

What is your status at West Chester University?

- ✓ Faculty
- Student
- Staff
- Other

Study Personnel

Note: If you cannot find a person in the people finder, please contact the IRB Office immediately at irb@wcupa.edu to possibly get them added to the system.

WCU Faculty & Staff must have WCU affiliation for their CITI certifications (Same email address) & will have their CITI certifications/expiration dates integrated.

Any non-WCU study personnel should have their CITI certificates uploaded at the end of this section.

*required

Principal Investigator

Provide the name of the Principal Investigator of this study.
Name: Name of Investigator
Organization: Department
Address: 700 S High St , West Chester, PA 19383-0002
Phone:
Email: University Email

*required

Primary Contact

Provide the name of the Primary Contact of this study.

Name: Name of Investigator
Organization: Department
Address: 700 S High St , West Chester, PA 19383-0002
Phone:
Email: WCU Email

Co-Principal Investigator(s)

Provide the name(s) of Investigator(s) for this study.

Research Team Members / Other Personnel

Provide the name(s) of other personnel for this study.

List any Non-WCU Affiliated Personnel & their role

Upload any NON-WCU Affiliated Personnel CITI Certificates

Upload any non-WCU study personnel CITI certificates here.

*required

Study Site

Please select the location(s) of the study.

✓ West Chester University Campus

Please provide the names of the West Chester University locations.

Specific Address

External Site (non-West Chester University)

Please provide the names of the external collaborating sites.

Letter(s) of acknowledgment

Please upload a letter from each external site (MUST BE on their official letterhead and signed)

Study Dates

Please provide the anticipated study start and end dates.

- ***NOTE**: A study may not start PRIOR to official IRB approval.*

*required

Start Date

No research can start prior to IRB approval. Please allow approximately 4 to 6 weeks for approval process.

11-21-2022

*required

End Date

11-21-2023

*required

Has a grant/proposal for funding been submitted for this project?

Yes

If sponsor cannot be found.

Sponsor could not be found above

✓ No

4- Conflict of Interest

*required

Do you or any investigator(s) participating in this study have a financial interest related to this research project?

Yes

✓ No

5- Study Selection

Participant Enrollment

Enter the number of participants that will be enrolled in this study.

*required

Where will the research occur?

(Check all that apply)

- [ ] Online
- [ ] In-person on WCU campus
- [x] In-person at non-WCU site
- [x] Online (e.g., Zoom, Qualtrics, Survey Monkey)
- [ ] In-person (on WCU Campus)
- [ ] In-person (at non-WCU site)

*required

Enrollment at West Chester University

*Please enter the number of participants that will be enrolled at **West Chester University**.*

0

*required

Total Study Enrollment

Please enter the total number of participants to be enrolled at ALL study sites.

12

*required

Ages

Select the age range of subjects that will be enrolled in this study. Check all that apply.

- ✓ 18 years and older
- 12 years old and less than 18 years old
- 1 month to less than 12 years old

*required

Vulnerable Populations

Please check the population(s) that will be enrolled. Check all that apply.

For more information about conducting research with vulnerable populations, please reference the Federal Office for Human Research Protections website.

- Non-English Speaking
- Fetuses
- Pregnant Women
- Minors with Parental Consent
- Minors Who can Consent Themselves (Emancipated Minors)
- Prisoners
- Persons with Acute and/or Severe Mental or Physical Illness
- Other
- ✓ None of the Above

6- Study Design

Is this study a clinical trial?

- Yes
- ✓ No

*required

Study Background

Provide a brief summary of the proposed research in lay terms. Include brief background (with citations) and rationale for why the study is needed.

According to the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, higher ed is currently the most heavily unionized employment sector in the United States. As a result, academic fields as seemingly far-flung as labor studies, sociology, English, religious studies, and more have followed up a long tradition of analyzing/critiquing (ranting about) working conditions for faculty (e.g, Ohmann, Newfield, Hall, and many, many others) and other workers on campus with more focused studies on the processes of solidarity-building (e.g, Rhoades, et al).

Those studies focused on on *academic* labor organizing often observe that a central difficulty with building solidarity among higher ed faculty is our (forgive the generalization for now--that's part of the study's interest to see how well it's sustained) collective understanding of ourselves as *professionals* rather than *workers*. From both long experience as an organizer on and across campus (and in both union and non-union settings) and more current reading about the concept of professionalism in higher ed (e.g, Bledstein; Austin; et al), as well as research from labor studies and sociology on worker/workplace autonomy (Burawoy; Reich and Bearman; et al), I'm increasingly curious about the overlaps and distinctions in this body of literature between *professionalism* and *autonomy* as problems for those of us working actively to organize academic workers in solidarity--either within existing unions, or to form unions, or in non-unionized settings to accomplish concrete institutional goals (most often in the form of major policy changes and the attendant cultural shifts required to make those policies work).

In short: academic workers/faculty are often if not always drawn to the profession because of the autonomy it offers in the forms of academic freedom, shared governance, curricular/pedagogical control, schedule flexibility, and so on. Building solidarity among a cadre so committed to autonomy is complicated, but clearly not impossible; organizers win union elections and negotiate contracts; unions strike and win; faculty senates collectively make and win demands, or collaborate with management for important changes. This study is concerned with understanding how successful organizers (I understand for many people this word immediately evokes unions; I use it more generally as a substitute for

"activists") of solidarity have navigated the problem of collectivizing people so committed to autonomy. The consequences of understanding this phenomenon are obvious for labor organizers and anyone focused on improving labor conditions on campuses; as Amy Lynch-Biniek and I argue in a recent publication ("From Activism to Organizing, From Caring to Care Work," 2022), such solidarity-building is also essential to authentic DEI work as well as defending higher ed against increasingly aggressive political attacks.

References:

Austin, Ann E. "Faculty cultures, faculty values." New directions for institutional research 1990.68 (1990): 61-74.
Bledstein, Burton. "The Culture of Professionalism. The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America." (1976).
Burawoy, Michael. Manufacturing consent: Changes in the labor process under monopoly capitalism. University of Chicago Press, 1982.
Hall, Richard. The alienated academic: The struggle for autonomy inside the university. Springer, 2018.
Kahn, Seth, and Amy Lynch-Biniek. "From Activism to Organizing, From Caring to Care Work." Labor Studies Journal 47.3 (2022): 320-344.
Newfield, Christopher. Ivy and Industry : Business and the Making of the American University, 1880-1980. Duke University Press, 2003.
Ohmann, Richard. Politics of knowledge: The commercialization of the university, the professions, and print culture. Wesleyan University Press, 2003.
Reich, Adam, and Peter Bearman. Working for Respect : Community and Conflict at Walmart. 2018.
Rhoades, Gary. "Working in Coalition, and Wall-to-Wall: The New Progressive Normal." Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy 12.1 (2021): 4.

*required

Research Design

Please provide the research design you are utilizing for your study (e.g., Prospective Cohort, Case-Control, Observational)

Qualitative Interviews (semi-structured, open-ended)

*required

Research Question(s) and/or Hypotheses

Provide the research question guiding this research project as well as any hypotheses (if applicable).

Research questions--

What challenges have successful academic labor organizers encountered building solidarity at whatever scale they focus (campus, union, national organizations, disciplinary associations, etc)? What strategies and tactics did they use to address those challenges? How did they achieve success?

If *professionalism* and/or *autonomy* are among those challenges, did organizers find them to be especially thorny or simply more problems on a list of other problems? If they're different, how did organizers address them differently from other challenges?

*required

Source of Participants

Convenience sampling from among several well-developed networks of activists and organizers: people I've served with on advisory boards for activist groups (New Faculty Majority, Tenure for the Common Good, Center for the Study of Academic Labor); people I'm in similar groups with but not as a leader (Higher Education Labor United, Debt Collective); people I've met through those connections via social media or at conferences. Of everyone on my draft list of potential recruits, currently there are only two I've never met or spoken directly to, but I've been at least introduced to all of them in meetings or events, or interacted with them in social media. I am open to the possibility of referrals to other participants (if, for example, one leader prefers not to talk but suggests another who would likely agree, or in the process of an interview, a participant tells me about an effort I hadn't known about and suggests I interview one of those leaders too), but I have no plans to go more than one degree of separation outside my current network.

*required

Inclusion Criteria

List and describe the inclusion criteria.

To be included, participants will--

Have led or been part of a team that led a project or campaign that successfully built solidarity among faculty (and where relevant, among managers and other campus workers). What constitutes "successful"

is their discretion; as long as they claim it, that's fine.

Where there's an official structure (union, faculty senate, disciplinary association, etc), have a title or similar way of signalizing a leadership position. {This helps me ensure that they understand confidentiality and similar legal issues, as well as organizational rules about what they are/aren't supposed to share--that is, it protects them from telling me things they shouldn't, in addition to my efforts to avoid revealing identifying or otherwise confidential information.]

Be willing to commit 60-90 minutes for an interview and potential follow-up questions as necessary.

Have access to organizational documents (constituting documents like bylaws, organizational charts, committee charges) and the ability/willingness to share them

*required

Exclusion Criteria

List and describe the exclusion criteria.

Not in a leadership position in the solidarity-building project
Unable/unwilling to share constituting documents

[Any other exclusion criteria--discomfort with language, concerns about safety from COVID, etc will get accounted for in the consenting process. I'm comfortable telling somebody I don't think they should participate if I have concerns on their behalf that arise during that step, or that they should withdraw during the interview if they say anything that reveals an unforeseen risk for the first time.]

7- Study Procedures

*required

Describe your recruitment procedures and any compensation given for participation.

Recruitment: I'll approach them all directly (see attached recruiting letter) by email, including anyone to whom I'm referred by another potential recruit or participant. For anyone who responds to the invitation with interest, I'll send the Informed Consent, offering to answer questions or discuss procedures by email or in a Zoom meeting, as they prefer. When participants are comfortable consenting, I'll collect the signed forms and schedule interviews. I plan to conduct the interviews virtually via Zoom, although I'm open to in-person interviews with anyone close enough so that I can afford to travel and we're all comfortable with COVID precautions (up-to-date vaccinations, appropriately ventilated/air-filtered location).

There is no financial compensation for participation. I will offer them reciprocated time and attention if at any point they want conversations about their own organizing work; I would do this anyway, but I'll put it in writing as a recognition that they're giving time to me.

Study Documents

If applicable, this includes flyers used for recruitment as well as letters of acknowledgement (ex. external group letter of acknowledgement, coach's letter, etc.).
Participant_Recruitment_Email_REVISED.pdf

*required

Describe all study procedures.

Provide a step-by-step description of each procedure.

1. Part of the interview agenda (attached) is some description of the organization (union, faculty senate, disciplinary association, etc) the participant represents. Once the interview is scheduled, I will ask them if they can share written/online versions of any of that information in advance--e.g., bylaws, organizational charts, committee charge documents; in some cases those are closely guarded if not legally confidential, and in others there are likely just not to be any in writing, but the more I can learn about structural matters in advance, the better.

2. The face-to-face or Zoom interview.

3. I will ask permission to contact participants with follow-up questions to clarify responses from the

interviews. I will not ask questions about anything I hadn't already.

4. Transcribe the interviews and share the transcripts with participants to check for accuracy, and for them to ask me not to reveal anything they prefer to keep out of the record.

5. Analysis (see below)

*required

Describe the duration of study participation, the time commitment for study participants, and the timetable for study completion.

Participant commitments:

- Participants should expect a half hour at most to find and send organizational documents (I will plead with them not to spend more than that, telling them f those aren't easy to find, don't bother.)
- Interviews should take 60-90 minutes. Under no circumstances will I let one go more than 10 minutes past that.
- I'll work to make sure any follow-up questions don't take more than 5-10 minutes.
- It's hard to say how long it will take for them to check the transcripts, but I'll offer them at least 2 weeks to do it, and it's not required for their participation.

Timetable:

- Dec 1-15, 2022: Recruiting/scheduling interviews
- Dec 15, 2022 to February 15, 2023: interviewing/transcribing/member-checking transcripts
- Feb 16, 2023 to March 30, 2023: analyzing
- April 1, 2023 to August 1, 2023: drafting/revising write-up

*required

Describe the information to be gathered and the means for collecting, recording, and analysis of data.

Two sets of data: organizational documents, which participants can email as attachments, copy/paste into emails, or send links to (see Section 9 for confidentiality measures); and interviews, which will be recorded and transcribed (I plan to do the transcription myself, aided when possible by the captioning capabilities in Zoom--see Section 9 for data security measures regarding Zoom files). Once the interviews are

transcribed, I will delete the video files from my password-protected computer.

Data analysis will emerge from the actual data (it's not unusual for qualitative researchers to select analytical tools based on what the data call for). I will use one or both of these analytical lenses—grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss), or critical discourse analysis (Fairclough). While the lenses differ in terms of their theoretical assumptions, both are highly inductive and lead to results that both synthesize themes across the data and highlight anomalous/specific moments of interest.

Data Collection Forms

Attach any data collection forms that you might be be using in the study.
Autonomy_Solidarity_Interview_Agenda_Updated.pdf

*required

Survey, Questionnaire, or Interview

Will the study utilize surveys, questionnaires, or interviews?

✓ Yes

*required

Attach all copies of surveys, questionnaires, or interviews.

Autonomy_Solidarity_Interview_Agenda_Updated.pdf

No

*required

Will the survey, questionnaire, or interview record any information that can identify the participants?

✓ Yes

No

*required

Please justify why the survey, questionnaire, or interview needs to record identifiable information.

I'm hand-recruiting participants because I already know who they are, what organization they represent, and some details about what they've done (which is the whole reason I'm interviewing them), so it's literally not possible for me not to identify them at least to myself. When they submit organizational documents, I'll certainly invite them to de-identity those in advance, or offer to do it before I store them. I'll certainly work to ensure that identities are protected before anyone besides a participant or me sees any data, notes, or any kind of write-up. Most people on my recruiting list are well-known academic labor activists/organizers who will be more concerned with revealing specific confidential details about their specific projects (or organizations) than about their own identities (e.g., union leaders are generally hesitant to reveal their membership percentages, but it happens sometimes when we're just chatting with other union people; faculty senates release minutes of meetings but keep details of their deliberations confidential). We'll use the member-check of the transcript to guard against releasing any information participants don't want released.

*required

Genetic Testing

Will this study involve genetic testing?

Yes

✓ No

*required

Drugs, Devices, Biologics

Will the study involve administering any of the following? Check all that apply.

Drug

Biologic

Device

✓ None of the above

*required

Participant Data, Specimens, and Records

Does this project involve the collection or use of materials (data, video or specimens) recorded in a manner that could identify the individuals who provided the materials, either directly or through identifiers linked to these individuals?

✓ Yes

*required

Please include information on how these materials will be protected and stored.

See Section 9 for data storage details.

No

8- Risks & Benefits

*required

Do you anticipate study participants will be subject to minimal or greater than minimal risk?

Minimal Risk to participants means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical and psychological examinations or tests and that confidentiality is adequately protected.

Greater than Minimal Risk to participants means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research risks are more than minimal risk, but not significantly greater. Studies that fall under this category will range in their probability of a moderate-severity event occurring as a result of study participation (and the level of safety monitoring will depend on that probability) but there are adequate surveillance and protections in place to identify adverse events promptly and to minimize harm.

- ✓ Minimal
- Greater than Minimal

What are the Potential Risks related to your research?

All research poses potential risk to participants or others. In many cases, these risks are clearly identifiable. But even in relatively simple data collection there may be less obvious risks. Please check all that apply

- ✓ Privacy Risks

  Describe any and all privacy risks:

  Provide detail regarding the frequency, severity, and duration of each risk.

  1. Exposure to academic managers: some participants are contingent faculty, graduate students, and pre-tenure faculty. While their participation in this project is not as risky as participating in the work they did that made me want to interview them, there's some risk of identification, particular when I cite organizational documents that may have their names in them (for example, one potential participant is an officer in their union; if I cite the union's

bylaws in relation to anything I say about their interview, the possibilities for who the participant is narrow significantly). 2. Risk of revealing confidential organizational information/data: union membership rates; confidential deliberations/meeting notes

How will you minimize these risks?

---

1. I will not require pseudonyms for people, institutions, or organizations, but I'll invite and encourage them, especially for participants in vulnerable professional situations. As for the citation problem, I will code participants and documents to de-identity them, and when I submit any write-up, I'll work with editors within the limits of their editorial policies to mask institutional/source identities (in Labor Studies, because of the nature of what we do, these kinds of problems are common and editors often have policies for protecting participants); if that's not possible, I won't use the information that could identify them. 2. The first step is the member-check, at which point anyone who has said anything they don't want me to use can redact it. I will give participants full authority to redact anything in the transcript they don't want released. Second, my own training as a union officer and organizational leader has made me acutely aware, in the way union people often are, of the boundaries around what's appropriate to share outside the organization and what isn't. If I can note that in real time during an interview, I'll do that; if I see anything in a transcript that a participant didn't redact that strikes me as risky, I'll either check with them about using it or redact it myself.

Social or Psychological Risks

Physical Risks

✓ Risks to Third Parties (institutions, community, researchers, or non-consented individuals)

Other:

Privacy Risks

Social or Psychological Risks

Physical Risks

Risks to third parties (institutions, community, researchers, or non-consented individuals)

Other:

*required

Expected Benefits

Describe the anticipated benefits to participants (if any). If there are none, please state that there is no direct benefit to the participant. Also, please state the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result from this research study.

Interviews generally offer participants an opportunity to reflect on and articulate their values and practices, and since that's the explicit purpose of these interviews, I expect that to be true. Because I'm also an organizer with experience doing much the same kind of work many participants are doing, I will also offer to share ideas/feedback/expertise to anyone who wants it.

The significance of the research more broadly is potentially multi-layered. At its most obvious, the results will help academic labor organizers/activists--union leaders, leaders of unionization efforts, activists working on large-scale DEI efforts, and others--think about building solidarity among a population that makes collectivity tricky. Depending on who agrees to participate, I hope to expand the scope of that benefit to administration/management who work with faculty on labor and DEI issues. At its most ambitious, the results could help orchestrate meaningful responses to political and economic threats to the integrity of higher education nationally, but even I feel grandiose about hoping for that.

*required

Are you seeking a waiver of informed consent?

A Waiver of Documentation of Consent is used when:

- *You are providing an Informed Consent Document to participants, but will not be obtaining their written signatures.*
- *Reading an Informed Consent script verbally, or over the phone, to participants when conducting a screening conversation and sharing study information requesting verbal consent.*

✓ No

Yes

Select one of the following and then provide a rationale explaining why this Waiver of Documentation of Consent will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of participants.

The only record linking the participant and the research would be the informed consent form and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality. Each participant will be asked whether the participant wants documentation linking the participant with the research, and the participant's wishes will govern.

The research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to participants and involves no procedures, for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

If the participants or legally authorized representatives are members of a distinct cultural group or community in which signing forms is not the norm, the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to participants, and provided there is an appropriate alternative mechanism for documenting that informed consent was obtained.

*required

Informed Consent

Describe the procedures for obtaining informed consent.

1. Recruiting email will ask for interest in participating. Anyone who responds with interest will receive a reply that includes the Informed Consent form and invitation to ask questions either by email or on Zoom (or another platform if they prefer).

2. I will answer all of their questions candidly.

3. Once they return the signed Consent Form* (with or without a conversation in between), before filling it and proceeding to scheduling I will double-check to be sure they understand the options for de-identifying documents, and the tactics we'll use (member-checking, screening for legal problems, my assurances that they have veto power over anything I might use in a write-up) to ensure their professional and legal safety.

4. When I'm comfortable with their understanding of their consent, we'll proceed to scheduling and conducing the interviews.

5. If at any point during the process either a participant or I need to revisit the terms of consent, including their right to skip questions or their voluntary withdrawal rights, we will.

*I know the Readability score on the form is high; every person on my list of prospective interviewees has at least one graduate degree, and most of them are as wonky as we are about the technical precision of the language. I hope you'll give me leeway here.

*required

Informed Consent Form

The attachment must be in a .doc or .pdf - links will **not** be accepted.

If you would like to use our informed consent generator to create a document that is fully editable, please click here: https://www.wcupa.edu/_admin/research/forms/confidentiality/

Please note - that if having a parent/guardian consenting - the consent form language will need to be modified to include "MY CHILD" instead of " I "
InformedConsentForm_REVISED.pdf

Child Assent Form(s) if applicable

For examples of assent forms - please see the ASSENT SAMPLES documents/examples on our IRB website.

Will your research involve any of the following?

Check all that apply.

- Deception
- Investigation Drugs or Dietary Supplements
- Investigational Devices
- Retaining Data or Biological Samples for Future Research
- ✓ None of the Above

9- Confidentiality

*required

What technological and physical safeguards will you use to protect data from inappropriate use or disclosure?

Check all that apply.

- De-identifying data at point of collection (e.g., using Qualtircs to anonymize data)
- Locked room or cabinet
- Behind a double lock (e.g. locked cabinet in a locked room)
- Restricted access to authorized research team members
- ✓ Password-protected computer or device
- ✓ Password-protected folder or storage
- ✓ Destruction of source data immediately after processing
- ✓ Destruction of audio or visual data immediately after transcription
- Modification of audio or visual data to eliminate identifiers
- Other:

What will you do with data or specimens at the conclusion of the study?

Check all that apply:

- I am not collecting any identifiers. I will retain data for the required retention period (3 years, or longer as required by other agencies) and then destroy it.
- I will deidentify data or specimen logs and erase or destroy any related codes. I will retain data for the required retention period (3 years, or longer as required by other agencies) and then destroy it.
- I will keep identifiable data for the required retention period (3 years, or longer as required by

✓ other agencies) and then destroy it.

I will destroy any leftover specimens.

I will retain data and specimens for future use.

Other:

Safeguarding Participants' Identity

*required

How will data confidentiality be maintained?

Not all of these provisions will apply to every participant, but most will:

1. On request (or by mutual agreement if I'm the one who thinks this), I will de-identify any documents participants share with me, including names of institutions, unions, disciplinary associations, etc or any information that identifies those groups).

2. During interviews, if a participant says something they then decide they want redacted, we will mark that in the interview transcript and I'll redact it. The same will be true during member-checks--a participant can ask for anything they said to be omitted.

3. Electronically signed consent forms and Interview recordings will be stored on my password-protected laptop computer in password-protected folders; everything will be stored locally to avoid security problems with cloud-based documents. Any interviews I record on my phone, I will immediately transfer to the local folder on my laptop and delete from the phone.

4. Once the interviews are transcribed and approved by participants via member-check, I will delete the recordings from my computer.

5. I will engage in one more round of member-checking drafts of any article or talk before finalizing it. I'll make sure participants see only sections that do not refer to other participants in identifiable ways.

6. I will destroy all data three years after study completion.

*required

Provide exact location (e.g., Building & Office Number) of where informed consent forms and/or study data will be stored (physical or electronic).

Stored at the PI's campus office and home address (list exact address)

*required

Provide the names and titles of individuals having access to the consent documents and data.

Name of Investigator (PI)
IRB co-chairs and Associate VP for Sponsored Research if necessary

*required

Specify the date for destruction of data (surveys, disks, etc.; must be a minimum of 3 years)

01-31-2027

10- Attachments

The documents/attachments listed here have been previously uploaded throughout the application. **No new uploads should be required here**. *Please double check that all appropriate files have been uploaded.*

Outside IRB of Record

This is required when engaging in multi-institutional research.

Study Protocol

Attach the protocol for this study that was reviewed by the Outside IRB.

Outside IRB Approval

Attach the IRB Approval from the Outside IRB.

Outside IRB Review Meeting Minutes

Attach the minutes from the outside IRB meeting(s) for the review of this study.

Outside IRB Correspondence

Attach all correspondence concerning the review of this study by the Outside IRB.

Study Procedures

Study Documents

If applicable, this includes flyers used for recruitment.
Participant_Recruitment_Email_REVISED.pdf

Study Instruments

Attach all instruments (i.e. personality scales, questionnaires, evaluation blanks, etc) to be used in the study.
Autonomy_Solidarity_Interview_Agenda_Updated.pdf

FDA Letter

Participant Protection

Informed Consent Form

InformedConsentForm_REVISED.pdf

Child Assent Form(s)