

CHECKLIST: Faculty Advisor Review of Student Research					
NUMBER	FORM VERSION DATE	PAGE			
HRP-251	11/10/2018	1 of 2			

Faculty who supervise graduate student research are called Faculty Advisors (FAs). FAs play an important role in human subjects protections. The FA bears ultimate responsibility for the ethical conduct of research carried out by the student. The time and effort FAs dedicate to their students has a considerable impact on student projects, quality of data, and the time required for IRB approval.

The purpose of this form is to document faculty advisor approval and screening of submission materials for student-led research. This document is to be completed by the advisor and submitted by the student PI in section 6 of the study submission SmartForm in the IRB				
system.				
Study Title:				
Student Investigator:				
Faculty Advisor:				
1 QUALIFICATIONS OF THE STUDENT INVESTIGATOR (all items must be checked and described in the in the Protocol, Section 25.0 Resources)				
☐ The investigator has the qualifications to conduct the research				
☐ The investigator has the resources to conduct the research (i.e. funding, time, access)				
☐ The investigator has completed the required Human Subjects Protections training (i.e. CITI)				
2 GENERAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS (check each item that has been reviewed and meets expectations of the advisor)				
All documents have been reviewed for clarity, consistency, and completion.				
☐ Protocol and overall study design are appropriate and hold merit.				
The protocol accurately describes the research in a clear, consistent manner				
o Where applicable, a distinction is made between procedures that are taking place solely for research purposes versus				
those procedures that are taking place regardless of research.  o The appropriate Protocol document is used: HRP-503 Protocol for Expedited/Full Board studies, HRP-255 Request for				
<ul> <li>The appropriate Protocol document is used: HRP-503 Protocol for Expedited/Full Board studies, HRP-255 Request for Exempt Determination for Exempt Studies, or HRP-250 Request For Not Human Subjects Determination</li> </ul>				
☐ The consent process is adequate (☐ Check if N/A)				
o The consent process is clearly stated in the appropriate Protocol document				
o If elements of consent are withheld, a debriefing statement is included as part of the consent process				
<ul> <li>A description of what types of personally identifiable information data is being collected and used for research along with</li> </ul>				
how long the identifiers are maintained is listed				
o If the research study involves children, there is a child assent process clearly stated in HRP-503 Protocol				
☐ The consent document(s) or script(s) are complete and written according to current UCF templates (HRP-254 for Exempt Studies,				
HRP-502/502b for Expedited/Full Board studies) (□Check if N/A)				
o Informed consent begins with a concise and focused presentation of the key information that is most likely to assist a prospective subject or legally authorized representative in understanding the reasons why one might or might not want to				
prospective subject or legally authorized representative in understanding the reasons why one might of might not want to participate in the research. This part of the informed consent is presented in a way that facilitates comprehension.				
o The study purpose and procedures are presented in a clear, concise manner. Information in the consent document is				
consistent with what is listed in the Protocol.				
o Signature blocks are removed for minimal risk studies or, only the appropriate signature block is retained. Parental				
Consent for Child is used where appropriate				
Recruitment method and materials are consistent with that is described in the appropriate Protocol document and are uploaded for review				
Data collection instruments are listed in the protocol and are uploaded for review				
Written material to be seen or heard by subjects (including screenshots of any simulations), if any, are uploaded for review				
Provisions for vulnerable subject populations (e.g. prisoners, children, pregnant women), if any, are described in the appropriate Protocol				
document ( Check if N/A)				
Provisions for privacy and confidentiality are adequate				
Data management listed in HRP-503 Protocol section 17 or HRP-255 section 3.2 fully describes how and for how long the data will be stored, distinguishing identifiable data management from de-identified data. *Note: storage length for de-identified and				
otherwise unidentified data is 5 years per UCF policy. The protocol sets the length of time for storage of identifiable data, links,				
recordings, etc. In general, your goal should be to store identifiable or linked data for as short of time as practical. If the study				
design warrants longer storage time periods, protocol specific justification is provided				
☐ Other:				
3 REVIEW COMMENTARY (provide any additional information regarding this submission that may be pertinent to IRB review)				



CHECKLIST: Faculty Advisor Review of Student Research						
NUMBER	FORM VERSION DATE	PAGE				
HRP-251	11/19/2018	2 of 2				

By initialing this document, the fa	aculty advisor is attesting to having conducted ade	equate revie	w of submission	materials and finds them to be
complete and accurate. Permiss	sion is granted to the investigator to submit to the II	RB.		

Faculty Advisor Initials: Date:
---------------------------------