Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation

THESIS GUIDE FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION I 2013-14

What Is a Thesis?

A Master's Thesis should demonstrate a student's capacity to deal convincingly with a subject at a professional level. This includes the ability to formulate a hypothesis and carrying out independent research in its support.

A thesis must also clearly identify the polemical nature of the research and analysis you will conduct. *A thesis is not a report on a subject matter that has been conclusively studied by others* (although you may draw on such material in support of your own work). A common test of the value of a thesis is that it will contribute to the body of knowledge either by modifying conventional thinking on a subject or by introducing new ideas into the discourse. Therefore, a thesis should include a review of the current state of knowledge in the field about the topic under study.

A thesis within the expanding framework of historic preservation may have one or more avenues of inquiry. These could include: historical analyses of architecture, urbanism and landscape form; development and/or critical analyses of ideas and techniques for physical planning, specific legislative policies, planning tools, site management, or financial arrangements that affect preservation; critical analyses of theoretical approaches to historic preservation; critical analyses of the history of the field; critical analysis of historical issues pertinent to the field; critical analyses of a design issues evident in historic buildings, landscapes or districts; development of original design approaches that reflect on or relate to historic buildings, landscapes or districts; development of original interpretation approaches for historic buildings, landscapes, or districts; laboratory investigations and evaluations of building and building conservation materials and related testing methods.

Schedule

Thesis Topic Discussion *Ware Lounge*	Monday, May 6th	9 a.m. – 12 p.m
Thesis Topic Presentation *Location TBD*	Friday, September 13th	9 a.m. – 1 p.m.
Submit Name of Advisor	Friday, September 20th	
Review Presentation w/ Advisor	Week of October 14th	
First Thesis Review *114 Avery*	Saturday, October 19th	9a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Thesis Outlines Due	Friday, November 22nd	
Review Presentation w/ Advisor	Week of January 27th	
Second Thesis Review *114 Avery - Identify 1st and 2nd Readers at this time*	Saturday, February 1st	9a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Draft of Thesis Due	Monday, March 31st	
Thesis Juries	Saturday, April 26th	To be Scheduled
Grades Due	Wednesday, May 14th	

Digital Version of Thesis Due Monday, May 19th

Bring to HP Office (413 Avery) Include Thesis, Abstract, and signed Author Agreement Form

Attachments

Expanded Schedule

Overall Thesis Guidelines and Formatting

Digital Thesis Guidelines

Policy for Historic Preservation Students with an Incomplete Thesis

Digital Thesis Author Agreement Form

Example 1: Bibliography vs. Footnote

Example 2: Page of Bibliography

Example 3: Page of Footnotes

Example 4: Page of Endnotes

Example 5: Sample Abstract

IRB Policy and Guidelines

THESIS GUIDE FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION I 2013-14

Expanded Schedule

Monday, May 6, 2013: Thesis Topic Discussion
9am-12pm: Ware Lounge (600 Avery)
Discussion of student's thesis topic idea/proposal (five minutes maximum); no PowerPoint presentation is expected. The presentation will be followed by short responses from a small group of faculty. This is meant to be an informal discussion. If you have a thesis proposal, it should be presented. If not, discuss your ideas about what you would like to investigate. The faculty understands that this may not be your final thesis topic, since many students work on projects related to their internships.

If the initial topic idea does not appear to be an appropriate preservation thesis, the student will receive notice from the department head. You should be reading on your topic and discussing their ideas with several faculty members in an attempt to focus your thinking. This should continue through the summer, as new ideas are developed.

Friday, September 13, 2013: Thesis Topic Presentation
9am-1pm: Location TBD
Students will present their thesis topics verbally in a second informal presentation (five minutes). The presentation will include further thinking about the topic for those students who have continued to work on their initial proposal, or the initial presentation of a new topic by students who have changed their thinking over the summer. Where faculty agrees a student needs to sharpen focus or modify the topic the student will receive a notice from the department head.

Friday, September 20, 2013. Advisor's Name Submitted
By one week after your topic has been accepted; you must choose your advisor and submit their name to the Assistant Director. The advisor must be a full-time or adjunct member of the Historic Preservation faculty. At this time you should be working on a tentative hypothesis and beginning research in preparation for a formal thesis review.

Friday, October 10, 2013: First Work Plan and Draft of Abstract Due
Each student should submit a work plan to their advisor for review. Draft abstracts should be submitted to the Assistant Director.

Week of October 14: Preliminary Thesis Review with Advisor
At some point during this week, you should meet with your advisor and present a dress-rehearsal of your thesis review presentation for their comments and suggestions.

Student should send in draft Abstracts and Bibliographies to the Assistant Director on Tuesday, October 15th so that they can be distributed to the faculty digitally prior to the Second Thesis Review. Digital presentations are due to the Assistant Director no later than 3pm on Friday, October 18th so that all presentations are loaded onto the computer prior to starting the review on Saturday morning.

Saturday, October 19, 2013: First Thesis Review
9am-4:30pm, 114 Avery
Each student is allotted 5 minutes for presentation of their topic and proposed methodology. Faculty comments for 10 minutes. You should plan on preparing a PowerPoint presentation (unless this is not appropriate to your topic) a short abstract of your proposal and a preliminary bibliography.

Following the presentations, faculty will confer. If a student's topic is determined not to be proceeding well, the student will receive a note and will be asked to re-present a more focused version of the initial topic or propose an entirely new topic in early November.

Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation

THESIS GUIDE FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION I 2013-14

Friday, November22, 2013: Thesis Outline Due
Each student should submit an outline of their thesis to their advisor for review.

Week of January 27, 2013: Preliminary Thesis Review with Advisor
At some point during this week, you should meet with your advisor and present a dress-rehearsal of your thesis review presentation for their comments and suggestions.

Student should send in draft Abstracts and Bibliographies to the Assistant Director on Tuesday, January 28th so that they can be distributed to the faculty digitally prior to the Second Thesis Review. Digital presentations are due to the Assistant Director no later than 3pm on Friday, January 31st so that all presentations are loaded onto the computer prior to starting the review on Saturday morning.

Saturday, February 1, 2014: Second Thesis Review
When possible, students will be placed into "affinity groups" of related topics. This meeting will include a five-minute formal presentation from each student detailing the progress that has been made and the further direction that the work will take. With the exception of a brief introduction, the student should not repeat the October presentation. The presentation will be followed by a discussion between students and faculty. By this time, students should have started to write their thesis and have completed a few sample chapter drafts.

At this time, students should identify a two thesis readers – people knowledgeable in the topic who can provide content review and critique. Readers can be members of the HP faculty or outside experts approved by your advisor.

Here are some questions that you might wish to address in this presentation:
- Are you on track with the assumptions that you made when you began your thesis or have your ideas about the topic changed as research has proceeded?

-If your ideas have changed, how have they changed and how has this impacted your initial thesis ideas?

-If your original thesis ideas have remained constant, what have you done to develop your ideas more fully?

-What have you discovered about your topic? What have you learned that will have an impact on the preservation field?

Week of February 3, 2013: Supply Reader Information
If either of your readers is not HP faculty, please provide their full name, mailing address, and e-mail address to the HP Office.

Note that by this time, you should be submitting second draft chapters to your advisor. Your advisor should have reviewed and commented on all sections of your thesis before March 31.

Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation

THESIS GUIDE FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION I 2013-14

Monday, 31st the draft of the thesis is due to advisor and readers.

- The thesis draft can be delivered to your advisor and readers as paper/hard copy or digitally. Please ask your advisor and readers how they prefer to receive the draft.
- Provide proof of e-mailing copies to those accepting digital delivery of the thesis by copying the Assistant Director.
- For those advisors and readers who request paper copies, these need to be prepared by the student. The paper copies can be brought to the HP office and they will be Fed-Exed out to each person.
- This is a draft – make it legible, but there is no rule for formatting of this version, other than to make sure it is paginated and has your name on it. Also make sure that there are the necessary illustrations, and that their sources are adequately identified.

- **Note: You MUST have your advisor review the draft before it is released to the readers, even if your advisor is only receiving it chapter-by-chapter over the course of weeks. The advisor must make first-pass edits. It is inappropriate for your readers to be presented with a draft that needs basic editing.**
- If readers and advisors do not receive your thesis in sufficient time to properly review it before the Thesis Jury, they can decline to review it. Without a thesis jury, you cannot graduate.

March 31-April 19, 2014

- You can, and should, continue to work with your advisor to improve your thesis. Even though your draft is submitted, it does not mean work stops.

Saturday, April 19, 2014 – Thesis Juries

- You will meet with your advisor and readers for one hour to discuss the thesis. If there is another date within one week of April 19 that works better for your jury, you may arrange it yourself, and let the HP Office know.
- The advisor and readers will have read your draft, and will offer comments to you on how to finish up.
- Every effort should be made to have advisors and readers present at the final review. When this is not possible, alternative arrangements can be made.

After April 19th

- Refine your thesis, incorporating comments from your jury. Work closely with your advisor (and readers if they wish) to complete the text.
- Begin the final formatting of the document.
- Prepare an abstract of the thesis, with the final title, your name, your advisor's name, and the short summary of your findings and include it on the disc you will submit with your final thesis to the HP Office. (See attached Abstract Example)

Grades are due Wednesday, May 14, for graduation May 21. Work out with your advisor when the final thesis is due so they have time to do a final read-through and provide a grade no later than May 14. **If you do not finish your thesis by this date you will receive a failing grade for Thesis II and will be required to enroll in and pay for an additional semester in order to complete your thesis.**

The archiving copy of the thesis is due by May 19th. If you don't turn it in, you will find your graduation envelope empty. There are precise instructions enclosed on how to deliver your thesis digitally for archiving in Academic Commons.

THESIS GUIDE FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION I 2013-14

General Thesis Guidelines

Advisors and Readers

The thesis advisor is a member of the Historic Preservation faculty. Students are strongly encouraged to speak with the faculty to determine which faculty member might be most appropriate to guide their work. Students may request that a specific faculty member be their advisor, but faculty members are not obliged to serve as an advisor. Advisors will review the student's work on a regular basis and will be principally responsible for grading the thesis. Note that adjunct faculty members cannot advise more than three students per year. In addition to the advisor, students are required to have two readers. Their role will be similar to the advisor although they may consult less frequently with the student and will not be responsible for determining the final grade. Readers do not require an official affiliation with the University. All readers must be approved by the thesis advisor.

Approval of a Topic

Proposals

An initial thesis topic discussion will take place at the end of the spring term. Students will be asked to discuss their initial thesis ideas in an informal discussion with faculty. You will be allowed 3-5 minutes to discuss your ideas. A small group of faculty members will be in attendance and they will be given 5 minutes to make comments and suggestions.

During the summer break students are encouraged to discuss their thesis topic with faculty members to refine their idea and gain a strong sense of who could act as their thesis advisor.

Thesis topics will be discussed again in the fall during at a second informal presentation before a small group of faculty members. Within one week following the approval of your topic students must submit a thesis proposal to the Historic Preservation Office and the name of their advisor.

Proposals must include the following:

- Topic: identify the subject of your thesis, defining its scope so as to demonstrate that it is a topic that can be adequately treated within the allotted time. Briefly outline some of the existing literature on your topic, demonstrating that you are familiar with major work in the area you propose to explore.
- Resources to be consulted: libraries, data banks, drawings, documents, buildings, sites, people, etc.

Reviews

During the third semester, each student is required to make a formal presentation to the collected Historic Preservation faculty that lays out the thesis topic, research methods and the relevance of the subject to the field. A second formal presentation in this same semester may be required if a student has not demonstrated adequate progress. An additional presentation at the beginning of the fourth semester is required of all students, which should provide evidence of significant progress and maps out plans for completion.

Joint Degree Candidates

Historic Preservation/ Urban Planning

The thesis must combine historic preservation and urban planning issues and must satisfy the requirements of both programs. A thesis jury is required by the Urban Planning Program and the Historic Preservation Program. The jury may occur at the same time, but advisors and readers from both disciplines must be present. Students register in the fall semester of the final year for Urban Planning Thesis I (3 credits) and in the spring semester for Urban Planning Thesis II (3 credits) *and* Historic Preservation Thesis (4 credits).

Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation

THESIS GUIDE FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION I 2013-14

Historic Preservation/ Architecture

By the end of the spring semester of the fourth year, joint degree candidates must have completed a Historic Preservation thesis. Most joint degree student have completed their thesis in the fourth year, but the thesis can be completed during your third year if all other HP requirements have been met. Since the Architecture Program does not require a thesis, you are free to choose any Historic Preservation topic; your thesis may be a design problem, but this is not required.

Timeline

The schedule for each year is posted on the HP website under "Thesis" and you will receive updated announcements from the Historic Preservation Office during the year reminding you of upcoming deadlines.

Second semester: Thesis Guidelines are distributed and students are requested to think about thesis topics. In addition to an informal thesis topic discussion that will be scheduled towards the end of this semester.

Third Semester: Students register for Thesis I (1 point). Students will present their topics at a second informal presentation and once their topic has been approved will present a short written abstract of their proposal to the Historic Preservation Office and will also provide the name of their thesis advisor. At a more formal review in October students will present their thesis topics and methodology.

Fourth Semester: Students register for the Thesis II course (4 points). This course does not meet during the semester but allows each student time to complete their thesis research and writing. Students should expect to check in with their advisors on a regular basis throughout the semester to discuss research issues and update them on your progress. Two readers will be selected during this semester. A formal presentation will take place early in this semester to assess progress and provide further guidance to students.

Thesis drafts are due to your thesis advisor and reader towards the end of March. You will then hold a Thesis Jury, an hour long session, with your advisor and readers in mid-April to discuss your thesis and take their comments on your initial draft.

Following Thesis Juries, students will re-write the thesis draft to incorporate comments from the advisor and readers. A final, revised thesis is submitted for grading to their advisor and is due prior to exam week. The final version of the thesis will be submitted digitally, according to instructions from the Columbia University Center for Digital Research & Scholarship to the Historic Preservation Office the Monday prior to graduation

Format

The thesis takes one of several forms, depending on the topic. These forms range from largely written to largely graphic. The appropriate format for the final document is determined by each student in consultation with his or her advisor.

General Requirements for the Thesis

An Abstract, a short summary of its contents along with title, author and advisor is required in the front matter and shoul be emailed to Leigh Smith @ lb663@columbia.edu as a word document to the Historic Preservation office.

- Thesis text must be double spaced.

- Footnotes/endnotes and bibliography are singled spaced with double spaces between citations. Quotations of more than 8 lines are indented 10 spaces on the left and the right, are single-spaced in block form, do not include quotation marks.

- Page Numbering: Must be consecutive from first page of text. Material that precedes the text, such as table of contents, acknowledgements, preface, etc., are numbered in lowercase Roman numerals (i, ii, iii, etc.) with the number omitted from the title page.

- Images must be numbered and their sources identified in captions or on a separate page listing the illustration numbers and their respective sources. They should be presented in a readable manner- i.e., not rotated from the normal viewing plane, and in a high enough resolution and size as to clear. Figure numbers should be keyed to the text.

- Appendices are optional. They should be reserved for relevant information on which the thesis draws, or to which the thesis refers (e.g. data collected, surveys, specific laws, maps, or images, etc.) Appendices should be numbered sequentially and listed in the table of contents.

For the proper formatting of footnotes, bibliography, captions, and appendices, you are strongly encouraged to follow The Chicago Manual of Style (also available as an e-book). Specific forms for footnotes, bibliography, and other elements may vary from thesis to thesis, they must be consistent within any one thesis.

A digital copy of your thesis and a signed agreement form should be dropped off to the HP office by or before May 19. A word document of your abstract that includes your name, the title and advisors name should be emailed directly to Leigh Smith @ lb663@columbia.edu. In addition, before submitting your thesis, you will be required to sign the agreement form acknowledging that your thesis will be archived on-line. You will have the right to keep your thesis closed to public viewing for up to two years. This form should be saved as a PDF and included on your media storage with the copy of your thesis for submission.

The title page of the thesis will carry the following information in the format shown below.

FULL TITLE OF THESIS
(in capital letters)

Your Full Name

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Science in Historic Preservation

Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation

Columbia University
(month and year of submission)

Digital Thesis Guidelines

Since spring 2012, theses produced for the Master of Science in Urban Planning and the Master of Science in Historic Preservation are delivered from the program to Avery Library in digital form. The thesis, which is archived in Academic Commons, the University's digital research repository, is then widely accessible and searchable (through Google and other search engines).

This requirement does not eliminate any responsibility for the student to provide paper review copies as requested by advisor and reader(s). It does eliminate the need to set margins to accommodate binding and to track down acid-free paper and pay for printing of a special copy for the library.

Theses will be delivered on a disk, thumb drive, or other common storage device to the HP/UP office before graduation, in accordance with guidelines provided by each program. Students may not submit their thesis individually to the librarians – it must come through the program. Students must include a signed agreement form permitting the thesis to be digitally archived through Academic Commons. The form is available on the Historic Preservation Program's website. The original signed form must accompany the disk for deposit in the library and a PDF of the form with digital signature will be incorporated into each digital library copy of the thesis. Students have the right to keep their thesis closed from public view for one or two years (this option is on the form). This option is generally used by students who wish to publish their thesis material.

Upon receipt, the Library will assign a permanent URL to each thesis, and this will allow a link to the full thesis from the GSAPP website as well as for the library catalog. The theses will be located and accessed via the Internet; there will be "universal access" to this material (i.e., it will not be restricted to those with a Columbia UNI/log-in).

The entire thesis should be saved as a PDF. Students are free, within the bounds established by their advisor and reader(s), to develop their own formatting standards as appropriate for the material, and as appears graphically consistent and clear. Where student work incorporates the intellectual property of other authors and creators their copyright needs to be respected and credited – this is especially important because your work will be readily available on the Internet and rights-holders can easily identify where their work has been cited or reproduced.

The thesis has always been the "master–piece" of the Planning and Preservation degrees – literally that which makes you a "master" of the subject. With wider availability than paper copies ever had, there is more reason to believe that students will present their very best work.

CENTER FOR DIGITAL RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES/INFORMATION SERVICES

Author Rights Agreement with Academic Commons

This document constitutes permission to deposit and make my work available through Academic Commons. Deposit of my work within Academic Commons is voluntary. I understand that giving my permission does not alter the copyright or other rights to the work that I might hold.

My signature below confirms that I have granted Columbia University the non-exclusive right to make a digital copy of my thesis and any associated work(s) available for permanent archiving and for public access in the Columbia University Libraries/Information Services research repository, Academic Commons, or any successor initiative based at Columbia.

This agreement refers to the work named below and to any associated work(s) deposited at this time:

_____

[*title and date of work or other citation identifying the work]*

I understand that this permission is nonexclusive and does not prevent me from entering into similar arrangements with other parties or from exercising any rights that I may have in the work(s). However, also I understand that I may need to inform subsequent publishers or others that I have granted this preexisting permission to deposit my work in Academic Commons.

I confirm that this is my original work, that I have the right to grant this use, and that this use does not, to the best of my knowledge, infringe upon anyone's copyright.

In connection with use of the work as set forth above, I hereby waive the confidentiality provisions of the Federal Family Educational and Privacy Rights Act of 1974 with respect to the contents of the work and with respect to information concerning my authorship of the work, including my name and status as a student at Columbia University.

_____

[Author's printed name] *[Author's signature]*

_____

[UNI] *[email address where you can be reached for up to one year]*
if the author has no UNI, write NA

_____
[Date]

I additionally request that the appearance of my thesis and any associated work(s) in Academic Commons be delayed for the period specified below:

☐ 1 year ☐ 2 years

Any embargo period exceeding two years must be approved in writing by the Associate Director for Urban Planning and Historic Preservation.

Version: AuthorAgreementFormGSAPP.doc, 2012-04-26

Academic Commons (http://academiccommons.columbia.edu), Columbia University's online research repository, is managed by the Center for Digital Research and Scholarship, a Division of Columbia University Libraries/Information Services.

Policy for Historic Preservation Students with an Incomplete Thesis

The thesis for the Master of Science in Historic Preservation is the centerpiece of your education, and should reflect the thought and rigor that makes it, literally, your "master" piece. Following University policy, a student who fails to finish their thesis by the required due date they will be given an "F", a grade that erases the credit for that course. In this case the thesis can only be completed if the student re-registers and pays for the required thesis course. The only exception is when there is a documented medical issue or extenuating circumstances that have been approved by the Admissions Office, in which case you would be given a CP (Credit Pending) or INC (Incomplete) and would be given until the beginning of the fall term to complete your thesis.

Registration must take place the week prior to each semester – in other words, in the week preceding Labor Day for the fall semester, and in the week preceding the Martin Luther King holiday for the spring semester. Students register and pay the current tuition rate for the thesis course that is missing. If thesis is not offered in the semester you register, you may use an Advanced Research course number for the purposes of registration. Consult the registration office for how to register for Advanced Research or Independent Study.

Prior to re-registering to complete your thesis, you must contact Historic Preservation Program Director Andrew Dolkart (asd3@columbia.edu) or Assistant Director Trisha Logan (tkl2116@columbia.edu) to discuss your thesis. You should have a clear idea of your methodology and timeline for completion before you register, so you are certain you can complete your work in the semester in which you are paying tuition. You will continue to coordinate with your chosen advisor and readers and will be required to hold a thesis jury prior to receiving your final grade. .

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
University of South Carolina | Thomas Cooper Library

{REFERENCE DEPARTMENT}

Chicago Manual of Style Guide for Bibliographies and Notes (Electronic sources)

Updated by JG 08/09

The examples herein are based on the Chicago Manual of Style 15th edition. For additional examples consult the manual available at the Reference Desk or the Chicago Manual of Style web site at http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools.html .

Type of Resource	Bibliography	Note Form
Article from a Library database with page numbers	Jones, Julia C., M. R. Myerscough, S. Graham, and B. P. Oldroyd. "Honey Bee Nest Thermoregulation: Diversity Promotes Stability." *Science* 305, no. 5682 (July 16, 2004): 402-404. http://web.ebscohost.com/ (accessed July 24, 2007).	24. Julia C. Jones, M. R. Myerscough, S. Graham, and B. P. Oldroyd, "Honey Bee Nest Thermoregulation: Diversity Promotes Stability."Science 305, no. 5682 (July 16, 2004), 403, http://web.ebscohost.com/ (accessed July 24, 2007)
Article from an online journal without page numbers	Moore, Roland S., G. M. Ames, and C. B. Cunradi. "Physical and Social Availability of Alcohol for Young Enlisted Naval Personnel in and Around Home Port." *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy* 2 no. 17, (June 30, 2007) http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1934352 (accessed July 30, 2007).	30. Ronald S. Moore, G. M. Ames, and C. B. Cunradi, "Physical and Social Availability of Alcohol for Young Enlisted Naval Personnel in and Around Home Port," *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy* 2 no. 17, (June 30, 2007), http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1934352 (accessed July 30, 2007).
Dissertations & theses	Shimpalee, Pattama. "The Contribution of Economic and Institutional Factors to Currency Crises: Additional Evidence from Asia, Europe and the Western Hemisphere". Ph.D. diss., University of South Carolina, 2004. In ProQuest Digital Dissertations [database on-line]; available from http://www.proquest.com/ (publication number AAT 3142857; accessed August 8, 2007).	1. Pattama Shimpalee, "The Contribution of Economic and Institutional Factors to Currency Crises: Additional Evidence from Asia, Europe and the Western Hemisphere," (Ph.D. diss., University of South Carolina, 2004), 31-33 In ProQuest Digital Dissertations [database on-line]; available from http://www.proquest.com/ (publication number AAT 3142857; accessed August 8, 2007).
Electronic book	Hüfner, Stefan. (Ed.). *Very high resolution photoelectron spectroscopy*. New York: Springer, 2007. http://www.springerlink.com/ (accessed May 12, 2008).	4. Stefan Hüfner, *Very high resolution photoelectron spectroscopy*. New York: Springer, 2007, 50-51, http://www.springerlink.com/ (accessed May 12, 2008).
Newspaper online and library database	Basken, Paul. "Nonprofit Lenders, While Helping Students, Help Themselves." *The Chronicle*, August 10, 2007. http://chronicle.com/weekly/v53/i49/49a01401.htm (accessed August 8, 2007). **{online}**	9. Paul Basken, "Nonprofit Lenders, While Helping Students, Help Themselves," The Chronicle, August 10, 2007, http://chronicle.com/weekly/v53/i49/49a01401.htm (accessed August 8, 2007).
	Hoge, Warren. "Diana, Princess of Wales, 36, Dies in a Crash in Paris: The end of a storybook life that veered from glamor to scandal and, finally, to divorce.." *New York Times*, August 31, 1997, http://www.proquest.com/ (accessed August 8, 2007).**{library database}**	3. Warren Hoge, "Diana, Princess of Wales, 36, Dies in a Crash in Paris: The end of a storybook life that veered from glamor to scandal and, finally, to divorce.." *New York Times*, August 31, 1997, http://www.proquest.com/ (accessed August 8, 2007).
Webpage	American Memory, Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers Project 1936-1938. "Voices and Faces from the Collection 'Sarah Gudger, Age 121'." Library of Congress, http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/snhtml/snvoices03.html (accessed May 12, 2008).	12. American Memory, Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers Project 1936-1938. "Voices and Faces from the Collection 'Sarah Gudger, Age 121'." Library of Congress, http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/snhtml/snvoices03.html (accessed May 12, 2008).

Chicago Manual of Style Guide for Bibliographies and Notes (Print sources)

Updated by JG 08/09

The examples herein are based on the Chicago Manual of Style 15th edition. For additional examples consult the manual available at the Reference Desk or the Chicago Manual of Style web site at http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools.html .

Type of Resource	Bibliography	Note Form
Article from a journal	Mcmillen, Sally G. "Antebellum Southern Fathers and the Health Care of Children." *Journal of Southern History* 60, no. 3 (1994): 513-32.	24. Sally G. McMillen, "Antebellum Southern Fathers and the Health Care of Children." *Journal of Southern History* 60, no. 3 (1994): 513-32.
Article from a newspaper	Morgenson, Gretchen. "Applying a Discount to Good Earnings News," Market Watch, *New York Times*, sec. 3, April 23, 2000.	30. Gretchen Morgenson, "Applying a Discount to Good Earnings News," *New York Times*, sec.3, April 23, 2000.
Book - single author	Rushdie, Salman. *The Ground beneath Her Feet*. New York: Henry Holt, 1999.	1. Salman Rushdie, *The Ground beneath Her Feet* (New York: Henry Holt, 1999), 24.
Book - two authors	Harnack, Andrew, and Eugene Kleppinger. *Online! A Reference Guide to Using Internet Sources*. 3rd ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.	4. Andrew Harnack and Eugene Kleppinger, *Online! A Reference Guide to Using Internet Sources* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000).
Book - edited no author	Soltes, Ori Z., ed. *Georgia: Art and Civilization through the Ages*. London: Philip Wilson, 1999.	9. Ori Z. Soltes, ed., *Georgia: Art and Civilization through the Ages* (London: Phillip Wilson, 1999), 280.
Book – organization, association, or corporation as author	University of Chicago Press. *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.	12. University of Chicago Press, *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th ed (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 100-101.
Chapter or other titled parts of a book	Asbrook, James B., and Carol Rausch Albright. "The Frontal Lobes, Intending, and Purposeful God." Chap. 7 In *The Humanizing Brain*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1997.	17. James B. Asbrook and Carol Rausch Albright, "The Frontal Lobes, Intending, and Purposeful God," in *The Humanizing Brain* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 1997), 20-30.
Dissertations & theses	Remedios, Richard E. "Defining my Process: My Journey Through the MFA Acting Program at the University of South Carolina." Master's thesis, University of South Carolina, 2007.	3. Richard e. Remedios, "Defining my Process: My Journey Through the MFA Acting Program at the University of South Carolina." (master's thesis, University of South Carolina, 2007), 35.

Bibliography

Abram, David. "The Consequences of Literacy: Reflections in the Shadow of Plato's *Phaedrus*." State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1986. Typescript.

———. "The Perceptual Implications of Gaia." *Ecologist* 15 (1985): 96–103.

Aries, Phillippe. *The Hour of Our Death*. Translated by Helen Weaver. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981.

Aristotle. *The Basic Works of Aristotle*. Edited by Richard McKeon. New York: Random House, 1941.

———. "De Partibus Animalium." In *The Works of Aristotle*. Edited by J. A. Smith and W. D. Ross. London: Oxford University Press, 1912.

Augustine. *City of God*. Edited by David Knowles. Translated by Henry Bettenson. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972.

Bakan, David. *Disease, Pain and Sacrifice*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

Barker, Francis. *The Tremulous Private Body*. London: Methuen, 1984.

Baron, Richard J. "An Introduction to Medical Phenomenology: I Can't Hear You While I'm Listening." *Annals of Internal Medicine* 103 (1985): 606–11.

Basmajian, John V., ed. *Biofeedback: Principles and Practice for Clinicians*. 3d ed. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1989.

Berg, J. H. van den. "The Human Body and the Significance of Human Movement." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 13 (1952): 159–83.

———. *The Psychology of the Sickbed*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1966.

Berry, Donald L. *Mutuality: The Vision of Martin Buber*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985.

Blacking, John, ed. *The Anthropology of the Body*. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Blom, John J. *Descartes: His Moral Philosophy and Psychology*. New York: New York University Press, 1978.

Bordo, Susan. "Anorexia Nervosa: Psychopathology as the Crystallization of Culture." *Philosophical Forum* 17 (1985–86): 73–104.

Borgmann, Albert. *Technology and the Character of Contemporary Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Brener, Jasper. "Sensory and Perceptual Determinants of Voluntary Visceral Control." In *Biofeedback: Theory and Research*. Edited by Gary E. Schwartz and Jackson Beatty. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Brentano, Franz. *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*. Edited by Oskar Kraus. Translated by Antos C. Rancurello, D. B. Terrell, and Linda L. McAlister. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

FIGURE 14.8. The first page of a bibliography for a book. See 14.57.

the Advancement of Science in 1874 Stoney had already suggested that "[n]ature presents us in the phenomenon of electrolysis, with a single definite quantity of electricity which is independent of the particular bodies acted on."[2] In 1891 he proposed, "[I]t will be convenient to call [these elementary charges] *electrons*."[3] Stoney's electrons were permanently attached to atoms; that is, they could "not be removed from the atom," and each of them was "associated in the chemical atom with each bond." Furthermore, their oscillation within molecules gave rise to "electro-magnetic stresses in the surrounding aether."[4]

Even though Stoney coined the term "electron," the representation associated with that term had several ancestors.[5] Key aspects of that representation, most notably the notion of the atomicity of charge, considerably preceded his proposal. In the period between 1838 and 1851 a British natural philosopher, Richard Laming, conjectured "the existence of sub-atomic, unit-charged particles and pictured the atom as made up of a material core surrounded by an 'electrosphere' of concentric shells of electrical particles."[6] On the Continent several physicists had made similar suggestions. Those physicists attempted to explain electromagnetic phenomena by action-at-a-distance forces between electrical particles. As an example of the Continental approach to electrodynamics consider Wilhelm Weber's electrical theory of matter and ether.[7] Weber's theory originated in 1846 and continued to evolve till the time of his death (1891). According to the initial version of that theory, electricity consisted of two electrical fluids (positive and negative). The interactions of these fluids were governed by inverse square forces, which were functions of

---

the Electron (Dublin: Royal Dublin Society, 1993), 5–28. The introduction of a new term is an event that can be easily identified and, thus, provides a convenient starting point for a biographical narrative whose subject is the corresponding representation. The appearance of a new term also signals the birth of a novel concept, whose identity has not yet solidified. Thus, it is not surprising that in its subsequent development the concept may merge with other related concepts. As we will see below, this is what happened in the case of the electron.

2. Stoney's paper was first published in 1881. See G. J. Stoney, "On the Physical Units of Nature," *Scientific Proceedings of the Royal Dublin Society*, new series, 3 (1881–1883): 54.

3. Stoney, "On the Cause of Double Lines," 583.

4. Ibid.

5. Note that the biographical approach can also come to grips with the "prehistory" of the electron's representation.

6. Kragh, "Concept and Controversy: Jean Becquerel and the Positive Electron," *Centaurus*, 32 (1989): 205.

7. For an extended discussion of Weber's program see M. N. Wise, "German Concepts of Force, Energy, and the Electromagnetic Ether, 1845–1880," in *Conceptions of Ether: Studies in the History of Ether Theories, 1740–1900*, G. N. Cantor and M. J. S. Hodge (eds.) (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981), 269–307, esp. 276–83.

FIGURE 14.1. A page of text with footnotes; the first note is continued from the previous page (with a short rule above it). See 14.36.

general movement away from UN-led missions and the greater reliance on lead states, ad hoc coalitions, and regional bodies to lead military and civilian functions gave rise to a growing number of [war-oriented] NGOs and private military companies." Roland Paris, "International Machinery for Postwar Peace-Building: The Dilemmas of Coordination" (paper presented at PIPES Seminar, University of Chicago, May 2006).

24. See John W. Betlyon, "Afghan Archaeology on the Road to Recovery," *Daily Star,* October 12, 2004, 12.
25. Andrew Maykuth, "A Plea to Save Afghan Antiquities," *Philadelphia Inquirer,* May 3, 2006, http://www.philly.com/mld/philly/entertainment/14485199.htm.
26. Unwillingness to put one's life at risk was of course not limited to cultural heritage NGOs; according to Michael R. Gordon and Gen. Bernard E. Trainor, "The State Department disaster relief team did not want to venture into areas of Iraq that were still contested by Saddam's supporters." See Gordon and Trainor, *Cobra II: The Inside Story of the Invasion and Occupation of Iraq* (New York: Pantheon, 2006), 154.
27. For a discussion of the history of UNESCO's cultural heritage protection efforts, see Mounir Bouchenaki, "UNESCO and the Safeguarding of Cultural Heritage in Postconflict Situations," in *Antiquities under Siege,* ed. Rothfield, 207–18.

CHAPTER THREE

1. James Fallows, "Blind into Baghdad," *Atlantic Monthly,* January/February 2004, 58, http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200401/fallows.
2. See Michael R. Gordon and Gen. Bernard E. Trainor, *Cobra II: The Inside Story of the Invasion and Occupation of Iraq* (New York: Pantheon, 2006), 106.
3. See ibid.
4. Ibid., 108.
5. Ibid., 107.
6. See Thomas E. Ricks, *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq* (New York: Penguin, 2006), 79–80.
7. Gordon and Trainor, *Cobra II,* 205.
8. For more on the Civil Affairs mission, see http://www.armyreserve.army.mil/ARMYDRU/USACAPOC/Overview.htm.
9. Maj. Christopher Varhola (Civil Affairs officer), interviewed by the author, April 15, 2005.
10. McGuire Gibson, interviewed by the author, February 9, 2006.
11. Varhola interview.
12. Ibid.
13. George Packer, "War after the War," *New Yorker,* November 24, 2003, 62.
14. The humanitarian group was one of four set up by Rice following a contentious Senate Committee on Foreign Relations hearing in August, where

FIGURE 14.2. A page of endnotes, with a subhead introducing the notes to a new chapter and a running head showing the text pages on which the notes are referenced. See 14.41, 14.42.

Margaret Hudson, “Planning for a Healthy and Sustainable Food System: Supplying New York City Bodegas Through Urban Agriculture.” Submitted May 2010. Advisor: Dr. Robert Beauregard.

This thesis contributes to the growing planning effort to address food insecurity in New York City. It examines the potential for bodegas to provide the city’s “food deserts” with greater access to fresh, local produce. Based on interviews of bodega owners, urban agriculture operators, and food policy experts, this thesis identifies the main opportunities and constraints for collaboration between urban farmers and bodega owners. It is determined that many bodegas currently lack the resources and infrastructure needed to stock fresh produce, and that owners often perceive a lack of demand for healthy foods.

Furthermore, while the urban agriculture movement is growing, it is not yet mature nor organized enough to effectively supply bodegas with produce. This thesis concludes that in their efforts to address food insecurity, city agencies should focus on developing formal networks of bodega owners and urban farmers for sharing information, increasing access to funding, and facilitating community outreach.

IRB Guidelines

Human Research conducted by Columbia investigators, whether in the U.S. or in foreign countries remains under University purview, applicable federal regulations, and institutional guidelines. Human subjects in foreign countries merit the same level of protection as subjects in the United States; acceptable practices may vary from place to place. Different mores, traditions, and institutions may require different research procedures, particularly in informed consent, recruitment practices, and documentation.

The IRB must ensure that adequate knowledge of the local research context is documented for the review of the proposed international research. The route by which knowledge of the local context will be obtained is dependent, in part, on the level of risk presented by study procedures, and the characteristics of the foreign site. Such knowledge may be obtained from a foreign ethics review board, an agency of the federal government, other sources within the foreign country, consultants, or a local expert.

Please read through the following pages for additional information about the IRB Process and review the IRB 101 Human Subjects Research presentation which is available online: http://www.arch.columbia.edu/programs/historic-preservation/thesis

March 16, 2012

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD GUIDANCE STUDENTS AS RESEARCHERS

I. SCOPE:

This Guidance applies to all research involving humans conducted by students at Columbia University ("Columbia") and provides supplemental information to the "Students as Researchers" Policy to facilitate human research conducted by students. This guidance provides practical information that will facilitate the submission of student research proposals to the Columbia Institutional Review Board (IRB).

II. EFFECTIVE DATE:

III. BACKGROUND:

Recognizing the time constraints imposed on student research projects that must be started and completed within a single semester, the IRB will make every effort to work with faculty and students to process proposals promptly. However, instructors must plan for and allow adequate time for the review process. The amount of time required for IRB review is dependent on the particular human subject issues raised by the proposed research and the completeness (i.e., quality and inclusion of appropriate details to allow for regulatory determinations) of the protocol that is submitted. The later in the term a proposal is received, the more difficult it will be to accomplish the review in time for the project to be completed during the current semester. It is strongly recommended that proposals be submitted to the IRB within the first three weeks of the semester for projects that must be completed during the same semester.

The Columbia IRB has created a simplified IRB submission process for students to help address the above mentioned challenges.

IV. Selection of Topic to be Investigated

Students engaged in the process of learning research techniques understandably want to focus on compelling or real-life issues. In the process of reviewing student research, however, the IRB has found topics and proposed studies that raise concerns for the well-being of the subjects and students themselves. Projects collecting data about illegal activities, those which could cause emotional distress in the subjects, those which would place the subjects at risk if confidentiality were breached, and those with children as subjects are some examples of projects that need to be constructed with special care.

Policies and guidance that may provide insights for addressing special considerations during development of a protocol are available on the IRB websites. IRB staff members are available

for consultation and can provide guidance in constructing a protocol that involves sensitive issues so that human subject protection requirements may be met; however, protocols that include the afore-mentioned elements may require additional review time.

A. Research with Protected Health Information
There are federal regulations (i.e., HIPAA) and institutional policies that govern the access or use of protected health information (PHI; e.g., identifiable medical records/information or biological samples). Any research using PHI needs IRB approval.

B. International Research
If the research will be conducted in another country, the student and IRB must consider additional issues before approval can be granted. The student should review the International Research sections (both Submission Materials and Review of Research Involving International Sites) of the IRB Standard Operating Procedures at: http://www.cumc.columbia.edu/dept/irb/policies/index.html.

The IRB will also need more time to acquire and confirm information about the local setting, such as local norms/customs, laws, and possibly obtain approval from a local ethics committee and/or institution. The IRB encourages students and faculty members to consult with the IRB staff while they are designing an international research study.

The Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP; in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services) provides a registry of laws and standards pertaining to the ethical conduct of human research in many foreign countries. The registry can be found at: *http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/index.html*.

C. Research with Other Institutions
Any research with another institution requires the approval of appropriate officials within that institution and their IRB/ethics committee, if applicable. Such approvals should be obtained and submitted to the Columbia IRB. Researchers may consult with the Columbia IRB regarding necessary approvals.

D. Research in the New York City Public School System
Any research activity involving humans (including activities not covered by Regulations) conducted in the New York City Public School system will require review by the Columbia IRB and the New York City Department of Education IRB.

V. Submission of a Research Study for IRB Review

The IRB receives applications for review via an electronic web-based system called RASCAL. The Columbia IRB has introduced a new abbreviated submission process for research conducted by students. Some RASCAL fields that provide necessary information for IRB review or tracking of protocols will still need to be completed. However, many fields in the RASCAL IRB module will not be need to be completed for research conducted by students. Therefore, students should rely on this guidance, rather than the Instructions and Help Screens in RASCAL for the preparation of their submission.

The rationale for implementation of this abbreviated submission process is that the Columbia IRB recognizes that students have a limited time to prepare and conduct their research study and are generally not familiar with the RASCAL IRB module. As a result, the Columbia IRB provides a process that will facilitate the submission and review of student research proposals by the IRB. The Columbia IRB provides template consent language on its websites that should be relied upon for drafting informed consent documents.

Abbreviated Submission Process in the RASCAL IRB Module for Research Conducted by Students

A. General Information screen: Complete all fields.

B. Personnel screen: Add all individuals who will be involved in the conduct of the study. The qualifications of the Principal Investigator must be consistent with the institutional requirements. The student(s) who will conduct the research should be listed as "Student" in the Study Personnel section in RASCAL (this is done by selecting "Student" on the drop-down list for "Role").

C. Research screen:
   1. Enter Research Questions/Hypothesis(es);
   2. Enter Scientific Abstract;
   3. Enter Lay Abstract;
   4. Study Description field: Enter the following statements:
      -"This is a study that will be conducted by a student(s) *[provide the name(s) of the student(s)]*. Please see the attached protocol for scientific and procedural details." Elements described in item J below that are not in the separate protocol (description of the project) should also be added to the Study Description.

D. Funding screen: Complete all fields.

E Location screen: Complete all fields.

F. Subjects screen: Complete all fields (i.e., # and demographics of subjects to be enrolled). In the Subjects Justification field, state the total number to be accrued for the study and the number of sites. If the research involves the request for a waiver of documentation of consent or a waiver of consent, justification should be provided in the 'Consent Form Waiver/Alteration Request' field.

G. Child Involvement screens: Complete, if children are included among subjects.

H. Human Specimen screen: Complete, if biological samples will be involved.

I. Complete and attach any applicable Hazmat appendices, if applicable.

J. Attach protocol that includes the following information:
   1. Hypothesis and summary of abstract;

2. Research Methodology/Research Procedures;
3. Identification of specific data that will be collected;
4. Description of how data will be identified (e.g., identifiable, coded, de-identified, anonymous; see IRB Terminology Related to Tissue or Data Collection), maintained and stored (paper, electronic, audio-tape, video, other), and plans for maintaining confidentiality of identifiable data;
5. Plans for monitoring data and safety, if applicable;
6. Description procedures for recruitment of subjects (e.g., in person, letter, phone call, access to their information) and what recruitment materials will be used (e.g., flyers, letters, etc.);
7. Description of the informed consent process.

K. Attach applicable consent documents, e.g., consent, assent, parent permission forms, and information sheets. The Columbia IRB recommends that informed consent documents are created using the RASCAL "Consent Form Builder" as this tool provides IRB-approved consent statements.

L. Complete and attach any applicable HIPAA forms. The Columbia IRB requires that researchers utilize the HIPAA Module in RASCAL to create HIPAA forms, if Protected Health Information will be collected during the study.

M. Attach all study instruments and supporting documents:
1. recruitment flyers, website or print advertisements;
2. questionnaires, surveys, and/or interview guides;
3. any required approvals from other institutions, IRBs, or ethics committees.

Columbia IRB Websites

CU-MS IRB: http://www.columbia.edu/cu/irb/

CUMC IRB: http://www.cumc.columbia.edu/dept/irb/

Appendix A: **45 CFR 46.101(b) Categories of Exempt Research**

(b) Unless otherwise required by Department or Agency heads, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from this policy:[1]

(1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:

(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
(ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

(3) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, if:

(i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or
(ii) Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

(5) Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of Department or Agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine:

(i) Public benefit or service programs;
(ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs;
(iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or
(iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

(6) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies,

(i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or
(ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[1] Institutions with HHS-approved assurances on file will abide by provisions of Title 45 CFR part 46 subparts A-D. Some of the other departments and agencies have incorporated all provisions of Title 45 CFR part 46 into their policies and procedures as well. However, the exemptions at 45 CFR 46.101(b) do not apply to research involving prisoners, subpart C. The exemption at 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2), for research involving survey or interview procedures or observation of public behavior, does not apply to research with children, subpart D, except for research involving observations of public behavior when the investigator(s) do not participate in the activities being observed.

Appendix B: **Categories of Research That May Be Reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) through an Expedited Review Procedure**[1]

Applicability

(A) Research activities that (1) present no more than minimal risk to human subjects, and (2) involve only procedures listed in one or more of the following categories, may be reviewed by the IRB through the expedited review procedure authorized by 45 CFR 46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110. The activities listed should not be deemed to be of minimal risk simply because they are included on this list. Inclusion on this list merely means that the activity is eligible for review through the expedited review procedure when the specific circumstances of the proposed research involve no more than minimal risk to human subjects.

(B) The categories in this list apply regardless of the age of subjects, except as noted.

(C) The expedited review procedure may not be used where identification of the subjects and/or their responses would reasonably place them at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects= financial standing, employability, insurability, reputation, or be stigmatizing, unless reasonable and appropriate protections will be implemented so that risks related to invasion of privacy and breach of confidentiality are no greater than minimal.

(D) The expedited review procedure may not be used for classified research involving human subjects.

(E) IRBs are reminded that the standard requirements for informed consent (or its waiver, alteration, or exception) apply regardless of the type of review--expedited or convened--utilized by the IRB.

(F) Categories one (1) through seven (7) pertain to both initial and continuing IRB review.

Research Categories

(1) Clinical studies of drugs and medical devices only when condition (a) or (b) is met.

(a) Research on drugs for which an investigational new drug application (21 CFR Part 312) is not required. (Note: Research on marketed drugs that significantly increases the risks or decreases the acceptability of the risks associated with the use of the product is not eligible for expedited review.)

(b) Research on medical devices for which (i) an investigational device exemption application (21 CFR Part 812) is not required; or (ii) the medical device is cleared/approved for marketing and the medical device is being used in accordance with its cleared/approved labeling.

(2) Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture as follows:

(a) from healthy, nonpregnant adults who weigh at least 110 pounds. For these subjects, the amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week; or

(b) from other adults and children[2], considering the age, weight, and health of the subjects, the collection procedure, the amount of blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these subjects, the amount drawn may not exceed the lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.

(3) Prospective collection of biological specimens for research purposes by noninvasive means.

Examples: (a) hair and nail clippings in a nondisfiguring manner;
(b) deciduous teeth at time of exfoliation or if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (c) permanent teeth if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction;
(d) excreta and external secretions (including sweat);
(e) uncannulated saliva collected either in an unstimulated fashion or stimulated by chewing gumbase or wax or by applying a dilute citric solution to the tongue;
(f) placenta removed at delivery;
(g) amniotic fluid obtained at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor;
(h) supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the collection procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques;
(i) mucosal and skin cells collected by buccal scraping or swab, skin swab, or mouth washings;
(j) sputum collected after saline mist nebulization.

(4) Collection of data through noninvasive procedures (not involving general anesthesia or sedation) routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves. Where medical devices are employed, they must be cleared/approved for marketing. (Studies intended to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the medical device are not generally eligible for expedited review, including studies of cleared medical devices for new indications.)

Examples:
(a) physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subject=s privacy;
(b) weighing or testing sensory acuity;
(c) magnetic resonance imaging;
(d) electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, electroretinography, ultrasound, diagnostic infrared imaging, doppler blood flow, and echocardiography;

(e) moderate exercise, muscular strength testing, body composition assessment, and flexibility testing where appropriate given the age, weight, and health of the individual.

(5) Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for nonresearch purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis). (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

(6) Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) and (b)(3). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

(8) Continuing review of research previously approved by the convened IRB as follows:

(a) where (i) the research is permanently closed to the enrollment of new subjects; (ii) all subjects have completed all research-related interventions; and (iii) the research remains active only for long-term follow-up of subjects; or

(b) where no subjects have been enrolled and no additional risks have been identified; or

(c) where the remaining research activities are limited to data analysis.

(9) Continuing review of research, not conducted under an investigational new drug application or investigational device exemption where categories two (2) through eight (8) do not apply but the IRB has determined and documented at a convened meeting that the research involves no greater than minimal risk and no additional risks have been identified.

---

[1] An expedited review procedure consists of a review of research involving human subjects by the IRB chairperson or by one or more experienced reviewers designated by the chairperson from among members of the IRB in accordance with the requirements set forth in 45 CFR 46.110.

[2] Children are defined in the HHS regulations as "persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted." 45 CFR 46.402(a).

Standard Social/Behavior Science Format

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT
[Title of Study]

Investigator: , Department

Telephone:

Investigators' statement

We are asking you to be in a research study [Sponsored by...]. The purpose of this consent form is to give you the information you will need to help you decide whether or not to be in the study. Please read the form carefully. You may ask questions about the purpose of the research, what we would ask you to do, the possible risks and benefits, your rights as a volunteer, and anything else about the research or this form that is not clear. When all your questions have been answered, you can decide if you want to be in the study or not. This process is called 'informed consent.'

PURPOSE

[State that this is a research activity. Describe the purpose of the activity.]

BENEFITS

[Describe the expected benefits to individual subjects and/or society. If there are no personal benefits, so state.]

PROCEDURES

[Describe the procedures involved. Include the commitment of time for each, the total amount of time involved, and how long the study will last. As appropriate, specify size of samples to be taken and names and doses of substances to be given. Describe questionnaires and interviews and describe or provide examples of the most personal and sensitive questions. State that subjects may refuse to answer any question or item in any test, inventory, questionnaire, or interview. Include the use of medical, academic, or other records, photographs, audio or visual recordings.]

RISKS, STRESS, OR DISCOMFORT

[Include information on the risks, including side effects, stress, discomforts, or the invasion of privacy which might result from each procedure.]

OTHER INFORMATION

[State whether data will be confidential (linked to identifiers) or anonymous (no links). If data will be linked to identifiers, please state who will have access to identifiable data. Describe how the data will be used and how long they will be retained. State that subjects may refuse to participate or may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled. Include a description of inducements (money, service, course credit) subjects may receive for participation.]

PARTICIPATION

Participation in research is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw from participation at any time without jeopardizing your employment, student status or any other entitlements. The investigator may withdraw you at his/her professional discretion.

ALTERNATIVES TO PARTICIPATION

Generally there are no alternatives to participation in social and behavioral sciences research other than choosing not to participate, as most of the research is non-therapeutic in nature. If, however, the study involves an experimental treatment or therapy or program for which there are standard therapies, treatments or programs, these should be noted here with contact information so that participants are aware of these options. If no alternatives other than non participation are available to participants, this should be stated here.

PRIVATE INFORMATION

Any information derived from this research project that personally identifies you will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without your separate consent, except as specifically required by law.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If at any time you have questions regarding the research or your participation, you should contact the investigator, name, who will answer all questions. His/Her telephone number is (xxx) xxx-xxxx. You should also contact the investigator or a member of the research staff if you have any concerns or complaints about the research.

If at any time you have comments regarding the conduct of this research or questions about your rights as a research participant, you should contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Administrator at (212) 851-7040.

PARTICIPANT'S STATEMENT

I have read the above purpose of the study, and understand my role in participating in the research. I volunteer to take part in this research. I have had a chance to ask questions. If I have questions later, about the research, I can ask the investigator listed above. I understand that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from participation at any time without jeopardizing my employment, student status or other rights to which I am entitled. The investigator may withdraw me at his/her professional discretion. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I can call the Institutional Review Board office at (212) 851-7040. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older and freely give my consent to participate in this study. I will receive a copy of this document for my records.

Subject's signature/consent: _____ Date: _____

Name: _____

INVESTIGATOR'S STATEMENT

I have discussed the proposed research with this participant, and in my opinion, the participant understands the benefits, risks and alternatives (including non-participation) and is capable of freely consenting to participate in the research.

Signature _____ Date: _____
Member of the Research Team

Print Name: _____

Sample Children's Assent Form

We are doing a study to try to learn about people who tell the truth and people who lie. We are asking you to help because we don't know very much about whether kids your age expect people to lie or tell the truth. If you agree to be in our study, we are going to ask you some questions about people. We will want to know if you think they usually tell the truth or if they usually lie. For example, you will be asked if a politician, teacher, parent, or other people usually lie or tell the truth.

You can ask questions at any time that you might have about this study. Also, if you decide at any time not to finish, you may stop whenever you want. Remember that these questions are only about what you think. There are no right or wrong answers because this is not a test.

Signing this paper means that you have read this or had it read to you and that you want to be in the study. If you don't want to be in the study, don't sign the paper. Remember, being in the study is up to you, and no one will be mad if you don't sign this paper or even if you change your mind later.

Signature of Participant _____ Date _____

Signature of Investigator _____ Date _____

EXEMPT RESEARCH

Federal regulations for the protection of human subjects in research (DHHS 45 CFR 46) require prospective IRB review and approval of activities that involve both "research" and "human subjects" as defined in the regulations, as well as monitoring and other oversight responsibilities.

However, the regulations include a provision (45 CFR 46.101(b)) whereby research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from the requirements of the regulations.

The exemption categories do not apply to all research with human subjects. Please see questions and answers which follow the table below.

Category **1** 45 CRF 46.101(b)(1)	Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
Category **2** 45 CRF 46.101(b)(2)	Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation. Note: Except for observation of public behavior, this category does not apply to research that involves children.
Category **3** 45 CRF 46.101(b)(3)	Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, if: (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.
Category **4** 45 CRF 46.101(b)(4)	Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

Category **5** 45 CRF 46.101(b)(5)	Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) Public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.
Category **6** 45 CRF 46.101(b)(6)	Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Question: Are the exemptions different for research involving children?

Answer: One of the six exemptions of research involving human subjects is narrowed in scope by Subpart D's additional protections for research involving children. The other five exemptions apply to research involving children as human subjects in the same way that they apply to research involving adults.

The narrowed exemption is the exemption at 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2), which generally applies to research involving educational tests, interviews or survey procedures or observation of public behavior, if the data are recorded without individual identifiers, or if disclosure of the recorded responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to their financial standing, employability, or reputation. Where children will be involved as research subjects, however, the use of survey or interview procedures is eliminated from this exemption, and so is research involving the observation of public behavior if the investigators participate in the activity being observed.

In other words, the only research activities involving children that may fall under this exemption are those involving observation of public behavior where the investigators do not participate in the activity being observed. To be exempt, these activities must also meet the condition that the data are recorded without individual identifiers, or the condition that disclosure of the recorded responses would not place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to their financial standing, employability, or reputation. Otherwise, all the requirements of the human subjects regulations apply.

Question: Are the exemptions different for research involving prisoners?

Answer: The exemptions are not applicable to research that involves prisoners.

Morningside IRB

"Open Office Hours"

Do you need to submit your research to the IRB?

Are you planning to do Human Subjects research? Are you advising students who are? Are you conducting interviews, focus groups or surveys? Will you conduct surveys on Survey Monkey or Mechanical Turk? Will you be obtaining data sets with individually identifiable data?

Are you confused about what to write in your proposal?

Stop by the Morningside IRB Office on Wednesday's for advice on submitting a protocol

When: Any Wednesday

Where: Studebaker Building*
615 West 131st Street, 3rd Floor
(Entrance temporarily moved to 622 W. 132nd St.)

Time: 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

*Alternatively, an appointment may be scheduled by calling 212-851-7040.

Everyone engaged in human subjects research must successfully complete TC0087 - Human Subjects Protection Training found on the Rascal Web site at: https://www.rascal.columbia.edu/login/tc0087/

PLEASE NOTE: NO HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING RECRUITMENT, MAY BEGIN UNTIL IRB REVIEW AND APPROVAL HAS BEEN OBTAINED.

International Research & Local Context Information

INTRODUCTION:

Human Research conducted by Columbia investigators, whether in the U.S. or in foreign countries remains under University purview, applicable federal regulations, and institutional guidelines. Human subjects in foreign countries merit the same level of protection as subjects in the United States; acceptable practices may vary from place to place. Different mores, traditions, and institutions may require different research procedures, particularly in informed consent, recruitment practices, and documentation.

The IRB must ensure that adequate knowledge of the local research context is documented for the review of the proposed international research. The route by which knowledge of the local context will be obtained is dependent, in part, on the level of risk presented by study procedures, and the characteristics of the foreign site. Such knowledge may be obtained from a foreign ethics review board, an agency of the federal government, other sources within the foreign country, consultants, or a local expert.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

1. Local Expert/Local Ethics Board: In order for the IRB to determine the risk level and appropriateness of the study with respect to local laws, regulations, cultural, social and political context, the IRB requires documentation of the appropriateness of the protocol from either a local ethics board or, for minimal risk protocols, from a local expert. The local expert must be experienced and knowledgeable about the local laws, regulations and customs in the locale in which the study is conducted. Please attach documentation of either local ethics board approval or local context from someone, who is unaffiliated with the research, which addresses each of the bulleted items below. The local expert must sign the local context document or, if it was received by email, a copy of the email with the email header must be attached to the protocol. Depending on the risk of the study and the characteristics of the foreign site, the IRB may request additional documentation of the local research context.

- Describe the qualifications of the individual (local expert) providing the local context information. Please note: the local expert should be someone who is unaffiliated with the research and has experience and expertise in the research location and field of research being conducted. Provide context of cultural, social and political norms and differences with U.S. culture with respect to research autonomy, consent, recruitment, etc. Include an explanation of what cultural sensitivities will be required to conduct this study; i.e., consider current events (attach additional documentation if necessary).
- Provide a statement addressing the appropriateness of the research methods and the adequacy of the procedures to protect the privacy of subjects and confidentiality of the data, especially if the information collected is sensitive in nature.

- Where appropriate, please provide letter(s) authorizing the conduct of the research at any international institution or organization, if applicable.
- Investigators may also be asked to obtain permission from community leaders (if applicable), especially if the local culture requires community leaders approval.

2. In addition, please include the knowledge/experience of the investigator(s) by addressing all of the bulleted items below:

- Please describe (in the study description) what, if any, knowledge or experience the researcher(s) possess(es) regarding the language and culture of the location where the research is being conducted. Does the researcher have knowledge of local community attitudes to address cultural norms while remaining in compliance with U.S. regulations for research?
- Please clarify if the researcher speaks/reads/writes the language of the potential subjects. If not, explain provisions for recruiting and consenting subjects as well as how the data will be collected.
- In the study description, please provide a statement that consent documents will be translated after the English version is approved if the study population is expected to include non-English speaking individuals.

3. Please identify any local/unaffiliated individuals, if any, who will participate in conducting the research, and describe their roles. If these individuals do not have IRB Review from their affiliated institutions, the Executive Director of the CU IRB must review the study and, for minimal risk research, agree to cover any unaffiliated members of the study team, before they can participate in any research related activities.

4. Local IRB/Ethics committee review or country approval may also be required depending on the risk level of the study. Some countries specifically require local ethics board review or approval from a government agency and have their own policies on human subjects research. In some cases, particularly for studies greater than minimal risk, the IRB may also request that a local IRB review and approval be obtained for the country in which the study takes place by an IRB/Ethics Committee.

   Please consult the International Compilation of Human Research Protections 2012, Edition; compiled by Office of Human Research Protections, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services found at: http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/intlcompilation/intlcompilation.html. This website gives specific information on the research requirements of a number of countries. It should be consulted before other arrangements are made. If in-country approval is required, please attach documentation of approval or describe how such will be obtained and submitted to the IRB via modification. Research activities should not begin until such required approvals are obtained and submitted and approved by the CU IRB