

9-20-2005

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 20, 2005

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 20, 2005" (2005). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 106.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/106

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Professional Standards Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

Professional Standards Committee
Approved Minutes from September 20, 2005
12:30 pm Hauk 110

Next Meeting: Tuesday, September 28, 6:00 pm, Warden dining room for review of FYRST and Critchfield Grants

Introduction/Preliminaries

The meeting was convened at 12:30 pm in Hauk 110 by the chair, Nancy Decker. Faculty members present were: David Charles, Gloria Cook, Don Griffin, Steve Phelan, and Paul Stephenson. Student representative present was Tara Maley. Assistant Provost for Institutional research Jim Eck and Associate Dean Hoyt Edge were also present. also present.

Information:

We had the following handout.

--Rollins College Institutional Review Board: Guiding Principles

1. Agenda Items

I. Review and Approval of Minutes from Sep. 6, 2005

The minutes of the 9/6/05 meeting were approved after the following changes

- date of next meeting and meeting location was corrected
- names of the members of the selection committee for Cornell Scholars were added to section D.
- spelling corrected on under E, third line
- changed wording for accuracy, under F, line 6.

II. Institutional Review Board: visit with Jim Eck

III. Procedural wrap-up for course and instructor evaluation (CIE) form

IV. Travel Policy

2. New Business

A. Institutional Review Board (IRB): P. Harris and M. Hunt had worked on developing an Institutional Review Board for Rollins. J. Eck was in e-mail contact with them during the process. It was noted that the correspondence between H. Edge and P. Harris was *particularly eloquent* with regard to examples of IRB policies that were available online. In these communiqués H. Edge had raised questions regarding cross-cultural issues and institutional review board policies that may conflict. It was noted that there may be certain observational studies on human subjects that would be exempt from institutional review. The question was raised as to whether the PSC still endorses the guiding principles and recommendations stated in the IRB proposal. H. Edge replied that he still thought there was a need for an IRB, despite his concerns with cross-cultural problems that may arise. N. Decker observed that S. Carnahan had stated her research may be in jeopardy if Rollins does not have an IRB because her granting institutions require that a school have an IRB in order to conduct her style of research. D. Griffin asked whether or not the faculty had voted on the establishment of an IRB in a previous faculty meeting. H. Edge and N. Decker replied that S. Carnahan had presented the IRB proposal at a faculty meeting but that no vote had been taken. N. Decker stated that following its presentation to the faculty the IRB proposal had to go back to the PSC, then be passed to the Executive committee and finally return to the faculty for a vote. S. Phelan observed that his daughter has had experience with research that required IRB review both at Rollins and in other post graduate institutions and that these types of IRB systems must be capable of doing their job well, in order to ensure that they

meet the standards of the institution and meet external standards as well. N. Decker asked J. Eck to estimate how many proposals per year he thought the IRB would receive? J. Eck replied that the number could become quite large because there wouldn't be any proposal that would be exempt from IRB review if it involved responses from students and/or faculty at Rollins College. H. Edge noted that this was why he felt the faculty would object to establishing an IRB if every student questionnaire, or survey, needed to pass through the IRB. J. Eck replied that in terms of proposals that are historically typical survey type documents, these could be passed very quickly through an IRB with just the approval of the IRB president. Expedited reviews would also be quick (1 week). However, other proposals involving faculty research in which tissue samples (for example) are used, or students/faculty are actually quoted, these would have to be thoroughly reviewed. T. Maley raised a question regarding classes (such as quantitative reasoning) in which students have to do a study that involves taking surveys. Would they too need to pass IRB review? J. Eck replied that in such a situation there would need to be a faculty sponsor. D. Charles raised a question regarding online q&a or discussions using the BlackBoard Web-based instructional software. Would that be regulated too? J. Eck replied that it's an imperfect system. It's not possible to review every single event that occurs at the college. You have to evaluate what is a significant study that might require IRB review. D. Griffin stated that he was worried about the amount of proposals that the IRB would be presented with, if every class assignment that involved a survey needed to pass through the IRB. S. Phelan noted that the Psychology Department was teaching their students that when doing human studies one needs to go through an IRB. He remarked that it was a learning experience. For example, a professor teaching statistics must ensure they have developed a useful guide (survey) for their students to use for assignments. D. Griffin asked if every student would need to submit their own study proposal to the IRB, or could the professor of a course pre-read and pre-approve these student proposals. D. Charles asked if it would be helpful to have a visiting member of the IRB speak to classes about the IRB if they are planning an assignment that would require IRB approval. H. Edge stated that an issue arises in a situation like a Q course where the expertise of the professor is evaluating the "Q" topics not the types of survey questions developed by students. N. Decker noted that this can act as an educational experience as well. D. Griffin commented that he thought we needed to simplify and be able to minimize the number of proposals that will come to the IRB. G. Cook asked if it was possible to divide the IRB proposals into different projects (e.g. Faculty Research, Student class projects, etc.) She emphasized that there should be steps in the process that simplify and make submission clearer. J. Eck replied that there may be some research topics that need not be approved at all. There may be projects that require minimal approval and there may be projects that require a lot of detailed review. G. Cook asked if there were models from other schools. H. Edge replied Yes, there are many examples. D. Griffin commented that he thought we were overdoing it with having class assignments require IRB review. H. Edge replied that the most troubling surveys are the ones proposed by students. D. Charles noted that faculty members should be trained to ensure that surveys done by their classes are written within guidelines of the IRB. N. Decker said that it would be helpful to hear examples of problem studies. J. Eck replied that there was one example of a female student asking other female students if they had had abortions, and if they replied "yes" she was handing out a questionnaire. J. Eck noted that the administration put a stop to that immediately. D. Griffin asked if that was a faculty designed study. J. Eck replied no. H. Edge noted that he had run into similar faculty studies. J. Eck gave another example of a student proposal to study the taboo words for male and female genitalia. He said we did not approve that one either. The problem here was the idea that surveying a large number of students was not needed. T. Maley asked where does depression screening fit in? For example, National Depression Survey Week? Does this need IRB review? J. Eck replied that he would say yes. What if someone who is depressed takes the survey and then becomes more depressed? H. Edge said that these are all questions that will be addressed on the floor of the faculty meeting. We could make a recommendation in general approval of establishing an IRB but have the IRB make the process of review as reasonable as possible. D. Griffin noted that discussion at the faculty meeting may get bogged down. It may be hard to get the IRB approved. J. Eck replied that it was his hope that this plan will be viewed as a proposal for how an IRB should be structured. Then, after the IRB is approved and formed (staffed) the actual process by which proposals reviewed will then be established. D. Griffin stated that he thought this was a sound idea...to come to the faculty with the proposal of forming a new committee (the IRB). The second step is for the IRB to develop a procedure that will be approved by the faculty. D. Charles stated that he had no problem with the document. N. Decker stated that it would be helpful to the faculty at large to have the kinds of examples you've provided to show the faculty the need for an IRB in view of the kinds of studies that students may design. J. Eck stated that he thought D. Griffin was correct about the near impossibility of getting into every classroom and covering every class assignment to ensure IRB review. He stated that the IRB is really designed to deal with faculty and student research. N. Decker asked if J. Eck was anticipating that more professors, who normally assign student surveys, would switch to designing the studies themselves prior to assigning them to students? S. Phelan noted that the student handbook could contain a simple statement regarding surveys and the fact that surveys must be approved

with a stamp by the IRB (just as posters now require a stamp). J. Eck commented that he thought there was still a feeling among our faculty that Rollins does not need an IRB. If we agree that we need an IRB and we are comfortable with the seven bullet points then we can move forward. N. Decker asked- Are we at the point where we can vote up or down on the PSC view that we need an IRB? D. Griffin motioned that the PSC break the proposal down into four parts:

1. Approval of the IRB
2. Approval of bullet points
3. IRB formation as the 1st bullet under recommendations
4. The IRB will be charged with formulating policy as to how it will achieve its objectives. Then the IRB will bring that policy back to the faculty for approval.

N. Decker asked if the PSC agreed with this four step procedure? The PSC passed the measure unanimously.

3. Old Business

A. Procedural Wrap Up of CIE: N. Decker reported that P. Harris and M. Ruiz have agreed to assess the statistical significance of the CIE. N. Decker asked H. Edge if there was any information regarding using scantron to score the hard copy forms of the CIE. H. Edge replied yes, UCF will permit us to use scantron with these forms but Rollins CIR forms will not be scanned until after UCF has scanned their own forms. The scantron data can then, presumably, be added to the data gathered via the online CIE version. The data will be given to the faculty members for their courses. We're in good shape so long as there is no problem with production of the form. N. Decker asked, how is the online form coming? H. Edge replied that Katie Sanchez (at IT) says it will be online soon. N. Decker asked, if the PSC responsible for seeing if the CIE form works online properly? H. Edge replied no, that he would be checking that. N. Decker reminded the PSC that the second CIR committee will be in charge of how the CIE will be used in review. She asked, when will that committee need to start work? H. Edge answered, not until after the 1st CIE period. N. Decker noted that the second CIE committee will start in January 2006. D. Griffin commented that faculty needs to be given information about the CIRE and be ready for it. N. Decker asked H. Edge if his office would handle that? H. Edge replied yes. H. Edge reminded the committee that our next meeting would be held Sep. 28 in the evening at the Warden dining room to review FYRST and Critchfield grants. He asked if the PSC was to consider any applications received passed the deadline and noted that last year the PSC did not consider such applications. The PSC committee agreed that no applications received passed the deadline date would be considered.

4. Adjourn At this point meeting was adjourned (1:30 pm.)

Respectfully submitted,
Paul Stephenson, Recording Secretary