

10-28-2005

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 18, 2005

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 18, 2005" (2005). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 107.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps/107](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/107)

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](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

Professional Standards Committee  
Approved Minutes from October 18, 2005  
12:30 pm Hauck 110

Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 1, 12:30 pm, Hauck 110

Introduction/Preliminaries

The meeting was convened at 12:30 pm in Hauck 110 by the chair, Nancy Decker. Faculty members present were: Gloria Cook, Steve Phelan, and Paul Stephenson. Associate Dean Hoyt Edge was also present.

Information

The PSC committee was presented with a revised copy of the IRB proposal, and a letter from Michael Gunter.

**1. Agenda Items**

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

The minutes of the 9/20/05 meeting were approved as amended.

II. Institutional Review Board: Proposal for the next A&S Faculty Meeting.

III. Request from Michael Gunther

IV. Report from Sandra Blosssey

V. Travel Policy

VI. C.I.E.

**2. New Business**

**A. Institutional Review Board (IRB):** N. Decker began the discussion by informing the committee that the IRB proposal had been submitted to the Executive committee and following their review it was passed to the Department Chairs Meeting and the recommendations of the Dept. Chairs was passed back to the Executive Committee. The IRB has been revised and three points regarding the rationale for establishing an IRB have been added. These are Ethical, Pedagogical, and Legal reasons for its establishment. N. Decker noted that having this rationale may help when presenting the IRB proposal to the faculty. She noted that it should be made clear that the IRB will not impinge on academic freedom in research but rather that it will ensure that the college can demonstrate that it has a responsible method for conducting research with human subjects. N. Decker asked for questions and comments on about the rationale.

H. Edge asked, whether the IRB was something that SACs required (or recommended)?

N. Decker replied that she would check into that.

G. Cook commented that a big issue will be who must go through IRB review.

N. Decker reminded the PSC that the Executive committee was to nominate a slate of people to serve on the initial IRB.

H. Edge asked, who will vote on the slate?

N. Decker replied that the Executive committee will put forward the slate and the faculty will vote on them-or vote on approval of the entire slate. The problem is that the initial slate must be composed of individuals qualified to serve and two students must also serve on the committee. Students can only serve for a year and will require training. Paul Harris has even suggested that students not be on the committee.

P. Stephenson asked if the college by-laws required that students serve on all standing committees.

H. Edge replied that was not the case.

N. Decker informed the PSC that she had been looking at websites of schools with established IRBs and that the composition of the IRBs and their procedures vary.

H. Edge noted that the faculty may say that they are being asked to vote on something that they don't fully understand because of terms such "might" in the third bulleted point under recommendations in the revised IRB document.

S. Phelan asked if the IRB also affected the Crummer School and thus would need representation from Crummer as well as Holt.

N. Decker replied that there will be a rotation of the board so that there is always a group of experienced individuals as well as a new representatives.

S. Phelan stated that this must all go to the faculty since this involves the establishment of a standing committee.

N. Decker stated that the IRB will initially be established in Fall 2005. That the initial board will return to the faculty in Oct. 2006 with more detailed recommendations about the organization and implementation of the IRB.

G. Cook asked if the PSC was expected to vote today on the changes to the IRB?

N. Decker replied no, that this meeting is to give the PSC a chance to examine the document one final time and discuss how to present it to the faculty.

H. Edge noted that the second bulleted item of the document should be revised to include the composition of the board.

S. Phelan asked if the course release time that was initially proposed for the chair of the IRB had been dropped.

N. Decker stated that the Executive Committee had recommended that course release time be withdrawn from the proposal because it could be viewed as a bone of contention at the faculty meeting.

S. Phelan replied that given the huge amount of work that the initial IRB committee will have to undertake, he thought it was a mistake to not include release time for the chair of the committee. He noted that it was too late to do anything about it at this point since the proposal would be presented to the faculty in two days.

N. Decker noted that if the IRB proposal was not brought to the faculty on Thursday, that it would have to wait until November and be presented at the same time as the honor code proposal. Having the two proposed simultaneously seemed to be poor timing. N. Decker said that she would put together a power point presentation for the meeting that contained the rationale and guiding principles behind establishing the IRB. She also noted that there are several faculty for whom establishment of an IRB is critical for their research, and that they would be present and support the IRB at the faculty meeting.

G. Cook asked for clarification of what the faculty would actually be voting upon. Discussion followed.

N. Decker summarized the discussion. The faculty will be voting on the following:

1. Establishment of the IRB
2. Approval of the initial slate of IRB members as nominated by the Executive Committee

3. After six months of operation the initial IRB board will return to the faculty with recommendations regarding staffing of the IRB, and its operation and guidelines. These will need to be voted upon by the faculty.

N. Decker noted her concern that the establishment of the IRB not be perceived as a “fait accompli” but as an ongoing process.

S. Phelan asked if whether the establishment of the IRB actually required a change in the By-Laws since it involved the creation of a new standing committee. If so, these changes will have to be made to allow the existence of the IRB.

**B. Request from Michael Gunther:** H. Edge stated that the request from Michael Gunter can, and would, be handled by the Dean of Faculty’s office.

**C. Report from Sandra Blossey:** The report from S. Blossey said that the UCF meeting was simply an initial organizational meeting and it was not necessary that a faculty member attend.

### **3. Old Business**

**A. CIE:** H. Edge presented a hard-copy of the new C.I.E. form for PSC to review. He hoped that it was a faithful reproduction of what’s online. The form needed immediate approval for printing and in order to confirm scanning time at UCF.

N. Decker asked how many students would be doing the CIE by hand?

H. Edge replied that the estimate was just under 1000 forms would be completed by students. He stated that 14-15 faculty members wanted to have their classes complete the CIE by hand. There may be students who fill out multiple forms because they happen to be in those classes. He noted that because we have to wait for UCF to scan the forms, and that won’t happen until after Christmas break, we won’t get back the quantitative data for these forms until January. The quantitative results will be available only to faculty. Qualitative results will be available to both faculty and the administration. This information should be available online.

The printed CIE form was approved by the PSC.

**B. Travel Policy:** H. Edge suggested that perhaps the travel policy issues should be considered by a sub-committee of the PSC prior to full review by the PSC.

N. Decker asked how quickly the Dean of Faculty needed a response.

H. Edge replied that the initial needs had already been addressed but that longer term changes needed to be addressed during this academic year. At issue was how would the policy change? Is the current policy adequate? With the limited resources at our disposal do we need to keep the current policy. He noted that the travel budget has doubled but that it will not continue to grow at a rate the keeps up with demand. Some items that should be considered are cut-backs in *per diem* amounts, funding “crunches”, and what priorities could/should be established for obtaining travel funds.

### **4. Adjourn** The meeting was adjourned (1:43 pm.)

Respectfully submitted,  
Paul Stephenson, Recording Secretary