

9-29-2005

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 29, 2005

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 29, 2005" (2005). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 109.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/109](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/109)

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 Executive Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences**  
**September 29, 2005**

**Members attending:** L. Duncan, P. Lancaster, R. Casey, Mark Anderson, Pedro Bernal, Tom Cook, Nancy Decker, Patricia Lancaster, Dorothy Mays, Catlin McConnell, Rick Bommelje

**Guest:** Jim Eck

- I. Call to Order:** T. Cook called the meeting to order at 12:36 pm.
- II. Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the meeting of September 8, 2005, were approved
- III. Finance & Services Committee:** D. May reported that the F&SC would like to endorse the recommendations of the salary task force. FSC would like to publicize the recommendations by posting the proposal to the committee website, along with supporting data. FSC would also like to host one more colloquia on the issue. It is the desire that the committee will bring the final recommendations to the Executive committee as opposed to the taking them to the faculty for a vote. The original charge of F&SC was to study the faculty salary issue and make a recommendation. F&SC members have agreed that the recommendations represent a salary strategy and a not a policy. Additionally, members have acknowledged that some of the principles in the document have already been implemented, which is an indication that there is good faith on both sides. D. Mays asked if for input on the appropriate next step in the process. T. Cook asked for clarification on to whom the recommendation is ultimately directed and D. Mays indicated that it is those who set salaries. D. Mays shared that the principles that have been recommended are controversial (i.e. keep up with peer institutions, recognition of years of service, etc.). P. Lancaster asked if there was a specific formula being proposed. D. Mays stated that there are no specific dollar amounts identified in the recommendations. P. Lancaster asked if there was a principle of merit included and D. Mays confirmed that there is not mentioned. There was discussion about the recommendation that salaries be kept in line with inflation. D. Mays confirmed that the recommendation does include making regular adjustments. L. Duncan stated that in Law Schools, one of the accreditation criteria that the ABA used to insist on is that, out of a peer group of schools, faculty salaries be raised to the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. This initially sounded reasonable until one realizes that ABA reviews schools every 6-8 years. When implemented, the ABA criteria caused a runaway escalation of law salaries. T. Cook asked what percentage of the F&SC endorses the proposal and D. Mays confirmed that it was pretty unanimous. There were a few members who had a concern that it would have more weight with full faculty endorsement. However, the majority felt that since this is a recommendation, there are some parts of it that are easier to implement than others. D. Mays shared that the last time salary recommendations were brought to the full faculty was in the early 1980's. The outcome was that it was implemented for one year and then tabled and not implemented again. D. Mays stated that the F&SC is appreciative that a number of recommendations have already been implemented and believes that the administration will support this document where it can. L. Duncan asked if, for those recommendations that have not been implemented, the F&SC believes that they can be.

D. Mays stated that the recommendation to keep up with peer institutions will be difficult. Additionally, there is a recommendation that new Ph.D.'s that are brought on board should receive a slightly higher rate. The recommendation states that all existing faculty will have their salaries adjusted to the same number. R. Casey stated that this can be done; however not in addition to the percentage raises to the level that we have been used to. L. Duncan inquired about the issue of the size of the faculty. Since the revenue and expenditure budgets tie into the numerator of the equation and the number of faculty is the denominator, the key dimension is the size of the faculty. If there was a commitment made that the amount of compensation dollars would not be decreased, would the faculty be open to exploring the idea of getting smaller rather than continuing to grow? R. Casey pointed out that one of the difficulties in answering the question is that there have been 7 years of growth. R. Casey further pointed out that one of the issues about the proposal is that it only focuses on base salaries and not about the connection with overloads and administrative pay. N. Decker shared that it would be important to have a fuller discussion with the faculty but also realizes the pragmatism of the F&SC's concern not to take the issue to the full faculty. D. Mays stated that the task force document is not easily understood and educating individuals on the document is a difficult task. T. Cook asked if Doug Child would be willing to stand up in a faculty meeting and explain the document. D. Mays pointed out that he did do this at the colloquium last year and there were a number of diversions. L. Duncan identified that the document represents the sense of the faculty, assuming the faculty is comfortable with their chosen delegates. It does not weaken the document to not have the consensus of the full faculty. R. Casey made one recommendation on the colloquia, based on past experience, that there actually be three colloquia – one each for Assistant, Associate and Full Professors. P. Lancaster suggested that another way to get a wide range of comments is through an on-line forum. D. Mays thought this would be a nice way to gather additional comments. D. Mays summarized by stating the F&SC will have more extensive colloquia and ensure that it is well advertised with ample lead time. T. Cook also stated that it should be made clear to the faculty that the colloquium is their place for input and that the proposal will not be coming to the full faculty for a vote.

#### **IV. Institutional Review Board (IRB).**

Tom Cook introduced Jim Eck who was charged by the Provost in Fall 2005 to initiate a task force on creating an Institutional Review Board for research dealing with human participants. The task force developed guiding principles and recommendations which have been sent to PSC. J. Eck noted that he developed a similar process at Samford University. It is typical for small colleges like Rollins to have an IRB. The task force and PSC both confirm that there is a need to have an IRB.

J. Eck reviewed the 7 guiding principles and 3 recommendations that were developed by the IRB task force, which have also been embraced by PSC. The task force also developed drafts of IRB protocols for research that falls into three varying degrees of risk. Although the IRB task force has developed initial protocols for exempt, expedited and full reviews, it is anticipated that once the IRB is formed, there initial responsibility will be to make amendments with faculty input. J. Eck reinforced that the primary purpose today is to get feedback on the one page guiding principle and recommendations.

T. Cook stated that PSC is bringing the one-page IRB guiding principles and recommendations to the Executive Committee in hopes that it will be brought to the faculty for adoption. Once the IRB is formed, it will decide on the more detailed procedures.

There was discussion about the document and specifically about the implementation. L. Duncan shared that during last year's discussion there were exaggerated examples that caused concern. However, there are numerous student polls that are continually being done in courses throughout the institution. L. Duncan asked J. Eck how this would be managed. J. Eck indicated that there is no intent to impede the research process. The faculty member would need to assess the level of risk. M. Anderson pointed out that in teaching a course like Quantitative Reasoning, multiple surveys are conducted each session and that the IRB process could encumber a faculty member. N. Decker shared that the PSC expressed concern about the work load of the board and, if there were hundreds of applications, who would be interested in serving. Additionally, it was felt that developing a faculty IRB education process is essential (i.e. to be IRB certified). N. Decker asked J. Eck to describe an example of a research study that would need to go through the full review. He shared two cases that were processed by the existing Human Subjects Review Committee in which, due to the nature of the study, the committee did not allow the research to continue. J. Eck emphasized that the IRB process will ultimately facilitate better research and not overly hinder it. It is also possible that there could be some research that is exempt from the informed consent claimed and possibly from IRB review completely. M. Anderson stated that it would be helpful to have a description of innocuous items.

P. Lancaster asked if it was the belief of PSC that the faculty should have an opportunity for discussion about IRB and N. Decker affirmed. It was also emphasized that the last time the IRB issue was brought before the faculty it was somewhat rushed and there was negativity about it. T. Cook pointed out several examples of types of interviews and surveys that could cause faculty concern about what does and does not qualify. L. Duncan stated that the problem with relying on common sense is those that don't have it get us into trouble and endorsed the idea of having a training session of what qualifies and what does not qualify. C. McConnell asked a question about student membership on the IRB and J. Eck responded that there would be one A&S student and one graduate student. C. McConnell recommended the students be appointed versus elected.

T. Cook asked about sanctions for faculty members who do not participate and J. Eck stated that since this is a legally recognized and sanctioned IRB, the college offers no protection to the research. L. Duncan confirmed that some federal grants require that an institution have some measure of oversight of research involving human subjects.

P. Lancaster explained the advantages of having the institutional protections. N. Decker shared that the issue is finding the delicate balance between being protected by the institution and the freedom of research. PSC believes the next step is for the faculty as a whole to have a larger discussion about IRB. R. Casey questioned the recommendation that the chair of the IRB get a course release each year since other chairs do not. There was continued discussion on the types of research that does and does not qualify. P. Lancaster stated that part of role of IRB would be to educate faculty and give specific examples on which types of questions need approval. R. Casey emphasized that methodology is the concern, not the content. P. Bernal stated that it is beneficial to draw

on precedents. Drawing on a parallel with the honor code, we should get on with the best version and amend it as it evolves.

T. Cook asked if there is to be an IRB if it must be adopted by the faculty and R. Casey confirmed that it must come from the full faculty of the entire college. L. Duncan asked what role students play in the process. T. Cook asked if a colloquium is in order so that clear lines can be developed and taken to the faculty. L. Duncan would like more information on how other institutions have implemented this. T. Cook identified that the task force has gathered extensive information. P. Bernal stated that the faculty needs to understand that this is a help and not a hindrance, especially with federal funding. N. Decker indicated that this might be of interest to address how this can be of use to faculty in all of the disciplines. M. Anderson raised the issue of making the IRB process optional. R. Casey stated that it is difficult to make it mandatory unless it is clear what the consequences are for non compliance. R. Casey emphasized that we must have an IRB. P. Lancaster also stated that it is worth having. T. Cook summarized by stating that since there is no resolution, the Executive Committee will be revisiting this. P. Lancaster stated that until we move it to the full faculty, we will not get anywhere. R. Casey asked if the department chair structure is a place to have an enforced colloquium. N. Decker agreed that there would be representatives from every discipline. R. Casey stated that a voluntary colloquium is not the place to get the feedback for getting a good, final document. L. Duncan reinforced the importance of the IRB education program as part of the process.

T. Cook suggested that this be a continuing issue for discussion during the next Executive Committee meeting

**VIII.** The meeting adjourned at 1:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Bommeljé  
Vice-President/Treasurer