

10-13-2005

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 13, 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, October 13, 2005" (2005). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 110.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/110](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/110)

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**  
**October 13, 2005**

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

**Guest:** Jim Eck

- I. Call to Order:** T. Cook called the meeting to order at 12:34 pm.
- II. Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the meeting of September 8, 2005, were approved with changes
- III. Announcements:** C. McConnell announced the activities of the upcoming Homecoming Week
- IV. Institutional Review Board (IRB).**

T. Cook shared that Dean Casey took the IRB proposal to the Department Chairs meeting and asked for feedback. N. Decker stated that there were similar comments as were raised in the last Executive Committee meeting. There seemed to be a clear sense from some of the Department Chairs that it is do-able to put forth the IRB proposal to the full faculty without describing the suggested procedures. The Board, within the first six months of operation, will come back to the faculty with a full set of procedures after having had the experience working with the policy. M. Anderson's impression was that there was strong support from those whom would be affected by it, especially from those in the Social Sciences. M. Anderson also identified that there were questions about student membership on the board. T. Cook pointed out that the presence of students on the board could be justified from the educational perspective.

N. Decker shared that after having processed the IRB discussion with three groups (PSC, Executive Committee and Department Chairs), there are 3 goals behind the policy: 1). ethical – to make sure if research project are being done on human subjects that the human subjects are being treated ethically; 2). pedagogical – that instructors and learners are learning how to create; and 3). legal – protecting individuals and the institution from prosecution. C. McConnell inquired about the board actually meeting or if the business was going to be done by electronically through email. If it is done electronically, C. McConnell stated it likely would not be beneficial since there would be limited learning taking place on the part of the students. T. Cook's impression is that there is a small subset of the proposals that would be required to go through full Board review and the majority would not require this process. T. Cook asked the Executive Committee members for feedback of their impressions if students should be on the Board. C. McConnell endorsed student membership based on the educational nature of the process. T. Cook expressed that, in his opinion, student participation will enhance the process. J. Eck noted that there have been two changes made in the one page document based on the Department Chairs meeting: 1). a movement of the word Rollins College in the first sentence above the bulleted guarantees reads: **“Research proposals at Rollins College involving human subjects should guarantee:”**; and 2). a fourth recommendation which

states “within six months of its formation, the IRB will present to the faculty specific guidelines about levels of review and data-gathering processes exempt from review. M. Anderson stated this will be a lot of work for the IRB Chair during the first 6 months during the development phase. However, after this period, it is unknown what the workload for the Chair will be and questioned the release time, since all members will be reviewing the proposals. R. Casey agreed. M. Anderson indicated that after the first six months of operation, the Chair will have a better idea of the workload to assess release time. J. Eck asked if the proposal should be modified and state. **“The position of IRB chair, a full-time tenured professor, should rotate every three years.”** M. Anderson endorsed this change. T. Cook raised the issue about the two full-time faculty elected by the all college faculty. R. Casey shared some options for the election strategy in Arts and Sciences and Crummer. One option is that each faculty vote for a Board member. P. Lancaster suggested that, unless the Arts and Sciences faculty has a strong objection, in the past when things have needed approval by both groups, elections have been done separately. This has been the case with the proposed mission statement. There was discussion about the faculty representation on the board. N. Decker asked if the Crummer faculty was aware of the IRB proposal and T. Cook affirmed. M. Anderson inquired if the faculty member from the graduate programs would be from Crummer. P. Lancaster indicated that a faculty member could come from the Counseling department. J. Eck indicated that there is also an at-large-member. There was discussion on student representation on the board. C. McConnell asked if the two students would represent A&S and Holt. R. Casey shared that the document states that there would be a student from A&S, who would also represent Holt, and a graduate student from Crummer, Counseling or MHR. R. Casey indicated that an election mechanism for students would be difficult. R. Casey suggested the possibility of presenting a slate as is the case with FEC. P. Lancaster reinforced the slate and pointed out that it can be balanced before voting on it. R. Casey identified that there may be two processes: 1). the initial membership of the IRB; and 2). the creation of a self perpetuating committee, with a nominating arm for replacements. P. Lancaster stated that the Executive Committee could initially create a slate from those faculty members who are knowledgeable and interested in participating. J. Eck recommended making and adjustment to read, **“The membership of the IRB should include at least six members and a chair. The six members might include two full-time faculty, an at-large member, a student affairs representative, and two students. The terms of office should be staggered so that membership constantly rotates.”** R. Casey inquired about the student affairs representative and P. Lancaster shared that extensive surveys are created in the student affairs department and a representative would be looking out for the interest of the students. R. Casey inquired if the initial board members will need to become equipped to learn how to execute the process properly, similar to the honors council. D. May pointed out that since most of the proposals will focus on interviews and surveys, AAUP has education materials about the IRB. P. Lancaster stated that some members of the current Human Subjects Committee may be willing to assist in the start-up phase. J. Eck identified that a substantive amount of material can be provided to the IRB on implementation. N. Decker raised the issue of training and shared that both Davidson College and Samford University have online IRB

training programs. During the first six months, the Board will need to establish some sort of training for Board members, instructors and students – on-line or otherwise.

R. Casey inquired if there is an appellate process. J. Eck was not aware of one. R. Casey shared that there were concerns on this issue in the Department Chairs meeting. T Cook also pointed out that another question that was raised in the department Chairs' meeting was if this is mandatory and what sanctions are there. J. Eck indicated that it would be unlikely to deny a research topic. P. Lancaster identified that if a person does not go through the process, they are going against the policy of institution. J. Eck reinforced that the person would have to deal with any consequences themselves. D. May stated that there are faculty members who will have no interest in participating in the process because of the innocuous nature of their surveys.

R. Casey asked J. Eck about the non-compliance issue at Samford University and he identified that it was not an issue. P. Lancaster shared that there are faculty, especially in the Sciences and Social Sciences, who need the IRB as an institutional safeguard. Additionally, more faculty will become aware of the process through on-going IRB education opportunities. R Casey stated that if a concise training process was established and mandated across the faculty, the educational process will take care of a majority of the compliance issues.

P. Lancaster emphasized that the IRB proposal does not state that the kind of research that is done will be controlled, only that the research methods are protecting the human subjects involved. N. Decker pointed out that a faculty concern could be on the infringement of academic freedom. T. Cook stated that another possible issue deals with the spontaneity of research. D. May suggested that the key is to highlight the 3 goals behind the policy and that the issue of the nature of the research is not included in the goals.

R Casey reinforced that the Board will be operational for a year and will gain experience which will be helpful when it brings the specific procedures back to the faculty. P. Lancaster pointed out that on the Human Subjects Committee, one faculty member resigned from the Human Subjects Committee because there is currently no institutional endorsement. R Bommelje stated that during the last Executive Meeting, P. Bernal indicated that for grant purposes, it is essential for some faculty members and without the IRB in place, there will be no funding. P. Bernal reiterated that any funding from the federal government requires it. N. Decker inquired about the parallel with the honor code process. P. Bernal stated that the IRB, like the honor code, should be viewed as a helping process and not a punitive one. T. Cook raised the issue of the IRB being ready in six months after the establishment of the initial Board, to bring the specific procedure back to the faculty. R Casey recommended that it state **“by the beginning of Fall 2006.”** T. Cook asked if the Executive Committee is satisfied with the IRB makeup and version of the selection process. R Casey suggested using the Executive Committee to nominate a slate for the first Board and then it would become a self sustaining committee. It was also confirmed that two students would be a part of the Board and will each serve a one-year term.

P. Lancaster inquired about the confidentiality of the proceedings of the IRB and J Eck affirmed. P. Lancaster pointed out that it would be an expectation that anyone serving on the committee would respect the confidentiality. T. Cook indicated that there can also be a concern regarding cross cultural research.

T Cook confirmed that the IRB proposal will be the only item on the next faculty meeting. J Eck will make revisions to the proposal which will be attached with the faculty meeting agenda.

T Cook asked if P. Bernal is ready to bring the honor code recommendations to the November meeting and he affirmed.

**V.** The next Executive Meeting will be held on October 27, 2005 at 12:30 pm in the Faculty Club.

**VI.** The meeting adjourned at 1:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Bommelje  
Vice-President/Treasurer