

10-20-2005

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Oct. 20, 2005

Arts & Sciences Faculty

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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Oct. 20, 2005" (2005). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 66.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/66

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

**Minutes of the Meeting
Arts and Sciences Faculty
October 20, 2005**

Members Present: V. Aggarwal, M. Anderson, B. Balak, G. Barreneche, P. Bernal, E. Blossey, B. Boles, R. Bommelje, D. Boniface, E. Bouris, W. Brandon, S. Carnahan, S. Carrier, R. Carson, R. Casey, J. Cavanaugh, J. Chambliss, D. Charles, M. Cheng, G. Child, G. Cook, T. Cook, D. Crozier, D. Cummings, M. D'Amato, J. Davison, N. Decker, K. Dennis, S. Easton, J. Eck, M. Fetscherin, E. Friedland, J. Gorman, E. Gottlieb, E. Gregory, D. Griffin, M. Gunter, D. Hargrove, F. Harper, P. Harris, S. Hewit, J. Houston, G. Howell, R. James, P. Jarnigan, J. Johnson, Y. Jones, S. Klemann, H. Kypraios, T. Lairson, C. Lauer, B. Levis, L. Lines, D. Mays, G. Meyers, A. Moe, B. Moore, J. Morrison, R. Musgrave, R. Newcomb, M. Newman, T. Papay, S. Phelen, J. Queen, C. Rock, D. Rogers, J. Schmalstig, W. Schmidt, B. Sherry, J. Shivamoggi, R. Simmons, J. Sinclair, J. Siry, C. Skelley, P. Stephenson, M. Stewart, D. Stoub, B. Svitavsky, L. Tavernier-Almada, K. Taylor, G. Valiante, R. Vitray, G. Williams, Y. Yao, J. Yellen, W. Zhang

Guest: Sherry Fischer, Pennie Parker, Sareet Taylor

I. Call to Order: T. Cook called the meeting to order at 12:38 p.m.

II. Approval of the Minutes: The minutes from the September 22, 2005, meeting were approved.

III. Announcement:

M. Gunter announced that the Thomas P Johnson guest speaker on Thurs., Nov 3 will be the President of the Wilderness Society, William Meadows, who will deliver a presentation entitled "Wilderness in a Red and Blue World".

C. Rock announced that the Thomas P. Johnson Scholar, Dr Geoffrey Hodgson, renowned economist from the University of Hertfordshire, UK, will be on campus the full week of Oct. 24.

T. Cook introduced Sareet Taylor, newly appointed Health Promotions Coordinator. Sareet shared that her goal is to serve as a resource base for the campus in the area of health promotions. She is in the process of training seven peer educators who will be raising awareness in the areas of and alcohol and drug abuse issues, sexual assault, healthy relationships, sexual health and stress management.

Dean Casey announced that the emergency operations team will be meeting tomorrow to discuss decisions that need to be made in preparations for Hurricane Wilma. P Lancaster added that information on the hurricane is continually updated on the Rollins web page.

T. Cook reminded members that the Faculty Fall Party will be on Friday, November 11 in Baldwin Park. A special thanks was extended to Helen Byrd for preparing the invitation. RSVP's should be sent to mberger@rollins.edu.

IV. Professional Standards Committee

N. Decker presented the proposal for discussion on the establishment of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for research dealing with human subjects.

As background, N. Decker shared that Rollins College has had an informal review board consisting of a group of faculty members who have met periodically as it becomes necessary for colleagues to have research proposals reviewed, specifically to be eligible for federal grant funding. There is an institutional need for the college to engage in a more rigorous and more extensive review policy with an institutional wide review board. A task force, constituted by the Provost, put forth recommendations concerning a college wide Institutional Review Board. The recommendations were presented to PSC in Spring 2005 and this Fall. The proposed policy was discussed by the Executive Committee and the Department Chairs before bringing it to the faculty as a whole.

N. Decker summarized the one page proposal (attachment) and emphasized that what is being proposed today is that, with approval of faculty, the Executive Committee would nominate a slate of qualified individuals to serve on the initial Board. In Fall 2006, it is expected that the IRB will come back to the faculty to propose specific guidelines, after having operated for six months. This would include levels of review, data gathering processes and what types of proposals will be exempt from review and those that will be subject to the cursory and full reviews. 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. The position of IRB chair, a full-time tenured professor, should rotate every three years. N. Decker concluded her summary by emphasizing the two recommendations.

T. Cook stated that the proposal is being offered as a motion and it was seconded by J. Siry.

T. Cook opened the floor for discussion.

J. Davidson inquired if the Holt School and Crummer School would be included in the process and it was affirmed by N. Decker. J. Davidson expressed a possible problem with adjunct faculty in the Holt School who may not perceive the need to have their research approved. Dean Carrier explained that adjunct faculty would be educated and would take part in the process.

J. Davidson queried if the process would include surveys from the Student Affairs Office. N. Decker affirmed and pointed out that membership of the IRB would include a representative from the Student Affairs Office. M. O'Sullivan asked for the definition of a minor. and N. Decker stated it is an under aged person, under 18. M. O'Sullivan stated that there should be a notation of this. M. O' Sullivan also asked if student evaluations will be covered. N. Decker responded that is an example of the type of issue that the constituted board will need to determine. A. Moe specified that the last two items in the proposal deal with full IRB reviews and queried, as opposed to what? N. Decker explained that the initial procedural possibilities developed by the task force included 3 levels of possible investigation: 1). full investigation; 2). exemption, which means there would be no need for any type of review whatsoever; and 3) a level of review that would not require full board participation. The chair and one or two members would review the proposal and sign off. A. Moe stated that, while he is supportive of the proposal, it has been his experience that with minors, especially in low risk research activities, there should not be a full board review. N. Decker responded that this will be a determination that the initial board will make. P. Harris pointed out that the guidelines in the proposal are a direct extension of U. S. Department of Health & Human Services. He further stated that course evaluations are exempt. A. Moe indicated that he did not believe all institutions require a full IRB review for low risk research projects, even if they involve 10 to 11 year old children. E. Gregory shared that she was on the task force and stated that all institutions do not require it because they are not in compliance with federal guidelines. Rollins is currently not in compliance.

M. Newman asked if the proposal involved the creation of a standing committee and, if so, it would require an amendment to the by-laws. If this was the case, no action can be taken today.

M. Newman offered an alternative that it be created as a part of an existing standing committee. H. Kypraios asked if student survey projects in a course would be included. N. Decker indicated that this would be the type of decision that would be made by the initial IRB. During the first six months of operation, the initial IRB will have a better understanding of the workload involved and the educational processes that will be helpful for faculty and students. D. Rogers asked if it was an intentional decision not to have representation from Holt and Crummer on the IRB. N. Decker stated that there is the possibility among the 3 faculty positions to have distribution over the various parts of the college without sequestering them. D. Griffin inquired about Crummer having to approve the IRB and N. Decker affirmed. E. Gregory pointed out that Crummer was represented on the task force. C. Rock asked for clarification on international surveys. N. Decker stated that it is her understanding that they would need to be submitted to the board and there does not seem to be a nationality distinction.

Dean Casey reinforced that there has been much debate in the Executive Committee and the Department Chairs on the need for a balanced group. The creation of a slate, as opposed to an open election process, will better insure the even distribution of membership over the different areas of the college. It is the hope that board will perpetuate itself and will consider having diversity inclusion by having different constituencies in its make-up. W. Schmidt asked if the college hires a faculty member who is ABD and who has received approval for their research from their degree granting institution, would they have to submit it to our IRB? N. Decker indicated that this would be an issue of policy that the initial board will have to answer during the first six months. S. Carnihan stated that these types of questions are covered in federal guidelines. P. Harris shared that if the data is being collected at the college, they would need to go through the IRB process. J. Davidson stated she was curious about the inclusion of two students on the committee, especially from the perspective of their expertise. N. Decker noted that the initial board will include two students and that this is an item that has been widely discussed. It is possible that the initial board, after six months, could come back and decide that despite the pedagogical goal, it could be pragmatically less effective to include a large number of student representatives. D. Stoud shared that it is fairly common to have a community member on an IRB and asked if this had been considered. E. Gregory indicated that the at-large-member could be a member of the community.

T. Cook asked if the PSC would consider a friendly amendment to establish the IRB under the auspices of the PSC and if this would satisfy M. Newman's concern. T.

Lairson inquired if the Crummer representative would be happy serving on a subcommittee within an A&S committee. N. Decker stated this was part of the last PSC discussion and it is the hope that this will be included in the work of the initial IRB to determine its fit in the by-laws. D. Charles reinforced that the purpose today is to vote for the establishment of a group that will establish the rules of the IRB. M. Newman pointed out that the provisions identified in the proposal indicate this is not simply an initial committee that will make recommendations; rather, it is a full committee.

Additionally M. Newman raised issues about the Crummer and Holt involvement and that perhaps this should be brought before the all-college faculty. D. Griffin suggested that the initial IRB be established on a temporary basis and their recommendations will be considered after they have been working for six months. T. Cook indicated that technically, the group would be "sun-setted" and D. Griffin affirmed. The initial IRB can be placed temporarily under the PSC.

T. Cook reminded members that Crummer did have representation on the task force. When it comes time to vote all-college, the appropriate forum will be determined. M. Newman stated that D. Griffin's proposal will by-pass the procedural problem and the proposal can be voted on today because this would not involve an amendment of the by-laws. T. Cook asked if this is a friendly amendment. P. Lancaster suggested replacing

with word “initial” with provisional and specify the time period. N. Decker revised the proposal to read as follows: **The Executive Committee of the Faculty will nominate a slate of individuals to serve as the provisional Institutional Review Board for a period of no longer than 14 months.**

N. Decker asked the PSC members if they accept this as a friendly amendment and they affirmed.

J. Siry stated that the by-laws issue would be an Executive Committee item.

On a question raised about confidentiality of the IRB, P. Lancaster responded by stating that this should be a part of the process

T. Cook asked if there was further discussion of the proposal amended.

M Newman called the question. The question was called.

The motion of adopting the revision of the policy passed unanimously by voice vote.

V. **Adjournment:** There was a motion to adjourn and the motion was passed at 1:34 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Bommelje
Vice-President/Secretary

Attachment 1
Rollins College Institutional Review Board -- Proposal

Rationale:

The reasons for establishing an Institutional Review Board are threefold.

Ethical

Rollins College affirms that human research subjects should be treated with dignity, respect, and with due regard for their welfare. Those participating in research have the right to be informed regarding the nature of the research, including its methods and procedures (any aspect of the research that could reasonably influence a subject's willingness to participate, the nature of any benefits for the research subject or for society, and its reasonably foreseeable risks); the right to withdraw from participation in the research without penalty; and the right to have the subject's confidentiality respected.

Pedagogical

Fundamental to the work of Rollins College is the need to instruct both students and faculty as to the most appropriate manner in which to carry out academic research. The review of research projects involving human subjects helps those engaged in such research to construct information-gathering devices (including interviews and surveys) so as to adhere to the ethical standards set out in point 1 (above).

Legal

Rollins College must comply with Federal Regulations concerning experimentation involving human subjects (45 C.F.R. Part 46, Protection of Human Subjects).

Guiding Principles

In order to provide for the protection of human participants and to promote professional research standards, Rollins College is establishing an Institutional Review Board (IRB). The goal of the IRB is to work with administrative, faculty, staff, and student researchers in a collegial way to enhance the validity of their research by helping to ensure that projects involving human participants adhere to established ethical, moral and legal standards. The IRB also serves to weigh any potential risk to research participants against the benefits that the proposed research may provide. Human research is any activity developed for the purpose of collecting and organizing data from human participants in such a manner as to test hypotheses, address research questions, or contribute to generalizable knowledge. The IRB reviews proposals to confirm that the project design provides safeguards for research participants.

Research proposals at Rollins College involving human subjects should guarantee:

- that ethical and moral standards are in compliance with federal guidelines
- that informed consent has been obtained from all participants
- the anonymity or confidentiality of the participants
- that participation is voluntary and that participants may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty
- that researchers will avoid the use of deception whenever possible. In the event that deception is essential to the integrity of the research, a debriefing must follow.
- a full IRB review if participants include vulnerable populations such as minors, mentally compromised, or incarcerated people.
- a full IRB review if risk to participants is more than minimal.

Recommendations

- The Executive Committee of the Faculty will nominate a slate of individuals to serve as the initial Institutional Review Board.
- In the fall term of 2006, the IRB should present to the faculty specific guidelines about levels of review and data-gathering processes exempt from review.
- 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.
- The position of IRB chair, a full-time tenured professor, should rotate every three years.
- All proceedings of IRB meetings should remain confidential.