Co-Chair Cushman called the meeting to order at 12:30 pm via Microsoft Teams.

1. **Approval of the Minutes.** The minutes of October 2021 were approved as written.

2. **Chairs Update.**
   
   o The final report of the Academic Reorganizing working group will be presented at the November Faculty Senate Meeting. It is encouraged for members of the RSCA to attend or watch the meeting. The meeting will be on Teams on November 15th at 4:00pm.

   o Mary thanked the committee for all the volunteers that have helped represent the RSCA on other university committees.

3. **Libraries Budget Update, Bryn Geffert.** This is a follow up conversation from the presentation that Dean Geffert did at the October RSCA meeting. Dean Geffert stated that
this is an opportunity for the Libraries to set their priorities. Once the priorities are set it allows to form budgets around these priorities.

Dean Geffert reviewed the Libraries Strategic Priorities and Strategic Initiatives draft proposal. The proposal is not yet ready for distribution to the general population. The RSCA gave feedback in these are

- Teaching and learning
- Investigation & Discovery
- Engagement and Community
- Sustainable Information Ecosystems
- Organizational Excellence

The RSCA is asked to send all feedback to the Faulty Senate Office to be collected and sent to Dean Geffert.

4. **IRB Discussion, Vicki & Rachelle.** The RSCA was joined by Mathew Price, Donna Silver, Theodore Marcy and Melanie Locher to discuss how to create better relationships and engagement with the IRB.

---

**What does the scholarly literature say?**

- **Epistemological difference:** “Existing approaches to ethics review are seen as rooted in positivism and promoting a biomedical conception of risk and harm, which may be at odds with social science research that is rooted in a critical or constructivist paradigm.” (Guta et al. 2013)

- **“Ethics creep”**
  - IRBs “increasingly focus on risk management rather than on the ethical issues of the project” (Fouché & Chubb 2016)
  - Suggestion to avoid this: “researchers might instead work with the IRB to develop external guidelines for assessing and addressing power relations within participatory inquiry projects” (Boser 2016)

- **Tensions related to community-based research, action research, co-design**
  - “The need (on the one hand) to co-create and adapt interventions for the purposes of maximizing fit and (on the other hand) to pre-specify them for the purposes of ethical approval creates a tension for which there is no simple or formulaic solution.” (Goodyear-Smith et al. 2015)
  - Some IRBs are responding to these issues and “Walking along beside the researcher” (Guta et al. 2012)
For a complete recording of the discussion, you can contact the Faculty Senate Office at Facsen@uvm.edu. The committee would like to work on communication between faculty and the IRB. Ongoing discussions with the IRB will helpful and each member of the RSCA should bring this information back to their units. The committee would also like to see a more public forums on this topic. The IRB is willing to present at any unit that requests it.
based on the individual units needs. They will continue to work on ways to promote communication with faculty.

5. **Old or New Business.** There was none at this time.

6. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

*Sabbatical

The next meeting of the RSCA will take place on Thursday, December 16th at 12:30 on Microsoft Teams.