



FACULTY SENATE

Research, Scholarship & the Creative Arts Committee

November 11, 2021

12:30-2:00

Microsoft Teams

Present: Mildred Beltre (CAS, Fine Arts Rep), Brandon Bensel (Postdoctoral Association), Vicki Brennan (CAS), Mary Cushman (LCOM), Evan Eyler (Faculty Senate Vice President), Rachelle Gould (RSENR), Jennifer Hurley (CESS), Dimitry Kremontsov (CNHS), Christie Silkotch (LIB), Daniel Weiss (LCOM), Sarah Wood (SGA), Chun Zhang (GSB)

Absent: Raju Badireddy (CEMS), Thomas Borchert (FS President), Pending (GSS), Jill Preston (CALs), Jonah Steinberg (CAS)

Guests: Melanie Locher, Theodore Marcy, Matthew Price, Donna Silver

---

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.**

- 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 15<sup>th</sup> at 4:00pm.
- 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 Faculty 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)

## Works Cited

- Boser, S. (2016). Power, Ethics, and the IRB. *Qualitative Inquiry* 13(8), 1060-1074. doi: 10.1177/1077800407308220.
- Fouché, C.B., and Chubb, L.A. (2016). Action researchers encountering ethical review: a literature synthesis on challenges and strategies. *Educational Action Research* 25(1), 23-34. doi: 10.1080/09650792.2015.1128956.
- Goodyear-Smith, F., Jackson, C., and Greenhalgh, T. (2015). Co-design and implementation research: challenges and solutions for ethics committees. *BMC Med Ethics* 16, 78. doi: 10.1186/s12910-015-0072-2.
- Guta, A., Nixon, S., Gahagan, J., and Fielden, S. (2012). "Walking along beside the researcher": how Canadian REBs/IRBs are responding to the needs of community-based participatory research. *J Empir Res Hum Res Ethics* 7(1), 15-25. doi: 10.1525/jer.2012.7.1.17.
- Guta, A., Nixon, S.A., and Wilson, M.G. (2013). Resisting the seduction of "ethics creep": using Foucault to surface complexity and contradiction in research ethics review. *Soc Sci Med* 98, 301-310. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.09.019.

## Discussion questions

- What is the purpose of the IRB? Walk beside researchers to design ethical research OR assure that the institution is protected?
  - How do those things come into conflict with each other?
    - Example: Extensive forms needed
    - Example: Documentation of compensation as a hurdle
    - These requirements exclude people
  - How do we resolve this conflict? Who has responsibility (researchers? IRB? Both?)
- How far does the role of the IRB extend?
  - Assessing methods vs. the risk to subjects
  - "Micro-managing projects" vs. setting guidelines for projects



For a complete recording of the discussion, you can contact the Faculty Senate Office at [Facsen@uvm.edu](mailto:Facsen@uvm.edu). The committee would like to work on communication between faculty and the IRB. Ongoing discussions with the IRB will be 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 forum 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.