

**Deans' Council Minutes**  
**February 1, 2005**

**Enrollment Management – What is going on in recruiting for Graduate School?** Deans reported on department activities. Dean Headley reported there might be a problem in that some faculty advisors may not be pursuing inquiries and applications to their departments in a timely manner. He is presently gathering more information in an effort to identify such departments. Rapid turnaround of applications and follow-up of inquires are essential to be competitive.

**University Studies Committee Report** – sent to Faculty Senate with Deans' Council and Provost's Recommendations

**Ad Hoc Work Group on Retention Report** – Deans began going through report item by item, completing seven (7) goals. The remainder of the recommendations will appear on Feb 15 agenda.

**Course Fees** – Provost reviewed outstanding balances and noted that failure to use fees in the relevant instructional period does not make it easy to justify additional fee requests.

**Email for University Communication** – policy draft - Deferred until next meeting.

**Report of Institutional Review Board (Human Subjects) (Attachment)**

**Graduation rate data** – A&M Commerce will participate in a national project on improving graduation rates. Karla Hase (SHED) will be liaison to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and will participate as an audit team member at another regional institution. As similar analysis will be conducted at A&M-C with Dr. Hase and Dr. Randy McBroom taking the lead. The purpose will be to identify factors that delay student graduation.

**2005-05 Academic Calendar** – Deans reviewed the calendar prepared by Registrar Paige Bussell.

**Winter-Mini Allocation** – Provost reviewed expenditures for 2004, as well as per student costs: Business & Technology at \$101/student; Education & Human Services at \$177/student; Arts & Sciences at \$227/student. Provost confirmed earlier Council decision to offer Winter Mini salaries at 6.25% of Academic Year salary with a cap of \$3,000 per individual.

Allocations for 2005: Business and Technology \$9,000; Education & Human Services \$16,000; Arts & Sciences \$15,000.

## 2003-2004 Institutional Review Board Report:

Tracy Henley, Chair

January 7, 2005

This report documents activities of the IRB since Dr. Henley became chair in September of 2003 (basically the last 16 months). Further details, or the data in some other fashion, or this provided as hard copy, are available. Natalie Henderson maintains and assembles these data and serves as IRB point of contact.

<u>1.Total Number of Protocols Submitted</u>	<u>Since September 2003</u>	<u>130</u>
Number of Protocols Approved [1]		109
Number of Protocols Rejected [2]		1
Number of Protocols Currently "Suspended" until revisions are made [4]		2
Number of Protocols submitted but determined not to be Human Subjects [3]		9
<u>Number of Protocols Pending [4]</u>		<u>9</u>

### Notes:

[1] About half of these protocols were accepted as submitted, and about half required one or more revisions. One goal for improvement would be better training (and/or simpler forms) so that fewer revisions were required.

[2] The aim of the IRB is to work with all researchers such that their project can be done in ways consistent with Federal regulations. Often this requires making substantial revisions from what was initially submitted. But, an actual rejection is (and should be) a rare occurrence.

[3] As is appropriate, researchers using archival data submit to the IRB so that we can determine if their work is exempt from Federal regulations (CFR 45-46). Nine projects were determined to fall beyond the scope of the IRB given that they used anonymous archival data (e.g., census data) or involved an analysis of existing public records (e.g., enrollment reports from a public school).

[4] Pending projects include 2 new protocols that have yet to be reviewed, and 6 protocols that are being revised. A project is "suspended" if revisions are not made in a timely fashion. Basically, this requires that the researcher start the process anew.

## 2. Breakdown by Department of the PI

<u>Department</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Faculty/Staff</u>
Agricultural Science	2	1	1
Business Administration	7		7
Biological & Environmental Sciences	2	1	1
Computer Science and Information Systems	1		1
Counseling	7	4	3
Economics and Finance	1		1
Educational Administration	30	28	2
Elementary Education	15	11	4
Health, Kinesiology & Sports Studies	3		3
Institutional Effectiveness	1	1	
Literature and Language	11	9	2
Mathematics	1		1
Political Science	1		1
Psychology and Special Education	25	11	14

Secondary and Higher Education	17	13	4
Social Work	5	1	4
<u>Proposals from Outside the University</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	

There is perhaps some under-representation in the last category. We have had several other inquiries from off-campus, but most of these have not (yet) produced an actual IRB submission.

### 3. Breakdown by submitter status:

Number of Faculty/Staff Protocols submitted	50
Number of Student Protocols submitted	80

Proposals are triaged into three categories commonly called: administrative, expedited and full board. Federal law (CFR 45-46) dictates these categories, and allows for the IRB chair (or an appropriate designee) to handle the first two categories but requires that a duly constituted full board review certain protocols (e.g., such as those working with minors). The board here at TAMU-Commerce meets on an as-needed basis, but roughly once each month. The full board considered over 15 different proposals. The board includes: Jena Hamra, Jon Jonz, Srinivas Nippani, JoAnn DiGeorgio-Lutz, Carmen Salazar and Mary McDaniel (community member). Mary Hendrix and Pat Prapan serve as ad hoc members when their expertise is needed.

In conclusion, I am delighted to report that we have had no adverse incidents, or substantial issues of non-compliance. In short, nothing happened that we were obligated to report to any Federal agency or for administrative attention. From my perspective as Committee Chair everything appears to be running smoothly, and let me again hasten to add that much of this owes directly to the efforts of Natalie Henderson. Given the size and nature of our University, the volume of protocols seems about what would be expected. As the emphasis on research continues to grow, submissions will no doubt rise accordingly.

In calendar year 2005, the IRB (principally me as chair) needs to redouble its efforts to provide both informal and formal training to as many faculty and students as is possible. Since I became chair I have made formal presentations to one Elementary Education course, at a colloquium in Psychology and Special Education, and to the Social Work faculty. More of these presentations need to be conducted both for the general good of all concerned and to keep us in compliance with Federal guidelines.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tracy Henley, IRB Chair