

**ADMINISTRATIVE & ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, September 2, 2015, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.**  
**Wisconsin Idea Room**

Present:

Deans: Diana Hess, Melissa Amos-Landgraf, Aaron Bird Bear, Dawn Crim, Jim Escalante, Barb Gerloff, Jeff Hamm, Cheryl Hanley-Maxwell, Jack Jorgensen, David Rosenthal

Chairs: Brad Brown, Eric Camburn, Dorothy Edwards, Tom Popkewitz for Beth Graue, Bill Hoyt, Jin-Wen Yu

Directors: Beth Giles, Anna Lewis, Bob Mathieu, Mitch Nathan, Noel Radomski, Cigdem Unal, Charlene Walker, Jim Wollack

Academic Staff Representative: Ann Fillback Watt

Classified Staff Representative: Heidi Udelhoven

Student Representative: Sean Owczarek

Auxiliary: Molly Carroll, Eric Greiling, Beth Janetski, Sheila Voss

Guests: Matt Messinger

The Administrative and Academic Planning Council was called to order at 9:05 a.m. A motion to adopt the September agenda and the June minutes was moved by Dorothy Edwards, seconded by Jin-Wen Yu, and unanimously approved.

### **Administrative Planning Council**

Center on Education and Work external review: report and response (Mitch Nathan)  
 Mitch began with his song for CEW -- John Lennon's "Working Class Hero."

Last spring, an External Advisory Committee convened to provide insights and recommendations regarding the future of CEW. Please see the documents Mitch shared: APCdoc2015.09.02 and APCdoc2015.09.03.

Since becoming the director in 2012, CEW's new vision has focused on these central ideals:

- Career planning
- Supporting data-driven decision making
- Professional training
- Research as the "connective tissue" for long-term advancement

In framing CEW's responses to the recommendations of the review committee, CEW prioritized them in these three groupings:

Primary recommendations:

- Create a new strategic plan by June 20 1016
- Have regular, direct contact with the dean (while he hasn't been excluded, the director's relationship with the dean has been mediated by WCER's director)
- Explore a more sustainable model for the director's time commitment (currently 0% FTE)
- Promote research initiatives
- Revisit CEW's organizational structure

Secondary recommendations:

- Examine space and facilities needs
- Foster UW relations
- Develop short- and long-term marketing plan
- Increase SOE involvement with CEW

Tertiary recommendations:

- Formation of a non-profit (explore options and trade-offs)
- 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration and report (discuss in terms of current priorities)

Discussion / questions:

- An individual may have multiple careers in his/her life. How does this fit in post-secondary career planning?
- Any thoughts of partnering with the Graduate School's initiative for doctoral students coming out of the UW?
- Is there overlap, cross-over with L&S's career center?
- More on CEW's scholarship and research: How do people look for work? How do they define their next job? How do we match people to jobs? How do we broaden participation in STEM careers?
- What about professional development grants?

Education and Social / Behavioral IRB Annual Report (Bob Mathieu)

Bob shared the Education and Social / Behavioral IRB Annual Report (APCdoc2015.09.02.04), summarizing activities for 2014-15.

There have been personnel transitions in the IRB office during the past year, resulting in long periods of being short-staffed. Currently there are 2.5 openings. Bob has charged Teresa Mason in WCER with IRB support. When you submit a proposal, you may start at WCER as part of your grant management.

The IRB office continues to increase visibility on campus through expanded outreach efforts. Their "bring your own laptop" drop-in hours are a resource that graduate students in particular continue to appreciate. The IRB training series has also been well-received. The ED/SBS IRB has been live on the ARROW system for nearly three years. Some issues still exist but the IRB office continues to work to resolve them. Addressed issues include updates to the application questions, workspace formats, and overall functionalities in response to requests from various ARROW users.

The most significant development affecting the IRB office, from an administrative standpoint, has been the roll-out of Post Approval Monitoring (PAM) program. These are part of and overseen by the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education office. A gap was identified during a re-accreditation visit by the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs, requiring that the campus have a process in place to conduct random, periodic compliance checks to ensure the research activities outlined in the protocol application approved by the IRB are, in fact, what takes place and that the research records are available for review.

The PAM audits are not a function of the IRB office (Dan Ulrich's office in the VCRGE office is does the audits of active IRBs). However, the IRB office has piloted a few post-approval monitoring checks during the summer of 2014 to give the staff a sense of how the larger-scale campus audits would affect workload and day-to-day operations. As predicted, the impact has been significant; while there has been a positive impact from the perspective of overall campus compliance, there has been a notable effect on the office workload.

Issues and concerns:

- Burden without meaningful protection of participants
- Rules specific to Education not always implemented.
- Bob is working with the University Committee to increase research voice in IRB oversight.

Issues and concerns discussed by Administrative Council:

- Decisions in IRB on one campus are not consistent with decisions on another campus, putting our researchers behind because they can't do the same sorts of studies. Can there be an effort to become more consistent between campuses?
- Concerns about PAM. The random quality feels very bureaucratic. Would rather you would assemble all compliance documents for a planned audit.
- Guidance needed for "vulnerable populations" for those who do research with adults with disabilities, whether or not the study would meet criteria of usual procedures.
- Questions on exemptions
- ED/SBS IRB has been reluctant to consider non-invasive imaging as minimal risk.
- Studies with de-identified data, told not to close the study so data remain accessible. More information on legitimate closure is needed.

### **Academic Planning Council**

(no agenda items this month)

The meeting adjourned at 10 a.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Sheila Voss

Approved by Dean Diana Hess: October 6, 2015

Approved by Admin and Academic Planning Councils: October 7, 2015