

Academic Policies Committee	
Minutes	
Thursday, April 7, 2016	
Meeting: APC 2015/2016:05	
Convened	Meeting convened 3:21
Attending	William Cornwell, Susan Edwards, Lynn Fletcher, Hannah Fraley, Bonnie Galinski, Hongtao Guo, Mindy Jeon, Marty Krugman, Pamela Leong, Ken Reker, Arthur Rosenthal, Steven Silvern, Mustaf Yatin
Guest(s)	Emerson Baker (History) Neal DeChillo (Associate Provost and Dean, College of Health & Human Services) Kristine Doll (World Languages and Cultures) Sophie Evett (Psychology) Lisa Johnson (Social Work) Rocky Shwedel (School of Education) Megan Williams (Director, Sponsored Programs and Research Administration)
I.	<p>Approval of Minutes The approval of the minutes of February 11, 2016 and the March 3, 2016 addendum was conducted over email.</p> <p>Motion to approve the minutes of February 11, 2016 and addendum of March 3, 2016 Made by: B. Galinski Seconded: P. Leong In favor (11). Against (0). Abstentions (0). Motion passed.</p>
II.	Introduction of Members
III.	<p>Chairs Report</p> <p>A. Welcome – Vice Chair Krugman stated that he will be running the meeting in Chair Walker’s absence. He also noted that there is no old business because the Academic Calendar 2017/2018 was approved by the committee via email.</p>
IV.	New Business
Motion	<p>A. Professional Readiness Process – School of Social Work</p> <p>Motion to approve Proposal 16:223 Made by: S. Edwards Seconded: P. Leong</p> <p><u>OVERVIEW:</u></p>

	<p>L. Johnson (school of social work) explained that SWK has a gatekeeping process to ensure that students are prepared to move forward in their major and created the continuation process. After making changes to the higher level courses and changing some policies (GPA from 2.3 to 2.7), they decided to update the name from continuation to professional readiness process.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION:</u> W. Cornwell asked for clarification around the new procedures as to whether the new process is longer. L. Johnson responded that they moved from two practice courses to three with an interview in order to move into the field work.</p> <p>H. Guo inquired about the GPA change. L. Johnson responded that they reviewed current data on GPAs and found that the current 2.3 is low and students below the 2.7 have challenges in the major.</p> <p>L. Fletcher inquired as to what happens if students don't meet the GPA. L. Johnson responded that students can retake a class to get to the 2.7; however, if they fail twice, the student has to withdraw - students need a 2.7 in order to continue in the SWK major.</p> <p>L. Fletcher asked if this creates a bottleneck for the program. L. Johnson responded no and that so far there is a high approval rate.</p> <p>M. Yatin asked if the the GPA change impacts the enrollment. L. Johson responded that the School of Social Work was not concerned because they looked at students across the curriculum and were comfortable with what the data showed.</p>
Vote	<p>To approve proposal 16:223 In favor (12). Against (0). Abstentions (0). Motion passed.</p>
Motion	<p>B. IACUC Committee Composition</p> <p>Vice Chair Krugman stepped aside as he is a faculty member and past chair of a department (psychology) that conducts research on live animals. H. Fraley stepped in to manage the motion.</p> <p>Motion to approve Proposal 16:240 Made by: W. Cornwell Seconded: A. Rosenthal</p> <p><u>OVERVIEW:</u> Vice Chair Krugman stated IACUC regulates how animal research is done at Salem State and provides a standard for treatment of animals nationwide. When he was chair of APC there was a revision of the animal care policy. There is a concern among some faculty that the proposal passed in 2014 did not formally include governance as</p>

well as an opportunity for MSCA to nominate a member of the committee. By law, IACUC must include a non-scientist, but since 14:403 was approved, an administrator has been named each year and as a result there isn't a broad faculty voice on the committee.

DISCUSSION:

K. Doll (World Languages and Cultures) commented that faculty need a broad voice so the committee should be open to two or more faculty who may or may not be a practicing faculty members.

N. DeChillo (Dean of CHHS and serves as Chair of IACUC) stated that they value diversity of input and is not sure this is an academic policy. He stated that the committee meets federal guidelines and the policy is aligned with peer institutions in that appointments are made by the institutional officer and not the faculty union and if the members don't understand animal research and ethics, they won't be able to contribute. He also stated that this is politically charged on many campuses and that the committee membership is confidential to keep members safe; this proposal puts faculty at risk.

R. Shwedel (Education) stated that this is an academic policy issue because students work with faculty on research and that it represents the general public by having one committee member who works outside of the research. Confidentiality is all the more reason to have members from various offices on campus. He also stated that closing the committee makes us a non-public institution.

Vice Chair Krugman added that the psychology department, which works with the rats, uses a high level of care and is aware that there are colleagues on campus who take a stand on animal research and would be against euthanizing.

N. DeChillo confirmed that all animals die naturally on campus and are not euthanized. This was a result of concerns that were brought to committee and changes were made.

R. Shwedel asked about animals with non-curable illnesses N. DeChillo responded that they work with animals for a set period of time and then retire the animals. They then go through their natural life cycle. If an animal is ill, they would take it to the vet.

M. Yatin asked if researchers made rats ill – for instance, by injecting cancer cells in live animals to track the progression of cancer. M. Williams (research administrator)

responded that live animals are used for psychology research only. N. DeChillo added that biology and psychology are the only departments engaged in animal research.

P. Leong asked about the composition and size of the IACUC at sister institutions. M. Williams responded that of our sister institutions, only two have IACUC and they follow the same standards.

S. Silvern asked how voting and confidentiality are handled and inquired about the types of decisions that the committee makes. N. DeChillo responded that it is standard practice not to list members or widely disseminate minutes from meetings to preclude outside influence. He also commented that the committee is responsible for making sure that students are trained and that animals are cared for in an appropriate manner. Animal safety is priority.

R. Shwedel stated that he is in favor of animal research and the committee work; however, since students are involved, it is an academic issue which is all the more reason to include faculty who aren't doing research. He also stressed that not all people who signed the petition are against animal research.

N. DeChillo commented that there were faculty who notified PETA, who then requested the names of committee members.

R. Shwedel commented that, as a public institution, this should be open to all faculty.

N. DeChillo recommended that committee members must openly consider animal research and not oppose animal research. R. Shwedel agreed that that could be a consideration but that it's not a requirement for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) committee and isn't aware of any other committee that has this requirement.

Vice Chair Krugman stated that IACUC is a federally mandated program created to ensure the ethical treatment of animals all across the U.S.A. and they set criteria for establishing the IACUC committee. He also stated that the original proposal followed the standards, however, the current proposal is trying to do something different and create a special category. He is concerned that this proposal is opening a door to interference with the committee function and could jeopardize research done at Salem State if animal rights become part of the discussion within the committee.

R. Shwedel responded that one or two members would not impact the decisions and that the committee already has one slot dedicated to a non-research member.

	<p>H. Fraley asked about the genesis of the change and if the change would impact the safety of faculty and students. S. Evett (Chair of the Psychology Department) stated that she serves on IRB and when changes were made to the IRB committee composition, the changes originated in the IRB committee. The current proposal originated outside of the IACUC committee, and without consent from or consultation with either the IACUC committee or the most affected departments of psychology and biology and this concerns her.</p> <p>W. Cornwell asked if N. DeChillo’s original point should be considered as to whether or not this falls under APC as this is a contractual committee and it is not clear whether or not this falls under APC. Vice Chair Krugman stated that it does since this policy was historically treated within the jurisdiction of the committee.</p> <p>W. Cornwell asked if goal of IACUC is to set policy or verify that we are meeting standards. N. Dechillo responded that the committee interprets federal guidelines to make sure they are safe.</p> <p>There was some discussion about institutional vs. federal policy and if membership would impact the care of the animals. Vice Chair Krugman stated that the federal guidelines provide for an outside review making it more ethical.</p> <p>There was further discussion about the confidentiality of the committee, ethical treatment of the animals, and a means to bring concerns to the committee. N. DeChillo stated that the committee could consider a confidentiality statement and training for committee members. N. DeChillo also stated that concerns have been brought to the committee’s attention and have been addressed.</p> <p>S. Evett noted that the proposal specifically addresses the faculty representation on the committee and asked if the proposal is to increase the faculty membership and suggested that this should be proposed to IACUC for consideration. Vice Chair Krugman agreed and also pointed out that IACUC just found out about the proposal and the committee should table to allow the IACUC committee a chance to respond.</p> <p>Motion</p> <p>Motion to table proposal 16:240 Made by: S. Edwards Seconded: P. Leong</p> <p>Vote</p> <p>In favor (12). Against (0). Abstentions (0). Motion passed.</p> <p>H. Fraley handed the chair back to Vice Chair Krugman</p>
--	---

	<p>K. Doll (World Languages and Cultures) had to leave for class and asked that her proposals are tabled until the next meeting.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">C. Directed Study Exception for General Education</p> <p>Motion to approve Proposal 16:242 Made by: L. Fletcher Seconded: S. Edwards</p> <p><u>OVERVIEW:</u> E. Baker (chair of the general education committee) stated that the policy put forward has to do with the capstone experience for students that are offered an individualized study format that also meets the requirement for the W-III. The current policy prevents any directed study/independent study from fulfilling a general education requirement. This is an issue with the W-III courses when departments have a culminating senior academic experience that is taught on an individualized basis and that also meets the criteria and intent of the W-III category.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION:</u> There was some discussion on the difference between a directed and independent study and that we should establish clear definitions. E. Baker stated that the Registrar pulled every course listed as a directed and independent study and they are used interchangeably.</p> <p>Vice Chair Krugman stated that we should establish clear definitions.</p> <p>W. Cornwell asked if this policy is at the course level. E. Baker responded that this exception will apply to every offering in question, rather than to individual students.</p> <p>There was further discussion around the awareness of the current policy and changing course descriptions, and also addressing the difference between independent and directed study.</p> <p>Vice Chair Krugman recommended acting on the policy.</p>
<p>Motion</p>	<p>To approve Proposal 16:242 In favor (12). Against (0). Abstentions (0). Motion passed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">D. Defining Directed Studies and Independent Studies</p>
<p>Motion</p>	<p>Motion to approve Proposal 16:223 Made by: P. Leong</p>

<p>Motion</p> <p>Vote</p>	<p>Seconded: S. Edwards</p> <p><u>OVERVIEW:</u> E. Baker stated that during general education committee discussions around using directed studies courses to fulfill the W-III requirements it became clear that there is confusion in the university community over the use and definition of the terms directed study (DS) and independent study (IS). Some departments use the terms synonymously while others use IS as a substitute for a traditional course that is not offered in the semester for which the student wishes to enroll. Others use IS as an extension of a traditional course, providing the student with an opportunity to pursue/research a subject in more depth.</p> <p><u>DISCUSSION:</u> Vice Chair Krugman asked if Megan Miller (registrar) should establish a policy for this. E. Baker responded that M. Miller is worried about a policy when there is no definition.</p> <p>Vice Chair Krugman inquired whether or not it makes sense to have a university-wide non-contract committee look at the issue and is not sure APC is the right venue for this policy.</p> <p>E. Baker recommended that we refer to a subcommittee or advisory committee.</p> <p>N. DeChillo stated that it is the purview of APC to consider this issue.</p> <p>There was further discussion around the definition and who should consider the policy, as well as a suggestion to invite M. Miller to attend the next APC to clarify the definition.</p> <p>Motion to table and invite M. Miller to attend the next meeting to help clarify the definition. Made by: W. Cornwell Seconded by: M. Yatin</p> <p>In favor (8). Against (0). Abstentions (0). Motion passed.</p> <p>Vice Chair Krugman stated that items E – I will be discussed at the next meeting.</p>
<p>V.</p> <p>Motion</p>	<p>Adjournment</p> <p>Motion to adjourn Made by P. Leong</p>

Vote	Seconded by W. Cornwell In favor (8). Against (0). Absetntions (0). Motion passed.
Adjourned	At 4:54 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Bonnie Galinski