IRES Meeting Minutes

10-11-22, 1 p.m., SC234

Attendees in person: Amber, Gary, Marsha, Shaunna, Kate, Jessana

Zoom (offered to members): none

NOTES:

* Meeting called to order. Shaunna leading meeting, Amber is scribe.
* There were no meeting minutes recorded from Spring 2022. We checked with previous co-chair; we had a meeting, but there is no official record of it. Group decided this is OK, since the meeting was so short and nothing was discussed.
* Kate’s Institutional Research Policy:
* Anything that comes through the system that is applicable to NHTI is reviewed by us. Dan Shagna is the CCSNH rep for NHTI, but his term has just ended. Amy Huard will be appointing a new NHTI member by Oct. 15. Dan talked to Andrew and they thought the best person for the IRB job would come from the IRES group. He has had a 3-year term and has done about 10 hours of work total; all meetings and communications are done via email, with Amy the most knowledgeable and the lead.
* The NHTI stance is “Should we have this on our campus? Do we want this happening on our campus?” Should NHTI have a checklist in place for the IRB to review? Checklist with be for informational purposes, not an approval process – then it would go to CCSNH for overall review.
* If you want to complete any research on campus, you would have to fill out the checklist first. There are no retroactive approvals from CCSNH.
* Kate will talk to Amy about anonymous vs. personally identifiable student research and whether the distinction is important for the IRES scope and research approvals/announcements. Does this apply to the CCSSE, with research conducted and gathered on other campuses? Do all surveys need to come through IRES, or should we refine the institutional research scope to not include anonymous student surveys?
* Kate will ask Amy how other colleges do it to clarify our scope.
* We will send the policy to IRES members one more time for any revisions, to be done by the end of the week. Once we here back from Kate’s discussion with Amy, we will present it to Andrew and Mark to show them the new scope vs. the old scope to let them know. Then, we will bring it to College Council for approval.
* Invite Andrew and Mark to attend next IRES meeting or provide feedback on policy before next meeting.
* Amber nominated Kate to be the NHTI rep from IRES on the CCSNH IRB. Unanimously approved, Kate accepted position and will let Amy know.
* Preparation for presidential transition: What do we think of the role of IRES given the new presidential appointment? How often should we meet? How do we all see our role during this transition?
* Jessana: We should focus on the IRB policy with Mark and Andrew, and after that we may have a problem planning something that could get changed.
* Kate: We can have a regular meeting to review the proposals as needed.
* Marsha: Agreed, as needed ongoing. I don’t want to stop the work of the college from moving forward while we wait for a new president. We do not want to slow down work at the college by having too many redundant levels of governance.
* Gary: I think this group is redundant since everything has to go through College Council. The IRB can be merged with the Data Team, as al of the data will be going through there anyway.
* Shaunna: We meet to review proposals that fall under the current approval system.
* Rotating Keeper of Minutes will be held on volunteer basis for each meeting until new scribe is appointed: Unanimously approved by all present.
* Term dates: Jessana’s term will come to an end in January, Kate’s term has ended but she has agreed to stay during all of this transition, ending in spring term.
	+ We could reach out to Student Council to get a student member.
	+ We will operate during the transition but will need to examine the overlaps in committees to cut down on redundancy.
* Next meeting date/time: Nov. 15, 1-2 p.m. same location? SC 217/234 – request hyflex room/conference room from Heidi.
* Meeting adjourned.