

TTU Faculty Senate Minutes
Senate Room in the SUB Matador Room
February 11, 2015, #339

Senators present were: Brashears, Cox, Farmer, Buelinckx, Pongratz, Chris Taylor, Batra, Cargille Cook, Carter, Grair, Held, Milam, Morgan, Morales, Nite, Qualin, Rahamamoghadam, Rankumar, Smith, Surluga, Ritchey, Koricich, Patrick, Richman, Colette Taylor, Dallas, Ghebrab, Matis, Soliman, Caswell, Blum, Gilliam, Spallholz, Yuan, James, Metze, Becker, Cassidy, Heinz, Hidalgo, Ortiz, Peaslee, Brookes, Donahue, McKoin and Ankrum. **Senators absent were:** Canas, Elbow, Hawkins, Hom, Juan, Shi, Skidmore, Swingen, Arnett, Bayne, Morse, McGinley, Cochran, Weiner, Lastrapes, Meek and Tate.

I. Call to Order at 3:16 p.m. – Dr. Michael Farmer, Faculty Senate President

II. Approval of minutes, Meeting#338, January 14, 2015.

Correction to Senator Becker's name and the correction of the Grievance Policy being submitted by the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee instead of an Ad Hoc Committee were submitted. With the acceptance of those corrections, there was a move to accept: Senator Ramkumar, Seconded Senator Ankrum. Unanimously approved.

III. Recognition of Guests:

Dr. Lawrence Schovanec, University Provost; Dr. Rob Stewart, Senior Vice Provost (SVP). Dr. Alice Young, Associate Vice President-Research Integrity, and Dr. Diane Warner, President of AAUP

IV. Speaker: Dr. Alice Young, Associate Vice President-Research Integrity

Dr. Alice Young gave a presentation titled "Review of Regulation and Research Compliance @ TTU. The presentation designed to explain why the university has regulations and what the university has done to be in compliance with regulation imposed by the federal government and funders. The Office of Research developed OVRP Councils and Compliance Committees to manage, control and document the university's response to regulations. These faculty-lead committees to address a variety of compliance issues (please see pdf emailed to FS). The Federal Demonstration Partnership is a program sponsored by the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable of the National Academies. Its purpose is to reduce the administrative burdens associated with research grants and contracts. The FDP has surveyed the faculty, funded faculty at US research institutions in 2007 and again in 2012 asking about the burden these regulations. They made a report that commonly called the Faculty Burden Survey/Faculty Workload Survey. The handout and the materials I sent to the senate has the links to these report (the powerpoint presentation will be shared with the FS after this session). The Office of Compliance has developed to manage and control university response to federal and funding requirements for documentation. The national science board made a report last fall looking at these administrative burdens and this provides a snapshot of things that are facing university researchers. As an institution we have several committees that oversee our research compliance and Dr. Young briefly described their function and member make up and what are the federal laws that are applicable.

Discussion:

Senator Held: There was extensive discussion in our last meeting about the backlog of issues before the IRB and how that this backlog is not just handicapping or hampering research on campus but at least three senators, Senators Colette Taylor, Patrick and Soliman voiced objections and concerns. Were those communicated to you?

Dr. Young: It was communicated to me that there were questions and concerns. The IRB chair and the Manager of Research complied and sent a report for President Farmer in the last couple of weeks that described the range of review times and the different types of protocols; and also, addressed questions about whether or not we have sufficient numbers of faculty available to review protocol. Because I know the FS minutes will reflect that we came to you in

last spring to say that IRB would have very few members available in the summer to review protocols and the possible slow down during the summer. At present, I don't know if President Farmer has provided that report to the Senate.

Senator Held: There were several senators that reported, like Senator Richman and another that is unidentified that they have review times of four months. That seems a bit excessive beyond summer. Why is that happening?

Dr. Young: There are two reasons. One is that when a protocol arrives at HRPP, there may be revisions that need to be made before it gets sent to faculty for review. So a member of the HRPP staff will send it back for modification. Then once it is sent back, and sent reviews may actually also request modifications. At Texas Tech, the model has been that the reviewer will usually reveal their identity, but not always. The reviewer may ask for substantial modifications. We have also had situations that the protocol has to go to the full board and the full board may ask for modifications. Then sometimes it may be a month, or two months later before the board meets. That is particularly a problem in summer because we don't have a quorum.

FS President Michael Farmer: I will inject a little bit into that. I have had time to review the report and I have formed a committee with all faculty and asked for other representation. Colette Taylor is our Senate representative on the committee and I have two members of the IRB, three faculty and one senator on that committee. We are going to look at the response including the comments we had here and can see where we are. I don't know where the committee will go, but we have three people who do IRBs on a regular basis and two faculty members who are on IRB. I would like to have two meetings of that group to see what they come up with. We are going to vet what's real, what's not, what's happening. And

Senator Held: I would like to clarify with Senator Taylor if I may.....my understanding is that it wasn't an issue that you were told to revise something, the issue was that you never got any feedback whatsoever about your IRB proposal for a period of months. Am I off base here?

Senator Taylor: No. That would be correct and it has been an issue for several faculty members. So, I think the subcommittee will meet on Monday and that will be one of the issues we discuss.

FS President Michael Farmer: Of these items that are issues of fact and we just want to find out what happened.

Senator Held: This is common sense. Did you say there were only three staff members in the IRB?

Dr. Young: There are three staff members, two of whom have what is called certified IRB Professional Certificates which is a test-based certificate that our IRB has said allows them to make decisions about protocols that fall under the category of an exempt proposal. But another issue, and this is something I actually brought to the Senate last spring, is that over the first six months of last year, we had staff on family leave and other issues that reduced staffing.

FS President Michael Farmer: I will just give you a heads on where I think this will go...I think some of the issues is communication with the staff on non-exempt surveys I suspect there will be a bigger dialogue on this issue.

Dr. Young: This is an issue that Provost Schovanec and Vice President Duncan are talking about...one of the questions facing TTU is what is the appropriate source of resources for staffing of HRPP. Currently the funding comes from the VP Research office, so its index to the F and A. We value faculty scholarship and we have a lot of faculty whose work involves human subjects or participants and of the 1748 active protocols?

Senator Held: Did you say 1748 protocols? Managed by three staff members

Dr. Young: Yes

Senator Held: That seems to be excessive.

Dr. Young: And of those fewer than 200 are associated with funded projects. There are a lot of protocols that support graduate education.

FS President Michael Farmer: I have a little troubling following. Are those staff paid out of the Provost Office or the VPR?

Dr. Young: They are paid out of the Vice President for Research's office and summer salary for IRB chair. Previously we had some funding to support summer salary for IRB members that come from the Provost Office. Staff for the other committees also come from the VPR's office. But I think Senator Held raises a good issue that it's not just the funded research that falls under

the review of these committees. We at TTU have made the commitment that all research needs to be reviewed or have an IRB.

FS President Michael Farmer: I think one of the tensions is that the need for more staff increases a little bit more of a distance with the faculty. The alternative there is more faculty volunteers.

Dr. Young: It is important to remember IRB and that the work of the IRB and the IACUC is local work. Different IRBs have different rules.

Further discussion was had about the types of revisions that were asked for and whether or not the revisions come from the faculty or the staff.

Currently the funding comes

V. Old Business: Review of Committees & Liaison Reports

Intellectual Property update, FS President Michael Farmer

There are two OPS on intellectual property being written that shadows Regent Rule 10 and we are currently working with other institutions in the system to rewrite it. It is going to take some time, but I think we will come out alright in the end.

Tenured Women Leaving Tech-update, FS President Michael Farmer

Most surveys are completed. There seems to be three main reasons that these former faculty members left: It seems that 50 % of the women are leaving for family reasons, 25% were poached by other institutions for salary reasons while the other 25% left because they felt they were having trouble being promoted and felt there was a glass ceiling. Those committee members who have not filed their reports, please forward them to FS President Farmer.

Pedestrian Safety update, FS President Michael Farmer for Carolyn Tate

It was reported that Senator Carolyn Tate was still working on this issue with the Public Safety committee but not getting very far. The committee wants to use the old Watch Out for Bicyclers campaign. She is determined to make headway to get better signs and other things and will continue to work to make progress.

Child Care Update, FS President Michael Farmer for Richard Meek

The committee is waiting for the completion of a demand analysis. There was a concern expressed about wording of the survey being available to both graduates and undergraduates. The President is very active on this as well and was concerned about nontraditional surveys. We have a number of people working on this. For the first time ever, I am hopeful we will make progress. Additionally, there are some faculty working to create a cooperative to be a stop-gap.

Administrator Evaluation Survey update, Senator Jorge Morales

Senator Morales reported that the results from this year's Administrator Evaluation surveys that are coordinated by a Faculty Senate committee were now available online on the faculty senate page. We were concerned about the ability to pull data out but we were able to address that. Overall scores and individual department are searchable. Highlights are detailed in the executive summary. There were poor response rates that may have skewed the data received. For example, the response rate for Department Chairs was 38%, Deans was 32% and Provost was 21%. Overall, means for the Deans=4.29 on a 5 point scale, Administrators was 4.28 and general faculty scored the Provost at 3.88. When faculty looked at their deans the universally lowest score was the failure of the Dean to seek faculty input in decision-making. That was for all the Deans across all colleges. The mid-level administrators rated the deans at an average of 4.01 while the general faculty rated the deans at 3.29.

There was some discussion on the rating scale and our ability to change it in the future.

There was discussion on the reasons for low response rates. The committee will investigate the possible issues involved regarding the lack of faculty response. **Senator Richman** asked how the administration

will be used. **FS President Michael Farmer**, it is really up to the supervisor. **Dr. Schovanec** stated he shares the information with each Dean. **Senator Richman** suggested that maybe this information should get back to the faculty and give them a reason to respond. Some faculty may feel like it doesn't matter if they see nothing being done. The committee will investigate the possible issues involved regarding the lack of faculty response. It was suggested that faculty senate get more involved in the recruitment of more faculty to respond. **FS President Michael Farmer** suggested we think about a FS retreat to discuss how to get more people active.

OP 70.17 Overtime-Faculty Status and Welfare, Senator Lewis Held

Senator Held reported that senators should have received the draft in an email that we are voting on today. One change was related to faculty work hours being determined by their administrators which were deleted because we are salaried not hourly employees. The other section was related to where we work. According to state law we were not allowed to delete this section as we wanted, but we inserted the phrase from the state law, "during normal office hours".

OP Revision Approved by the Faculty Senate.

OP 32.05 Faculty Grievance Procedure-update, Senator Lewis Held

Senator Held reported that they were waiting a response from the Provost of the revision. Dr. Rob Stewart, Senior Vice Provost (SVP) stated that the revisions were approved by the Provost's Office and moved to the President's Office. There was a brief misunderstanding of some of the wording, but that has been resolved. A clean revision was returned to the President's Office and accepted. Therefore, this revision will be voted on at the next meeting.

Summer Employment update, Senator Shane Blum

Senator Blum reported that had a follow-up meeting with the Dr. Rob Stewart, Senior Vice Provost about some logistical issues with funding. The Provost Office are currently reviewing the possibilities and gathering information for us to review. We will see where we are before the next Senate meeting. It is too late for this summer, but we are making progress on the logistics and the Provost Office is doing an analysis on SCH and the existing summer funding. They are currently in budgeting planning for Summer 2016. **Dr. Schovanec** stated that they were making plans to release summer funds earlier next year to help Deans plan better, but there will still be the ability to colleges to ask for additional funds. There was some discussion of the funding structure for funding summer courses and salary differences in the colleges. Senator Blum reminded FS that this committee was looking at unorganized classes at the 6000, 7000 and 8000 levels that are designed for theses/dissertation work during the summer.

Senator Held brought up a future potential budgeting issue related to student fees and the legislature. FS will need to watch how this will play out.

Guns on Campus update, FS President Michael Farmer

This resolution will be tabled until next meeting. FS President Michael Farmer highlighted the changes to the state legislation that is occurring and might pass.

V. New Business:

Office Nominations Committee-2015-2016: The following senators will serve on the nominating committee: Gary Elbow, Colette Taylor and Richard Meek. Please consider running for office next year.

VII. Adjournment.

Moved by Senator Ramkumar, seconded by Senator Carter
President Farmer adjourned the meeting at 4:50 pm.