

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
January 20, 2016, #346

Senators present were: Cox, Farmer, Buelinckx, Zugay, Brittsan, Calkins, Cargile Cook, Carter, Grair, Held, Kaye, McCheney, Milam, Morales, Nite, Nokken, Qualin, Arnett, Fleischman, Ritchey, Richman, Siwatu, Bayne, Dallas, Ghebrab, Morse, Nejat, Zuo, Williams, Gilliam, Kalenkoski, Parkinson, Whiting, Yuan, James, Metze, Cassidy, Hidalgo, Litsey, Weiner, Gring, Keene, Langford, Ortiz, Ankrum, Brookes, Donahue, Orflia and Hays. **Senators absent were:** Sharma, Adams, Canas, Hom, Mayer, Morgan, Rahamamoghadam, Ramkumar, Skidmore, Surluiga, Wilde, Dass, Crews, Soliman, McGinley, Parkinson, Henry and McKoin.

Guests were: Kelly Cukrowicz, Associate Professor, Psychological Sciences, Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Scott Burris from the IRB, Provost Lawrence Schovanec, Ombudsperson Jean Scott, Camille Thomas from the Library and Richard Meek, recording meetings.

- Call to order – Dr. Michael Farmer, Faculty Senate President **3:20pm**
- Approval of minutes, Meeting #345, November 11, 2015 **3:21pm**
 - Moved: Senator Giliam
 - Seconded: Senator Kalenkoski
- Introduction of Guests: Kelly Cukrowicz, Associate Professor, Psychological Sciences, Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), Scott Burris, Jeanne Scott (ombudsperson), Richard Meek (AAUP rep)
- Speaker: Kelly Cukrowicz, Associate Professor, Psychological Sciences, Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) **3:22-3:49**
 - Goals: some things that have changed following subcommittee, talk about transition to new Cayuse IRB system;
 - Concern raised last year: number of IRB protocols that staff and reviewers are reviewing, lack of staff compared to peer institutions; issues went to administration; necessary solutions shared with reviewers;
 - Data presented, 2013-2015, broken down by full year as well as summers; total number went up dramatically between 2013-14, and less between 2014-15; in the summers, went down 2013-14, and up dramatically 2014-15 (number of proposals assigned to reviewers; 356 in summer 2015 -- significant, many more able to be assigned to reviewers; only 12 new proposals submitted in summer 2014 and summer 2015, able to assign a lot more for review. Fall 2014: backlog of almost 100 proposals, much delay experienced by investigators;
 - Most critical: increase staff and reviewers; recommendations made: provide at least 2 add'l staff members (admin funded 1 position); train 8 new reviewers instead of 4 (Fall: trained 5, plan to train 4 more in the spring); offer summer stipend to reviewers (admin did this -- 4 reviewers were given a summer stipend, total number of proposals was 120 more as a result); provide Associate IRB Chair (Dr. Scott Burris has been in this position since June);
 - Problem: Time frame. Reviewers were given PIs proposals, people were given 10 working days, plus additional time; PIs were told 10 days for result. Expectation now being brought in line with actual practices. Cayuse gives PIs a way to track stages of review. No more guessing.
 - Problem: approval during breaks. Proposals are now reviewed during summer break; in December, and Spring Break, faculty reviewers not on duty;

- Problem: PIs must change to specific language as a REQUIREMENT of approval, not a suggestion; now language is only a suggestion unless federal law requires it;
- Demonstration/explanation of Cayuse, and how PI will be better informed up front and throughout the process with the new system;
- 1400 protocols entered into Cayuse, and training offered;
- 4 trainings scheduled in January, February, plus additional sessions independently scheduled;
- Typical timeline: PI submits protocol, assigned to reviewer (1-5 days); review will go back to PI within system, revise, go back to reviewer, IRB review will be complete and it will be approved.

DISCUSSION:

- Senator Held: Customer Satisfaction survey? Delay time after changes happened? Has 1 staff position solved the process? Looking for a satisfaction metric.
 - Dr. Cukrowicz: has not yet been implemented, understood would be taken care of by subcommittee.
 - Pres. Farmer: recommended after one full year of operation, then survey.
 - Dr. Cukrowicz: added staff that are not faculty members (1 additional), then Scott Burris (faculty, and now Associate Chair), plus 4 faculty members paid over the summer to review, led to 120 more proposals being reviewed during the summer. Went into Fall 2015 with ZERO backlog as a result. Feels like it has been very reasonable. Only delay has been in December, and as soon as we came back, everything is assigned out. Only wait time would be for people who turned in proposals at start of winter interim break.
 - Senator Litsey: would like to see comparison of Fall 2015 in comparison to Fall 2016, instead of calendar year, for example, for metrics.
 - Senator Fleischmann: in Business, we use established scales, and it seems that if it were possible for those surveys to be exempt, it would reduce workflow.
 - Dr. Cukrowicz: we still review exempt protocols, but we have assigned them to one person.
 - Senator Nejeat: question: what if a project has to rely on the timing of IRB approval? Can there be a provision for an expedited process?
 - Dr. Cukrowicz: we can let staff know that it is an urgent case. We try not to get into the business of reviewing everything on an expedited timeline, but we do our best.
 - Senator Nokken: can't you get data and get IRB approval post?
 - Dr. Cukrowicz: you shouldn't do that.
 - Dr. Burris: comment: individual IRB reviewers review exempt and expedited protocols; there is no mechanism for an individual reviewer to deny a proposal, only the full board can do that.
- Old Business: Review of Committees
 - *Ad Hoc Committee-Fair Use/Work For Hire report (Cox) 3:49*
 - No-one should have to give up copyright rights;
 - Should be rare, and when they do occur, documented;
 - Text went out with agenda (note: see email dated January 15);
 - Key is, it must be disclosed at the time of assignment, and statement must be signed by you and the person who assigned you, and by a direct supervisor. All is transparent, on record, and in your file.

DISCUSSION:

- Senator Donahue: where do you see photographs with this?
 - President Farmer: they are already defined in copyrightable material, there is a distinction for faculty already.
 - Senator Cox: the statement is our best shot at it. If there are situations that remained uncovered, we would like to hear about them so we can move forward through the process.
 - President Farmer: would like to vote on principles next month.
- *Funded Research Group/Post Award report (Farmer) 3:58*
 - Have met, have a few agenda items, several themes we want to work on; right now, individual incidences, likely won't be able to get the kind of thematic areas we hoped we might; we will end up having conversations with individuals in different colleges. In some sense, we may have a larger problem but one that is more fixable.
 - Will go over in a meeting with Michael Daley next month.
 - Spoke with Noel Sloane about it, she was happy to see what a person has to do, and be aware of the potential areas of concern.
 - *Guns on Campus report (Milam) and DISCUSSION 4:01pm*
 - President Farmer: would like the Senate to write a resolution next month;
 - Vice-President Milam: Report is done, in the hands of President Nellis (who is with us for 3 more days); waiting to see if it will come out of his office or that of the next President;
 - Provost Schovanec was interviewed by various newspapers, publications, talked about contents of the report;
 - The most controversial elements have already been made public;
 - TTU task force reluctantly did not believe we could ban guns in the classroom under SB 11 (as did UT);
 - With one part we went further than UT and others: we put in the report "office option" (faculty members can choose whether they want their own office gun-free), don't know if will stand up to SB11;
 - Also strongly recommended increase security on campus, not specific in form that might take in gun-free zones (almost permanent, full-time security);
 - Task force worked hard to listen to 5 different focus groups and one large forum, and campus is split on what all this means;
 - Provost Schovanec: Meeting with John Huffaker, Phillips, Wall, who were prepping Chancellor Duncan for a panel, and they had gotten info from the Attorney General on certain interpretations;
 - Issues in identifying one dorm (may have to provide our own provisions for securing it);
 - Re. office option: sense that won't fly with Attorney General, but we will try to leave it in there; have to say it's a private office, give a person the right to decide;
 - Disallowed guns at ticketed events and performance venues;
 - Everything is still in flux;
 - Trying to decide when to go to the Board with it; said February, but no one else has made final recommendations, there is a sense that someone is waiting to sue first party who does;
 - Official approval may be delayed;
 - President Farmer: can we distribute our report to the faculty?
 - Provost Schovanec: yes.

- Vice President Milam: UT Faculty Council had issued a resolution prior to the task force issuing their report; U of H issued a resolution against guns on campus before Dec. 23; all private Universities have opted out. It is likely that no one doubts there will be litigation. Students for Campus Carry are the most vocal about guns not being disallowed on campuses; 7 states have already done this, TX is the largest and is getting the most exposure;
 - President Farmer: suggest make resolution, be very succinct about what we want to say, would like resolution by end of Feb. to send back to the legislature;
 - Senator Kay: what about laboratories?
 - President Farmer: all labs not excluded;
 - Senator Kay: issue with guns allowed in large classroom close to a very dangerous lab;
 - President Farmer: we had not considered this, we need to provide a report to faculty;
 - Provost Schovanec: they want uniformity among the components; HSC did not impose any restrictions on labs, Angelo State was also generous in their allowances;
 - President Farmer: will talk about a resolution next month;
 - Will express our opinion, record vote on classrooms and offices; we have a good relationship with the population in Lubbock (they like us); this issue could damage that relationship, need to spin it and preserve the relationship.
 - Call for volunteers for the committee to draft the resolution, nominate Ron Milam.
 - Volunteers: Senators Kalenkoski and Litsey.
- Liaison Reports:
 - *Academic Council report* (Milam, Ramkumar) **4:13pm**
 - What happens if there is a vote and faculty shoot down a program?
 - As it stands right now, with a negative report from faculty, the program approval can go forward anyway;
 - Correction: Program approval is now on the form for faculty;
 - We're the only institution that represents faculty that has a way to make a statement.
 - *Graduate Council report* (Morse) and DISCUSSION **4:17pm**
 - The last meeting was Dec 10;
 - Dean's rep -- now the student finds his/her own instead of call going out;
 - Ongoing task: Dean Sheridan working to revise graduate faculty OP, inconsistent as currently written, causes various issues;
 - Still discussing the idea of a Masters degree on the way to a PhD;
 - Two new Associate Deans now;
 - Comment made last time: Senator Held inquired whether new positions should be voted upon by the Faculty Senate body, then carried forward, or whether Faculty Senate should approve Senator Morse as the voter; I can see the benefit of each method;
 - President Farmer: when we started, we went from about 15 to about 78 liaisons; could call this the "Liaisons Committee"; should en masse put forward nominations and electing people (who is a reporter, and who should be voting);
 - Morse's point: should be the voting body's position, which is a separate issue from appointments;

- President Farmer: hoping we can have a summer retreat, to vet these issues.
- *OP updates report* (Held) **4:21**
 - Disturbed by third-year review process (building law outside of the law-making machinery on campus); by any other name, it is a tenure review now. Concerned about making policy without having an OP to vote on and incorporate into the corpus;
 - Provost Schovanec: further comments about the fact that everyone does verify that work has actually been done (according to the Dean's Council); could be a problem to require a hard copy of every publication if a faculty member has produced hundreds of papers;
 - Senator Kay: produce hard copies just of everything produced during time at TTU;
 - President Farmer: needs to be addressed in Arts and Sciences internally, needs a point person.
- *AAUP report* **4:26pm**
 - Nothing to report.
- New Business:
 - *Graduate Fellowships report* (Dallas) **4:26pm**
 - Part of new duty as Associate Dean in Grad school;
 - Presented chart and info (to be emailed to faculty);
 - 1000 applications for internal fellowships;
 - Reviewers evaluate applications (seeking volunteers to review apps -- passed around sign up sheet);
 - Each reviewer already has 30 to review, trying to get it down to 20 apps per faculty member, at 8-10 minutes per application;
 - Another big goal: help undergraduate research pipeline, encourage undergrad research, get addl funding for undergrad research;
 - Trying to take initial steps for more/better apps for NSF grants (grad);
 - Fulbright -- trying to increase more/better apps;
 - NSF NRTs (trying to encourage, limited submission);
 - Please send suggestions for changes;

DISCUSSION:

- Senator Held: out of 1000 submitted, how many funded? how much \$\$?
- Senator Dallas: 10%, all from endowment money (handled by Dean Sheridan); Donna Wood handles some logistics; regarding money, possibly 2-3 million dollars, internal ones are much less, about 300K, and some are targeted, so even less; this averages at less than \$4000 per award for low-level internal awards;
- President Farmer: the app. process not particularly burdensome.
- *Nomination Committee for 2016-2017 Faculty Senate Officers* **4:34 pm**
 - Senator Nite is the only committee member so far, need to recruit 2 more;
 - Need new officers, have had lots of queries for Secretary, Treasurer;
 - Office takes effect in August, ex-Pres stays on in agenda mtgs until no longer needed.
- *Captioning* (Kaye) (moved to February agenda)

- Open Forum: 2 minute open topic from the floor **4:37**
 - Cargile-Cook: question about Op 70.17 (online instruction)
 - Online faculty -- point of duty, must be on campus to teach, but not even living in Lubbock;
 - One person will resign over this (retiring), other has prepared a request to go forward to the Chancellor or President, but Chair has denied it without sending it forward;
 - Senator Held: this should not be allowed, request that Provost Schovanec please look into this
 - Senator Held: How can TTU spend millions on recruiting old Nobel Laureates when we need so much more \$\$ for grad students? We have a one billion dollar endowment (discretionary funds to a large extent), being squandered on another "fishing expedition"; the Faculty Senate should be able to say, we should be going in either x or y direction, instead of hearing about expenditures after decisions have been made; can we not have a discussion before we spend that kind of money?
 - President Farmer: wish we had power to do so. We are mentioned exactly twice in the OPs;
 - Senator Held: administrators have given a lot of lip service to shared governance;
 - President Farmer: Noel Sloan is coming, at least she will be able to tell us where its going;
 - Senator Held: I want to know who makes the decision, and why there is no discussion beforehand;
 - Provost Schovanec: We have hired four National Academy members in the last 4 years, 2 of them were given Maddox Chairs (dictated by Maddox family), which cost \$9 million when filled; they get a big salary. However, all salaries are not always what you might think. No extra support is provided from central. Need to ask, what's come from cluster hires? Point well taken;
 - Senator Held: talked to Chancellor Duncan about teaching philosophy, talked about Marie Antoinette syndrome (most get crumbs -- rank and file faculty deserve more than a 2% raise);
 - President Farmer: the hope is that we change the discussion on faculty governance from one of special pleading to that of an incredibly productive increase in knowledge and the GNP of this country. Imagine what America would look like if we did not have University structure over last 100 years (25% GNP reduction). Faculty governance/shared governance needs to be taken seriously.
- Announcements: *Traffic and Safety report* in February (Ankrum)
- Adjournment. **4:48pm**
 - Moved: Senator Kalenkoski
 - Seconded: Senator Fleischmann