Faculty Senate Minutes
March 20, 2019 #365

Senators Present Were: Al-Hmoud, Barenberg, Barnes, Bayne, Blum, Boren-Alpizar, Borshuk, Bucy, Cassidy, Cochran, Cook, Decker, Donahue, Fedler, Flueckiger, Gotlieb, Held, Hodes, Ireland, Jai, Johnson, Jones, Jonsson, Karp, King, Kleinhans, Lavigne, Legacey, Li, Louis, Matteson, McEniry, Meek, Mosher, Nathan, Pare, Pease, Ramkumar, Rice, Romi, Shumway, Singh, Skidmore, CM Smith, Stetson, Strieder, Thacker, Thompson, Walter, Wang, Watts, Weiser, Williams, Zook.

Senators Excused Were: Blum, Buelinckx, Flueckiger, Gilson, Juan, Rice, Rider, Romi, and Zook.

- **Call to order – Alan Barenberg, Faculty Senate President – 3:15pm**
- **Introduction of Guests – 3:16pm**
  o **Guests were:** New elected Faculty Senators-Michael Farmer, Siva Parameswaran, Beau Pihlaja, Daan Liang and Mukaddes Darwish; Vice President for Research Joe Heppert and Associate VPR-Alice Young; Jean Pearson Scott-Ombuds; IRB liaison-Cassie De Street; Provost Michael Galayean, Senior Vice Provost Rob Stewart, and Vice Provost Genevieve Durham-DeCesaro. Heidi Winkler from the Library and Cody Arnall, subbing for Senator Flueckiger. Maggie Gilcrest from the Staff Senate, Parliamentarian Ryan Litsey
- **Discussion of minutes, Meeting #364 – 3:17pm**
  o President Barenberg asks for discussion
  o No discussion
  o Senator Ramkumar moves to approve minutes, Senator Hodes seconds
  o Motion carries unanimously and minutes are approved.
- **Speakers – 3:18pm**
  o **Joseph Heppert, Vice President for Research and Alice Young, Associate Vice President for Research**
    - Here to discuss conflicts of interest
    - Mentions that the number of federal awards received is up $6,000,000 compared to last year, which is almost entirely due to faculty and other researchers
    - Mentions that federal research expenditures are up 14% over last year, which is approximately $3,000,000
    - These are great outcomes for Texas Tech
    - Conflicts of interest (COI) must be disclosed and managed prior to the submission of any proposal to the National Institutes of Health (NIH)
• National Science Foundation and other federal agencies are moving toward a similar structure – disclosure of COI prior to proposal submission
• All PIs and Co-Is need to have the COI submitted
• TTU will accept proposals without COI, but the COI must be submitted within 30 days of proposal submission
• If conflicts of interest are not submitted within 30 days of proposal submission, they will be withdrawn
• TTU VPR’s office will provide communication and reminders to faculty submitting the proposal prior to the 30 day limit

- Changes in proposal submission processes in Cayuse will take place June 1, 2019
- Faculty should also run their proposals through iThenticate prior to submission

- Faculty need to remember that the certification page in Cayuse is the legal signature for the proposal – it is not appropriate for another person to certify the grant on your behalf, as it is a legally binding document
  - Senator Boal asks if a person’s name can be withdrawn from a proposal
  - Some agencies allow this, but others do not
- Federal government expects all formal international collaborations to be outlined in great detail in grant applications – specifically NIH
  - Includes any international faculty appointments, funding for a research lab, a time commitment at a research institution
    - Not disclosing these things could result in revocation of funding
    - TTU is advising to disclose any and every collaboration with international colleagues and institutions in other countries
  - Senator Boal asks how faculty can control for international collaborators who collaborate with unsavory institutions.
    - We cannot control for our international collaborators’ relationships with other collaborators
    - Best course of action is to maintain close communication with the VPR’s office about these issues

- President Barenberg encourages faculty to reach out to the VPR’s office with any questions or concerns
  - Genevieve Durham-DeCesaro, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (3:40pm)
    - Here to discuss the administrative course drop policy
      - When a student withdraws from TTU the student’s credit hours drop to 0, but dropping refers to individual courses
      - There is a draft OP regarding administrative drops
        - An administrative drop is initiated by the academic unit and not by the student
        - Administrative drops should not be used to prevent a student receiving a particular grade
- Administrative drops should not be used for changing the student’s financial aid status
- The draft OP on administrative drops addresses times when these types of drops would be appropriate
  - When a student has been advised to take a course in error – frequently happens with transfer students
  - When a student registers for the incorrect section of a course and needs to be dropped and re-registered in the correct section
  - When a student hasn’t completed a student-initiated drop in a course that is under enrolled and is going to be canceled
  - When students are in violation of the code of conduct
  - When students are unable to drop the course themselves due to health
  - When there is a natural disaster, such as Hurricane Harvey
- Having a uniform policy will ensure consistency across academic units
  - Senator Karp mentions that there are some courses in which the student is dropped if a certain number of classes are missed and asks where this kind of action fits in the drop policy.
  - That practice is probably not allowed, but the student will receive the grade that the student has earned up to that point in the course.
  - Maggie Gilchrist asks if a student fails a prerequisite course and is enrolled in the course requiring the prerequisite past the drop date
  - Most courses with prerequisites have built in checks and balances in Banner that will drop the student from the sequent course, but if the student were missed in this system, there is not a policy on addressing this, though it may be institutional error
  - Senator Matteson asks about incomplete grades, where the student didn’t fail the class, but perhaps the faculty member didn’t submit the paperwork on time
  - There is not a policy on this at this time
  - If there are any questions or suggestions, please contact President Barenberg

- Jean Scott, Ombudsperson (3:50pm)
  - Here to present a report
    - Ombuds office operates on the pillars of confidentiality, impartiality, independence, and informality
      - 42 visitors to office last year, some duplication
      - 49 meetings over last year
• These numbers have been consistent over the last 4 years
  ▪ Meetings lasted between 15 minutes to 3.5 hours, average about 60 – 90 minutes
  ▪ Visitors may choose to pursue additional action, at other times they choose not to do so
  ▪ At times the Ombuds will sit in on a meeting between faculty and administration
    o The role of the ombudsperson is to get a systemic perspective on issues across the university so administration can address patterns of concern
    o Dr. Scott has been honored to serve as ombudsperson for the last 4 years
    o Senator Ramkumar asks what trends are being seen at TTU
      ▪ Retaliation and fear of retaliation are still issues at TTU
      ▪ Communication on policies and procedures is not consistent across colleges
      ▪ The need for a more positive workplace environment
    o Senator Held asks how bullying is addressed
      ▪ These incidents are taken to the Provost
    o Senator Held asks for a full report from the ombudsperson’s office
      ▪ Dr. Scott agrees to provide a general report
  o **Heidi Winkler, Digital Services Librarian (3:59)**
    ▪ Here to present on alternative metrics (alt-metrics) tool called PlumX
      • PlumX was acquired by Elsevier two years ago, facilitating enhanced integration with other Elsevier products, such as Scopus
      • PlumX seems to work better with sciences than with humanities
      • If you leave TTU, you leave your PlumX account as they are institutionally linked
      • Discusses different PlumX features
      • If you would like a PlumX account, email Heidi and she will help
      • Senator Barnes asks if PlumX is integrated with Digital Measures
        ▪ No, there is no integration
      • Senator Boal asks for comparison between PlumX and Google Scholar and Web of Science
        ▪ Google Scholar and PlumX can be integrated, Scholar seems to be more sensitive to traditional publications
      • Senator Thompson asks how much it costs
        ▪ It is free to faculty
      • Senator Bucy asks if PlumX will be used for merit evaluation
        ▪ This is a conversation that is just getting started
      • President Barenberg does mention that for humanities PlumX does not work well
President Barenberg, Old Business – 4:07pm
- First order of business is officer elections
  - Each candidate speaks for approximately 1 minute
- President Barenberg clarifies that only current senators are eligible to vote in the officer election
  - Ballots are distributed by Nominations Committee members
  - Nominations Committee members collect completed ballots and exit to tally results
- President Barenberg asks for the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee Report
  - Senator Cochran reports that there are 4 OPs recommended for acquiescence: 70.05, 70.16, 70.44, and 72.10
- President Barenberg asks for any additional discussion on the recommendations
  - Senator Johnson clarifies which OPs are recommended for acquiescence
- Senator Cochran reports that there was resistance by deans on advisory votes by faculty for department chairs on OP 32.03
  - Now proposing an alternative in case that faculty vote is not taken
  - Faculty can go directly to the Provost’s office with concerns
  - Committee recommends approval of this OP with the substantive change
  - Senator Johnson asks Provost Galyean why proposed changes were not retained in the revised OP
    - Provost Galyean indicates the deans were concerned that votes may be inappropriate in some circumstances, felt that it limited their ability in some cases
  - Senator Ramkumar indicates that some deans are asking for names to be included in votes and asks why this is allowed?
    - Under the revised policy the dean cannot insist that names be included on votes
  - Senator Boal asks about cases when the dean want to hire a chair for political reasons and faculty do not support the decision, would the Provost’s office step in to assist
    - Provost Galyean refers to the policy and indicates that his office would intervene as necessary
  - Senator Held suggests an amendment in paragraph 2, section 1 of the OP, next to last sentence
    - Change the work “by” to “at the discretion of”
  - Senator Lavigne mentions that there is nothing in the current version of the OP that disallows the right of faculty to call a vote
  - Additional discussion ensues about language of the OP
  - Senator Held withdraws his suggestion for an amendment
  - Senator Donahue refers to a misspelling in the 2nd line of the 2nd paragraph
President Barenberg asks for additional discussion
- Senator Boal asks for clarification about ways to discuss concerns with Provost that don’t include a vote
- President Barenberg clarifies that the language of the OP addresses this concern

President Barenberg asks for a vote on the motion to approve the report
- The motion passes 53 – 1

Senator Cochran also mentions OP 70.20 on background checks
- Committee opposed based on concerns with section 2.b
- OP 70.20 is currently under revision by the Provost

Senator Cochran mentions OP 74.04 dealing with intellectual property rights
- Still under revision by committee

Senator Cochran discusses 70.06 dealing with working hours
- Still concerned with the definition of the term “employee”
- Proposes that in the case of faculty members whose employment status is governed by OP 32.01, OP 32.02, and OP 32.04, the provisions of OP would not apply, unless the faculty member serves in an administrative position
- President Barenberg asks for discussion

President Barenberg asks for a vote on OP 70.06 revisions
- Motion passes unanimously

President Barenberg asks for the Nomination Committee to report on the results of the officer election
- Senator Matteson reports that no run-off election is necessary
- Senator Matteson reports that next year’s officers will be:
  - Secretary – Senator Ramkumar
  - Vice-President – Senator Weiser
  - President – Senator Cochran

President Barenberg thanks all the senators who ran for officer positions

President Barenberg asks for any other old business
- Senator Held asks about scooters
- President Barenberg mentions that next month people from facilities, transportation, and the police will be at April’s meeting

President Barenberg, New Business – 4:42pm
- President Barenberg mentions that there are not processes set up to deal with threats made against faculty
  - Suggests we send this to the Campus Climate Committee
  - Senator Lavigne moves, Senator Johnson seconds
  - Issue is sent to Campus Climate Committee

President Barenberg mentions the issues with rising graduate student health insurance costs
- Recommends setting up an ad-hoc committee to collaborate with students on this issue
- If interested, email President Barenberg or Patty Gisch
o **President Barenberg, Liaison Reports – 4:44pm**
  - President Barenberg asks for any liaison reports – there are none

o **President Barenberg, Announcements – 4:44pm**
  - President Barenberg asks if there are any announcements
  - Senator Ramkumar discusses the AAUP forum with the President and the Provost on April 3 from 2:00 – 3:00
    - If you plan on attending, please let Senator Ramkumar know by March 27
  - The Administrator Evaluation Survey results were posted today
    - There is a link to the results on the Faculty Senate web page
  - The search for the new ombudsperson is soon to be posted
  - President Barenberg asks for any other announcements – there are none
  - President Barenberg asks for a motion to adjourn
  - Senator Matteson moves, Senator Hodes seconds

• **Adjournment 4:47pm**