

Faculty Senate Minutes

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

JCK 880, 4:00-6:00 PM

Attending

Senators: Alex White, Janet Bezner, Rebecca Bell-Metereau, Ben Martin, Shane Smith, Ted Hindson, Scott Bowman, Ting Liu, Michel Conroy, Diego Vacaflores, Jesse Gainer, Natalie Ceballos

Guests: Dr. Gene Bourgeois, Dr. Lisa Lloyd, Dr. Debbie Thorne, Dr. Garry White, Selene Hinojosa (Library), Garrett McGinley (Journalism Student), Sandra Sadek (University Star)

President's Academic Advisory Committee

Joint Interim Committee on Higher Education Formula Funding

The chair asked the provost to speak about the Joint Interim Committee on Higher Education Formula Funding (JICHEFF) which met on February 27. An alert from the Texas Association of College Teachers (TACT) indicated that a consensus reached was that non-formula funding should face a sunset process periodically to determine if it is still necessary. The senate asked, *"How likely is it that this will occur? If it occurs, how would this affect funding for Texas State?"*

The provost reported that Eric Algoe is preparing a new version of the 'white paper' on formula funding. The JICHEFF is important because it provides recommendations to the Appropriations Committee. However, the impact of the committee depends on who is on the Appropriations Committee and their priorities. Non-formula funding equals special funding or line item funding. The provost shared a budget summary that listed Texas State's special funding items: Round Rock Higher Education Center, School Safety Center, Edwards Aquifer Research and Data Collection Center, Materials Application Research Center (MARC), Small Business Development Center, and Institutional Enhancement. Institutional Enhancement funds department budgets and faculty salaries. Typically, a special item is intended to be temporary funding to get something started until permanent funding can be identified. Institutional Enhancement funds were used to start a new program. The non-formula funding was cut 32% in the last legislative session, but the new line item for MARC was added. In the wake of the Florida high school shootings, the Governor has tasked the School Safety Center to ensure that schools are safe, and 5 staff were cut when the 32% cut was made, so the Center is dealing with how to accomplish the extra work with the cut. The university is in conversation with the Governor's office to find extra funds given these new responsibilities. The administration intends to ask for the funds that were cut to be restored. Our list of non-formula funding is smaller than other institutions (3.4% of **our total** funding). Going into the next legislative session, we will be asked to prioritize our non-formula funding items, and the provost expects we will put the School Safety Center on top. The formula was tweaked last year, resulting in spreading the money out more widely. There have been a lot of changes in education delivery methods and salary structures since the formula was originally created, so we have encouraged them to examine the formula from the perspective of actual costs.

The formula includes a 10% supplement for undergraduate courses taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty. The amount of supplement that Texas State receives has decreased over time as the

percentage of undergraduate SCH taught by nontenure line faculty has increased. The provost hopes to develop a plan to incentivize units to have TT faculty teach undergraduate courses.

Eric Algoe has agreed to help the Senate understand higher education funding.

Search for new Chief Diversity Officer

The chair asked the administration to discuss the search for the new Chief Diversity Officer (CDO). The senate expressed concern over the number of titles and job duties assigned to the CDO and asked, *“What is the history at Texas State behind combining these separate roles into one office? Is it common for universities of our size to combine these roles?”*

Lisa Lloyd, Special Assistant to the President, indicated that the list of responsibilities is long, but many are very similar (the first 6 are about diversity and inclusion and building a culture thereof) and others are not very time intensive (e.g. Chairing the Committee on Equity and Access). One of the duties is managing and directing the staff in the office, which Lisa thinks is critical to providing the Chief Diversity Officer with the opportunity to lead. Efficiencies can be gained from a thorough review of the office, the staff and their duties. There are 3 investigators, 2 graduate students, and an administrative assistant. Day to day operations can be streamlined so the leader can build our culture of diversity and inclusion, in collaboration with all of us. Lisa benchmarked the organizational structure with peer institutions and for 6 of the 12 institutions, the position the Chief Diversity Officer and the Title IX Coordinator reside in the same person. There is no ‘common’ structure, hence Dr. Lloyd suggested we should do what is best for Texas State. We need to hire a person who can lead and manage this office and Dr. Lloyd believes that is possible.

The duties can be split into three categories: compliance, investigation and leadership. The staff conduct the investigations and compile the reports. Dr. Lloyd pointed out that much of the role of diversity and inclusion in faculty searches could probably be removed from the portfolio of this unit because it’s done competently via Faculty Qualifications.

Senator Gainer wanted to know what the rationale was for not having the CDO on the President’s Cabinet. The provost commented that the president’s preference is to hold all cabinet members accountable for the progress made toward the diversity and inclusion plan. In the benchmarking effort, Dr. Lloyd identified only 3 of the 12 institutions in which the CDO was on the President’s Cabinet. She believes what is more important is that the CDO coordinate all the diversity and inclusion efforts going on, advise the President's Cabinet, and to review and revise the diversity and inclusion plan.

In response to a senator’s question about what is being done to understand the climate at Texas State for faculty of color, the provost described a student climate survey which is ready to be rolled out and a faculty of color survey that may occur in the next 18 months. The Provost has invited faculty of color to gather and meet regularly and expects to receive recommendations about climate (about 50 faculty participated in the first meeting). This will be a function of the CDO.

There are two new positions in the strategic plan that would add resources to the office. It is hoped that the leadership from the CDO can confirm and identify if efforts across campus complement and extend each other.

When asked about the commitment of the President's Cabinet regarding equity and inclusion and diversity, the provost and Dr. Lloyd described a recent diversity training in which the cabinet took part.

Questions and Answers

A Distinguished Professor in the College of Business died recently and there was not an announcement from the administration. The Provost indicated that our current policy refers to current faculty, not former faculty. JoAnn Smith is writing a policy addressing the deaths of students and current and former faculty and staff.

Policy Review

Senators were assigned to review the following policies

- AA/PPS No. 04.01.10 (7.20) Faculty Criminal Background Checks (March 23) – Senator Bowman
- AA/PPS No. 04.01.02 Faculty Development Leaves (March 23) – Senator Conroy
- UPPS 01.04.12 Designation of Official Texas State Stationery (March 23) – Senator White

Dr. Walt Horton, Chief Research Officer

The chair shared 4 concerns about the IRB that had arisen during the course of senate discussions this year.

- 1) **Process:** The new process does not allow the researcher to suggest a level of review: exempt, expedited and full board review. There is the fear that very simple proposals (e.g. anonymous surveys) are lost in the stack of more complex proposals, causing delays. This is especially problematic for master's student research projects. Another process issue is that the IRB requires letters of support from off-site partners. Some off-site partners (in this case school districts) require IRB before writing a letter of support, so it's a catch-22.
- 2) **Time to Approval.** Sean Rubino reported to us that the first evaluation (essentially triage) is done by their office and is completed in an average of 7 days. Proposals that are recommended for exempt/expedited status are sent to a member of the IRB to review and sign off on the designation. Several members of the senate and the liaisons of the senate did not think this time line was consistent with their experience. In particular, during this current academic year the time to approval has been much longer. Chair White requested data from faculty relating what they have experienced. Nine faculty responded, listing 17 applications (all exempt), average length between application and notification 41 days, Standard Deviation of 26 days.
- 3) **Responsiveness.** Some faculty have complaints about unanswered calls or emails to the office.
- 4) **Role of IRB.** The faculty believe that the IRB process is important in terms of compliance with laws and regulations, but also in terms of protecting the rights and privacy of participants in the research involving human subjects. However, there is the perception that the IRB in several instances oversteps its role by commenting on aspects of the research design that do not relate to rights and privacy of the participants. These suggestions not only impinge on the rights of expert researchers to design their studies, but

also necessitate revisions or explanations of non-IRB-related aspects of the research that can delay approval.

Dr. Horton provided several handouts.

- a) Analytics – Human Subject Research.
 - a. Texas State is doing very well in the compliance area of Human Subjects Research. The desire is to increase efficiency and effectiveness without increasing compliance problems.
 - b. First time IRB applications: FY 17: 941, FY 18 (through 2 quarters): 532
 - c. Active Protocols: FY 17: 722, FY 18 (through 2 quarters): 398
 - d. Total approvals (see handout). When the IRB received about 150 student projects in the beginning of FY 18 they were not ready to handle the number of projects. Not ready in terms of the process, communication about when the peak times occur, triage process, and staffing.
 - e. Discussion: Sean Rubino indicated that exempt projects would be reviewed in 7 days, while these data are very different. Dr. Horton indicated that the triage occurs in 7 days, but then it goes to the committee for verification, and the Senate doesn't understand why the extra step is needed if the project is exempt. The range of days is large (0 to 50+ days), which skews the data.
- b) Dr. Horton shared the outline of a plan for continuous improvement in IRB Process (see handout)
 - i. 60% of applications are from students
 - ii. Plans include:
 - a) Re-engineer website listing real time data about time frames and peak times
 - b) Modify application web portal to make submit process more obvious
 - c) Continued outreach by Sean Rubino to inform faculty, staff and students about the process.
 - d) New IRB application portal online in June 2018. Testing and data migration is occurring now. The new system will take the answers to the risk questions and flag the applications that are "likely exempt" to expedite these applications. The application will be built in the portal rather than attaching documents to the portal. Reviewer comments will appear in the portal. Alerts will be sent automatically. Dr. Horton indicated that beta testers would be recruited soon to test the system.
 - e) Dr. Horton will continue dialogue with the IRB Chairperson
 - f) Increase staffing support for compliance area including support of IRB process. Currently hiring an admin 3 to support Sean Rubino and the contracts team only and no one else in OSP. This person will keep a log of applications and do other administrative work to free up Mr. Rubino and Monica Gonzalez to review applications. Also, hiring a compliance generalist who will report directly to Mr. Rubino who can perform reviews.

- g) Discussion: The Senate believes these enhancements will go a long way to assure faculty their concerns have been heard and addressed. A future discussion should address the IRB culture. Dr. Horton believes the IRB is moving in the right direction. He invited the Senate to attend an IRB meeting. Dr. Denise Gobert, Chair of the IRB, is open to a second IRB, maybe one focused on health research or students. The IRB scheduled a second meeting in December due to the volume but typically meets once a month. What is the expectation for time to review? Best practices (2-3 weeks for exempt) indicate that we should be able to decrease the time frames compared to FY 17. Concern expressed that faculty submit proposals over the holidays and the timeline is extended. The challenge is that the IRB (faculty) are not available, but staff are available over the holidays to answer questions.

Report from Academic Computing Committee

ACC Grant Recommendations – Dr. Garry White provided a report on the ACC grant. Twenty-three proposals were received and the amount of funding available for academic year 2018 – 2019 is \$500,000. Seventeen proposals can be funded based on their rank, with a left-over of about \$18,000. The committee prefers to avoid partial funding so is recommending skipping the next two proposals and funding the 3rd proposal on the list that has requested about \$18K. Could offer partial funding to the next proposal on the list, which is what is done in the REP and University Lecturers program. In this case, the granters would have to commit to finding the rest of the money or incrementally implementing the plan. The rating system already accounts for matching funding.

Budget has not changed in 20 years – there were only 20,000 students 20 years ago, so the amount of funding needs to be increased. If we continue to fund new proposals, the amount needed for replacement will increase in the future. The funding for this program comes from student computer fees so if the number of students has nearly doubled, why hasn't the amount available increased?

The Senate will vote on the proposal and discuss the changes suggested by the ACC at the next meeting.

Approval of Minutes: The minutes from February 28 were approved.

6:00 Adjourn