Faculty Senate Executive Council MINUTES February 23, 2015

Present: Deborah Baldwin, Mark Collins, Jennifer Fowler, Patricia Freeland, David Golden, Joanne Hall, Dean Kopsell, Bruce MacLennan, Bonnie Ownley, Rebecca Prosser, Tina Shepardson, Robert Spirko, Steven Waller, and Kathi Wong

Guests: Colleen Gilrane (Chair of the Institutional Review Board)

## I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Hall called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. and established that a quorum was present.

## **II. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS**

President's Report (J. Hall)

- The Board of Trustees will be meeting this week in Memphis. Faculty workload and evaluation will be discussed, among many other items.
- J. Hall reminded everyone that the bylaws of the Faculty Senate require that meeting minutes of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils need to be approved by the Faculty Senate. Since senators do not attend these meetings, highlights of these minutes are very helpful and should be presented at the Senate meetings.

<u>Chancellor's Report</u> (J. Cheek) The Chancellor was unable to attend.

<u>Provost's Report</u> (S. Martin) The Provost was unable to attend.

## **III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes of the Executive Council Meeting of January 20, 2015, were presented for approval. D. Golden moved to approve the minutes as written and K. Wong seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as written.

## **IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

IMedRIS and IRB Concerns Dialogue (C. Gilrane)

C. Gilrane explained that a significant amount of time has been spent with new IRB applications, which has slowed down the approval process. She indicated that the number of new applications has increased significantly because several people who should have been submitting applications to IRB in the past had not been doing so until recently. Temporary personnel support has been allocated to help take care of the backlog of applications. Questions arose as to whether increased need for IRB applications and approval were triggered by a new interpretation of the kinds of projects that require review. C. Gilrane replied that she did not think this was the case. She indicated that the guidelines by the Federal government on projects that are required to be reviewed, and what types of projects are exempt, are posted on the IRB website. Discussion followed on the types of projects that require an application. C. Gilrane indicated that when datasets come from outside UT, IRB has to make certain that the original agreements related to collection of that data are not violated. Training by CITI on Human Subjects Research is required for all researchers whose project requires an IRB

application. C. Gilrane confirmed that undergraduates participating with research projects in the Exhibition of Undergraduate Research and Creative Achievement are required to submit an application and take CITI training.

Revisiting Faculty Student Relationship Proposed Policy (J. Fowler)

The policy was revised by the Faculty Affairs Committee based on comments from the Faculty Senate Executive Council. The revised policy is posted at <a href="http://cdn-tepsilon.org">http://cdn-tepsilon.org</a>

<u>senate.utk.edu/files/2014/08/Relationships-Between-Faculty-and-Students-\_updated.pdf</u>. Discussion followed on use of the word "amorous" in section 2.2.6.1. To better clarify the meaning of this word, one sentence was changed:

**2.2.6.1 Definitions.** This policy applies to all faculty as defined in chapters 3 and 4 of the *Faculty Handbook*, whether employed full-time or part-time, whether paid or unpaid. For the purpose of this policy, "relationship" includes any amorous or sexual conduct, whether occurring one time, occasionally, or regularly. Amorous Inappropriate conduct is defined to be those behaviors that include are distinct fromsexual actions and yetor that indicate an pecialamorous relationship that is outside of the accepted norms for teacher-student relationships. Colleges, departments, offices, or other units may impose more restrictive policies governing relationships with students, which shall take precedence over this policy except to the extent such policies violate any Board of Trustees policy or conflict with law.

The revised document will be presented for a vote at the Senate meeting on Monday, March 2, 2015, and is posted on the Senate website (<u>http://cdn-</u>

senate.utk.edu/files/2014/08/Relationships-Between-Faculty-and-Students-4.pdf).

#### Elections Progress Report (B. MacLennan)

B. MacLennan gave the number of new senators that are needed from each college and the number of candidates reported by each caucus (in parentheses):

- Architecture and Design one (3 tenured/tenure track)
- Business Administration three (1 non-tenure track)
- Communication and Information two (no report from caucus)
- Education, Health and Human Sciences three (caucus started recruiting on Feb. 11<sup>th</sup>)
- Engineering three (8 tenured/tenure track)
- Law one (tenured/tenure track; will vote at faculty meeting)
- Arts and Sciences Humanities five (caucus is waiting for list of eligible faculty)
- Arts and Sciences Natural Sciences five (includes 2 empty seats expiring in 2016 and 2017; no report from caucus)
- Arts and Sciences Social Sciences two (no report from caucus)
- Nursing one (2 tenured/tenure track)
- Social Work one (still seeking candidates as of Feb 15<sup>th</sup>)
- Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources and UT Extension four (at least 1 from UT Extension; 8 tenured/tenure track, including 2 from UT Extension)
- Veterinary Medicine one (no report from caucus)

M. Collins asked if two candidates are needed to run for each open position. D. Golden responded that ideally the answer was yes, but sometimes you have to go with the number that you have. R. Spirko announced that he had written an article about the rewards of serving on the Faculty Senate that would be released this week. The article has since been posted (<u>http://tntoday.utk.edu/2015/02/26/faculty-senate-seeking-representatives/</u>).

# V. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

### Faculty Affairs Committee (J. Fowler)

J. Fowler asked if the appropriate work flow had been followed with changes in the Senate bylaws related to Research Council. B MacLennan indicated that this had been done and he will make those approved changes official.

### Graduate Council (P. Freeland)

P. Freeland indicated that a new "leave of absence" policy is being developed, which will involve an examination of what happens with "incomplete" grades when a student takes a leave of absence. The College of Law is offering a new MS degree program that is mainly associated with international students who are receiving training in U.S. business law. A new Assistant Dean of the Graduate School (Stephanie Galloway) has been hired.

## Research Council (T. Shepardson)

- Nominations for the Chancellor's Awards have been submitted.
- Council continues to interact with R. Nobles about issues related to research compliance.
- The Council committee that reviews and recommends awards for SARIF GREs has been reinstated as funds have become available for these awards. Information and applications are available at <a href="http://research.utk.edu/applications-for-2015-summer-gras-now-being-accepted/">http://research.utk.edu/applications-for-2015-summer-gras-now-being-accepted/</a>.
- The Undergraduate Research Fee Bill (sponsored by Travis Wilson, College of Arts and Sciences) proposes a fee of \$5 be levied on each undergraduate student entering the University of Tennessee in or after fall 2015. The fee is being proposed by undergraduate students. The fee would be directed to the Office of Undergraduate Research for support of summer research internships and travel to conferences. The proposal is posted at <a href="http://cdn-senate.utk.edu/files/2014/08/Undergraduate-Research-Fee-Bill.pdf">http://cdn-senate.utk.edu/files/2014/08/Undergraduate-Research-Fee-Bill.pdf</a> and will be considered by Research Council at an upcoming meeting. D. Golden stated that there is also a pool of money that is allocated from the Student Programming Allocation Committee from students who do not opt in for use of their funds on student activities programming. He suggested that these funds may potentially be available to support undergraduate research.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

## Faculty Handbook Issues

Questions were raised and discussion followed about whether annual evaluations of department heads by faculty, as described in section 1.4.5, page 5 of the *Faculty Handbook*, are occurring across the colleges. J. Hall will raise this issue with Chancellors Cheek and Arrington.

#### Graduate Student Residency Resolution (J. Hall)

The resolution was presented at the Faculty Senate meeting of February 2, 2015, and is posted at <u>http://cdn-senate.utk.edu/files/2014/08/Residency-Bill\_final\_FacultySenate.pdf</u>. Questions were raised about specific examples of how this affects students. Additional persons will be contacted for more information.

# <u>Resolution on Apportionment of Tenure-Tenure Track to Non-tenure Track Senators</u> (B. MacLennan)

J. Hall indicated that eligibility for election to Faculty Senate varied greatly across universities, and then described examples of how this is done at specific institutions. D. Golden said that the Faculty Senate had decided on this issue at the last Faculty Senate meeting because there was no second to the motion on apportionment of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty in Faculty Senate, therefore the motion failed. M. Collins agreed and pointed out that there may not be enough faculty willing to run for Senate if non-tenure track faculty are given limited opportunities. J. Hall indicated that Faculty Senate bylaws do not state whether non-tenure track faculty can run for President of the Senate, and this needs to be clarified. B. MacLennan presented a resolution drafted by C. White (absent) on apportionment of tenure/tenure track and non-tenure track senators (http://cdn-senate.utk.edu/files/2014/08/Resolution-on-Apportionment-Senators\_TTT\_NTT\_FINAL\_ALA-format.pdf). C. White had made a motion to accept the resolution. B. MacLennan seconded the motion so that a vote could be called. J. Fowler called for the question and the vote was taken. There were two yes votes (in proxy as voters were absent), 11 votes against, and 1 abstention. The motion failed.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie H. Ownley, Secretary