

Minutes

Faculty Standards Committee of the University Senate Minutes

Monday, October 5, 2020 (2:00 – 3:30 PM, WebEx)

The following FSC members were in attendance.

Lisa Holle, Chair, Pharmacy Practice
Marysol Asencio, El Instituto
Dan Burkey, Engineering
Elizabeth Jockusch, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Betsy McCoach, Neag
Linda Pescatello, Kinesiology
Paula Philbrick, EEB, Waterbury Campus
Cristina Wilson, School of Social Work
Sarah Woulfin, Educational Leadership
Likhita Athina, USG Representative
Preston Britner, Human Development & Family Sciences
Lewis Gordon, Philosophy
Kathleen Holgerson, Women's Center
Martina Rosenberg, CETL
Jeffrey Shoulson, Senior Vice Provost, Ex-Officio member
Guest (2-2:30 pm) Mike Glasgow Jr; Associate VP for Research Sponsored Program Services

1) Old Business

- a) F/U from Research Grant Deadlines – a proposal for enforcement of deadline policy - *Guest Michael Glasgow, Jr.; Associate VP for Research Sponsored Program Services (2-2:30 pm)*

The statement below was agreed upon by FSC via email after September meeting and was sent to the SEC.

The Faculty Standards Committee reviewed the proposed internal deadline for grant proposals and related FAQs and correspondence received from the SEC and OPVR. We understand the issues OPVR is facing including the stress and pressure put on SPS staff, significant delays in review for those investigators submitting in advance of the deadlines, and the potential for a reduction in quality of rushed reviews. We, too, as faculty investigators are interested in an efficient, expeditious, and high-quality review process but do have several concerns about this proposed enforcement policy. The concerns range from potential loss of funding opportunities to lack of clarity around what should be submitted when. However, since not all stakeholders involved in the grant proposal submission process have been engaged in reviewing the proposal for enforcement of the internal deadline for grant proposals, we believe more discussion is warranted before imposing this policy. We'd like to get input from tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty at all levels with relevant grant experience as well as grant support staff at the College/School levels, Deans of Colleges/Schools, and staff within SPS to ensure we are identifying an efficient and expeditious process that supports all staff and faculty in the submission of high quality grants. We realize OPVR wants to initiate this policy more quickly, but feel it is warrants more discussion. We'd be happy to have OPVR/SPS staff join us for our October meeting.

In response Carol Atkinson-Palumbo, SEC chair, called a meeting between FSC chair Lisa Holle, *Michael Glasgow, Jr.*; *Associate VP for Research Sponsored Program Services* and *Michelle Williams, Associate VP for Research Development*. Discussion included more details about the FSC and SEC concerns (as highlighted above). Mike and Michelle described some of the challenges within SPS and OPVR as well as other initiatives that were underway to improve efficiency of grant submission process university wide. Holle and Atkinson-Palumbo continued to emphasize the need to have this be a collaborative and not punitive effort that continues to work toward the goal of a highly successful research I university that can strive to meet President Katsouleas's goal of doubling research. Additionally that given pandemic, we're all understand tremendous pressures/stressors that are not typical and that this should be considered when issuing this policy. Discussion of pushing out the deadline for the enforcement of research submission deadline was further discussed. Plan was to share this information with President Katsouleas and Vice President for Research Radenka Maric and invitation was extended to Michelle Williams and Mike Glasgow, Jr. to attend October FSC to discuss further.

Dr. Williams was unable to attend due to other commitments. Mike Glasgow, Jr. shared some of the efforts of SPS including 1) recruitment and hiring of staff to assist with grant writing; 2) further training of SPS and college/school level grant support staff for efficiency and appropriateness of grant review as well as new staff orientation that will be lengthy (6 mo+); 3) new faculty orientation and guidance about the SPS and grant writing process; 4) clear role/responsibilities delineation of local grant staff; 5) roll-out of software that will allow investigators to see where the grant submission is within review process and communication with all involved in grant submission; and 6) implementation date will occur January 1, 2021 with a Town Hall for further discussion amongst stakeholders Fall 2020.

Committee members asked for clarification on following and discussion ensued as such:

- Data on when submissions are received from colleges/schools vs when SPS reviews/submits and data on when college/school grant review and SPS review have discordant recommendations. Mike Glasgow, Jr stated he has data but not with him for this discussion
- Implementation process – seems as this could be tricky if in a situation where no pass is available and investigator is unable to submit – that means a potential financial and research credibility loss for investigator and university. Will university be willing to do this in the end. After first year, the passes used will be reviewed and the process evaluated for further description for 2022.
 - Exceptions to the research deadline enforcement include
 - Late-breaking grant submission deadlines
 - Rapid awards
 - Multi-institution awards
- Fairness if technical glitch or investigator submits early but because of backlog it puts unfair stress/potential for errors on investigator's part as they don't have clear expectation when it will be returned from SPS for revisions. This might lead to investigators "not working at their best" especially during pandemic
- UConn Health subawards/shared grant contract improvement – Mike Glasgow Jr indicated there are now liaisons at each site (UConn-Storrs and UConn Health) who can facilitate subawards/grant review process. An affiliation agreement is underway to allow collaborations without typical subaward process.

- b) Sept 2020 Minutes – approved with following changes
 - Heading should be "Minutes" (not "Agenda")
 - Under Old Business, the Minutes should be for April 2020 (not 2019)

2) New Business

- a) Emeritus By-Law Revision – revisit
 - Process for endorsing existing by-law amendment (attached by-law amendment document) – Lisa spoke with SEC and this was their response:
The SEC discussed this topic. If the current FSC is supportive of the original motion, it can simply endorse and ask the SEC to resubmit to Gulley Hall. Then it is off of your docket. The SEC may then decide to forward to President Katsouleas and Provost Lejuez as is or it may decide to revise the motion. If the latter, the SEC would be responsible for bringing the revise motion to the Senate floor for discussion and vote.
 - Provost Office’s request for consideration – current Provost’s team is interested in input on the following considerations. A peer institution comparison of Emeritus policies was compiled by Provost’s office and shared with committee (attached)
 - Include tenure, non-tenure track, and administrative positions?
Committee discussed and agreed to include non-tenure track positions automatically but use current terminology “Clinical, In-Residence and Extension Faculty (CIRE).” Discussion ensued about whether all professional staff and/or administrators should be automatically included. As current by-law stands any professional staff are eligible following recommendation of President and Retirement Committee. A request for how many professional staff have requested and have been bestowed this designation was requested before a decision is made about this group.
 - What is minimum service and/or rank required?
Agreed with By-Law Amendment from 2017 as associate rank and for minimum of 5 years at University
 - Process for removing “emeritus status” for any reason?
Agreed to have a clause to the effect that this designation is a privilege not a right and can be revoked at any time by Administration
 - Presumptive/automatic status vs committee review/recommendation?
As above, okay with current automatic status for associate professor or above tenure-track and CIRE with at least 5 years of experience (in total). Considerations for administrative and/or professional staff are ongoing.
- Plan was to draft language for By-Law amendment that incorporates above, Provost office to gather information about professional staff requests/emeriti positions and finalize By-Law amendment at November meeting with intent to bring to SEC and Senate for vote this year.*
- New Distinguished Professor title discussion – Lisa/Jeffrey
 - Update from Administration – Provost’s office was also independently interested in exploring a possible new “distinguished type” professor designation as they also see the value of this for recruiting, retention, and

supporting current and/or future initiatives that are value/mission-based. Jeffrey Shoulson shared that some discussion had ensued at Provost's office that perhaps this could be a designation that could be based on a current initiative – example Distinguished Professor of Inclusivity that might be bestowed on a number of faculty for a distinct time period and associated with research dollars. However, Provost's office was interested in other ideas from our committee.

- Current BOT process; outlined below was shared with committee
<https://provost.uconn.edu/events-and-recognition/awards/#>

Discussion on this topic included that it could be useful to have another “distinguished professor” designation. It might be beneficial to have the title be different so there is not confusion about title vs BOT Distinguished Professor title. It was brought to the attention during meeting that there is a University Professor title although all that was found about title was: This title is awarded by the University's Board of Trustees to tenured nine month faculty members for outstanding scholarship and distinguished service to the University. As of 2019, the title has been bestowed on 29 faculty members throughout the University's history. Additional discussion included whether a new title like this should be designated by administration or by faculty peer-review. Pros/cons of both were discussed. Additionally, concerns about the current BOT distinguished professor nomination/selection process and the lack of diversity of current BOT distinguished professors was discussed. Questions about whether an evaluation of current BOT distinguished professor process has been done in past and if not whether this should be considered given concerns.

Plan was to gather more information about University professor designation, and about evaluation of BOT distinguished professor process and then to continue discussion at November meeting to develop a more formal proposal.

- c) SET+ - Did not discuss due to time limitations. Will put on November agenda
 - a. Modifications SET +/- use of while instructing in new/varied formats (eg, online, hybrid as new designs, nearly all new prep)
 - b. For discussion - consider modifications of SET+/use of evals while instructors teaching in new/varied formats (online, hybrid as new designs, nearly new preps)

3) Announcements

Reminder of Future Meetings

- Nov 2, 2020
- Dec 7, 2020
- Feb 1, 2021
- March 1, 2021
- April 5, 2021
- April 26, 2021