

Faculty Senate Policy Committee
Meeting Notes
September 7, 2022
3pm – 4:30pm
Zoom Meeting

Members Present: Karen Armitage; Robert Cristenson; Karen Patterson (interim chair); Min Young Ro

Ex-Officio Present: Amy Levi, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Health Sciences Center; Barbara Rodriguez, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; Brandon Toensing, Associate University Counsel; Vivian Valencia, University Secretary Emerita

Staff Present: Nancy Middlebrook, University Secretary; Carol Stephens, Professional Consultant, Office of the University Secretary; Caitlin Wells, Operations Specialist, Office of the University Secretary

Guests Present: Karl Benedict, Director of University Library Information Technology and Research Data Services; Angela Catena, Title IX Coordinator, Office of Compliance, Ethics, and Equal Opportunity (CEEEO); Francie Cordova, Chief Compliance Officer, CEEEO; Grace Faustino, IT Project Manager, Office of the Vice President for Research; Adrienne Helms, Clery Coordinator, CEEEO; Heather Jaramillo, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity; Nasha Torrez, Dean of Students

Quorum achieved at 3:05pm and meeting was called to order by Karen Patterson.

1. Approvals

Agenda and minutes for previous meeting were approved by committee members.

2. Updates

C70 “Confidentiality of Faculty Records”

Policy C70 is still waiting to go before the Regents’ Student Success, Teaching, and Research (SSTAR) committee. The next regular meeting will take place on October 6, 2022.

Political Activities Policies: C150 “Political Activity” and C240 “Leave of Absence Incident to Political Activity”

These policies went out for a faculty vote in April 2022 and the voting period was left open until a quorum of 10 percent was reached. Changes to Policy C150 were approved, as was deletion of Policy C240. These policies need to be approved by the Board of Regents to go into effect.

3. Discussion/Action Items

Chair/Vice Chair Election

Because the Committee roster has several unfilled slots, the existing Committee voted to have Karen Patterson continue to serve as chair until the next meeting. She is willing to serve for another year.

F100 “Teaching Load”

The Committee reviewed comments received during the campus comment period. The five comments received were in favor of repealing the policy rather than revising it. The Committee had not put the policy forward for removal before because there were some faculty (division chairs, visiting faculty, etc.) who were not covered by collective bargaining agreements (CBAs). Barbara Rodriguez did not think leaving the policy in place would have a negative impact because workloads of those faculty covered by the CBAs are in place and the policy would only affect those not covered by the CBAs. Karen Patterson noted that the case for repeal was that the wording was confusing for some faculty members. Carol Stephens said that leaving the policy in the Handbook (with the additional clarification that the CBA takes precedence over the policy for faculty in a collective bargaining unit) would likely not be harmful and would provide guidance for faculty not covered by a CBA. Stephens suggested changing the wording under applicability to “All branch community college academic faculty, staff, and administrators” in order to clarify that the policy only applies to branch faculty, not to the rest of campus. The Committee voted to accept the changes to F100. The policy will now go to the Committee on Governance for a vote of the full faculty.

A61.2 “Faculty Senate Curricula Committee”

Last semester, Karen Patterson and Lee Brown talked to representatives from the Faculty Senate Curricula Committee (FSCC) and the Diversity Council, and after discussing the issue with both, Patterson and Brown proposed the compromise of adding of one (1) ex-officio representative from the Diversity Council’s Diversity Curriculum Subcommittee to the FSCC. Additionally, FSCC requested that references to specific forms (Forms A, B, C, and D) be either removed or replaced with “program revision request” to align the policy with new catalog and curricula workflow tools. The Committee voted to send the policy out for campus comment.

A53 “Development and Approval of Faculty Policies”

In order to leave time for presentations with meeting guests, the Committee decided to table this item until the next meeting.

D175 “Undergraduate Student Conduct and Grievance Procedures”/D176 “Graduate and Professional Student Conduct and Grievance Procedures”

Francie Cordova introduced the proposed changes to D175 and D176. Previously, the policies had been changed to have disciplinary issues involving HSC or law students handled by the respective deans of those colleges instead of the Dean of Students. This put UNM out of compliance with Title IX and other federal standards, as sanctions for those infractions must be applied equally and there are strict reporting requirements. CEEO requested that the policies be changed so that the Dean of Students is responsible for handling the application of sanctions in civil rights cases for all students, which is how it has been done historically and which makes it easier for CEEO to ensure accurate reporting in the annual Cleary report. These changes apply only to cases involving civil rights issues.

Nasha Torrez had concerns that the changes would put too heavy a burden on the Dean of Students’ office and about changes in the policy over the past five years, and requested more time to review the policy. Cordova noted that there is a time crunch on the issue because the policy changes need to be put in effect by October 1 in order to meet Clery Act reporting deadlines, and that if UNM is not in compliance by that time, the University will be fined. Carol

Stephens said that because the proposed changes are all below the line, one solution may be to pass the changes before the October 1 deadline to address the compliance issue, and then revisit the policy over the coming months to address any other concerns. The Committee voted to accept the revisions and send them on to the Faculty Senate Operations Committee for approval, and Karen Patterson invited Torrez to meet later to revisit the policy and discuss her concerns. Brandon Toensing noted that sometimes there are several versions of a policy and that it can be hard to determine which version is being reviewed. Patterson said that the files that are sent out along with the agenda are the definitive versions that will be discussed by the Committee, and that any suggestions to a policy should be based on those documents. If a policy is altered or revised, the revised version will be sent out with the agenda for the next meeting.

E30 “Research Data Management Policy” and Accompanying Standard E30#1

Karl Benedict and Grace Faustino presented an overview of the proposed Research Data Policy (E30) and its accompanying standard (E30#1). (Slide deck attached at end of notes.) They and the Research Data Management working group have been working on developing this policy for over two years. They have been consulting with stakeholders across campus, as well as Carol Stephens, to develop a policy and standard governing research data throughout the data lifecycle and that outlines the responsibilities of data owners, researchers, data stewards, data custodians, and data users. They have drafted the policy and standard that has been endorsed by the Research Policy Committee and are now passing it along to FS Policy Committee for review and approval.

The Committee will discuss the policy at a later meeting and Benedict and Faustino are happy to assist with those discussions and give any information needed.

Meeting Modality and Work Status Table

Meetings will continue to be held via Zoom. The Committee will discuss the work status table at the next meeting.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.



Proposed *Research Data Policy* Introduction & Overview

Karl Benedict - *Co-Chair IT Research Technology Advisory Board*
Grace Faustino – *Office of the Vice President for Research*

March 23, 24 2022

Research Policy Committee & IT Use Committee Meetings

Background

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| April 2019 | Research Data Management working group of the IT Research Technology Advisory Board (RTAB) formed. One component of charge included development of Research Data Management Policy. |
| July 2020 | Policy work initiated |
| July-August 2020 | Review of policies from 47 peer institutions (HED, IPEDS, and ARL+R1+comparable research funding from <i>Briney, Goben, and Zilinski 2015</i>) |
| October 2020 – February 2021 | Feedback sought from FS Research Policy Committee (RPC), RTAB, FS Policy Committee (PC) |
| March-November 2021 | Policy revisions based on feedback |
| December 2021-January 2022 | Carol Stephens reviews, edits, and restructures draft policy into current draft Faculty Handbook Policy E30 and associated Standard E30#1 |
| March 2022 | Review and consideration for endorsement by RPC, and IT Use Committee |

Contributors:

Lijing Bu, Mark Servilla, Vincent Sarracino, Jonathan Wheeler, Grace Faustino, Carol Stephens, Karl Benedict & commenters from the OVPR, RPC, PC, and RTAB

Objectives

- Define required activities associated with research data management
 - By UNM policy
 - By other regulatory agencies
 - By sponsors
 - By collaborators and research project participants
- Link to and clarify connections with other UNM data policies
- Define roles and responsibilities for different participants in the full research and data lifecycle
- Provide guidance for how to achieve compliance with this and related policies, regulations and requirements

Structure & Content

- Faculty Handbook [Policy E30](#)
 - Recognition of rights and responsibilities of data owners and participants in research data lifecycle
 - Ownership and rights associated with research data
 - Rights and responsibilities concerning access, use, sharing, security, confidentiality, and maintenance of research data, both in analog and digital form
 - Rights and responsibilities of: Data Owners, Researchers, Data Stewards, Data Custodians, Data Users
 - Definition of key terms
 - Data stewardship procedures
 - Compliance with data use agreements

Structure & Content

- Faculty Handbook [Standard E30#1](#)
 - Expanded definition of roles and responsibilities for
 - **Data Owners** – support for systems and services that enable researcher compliance
 - **Data Stewards** – ensure project compliance with all requirements for data security, confidentiality, documentation, sharing, preservation, and retention in compliance with UNM, sponsor, and other regulatory requirements
 - **Data Custodians** – support data management by maintaining systems that ensure security, availability, integrity, backup/recovery, preservation, and retention of research data
 - **Data Users** – use research data products in compliance with applicable policies and regulations, license terms and other data use agreements, ensure secure storage and use of confidential data, maintain appropriate training and certifications

Structure & Content

- Faculty Handbook [Standard E30#1](#)
 - Expanded data stewardship practices
 - **Data Management Planning** – both as a general practice, and as a required document for some research proposals
 - **Data Sharing** – recommended practices and methods for effective data sharing in compliance with sponsor and publisher requirements
 - **Data Preservation** – ensuring that research data are preserved in a system that will ensure long-term access for re-use
 - **Data Protection** – management of data in compliance with applicable data classification criteria, including access controls, system encryption, physical access to systems, and backups
 - **Data Retention** – that data are retained for a period of time that complies with UNM, State, and Federal requirements to enable audit & investigation
 - Sharing of relevant related information and support resources

Questions and Discussion