

<FINAL> Meeting Minutes, Professional Concerns Committee
March 5, 2020
UC 135, 3:15 pm

Members in Attendance:

Shannon Alexander, Mike Carrell, Kathleen Fuegen, John Farrar, Nicole Grant, Jackie Herman, Collin Herb, Ken Katkin, Mike King, Alexis Miller, Makoto Nakamura, Gary Newell, Michael Providenti, Holly Riffe, Hans Schellhas, Tracy Songer, Mauricio Torres, Maggie Whitson

Other attendees:

Janel Bloch, Sue Ott Rowlands, Phil McCartney

Members Not in Attendance:

Kalyani Ankem, Linda Dynan, Doug Feldmann, Brant Karrick, Jim Kirtley, Ban Mittal, Kathy Noyes, Michael Washington, (Rep TBD from Academic Affairs/Honors/Undergraduate Education, (Rep TBD from English)

1. Call to Order, Adoption of the Agenda
2. Approval of the minutes from the February 20 meeting
 - a. Motion to approve: K. Fuegen
 - b. 2nd: M. Whitson
 - c. Approved
3. Chair's Report and Announcements
 - a. Faculty Senate
 - i. President Vaidya: options becoming clearer for pension decision.
 1. Pushing for more equitable funding per FTE. NKU is lowest.
 - a. NKU is about 500 per full time enrollment below the average. They are making this argument in priority of funding.
 - ii. Provost: meetings the week of 3.2 for review of programs. Provost will send out a message to faculty on Monday 3.9 updating the process which was an overall good outcome.
 - iii. TEEC: university-wide syllabus approved (to include boilerplate language), would allow for a shorter, customized syllabus in each section.
 - a. The understanding around this is that the boilerplate will be published and standardized and available in another place therefore faculty syllabi will be shorter
 - iv. New FOK (GenEd) SLOs were approved. More info from GenEd committee coming soon.

1. Assessment for Foundations of Knowledge will happen in the fall
- v. Research misconduct policy was rejected by the Provost (Appendix A).
There was a motion made to approve the Executive Committee version that was circulated in PCC in October. However, this version was not the version approved by PCC and sent to FC for review. The Executive Committee version was brought up as a motion to send to the board of regents instead of the PCC and Faculty Senate approved version that was rejected (see point iv. 1) by the Provost. This motion was postponed until the march meeting.
4. Old Business, Discussion Item, Research Misconduct Policy response to faculty senate meeting (in particular the postponed motion and Provost rejection of Research Misconduct Policy.)
 - a. Background argument from general council (GC), our definition needs to conform to 6 year period of limitations and the federal guidelines.
 - b. Noted: THE GC memo was responding to a memo that was modified but not the final one. PCC removed self-plagiarism language and in particular, concerns about disciplinary standards of what constitutes research misconduct.
 - c. Discussion: What is the role of the senate in collegial government about policy? They (Faculty Senate) don't have to recommend what we (PCC) want them to recommend. Therefore....do we just stay with the same handbook policy that we've had? Should we change a recommendation even knowing that it doesn't matter and the administration doesn't have to go with it?
 - d. Options: FS motion is postponed and FS will have to do something before that motion actually occurs. Do we (PCC) oppose the motion to adopt the EC's version of the research misconduct policy? If we oppose that and it the motion fails (to send the EC version to the board of regents) does the chair then motion to approve that the original faculty senate and PCC approved version be sent to the board of regents. Then only one version would go forward to the board of regents and the president could only vote the one placed in front of him.
 - i. Discussion – Summary.... Reaffirm – vote no on the EC substitution and move to send the original PCC and FS approved version to the BOR.
5. Old Business, Voting Item, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure process
 - a. No votes occurred in this meeting. There will be changes made and a final version will be sent to all PCC members BEFORE the next meeting.
 - b. **PCC action:** Members are expected to send the final version to their departments and come prepared to the March 19th version with feedback. PCC members are also expected to review previous discussions within meeting minutes to answer any questions from their departments that have been previously discussed in the PCC. The only discussions that will be addressed are those that bring new concerns to the table.
6. Adjournment – 5:10 pm

Respectfully Submitted by Tracy Songer, PCC Secretary

Appendix A

Matthew Zacate

From: Sue Ott Rowlands
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2020 12:01 PM
To: Matthew Zacate
Cc: Ashish Vaidya; Sue Ott Rowlands
Subject: Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy
Attachments: Research Misconduct Policy Provost Approved.pdf

Dear Matthew,

President Vaidya designated me to represent him regarding changes that were being proposed to the Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy in section 16.7 of the Faculty Handbook. On January 10, 2020, I provided you the following reason why the changes that the Faculty Senate proposed were disagreeable:

"In response to your memo of December 12, 2019, I cannot approve the proposed policy appended to the memo that has updated the Scientific/Research Misconduct Policy in section 16.7 of the Faculty Handbook. After reviewing the General Counsel's memo of October 11, 2019, the version appended to your December 12 memo is not consistent with federal law nor is it in the best interest of the university."

I also attached a version of the policy that would be acceptable as that version addressed the concerns outlined in General Counsel's memorandum of October 11, 2019. It is my understanding that Faculty Senate, the Professional Concerns Committee and you were provided a copy of General Counsel's memorandum that details why the version Faculty Senate proposed was not consistent with federal law nor in the best interest of the university. As the President's designee regarding the Faculty Senate's proposed changes to section 16.7 of the Faculty Handbook, my decision relied on General Counsel's advice and guidance and my own research into the matter.

I respectfully request that the Faculty Senate consider approving the attached version of the policy (the Executive Committee's version).

Best regards,

Sue

Sue Ott Rowlands
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Northern Kentucky University
859.572.5788
sottrowlands@nku.edu