To: Julie Harlin, Speaker, Texas A&M University Faculty Senate
From: Gregory Heim, Faculty Senate SEBAC Representative
Date: October 18, 2018
RE: Report from System Employee Benefits Advisory Committee (SEBAC) Meeting

The October 16, 2018 SEBAC meeting covered several issues of interest to Faculty Senators and to the faculty and retirees of Texas A&M University. The meeting reviewed present status and directions for medical plans, dental plans, life insurance plans, the EVIVE online service, and other wellness services being offered to faculty, retirees, and their dependents.

**TAMUS Self-Insured Medical, Dental, and Optional Plans**
System benefits administrators report that the TAMUS health plans continue to be in good shape, with a FY2019 System subscriber count similar to that for FY2018. For the Bryan/College Station TAMU campus, the subscriber count increases annually by a few hundred subscribers. Across the FY2018 period ending August 31, 2018, the total paid claims were below the total premium funds, leading to excess funds for medical insurance (across all plans) and dental (across all plans). As such, both sets of plans are continuing to follow funding trajectory patterns that were first initiated in 2016.

From FY2018 to FY2019, the largest increase in plan participation was a 7% increase (or 295 participants) for the Health Care FSA, which benefits administrators mentioned is good for System healthcare costs. The largest decreases in plan participation were for the Accidental Death & Disability plan, which decreased by 4% participation (766 policies), followed by a 3.2% decrease for the Long-Term Disability plan (425 policies).

While several benefits plans did experience premium changes between the FY2018 and FY2019 academic years, benefits administrators state that this will not happen again for the next few years since the rebidding of plans (which happens every 5-6 years) was changed to a staggered schedule. During intermediate years, benefits administrators try to keep premiums flat for 2-3 year epochs. In FY2018, the employer-paid Basic Life premium increased – that premium had not changed in 6-7 years. In FY2019 we will only see the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) go out for rebid, while the benefits office will also undertake a planned renewal with Delta Dental PPO/HMO, assuming negotiations go well.

**EVIVE**
Benefits administrators reviewed the ongoing data for EVIVE, the intended one-stop shop for all TAMUS healthcare partners, incentives, reminders, programs, and the like. EVIVE presently exhibits a total registration of 44% of eligible TAMUS actively employed members, with the System pushing for 50% in the near term, and a stretch goal of 100% registered. However, only 18.7% of the total TAMUS retiree population is registered for EVIVE. As such, EVIVE is presently sending out lots of marketing pieces and emailed notices to members and retirees trying to encourage participation within EVIVE.

For FY2019, the EVIVE goals are to help TAMUS members complete the tasks required to obtain the $30 per month wellness incentive, as well as to (1) improve preventive
adherence for certain care guidelines and cancer screenings, (2) reduce risk through prevention programs, (3) improve steerage of members to lower-cost ER alternatives via Benefits Value Advisors and other tools, and (4) decrease musculoskeletal treatment spend by having members consult with resources including Benefits Value Advisors, the Airrosti therapy service, and 2nd.MD.

Based on one month of unique user data within EVIVE reported to us, it seems that overall use of the EVIVE portal is fairly low for accessing healthcare services. Among the 39,687 actively employed and retired TAMUS members, the following numbers used EVIVE to access the Blue Cross Blue Shield Blue Access for Members (687, or 1.7%), Express Scripts (175), Well on Target (127), and Delta Dental Portal (95), with most other services exhibiting EVIVE users far less than that.

**Proactive Outreach and Wellness Services**
The System continues to pay for and add to the list of services available to all TAMUS employees and retirees. The newer services include:

- **Virtual Visits** (via MD Live – mdlive.com)
  - For the cost of a normal co-pay, covered employees, retirees, dependents, and GradPlan members can have an online visit with a doctor. However, this service cannot be used to perform the annual wellness exam.

- **Opioid Management Program** (via Express Scripts) – Started September 1, 2018.
  - This service limits the number of opioid pills a patient can obtain at a time.

- **Prescription Care Management** (PCM) – Starts November 1, 2018
  - This prescription service attempts to switch members from a high-cost, brand name drug to a therapeutically equivalent drug, via a series of conversations with prescribing doctor, patient, and pharmacy.

- **SaveOnSP** (via Express Scripts) – Started September 1, 2018.
  - This service for specialty disease drugs enables patient use of pharmaceutical manufacturer co-pay assistance programs, rebates, and discounts.

**Other News and Issues**
System benefits administrators are studying the following issues, since they may affect future TAMUS benefits costs:

- Proposed merger of Baylor Scott & White Health with Memorial Hermann.
- Cost control efforts for services provided by MD Anderson Cancer Center/UTAustin.
- Employee Retirement System (ERS) recently was able to decrease its healthcare costs, and thus will not ask the Legislature for added funds in 2019. Since TAMUS healthcare appropriations are pegged to ERS levels, this means TAMUS will not get an increase, and will need to explore other sources of savings.
- A new retiree drug plan will be introduced (Employer Group Waiver Plan (EGWP)), effective November 1, 2018. EGWP is a Medicare Part D plan that eliminates the prescription “donut hole” problem, but will lead to some new monthly fees for high-income retirees (i.e., incomes over $85,000 per year).
- TAMUS benefits administrators will be creating a special retiree page that brings together all of the information about programs relevant to retirees.
Faculty Senate – Academic Affairs Committee

Fall 2018 Report

The committee met three times: September 17, October 15, and November 19.

Initial charges from the Executive Committee:
1. Publish reports from last semester, including disability services, Q-drop, analytics report, and open access course materials.
2. Follow up on implementation and review data for the online Q drop.
3. Follow up on mental health services.
4. Confirm that discrepancies in academic standards in on-line/distance vs. on campus courses now have a uniform process for determining equivalency.
5. Explore the assistance/support provided to faculty by Disability Services to meet needs of disabled students.
6. Explore the issues related to the rising cost of textbooks and ways to become more efficient and cost effective.

Action on various charges:
1. At end of the academic year 2017-18, AAC had submitted the following reports:
   a. Recommendations based on a review of the service provided by Disability Services to Faculty of Texas A&M University
   b. Open Access Textbooks (and Other OERs) at Texas A&M, which included a “Textbook Cost Resolution”
   c. No reports generated on Q-drop or Academic Analytics.

2. Vanita Mahajan followed up on implementation of online Q-drop and learned that this has not been implemented, and so the committee has nothing further to report.

3. Dr. James Deegear, Associate Director of Clinical Services, Student Counseling Service, Texas A&M University, met with the AAC at the November meeting and gave the committee a detailed presentation on counseling services available to students and changes implemented in Student Counseling Service to decrease wait times for students. These include: streamlining the in-take process, increasing the number of workshops and groups, increasing staff, and better management of appointments. Dr. Deegear also discussed a new program, “Kognito,” which is an online training platform for faculty to learn how to talk to students who may come to them for assistance. Discussion with Dr. Deegear included some of the following ideas that we may want to pursue:
   a. Development of a TrainTraq type of module to create awareness of mental health issues and resources on TAMU campus for faculty and staff to complete on a yearly or bi-yearly basis.
   b. Sending the Faculty Senate a one-page overview of TAMU SCS services along with contact information.
c. Identifying ways for the SCS to reach out to departments across campus to provide in-person overview of services and information on how we operate (wait times, length of service, access to crisis, etc.).

d. Development of a kind of placard for faculty to display on/by their offices that indicates their availability to others to talk with distressed students to make them aware of resources and/or consult with fellow faculty/staff about resources for supporting distressed students.

e. Identifying some way to develop infrastructure across campus to transport students in distress to resources for support. TAMU CARPOOL was discussed as a kind of model for this type of service.

f. AAC committee members and other members of the Faculty Senate might consider being part of the soft rollout of Kognito.

4. Processes for certifying “non traditional” courses: Individual members of the committee will investigate these processes in our individual colleges and report back to the committee at the January or February meeting.

5. Disability Services: Report submitted last year with recommendations. Committee has tabled this item, awaiting further instruction from EC.

6. AAC has agreed to review last year’s “Textbook Cost Resolution” and vote (electronically) on whether to resubmit as is for consideration by the full senate, or to make revisions.

Other issues:

1. Student Rule 7, Attendance: Renewed efforts to revise the rule, after the rule change was not approved by the Faculty Senate in 2017-18. Proposed revision circulated to committee members with discussion. AAC members submitted concerns to AAC chair, who forwarded summary to Speaker Harlin. Three members of AAC volunteered to serve on task group, chaired by Ann Kenimer, to resolve various rule change proposals.

2. AAC discussed recommendations of the Student Success Taskforce, notably recommendation of FYEX, 0 credit, 2 semester course(s) for all first time in college freshman Fall 2019. Committee invited Dr. Tim Scott to speak to committee at next AAC meeting, December 17.
The Budget Information Committee has been reviewing the tasks set before us and trying to frame a set of questions for Dr. Jerry Strawser. He has agreed to meet with us sometime early in the Spring semester to give us as much information as he can regarding these questions. The list of questions we have forwarded to him are:

1. We would appreciate an update of the annual TAMU budget and expenditures, especially as these pertain to expectations for the 2019 Legislative season.
2. We would appreciate an overview of the budget for transportation services on campus, especially with respect to (a) faculty-generated revenues, and more generally, any other major revenue line items, and (b) annual expenditures on streets, sidewalks, football parking, garages, and other programs.
3. With respect to the collaborative partnerships for building new dorms and the new hotel, are those original financial projections for these projects on track? Are we achieving the revenue streams that were projected? Are we at risk of not hitting the capacity utilization agreement for the new hotel?
4. What is the present state of the financing for new building construction? How have increased costs in raw materials (steel/concrete/etc.) affected future building plans?
5. What is the budgetary situation for the maintenance of older buildings? Have any related bonuses/penalties been assessed based on the outsourcing contracts, as negotiated previously. When there were cost savings predicted, have they been actually achieved through the centralized outsourcing contracts?
6. We understand the University may be moving toward a Responsibility Center Management (RCM) budgeting model. How might this move to RCM affect College and Department funding and budgeting?
7. Given the “Flat Growth” philosophy of the Regents with regards to pricing of undergraduate education, and the capping of the present student population for the time being, how will these factors affect the budgets of Colleges and Departments?
8. With respect to TAMU expenses pertaining to administrative overhead, how does TAMU compare to peer and aspirant institutions? How have administrative expenses changed over the past decade? How will administrative expenses change going forward?
9. Given the presently dynamic macro-economic situation, what is the University’s contingency plan if the economy crashes? What variables are University financial managers considering and preparing for?
10. What is the TAMU plan (across a 5/10/20-year horizon) for student/institution growth and for sufficient revenue to cover those plans?

Once we meet with Dr. Strawser we should be able to respond to the charges set before us.
This fall, the Core Curriculum Council concentrated its efforts on reviewing and approving new courses for the core, ICD and CD, with the goal of approving as many submissions as possible for the 2019 catalog. That necessitated the Council, in the majority of cases, to return submissions to faculty members for refinement to meet what is becoming a closer scrutiny of core course offerings by officials at the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

With an eye toward using the core for basic assessment needs to meet changing accreditation requirements, the Core Curriculum Council joined the Provost’s Office last month in hosting a conference on the core and the importance of general education in the success of Texas A&M University students. Well over 100 faculty and administrators attended sessions, with frank and beneficial discussions about state requirements of the individual components.

At that conference, one thing became clear: Texas A&M stands apart from other public institutions in the state in the percentage of upper division courses in the core. At A&M, more than 30 percent of the courses in the core are 300- and 400-level, by far the highest percentage in the state. Officials from the Coordinating Board made it clear at the conference, as they have through rejection of upper-division courses submitted in the past year for the core, that they would be looking closely to make sure that any upper-division courses submitted for the core fit their definition of general education. That is causing the Core Curriculum Council to carefully assess any upper-division courses submitted and will force a major reassessment of upper division courses currently in the core when they come forward for recertification. This may require a significant push for new courses at the 100- and 200-level to augment the Texas A&M core.

Finally, the Core Curriculum Council plans to concentrate in the spring on the backlog of courses submitted for recertification. Our goal is to identify any problems or issues those courses appear to have in relation to meeting requirements set by the state and giving faculty members adequate time to revise and/or refine course offerings to clearly meet state mandates.

Tamy Frank-Cannon and Dale Rice, co-chairs, Core Curriculum Council
The Legislative Affairs Committee met twice with Mr. Michael O’Quinn, Vice President for Government Relations and Strategic Initiatives. Mr. O’Quinn discussed the upcoming Texas legislative session and how the outcomes might affect the University. Now that the election is over, new chairs may be selected for relevant committees at the state level. He agreed with us that the Legislative Affairs Committee members should plan on going to Austin in January or February to meet members of these committees.

The Legislative Affairs Committee members discussed topics of concern to bring forth to the legislators. Adequate funding, dual credit and transfer credit, and the field of study issues headed up the list.

Faculty Senator and committee member Patrick Burkart gave a presentation on the TCFS, AAUP, and TACT joint meeting in Austin, and also mentioned the AAUP members meetings with legislative aides this summer. The topics discussed were similar to those identified by the Legislative Affairs Committee. One of the speakers at the joint meeting gave a presentation on campus involvement of Koch Industries.

The Legislative Affairs Committee will be organizing visits with Texas legislators this spring, and will create a discussion topic list for each member.

Prepared by Senator Price
This report will discuss progress toward the charges initially set for the Personnel & Welfare Committee by the Executive Committee. Charges dealing with similar issues have been grouped for discussion.

4. Explore the current status of post-tenure review by caucuses.
7. Identify best practices for annual reviews - for all faculty titles; evaluation and promotion.

The committee has set up a team drive and has begun collecting documents on evaluation, promotion, and evaluation from the various Colleges and Departments. Once we have a “critical mass” of these documents, each member of the committee will review documents from two colleges, not their own, with the goal of identifying best (and potentially not-so-best) practices that can be identified for broader implementation. By having two members review each document, fresh eyes and different perspectives can be used to evaluate the procedures.

The members of the Committee recognize that the needs and practices of a faculty of a University this size preclude a one-size-fits-all approach to these procedures, and it is neither the goal, nor the desire, of the Committee to proscribe uniform, mandatory procedures for evaluation, promotion, or post-tenure review across the University. Rather, the Committee wishes to provide openness in the processes currently in place and to identify best practices that can be adopted, where appropriate.

1. Create consistent and regular procedures for APT faculty across University, dealing with practical differences between colleges as needed.
2. Explore issues related to the ‘class difference’ APT experience and develop related recommendations.
3. Explore issues related to the elected APT Committee; connect them to the Dean of Faculties as a starting point.

While the University-wide APT Committee was confirmed early in the semester to report to the Dean of Faculties, with the announcement by the current Dean of Faculties of his retirement, the status of the University-wide APT Faculty Committee was again discussed. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has decided to return the committee to Personnel and Welfare as a subcommittee. Currently, the subcommittee is investigating the differing uses of multi-year contracts across the University. In particular, the University would like to standardize the use of rolling (i.e., overlapping) vs. fixed (i.e., consecutive) contracts.

5. Discuss SAPs for department head and dean accountability in light of new system rules.

This is being discussed at the full Senate level.

6. Explore the role of Academic Analytics in evaluation of faculty productivity.
8. Discuss the scope, role, and numbers of adjunct faculty and implications for the University.
9. Work with Dean of Faculties to have conversations surrounding professionalism, civility, positive patterns of behavior, power differentials, and listening to understand.

The Committee has not addressed these charges at this time.

Respectfully submitted,
Bruce Neville
Chair
Presented with a long list of charges, the committee elected to start with two specific projects.

The first is to investigate problems remaining with Workday TAMU. Each committee member was asked to report concerns from his/her department or college. Factors specifically affecting faculty were assembled into a draft report (attached) that will be submitted to the Senate and shared with the Council of Principal Investigators. Universally reported issues involve long delays in a very cumbersome hiring process and accuracy and visibility of encumbrances. The committee will next discuss the issues with Dr. Jerry Strawser (VP for Finance and CFO) at a date to be determined for guidance on how to proceed to best get these problems corrected.

Three charges related to Transportation Services were lumped into one. The committee met (Nov 28) with Peter Lange (Vice President for Transportation and Ron Steedly, alternate transportation specialist, to gain input on these charges:

1) Follow up on Ofo bike management - bike racks, parking, etc.

Ron Steedly, noted the value of having a workable bike-share program with the fact that 16,000 different users rode Ofo bikes last September. The problems with Ofo, especially the company’s failure to collect bikes taken off campus, led to termination of that contract. A new agreement with Vioride that provides better prospects of preventing abuses is now in place. First, Ron will be in charge of student workers who will collect and redistribute bikes as needed, with the cost billed to Vioride. Vioride will block users who abuse established rules, and more importantly, bikes that are ‘ditched’ will lead to a non-return fee of up to $600. The initial geofence will include the campus, College Station and a small part of Bryan nearest the campus.

Ron is exploring a plan that will allow Campus Police to issue tickets for bicyclists who violate campus rules rather than just violation of state laws such as running stop signs (riding on the sidewalk is legal). He will recommend the possibility of taking a bike safety course to avoid a fine.

2) Explore the campus master plan and implications regarding new buildings, roadways, parking etc.
3) Explore the future of campus transportation

Peter Lange used visuals from the campus master plan to address these charges. Although the plan is simply a long-term concept without specific dates for changes, the same principles that have applied in the past will continue. However, in the most recent plan priorities have been established for consideration of new projects such that pedestrian traffic is highest priority, followed by bicycles, busses, mass transit, service vehicles, shared vehicles, multi-rides and finally single use vehicles in that order. As new buildings and
greenspaces on the campus are added, parking will be moved more and more to the periphery, with garages replacing surface lots. The plan ultimately anticipates 11 more garages with overlapping radii within 10 walking minutes of most buildings. The next garage to be built is in the planning stages. It will take up about 1,000 current spaces in lot 50 (across from Zachary) but will provide 1700 spaces when finished.

As new buildings come on line, efforts are being made to provide wider sidewalks for shared use by bikes, boards and pedestrians and for alternative bicycle routes that are more conducive to use than currently exist. More dismount zones are anticipated and will soon be designated and presumably enforced. The area around the MSC will have two lanes for busses, very wide sidewalks for waiting passengers and a two way separate bike path as well.

Road networks will continue to allow busses to provide connectivity across campus. However, especially on main campus, more limited-access streets are anticipated. Currently, parking spaces lost during construction will mostly be replaced by additions in the research park area on west campus.
The Senate Planning Committee was charged by the Senate Executive Committee with investigating problems that are still with us following the System-wide introduction of ‘Workday’s cloud-based human capital management” tool in December 2017. This report focuses on issues that directly affect faculty productivity. Committee members were asked to investigate problems in their units. The information below has been assembled from 6 different reports, each from a different TAMU College.

Issues identified include:

1) Hiring personnel at all levels is very slow and cumbersome, as detailed by the following information from our reports:

   a) **There are long delays** between initiating a new position and having it posted. For example, a professor who was awarded a two year grant from NIH was told it would take 3 months to post a position for a technician to work on the project. A long series of sequential signoffs is required so if any approval is delayed, nothing can happen. If any negative response occurs, the whole process must be restarted, even if the correction needed is a minor wording change or a change in an account number. (All responders mentioned this as a problem.)

   b) HR is expected to vet credentials for each applicant before hiring can be initiated. In most cases a search committee or the individual responsible for hiring could easily narrow the candidate field substantially based on prior experience or training. HR vetting of applicants is a significant delay in hiring as HR is overwhelmed with this wasted effort.

   There is also the problem that position announcements must be closed in order to start interviews. If the interviews do not yield a hire, a new position announcement must be approved and the process started over again.

   c) Candidates are instructed to include reference letters in a single PDF file, possibly including applicants for faculty positions. This is untenable if it does apply to faculty letters! The College of Engineering has hired the services of a private company to assist with hires to avoid the problem of candidate uploaded reference letters.

   d) Workday cannot readily accommodate variable starting dates or fractional month pay. Some GATs starting August 16 this year got either no pay or a full months pay for that month. An added difficulty in managing the accounts is that no encumbrances can be made before a position has been filled and the employee starts, making it especially difficult to manage spending.

   e) Workday causes problems when pay is to come from more than one account, including research grants. Grant dollars available for salary are not shown to staff
when making the entries. However, routing can begin even if the funds are not available. Supplemental pay sources for Extension faculty do not show up at all.

2) Problems persist for payroll and spending from research accounts

   a) Encumbrances are not accurate. (Mentioned by 5 of 6 reports) Over and under payments are frequent. Under payments are not corrected until the next month which can be a real problem for new or lower pay employees. Likewise, balancing out research accounts can be a problem. A planning committee member had grant dollars from an expiring account increase by $7,000 from the previous month, at a time too late to spend the funds.

   b) Benefits for faculty and graduate students can disappear from one month to the next. The 9 month + 3 month problem is not fully resolved.

   c) A long lead time is required for supplemental pay and even so, results are erratic.

Overall there is a very high level of frustration evident among those who deal directly with Workday on a frequent basis. In general they feel it is taking much more time and effort for a process that is much less efficient than it should or needs to be.
Committee met 4 times this semester.
Oct. 1st – Committee charge discussed. Detailed meeting notes attached.
Nov. 5th – presentation and discussion with David Carlson on Library subscription changes.
Dec. 3rd – Updates on charges. Detailed meeting notes attached.

Committee Charges from Executive Committee 2018-2019: (charge from ExCom, status update)

1. Differentiate the role and mission of this committee from CPI

This committee has the responsibility to study policies, procedures, and regulations and to recommend actions in the following areas:

1. External funding of research.
2. Internal funding and distribution of research funds.
3. Travel related to soliciting, conducting, and presentation of research.
4. Libraries, computing, and other support facilities affecting the environment.
5. Publication or other means of disseminating research findings.
6. Copyrights and patents.
7. Other matters affecting the conduct and dissemination of research.

Committee recognized that reading the senate charter for this committee much overlap exists between the Council of Principle Investigators (CPI) and Faculty Senate Research Committee (FSRC). With the mission of the FSRC being broader than that of the CPI. FSRC concede that CPI will focus on externally funded research and grants (item #1). FSRC will focus on all other research activities. FSRC will be invited to participate in CPI meetings and report to FSRC as needed.

2. Protect freedom of scholarship.

This charge, protection of research academic freedom\(^1\), and similar type activity, was discussed as being part of item #7. The FSRC considered this within its responsibility as it is not within

---
\(^1\) American Association of University Professors (AAUP) definition of academic freedom, https://www.aaup.org/our-work/protecting-academic-freedom
that of the CPI. The FSRC will be available to constituents and strive to be aware of such issue
that may arise.

3. Promote *scholarship* on campus and emphasize those areas not covered by traditional
CPI faculty - Examples
   a. Participate in the development of internal funding streams to support scholarship
      in the humanities, and other fields
   b. Develop and/or promote the use of small scale Core Facilities - accessible to
      faculty across campus (3D printing, large format plotting...)
   c. Unfunded research

The FSRC is scheduling a meeting with the VPR office for its February meeting. The goal will
be to discuss recent Triad and X-grants (status, future goals, and comparison to original plans)
and these other issues. Pending the meeting outcome a presentation by VPR to full senate may be
requested.

4. Consider changing the name from research committee to scholarship committee or
   something else to be more inclusive of the intellectual activities faculty do on campus.

This was discussed it was decided that the name research was more inclusive and appropriate to
the all the activities of the faculty.

Additional Committee Charges from Committee Discussions:

5. Following the faculty senate vote the FSRC worked with the Provost to assign the Dean
   of the Libraries to execute the open access policy. The FSRC will continue to checkup on
   and participate in the execution of this policy as necessary.
6. The FSRC became aware of funding issues within the University Library which will
   results in a decrease in service. The FSRC sought and received additional information on
   this from the Dean of the Libraries. The FSRC believes this to be impactful on research
   and seeks to share this more broadly with faculty.
What is an Open Access Policy?

Open access scholarly literature is “digital, online, free-of-charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions”¹. An Open Access Policy reserves rights for TAMU faculty and employees to make their articles freely available to the public in an open access repository. This is possible when TAMU authors automatically grant a non-exclusive copyright license to the University prior to any later agreements authors may make with publishers. An OA policy doesn’t control where TAMU authors publish or require them to pay open access fees to publishers in order to comply.

Open access policies directly support the mission of land grant universities by making publically supported research openly available. Universities around the world have created Open access policies to share their research so that society has equitable access to published scholarship. These policies generally allow authors to archive a copy of their publication in an institutional repository or published in an open access journal, in ways that help address both the price barriers and the permission barriers that undermine global access to the products of a university’s scholarly and creative work. Over six hundred universities and research institutions worldwide, including more than half of our peer institutions (as defined by Vision 2020), have an open access policy².

The Faculty Senate Research sub-committee recommends that TAMU adopt an Open Access Policy. An open access policy at TAMU would be managed by the TAMU Libraries, who would provide the support to TAMU authors so they can archive an open access copy of their publication in our institutional repository so that the burden on the authors would be minimal. We are proposing the Faculty Senate as a whole vote on a resolution to recommend that the President’s office implement such a policy.

What are some Benefits of Open Access Policies?

- Increases citation rates for researchers who publish openly³.
- Meets the emerging public access mandates of federal funding agencies and many nonprofit organizations⁴.
- Improves access to new knowledge that directly supports economic innovation, a range of governmental and non-governmental services, and levels the playing field for researchers in developing countries.
- Help address long term and key issues with the costs associated with scholarly publishing.

Common Questions Raised About Open Access Policies

How will the policy function? The University Libraries will identify new TAMU-authored publications, notify TAMU authors and provide authors an easy method of uploading the right versions of papers into our institutional repository. The University Libraries will also maintain the records of authors seeking a waiver for the policy. Once curated in our institutional repository, the articles are discoverable by Web search engines and the publication is accessible to all.

Do I have to participate? No, TAMU authors have the option to ‘opt –out’ of the policy by requesting a waiver. For example, certain high impact journals with release restrictions (e.g. Science and Nature) can be special cases where open access isn’t desired.

Will an Open Access policy control where I publish? No. Open access policies don’t determine where authors publish and always include an option to request a waiver or embargo, if required by a publisher.

---

³ http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/02/22/expanding-public-access-results-federally-funded-research
Won’t publishers push back against these policies? Most do not. The University of California system has tracked which publishers requested waivers. Since 2013, the four most requested waivers were from, *Nature*, *Science*, *PNAS*, and the *American Roentgen Ray Society*. Many journals even specifically allow some types, though typically not all types, of open access.

How does this relate to the ‘open access’ publishing fee journals charge? Some journals are open access journals where the journal is supported by author publication charges instead of library subscriptions. While these journals are one option to make TAMU research open access, this is not required for an open access policy. An open access policy makes a preprint version of the article accessible on TAMU institutional repository, OAKTrust.

How does this relate to the public posting by authors on personal webpages and social networking sites (e.g. Research Gate, Mendeley, Academia.edu, etc…)? In current practices most authors assign their copyright to the publishing journal. Posting on a public website might be in violation of that journal-author agreement. The open access policy would allow posting of our research for non-commercial use on a Texas A&M University website or our institutional repository

How does this affect my interaction with the journal? Nothing changes from the author’s perspective. You can even still sign the journal’s copyright agreement, since that does not affect the University’s claim of non-exclusive copyright license prior to any later agreements authors may make with publishers.

Is this Allowed / Legal? Yes. The University has always had the right to retain non-commercial use copyrights but has never exercised this right for this purpose.

Does this apply to all creative works? Not at this time. The recommended implementation is to apply this policy only to future journal publications where one of the coauthors is a TAMU employee.

Do I lose ownership of works I create? No. An open access policy does not transfer ownership, which will remain with Faculty authors under existing University policy. There may be some changes to this University policy or an additional University policy document to address the implementation of an open access policy. The specifics of those changes are beyond the scope of this senate committee recommendation.

How will this be implemented? The faculty senate will recommend to the President’s office the creation of an open access policy committee including all relevant stakeholders, including: faculty, library, legal, and administration. The goal of this committee will be to create a policy similar to those of our peer institutions.

### Open Access Policies at TAMU Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer University</th>
<th>Open Access Policy Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California System</td>
<td><a href="http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/">http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td><a href="http://www.policyleibrary.gatech.edu/faculty-handbook/5.5-policy-open-access-faculty-publications">http://www.policyleibrary.gatech.edu/faculty-handbook/5.5-policy-open-access-faculty-publications</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td><a href="http://www.senate.illinois.edu/sc1512.pdf">http://www.senate.illinois.edu/sc1512.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td><a href="https://libraries.psu.edu/services/scholarly-publishing-services/open-access-publishing">https://libraries.psu.edu/services/scholarly-publishing-services/open-access-publishing</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 [https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/publisher-communications/](https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/publisher-communications/)
6 [http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/index.php](http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/index.php)
Faculty Senate Research Committee

10/1/2018

Attendance (present as highlighted below)

Last Name First Name College Email
Abd Elmageed Zack Pharmacy elmageed@tamhsc.edu
Alvarado Jorge Engineering jorge.alvarado@tamu.edu
Arosh Joe Vet Med jarosh@cvm.tamu.edu
Arroyave Raymundo Engineering rarrowaye@tamu.edu
Battle Guy Science battle@math.tamu.edu
Conway Daniel Liberal Arts conway@tamu.edu
de Figueiredo Paul Medicine pdefigueiredo@tamu.edu
Deva Reddy Libraries devaereddy@tamu.edu
Hetland Robert Geosciences hetland@tamu.edu
Jimenez Daniel Engineering djimenez@tamu.edu
Katz Claire Liberal Arts ckatz@tamu.edu
Miranda Rajesh Medicine miranda@medicine.tamhsc.edu
Mora-Zacarias Miguel Agriculture mmora@tamu.edu
Sezgin Ergin Science sezgin@tamu.edu
Simmons Joe Dentistry Jsimmons@tamhsc.edu
Staack David Engineering dstaack@tamu.edu
Sullivan Thomas Libraries tdsullivan@library.tamu.edu
Tao Feng Dentistry tao@tamhsc.edu
Watanabe Coran Science watanabe@chem.tamu.edu

Former Chair – Robert Hetland

Election of Chair – David Staack – vote 8/8

Review of Charge and agenda:

1. Differentiate the role and mission of this committee from CPI

This was discussed in AY 2018. Chair was invited to attend CPI. FSRC would address issues of broader research context not only funded research. Clear differences were discussed and identified. There were unique charges. FSRC chair can/should attend CPI Meeting.

This is a long standing question. There are VPR research activities which do not go through the FSRC. VPR meeting 1) University research council, 2) Research compliance. FSRC suffered from lack of agenda.

Increasing activities within the FSRC. 1) FSRC become more involved in VPR meetings. 2) FSRC should deal with issue coming up from faculty not coming down from VPR. 3) Chair can set agenda based upon CPI and URC meetings.
2. Protect freedom of scholarship (need more information here: about setting research agenda/program or ways to publish or else?)

Claire Katz – champion on this. President’s comments re Philosophy dept last year. What is appropriate action?

3. Promote *scholarship* on campus and emphasize those areas not covered by traditional CPI faculty - Examples
   a. Participate in the development of internal funding streams to support scholarship in the humanities, and other fields
   b. Develop and/or promote the use of small scale Core Facilities - accessible to faculty across campus (3D printing, large format plotting…)
   c. Unfunded research

Triads and X-grants are within 3a. One issue only T/TT – hard to manage bigger pool. But the pool is not bigger this year. Why were APT faculty not included in Triad this time? Email to VPR on behalf of committee. Comment within HSC – lots of clinical faculty (outnumber T/TT) – is this competition appropriate. Comment – what would the mechanism for including APT be? In favor 8/8. [Action Item]

4. Consider changing the name from research committee to scholarship committee or something else to be more inclusive of the intellectual activities faculty do on campus.

Comment: Some support in email chain.

Comment: Research is one of three pillars and within annual review. E.g. Morell act and historic acts establishing land grant establish research as the appropriate word.

Comment: Scholarship is a broader or narrower definition. Scholarship is a subset or a super set of Research. Quick poll (8/8) scholarship is a subset of research. Name of committee should stay as it is. Definition of Research as pillar and most broad is common outside of university.

Comment: Where did this come from? Pt 1 conflict/overlap with CPI.

5. Open Access.

Faculty senate passed a recommendation to support an Open Access Policy. Need to contact the Provost about this. 8/8 vote yes [Action item: Rob, David, Bruce].

Adjourn 4:06 pm
MEMORANDUM

TO:    Deans and Department Heads

FROM:  David H. Carlson
        Dean, University Libraries

SUBJECT: Libraries Materials Budget Issues for FY19

There is a long history of commercial publishers raising their subscription costs to libraries at rates that exceed the average national inflation rate. Each year, the serials vendor, Ebsco, offers an objective assessment and analysis of serials price increases and projections for the coming year.\(^1\) The most recent analysis makes this conclusion: “...We expect the overall effective publisher price increases for academic and academic/medical libraries for 2018 (before currency impact) to be in the range of five to six percent.” We do not yet have data for 2019 but we expect a similar forecast. Moreover, it is our experience that the increases for HSC-only materials, primarily medicine, pharmacy and nursing, particularly materials that are clinically-focused, have been closer to fifteen percent.

This year, the A&M Libraries did not receive an increase to its materials budget for FY19. In the context of a five to six percent increase in materials cost this creates a budget deficit. We will be pursuing a number of strategies to manage this and that will minimize the impact on campus. I am writing to advise you of two strategies in particular.

1. All requests for a new serial (or any new content with a continuing cost, such as a database) must be off-set by the recommendation of a serial(s) for cancellation. The cancellation must be in the same proximate subject area as the new title and be approximately equal in annual cost.

The Libraries will be happy to work with faculty in this process. Most serials are received electronically and we have usage data over several years that can be helpful. Also, last year we engaged an analysis of our e-resources from 1Science that includes other useful measures of campus impact.\(^2\) The analysis details the number and titles of journals with articles by A&M faculty members. The report also shows the number and titles of journals cited by A&M authors in their articles. These measures of usage, publication venue, research reliance, and cost, present a useful, multi-dimensional model of a title’s value and worth both from a usage and research perspective.

---

\(^2\) https://www.1science.com/
2. The Libraries will pursue the cancellation of either Elsevier’s SCOPUS or Clarivate’s Web of Science (WOS).

There are several reasons for the focus on these two resources. First, these resources are largely duplicative with significant overlap in coverage (see chart). Second, more than half of our colleagues in the Greater Western Libraries Alliance offer one, but not both, of these resources. Third, while SCOPUS and WOS are important resources, they are search and discovery tools; a cancellation incurs no loss of content. Finally, these are expensive resources. A single decision in the cancellation of one of these tools will resolve our materials budget deficit by twenty to thirty per cent.

The Libraries will not make this decision in isolation and we will engage campus faculty. Please look for a survey from us later this semester and complete it. If you have immediate concerns, please contact the subject liaison for your department/unit.

I regret these actions are necessary. Our funding for materials in past years has been very solid. Due to this record of extended support I am confident that we can get through FY19 with minimal diminishment to the high-quality information resources that we provide to campus.

Conclusion

In her memo to me about the FY19 University Libraries budget, Provost Fierke wrote that while the University has “…traditionally provided the inflationary increases [for materials] every year, we do not believe this model is sustainable at this annual increase.” The challenge to manage this decision will be difficult, but I agree with Provost Fierke. I believe our current system of scholarly communication is fundamentally flawed. The system enables exorbitant price increases by commercial publishers and requires the transfer of our intellectual and discovery insights to for-profit companies who then sell access back to us. The Libraries will continue to pursue strategies that will not simply help us get through a bad budget year but work for meaningful, substantive change in a scholarly communications system. The Libraries can be a positive influence for change but I believe that only the faculty can bring about the meaningful, substantive change that is required.

It is not the only positive change but one interesting development is publishing through open access venues which raises the visibility of your research and enables retention of copyright. Recent analysis by the library has showed that approximately 17% of all scientific publications authored by TAMU faculty are now published in open access journals. I cannot explore the topic of Open Access in depth in this memo but every year the A&M Libraries participate in Open Access Week. This year, the dates are October 22 through 28. Our primary speaker is Ivan Oransky from Retraction Watch. In addition to his

4 https://retractionwatch.com/
insights about retractions in the scholarly literature, we’ve asked Dr. Oransky to make observations about the impact of open access publishing.

As another element of OA week at A&M, I have developed an “enactment” which demonstrates the flow of money in scholarly communications in a manner that is both instructive and, I hope, entertaining. Watch for the announcement of a “performance” of A Game of Coins during OA week. I hope you can attend. More events will take place and I encourage you to watch for announcements and check the library’s web page for time and schedules.⁵ I encourage you and your colleagues to contribute to the conversation.

---

⁵ [http://library.tamu.edu/services/scholarly_communication/Open_Access/OA-week.html](http://library.tamu.edu/services/scholarly_communication/Open_Access/OA-week.html)
Review of Last Meeting:

David Carlsen gave a presentation changes about library subscription policy. Provost has required level funding in the library. Trying to minimize impact. Data about what to cut was based on usage. Suggested that Library speak to whole senate in the spring since this was good information to share. Slides to share – sent with email.

Current 12/3/18 Meeting

Attendance: (those highlighted are in attendance)

Last Name First Name College Email
Abd Elmageed Zack Pharmacy elmageed@tamhsc.edu
Alvarado Jorge Engineering jorge.alvarado@tamu.edu
Arosh Joe Vet Med jarosh@cvm.tamu.edu
Arroyave Raymundo Engineering rarroyave@tamu.edu
Battle Guy Science battle@math.tamu.edu
Conway Daniel Liberal Arts conway@tamu.edu
de Figueiredo Paul Medicine pdefigueiredo@tamu.edu
Deva Reddy Libraries dereddy@tamu.edu
Hetland Robert Geosciences hetland@tamu.edu
Jimenez Daniel Engineering djimenez@tamu.edu
Katz Claire Liberal Arts ckatz@tamu.edu
Miranda Rajesh Medicine miranda@medicine.tamhsc.edu
Mora-Zacarias Miguel Agriculture mmora@tamu.edu
Sezgin Ergin Science sezgin@tamu.edu
Simmons Joe Dentistry Jsimmons@tamhsc.edu
Staack David Engineering dstaack@tamu.edu
Sullivan Thomas Libraries tdsullivan@library.tamu.edu
Tao Feng Dentistry tao@tamhsc.edu
Watanabe Coran Science watanabe@chem.tamu.edu

Item 1: Discussion of Library Activities:

Is the library benchmarked? Right now the library is highly ranked. Carlson said in the future our ranking might diminish. Does web of science and Scopus provide actual article access? Is article access being cut?

Is there action to take in this committee? Should this committee put forth a recommendation to the Senate. Or is that too early and information should be spread to senate and their feedback sought too?
Unanimous – FSRC will ask EC to invite Library to discuss cuts in the library.

Memo from Carlson – to be shared within FSRC.

Item 2: FSRC Report

In DEC faculty senate meeting FSRC will report out on activities.

Review Committee Charge (see Oct minutes). No changes.

Question – is there an action item associated with Academic Freedom? No just a reminder that these AUP type things is within the charge of this committee (and are not covered by the CPI).

Other / New items:

1: Open Access Policy Status? Provost assigned Library Dean (David Carlson) to implement an open access policy. Senate approved initiative statement is available online and as attachment X from sept senate meeting. [http://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/166371](http://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/166371)

2: Triads have been submitted again. Opened to Faculty only. Other positions. Research professors and scientists have been excluded. It was not opened up this time. VPR office – should be asked if other types of professors should be included. Can VPR present to FSRC on seed grant initiative. Discuss outcomes and success of prior uses.

Invite VPR office to present to FSRC in Jan or Feb to discuss current Triads and X-grant and outcomes from prior round. Compare implementation to original model.