

**Administrative Council
October 2, 2024 - 3:30 p.m.
TEAMS Meeting**

Minutes

Voting Members Present		
Eric Carlile	Scott Christen	Kristine Craven (Chair)
Mark Creter	Jennifer Dewar	Andrew Donadio (Vice Chair)
Joshua Edmonds	Esma Fidan	Mary Lou Fornehed
Jerry Gannod	Barbara Jared	Kelsey Hewitt
Amy Hill	Colin Hill	John Liu
Twanelle Majors	Holly Mills	Michael Natrass
Fred Nichols	Joseph Ojo	Rob Owens
Bedelia Russell	Steven Seiler	Kensea Skelton
Sandra Smith-Andrews	Leslie Suters	Dennis Tennant
Thomas Timmerman	Kristen Trent	Kyle Turner
Dan Warren	Braxton Westbrook	Emily Wheeler
Mark Wilson		
Voting Members Absent		
Amy Brown	Teddy Burch	Wei Tsun Chang
Yun Ding	Amy Foster	Richard Le Borne
David Mann	Lisa Rice	Joseph Slater
Hannah Upole		
Resource Persons / Others Present		
Julie Baker	Kevin Braswell	Aleta Cannon
Neal Hunt	Charmian Leong	Cynthia Polk-Johnson
Mustafa Rajabali	Mike Reagle	Brian Seiler
Becky Smith	Kevin Thompson	Kevin Vedder
Elizabeth Williams	Lee Wray	

Summary:

Approved agenda.

Approved September 4, 2024 minutes.

Received new Research Security Framework Policy No. 791. First Reading.

Received revised Hover Boards and Similar Personal Conveyance Vehicles Policy No. 191 (renamed: Bicycles and Micro Transportation Devices (MTD)). First Reading.

Received revised Cellular Service and Wireless Allowance Policy No. 560. First Reading.

Received revised Solicitation and Acceptance of Gifts Policy No. 356. First Reading.

Proceedings:

Chair Kristine Craven called the Administrative Council meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. Holly Mills motioned to approve the agenda for October 2, 2024. Andrew Donadio seconded. Motion APPROVED.

Donadio motioned to approve the September 4, 2024 minutes. Braxton Westbrook seconded. Motion APPROVED.

New Research Security Framework Policy No. 791 was presented as a First Reading. Charmian Leong explained the new policy was drafted due to the need for developing and implementing policies and procedures to comply with new research security requirements mandated by a presidential directive called the National Security Presidential Memorandum 33, or NSPN 33, and the CHIPS and Science Act. NSPN 33 required the strengthening of protections for U.S. government-supported research and development against foreign government interference and exploitations. The primary goal was to protect intellectual capital, discourage research misappropriation, and share responsible management of U.S. taxpayer dollars, including full disclosure of potential conflicts of interest and commitment. The CHIPS and Science Act contained research security provisions as well, including prohibiting participation in malign foreign talent recruitment programs. Policy No. 790 at Tennessee Tech addressed malign foreign talent recruitment programs and was presented as an information only item at the last meeting on September 4, 2024. Policy No. 790 had been effective since August 1, 2024.

In response to NSPN 33 and the CHIPS and Science Act, Tennessee state legislature passed a new law in April 2024 called Public Chapter No. 955. This law stated that all Tennessee higher education institutions must have a research security policy in place by January 1, 2025, and it must be publicly available on the institution's website. Policy No. 791 was drafted to comply with federal regulations on research security. Tennessee state legislature wanted to make sure Tennessee schools would remain eligible for federal funding. Due to the deadline set by Tennessee legislature, a research security policy needed to be in place by the new year. Policy No. 791 was drafted to comply with Tennessee Public Chapter No. 955 and was based on the research security provisions of NSPN 33 as well as the CHIPS and Science Act. In drafting the policy there were several goals. Firstly, to recognize the importance of international collaborations and ensure researchers had support and the resources needed to perform collaborative work. With that came the responsibility of protecting researchers and Tennessee Tech from potential conflicts due to the increasing number of federal laws and regulations regarding research security and undue foreign influence. A main goal of this policy was compliance, with a proposed framework focused on compliance with federal laws and regulations with disclosures to federal research funding agencies, conflicts of interest and

commitment, cybersecurity, foreign travel security which would include transit countries in a revision, research security and insider threat awareness training, and export control training. Federal agencies' final policies on research security were still pending, but the policy was required to be in place by January 8, 2025, with an implementation deadline of July 2025. However, Tennessee state law required a publicly accessible research security policy in place by the new year. The best option was to take what was currently available from the research security program guidelines issued by the White House Office of Science and Technology policy. The guidelines were issued to fulfill the mandates of NSPN 33 and the relevant provisions of the CHIPS and Science Act and would be constantly monitored for updates. It was expected that Policy No. 791 would be revised several times as federal agencies' policies are finalized.

Jerry Gannod asked about the review cycle and monitoring of the policy and changes. He noted Tennessee Tech's review cycle was every three years and asked if that was consistent with what the changes were expected to be. Leong explained that the review cycle was every three years or as necessary, and it was foreseen that it would be revised much sooner than three years due to anticipated changes.

Cynthia Polk-Johnson presented revised Policy No. 191, previously titled Hover Boards and Similar Personal Conveyance Vehicles, and renamed Bicycles and Micro Transportation Devices (MTD). An ad hoc committee was formed last fall to review this policy due to the increase in the number of micro transportation devices on campus as well as construction. The policy was revised comprehensively, including the purpose and what it would mean if a student or employee were to violate the policy. A cross-section of faculty, staff, and students made the revisions. The goal was to address every area and be as least restrictive as possible.

Sandra Smith-Andrews asked if there was not a university-issued parking area, such as on the south side of Stonecipher Lecture Hall, would it be illegal for students to park bicycles or MTD there according to the policy. Polk-Johnson stated that yes, that would be considered a violation of the policy if they were in a non-designated storage area. Smith-Andrews then asked if they would get a ticket or what the consequence would be. Polk-Johnson responded that Parking and Transportation would handle that unless it was a violation of law, then it would possibly result in a citation from University Police. Otherwise, it would be handled by the Parking and Transportation office. Smith-Andrews then asked what the incentive would be for voluntary registration or what it would address. Polk-Johnson explained that bicycle theft was the number one issue on campus, and voluntary registration would allow for registration of a bicycle or MTD through University Police, and it would be on record in case of an incident.

Bedelia Russell asked where the term micro transportation device came from. Polk-Johnson explained that it was national language for such devices and other universities used this. Craven asked if there was any reason why two weeks was the timeframe for a bicycle or device to be left before it was considered abandoned. Polk-Johnson explained that in looking at policies from other universities that was the standard practice. It could always be reviewed and could be extended or decreased if necessary. Smith-Andrews asked if there was a procedure in place

to address if someone left their bicycle or MTD legally parked for longer than two weeks due to damage or maintenance issues. Polk-Johnson answered that they would need to notify Parking and Transportation and/or University Police and language could be added to the policy to address this. If Parking and Transportation or University Police were not notified, they would not have another way of knowing about the issue. Jennifer Dewar asked how new employees and students were made aware of the policy. Polk-Johnson explained that after it was approved by Administrative Council, notification could be sent out to students via email and it would be in Policy Central. Mustafa Rajabali stated that he had seen a tagging system used at other universities to indicate that a bicycle or MTD was not to be moved.

Kevin Thompson presented the revised Policy No. 560 Cellular Service and Wireless Allowance. Previously Tennessee Tech allowed a stipend for employees for cell phone usage. This was not an active practice currently and so the policy needed to be updated. The verbiage regarding the stipend was removed from the policy and was updated to reflect the change and use of an approval process. The document now stated that if a department or unit needed a cellular plan or device to carry out job functions, Telecommunications would provide that upon approval from the Office of Planning and Finance. There was a form that could be completed and sent to Planning and Finance for approval and would then be routed to Telecommunications. Most employees that utilized this option were on call staff such as Facilities, Residential Life, and Biology staff doing fieldwork.

Elizabeth William presented the revised Policy No. 536 Solicitation and Acceptance of Gifts. The primary changes made to the policy were to allow the Tennessee Tech Foundation to accept and manage gifts that were given to the university. This had been problematic in the past when donors would give a gift, not specifically to the Foundation, usually in estate plans or wills where the Foundation was not aware of them until they were given. The Foundation was the preferred vehicle to receive private gifts to support the university, but the language currently in section five of the policy prohibited the Foundation from accepting gifts made to the university. By updating the language, the Foundation would be able to accept those gifts unless the donor stated in writing that the gift must be held by the university.

The other change to the policy was regarding crowdfunding, a popular fundraising option in the last few years. Advancement had used crowdfunding for the I Heart Tech Students campaign and this allowed for solicitation of smaller donations from a larger number of people. The new language in the policy helped define crowdfunding and initiatives that would be implemented. The remainder of the changes were mainly general updates and clarifying of language.

There were no Other Such Matters.

Mills motioned to adjourn. Scott Christen seconded. Adjourned at 3:59 pm.

Aleta Cannon, recorder

Documents on file with minutes:

Agenda of October 2, 2024

Minutes of September 4, 2024

Received First Reading:

New Participation in Malign Foreign Talent Recruitment Programs Policy No. 790

Received First Reading:

Revised Hover Boards and Similar Personal Conveyance Vehicles Policy No. 191
(renamed: Bicycles and Micro Transportation Devices (MTD))

Received First Reading:

Revised Cellular Service and Wireless Allowance Policy No. 560

Received First Reading:

Revised Solicitation and Acceptance of Gifts Policy No. 356