FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

Vol. 41/No. 4

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

December 9, 2015

Minutes

Faculty Senate Meetings Are Open to All Members of the University Community

Meeting:	Faculty Senate Meeting December 9, 2015, Wooten Hall, Room 322
Present:	Brian Ayre; Beasley, Kathryn; Glen Biglaiser; Sheri Broyles; V. Barbara Bush; Douglas Campbell; Denise Catalano; Adam Chamberlin; James Conover; Shelley Cushman; Elliot Dubin; Kamakshi Gopal; Paul Hutchison; Lee Hughes; John Ishiyama; Andrew May; Smita Mehta; Reza Mirshams; Saraju Mohanty; Maria Muñiz; Divesh Ojha; Phil Paolino; Dan Peak; Jonathan Pinkston; Emile Sahliyeh; Jyoti Shah; Stephen Slottow; Jeffrey Snider; Jessica Strubel; Phil Sweany; Beth Thomsett-Scott; Mary Ann Venner; Oksana Zavalina; Tao Zhang.
Absent:	Kim Baker; Jennifer Callahan; Morgan Gieringer; Jennifer Lane; Guido Verbeck; Karen Weiller.
Visitors:	Neal Smatresk President; Finley Graves, Provost and VPAA; Christy Crutsinger, Provost Office; Margaret Vestal, Provost Office; Mike McPherson, Provost Office; Angela Wilson, Provost Office; Matt Zabel, URCM; Ernestine Bousquet, URCM; Laurel Crawford, Libraries; Susan Smith, Libraries; Sian Brannon, UUCC.

I.	Welcome and Introductions	The meeting was called to order at 2:02pm Congratulations to Doug Campbell for winning I Love My Librarian Award
II.	Approval of Minutes (November 11, 2015) [Vote]	*Motion to approve moved by Senator P, seconded by Senator Cushman* *Discussion: None* *Passed unanimously*

III. Faculty Senate Discussion-Salary raise

Salary raises, what is left to do in terms or equity, merit, and compression?

- Transparency issues: There wasn't detail information provided regarding the raises so it was difficult to see what parts were equity. There also wasn't a general statement provided regarding what the process was.

- How were the equity adjustments made? How much did the PAC reviews come into play? Was it tied to job performance?

Other questions:

- Why does UNT stay open during the week of Thanksgiving?

IV. President Neal Smatresk and Provost Finley Graves

Provost:

How did the salary raises process go? We had $600,000 available for equity. We hoped it would address gender, ethnicity and compression equity. We asked the Deans to submit their requests. The amount requested was about 1.4 million. The decision was made to address gender and ethnicity. Later we will address compression. Identified women and people of color whose names were submitted. Put the amounts in the merit spreadsheet first so the people who received equity had that applied first, then merit.

We accepted what the Deans submitted to us. Performance did play a part in that. Some did not receive an equity adjustment due to job performance. Total amount of merit was 2.1 million. Chairs make recommendation based on performance data they have.

Highest merit was 5.27%. The median was 2.5%. The cap was approximately 5%. Salary data from May compared to now was sent to Faculty Senate EC. Due to vacancies on campus we held back 4%. It goes into a pool of money in case we have to make a counter offer, spousal accommodation or address other salary issues.

We want to see what impact the equity adjustments had. Allen Clark's office will eventually be doing this. There was one college where no equity was requested. Hope to address compression next year.

Other topics: Thanksgiving Break, since schools are out, is there consideration for the university to have an extended Thanksgiving Break? We can look at that.

President:

Question about more bicycle patrols.

More bicycle patrols: According to police we have as much campus presence as we have had in past years. Possibly police on horses. Helpful with crowd control. It's a consideration.

Recent Board of Regents Meeting: Really impressed with what's happening at UNT. Made a significant addition to our reserves. We were ahead of the other campuses in strategic planning. Our numbers are turning across the board. Gave the members a VIP reception at the Union. Noticed a fundamental change in how UNT is received.

Applications for next year appear to be up 10%. We go up for SACS reaccreditation next Spring. Not a time to air grievances. Also does not help the process.

Hired a new football coach. It is a way to build a national presence, but not the only way. We lost a lot of money this year from the football program.

Question: A faculty member had a badly behaving student. The student was referred to the Dean of Student's Office. The faculty member was told that it was up to the faculty member to deal with the situation.

Answer: Without knowing the circumstances it is difficult to tell. Faculty member can send an email to the President, cc Elizabeth With and give the details of the situation.
Could the Dean of Students give an explanation as to why it couldn't be handled in that office?
Can we come up with guidelines?

Question: 15.0 language. Will discuss later in the meeting.
Question: Graduation ceremonies. In college of Arts and Sciences, faculty have been asked not to participate but can attend. Another senator mentioned she was told to go home when she attended the June graduation ceremony and she was dressed in full regalia. The email received will be forwarded to the Provost's Office. The President encourages faculty to go to any ceremony they would like to go to. Even if space is an issue, we will find the space.

Question: Campus Carry-UT President was pushing back on not allowing concealed weapons on campus.
Answer: The faculty pushed back and the UT President was addressing it. The rough draft on the policy was submitted to the President's Cabinet. I am reluctant to adopt stricter standards but also do not want to have liberal standards either. What is the right compromise? Would like input from all constituencies. Policies have to be approved in the Spring cycle. The policy will be reviewed by faculty to get faculty input.

V. Policy Status Update (V. Barbara Bush)

15.0 Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure:

As a whole the policy was approved last Spring by the Faculty Senate. There were three concerns that were brought back to the Executive Committee and the committee reviewed the President's concern:

a.) Librarians being tenure-track: no structure in place. EC's recommendation was that language be removed from 15.0 but could be considered at a later time once the structure was in place.

b) Grievance- Every level faculty can dispute a decision.

c) Full faculty vote (substantive): Brought back to the faculty senate with the changes. Language modified to meet President's concern. No vote in EC because we were referring it to Faculty Senate for a vote. Full faculty vote at every level for tenure track faculty: EC suggested the language all eligible faculty will vote during the 3rd year and the vote will be recorded and placed in the dossier. In the 3rd year review, the vote would be included. The voting record would be submitted to the dossier along with the review from the unit committee. In the timeline of reviews, the wording was added that the continuation vote would be included.

Motion to accept the amendments moved by Senator Broyles, seconded by Senator Thomsett-Scott

Discussion:
Language "all eligible tenured faculty"-what does that mean? Area faculty, division faculty, college faculty?
There are different structures so it is left up to the unit. Who votes in your 3rd year? Do you have a full faculty vote? When you come up for tenure who votes on it? The division RPT. Whoever votes on you in your up and out year should be the same people voting on your 3rd year and after. The person is getting accurate information about their progress. Whoever votes in your year 6 should be the same in years 3, 4 and 5. Our intent is to take what feedback you would have gotten in year 6, and to get it in year 3, 4 and 5. You can determine what the unit is. Have to have on record what the unit is.

How do you handle non-votes? All faculty should feel a responsibility to vote. Should impact their score on service. A good Chair and Dean should impress on faculty that they have an obligation to participate in the vote. All that are eligible should vote. Candidates should not be penalized.
When will this take effect? For brand new faculty entering in Fall of 2016, this should take effect. The vote is the process, not the criteria. Would like to see the new policy be in effect for tenure track faculty in the fall of 2016.

Will voting faculty members have access to candidates' dossiers? There would be a subcommittee of the faculty of the whole. They would write up their findings. That would be given to the voting faculty. They could offer edits/suggestions. The report is set and the faculty as a whole vote.
If faculty do not vote? They are not fulfilling their service commitment. What should happen if there are faculty who are afraid to vote due to bullying? Votes should be anonymous. We need to offer assistant professors clear guidance on their progression. Chairs need to manage bullying situations.

In departments that have a small amount of faculty will this constitute a double vote? Do not have to do a double vote. Candidate should be informed on a vote.

Does this mean the units, colleges and departments will need to update their promotion and tenure documents? Yes, please do it this spring if you can. Half of all departments are using committees of the whole anyway. Do not see the point of a separate vote.
What about faculty who have negotiated a 4 year probationary period? They should be extended. Anyone can go up early but you take your chances. You should not be negotiating an earlier contract.

After the changes, we never brought it back to the Deans.
Approval of the Deans-once the vote is completed here it goes to the President. He will discuss it with the Deans. If the President has any changes it could come back to EC.

Vote: 22 in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstentions. Motion has passed.

Informational item:

- 15.1.19 Faculty Workload – Non-substantive changes from OGC

Changes of wording from Legal-unit administrator wording was not specific enough, wording on professional responsibility. Reference to specific policies. Suggestions made to give it legal sufficiency

First reading:

- 15.2.17 Online Courseware Intellectual Property
- 18.1.20 Continuous Enrollment

Please look over these documents and you can submit comments to EC.

VI. Update Committee on Committees (James Conover) [Vote]

Faculty Policy Oversight Committee

- Charges to the Faculty Oversight Committee

Distinguished Professor Committee Appointments

Nominations from the floor: Group II teaching assistants-Scott Warren, Learning Technologies

Committee makes a motion to accept nomination
Seconded by Senator Chamberlain
Motion carries

Group III faculty for Teaching Fellows
Motion to accept a single candidate
Seconded by Senator Thomsett-Scott
Motion carries.

Faculty Oversight Committee: EC would like to reactivate this committee.
Reviewed charges of the committee
Motion to reactivate this committee moved by
Senator Thomsett-Scott, seconded by Senator Cushman
Motion carries.

Committee moves to vote on the committee members for the Faculty Oversight Committee:
Seconded by Senator Thomsett-Scott
Discussion: Do we need to vote on this? EC brings decisions to Faculty Senate
Vote: Motion carries.

As a Faculty Senate for the next meeting we would like to reactivate two committees: Salary Study Committee and Budget Committee. We may recommend some other committees be deleted.

Motion to reactivate Salary Study Committee and the Budget Committee
Moved by Senator Thomsett-Scott
Seconded by Senator Shah
Motion Carries

VII.	UUCC Update (Brian Lain) [Vote]	Sian Brannon filled in for Brian Lain. *Reviewed minutes* *Seconded by Senator Sweany* *Discussion: None* *Motion carries with one abstention*
VIII.	Committee of the Whole	Any comments: This is the last meeting of the senate for this semester. Thank you to the Senate for your hard work
IX.	Adjournment	*Motion moved by Senator Peak, seconded by Senator Campbell.* Meeting adjourned at 3:44pm.