



FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 10, 2016
MINUTES

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

- Meeting: Faculty Senate Meeting February 10, 2016, Union room 332
- Present: Brian Ayre, Kim Baker, Kathryn Beasley, Glen Biglaiser, Sheri Broyles, V. Barbara Bush, Douglas Campbell, Denise Catalano, James Conover, Shelley Cushman, Elliot Dubin, Morgan Gieringer, Kamakshi Gopal, Lee Hughes, Paul Hutchison, John Ishiyama, Jennifer Lane, Andrew May, Smita Mehta, Maria Muniz, Phil Paolino, Dan Peak, Emile Sahliyah, Jyoti Shah, Jeffrey Snider, Srinivasan Srivilliputhur, Jessica Strubel, Phil Sweany, Manish Vaidya, Mary Ann Venner, Guido Verbeck, Karen Weiller, Oksana Zavalina, Tao Zhang.
- Absent: Jennifer Callahan; Adam Chamberlin; Reza Mirshams; Saraju Mohanty; Divesh Ojha; Stephen Slottow; Beth Thomsett-Scott.
- Guests: Christy Crutsinger, Provost Office; Mike McPherson, Provost Office; Patrick Pluscht, CLEAR; Brian Lain, UCC and QEP; Traci Cihon, QEP; Sian Brannon, UCC; Elizabeth Vogt, University Accreditation; Matt Zabel, URCM; Susan Smith, Libraries; Kathy McDaniel, Registrar.
- I. Welcome and Introductions Welcome to our new room at the Union. We have it reserved for once a month. Manish Vaidya has returned. Thank you to Dr. Pinkston for filling in. Happy birthday wishes to Dr. Strubel.
- II. Approval of Minutes Motion to approve minutes. Moved by Senator Hutchison, seconded by Senator Broyles (December 9, 2015) [Vote] Approved with two abstentions. Motion carries.
- III. Faculty Senate Discussion-
 - Concierge approach to faculty: governance issues, accountability, and consequences for administrative impediments, “UNT Runaround”
 - Technology implementation: System transition and communication, lack of authority and responsibility and how it impacts our workplace, student learning and retention
 - Classrooms/lecture halls: Updating classroom technology

There is a big push for the concierge approach for students. Where does a faculty member go for answers about different issues? We need more of a

customer service approach for faculty as well.

We do have an ombudsman. We also have a mechanism for faculty grievance. For other things we would like as faculty to have a customer service mentality. There have been issues about technology and its implementation: FIS, HR, and a new push for technology where faculty are not consulted beforehand, especially for 110 classrooms.

Classroom technology is a big issue. If we are going to be decentralized in teaching, building classrooms should be capable of handling the technology needs.

Our discussion item is the main topic which is in open discussion within the presence of the administrators. This is the time for feedback and we will have other discussion items later.

Feedback from constituents:

- At a senator's department meeting it was brought up that the Frisco campus courses are going to be duplicates of what is offered on the Denton campus? Who made that decision?
- Concierge: If a classroom is not set up the way it is supposed to, we are wasting classroom time to restore the layout to the way it was originally set up. Who do we contact to fix this? We will invite a facilities rep to come to a future Faculty Senate meeting. There is a mailbox icon on the desktops of the computers in the classrooms. The message goes to Classroom Support.
- In Discovery Park, all the classrooms were impacted by Classroom Support changing things in the rooms and then two weeks later switching them back. Who made this decision? Faculty using those classrooms were not consulted.
- Classroom Optimization Group surveyed people teaching in a 110 classroom. A report was put together which was submitted to Bob Brown. A new committee is supposedly being created to address the issues mentioned. The survey provided great feedback from faculty. A communication plan would be more helpful than one on one addressing of problems. The new group does not have faculty representation on it at this time.

We need to have faculty involvement taking place up front. Doing so can help avoid major pitfalls.

IV. President
Neal
Smatresk and
Provost
Finley
Graves

President Smatresk and Provost Graves were not able to attend. Christy Crutsinger filled in.

How courses and programs were scheduled at Frisco: It was a quick timeframe. Provost sent a call out to Deans to submit program proposals for Frisco. Anything that would fit within the frame of the vision of the Frisco campus-technology and communication components-or ties into what is happening in Frisco was requested. Then there was a vetting process. Everyone who made a proposal was given approval. Types of courses: Criminal Justice (There will be a cybersecurity lab in Frisco. It has great growth potential.), Journalism courses address the communication theme and social media), digital retailing (JC Penney headquarters are in Frisco), Educational Leadership, and Business (MBA courses). We hope not to duplicate courses going forward, but because of the short turnaround time we had duplicates this time. There are think tanks (faculty-interdisciplinary) that are building new degree programs (big data analytics, sports, journalism, criminal justice, and gaming). Is there a faculty rep on the decisions being made? Faculty are heavily involved in the think tanks. Brenda Sims is the director of the Frisco Campus. She is a faculty member and welcomes suggestions on what to offer at the Frisco Campus. Any cost analysis being done at Frisco? Not sure. We have about 240 students there right now. We are in a five year lease at Frisco. The potential is that it will be a money maker. If we do this right we can plug this model into other areas in DFW. "Moving at the speed of light" is the tagline at the Frisco campus.

Concierge approach: Student concierge model of service was created for students. We tend to work from the bottom up and we need to change it to taking it to the level where it can be resolved. FIS System implementation problem is an example. We took the issue to Bob Brown and he is working on a resolution. Regarding faculty issues, you may contact Mike McPherson (AVP for Faculty), facultysuccess@unt.edu. The President and Provost have admin assistant positions posted. When things are not going well, we can reach out to these people. Once they are hired, an email will be sent out. The UNT System wants to be part of the "Best Places to Work" network. This is a huge incentive to implementing a concierge approach for UNT.

With the FIS situation it seemed to be a program issue. It looks like 80% of the problems have been resolved.

Academic advisors are working on plans to minimize the student runaround. How do we handle customer service amongst ourselves? We need to practice good stewardship. How is the concierge model going to work? It is a mentality, a change of culture. The student model is a decentralized model of customer service. It was implemented last year for students. For faculty mentoring new faculty there is no one person who can solve everything. It's a culture change. The culture change would apply to and impact everyone. It becomes a network. We should be saying "how can I help you" instead of "no we can't do that here". For example, how do make the process for travel reimbursements less problematic?

The President and Provost have allocated funding to improve classrooms. The

issues can be resolved, but we need to improve communication amongst groups involved. It is important to fix these issues before we grow.

- V. Policy Status Update (Christy Crutsinger) The Policy Oversight Committee has been filled and met last week. It is currently reviewing policies. Jim Conover is the Chair for now. (We were provided with an updated sheet of policies being reviewed.) The Campus Carry policy and the Sexual Harassment policy are being reviewed. We only have one policy out of compliance: 19.8 (Adoption and Pricing of Instructional Materials. Currently in the review cycle are 15.2.19 (Awarding Posthumous Degrees) and 13.9 (Shared Governance and Role of Advisory Committees and Academic Administration). They will be reviewed so we are not out of compliance with those. There are none at PAG right now. Several policies are at General Counsel. The Academic Appointments policy and 15.0 are at legal and were found insufficient. Dr. Crutsinger will get more details. Our goal is to get 15.0 through legal. We need to get our bylaws in line. Policy 15.25 (Student Attendance) was approved by legal. Policy 15.1.9 (Academic Workload) and policy 15.1.10 (Tenured Administrators) are in the President's office.

- VI. Policies Second Reading and Vote (Jim Conover) Policies will go through staggered review rates. If you have questions about policies, contact facultysenate@unt.edu.
- 18.1.20 - Continuous Enrollment: The most recent version is posted to the policy website. <http://policy.unt.edu/>. Some edits needed to be made to the policy to expand the policy statement.
- Motion to vote on policy 18.1.20
Moved by Senator Srivilliputhur, seconded by Senator Cushman
Discussion: Is it true that students who are doing their dissertations no longer need to enroll in six hours? Right now this is not policy. The Graduate School has a tuition waiver for six hours, but that does not relate to this policy. There are also changes taking place with graduate tuition plans. What about foreign students? If they are ABD what constitutes full time? Three hours constitutes full time. Should it say somewhere in the policy what is considered full time? That is outside the scope of this policy.
When we are looking at a text document it address local issues but it also impacts other issues that could possibly be linked off the web. We should address this issue at a future Faculty Senate meeting. We have to solve these problems to also help us stay Tier One.
Motion carries unanimously.
- 15.2.17 - Online Courseware Intellectual Property: It is different to the original policy.
- Motion for second reading
Moved by Senator May, seconded by Senator Sweany
Discussion: Lots of major changes from the original policy. There is no provision for royalties in the new policy. There is no longer a category for

work totally created and owned by faculty. In the jointly held section, it doesn't clarify what is owned by the university. This is the only policy that exists on this topic. If this policy does not make it forward to second reading, it comes back to EC. We then push it back down to the Policy Oversight Committee. Perhaps some of the issues can be addressed in other policies.

Background of this policy: There has been a directive that no royalties be paid. Should this be mentioned in the policy statement? What happens when we create work and it's still being used after we leave the university? The primary change to this policy is that it applies to online courses. If you teach a blended course and we put forward an electronic syllabus and it's less than 50%, it lies outside the scope of this policy. If it's more than 50% online than this policy applies. More specificity is needed in this policy. The purpose of royalties in the past was as an incentive. The process hasn't been fair as to how online courses have been assigned.

Motion carries with 19 for, 12 against

VII. Senate
Discussion

• **Faculty Role in Curriculum**

Faculty own the curriculum. We have several committees to voice faculty opinions on the curriculum.

Discussion: On the agenda for meetings we always mention that faculty own the curriculum. It's an important point we should make any time the topic of the curriculum comes up. Capstone courses were rejected by the state. Question about the faculty membership status on Graduate Council. There was an election for new members. There was an issue with the election. Nominations were made, but no results have been confirmed. The problem was with the voting process. EC will follow up with Adam Chamberlain, Chair of the Elections Committee.

VIII Committee
on
Committees
Update (Jim
Conover and
Guido
Verbeck)

We have two new reactivated committees. Thank you, Senator Ayre, for bringing the issue forward. During the administrative switch these committees were made inactive and we realized we needed them back. They are now active standing committees. We need to populate these committees. The terms will be staggered.

• **Faculty Senate Salary Study Committee**

Compression is an issue that will be addressed. Fairness in salary, equity in pay will be addressed as well.

• **Faculty Senate Budget Committee**

Point of information: We have had some faculty appointments to administrative committees.

On the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) we need to retain leadership due to transition. Can we add an additional year to the members' terms?

Motion to add an additional year to FGC members' terms

Moved by Senator Broyles, seconded by Senator Cushman

Motion carries.

- IX. UUC Update (Brian Lain) [Vote] We want more faculty involvement in the curriculum. We had an update on the QEP. It is called Career Connect. We have a website proposal moving forward. We have some experimental courses taking place. We are beginning to see changes in degree plans as a result of the loss of Capstone courses. Motion to accept the minutes seconded by Senator Conover. Motion carries to accept the minutes. (Please let EC know of any future issues that come up that we need to address.)

- X. Committee of the Whole
- QEP Update
QEP is going to be rolled out at the end of March. QEP presentation will be made in March. We will have a formal presentation made by the QEP committee.
 - Post Award Decentralization
Post awards have been decentralized by the Research Office and have been moved back out to the departments. This is causing a lot of problems. Reach out to your constituents and be proactive on addressing this. If pre and post awards are decentralized, how does this impact Tier One? Pre award has been centralized again. This has had better outcomes. The overall process is impacting areas in a negative way. What are the consequences when negative things happen? Mistakes done by the Research Office are impacting faculty. Please send comments about this to Chair Guido Verbeck.
What is the focus of the Office of Research and Economic Development?
Answer: Pre award and tech transfers. Why do we have so many layers of administration? Why can't it go from department to final approval? Is this consistent with other universities that are Tier One? Questions about budgeting for office supplies in your grants have been asked. We need clarity. Apply a concierge approach to these issues. Faculty feel like they are getting the runaround on information. We have to follow federal guidelines.
In March we are going to have the SACS QEP. President mentioned to the department chairs that we need to take the QEP seriously. It is directly attributed to SACS Accreditation.
Is there an effort to coordinate problems related to the Research Office so we have a more firm foundation moving forward? We got Tier One status due to the number of our graduated PhD's. We are ranked 113 out of 115 regarding research dollars. There has to be a huge culture shift.

- XI. Adjournment Motion to adjourn
Moved by Senator Broyles , seconded by Senator Shaw
Meeting adjourned at 3:42pm.