MINUTES

Meeting: Faculty Senate Meeting September 9, 2015, Wooten Hall, Room 322

Present: Kim Baker; Kathryn Beasley; Glen Biglaiser; Sheri Broyles; V. Barbara Bush; Jennifer Callahan; Douglas Campbell; Denise Catalano; Adam Chamberlin; James Conover; Shelley Cushman; Morgan Gieringer; Kamakshi Gopal; Paul Hutchison; Lee Hughes; John Ishiyama; Jennifer Lane; Andrew May; Smita Mehta; Reza Mirshams; Saraju Mohanty; Phil Paolino; Audhesh Paswan; Dan Peak; Jonathan Pinkston; Emile Sahliyeh; Jyoti Shah; Stephen Slottow; Jeffrey Snider; Jessica Strubel; Phil Sweany; Beth Thomsett-Scott; Mary Ann Venner; Guido Verbeck; Karen Weiller; Tao Zhang.

Absent: Brian Ayre; Elliot Dubin; Maria Muñiz; Divesh Ojha, Srinivasan Srivilliputhur; Oksana Zavalina.

Guests: Neal Smatresk, President; Finley Graves, Provost and VPAA; Christy Crutsinger, VPPA; Margaret Vestal, Office of the Provost; Angela Wilson, Office of Faculty Success; Mike McPherson, Office of Faculty Success; Brian Lain, UUCC; V. Sian Brannon, UUCC; Daniel Chen, SETE Task Force; Pam Harrell, SETE Task Force; G.L. Seligmann, History; John Quintanilla, SETE Task Force; Mark McKnight, SETE Task Force; Costas Tsatsoulis, SETE Task Force; Tracy Everbach, SETE Task Force; Jan Holden, SETE Task Force; Laurel Crawford, Libraries; Susan Smith, Libraries; Jeremy Berg, Libraries; Karen Harker, Libraries; Erin O’Toole, Libraries; Sarah Lagro, North Texas Daily; Kim Nguyen, Facilities.

I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 2:08 pm.

II. Approval of Minutes (June 10, 2015) [Vote]

Moved approval by Senator Hutchinson, seconded by Senator Sahliyeh. Four abstentions.

III. Election of Senate Officers and Executive Committee Members

Election of Senate Officers and Executive Committee Members

Conover announced resignation. First order of business is the election of officers.

Senator Peak moved and Senator Cushman seconded nomination of Guido Verbeck as Chair. By acclimation, Guido Verbeck voted Chair.

Senator Venner moved and Senator Broyles seconded nomination of V.
Barbara Bush as Vice Chair. By acclimation, V. Barbara Bush voted Vice Chair.

Senator Lane moved and Senator Peak seconded nomination of Mary Ann Venner as Secretary. Nomination approved by majority. (One no.)

Executive Committee:
- Group I - Sheri Broyles
- Group II - Doug Campbell
- Group III - Phil Sweany
- Group IV - John Ishiyama
- Group V - Dan Peak
- Group VI - tbd
- Group VII - Brian Ayre
- Group VIII - Jennifer Lane

IV. Faculty Senate Discussion

Topic: Concierge approach to faculty needs

Feedback and questions from constituents:

Moving into Tier I how do we ensure ethical standards for hires, solve specific issues for faculty members?

Our departments have lack of knowledge of what the concierge will be doing. Need to do something to improve environment to reduce bullying in the university. Faculty need someone they can talk to without fear of retaliation. Having someone help navigate the policy waters. Want to be able to talk to someone about department issues outside of the department. Having someone to help map out the path to achieve a particular university goal.

Concierge approach, more faculty friendly approach when you are running into roadblocks. What is in the way that is preventing us from doing our jobs?

Faculty profile system Sedona has not been successful in downloading information.

What is our progress/status on being recognized as a national research institution? What is the deadline?

Other items submitted online were shown on the projection screen.

President:

President: Faculty concierge: He agrees on having someone to navigate the maze but said it is hard to act on unclear issues. When things are not going right we need to address them. A faculty concierge could get you the help that you need, give the Administration feedback so they can start to solve the customer service issues. Dealing with situations one at the time helps one person but maybe there is a bigger issue. He likes the idea of having a
faculty concierge. Could Faculty Senate create a system to get those issues to administration? If there is something going on with an area, we need to let the President know. Will explore it further with EC and the Provost.

**Bullying:** He is very concerned about bullying. When that happens he needs to know. If it is retaliation for something, that is actionable. When someone brings a credible charge forward, we investigate. He will not stand for a hostile workplace, malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds. There are reasons behind the changes that have been made. If you don’t find remediation, notify the President.

**Tier 1:** There is no deadline regarding Tier 1. Working on fixing underlying issues. Academic spending is up, administrative spending flat going down slowly. Move more decision making especially with budgets to the Deans. Deans are now more accountable according to a series of metrics. How do their decisions and performances help us get to Tier 1? Working in ways to achieve more successes in the short term. Stay tuned. Series of town halls will be held this year: How do we increase/improve our research profile, retention, improve our sense of community (be more collegial).

**Good news:** We are basing our budget on 1.75 % growth. Solved our proportional benefits challenge, will receive more formula funding, HEAF funding is flat, but it will increase next year by 50%. Hitting about 4% growth. As of census day we topped 37,000 students. Brought in 15 National Merit scholars. We have accepted largest first time freshman class, up 7.5% percent: single most positive indicator of health. Incoming grad student class up 15%. Still need to work on increasing the number of doctoral students. Have a large transfer student class, up over 7%. Hired a firm to outsource financial aid application processing—improved application processing time. Awarded more financial aid this year. We had 1.5 million dollars in scholarships and implemented the tuition waiver plan. Issues with the tuition waiver plan include a significant cost and not yielding as many doctoral students as we had hoped. The plan did achieve an effect but will need to fine tune it.

Deans have already been assigned budgets for searches. Increased FTE faculty by about 100. Working on how we are going to build for the future to become prominent nationally. What will we do with the new campus in Frisco? How will we utilize the UCD in Dallas?

**Frisco Campus:** Working on lease issues. Phase I: Soft launch in January 2016. Strong focus working with corporations to help their employees. A few classes will be held out there to start, at least one degree program, a masters program out there, an entrepreneurial boot camp, crime data lab, programs to generate revenue and pay the rent, collaborative programming around business tech. By Fall 2016 hope to offer full four year programs and masters program. There is 30,000 sq foot space which will hold about 500 students at a time. Want it to be a high tech space. Looking for new collaborative proposals. Phase II: Earn enough money to bond the new campus.
The President commented that a 2.6% equity in pay raise is confirmed.

1. What were the main identified planning points from the Planning Implementation Workshop, and how will they be implemented.

*President:* Very good planning session. Students are saying good things about the university.

2. The Senate EC had follow up questions regarding the feedback on 15.0 from our June meeting. We are interested in moving forward expeditiously in our further conversations with the feedback from the president and provost after their read through of the faculty senate approved version of policy 15.0.
   
   a. What are the president/provost’s specific concerns with the appeal process at the department level?

   b. What are the president’s specific concerns with the nature of the faculty vote on promotion and tenure? How will librarians be addressed in 15.0?

*Christy Crutsinger* briefly commented on the status of 15.0 in section VI.

3. In lieu of student retention, distance learning, online resources, we have a large technology gap inhibiting direct access. Is there a mechanism for addressing this issue, when our competitors have more technology implemented and uniformity? *Not addressed.*

4. Faculty are concerned that not all the offices charged with faculty support for research and teaching offer services with the intent of eliminating barriers and impediments to faculty success. How can we adopt a “concierge” approach to faculty needs? *See President’s comments at the beginning of this section.*

*Provost:*

**Comments on Sedona:** When we input our information into Sedona it uploaded into the Faculty Profile System—it broke at the end of 2012. If we replace the faculty profile system we would like a system that can migrate everything that is in the faculty profile system. Allen Clark has been looking into various faculty profile systems.

---

**VI. Fall Semester Plan for Policies review (Christy Crutsinger)**

**Status of Policy 15.0 Faculty Review Promotion and Tenure**

*Crutsinger:* Still reviewing policies. Finley has been working with the library regarding the librarians’ status in 15.0. EC has met with the President. We want to come to an agreement.

Distributed learning policy is still being worked on and the Technology policy are still being worked on.

Academic workload got bounced back from Legal.

What’s going on in the Policy Office? We have a new staff member, Deena Merrill. Four new policies that have been revised are now posted on the
Adoption and pricing of instructional materials authored by faculty policy is being reviewed. Goal is to look at these on a cycle rather than all at once.

Chair Verbeck commented: Creating a standing committee for policy review. If they come back from legal and it’s a sub issue we will bring it back to Faculty Senate.

Second Reading:
*18.1.16 Student Academic Integrity
(No first and seconded needed.)
Open discussion: None
The motion passes unanimously.
Chair Verbeck commented: Issues regarding the policy can be brought to EC when a comment from a guest was made after the vote.

VII. Student Evaluation of Teaching Task Force
(Christy Crutsinger)

Task force members were in attendance. Pam Harrell, Chair of the Task Force led the PowerPoint presentation. New system fill rate during trial run: Response rate without much marketing averaged about 40%. Why discourage extra credit? Ethical concerns from faculty. The system was produced by the University of Washington.

Calling the IA System SPOT: Student Perceptions of Teaching

Questions: How many total questions? Answer: There are four global questions. Could we take advantage of a texting option? Answer: We will look into it.

VIII. Senate Committees

Ad-hoc Faculty Grievance Committee Membership
Chair Verbeck: Goal is to see this through. We recognize the need for full professors on this committee.

Vote to continue ad-hoc committee: Senator Peak moved, Senator Cushman seconded.

Discussion: none
The motion passed unanimously.

Active/Inactive Committees
Chair Verbeck: Thank you, Senator Chamberlain, for conducting the elections.

Vote: Accept committee members except for UUCC nominees

Question: UUCC: There are three candidates listed, should we designate one at large?

Motion moved by Senator Broyles, seconded by Senator Mehta to designate one at large.

Discussion: none
The motion passed unanimously.

Concern: someone who moved forward for a Group II position on the committee and then we make them at large even though they may not have signed up for that?

Senator Thomsett-Scott moved to have Donna Arnold be the Group II
representative, seconded by Senator Lane
The motion passed unanimously.
Comment from UUCC Co-Chair Sian Brannon: At large position may already be filled. We will revisit at the next committee meeting.

IX. Committee on Committees
(Laura Waugh and Audhesh Paswan)
Great year for Committee on Committees. Filled many spots. Senator Waugh is resigning from Committee on Committees.

X. UUCC Update
(Vote:]
(Brian Lain)
Brought forward by the committee, seconded by Senator Paswan.
The motion passes unanimously.

XI. Committee of the Whole
Chair Verbeck: Grievance Committee must be created. Policy Review Committee-standing committee must be created. Outreach to faculty departments has been phenomenal.

XII. Adjournment
Senator Chamberlain moved and Senator Peak seconded for adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 4:06 pm.