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| Meeting:  | Faculty Senate Meeting, October 9, 2013, Wooten Hall 322 |
| Present: | Kim Baker; Cindy Batman; Erica Boykin; V. Barbara Bush; Jennifer Callahan; Doug Campbell; William Cherry; James Conover; Barbara Cox; Shelley Cushman; Dutch Fayard; Robert Figueroa; Jeff Goodwin; Francisco Guzman; David Kaplan; Fang-Ling Lu; Seifollah Nasrazadani; Dan Peak; Elizabeth Prosek; James Quinn; Pat Reese; Brian Richardson; Dorian Roehrs; Jyoti Shah; Jeffrey Snider; Srinivasan Srivilliputhur; Manish Vaidya; Mary Ann Venner; Mark Vosvick; Karen Weiller; Dale Yeatts; Oksana Zavalina. |
| Absent: | Guido Verbeck; Kelly Taylor; Farhad Shahrokhi; Jennifer Lane; Leon Kappelman; John Ishiyama; Pam Harrell; Ian Finseth. |
| Guests: | Warren Burggren, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Christy Crutsinger, Vice Provost for Faculty Success; Kathryn Cullivan, CAS; Richard Deter, Chief of Police; Jannon Fuchs, Biological Sciences; Julie Glass, VPAA Office-Core Curriculum; Katy McDaniel, Catalog & Curriculum Support/ Registrar’s Office; David McEntire, Summer Session; Brian McFarlin, UNT/KHPR; Sadaf Munshi, LTC; Yolanda Flores-Niemann, VPAA; Kimberly Reasoner, Division of Community Engagement; Geary Robinson, Parking and Transportation; Mark Wardell, Toulouse Graduate School Dean; Celia Williamson, Vice Provost for Educational Innovation; Matt Zahad, URCM. |
| I. | Welcome and Introductions | The meeting was brought to order at 2:00 PM. Chair Vosvick presented a reminder of the attendance policy.   |
| II. | Approval of Minutes [vote] | Senator Srivilliputhur moved to accept the minutes and Senator Goodwin seconded the motion. The September 13, 2013 minutes were approved with a proposed change regarding the election of Senator Venner. |
| III. | Faculty Profile System | Allen Clark was unable to attend. Senator Guzman presented on the Faculty Profile System. There will be a thorough analysis of the current system. Clark may develop a task group of volunteers, one from each Senate group. It is anticipated that the work of this task group will be completed by May. The Provost has stated that we are wed to this system as a place where faculty can show achievements. Feedback from the Senate: Our current system does not have equitable categories. Any new system should be populated as an import from existing system. Lucero will be soliciting nominations from Senate groups. |
| IV. | Faculty Senate Discussion | **Student Fees for Outside Speakers** This issue came from a department chair. The Senate was asked to gain input from constituents. Chair Vosvick asked for feedback. Senator Richardson stated that his department has a keynote speaker for all students each fall, and that there would be no way to pay this speaker without fees (communication studies) Senator Vaidya stated that scrutiny by the state should be considered. There is some confusion over the use of fees. Senator Figueroa stated that several departments have depended on course fees; however, others acquired funds in other ways. The restrictions may hamper the ability to draw international speakers.**Update from the Budget Office -** **Kathryn Cullivan**Changes to the use of course fees came from the university business office, not from the state. Cullivan explained that instructional fees are meant to provide “direct support for learning in the exact course for which it is charged.” Question: Can we use fees for speakers if we bring them into course? Yes. There are occasions on which part of syllabus includes speakers in course. How did we come to this state of affairs? Over time, boundaries have been tested creating a “slippery slope.” Use of fees will continue only if done “by the rules.” Account numbers are by department. Every department has course fees although engineering has general fees for the college. Only staff directly linked to a course can be paid from fees. Program fees are under discussion. The issue for department chairs is how funds are assessed and utilized. |
| V. | Senate Discussion | **Parking Issues**Comments from the floor:Many issues may be unique to UNT because it is a split campus. Off main campus buildings should have visitor parking.Access for visitors to the library should be considered along with more public access and safety for Willis patrons. Availability of parking permits short termDiscount on parking for visitorsCollaboration with communities– keeping in mind the costsFor visitors to campus there should be the option to waive ticketsFor research subjects – should there the same costs as visitors in general? Indirect costs of parking are reinvested.Campus parking is neighbourhood issue.Parking during sporting events.Parking fees, metered parking does not allow enough time.Guest speakers; Fouts Field; Garage; Accountability. |
| VI.  | Parking and Transportation Services Director and Police Chief | **Geary Robinson and Richard Deter**Academic Affairs perspective on parking is desired. What will be the policy regarding research participants. Robinson stated that there has always been a negative relationship between parking and the ranking of institution. Parking is at a premium because of structures and the building process. It is not our role to make parking abundant. One option to explore is the policy that allows freshmen to bring cars to campus. What does having abundance on campus mean?Robinson acknowledges that parking as a universal problem. Parking is self-sustained, thus the concept that everyone pays. Parking is a resource. With visitors and special events “customer comes first.” Do we displace campus personnel for visitors? There is not enough dialogue currently. There was a parking committee years ago, and that committee looked at fee levels, set fees. Structures will take the place of parking. We have 12,000 spaces for 40,000 students. There has been no change in the procedure that visitors get one free ticket. Indirect research dollars may have to cover parking for research subjects. “A” spaces underutilized, so parking created an experiment behind Chilton by limiting permits. Hickory Street meters were requested by Denton. Online visitor permits are coming soon. Parking is not a cash cow. There were committees including students and staff, but they became non-functional. As a result, the appeal process was changed to one person reporting directly to Deter. Parking priorities have to be part of the master plan. Parking wants representatives for a new committee to give input on rules and regulations, planning, and costs. The President reserves the right to set fees. It is hoped that by November there will be a group that meets regularly. Much turnover in parking, may have had oversteps. Robinson should be last authority, but sometimes they do not know. Visitor parking remains $5, not $10. It was requested that parking concerns be addressed to Robinson and Deter instead of the employee. Growing pains. Highland Ave, D&C will they be open, minute by minute.Need representatives. Robinson likes to share responsibility.  |
| VII. | Summer School | **David McEntire**There are not enough students in summer--about 1200 headcount, SCH over 10,000. Over the last three years, there has been a decrease in number of over 30 %. The possible reasons for this decrease include lower academic priorities, usage of college allocations, discounts for tuition, transportation expense, and faculty emphasis on research.The plan is to protect allocations, critically review schedules and online instruction, among other possible actions.Q&AHave you thought about revising schedule in a way that would change faculty workload to include summer?Comments: As to the continual decline over past four years—there may be other reasons such as financial aid. In some cases, there is a rising student demand for summer classes, but not enough money to offer them. Summer school must become  a “cash cow.” We need incentives for faculty to teach during the summer. There are incentives for large classes although some colleges do not provide them.Timing of allocation. Deans have “pot of money” in advance. At times additional money comes too late.A faculty concern is the cap for summer salaries.We should think of changes in length and how course are offered. |
| VIII. | Graduate School Programs Review | **Mark Wardell**Last year first year we were asked to have seven-year evaluation for all graduate programs. This review was rolled out last year without much forethought. Many did not understand requirements, but there are guidelines. Basics: Every review requires two external reviewers—two for masters which is above what state requires. Reviewers paid—ten programs will be reviewed this year. Wardell has met with chairs to review the process, expectations, and desired outcomes.Desired outcome: 1) Satisfy THECB. They have not approved our calendar. When this happens all programs to be reviewed will be notified.2) Realistic assessment of graduate programs—What can we do to improve within next five years? To address bold goal #2, faculty and chairs have to provide a realistic self-study for which the template will be provided. Qualifications for reviewers strong. They spend two nights on campus, and the report they produce is in the hands of the program after reviewers leave campus. On the last day of the visit, the reviewers meet with the chair to give an oral report. The written report is provided to the campus in 25 days, with 25 days for a campus response. Then there is another 25 days for post review. THECB receives the external reviewers’ report, response, and summary post review. Undergraduate programs are not included; however, resources will be examined. Callahan raised an issue about accreditation. |
| IX. | Other issues | PepsiCo expressed concern that UNT was entering into a ten-year, no-bid, exclusive contract with Coke. The Provost does not know if there was a bidding process. There was concern about the efficiency of business services, particularly related to payroll. UNT System employees, not campus employees are responsible. Issues arise on a regular basis. There will be a System representative assigned to this campus.There is no courier to the Health Science Center. Results of the administrator survey will be announced when Lucero returns.  |
| X. | Update Committee on Committees [vote] | **Jim Conover (TBC)**Call for vote on non-contested positions. Moved Weiller, Cherry second. Unanimous approval.Call for contested. Two candidates for Committee on Status of Women (Group 2).Academic Affairs Committee Group 7: Rudy ThompsonAt-large: Monahan (Libraries) Lee Hughes (5-2 one abstentionGoodman moved, Yeatts second. |
| XI. | UCC [vote] | **Sian Brannon**Minutes distributed. Vaidya moved to approve, Cushman seconded. Approved unanimously. |
| XII.  | Committee on the Whole | No Items. |
| XIII. | Adjournment | Adjournment 4:15Yeatts moved, Cushman second.Vote unanimous. |