



FACULTY SENATE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

University Union 332
Minutes October 9, 2024, 2:00 p.m.

Acree, William	CHEM COS	P	Joyner, William	MUVS MUSIC	P	Sankofa, Nicole	EPSY COE	P			
Armintor Marshall	ENGL CLASS	P	Kim, Jungkwun	EENG CENG	P	Savoie, Michael	SCM RCOB	P			
Bednarz, Jim	BIOL COS	P	Knight, Laetitia	WLLC CLASS	P	Scott Bracey, Pamela	MDI CACS	A	TEMPORARY SENATORS (Voting)		
Ben Othmane, Lotfi	CSE CENG	P	Lemberger-Truelove, Matthew	CHE COE	A	Schalkwyk, Willem van	MUVS COM	P	Orhan Erdem	ADA	P
Briggle, Adam	PHIL CLASS	P	Lund, Brady	IS COI	P	Schoolfield, Anne	ENGL CLASS	P	Rick Cazier	ACCT	P
Britain, Jeffrey	HTM CMHT	P	Manzo, Maurizio	MEEN CENG	P	Sexton, Mike	MGMT RCOBB	A			
Campbell, Doug	LIBR	P	Martin, Eugene	MRTS CLASS	L	Sheppard, Steven	SPAN CLASS	P			
Chamberlin, Adam	DANC CLASS	L	May, Andrew	MUCS COM	P	Shiner, David	PHYS COS	P			
Chaing, Jason	EPSY COE	P	McKay, Melissa	DMI CACS	P	Subramaniam, Karthigeyan	TEA COE	P			
Condrey, Coby	LIBR	P	Morton, Sophie	WLLC CLASS	P	Thurman, Emily	SPAN CLASS	P			
Evans, Sarah	IS COI	P	Mukherjee, Sundeep	MSE CENG	P	Trippeer, Barbara	ADES CVAD	P			
Frenzel, Ervin	CSE CENG	P	Najour, Caroline	WLLC CLASS	P	Trudeau, Justin	COMM CLASS	L	STUDENT SENATORS (Non-voting)		
Ginther, Jeannette	TEA COE	A	Nasco, Dennis	MGMT RCOB	A	Welch, Lisa	BIOL COS	P	Alfred Dozier IV	SGA	A
Hutchison, Paul	ACCT RCOB	P	Ojha, Divesh	SCM RCOB	L	Wilson, Carol	MUVS COM	A	Bala Sankar Kilaru	GSC	P
Iaia, Joseph	MATH COS	P	Peters, John	ENGL CLASS	L	Wolski, Kristin	LIBR	P			
			Quevedo-Torrero, Jesus Ubaldo	CSE CENG	A	Philpot, Denise	ADA	P			
			Rubio, Brenda	TEA CENG	P						

Guests: Harrison Keller (President), Mike McPherson (Provost), Holly Hutchins (OFS), Angie Cartwright (OFS), Courtney Glazer (Accreditation), Amanda Fuller (UBSC), Kevin Yanowski (UNT Libraries), Amanda Fuller (UBSC), Chris Long (TEdA), Mariela Nuñez-Janes (ANTHRO), John Bellon (Staff Senate), Yvonne Dooley (UNT Libraries), Majed Yaghi (RCOB), David Kaplan (PHIL), Brian Richardson (OFS), Uyen Tran (CHE), Barrett Taylor (CHE), Jennifer Lane (Grad

I.	Welcome and Introductions	<p>Senate Chair Condrey welcomed everyone and reviewed how to use the microphones on the tables.</p> <p>He also acknowledged feedback received about the impact of SB 17 on campus activities. Faculty Senate Officers are gathering it all in one place and looking for common threads. We are reserving time on November meeting for discussion.</p>
II.	Approval of Minutes (September 11, 2024) [vote]	<p>Senator Savoy moves and Senator Hutchinson seconds. Vote: 2 oppose, 1 abstention. Motion passes.</p>
III.	University Update (President Harrison Keller)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President aimed to reserve the balance of his time for questions from the senators and guests. • He's been here for 10 weeks and has been accelerating his personal learning. He appreciates the faculty's help and support. • President gave updates on the three current initiatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strategic Budgeting – We are now an institution with more than 46 thousand students a budget of more than 1 billion dollars a year. We've been using historical and incremental budgeting, making it hard to see where our budget decisions are directly related, in some cases, to our priorities as an institution. When we have some even minor shocks to the system, like the recent issues that we had to deal with around enrollment being a little softer than anticipated, there was about 8 million dollars that we had to find across academic units and the central budget. We aren't really structured in a way to be able to absorb that sort of normal, ordinary bumps in the road. We need to move aggressively in the direction of a more strategic and transparent budgeting process. We have a steering committee of stakeholders across the campus. We also have a technical group that's primarily the budget officers from across the campus. The technical group has been actively involved scanning systems deployed on other campuses to see features we want to have in place. For example, we want a model that encourages collaboration across departments. Goal is first iteration will happen in the next cycle, starting with templates received by each department in new year. This is an aggressive timeline. ○ Research – The net new dollars from TUF are about 16 million for the year, though they will grow. Still represents an opportunity to think about 50 million dollars over 3 years for strategic investments. Especially looking to leverage new dollars in areas where there are other states funds available, such as cancer research, semiconductors, and aerospace technologies. Also looking to strengthen our interdisciplinary

work around data science/analytics and AI. Several of these initiatives have important educational components, including having more students directly involved in research. VP for Research is working with the units, looking at all of the grants that have been submitted, where we've been successful, where we came close, and where there might be some opportunities with even small-targeted investments for us to support what we're doing in research.

- Student Success – We must improve dramatically our student persistence and student graduation rates. But even more, we don't want them to finish on time and have trouble landing a job and starting a good career. The President has worked on a lot of these initiatives in different places. Student success really starts at matriculation and through graduation and into their first job/early careers. We want them to look back and see UNT as the platform for their success. Lisa McEntire is the lead and has started by consolidating a few things. Now they are examining all the initiatives we have underway. In some cases, we need to see what to take to scale and other cases to see what it's like across the country. The goal is to develop a plan we can put into implementation in close partnership with academic units.
- Current Budget Update - We are on track for where we expect to be. Costs are running a little bit higher around some of our student support services but nothing that raises any warning flags. But we are on track, especially because of the adjustments that the units have made to deal with the shortfall.
- Partnerships on Civil Discourse – The President has composed a Student Advisory Council of a cross-section of about 25 student leaders from across campus. One of things he proposed is that they take up the issue on civil discourse. He has started talking with them about example cases to draw out their point of view. The president would like to put together a steering committee of faculty, administration, and students to develop an initiative on civil discourse for UNT. He knows there is interest in more faculty support and also more clarity about our commitment to free speech, to academic freedom, and to our responsibility to educate our students as democratic citizens.

Presidential Answers to Questions

- Q - Will the student success efforts include the possibility for students to earn industry certifications before first job?
- A – Yes, this is something I'm a big fan of. You can see in the data significant differences between students who have some of these additional certifications and students who don't in terms of their job opportunities and what their career trajectories are like, and that can be across different kinds of disciplines. that students have certs have more success in career and open up opportunities. This is the kind of data that I would love to us to dig into much more intensely, and to be able to get that data back into the hands of the deans and the chairs and faculty and see

		<p>what's driving the variance and where it might make sense for us to incorporate more room for internships or for microcredentials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q – There has been a lot of confusion about the \$500 salary adjustment • A – From my understanding, it is a general attempt to make good on earlier commitments that have been made. The \$500 increase is to the base salaries. • Q – You mentioned certifications like in project management. We have tried to put these in place here before, but there was no structure to do so. Many of these certifications can be expensive, so where will the money come from? • A – The President has ideas, but in general this will be something we take on as a large project to investigate. We don't want to reinvent the wheel, so may have partnership, even across institutions. It's going to have implications for advising students and even, in some cases, how we structure curriculum This is something we need to organize around and take on as a project, maybe starting next semester. Currently trying to get better data on the earnings of our graduates. So, stay tuned for future activities. • Q – We know the budget transformation is on a tight timeline. What kind of timeline will there be for the revamp of research operation? • A - On research, we have some funds that we can expend in this fiscal year. We're especially looking at where we might be able to use those strategically, especially around these kinds of thematic priorities I mentioned that we might be able to leverage into additional state support. There are some places, for example, we can get a faculty hire over the goal line, or there's equipment that we need, or there's some some renovations that we need to finish out that will make a significant difference. That's what we're looking at, for the very near term. It's important also for us to think more on a 3-year horizon. Part of his role is to be a chief advocate for the institution in the legislative process. He wants to make the strongest possible case I can to the policy makers to continue to invest in UNT. • Q – Will there be a team looking at our accounting software because now what we get in terms of cost and budget reports are awful. • A – Yes, we can. Mabe even more importantly than the software, we need to provide better grant support within the colleges and within and even from central in the VP for Research office to help manage some of the compliance reporting. We've got to up our game on our on our research and we need to provide better grant support in the colleges and from central. Some of the reports are onerous for PIs, so want to up our game in research support.
IV.	SB 17 compliance guidance for faculty (Clay Simmons)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This presentation is meant to cover the requirements of Senate Bil 17 and how that is impacting faculty. • The interesting part about this law is the interpretations that we're getting from general counsel's office change regularly. We are

		<p>still trying to feel our way through how this statute is going to be enacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Texas Education Code § 51.3525 put some pretty stringent rules around certain DEI related topics at the university.• There is intense scrutiny of universities by the legislation and interest groups. Our General Counsel and the Chancellor had to testify in the spring as to the efforts undertaken to implement this law.• The State Auditor's office is required to audit every university. This is going on currently at Texas A&M.• The statute itself is fairly complex. If you read through the statute, you'll notice that certain items are mentioned in some sections of the bill, and then other items are mentioned in other ones. We rely very heavily on our general counsel's office to help us work through these issues.• The University's tolerance for violations of SB 17 is pretty low mainly because of that intense scrutiny we're receiving by the legislature and the interest groups. We're very cautious about how we approach this topics and we're trying to take a very stringent reading of the law and make sure we're doing the things the legislature expects us to do.• The penalties are pretty severe. The final risk that we run in the possible loss of our State funding, since we get about 30% of our funding from the State of Texas.• Also, the university is required under the law to take action against individuals who intentionally violate statute. This falls under our general misconduct policies and functions like other misconduct issues.• The UIC office serves as point of contact for the campus, so if you have any SB 17 questions, please send them to compliance@unt.edu. Though they really encourage you to go through your chain of command first (chair, dean, etc) to see what they are comfortable with.• So far, they've reviewed over 200 activities across the institution. They are looking at legal risks that are presented with some of these activities. But they're also looking at the political risk that comes along with a lot of these.• When they get that intake through the email address, they conduct their own internal review, based on the information that they've gotten from general counsel and the experiences they've had working with this bill. UIC puts together a justification for why they think their interpretation is correct. After they make our determination, they communicate that to whoever asked the question. They'll often also communicate that with the Dean or the Vice President over that area, just to make sure they're aware of what's going on. It is a very fulsome process that requires a lot of documentation because we are preparing for that state audit that will be occurring in the next year or two.• They have also created a SB 17 Decision Tool via Qualtrics, a survey that walks you through an analysis of a question you might have, you can go to
--	--	---

https://unt.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_023UTZ1Dq4AiZ9k. It is not 100% correct, but it is generally. They capture all the data for people who use the tool, and if they have a question or have a concern, they'll reach out to you just to get more information.

- And then, of course, general counsel's office has issued some guidance and a fact, so you can go to their FAQ. They are at <https://www.untsystem.edu/offices/general-counsel/dei-sb-17-faqs.php>.
- Prohibited activities are:
 - Promoting differential treatment or providing special benefits to individuals on the basis of race, color, or ethnicity
 - Promoting policies designed in reference to race, color, or ethnicity
 - Conducting activities designed in reference to race, color, ethnicity, gender identity, or sexual orientation
 - Compel, require, induce, or solicit a person to provide a diversity, equity, and inclusion statement
 - Require participation in diversity, equity, and inclusion training
- Exceptions include:
 - Academic course instruction
 - Limitations on the exception:
 - Classroom lessons on DEI topics must be limited to elements of the course
 - e.g. A class on mathematics may not include an activity on microaggressions, whether graded or not
 - Syllabi – course activities must relate to the course goal or objective
 - Scholarly research or a creative work by an institution of higher education's students, faculty, or other research personnel or the dissemination of that research or work.
 - Research must meet the definition of true research. And there's a very good definition of research in the research misconduct policy.
 - The identity-based aspects must be essential to the research. So if you're doing research on homelessness, you have to be very careful if you're going to focus on a certain identity within homelessness. So if you're looking at LGBTQ homeless individuals, then you'll have to make sure that that is narrowly tailored within the scope of work. And so the scope of work becomes very important for the analysis. We're looking at these types of topics.
 - Limitations on the exception:
 - a. Research may not result in activities prohibited by SB17
 - (3) an activity of a student organization registered with or recognized by an institution of higher education.

- (4) guest speakers or performers on short-term engagements
 - a. speaker must be a 3rd party (i.e. not a university employee)
- (5) a policy, practice, procedure, program, or activity to enhance student academic achievement or postgraduate outcomes that is designed and implemented without regard to race, sex, color, or ethnicity.
- (6) data collection; or
- (7) student recruitment or admissions.

Questions and Answers

- Q - Can you say more about research exception? I looked up the definition in the research misconduct policy. In the humanities, the IRB office would say much of our work is not research, because it doesn't contribute to generalizable knowledge. Is it covered under the exemption?
- A – According to what we know now, it is not covered under the exemption as research.
- Q – When is the university going to push back on some of this. If we take the most conservative reading of the law, this may get to the point where entire disciplines are not free to publish. We need the university to have our back.
- A – That is above my paygrade as a compliance officer. My job is to ensure compliance with the law. If UNT would like to push back on enacted legislation, that is probably for the Board to decide.
- Q – How many of the 200 activities that you've reviewed were canceled?
- A – About 90 were eliminated and 17 were modified.
- Q – And how many of those 90 were decided simply because you're unsure of the meaning of the statute?
- A – Because there's an audit coming up, we are being very careful how we approach this topic, and we are not pushing the envelope on definitions. We're trying to implement the intent of the statute.
- Q – Who can call in a review of an activity? Is it anybody who contacts your office?
- A – Yes.
- Q – Can you point out where in SB 17 it defines what research is and is not?
- A - It does not have a definition.
- Q - So where are we getting these definitions?
- A – The definition of research that was recommended to me by the office of general counsel is the one that's in the research misconduct policy that comes from 13.006 III M.
- Q – I am a faculty member who was a member of one of our faculty resource groups, and we have been in existence for over a decade, fulfilling the goals of the university for recruiting and retention. When the news about the faculty resource groups and

about the Faculty Senate Committees being eliminated, rolled out, I, along with probably all of my colleagues, were pretty shocked and demoralized. So the question that I want to ask is a little bit more about the political climate and the urgency. Senate Bill 17 has not changed from the time it was signed into law. So, I would like you to tell us more about what changed at UNT in terms of its priorities and its reading of the bill. And then the second question that I have is about this reporting system that has been developed. One of my courses was just tagged for review. The email did not state that it was being reviewed because of SB 17, but I suspected that it was given that we've had a conversation before. It was a very, very unusual request. So my question is, where is academic freedom? How is that being thought about and discussed, and similarly with the elimination of the Faculty Senate committees? We have procedures and policies in our faculty senate bylaws about committees – were they taken into account in the interpretation of SB 17?

- A – First of all, the initial response to Senate Bill. 17 compliance was run by general counsel's office and other units at UNT. It transitioned over to UIC in late March or early April. Our interpretations have been pretty consistent across the board since that time, so I wouldn't say that our enforcement posture has changed. I would say that the compliance office is just better at compliance. So we have interacted more with campus than I think the general counsel's office generally does. In that time, some of the OGC interpretations have evolved and that's both more stringent and less stringent, depending on what the topic is. I anticipate that to continue just as we see more incidents, more cases, and we have a better sense of what we think is the general approach to how Senate Bill 17 is being applied across the state. OGC does work with their colleagues in other universities to see if we're, you know, overshooting the mark or undershooting the mark. So occasionally there are adjustments there.
- A – Second, academic instruction is generally accepted, but there are exceptions to the exception. We have to do a little bit of work in looking at what's going on in the classrooms to make sure that we're not doing things like requiring DEI statements, which we have found in the past, and to look at syllabi to make sure that they're within the bounds of the law as well. UIC is conducting a review across the institution right now about that and 99% are perfectly fine. As for academic freedom, I don't think that this really impinges on academic freedom, because it's a state law now. State law is at the very top of the hierarchy when you're determining what's allowable within an institution and what's not. As a state agency, UNT always endeavors to comply with the law to the best of our abilities.
- A – As for the faculty senate committees, this was a state law issue, so based on the information that we had and the advice we've received from general counsel's office those committees

		<p>were outside of the bounds of the legislation, and so, therefore, we were not legally permitted to continue those, and they had to be eliminated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q – Is SB 17 being constitutionally challenged on any front? Also, why wasn't the established Faculty Senate process followed around the elimination of committees in order to avoid conflicts between administration, OGC, and Faculty Senate. • A - I'm not aware of any challenges to Senate Bill 17 that are in the court system. As for the dissolving of the committees, while I understand, and I do value the Faculty Senate's role, if the university is legally prohibited from conducting a certain type of activity, I don't know that it would be that useful to go through a process when there's only one possible outcome. • Q – There was one other Faculty Senate committee on a status group that remained, one on faculty with disabilities. These committees were intertwined with the dissolved ones in their work for civil rights. Why was it not removed? • A – Disability groups were not called out in the language of the law. • Q – I'd like to make some observations and then ask a question. First, I've noticed that during this meeting, 2/3 of people who have been willing to speak up are white men. Second, I realize that Clay is the compliance officer, not the decider. So, I realize that we can ask questions but often the answer will, realistically, be a decision above your head. Third, the wording of the law hasn't changed, but you just said at the beginning of the remarks that the OGC interpretation seems to change by the day. I find that odd that the letter of the law doesn't change, but the interpretation or the feeling about what that means seems to change. That's just personal observation. My question: UNT is up for accreditation in 2026. Is anybody thinking about the impact on academic freedom and shared governance when it comes to SACCS re-accreditation? • A – First, I wouldn't say that OGC interpretation changes daily but occasionally. At this time, I am unaware of any conversations about accreditation and this senate bill and our reaction to it. • Q – I see on the PowerPoint a slide about the UNT Trust Line. The trust is between whom? Who's the 3rd party that operates this? • A – It's a company called Ethics Point. • Q – Did UNT hire them? Or is that a state funded? • A – It was sourced by UNT. And we changed companies, it's actually called OneTrust. • Q – So, do you also have a similar slide that you can share with us for faculty, who have been victimized by these interest groups that are out there trying to get us by taking bits from our syllabus or recording us in our classes when we have the academic freedom to be teaching that those types of materials in our classes? • To that, I would say that I'm sorry if you feel victimized by that. In general, our office get all kinds of allegations to this trust line
--	--	--

against faculty, staff, and other folks. Our office has trained investigators, and so when we do an investigation, we go in with an open mind. We take the allegations that we have, but we don't make judgments at that point. We investigate the facts. Everybody has a chance to speak with us and participate in the process. Then we make a determination based on the facts. I don't think that you need to feel victimized because you will not be punished for something that is not proven.

- Q – But dealing with allegations is part your job, though. I don't just speak for myself, but for others who are not here that have been victimized by these interest groups, by students, by influencers, if you will, that will take screenshots out of context of our syllabi or YouTube videos or just audio recordings of a class and say, “See, they're still teaching us, or they're still doing this,” or they'll dox us. Where are the faculty resources for us that have been victimized by those individuals, and we have not broken the law, but we are smeared or doxed in the media?
- A - I don't have a good answer for that. It's something that's very difficult to control. My office is just an investigation function for the university. So I am aware that there are a lot of faculty resources out there, and I would assume that Faculty Success would be able to guide you to those.
- Q – Some of us have been victimized of DEI, when we were forced to do things. Just because we didn't use any DEI initiatives, we were prevented from going for promotion. We were asked to use scholars of color in our syllabi, but I am not going to go and profile every author I use, and some of us were put on mandatory review because we didn't change the syllabi. What happens to those who were victims of DEI? For the record, I'm not against DEI, but the trauma and the stress that some of us went through, being labeled as someone who wrote a dissent letter when you didn't. You're not being promoted because you did not use scholars of color in the syllabi or put on mandatory review. What is that, then? Who's going to answer for all this stuff?
- A – I don't have an answer, but I think, I part, that's the reason you see this kind of legislation coming up.

Schoolfield moved to extend this section of the agenda. Seconded by Welch. No discussion. Vote to extend for 5 minutes. Most in favor, with 4 abstentions. Motion to continue for 5 minutes passes.

- Q – UNT is minority serving institution. Some industry partners or grant opportunities are coming to us because we serve a certain kind of population, or we're engaged in research that supports these populations. So, will there be guidance to assist faculty to make sure that as we pursue these opportunities in support of our students or engaging in research with these particular areas that we are staying within UNT's reading of the law and compliance? Will there be guidance in how we form the language, how we can stay within the boundaries of the safety

		<p>zone?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A – Yes, I had a discussion today with the VP for Research to talk about developing those resources and the need for that for our faculty. We've only had 4 research questions come through our office, and 2 of them are still with general counsel right now. So the process we have now is that any kind of research questions we get, we take to Pam and have her team take a look at it and tell us what they think. And so the guidance that we got today from OGC was about looking at the scope of work and making sure that it's well written, so that any kind of DEI type activity that's occurring in there falls within the scope of work and then falls under the research exception. Dr. Padilla is going to help develop guidance for faculty and I'll work with her to make sure that gets disseminated. • Q – In reference to the dissolved committees and resource groups, I know there were recommendations made to recreate or rewrite their missions and their charges. And then a decision was made not to follow that advice. Who was that decision maker? • A - I'm not going to throw folks under the bus on that particular decision. I presented a range of options, and we made a decisions. I'm not going to go into those details. • Q – We've discussed the research exemptions. But what about other academic activities that aren't covered by research, because there are a lot of academic activities that occur, such as writing journal articles, writing poetry, fictional and nonfictional works that might come under service, particularly for the professional faculty, that are under a research umbrella. How is that going to be viewed? • A – As long as you're not doing one of those prohibited activities, then you're on safe ground. If have any questions, though please send it to the email address I gave before.
V.	COACHE update (Holly Hutchins)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Hutchins is co-chairing the COACHE survey steering committee with Dr. Brian Richardson in Communication Studies. There are about 14 members on the committee, including several senators. • COACHE survey assesses 25 benchmarks of faculty satisfaction with the academic workplace. It's our 6th year participating, so we have a lot of longitudinal data. In total, it's based on 20 plus years of data from a wide range of institutions that they are updating every year. • In previous years, we've used our results for instituting salary surveys, market adjustments for faculty, and looking at workload reform, expanding award eligibility for our professional faculty, especially. • Last week, faculty received a letter from the Provost with the overall results. There is an executive summary on our COACHE website where you can view the results (https://vpaa.unt.edu/fs/projects-and-surveys/coache/) • There is a set of peer institutions that we specifically benchmark against. But then we have a broader cohort of 85 similar institutions that we also compare too. We get a great response

		<p>rate, so thank you to those of you who advocate for taking the survey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfaction with governance was lower this year and the number issue faculty want UNT to address is compensation, even after last year's merit increase. In the qualitative data, five themes emerged: compensation, facilities, resources for work, leadership, and culture. • There is a lot of depth to the data and layers to peel away, like an onion. • The committee has so far looked at where low satisfaction is occurring at UNT, broadly speaking, across all faculty or across different demographic groups or different divisions on campus. They are reaching out to various stakeholder groups to get involvement in digging deeper into the data as well as make more voices heard. Areas of focus based on the survey include interdisciplinary collaboration as well as promotion and tenure policies. The committee needs more hands-on deck and specifically need faculty leadership. You will have received an invite for this in your email. <p>Questions and answers</p> <p>Q – How do our response rates compare with previous years? A – There is a lot of data, and we can share more with FS. But in general our response rates have remained robust.</p> <p>Q – I didn't see anything specific about lecturers. A – All types of faculty participate well. Professional faculty satisfaction was higher in 2024 than in 2021.</p> <p>Q – How did satisfaction compare between tenured faculty and professional faculty? A - Not sure at the moment, but there were more distinct comparisons between pre and post tenure faculty.</p> <p>Holly concludes - We're not one of those committees that just sit around. So please share with those individuals that you know that are passionate about one of these areas that you know, that have different perspectives. We do welcome all, and we will certainly put you to good work.</p>
VI.	Committee on Committees (Brady Lund) [vote]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call for any further nominations for standing committee vacancies. • Several positions do have nominations. There is one group with 2 nominees for a single position the Teaching Fellows/Assistant committee. There was deadlock in the group, so the Faculty Senate has to vote on which to appoint to the committee. • Vote: 9 for Dr. Karen Gregg, 13 for Dr. Teresa Cardon. Majority of senate abstains. Dr. Cardon will be appointed to the committee position. • Need a motion to treat the remaining nominations as a group. Bednarz makes the motion and Morton seconds. No discussion. Motion passes unanimously. • Motion to approve the slate of candidates as presented. Passes

		unanimously.
VII.	Executive Committee Update (William Joyner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In recent weeks, the EC members selected standing committee liaisons – one EC liaison to each committee. • We received an update on 06.032 about Online Courseware Intellectual Property. Back on May 23rd, senate voted on suggested changes. It went through FPOC and then legal, then came back with no changes. • We accepted committee reports from <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluation of University Administrators ○ University Faculty Grievance • We approved expedited appointments to Ulys and Vera Knight Award Selection and Review Committee, which needs a confirmation vote. [vote] – motion from Najour, seconded by Frenzel, passes unanimously. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Rick Cazier, Associate Professor, Accounting ○ Dr. Mariya Gavrilova-Aguilar, Clinical Assistant Professor, Management
VIII.	Other Standing Committees Updates [vote]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UUCC Report/Minutes [October] (Natalie Ellis / Courtney Glazer) – The senate has received a copy of the minutes, which is typically the longest meeting of year. This meeting marks the close of the catalog year so everyone is getting in changes at the last minute. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FS Chair asked, was it impacted by SB 17? ○ There were blocks of course changes but more a result of curriculum changes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vote to accept the minutes passes unanimously. • Graduate Council Minutes [August] (Jennifer Lane) – The August minutes are pretty routine. September's are much more substantive but we just have a draft because there was lots of business. As a reminder, it is good to make sure a department representative attends when you have proposed changes on the agenda because sometimes the description is too scant, and we may turn it down. Someone needs someone to be there for discussion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vote to accept the minutes passes unanimously.
IX.	New Business	Call for new business. There was none.
X.	Old Business	Chair asks that further comments regarding the impact of SB 17 be saved for next time. Take some time to digest what we've learned today and talk to our constituencies about a way forward.
XI.	Comments for the Good of the Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The November Faculty Senate meeting has changed from the 13th to the 20th and will be held in Union 332. There will be no end-of-month Executive Committee meeting. • The December Faculty Senate meeting will be held on its usual Wednesday, December 11, in Union 332. • The Texas State Employee Charitable Campaign is underway! This is a Legislature-approved fundraising drive that benefits agencies providing direct or indirect health and human services in the local, state, national and global communities. You may give one time or sign up for ongoing payroll deduction. https://secc.unt.edu/ • Campus Safety Is Everyone's Responsibility. It is OK to call 9-1-1 when you identify an imminent threat to the safety of you or the community. The UNT Police are trained to help and want you to

		<p>contact them. You can report non-emergency issues by talking to any on-duty, uniformed officer, calling the anonymous tip line at 940-369-TIPS, or emailing UNTPD.Threatassessment@ad.unt.edu.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Register now for the upcoming Mental Health First Aid (MHFA®) workshop scheduled for October 16th, 2024 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. in SSB 102, with hot lunch provided. This one-day training course teaches people how to identify, understand, and help someone who may be experiencing a mental health issue. The registration deadline is Oct. 12th Register for the training through UNT Bridge.
XII.	Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 3:46 pm.