



FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Willis Library 250H

Minutes May 14, 2025, 2:00 p.m.

P= present A= absent L= on leave

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

Guests: Harrison Keller (President), Mike McPherson (Provost), Holly Hutchins (OFS), Gabe Ignatow (OFS), Courtney Glazer (Accreditation), Natalie Ellis (UUC), Lilly Ramin (Libraries)

I.	Welcome and Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Elected Senators Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shenita Floyd from Advanced Data Analytics Rose Baker from Learning Technologies Certificates of Appreciation for outgoing senators
II.	Approval of Minutes (March 19, 2025 and April 9, 2025) [vote]	<p>Hutchison moves to approve the minutes for the March and April meetings. Chamberlin seconds.</p> <p>FS votes unanimously to approve the minutes.</p>
III.	University Update (President Harrison Keller / Provost Mike McPherson)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislative update Public displays of student research output Faculty and staff salaries Interim leadership appointments and search updates <p>President Keller Legislative Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have entered a time when things are moving quickly. This is the best information he has now. All the higher education budget decisions were being held until SB 37 moved on House. There has been a lot of discussion around the chambers on where it might land. He has not seen updated draft. It appears some version of a general education review will require the core curriculum for undergraduate graduation requirements to go to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. This is not a concern because we have productive working relationship with the board, and they align with changes we've contemplated around core curriculum. But this will require changes on a tight timeline so we will need to organize quickly. It will be an opportunity to ask ourselves, "What do we want UNT students to know?" and to develop our vision. Provisions around faculty senates have been consistent in the last two versions of the bill. There may be some flexibility in the numbers but both versions still have the president appointing half of the senators as well as appointing the officers. The President wants to make clear to all that he deeply appreciates the working relationships we have and the partnership with EC and the full FS. He is committed to working in good faith on however this lands. We will comply with the law, and we need to make it work for UNT. Looking forward to working with the senate to do both. He is not sure where things land on how regents will be involved on hiring decisions. There are differing opinions on how much they should have to approve faculty job position listings or the hiring of deans and provosts. It is already in the scope of their authority, so if they said they wanted to do this now, they could do it under current law. One element of the bill that is new and that he's most concerned about is a new ombudsman position which, in some versions of the bill are an appointee of the governor and/or reporting directly to the governor. Specific investigator duties may include looking for violations of the requirements of SB 17 and SB 37. There are also different versions of the bill's language about who can file a complaint. As it stands in the house version, only students, faculty, and staff can complain, and they need to be certified. If during an investigation, violations are found, then the ombudsman's office will make recommendations to the university. Then what happens? If the university adjusts, they will be complying. If found to continue in noncompliance, one version of the bill has the issue referred to the state auditor and other to the attorney general. This plan to set up a new office/department with new penalties for universities is something he is watching closely. The legislative committee can now move forward on higher education budget consideration. Originally, with calculations, we were down about 44 million for the biennium. UNT made calculations and lowered it by 12 million. Now, that is still concerning, but it is not clear if that is where things will land. One potential help is the

release of the institutional enhancement dollars, about 423 million, which were held back by the legislature but could be driven back to institutions. Overall, the financial picture may not be great for us. But with a new funding formula related to how students graduate, over the long term could be a much better structure for us rather than ad hoc structure in place now.

- Other policies he is watching are those that would impact the College of Education. There is language in House Bill 2 and Senate Bill 2253 on educator preparation. This could potentially drive money to teacher preparation programs, but it could result in an unprecedented expansion of the authority of the state education commissioner.

Q & A

- ? - There was talk early in the legislative session that the exemptions for scholarship and teaching written into SB 17 would be removed in SB 37. Is that the case in the current version of the legislation?
- President – In the review of the core courses in the general education curriculum, some of the language has been carried over. For example, that courses cannot promote the idea that any race is superior to another. But he did not see any language that took away previously maintained protections for scholarship and teaching.
- ? - Thank you for good summary. But I noted that there are still requirements related to workforce demand and low enrollment. This is a concern because we don't know how you can formulate that. Another issue with the bill is that it still removes faculty participation on grievances and hiring. Only things I think you missed in your summary.
- Pres – He talked to Creighton on the grievances issue. The President's impression was that this is more about faculty in the same unit being involved in grievances. In the legislature, there are lots of anecdotes hanging around these provisions.
- ? – My faculty are worried about the vagueness.
- President – If they give us a requirement to work on workforce demand formula, that's okay, but if the THECB is going to write it, that's different. If the responsibility is on our side, we can work with due speed so we can help inform those conversations. We do look at the earnings of our graduates. What has been effective for the President to build collaborations is to use data. For example, look at philosophy graduates versus economics graduates. When you look at wages, then philosophy is not up for consideration. But when you look at real net cost and what happens in marketplace, then there is a demand for philosophy majors. A whole lot turns on how those estimates are made, so there is great importance for us to inform the conversation.
- ? – In the coming changes for FS requirements, did the legislators ask the college and university presidents?
- President – I am proud to serve as president and in that role, I am happy to inform deliberations when asked. The requested changes are not something that originated from him or other presidents but from outside institutions. We've had opportunity to provide feedback and dialogue, and the legislators respect our concerns.
- ? – We have heard that this is a compromise because Senator Creighton wanted a state committee of appointees to appoint each institution's faculty senators. Having the presidents do so was a compromise recognizing that a committee would not have any knowledge of the faculty members. Still, this is a concern when you consider all the duties of a president.
- President – He has no speculation on how the legislator views this in relation to presidential duties. But if you look back, there are anecdotes that resulted in people being upset with FS across the state. This isn't aimed at UNT.
- ? – Some of us are unclear. Can we still teach courses on African American literature or one focused on something like gender or disability if it is a requirement for the major?

- Pres – There is a difference if a course is part of a major versus as a graduation requirement for the university degree. The general education review is just focused on the general requirements for graduation. Individual majors are outside of the review.
- ? – If SB 37 passes, could there be training for those of us who do teach the core courses so we can be know what we are allowed to do?
- President - We do have some time to implement this. The President would still like us to work on together an initiative around civil discourse. Two things he heard a lot this year. One from students – they want to be able to talk about the issues of the day, including controversial things they couldn't talk about in high school. From faculty – in this era with the HD camera, videos taken in classes can go viral, making faculty anxious about how they can talk about these issues in a way, so they remain in compliance and not put their career in jeopardy. They have a responsibility to engage in the topics that create responsible the responsible citizens that policy makers care about. Perhaps we could have some of these policy makers here as a speaker series. We don't believe they want students cut off from controversial topics and we don't want people to shy away from it.
- ? – We have a course in my department that's neither about race nor gender but discusses multiculturalism. It has become hard to find people willing to teach it yet it's a required course in the department.
- President – These stories illustrate the concerns that people have and we need to address these. But the state bill is about general education requirements, not about the major requirements
- ? – When will the legislature be finished so we know about the budget for next year.
- President – They will be finished June 2nd but we could know in about the next week where we are going to land. He has heard requests from all the deans and VP. The Governor could line items out. Once we think we know where it will land, we can go forward. Our enrollment was soft in master's programs, which is where our growth has been in the last decade. This is especially true for international students, where the enrollment overall is down 35 to 40 percent. No matter what happens in Austin, we are potentially down 32 million dollars, in any scenario. So, the board needs to know will have to cut the budget. Moving aggressively to recruit and retain qualified students and faculty - that will all take a while. So, the President asks, "Stick with me!" Currently we have about a 77% retention rate while UT Dallas has about a 90%. If we could close that gap, that alone would give us 30 million dollars. As we get better at retention, we will also be better at enrolling more students. But we don't see scenario in which we don't make budget cuts for FY26.

Faculty and Staff Salaries

- Here what he tells deans and vice-provosts. It is striking when we talk to staff and faculty how much people love this university. But no matter how much people love the university, they love their families more. So, to be competitive, we need to be committed to higher faculty and staff salaries. Starting FY27 every unit must budget for merit pool. That has never been structured into budgets before.
- Where we can on the staff side we are rolling out positions. With doctoral students, with staff, even with faculty, we can get ourselves to be more competitive starting with fewer faculty. Then we can grow from there, when we have more revenue to put in more in system. We don't want to hunker down and stay not competitive. Instead we do what we need to make us an excellent university. We have been infusing TUF funds into departments that are important to accelerate research. Departments where we had few takers for doctoral students now have health insurance and stronger packages. Offering fewer spots but aiming to have more applicants accept be able to retain talent. He is trying to advocate for more resources.
- The FS Chair noted that in the recent EC meeting, the President said we need to stick with him for one more year as the administration works towards a goal of increases.

		<p>Provost McPherson</p> <p>Displaying Student Work, Research in Particular</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was an event a month ago at Frisco Landing that didn't go the way we wanted, resulting in very upset students and faculty. But in consultation with the EC may eventually end up in a healthier place and offer a good example of what happens with administration and FS work together. • In this situation, we had some students who did some work out at Frisco, and that work was displayed being displayed in the atrium there. You may remember there was recently a different kerfuffle about a gallery space in the Union. A policy is being developed to speak to how that sort of thing is vetted. The idea is not to censor what goes in the galleries, but to insure we are compliant with state law. There needs to be some kind of oversight. • In the Frisco case the work was in a public space and not a learning space. We were going to have student work moved to a learning space, and the lawyers said this was not a problem. But this didn't happen, some balls were dropped, and the student work got stuff in closet. This was not an optimal outcome. • We need to do a couple things moving forward to prevent these conflicts. First, in Frisco and other spaces there may not be an official gallery, but we need a designated place to display student work. Last week, someone pointed out an inconsistency in places like the Chemistry Building where the student research posters are displayed in the corridors. So, need to find policies that will be consistent and that we are all happy with. He promises we will work on this together. • ? - A senator identifies the Frisco student work as coming from their class. They clarified that the work was not displayed in the atrium. It was in the Frisco Landing café, against the windows, and egress was not blocked. But the faculty member is still confused if the student work was moved because it was in the way or if there was a potential violation of SB 17? • Provost – There was concern that it might be controversial and it had not gone through any kind of process at the university level to vet it. That's what was missing. • ? – But it seemed to follow under the exemptions, given it was student research of a student's choice. • Provost - In general, what we need and a policy process for public spaces. We are already looking ahead to the fall. <p>Interim Appointments and Searches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recently, the point was made, correctly, that academic leaders do not always consult faculty when doing an interim appointment in leadership. The Provost can't control what deans do when they appoint interim chairs. But he can talk about how he does things. • The provost does consult with faculty for these interim appointments when he can and this is what he prefers to do. For example, with the University Librarian search that is concluding now, also for the Vice Provost for International Affairs he did consult with many people from those units. But sometimes for various reasons he can't consult, such as if there is a crisis or he knows something specific about their unit. But he pledges to consult as often as he can. He knows it leads to better decisions. • ? – You mentioned the university librarian position. Will we be notified of the on-campus interviews, so that interested faculty may attend? • Provost - Yes, we will make that information available. We do best our to do these kinds of searches during the academic year but at least employees in this department are on 12-month contract.
IV.	University Elections Committee (Jason Chiang)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officer Elections [vote] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are no additional nominees from the floor ○ The nominees for 2025-2026 are

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chair – Coby Condrey ▪ Vice Chair – Melissa McKay ▪ Secretary – Rose Baker ○ Chamberlin moves that we vote to elect these officers as a slate. Bednarz seconds the motion. The new officers are elected by the senate unanimously. • Senator and standing committee elections update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ None
V.	Faculty Policy Oversight Committee (Lawrence Williams / Angie Cartwright)	<p>First Read</p> <p>06.049 Course Syllabi Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This came to FPOC due to accreditation requirements for separating out the graduate and undergraduate syllabi in cross listed courses. • They also want to add the policy of a statement on all syllabi from the instructor on their AI policy, being able to make own statement about how they will use or allow the use of AI in the course. • This policy was due for review next year. But it helps the committee to get ahead now. FS will see this as a second read in the fall. • FYI, the Provost wanted to wait for this AI requirement until the fall because Vice Provost Lisa McIntyre and her team are going to be doing a huge revision of our academic integrity policy, and they will likely have some pointers for AI academic integrity in that policy. So, we are 99% sure the Provost will strike this part of our policy because he wants to see what the team will come up with. • ? – We have colleagues dealing with this kind of cheating now. If they write their own statement into a syllabus, will legal stand by it? And in the past the provost has given us example text for this kind of thing. My faculty are hoping to have something like that. • A – Faculty have the freedom to write these kinds of things in to their syllabus. They have just not been required. And legal doesn't approve all that goes into our syllabi. At this point, because there is a range of how faculty will choose to use or not use AI, it best for each to write their own. You are encouraged to reach out to academic integrity when things happen in your courses and have things added to the academic integrity database. Also, remind faculty that CLEAR has courses available on the productive use of AI with • Q – I have a course with both honors students and regular undergraduates. Do I need separate syllabi in that case? • A - We will check with the accreditation office, but it's likely not needed. It's more about graduate versus undergraduate for accreditation board. • FS Senators discuss how best to ensure the syllabi are available in Canvas and in FIS. • As a note, this is Dr. Cartwright's last FS meeting, now Dr. Ignatow will be attending as co-chair of FPOC.
VI.	Committee on Committees (Brady Lund) [vote]	<p>Standing and Administrative committee nominations for 2025 [vote]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of these vacancies had a single nominee and any with multiple nominees have been worked out through caucusing. but there are 7 at large vacancies that have multiple candidates. Those with multiple nominees, will be put into a Qualtrics survey that will be distributed later. For today, we propose that vacancies with a single nominee be approved as a bloc today. • Bednarz motions to accept all the nominees as a bloc. There is no discussion. Motion passes to accept the nominees with two abstentions. • FS votes unanimously to approve the bloc of single nominee candidates. • Note that there are still some vacancies that will need to be addressed in the fall.
VII.	Executive Committee Update (William Joyner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended Graduate Council nominee – Jennifer Lane (MUVS) [vote] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Senator Joyner calls for the vote. The vote is unanimous. • Committee charges revisions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revisions for each committee's charges are mostly done and will be posted on the FS website by September. It's been a good exercise for the EC liaisons.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Chair points out that our FS committees are doing the work of shared governance. We want to make sure they know what they are doing. • Executive Committee appointments to standing committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Faculty co-chair of the FPOC – Adam Chamberlin (THEA) ○ Faculty co-chair of the Faculty Research Committee – Maurizio Manzo (MEEN) ○ At-large representative on Faculty Research Committee – Ronnie Jia (ITDS) ○ Faculty co-chair of the Oversight Committee on the Core Curriculum – April Prince (MHTE) • Accepted end-of-year reports from standing committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Faculty Awards Committee ○ Committee on Committees ○ Committee on Faculty Participation in Governance ○ Faculty Research Committee ○ Oversight Committee on the Core Curriculum ○ University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee ○ University Writing Committee • The EC offers a gift for Coby in acknowledgement of his good leadership during the difficult year. <p>Faculty Advocacy Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Provost and the Office of Faculty Success asked the Chair about transferring ownership of the Faculty Advocacy Network (FAN) to FS. This is to remove the current conflict of interest, given that faculty who need an advocate are generally dealing with a situation for which the Provost is making the final decision. • We hope to move this into the FS Academic Affairs Committee, a group that has recently expressed a desire for more meaningful work. If that doesn't work, we can create a separate committee for this. Currently if faculty need an advocate, the FAN website is still under the Office of Faculty Success, but it says to contact the Chair of Faculty Senate to get that assistance. • One difficulty for the FAN has been a shortage of available faculty advocates. Once we have ownership, one of the first tasks will be to recruit additional faculty advocates. Dr. Kimi King, who has informally run the program has agreed to provide training and support for interested faculty. • Another important task for the committee is to persuade unit administrators that being a faculty advocate is a good use of service time. The advocates' work is not to be in opposition to the administration and there is value in supporting our colleagues. We need administrators to be on board with this view and hold faculty harmless for serving as an advocate. • One senator stated that two faculty members, unable to find a UNT advocate, sought help from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The AAUP is now affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). If you as a private citizen join this group, the AFT can provide additional resources for difficult situations.
VIII.	Other Standing Committees Updates [vote]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UGCC Report/Minutes [May] (Natalie Ellis / Courtney Glazer) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Ellis presents the May minutes for a vote ○ FS votes to accept unanimously • Graduate Council Minutes [March] (Jennifer Lane) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair presents the March minutes in Dr. Lane's place ○ FS votes to accept unanimously
IX.	New Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A senator reminds faculty that SB 37 has not yet passed, and we can take action as private citizens. • A senator expressed surprise that the President didn't talk about the college and department restructuring that has already been completed. They would like to know what's on the horizon, given that faculty are nervous, especially with negative forecasts about the budget. The new President has talked repeatedly about transparency. Why are significant changes like the disbanding of the graduate school and the change of

		<p>directorship for digital initiatives being told to the faculty and to the FS specifically after the fact? And, when these things do happen, why are we not given fulsome answers from the administration? Isn't the role of the FS oversight of the administration? We are certainly being transparent with them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair explains that we didn't have questions about the restructuring on the agenda this time. Before the FS general sessions, the EC creates a list of questions for the President and Provost to address during the session. But individual senators can always ask any specific questions they have and are encouraged to do so. • Some EC members describe talking about transparency with the administration on a regular basis. We are continually in conversation. An administrator has told us that asking for faculty feedback when they cannot change the final outcome would be an exercise in frustration. But the officers and the EC continue to insist that the administration needs to keep the faculty informed. It seems that there is transparency when it is agreeable. We need to continue to push for information about changes and decisions, even if have a say or not, so we can prepare. • A senator asked if the FS can be independent and have more oversight. The chair reminds everyone that a FS serves at the pleasure of a university provost. • Senators discuss the issues around the public displays of student work, which have been more intense than the narrative presented by the Provost. CVAD were able to have listening sessions after the Union gallery incident. Their impression is that there are going to be designated learning spaces where the posting of student work is acceptable. Then there will be some galleries in specific places, like the Union, that have public access for which displays will undergo a new level of review. • Senator Morton formally thanks Vice Chair Joyner and Secretary Evans on behalf of the FS for their hard work this year.
X.	Old Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks to everyone who participated in the survey for the evaluation of administrators. It is now closed, and the data is being prepared. The results will go to senior level for inclusion in evaluations. • The EC has heard from many faculty about maintenance and repair issues in their buildings. Please go to your department facilities contact and have them submit a request for service. If there are a high number of reports submitted, they will have to act. (See the comments for the Comments for the Good of the Order below.)
XI.	Comments for the Good of the Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To report maintenance needs for campus buildings, contact the building manager; alternatively, faculty can submit a ticket at the "Request Service" tab on the Facilities website or contact Work Control directly at Work.Control@unt.edu or 940-565-2700. • In lieu of an in-person meeting for June, June business will be conducted by Zoom, email and/or Qualtrics. All Senators are expected to watch for communications from the Senate through at least June 11 in the event a meeting or voting is required on any matter. • PLEASE NOTE: There are no regularly scheduled Faculty Senate general session meetings in the months of July and August. The new Senate year begins at the first full Faculty Senate meeting in September (September 10).
XII.	Adjournment	4:00 pm