****

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**University Union 332**

Minutes – December 14, 2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Anderson-Lain, Karen**  | COMMCLASS  | P | **Ginther, Jeannette** | TE&ACOE | P | **Nodeland, Brooke** | DCJCHPS | P | **Trudeau, Justin** | COMMCLASS | L |
| **Aviles-Diz, Jorge** | SPANCLASS | P | **Hargis, Carol** | LIBR | P | **Ojha, Divesh** | MLOMRCOB | P | **Watson, Wendy** | PSCICLASS | P |
| **Baker, Rose** | LTECCOI | P | **Hensel, Paul** | PSCICLAS | P | **Olness, Gloria** | ASPLCHPS | P | **Williams, Lawrence** | WLLCCLASS | P |
| **Bednarz, Jim** | BIOLCOS | P | **Joyner, William** | MUVSCOM | P | **Peak, Dan** | ITDSRCOB | P | **Yeatts, Dale** | SOCCLASS | A |
| **Britain, Jeff** | ACCTCMHT | P | **Ketron, Seth** | NCFMKTG | P | **Perez, Jose** | PHYSCOS | P |  |  |  |
| **Campbell, Doug** | LIBR | P | **Lane, Jennifer** | MUVSCOM | A | **Peters, John** | ENGLCLASS | P |  |  |  |
| **Catalano, Denise** | RHSCHPS | P | **Long, Chris** | TEACOE | P | **Petros, Amy** | CHEMCOS | P |  |  |  |
| **Chamberlin, Adam** | THEACLASS | P | **Manzo, Maurizio** | MEENCENG | P | **Philbrick, Jodi** | ISCOI | P |  |  |  |
| **Cherry, William** | MATH COS | P | **May, Andrew** | MUCSCOM | P | **Sankofa, Nicole** | EPSYCOE | P |  |  |  |
| **Chesky, Kris** | MUISMUSIC | A | **McKay, Melissa** | NCF | P | **Schoolfield, Anne** | ENGLCLASS | A |  |  |  |
| **Chiang, Jason** | EPSYCOE | P | **Moreland, Kimberly** | ENGLCLASS | P | **Siller Carrillo, Hector** | MEENCENG | P | **TEMPORARY SENATORS (Voting)** |
| **Christian, Jack** | ENGLCLASS | P | **Mukherjee, Sundeep** | MSECENG | P | **Tixier, Scott** | MUISCOM | A | Barbara Pazey (for Justin Trudeau) | TEA | A |
| **Condrey, Coby** | LIBR | P | **Najour, Caroline** | WLLCCLASS | A | **Tomlin, J.** | HISTCLASS | P |  |  |  |
| **Cook, Daniel** | MUCECOM | P | **Narayanan Arunachalam** | ITDSRCOB | P |  |  | P |  |  |  |
| **Evans, Sarah** | ISCOI | P | **Nasco, Dennis** | MGMTRCOB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **STUDENT SENATORS (non-voting)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Jermaine Turner | SGA | A |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **SUBSTITUTES (non-voting)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Guests: Neal Smatresk (President), Mike McPherson (Provost), Angie Cartwright (OFS), Courtney Glazer (Accreditation), Ashley Olsberg, Brenda Kihl

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| I. | Welcome and Introductions | Meeting called to order at 2:01 pm.Senator Chamberlin recognized Jeffrey Britain from Hospitality and Management as a new senator.  |
| II. | Approval of Minutes (November 9, 2022) **[vote]** | Senator Ketron moved to approve the minutes, and Senator Aviles-Diz seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.  |
| III. | University Update (President Neal Smatresk / Provost Mike McPherson) | **President Smatresk*** It has been a busy few weeks; lost 3 weekends to athletics; hires have been made
* Graduations this weekend; most exciting time of the year and makes him smile
* Updates
	+ Spring enrollment holding at about where fall enrollment; expected to be up
	+ According to VPRI Padilla - for the first two months of this year, expentidures and new awards are up by sixfold
	+ Key hires have been made in Advancement, especially relating to data capabilities
	+ Enrollment and Advancement are strong, and Athletics being rebuilt and improved
	+ Hope to get more national publicity, as football is on regular television
	+ Just closed on an estate gift that would be $20-50 million
	+ Legislative session
		- Ongoing conversation that if public schools in the state do not raise tuition, then the state will increase the formula, give us back Hazelwood, and pay the extra insurance premium; this would be a game changer for us
		- If all the funding comes through, would like to fix compensation/equity issue in one year
* Values update
	+ Chancellor just sent out a note today about the Values Journey
	+ When you look at the values, there’s nothing we don’t do already or don’t already celebrate
	+ January 26 – There will be a launch of the values; people who represented us in the big values discussion will be talking about how we begin to implement the values
	+ Will be another big rollout in March
	+ Questions/comments?
		- Senator Watson: once we have articulated a set of values, will we change policies to advance the values?
			* Response: Some of things that we do have that have policies wrapped around would benefit from a conversation about whether they are consistent with the values, e.g. how we evaluate staff on an annual basis
		- Senator Watson: Would like to see some actual change, such as around inclusion
			* Response: Having policies doesn’t make change, living the values has us change
				+ Provost McPherson: AVP Cartwright looking at policy through an equity lens
* Plan for student raises
	+ Low and slow unless we get a big infusion of cash
	+ Getting students from $8/hr to $15/hr would cost $17 million, and we have priorities in front of that, such as compensation for faculty and staff
	+ By next year, students will be getting to $9-9.50/hr
	+ We have some staff that are not at $15/hr, so will not put students at that level until staff compensation is fixed
* Student engagement
	+ Conversation that we have doing all the time and can’t wait to have a VP for Student Success in place
	+ Hearing the same things everywhere - students aren’t coming to class; not engaging at the same level as they used to; not studying as hard as they used to
	+ There are students who have lost the ability to understand what their accountabilities are; how to be in a class; how to learn and engage
	+ Engagement is the #1 academic problem that we have
	+ Rolling out an initiative around engagement and retention; faculty have more touch points with students, so faculty have to be part of the solution
	+ Need to get students back in the saddle and re-socialized
	+ Under auspices of Provost, convene faculty on a voluntary basis to share the issues/problems that are emerging and convene groups of students - randomly select students who aren’t engaged; has asked Faculty Senate Executive Committee to support this event
	+ If a student has one card swipe into the library, rec center, Sage Learning Support Center, 6% more likely to be retained; we have students with no card swipes anywhere
	+ Provost McPherson - Faculty Senate has created a new standing committee on Teaching Effectiveness and will be working with this committee on the event
	+ Questions/comments?
		- Senator Peak – on the topic of card swipes, has had 5-10% of students say they do not have an ID card
		- Senator Cherry – has had half a dozen students who have asked how to get an ID card
* Update on searches
	+ Provided update on searches relating to Athletics earlier
* Happy Holidays!
* Grand opening for Frisco campus in January
* Thank you for what you do
* Questions/comments?
	+ Senator Baker: one of the students asked about the parking garage being built
		- Response: Not our parking garage; $34,000 is the current price per parking space for a parking garage; we will not be building a parking structure any time in the near future

**Provost McPherson*** Update on searches
	+ VP for Student Success – should have a list of finalists by the end of the week; right now, interviewing the short list; should have finalists on campus in January
	+ 3 Dean searches in CLASS, COE, & COS – progressing as scheduled, not involved at this point
		- CLASS finalists on campus in mid to late January
		- COS finalists on campus in beginning to mid- February
		- COE finalists on campus in mid to late February
* Vision for an equitable workplace
	+ Salary equity
		- Continue the practice of reviewing faculty salaries on a 3 year cycle for equity
		- This year, will be reviewing librarian faculty salary equity
		- Faculty Salary Study Committee is an integral part of process
		- Faculty salaries (non-librarians) will be reviewed in the 2024-2025 academic year
		- Academic Resources and Human Resources routinely monitor for salary in equity in market
		- Earlier this year, any faculty/staff below 85% of market were given a raise to get them up to 85%
		- Chairs can request that a faculty equity review be done anytime
	+ Workload equity
		- Workload varies from faculty member to faculty member because of needs of unit and person and is negotiated annually
		- Workload decisions can be grieved if a faculty member finds them to be unacceptable
		- In February, a faculty member from University of Maryland College Park will be on campus to facilitate discussions on workload equity and how to talk about it as a community
	+ Climate equity
		- Unit-level climate – continuously concerned about it and collect several types of data related to this unit level climate
		- Trying to figure out which departments are nailing climate and which departments need some improvement
		- COACHE survey is done every 3-4 years; just posted on Faculty Success’ website, but is broad and at the university level
			* VP Hutchins has asked DARE to be ready to create unit-level reports; encourage chairs to ask for these reports and have a discussion about them
		- Going to be talking to the deans about climate; specifically, asking where the pain paints are and what they are doing to make them better
		- Gallup survey also provides unit-level data results; chairs and deans have access to this
		- Faculty Success has just released the annual faculty separation report which gathers data about why faculty members leave the university
		- Looking at these sources of data, worried about collegiality and engagement; wants to be better as a university; expensive to recruit faculty
		- Nice data collection that DARE puts together called Insights; just added a dashboard about faculty, so you can track retention; can get access to this with training
		- Charges us to partner with Provost’s Office to help people feel engaged and heard
* Questions/comments?
	+ Senator Olness: Spreadsheets go unit by unit; however, the connectedness among faculty is not siloed by unit; mentorship cuts across units; another factor in the picture, would be to ask people about their connectedness beyond the unit, beyond colleges, etc. What are your thoughts?
		- Response:
			* Couldn’t agree more; Faculty Success facilitates many mentoring programs; many of the most powerful networks evolve organically
			* Happy about Faculty Senate Lounge, as there is a space to get together to build networks
	+ Senator Perez: Collegiality is a two way street; there are lot of people who are very concerned about the climate, and they complain, especially climate regarding national origin; when people do complain, they are retaliated against
		- Response:
			* Retaliation and discrimination is against the law; allegation of discrimination should be reported to EO
			* Apologized to Senator Perez about making a comment about engaging in a “battle of wits” regarding whether it is federal law that discrimination should be reported to EO and indicated will follow-up with Senator Perez by email about this
		- Senator Perez: There are a lot of issues at UNT and complainers are immediately branded as not collegial
	+ Senator Watson: Has gone to EO regarding issues related to colleagues, and the response has been is that it is not against the law; part of an employee resource group where all conversations are about discrimination and lack of inclusivity; have a culture of toxic positivity where if you raise issues, you are seen as a the problem; fundamental point is that you cannot raise concerns without being labeled a troublemaker
		- Senator Perez: Tremendous amount of gaslighting by the administration to portray those of us who complain about these issues as being crazy; knows at least 20-30 former faculty members at UNT who experienced the same thing
	+ Senator Peters: Is salary equity done in conjunction with the chairs? There might be some individuals below the 85% median because they are under performing.
		- Response:
			* 2 separate but related things here – (1) routine where equity is reviewed according to data every three years and (2) raising those below the 85% median no matter if they are underperforming
			* Chairs and deans are very much involved in the equity review
	+ Senator Peak: Should be consequences when EO files a complaint against you and it’s false and won’t talk to you about it; seriously considering suing as EO for making an allegation and never backing down after providing evidence
		- Response: Does not seem right to have evidence; doesn’t manage this office
		- Senator Chamberlin: Need more clarity and transparency in EO
 |
| IV. | Collaborative Learning and Active Workspaces (Ashley Olsberg) | * Thank you for a moment of your time; good to see friends
* Works in the Division of Digital Strategy and Innovation (DSI) and runs the tech team
* DSI Tech is the classroom support services team plus videoconferencing network team; manages technology in classrooms
* Strategy has had to shift over the years, but COVID put gasoline on the fire
* Focus on audio/visual; once you get in the classroom, we handle the computers, displays, cameras, and outside of the classroom, we handle the Zoom classroom
* 4 primary goals
* Structured approach to manifesting feedback and creating comprehensive design packages for learning
* Remove points of friction for anyone teaching in their classrooms
* Seek to understand that there is not one way to teach and try to create a diversity of solutions across their total portfolio of services
* Ensure that feedback loops maintain robust; monitor classrooms and Zoom cloud architecture
* Comprehensive classroom design – packages are linked online at classroomsupport.unt.edu/claw
* Provided a list of examples of how faculty feedback led to changes, such as advocating for flexible seating being standard
* Asked the Faculty Senate: Where should we go next?
	+ Senator Chiang: There are some classrooms that I enjoy teaching in, and I’d like to stay in those classrooms all the time; Wooten Hall is my favorite; love the smell
	+ Senator Cook: Most of the College of Music and College of Music Annex are still on VGA; music and arts-related fields need HDMI
		- Another senator commented that they would like to have HDMI in the Business Leadership Building
		- Response: Have been able to get funding with administration’s support to upgrade video support in the classrooms
	+ Senator Cherry: Send out more information about Ditto and that it is available
	+ Senator McKay: In some of the classrooms in Frisco, can we move the workstation so it is not against the wall which gives our students our backs?
	+ Senator May: If you are facing a group of students and the screen is behind you, it is extremely helpful to have a conference monitor on the lectern so you can see what you are displaying to the students and not have to mirror the screen you are working on; it is helpful in the production studios and teaching spaces to have a KVM switch to choose which inputs to use; there are lots of peripherals that are used in music teaching, so do you have a way of polling faculty about their site specific needs?
		- Response: Historically started off supporting 110 classrooms, so have been designing to common denominators; as we have begun supporting college-owned spaces, we are looking for ways to get more specific feedback about discipline needs
* Senator Chamberlin encouraged senators to send more comments to Ashley Olsberg.
 |
| V. | Faculty Policy Oversight Committee(William Cherry / Angie Cartwright)**[vote]** | **Second Read*** 06.004 Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Reduced Appointments
	+ Not up for regular review, but there was a serious legal compliance issue with this policy regarding external reviewers; State requires that their identities be released
	+ FPOC only looked at the language regarding the change regarding external reviewers
	+ When the policy got to the Executive Committee, they added language regarding the unit review step, specifically that when a there is a potential negative review, the candidate should receive a substantive notification as to the concerns, so the candidate can fully address them
	+ Senator Long proposed some suggested revisions; an amendment to Executive Committee’s proposal
		- Senator Long: Proposing this amendment because some candidates have not been given specific information regarding the potential negative recommendations at various steps in the process (usually paragraph B); Notification of possible negative recommendation has to come with a list of concerns that can be addressed by the candidate
		- Senator Long moved to add “explicitly” to the language that the Executive Committee added and parallel language be added to every step in the process – E.7.B., E.8.B., E.9.B., E.10.B., and E.11.B. Unit Administrator, College Dean, College Personnel Affairs Committee, and it was seconded by Senator Bednarz.
		- Discussion:
			* Senator Joyner: Just lived this this week, and supports the motion because it worked well
			* Senator Murkherjee: Has the timeline of 10 days always been in the policy?
				+ AVP Cartwright: The timeline of 10 days has been in the policy since 2020 revision; nothing has been changed except what was tracked
			* Senator Catalano: Have an issue, but not sure how to address it in the policy; smaller colleges do not have enough people to form committees, so the chair of a committee was not from the academic program that the candidate was coming out of, so there was a lot of lack of information, which caused some issues
				+ Senator Anderson-Lain: As a point of information, that would be resolved because this would come as written feedback, not just an informal conversation
				+ Senator Peters: Isn’t that a problem with whoever put the committee together? Solution to make sure that the chair is from that unit
				+ Senator Catalano: The person was from the same unit, but there are 7 different academic programs within the unit
				+ AVP Cartwright: You all use the small college rule because of your units, so there are some nuanced details that are specific to your college that we need to work out; VP Hutchins and Dean Dash have talked about this
		- The motion passed unanimously.
	+ Senator Sankofa’s proposed language is regarding reappointment voting in years 1, 2, & 3; experience as an assistant professor and discussion with tenure track and tenured faculty has indicated this has been terrible - brutal mini-tenure; particularly hard for bottom heavy departments with lots of junior faculty, as it increases the workload of tenured faculty; reappointment voting fosters a climate of mistrust and creates animosity
		- Senator Sankofa moved that we remove the language that reappointment review be “(separate from annual review)” in IV.B.2.a. and delete IV.B.2.c.i. entirely, and Senator Long seconded the motion.
		- Discussion:
			* Senator Peters: Would this be eliminating also the written review of candidates outside of the midterm and tenure review?
				+ Senator Sankofa: No, this language was not changed
				+ Senator Cherry: Still an unit administrator section; would not be a vote of the unit review committee on reappointment or non-reappointment
			* Senator May: Was unaware of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year reviews and the 4th, 5th, and 6th year reviews; only aware of 4th year and at tenure; was the intention to have annual progress feedback? It certainly makes a lot of work and if there is a vote, it is potentially damaging to collegiality
				+ Senator Cherry: Depends on which college you are in; the College of Arts and Sciences has always worked where the department’s personnel affairs committee voted on reappointment of probationary faculty; wasn’t involved in the last policy revision where this language got tweaked
			* Senator Chamberlin: When this was tweaked, the Executive Committee and Faculty Senate voted against the inclusion of this language, and the President added the voting back in
			* Senator Cherry: What is relatively new at UNT is the full faculty votes which does not happen in the early year votes – these are votes are votes of the unit review committee
			* Senator Chamberlin: The way this has been procedurally practiced has been different in different departments
			* Senator Murkherjee: During a probationary period, if you get a negative vote, what happens?
				+ Senator Cherry: Technically, they are all recommendations until it gets to the Provost to make the decision
				+ Provost McPherson: If there is dissent, then the Provost’s job is complicated; if there is unanimity in reappointment, that is more straightforward; if the question is, can this lead to a person losing their job, then the answer is yes; that is not unhealthy for an university to have – better that a person knows earlier that there trajectory is not going to lead them to tenure
				+ Senator Murkherjee: Isn’t that too short of a period – 1st, 2nd, 3rd year – a person hasn’t had a chance to prove themselves
				+ Provost McPherson: If a person has not had a chance to prove themselves, they shouldn’t be not reappointed; there are circumstances where you find people do not belong and need to be given an opportunity to find a better fit
			* Senator Narayanan: The intention is that there will not be any reappointment reviews in the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years? Doesn’t the unit administrator need a recommendation from an unit review committee? I think we need more discussion about this.
			* Senator Ojha: I had a belief that the 1st and 2nd year votes were just to provide feedback and the 3rd year vote was when the actual decision was made whether to keep the person or not; is this true?
				+ Senator Cherry: As far as I understand, there has always been a form that an administrator has to fill out about reappointing a probationary faculty or not
			* Senator Watson: Why should the reappointment review be separate from the annual review process? Duplicative to have both processes
				+ Senator Cherry: Annual merit review was confined to a 3-year period and progress to tenure is for the person’s whole career

Senator Ohja agreed with Senator Cherry; it is important for probationary faculty to get very clear feedback about progress to tenure * + - * Senator Sankofa: Rollback 2019 where we still had constructive feedback for junior faculty through annual review process and given to chair to make the reappointment decision; emphasis is on the culture and climate
			* Senator Olness: As point of clarification, is the issue hinging on the vote process? Can feedback be provided without the voting?
				+ Senator Sankofa: Yes, the voting is the problem
			* AVP Cartwright: Understand what you are saying about collegiality; one of the points that we may be missing is that composition of PAC and RPTC are completely different; the feedback that one would receive from a department PAC may not be the same as one would receive from a department RPTC and the person might be taken by surprise
				+ Senator Chamberlin: In some smaller departments, they are the same committee
				+ Senator Cherry: I’m in a larger department, and they are the same committee
			* Senator May: In a smaller department, it makes a huge administrative overhead to have two separate processes for the same personnel in the same year; often in the 1st 3 years, people are still finding their way in teaching or may have setbacks in research, so there is something to be said to have a longer period of time before there’s a rush to judgment about whether to reappoint someone
			* Senator Cherry: How many people feel that this change substantially
			* Senator Olness: So the full faculty is being solicited in the form of a vote, but the qualitative feedback is not accompanying the vote?
				+ Senator Cherry: There is not supposed to be full faculty voting in years 1, 2, and 3 according to the policy

Senator Anderson-Lain: It happens in my department * + - Senator Chamberlin: This is a larger discussion that we do not have time to solve at this point; reach back out to constituents to get their feedback
		- Senator Aviles-Diz moved to table the motion to amend the policy, and Senator Joyner seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
	+ Senator Anderson-Lain moved to vote on the amended proposal with the reassurance that it will be brought back to Faculty Senate when we meet next, and Senator Peters seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
* 06.008 (formerly 07.023) Course Materials, Textbook Adoption, and Disclosure
* 06.012 Payment of Nine-Month Contracts
* 06.023 Program of Assistance for Teaching Personnel Whose Primary Language is Not English
* 06.031 Pre-Finals Days, Reading Day, and Final Examinations
	+ Senator Peters moved to table all the other Second Read policies (06.008, 06.012, 06.023, and 06.031) until the February meeting, and Senator Bednarz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
 |
| VI. | Committee on Committees (Melissa McKay)**[vote]** | * Standing Committee Vacancies
* Administrative Committee Vacancies

Senator McKay will send out concise email with the positions that need to be filled at the beginning of the year. Senator Petros moved to vote on the committee vacancies as a block and accept the slate, and Senator Joyner seconded. The motion passed unanimously.  |
| VII. | Executive Committee (Karen Anderson-Lain) | * Procedures manual change: consistency for departments within committee structure **[vote]**
* We were trying to do some clean-up of the Procedures Manual with inconsistencies of how departments were represented on committees
* Executive Committee moved to change the language in the Procedures Manual to a “Maximum of 2 persons per unit per committee where at-large membership is available.” The motion passed unanimously.
 |
| VIII. | Other standing committee updates | * University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee minutes (December) (Courtney Glazer/Ann Afflerbach) **[vote]**

The UUCC moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously. * Graduate Council (October) (Lawrence Williams) **[vote]**

The Graduate Council moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.  |
| IX. | New business | None |
| X. | Old business | **Second Read** (Karen Anderson-Lain/Adam Chamberlin) * 06.051 Faculty Grievance **[vote]**
	+ Added section G; change as to whether Faculty Grievance Committee can hear grievances of non-tenure track faculty members’ requests for promotion
	+ Discussion
		- Senator Catalano: Seems complicated; other decisions rest with the dean
			* Senator Chamberlin: This is specific to grievances impacting promotion, not reappointment; the decision of promotion was shifted to the Provost
	+ The Executive Committee moves to accept the addition of Section G to the Faculty Grievance policy. The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Cherry: FPOC is looking at this policy next semester |
| XII. | Comments for the Good of the Order | * Office of Faculty Success faculty mixer is being held now (3:30 p.m.) in the Faculty Lounge
* No January Faculty Senate meeting; next meeting is Wed, February 8
* Consider submitting a nomination for a worthy TF or TA during the call for nominations for the Outstanding Teaching Fellow/Teaching Assistant awards
 |
| XII. | Adjournment | Meeting adjourned at 3:59 pm. |