****

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**University Union 332**

Minutes – February 8, 2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Anderson-Lain, Karen** | COMM  CLASS | P | **Ginther, Jeannette** | TE&A  COE | P | **Nodeland, Brooke** | DCJ  CHPS | P | **Trudeau, Justin** | COMM  CLASS | L |
| **Aviles-Diz, Jorge** | SPAN  CLASS | A | **Hargis, Carol** | LIBR | P | **Ojha, Divesh** | MLOM  RCOB | P | **Watson, Wendy** | PSCI  CLASS | P |
| **Baker, Rose** | LTEC  COI | P | **Hensel, Paul** | PSCI  CLAS | P | **Olness, Gloria** | ASPL  CHPS | P | **Williams, Lawrence** | WLLC  CLASS | P |
| **Bednarz, Jim** | BIOL  COS | P | **Joyner, William** | MUVS  COM | P | **Peak, Dan** | ITDS  RCOB | P | **Yeatts, Dale** | SOC  CLASS | A |
| **Britain, Jeff** | ACCT  CMHT | P | **Ketron, Seth** | TOUL  MKTG | P | **Perez, Jose** | PHYS COS | P |  |  |  |
| **Campbell, Doug** | LIBR | P | **Lane, Jennifer** | MUVS  COM | P | **Peters, John** | ENGL  CLASS | P |  |  |  |
| **Catalano, Denise** | RHS  CHPS | P | **Long, Chris** | TEA COE | P | **Petros, Amy** | CHEM  COS | P |  |  |  |
| **Chamberlin, Adam** | THEA  CLASS | P | **Manzo, Maurizio** | MEEN  CENG | A | **Philbrick, Jodi** | IS COI | P |  |  |  |
| **Cherry, William** | MATH COS | P | **May, Andrew** | MUCS  COM | P | **Sankofa, Nicole** | EPSY  COE | P |  |  |  |
| **Chesky, Kris** | MUIS  MUSIC | P | **McKay, Melissa** | NCF | P | **Schoolfield, Anne** | ENGL  CLASS | P |  |  |  |
| **Chiang, Jason** | EPSY  COE | P | **Moreland, Kimberly** | ENGL CLASS | P | **Siller Carrillo, Hector** | MEEN  CENG | P | **TEMPORARY SENATORS (Voting)** | | |
| **Christian, Jack** | ENGL  CLASS | P | **Mukherjee, Sundeep** | MSE  CENG | P | **Tixier, Scott** | MUIS  COM | P |  |  |  |
| **Condrey, Coby** | LIBR | P | **Najour, Caroline** | WLLC  CLASS | P | **Tomlin, J.** | HIST  CLASS | P |  |  |  |
| **Cook, Daniel** | MUCE  COM | A | **Narayanan Arunachalam** | ITDS  RCOB | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evans, Sarah** | IS  COI | P | **Nasco, Dennis** | MGMT  RCOB | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **STUDENT SENATORS (non-voting)** | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Jermaine Turner | SGA | P |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **SUBSTITUTES (non-voting)** | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Guests: Neal Smatresk (President), Mike McPherson (Provost), Angie Cartwright (OFS), Amanda Fuller (UBSC), Brenda Kihl (Enrollment), Rudi Thompson (DSI), Brea Henson (Libraries)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| I. | Welcome and Introductions | Meeting called to order at 2:00 pm. Senator Chamberlin hoped everyone was doing well after the ice storm. |
| II. | Approval of Minutes  (December 14, 2022)  **[vote]** | Senator Catalano moved to approve the minutes of the December 14, 2022 meeting, and Senator Watson seconded. The motion to approve the minutes from December 14, 2022 passed unanimously.  Senator Ketron noted that he is now affiliated with Toulouse and no longer New College. |
| III. | University Update (President Neal Smatresk / Provost Mike McPherson) | **President Smatresk**   * Legislative update   + Just came back from Austin; 2 days roaming the halls and testifying before the Senate Finance Committee   + Met with 12-13 legislators and Lieutenant Governor, Speaker, and budget staff; tone and tenor of the meetings are really good   + Base budget has some riders attached to it that reflect large gains for universities if tuition is not raised for two years   + Asked for $50 million in enhancement funding   + Collectively asking for over $100 million; think we can get at least 1/3 of it   + Lots of conversations about tenure; Texas A&M took the lead on this by saying that we have this covered with post-tenure review; everyone is reviewed annually   + Discussions about critical race theory, which are much more concerning; more about academic freedom and teaching hard topics and having difficult conversations   + Discussions about diversity, equity, inclusion (DEI); there was an editorial in the Wall Street Journal about Texas Tech where a department set up their own interview process with highly weighted DEI principles; every major university got a letter from Governor Abbott stating to avoid illegal hiring practices   + Questions     - Senator Cherry: In some of the rumors coming out, there is talk about a minimum 5% pay raise for state employees; will this include higher education?       * Response: No clue; don’t get too excited one way or the other; no indication that this is automatic for anyone     - Senator Peters: It’s good that the legislators felt confident about the answer they got about post-tenure review. Where is this in the process at UNT? Post-tenure review needs to have some teeth in it.       * Response (Provost): What Texas A&M was planning to do came to us beforehand, and we looked at our policy in comparison to theirs; our policy is more stringent       * Senator Cherry noted that this policy is slated for review later this semester * Values Journey implementation   + Moving into a committee phase; 4 system committees; 1 campus committee; we have members on the system committees   + Looking at how we utilize values for hiring and evaluation; rewards and recognition; and more   + Local committee will translate what system comes up with   + Chancellor is especially interested in the values in terms of how we hire and reduce our voluntary turnover of employees; turnover for 1 year employees is very, very high   + Questions:     - Senator Catalano: Was this turnover – faculty, staff, administrators?       * Response: Primarily staff; will be drilling down into this data     - Senator Petros: Looking at the materials provided about the Values Journey and looked like there was a packet of slides; are departments are going to be convening retreats?       * Response: Values journey is for everyone; cogent suggestion about department level retreat; haven’t said everyone is running a values retreat yet * Building update   + Frisco Landing is open and booming     - Holding community events right and left     - Talked to President of Universal Studios and they want to partner; new park will be across the street     - PGA down the street     - TIAA moving out to Frisco; CEO wants to be on corporate board   + Multicultural Center is past the planning stage and into the contract stage; groundbreaking this semester   + STEM Building is past the programming stage; keeping it as undefined as possible with lab space that can expand and contract as needed     - Question from Senator Cherry: Is the site chosen yet?       * Response: It will be up near Environmental Science/Chemistry buildings; will remove a parking lot   + Looking at siting for a new residence hall, but will not take away a parking lot   + Question from Senator Peak: Are we going to build another parking garage?     - Response: No, it’s $34,000-$37,000 per space; flat surface parking is expensive enough   + Other building projects:     - SRB project has been programmed; very much connected to the STEM building     - CVAD auxiliary is finished     - Asking to buy a hotel in this session to accommodate our students   + Question from Senator Peters: What about Oak Street Hall? Didn’t it get demolished? What’s going to happen to that space?     - Response: Don’t know; potentially expanding into off-site locations for patients/clinics   + Comprehensive strategic space management planning session happening   + Classroom utilization statistics are not very high; we could be doing better about using our teaching facilities   + Question from Senator Peters: What about Curry Hall renovations?     - Response from AVP Rudi Thompson: Teach North Texas lives in it, and it’s awesome; facilities worked with historical society; not finished, but livable   + Gave the ITSS the boot from Discovery Park, and gave the space to Information Science; lot of pressure on teaching and lab spaces at Discovery Park   + Comment from Senator Peak: When you are doing your space planning, remember that we need places to test students.     - Response: Duly noted   + Working with VP/CFO Clayton Gibson to have a set menu of prices for renovations; also determining what is mandatory and should be paid by central administration vs. what is just renovations for visioning; reorganizing facilities * Question from Senator Cherry: How did New Orleans go this morning – oral arguments about Young Conservatives of Texas?   + Response: No resolution today; will call to find out more about this   **Provost McPherson**   * Academic integrity faculty resources and training   + ChatGPT     - Office of Academic Integrity has been working with CLEAR on this; CLEAR has just finished buying software that will integrate into TurnItIn that will detect use of artificial intelligence tools       * In the meantime, the Office of Academic Integrity suggests that if a faculty member suspects that a student has used ChatGPT or a similar tool and it is not okay, call the student in and ask them some carefully crafted questions about how they chose the topic, etc.       * Senator Watson shared about her first case of ChatGPT in wintermester; there are tools that you can use to detect the use of artificial intelligence     - Office of Academic Integrity is working with CLEAR on a syllabus statement that faculty may find helpful     - CLEAR, Faculty Success, and the Office of Academic Integrity can certainly provide training if it is requested   + President Smatresk:     - James Garrison is the new Chief Information Officer, and there has been a system wide audit of ITSS     - ChatGPT is going to have a tie in with Teams; whole bunch it can do – can take minutes and develop action items   + Questions/Comments:     - Senator Anderson-Lain: How does this align with the Code of Student Conduct and our academic policies?       * Response: Those are important questions, and we need to have long and deep conversations about this; need to make our expectations about using ChatGPT and other artificial intelligence tools clear in our syllabi     - Senator Perez: Plagiarism is defined as taking another person’s ideas/words; this isn’t another person, but it is a program assisting. Are we going to change the definition of plagiarism? How are federal agencies dealing with this in terms of using it to write a proposal?       * Response:         + Really interesting points; we need a rich conversation about this; don’t know what federal guidance is on this and need to find out what is federal guidance on this?         + In my personal opinion, we need to clarify our definitions     - AVP Rudi Thompson: We asked ChatGPT to write a 500-word essay on global climate change, and it took someone else’s paper 100%; difference between plagiarism and originality, i.e. did you write it or copy and paste information?     - Senator Watson: With student academic integrity, there is a difference between plagiarism and cheating     - Senator Peak: There is also the problem of self-plagiarism     - Senator Chamberlin: There is going to be philosophical conversation about this, as we need to look how it is going to impact policy; the important thing is to start with the syllabus     - Senator Cherry: Brings up some issues about using it to write a UNT Values Statement or UNT Policy on Workload     - President Smatresk: ChatGPT was asked to write an university strategic plan     - Senator Evans: Instead of immediately jumping to policy, it would be interesting to have conversations about usage; should be forward thinking about it     - AVP Rudi Thompson: Writing a white paper about the positive usages of ChatGPT * Peak season for 3 Dean and Vice Provost for Student Success searches; thanked everyone for participating * CANVAS reorganization   + When Adam Fein was also CIO, it made sense to have Canvas under DSI CLEAR   + When James Garrison became CIO, he was going to handle all systems   + Even though the reporting lines for Canvas Help have changed, the way faculty access this service will be the same – available via phone, email, live chat; no change to the service that the faculty receive   + Concern raised that the instructional design consultant idea has gone away; this hasn’t changed in any way, shape, or form   + Question d Senator Peak: Do we have a CIO and a CTO?     - * Response: Adam Fein’s title is Vice President for Digital Strategy and Innovation and Chief Digital Officer, and James Garrison is Chief Information Officer;       * Response from AVP Rudi Thompson: James Garrison is going to take care of the backend and security issues; if Canvas goes down or if there is a security breach, it is on James Garrison       * Senator Peak: How does that relate to Classroom Support?       * Response from AVP Rudi Thompson: No changes; still under DSI * Question from Senator McKay: New College is transitioning to a new Dean, but there was no search or faculty involvement. Was there a reason for this?   + - Response: Was his decision; typically with a dean, we do a national search; in his estimation, this job is different in important ways than a traditional dean; needed someone who can interact with local government, industry, and academics; didn’t think a national search would have yielded us anything. |
| IV. | Reapportionment proposal for 2022-2025 (Seth Ketron/Karen Anderson-Lain) **[vote]** | Senators Ketron (Chair, Committee on Faculty Participation in Governance) and Anderson-Lain presented the reapportionment proposal for 2022-2025. The target number was 147 faculty per group. The goal was two-fold: have the least amount of disruption to voting groups for senators that would be continuing on and be purposeful about assigning groups that were similar in nature. Senator Anderson-Lain thanked Jill Stover for gathering the lists of faculty.  Discussion:   * Senator Peak: Were there still be five senators per group?   + Response: Yes; it doesn’t change the constitution of the Faculty Senate * Senator Peters: This would be the final reapportionment? Trying not to move groups that didn’t need to be moved?   + Response: Correct. * Senator Campbell: I noticed that you had “All librarians” in the proposal. Why?   + Response: To save space in the table because of the number of different titles of librarians; not to minimize librarians; all department heads are excluded * Senator Long: Why was Teach North Texas moved away from the other Education faculty? What about moving Anthropology?   + Response: We moved them because they were listed under the College of Science; you have the option to make a motion for an amendment   + Response from AVP Rudi Thompson: It helps us to be with the College of Science because many decisions made in the College of Science impact us   The motion from Committee on Faculty Participation in Governance to accept the Reapportionment Proposal for 2022-2025 passed by majority with 1 abstention. |
| V. | Faculty Policy Oversight Committee  (William Cherry / Angie Cartwright) **[vote]** | **Second Read**  **[tabled policies]**  **Policies 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 Cherry asked for a motion to untable the policies: 06.012, 06.023, and 06.031.  Senator Lane moved to untable policies 06.012, 06.023, and 06.031 and consider them as group, and Senator Bednarz seconded. The motion to untable policies 06.012, 06.023, and 06.031 and consider them as a group passed unanimously.  Senator Cherry provided an overview of the changes to each of the policies: 06.012, 06.023, and 06.031.  The motion from Faculty Policy Oversight Committee to accept the changes to policies 06.012 Payment of Nine-Month Contracts, 06.023 Program of Assistance for Teaching Personnel Whose Primary Language is Not English, and 06.031 Pre-Finals Days, Reading Day, and Final Examinations passed unanimously.  **Policy 06.008 Course Materials, Textbook Adoption, and Disclosure**  Senator Cherry asked for a motion to untable policy 06.008.  Senator Catalano moved to untable policy 06.008, and Senator Evans seconded. The motion to untable policy 06.008 passed unanimously.  Senator Cherry explained that the policy 06.008 used to not be under faculty purview, but has been moved. Many of the changes came because of legal requirements. AVP Cartwright thanked Brenda Kihl for her substantial revision to the policy.   * Question from Senator Lane: Does the policy include any information about when students are supposed to have their course materials?   + Response: No; focuses mostly on disclosure of what materials are going to be required; designates that the bookstore is the one who organizes putting the list together of required materials   The motion from Faculty Policy Oversight Committee to accept the policy 06.008 (formerly 07.023) Course Materials, Textbook Adoption, and Disclosure)  passed unanimously.  **Policy 06.004 Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Reduced Appointments**  Senator Cherry explained that Faculty Policy Oversight Committee was asked to make a minor change to policy 06.004 for legal compliance, and there was a lot of interest in this policy as it made its way through the Senate. In December 2022, we approved some additional changes involved in the kind of notification that has to be given if committees are considering negative recommendations. On the floor of the Senate in December 2022, Senator Sankofa brought up how the previous change in 2020 impacted the climate in her department and in possibly other units on campus as well. She proposed a change whereby unit review committees would no longer be required to vote in the early years of tenure track faculty. We approved the legal compliance change to the policy, but we were asked to bring this policy back to discuss this issue about the vote.  Senator Watson moved to untable policy 06.004, and Senator Evans seconded. The motion to untable policy 06.004 passed unanimously.  Senator Chamberlin opened the discussion on the amendment to the policy that Senator Sankofa proposed.  Senator Sankofa provided a refresher on the discussion of the proposed amendment from December 14, 2022. She explained that the reappointment voting every single year for untenured faculty was a brutal process, as you see how many people voted yes or no on your reappointment. This is not keeping with our values at UNT.  Senator Anderson-Lain reported that the Senate officers did receive feedback is that the consistency that is supposed to be in the policy is not there in the implementation of the policy. Some faculty say that the entire tenured faculty vote without seeing the packet of the untenured faculty. If we do not change policy, we should argue for additional oversight of the process.  Senator Ojha said that he can see the concern about the written policy and its actual implementation; this applies to everything. There are a lot of instances of how a policy is written and how it is applied is different being two separate things. He stated that it is better not to have one person making a decision about an assistant professor; outcomes are more fair if it is a committee is making the decision. He suggested keeping the policy as written but making sure there is oversight.   * Senator Sankofa: Clarification on one point – in practice, it is very different. When you formalize something into committee work, they are using rubrics and standards for reappointment and may not be taking into consideration the trajectory of a person’s career. * Senator Ojha: The same information should be available to the committee as the chair; should not have inconsistency between the committee and chair and represents a problem within the department itself, not the policy * Senator Chamberlin: Questioned how the committee’s rubrics in Senator Sankofa’s department were developed and if they were voted on by the full faculty; this may be a policy issue within the department and college   + Senator Sankofa: This was just an example of how when you formalize the process into committee work that the process becomes about metrics * Senator Watson: Completely understands where Senator Sankofa is coming from, but feels that removing the committee from the process is dangerous because you are putting the completely in the hands of one person when that person who is not ultimately the one who makes the tenure decision   + Senator Sankofa: You are still going through the annual review process and getting feedback from committee; just taking away the separate reappointment review * Senator Perez: As a summary, Senator Sankofa doesn’t want the PAC to make a reappointment recommendation; they can make an annual merit review and so can the chair, but only the chair makes the reappointment   Senator Olness said that any process, any policy has to emerge and grow naturally from the purpose; what we should be discussing here is what is the purpose of these processes and policies; the purpose should drive how we make a decision about the policy.   * Senator Baker: Had quite a few conversations with quite a few people about this topic after the meeting in December; one of the things we dicussed was the reappointment review itself; the purpose of the reappointment committee is to tell you what you look like in the field; the purpose of the chair and the dean is to say to the person that your peers are saying that if you were to go out for peer review that you are looking good or not; the chair and dean are supposed to be the safety net   Senator Evans asked a clarification question – in terms of your reappointment decision, even if your PAC gives feedback, is it the chair and dean decision who decide whether you are rehired?   * Senator Cherry: No, it is the Provost who makes the decision; everything below this level is a recommendation   Senator Nodeland stated that the vote from the RPTC can serve as a protection as well, especially if there is a situation where there is an issue between the chair and the candidate; these votes are to give people an indication as to whether they are on the trajectory for tenure; PAC annual review doesn’t necessarily indicate that you are making progress towards tenure  Senator Cherry believed that the faculty within his department would vote against this change to the policy; proposed a compromise that the unit review committee doesn’t vote unless the department chair is making a negative decision   * Senator Chamberlin: This would provide checks and balances on the process * Senator Ojha: This isn’t how the process typically flows   Senator Watson thought that Senator Olness hit the nail on the head; what is the purpose of this process? I have always assumed the purpose of this process is to provide information to probationary faculty about whether or not they would receive the support of their faculty when it comes time for tenure.   * Senator Chamberlin: before the change in policy regarding the vote, the process was meant to advise tenure candidates if they were on the right track; and with the change, it is if you are not on the right track, then you may also be fired   Senator May asked whether it is up to the Faculty Senate to decide whether their 1st, 2nd, 3rd reviews with consequences; perhaps, it would be better just a 4th year reppointment review with reviews that provide advisement for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years.   * Senator Cherry: Faculty Senate decides shockingly few things; in this context, we can make recommendations, but it is not a decision   Senator Evans asked a clarification question about the differences among departments and how much can we dictate in the process.   * Senator Anderson-Lain: Asking the review committee to review materials in order to actually vote; why does the specific vote need to be provided?   Senator Nodeland stated that you can see everyone’s materials when they have submitted if you are one of the reviewers, but couldn’t you simply turn off showing the vote to the junior faculty members what the votes were?   * AVP Cartwright: We could turn the vote off, but it is a question of transparency; if you receive a negative vote, people want to know how many voted that way   Senator Evans asked whether you can turn in more than just your CV for review; could this changed in the policy?   * Senator Chamberlin: We need to talk about the implementation of policy and the minimum amount of information that needs to be submitted to Workflow in order for decisions to be made upon * AVP Cartwright: In FIS and Workflow, depending on how you run your report, you can embed a narrative within your CV; need to see how use the systems to work for us   Senator Mukherjee asked why this amendment made back in 2020. What is the history?   * Senator Cherry: The substantive change that was made in 2020 was because Provost Cowley thought midterm review should be in the 4th years, not the 3rd year; full faculty votes started with Provost Cowley in 2017, but not required in the early years * Senator Olness: For why and what purpose? That is the question we need to go back to * Senator Catalano: We need to find one good model for this process   The motion to remove the language in policy 06.004 Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Reduced Appointments that reappointment review be separate from annual review in IV.B.2.a. and to delete IV.B.2.c.i. entirely was voted down.  Senator Evans moved that reappointment review be separate from annual review in IV.B.2.a., and it was seconded.  Senator Sankofa clarified that this is just removing separate from annual review; it would be combining reappointment and annual reviews.  The motion to remove the language in policy 06.004 Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Reduced Appointments that reappointment review be separate from annual review in IV.B.2.a passed by majority.  Senator Chamberlin proposed that we send this back to the Faculty Policy Oversight Committee to review the change that was just approved.  Senator Watson moved to send policy 06.004 Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Reduced Appointments back to the Faculty Policy Oversight Committee for further discussion, and Senator Catalano seconded. The motion to send policy 06.004 Faculty Reppointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Reduced Appointments back to the Faculty Policy Oversight Committee for further discussion passed by majority with 1 against and 2 abstentions.  Senator Baker raised a question about the timing of the policy.  Senator Peak moved to extend the meeting time, and Senator Lane seconded. The motion to extend the meeting time passed unanimously. |
| VI. | Committee on Committees (Melissa McKay) **[vote]** | The motion from Committee on Committees to accept the nominees for the Standing Committee Vacancies and Administrative Committee passed unanimously. |
| VII. | Executive Committee (Karen Anderson-Lain) | **Procedures Manual change: Faculty Mentor Committee composition [vote]**   * This item was moved to the March meeting.   **Acceptance of mid-year standing committee reports [vote]**  Senator Petros moved to accept and approve the Faculty Awards, Faculty Development Leave, Faculty Participation in Governance, Teaching Fellows/Teaching Assistants, Oversight of the Core Curriculum, Committee on the Status of Women Faculty mid-year reports, and Senator Catalano seconded. The motion passed by majority with 1 abstention.  Senator Anderson-Lain announced that there was a vacancy in Group IV for the Faculty Policy Oversight Committee. Let the Executive Committee know if you have anyone to nominate. |
| VIII. | Other standing committee updates | Graduate Council (December) (Dale Yeatts)   * This item was moved to the March meeting. |
| IX. | New business |  |
| X. | Old business | **Reaffirm June meeting in asynchronous format [vote]**  The motion from the Executive Committee that the June Faculty Senate meeting be held asynchronously online passed unanimously. |
| XI. | Comments for the Good of the Order | * Bertina Combes’ portrait unveiling will be February 21, 2023, 3:00 p.m. in Faculty Lounge * UNT Libraries is sponsoring a Human Library in April – for additional details or if interested in “being a book,” contact Madison Brents x2413. – has been cancelled * The UNT Police Department is hosting a Fentanyl awareness event Thursday, Feb 16, from 5:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. in the UNT Union Lyceum. There will be a showing of the movie Fentanyl Factor and a discussion with subject matter experts. * Complete Care is a new family care benefit for UNT faculty, staff and students, that pairs Kinside and Urban Sitter’s sitter service providers for backup and emergency childcare, daycare and preschool services, babysitters and nannies, senior care, pet care, camps and school programs, basic household services and tutoring. Visit <https://blog.urbansitter.com/unt/> for more information. |
| XII. | Adjournment | Meeting adjourned at 4:03 pm. |