



FACULTY SENATE MEETING
November 11, 2015
MINUTES

Faculty Senate Meetings Are Open to All Members of the University Community

- Meeting: Faculty Senate Meeting November 11, 2015, Wooten Hall, Room 322
- Present: Brian Ayre, Kim Baker, Glen Biglaiser, Sheri Broyles, V. Barbara Bush, Jennifer Callahan, Douglas Campbell, Adam Chamberlin, James Conover, Shelley Cushman, Elliot Dubin, Morgan Gieringer, Kamakshi Gopal, Lee Hughes, Paul Hutchison, John Ishiyama, Jennifer Lane, Andrew May Gopal, Smita Mehta, Reza Mirshams, Saraju Mohanty, Maria Muniz, Divesh Ojha, Phil Paolino, Dan Peak, Jonathan Pinkston, Emile Sahliyah, Jyoti Shah, Stephen Slottow, Jeffrey Snider, Phil Sweany, Beth Thomsett-Scott, , Guido Verbeck, Karen Weiller-Abels, Oksana Zavalina.
- Absent: Denise Catalano, Srinivasan Srivilliputhur, Jessica Strubel, Mary Ann Venner, Tao Zhang.
- Guests: Neal Smatresk, President; Finley Graves, Provost and VPAA; Christy Crutsinger, VPPA; Margaret Vestal, Office of the Provost; Brian Lain, UUC; Sian Brannon, UUC; Eric Fritsch, Criminal Justice; David Wiley, CMHT; Sarah Lagro, North Texas Daily; Matt Zabel, URCM; Susan Smith, Libraries.
- I. Welcome and Introductions
The meeting was called to order at 2:03 pm. Senator Verbeck informed the senate the meeting was being recorded with Panopto for future viewing and reference.

Pamela Johnston is soliciting faculty feedback on the smoke-free campus policy; Senator Verbeck asked the senate to send her their constituents' comments to Pamela.Johnston@unt.edu.
- II. Approval of Minutes (October 14, 2015) [Vote]
Senator Sahliyah moved to approve the minutes; senator Cushman seconded. No discussion, the motion carried unanimously.
- III. Faculty Senate Discussion-Shared Governance
Issues forwarded by constituents to senators:
▪ Faculty see smoking on campus and don't know how to address it. The smoke-free campus policy says what to do with smokers, but what are the ramifications if individual faculty try to enforce it?

- Two departments in the College of Information want to change names to more closely reflect changes in the industry, but they are told these changes would not be approved by the Provost until the permanent Dean is hired. Is that the case, and if so, why do these changes have to wait for a year to be approved?
- Faculty continues to be concerned about the graduate student's tuition waiver. Several revisions have been made to the policy but for students coming in the spring it is not clear what kind of packet they will be offered.
- International student families are no longer receiving letters from UNT inviting them to attend commencement ceremonies. These letters are important for them to secure US visas and attend their children's graduation. Time is of the essence for students graduating this fall semester.
- There are issues about senior faculty compensation and P&T. Salary compression will be addressed next year, but once that is addressed, what is the plan for future years?

IV. President
Neal
Smatresk
and Provost
Finley
Graves

President Smatresk and Provost Graves

Shared Governance. Faculty participation in policies that affect faculty has been working well, but Dr. Smatresk understands that when government policies and guidelines are pushed to faculty without their input it makes it difficult to see the issue as shared governance and transparency. Sometimes things come down the road where there is no policy or a lack of policy enforcement and they go out to faculty in a very reactive way. There has to be a way to collaborate on those issues and come to an agreement.

UNT doesn't have one-stop shop across the board for policies. Policies reside in different areas and that makes it difficult sometimes for shared governance.

The review of policy 15.0 was a very good team effort. Deans gave input, faculty gave input, and a faculty committee reviewed the policy and the output was very good. There was one piece of it the President didn't approve, but he listened to faculty feedback from different sources and arrived to a compromise. The President wanted faculty as a whole to vote on the review of assistant professors starting on year one, but after consideration of feedback he agreed that the evaluation for continuation of assistant professors by the above rank committee as a whole will start on third year.

The Minors Program Policy was pushed to the Faculty Research Committee for review. There has to be a way to accommodate the public coming to campus while complying with the policy. Nothing will work if it gets to the point where everyone needs to fill a lot of papers to be able to work with minor visitors and students.

Tuition Waivers- The Provost worked with Dr. Costas, Interim Dean of the Toulouse Graduate School to reach a good solution on how to proceed with the

waivers. They want to honor current commitments, but want more uniformity in the use of tuition waivers and doctoral student's production.

Intending to increase college level authority and departmental initiative, colleges will get block grants of approximately 90% of what they got last year for waivers, and within boundaries, will allow them flexibility on how to allocate the funding but there has to be more accountability on the output from students. This will allow the Provost some flexibility if some colleges have a greater need for funding, or if their need went down, then that funding can be applied to other colleges.

The program considers waivers for 6-9 credit hours in the long semesters and 3 credit hours in the summer, but departments have flexibility on this within the expected outcomes.

One issue to consider moving forward is the variants between the doctoral student programs and the students teaching and research outputs expected by the departments.

The results of last year's waivers program were not optimal, but have created a viable solution going forward. If a student got an offer and the department agrees to continue the offer, then it will be honored.

There is no new funding for research students but last year's commitments will be honored. Beyond that, it would be up to the departments to decide if they want to support a student going forward. There are grants that do not support tuition, or those where the project manager has cut funding to the point where including tuition would make them not viable. These grants need to be approved by the Chairs and Deans, but funding research students in these grants will be a departmental decision. Issuing of offer letters to international students should be coordinated with UNT-International so that students can use them to obtain their visas.

Interim Dean Decisions- There is no prohibition for departmental changes while a new chair/dean is coming in. It depends on what needs to be done. If it is a prerogative for the Deans consideration then it might want to wait. Some policies can be changed before the new Dean comes in but there has to be faculty support. The interim Dean might want to consider case by case.

Salary Compression - The best way to avoid compression is having all faculty at the right market level. The issues of race and gender were addressed as best as possible with the money available, but not everyone's salary got fixed, and the results in terms of faculty satisfaction are not yet known. When the salary floor for assistant professor was raised this year it was promised that the next compression would be at associate professors level and there might be enough money to do it next year, but a 3% growth is needed to have the funding available. The market determines salaries and because of that it cannot be said that there won't be any compression in the future.

Another issue to consider aside from compression is that bump salary values between ranks have not changed in a long time. The currently values are modest adjustments, but there is not enough data to know if adjusting these values would be a university-wide solution. The administration will work every year to address small adjustments to help with all salary issues.

V. Update on
Concealed
Carry Task
Force and
Town Hall
Meetings
(Eric
Fritsch)

Eric Fritsch, Task Force chair.

The Campus Carry law allows licensed holders to carry their handguns on campus. Concealed carry licenses have existed in the state since 1997, what is new in the law is the removal of the restriction to conceal carry in institutions of higher education as of August 1, 2016.

The Open Carry law is taking effect in TX on Jan 1, 2016, allowing a licensed concealed handgun holders to expose their gun, but this law specifically excludes institutions of higher education from places where carriers can show their guns.

The Concealed Carry law permits universities to carve out gun-free areas, but these areas cannot be so broad that they nullify the intent of the law. The University needs to have justifications for the gun-free areas it creates, report these justifications before the legislature begins in Sept 1, 2016 and every two years thereafter.

The Task Force consists of 23 members representing the campus community, including individuals that will be in charge of implementing the law. Through a consultative process the group has created a website with a list of frequent Q&A, and form to submit input, and held seven town hall meetings live streamed to their website. The deadline to submit comments through the website is Friday, November 13, 2015.

With all the feedback received, the Task Force will develop a draft policy for campus carry to go to the President by December 15, 2015. The policy then goes to the Board of Regents for consideration on February 26, 2016. By law, any modifications to the policy made by the regents are final. Between February and August 1, 2016 there will be a training process about the implementation of the policy.

As per the Campus Concealed Law, UNT cannot revoke anyone's right to carry on campus; cannot revoke anyone's license, and does not have legal authority to ask anyone to identify themselves as license holders. Only the Police Department can ask for that.

Concealed carry licenses are hard to get; individuals have to be 21, free of convictions, cannot be under felony indictment, and have to be and remain crime-free. The TX Department of Public Safety tracks licensees, applications, and conviction statistics.

It is anticipated that UNT will have 1,200 carriers. Residence halls do not expect a lot of carriers because the majority of residents are under the age of 21, but there will be special procedures for residence halls as part of the policy.

The website <http://campuscarry.unt.edu> has information about the law, the task force, and live streams of the town home meetings.

VI. Faculty
Senate
Discussion-
Concealed
Carry

Question- What happens when a concealed handgun owner (CHO) goes from one place on campus where concealed carry is allowed to a gun-free zone?

Answer- Individuals will have to secure their guns in the vehicles before moving into the gun-free zone.

Question- Will there be parking security?

Answer - There are no plans for parking security at the moment.

Question- If the locker rooms are not declared handgun-free areas, how would a CHO change into a costume or uniform required by a course that will not allow for visual concealment?

Answer – The law allows for reasonable standards. If a CHO, for example, needs to change for a class and there are no secured facilities where to leave his handgun, then the individual should not bring their firearm to that facility. He should plan his day accordingly and leave his gun in his car. There are no plans to provide secured gun lockers on campus.

Question- If it is anticipated that the number of expected CHOs will not increase gun related incidents, what is the current amount of incidents?

Answer- There has never been an arrest of a CHL holder on campus, but more information can be provided by the Chief of Policy.

Question- There is the potential that concealed carry could slide into open carry at some point. Of the other 8 states currently with concealed carry laws, are any of them considering open carry on campus?

Answer- Open carry on campus is pretty rare, although Virginia has open carry law on campus. Having gun-free zones on campus was a last minute compromise before the bill passed, and there are some concerns that the gun-free zones might be pulled from the bill in 2017.

Comment- Not worried about people with licenses, but about people with mental health issues, or kids bullied by other people that could have guns. We shouldn't have a false sense of security that we don't have students on campus with mental issues. In TX there are kids who get guns for Christmas so it is common for students to have guns from an early age and there is no way to screen them. These factors add to people's sense of concern for personal security and those for those around.

Question - Are entire buildings going to be declared gun-free zones?

Answer- Depending on the needs, there will be entire buildings, entire floors and offices declared gun-free zones. Notices will to be posted outside and inside the areas declared gun-free. The CHO will make the decision to enter those safe areas and will know that if he does, he will be in violation of the law. The Task Force is not making a recommendation to the President on what areas should be considered gun-free.

Question - Some people have recommended that all offices be gun-free, would this be a consideration?

Answer- It is recommended that there are specific locations designed as gun-free where faculty can have the conversations they don't want to have in their offices, but this is only a recommendation from the Task Force and they won't make the decision.

Question- How can a blind faculty member/student protect him/herself? Could some classrooms be designated gun-free for faculty with those specific needs?

Answer- There has been a recommendation to the committee to have the ability to request gun-free zones for cases like this, and also for courses where topics covered in class provoke heated attitudes. It would be difficult for a classroom to be designated gun-free depending on the curriculum. Others are also concerned that faculty might not provide the same education as before because they won't feel as comfortable teaching topics that might cause heated exchanges in a class where carrying is permitted.

- VII. Faculty Policy Oversight Committee (Guido Verbeck) The Senate Executive Committee is working to repopulate the Faculty Policy Oversight Committee. Representatives are needed for groups II, VI, and VIII. The service terms have been staggered randomly, but members can serve a second term. The Senate Officers will collaborate with the committee to outline the committee's charges.
- Dr. Crutsinger's office has established a regular policy review cycle and the committee is needed to start working on the policies coming down the line.
- VIII Policy Status Update (Christy Crutsinger) Policies 1.4.10.2 and 15.1.6 had been previously deleted but not removed from the books.
- Policy 15.0 went to the Office of Legal Counsel but will need to be pulled back to make a language revision to include the removal of the vote of the committee on the whole during years 1 and 2 for assistant professors, as approved by Dr. Smatresk.
- Policy 15.1.19 Academic Workload was disapproved by the Office of General Counsel and changes were sent to the Executive Committee for review. The responsibility to assign workload is now up to the dean.
- IX. Committee Dr. Swan, originally nominated to the Faculty Mentor Committee decided to

- on
Committees
Update
(Guido
Verbeck and
James
Conover)
[Vote]
- serve as group VII representative on the Faculty Policy Oversight Committee instead. Dr. Kamakshi Gopal was appointed as group VII representative to the Faculty Mentor Committee.
- A motion to approve the candidates as a block was put forward by Senator Thomsett-Scott and seconded by Senator Sweany. Motion passed unanimously.*
- A motion to approve appointees to the Faculty Policy Oversight Committee was put forward by Senator Thomsett-Scott was seconded by Senator Chamberlin. No discussion. The motion passed unanimously.*
- The Charter and Bylaws Committee is working on the Faculty Grievance Committee bylaws.
- The elections are continuing, new call for nominations will be send out soon.
- X. UUCB
Update
(Brian Lain)
[Vote]
- UUCB received a notification from the Graduate School about proposed changes to the grad track process. Asked the committee for feedback about a new baseline for GPA and making a more selective process. They want standardized language for admission.*
- Motion to approve seconded by Conover. No discussion. Motion passed unanimously.*
- XI. Committee
of the
Whole
- Senator Verbeck reminded senate to send feedback on smoke-free campus to Pamela Johnston.
- There are issues with the SPOT evaluation timeline for some courses. Dr. Crutsinger knows of one entire department working with a different window for the evaluation, and will look into other timeline options for faculty.
- The minimum number of students in class for SPOT evaluation is 3.
- There are some standing committees that are populated but not active. Senator Verbeck requested information on these committees for the Committee on Committees to look at.
- XII. Adjournmen
t
- The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.