FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Terrill Hall – Room 120
MINUTES – March 20, 2019

GUESTS: Terri Day (Academic Administration), Christy Crutsinger (VPAA), Mike Simmons (Access Day One), Julie Leventhal and Jaymee Haefner (UUCC co-chairs), Sadie Brown (Journalism student), V. Barbara Bush (Immediate Past Chair), Linda Holloway (Interim Associate Vice Provost/Office of Faculty Success)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.</th>
<th>Welcome and Introductions</th>
<th>• Call to order at 2:04pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| II. | Approval of Minutes (February 13, 2019) [vote] | • **Motion to approve the minutes as distributed**  
  o Senator Krahmer moved  
  ▪ Senator McAfee seconded  
  o Discussion  
  ▪ None  
  o **Vote**  
  ▪ **For – majority**  
  ▪ **Abstain – 2**|
| III. | Faculty Discussion (President Neal Smatresk / Provost Jennifer Cowley) | • **Smart Education Conference**  
  o Despite a smaller turn out than President Smatresk would have liked, it was still fun  
  o Quality of presentations was great  
  o It went great  
  • **Mediation process and ombuds position**  
  o A year and a half ago President Smatresk talked to faculty and staff senates  
  o It was decided that the ombuds office as it existed was not working effectively  
  o We already had a policy on the books about mediation  
  o Vice President Debbie Rohwer now heads up the mediation process  
  ▪ She does not engage in mediation, she just oversees the process  
  ▪ The President has specifically asked for a complete information firewall between VP Rohwer and the President concerning mediation  
  ▪ This is also part of the mediation credentials that the mediators have  
  ▪ VP Rohwer will schedule mediation and/or direct the issue to most appropriate office  
  o This will be effective if you use it  
  o **Questions**  
  • **Communications**  
  o VP Rohwer’s office has sent out communications and already has some requests  
  o Mediation.unt.edu  
  ▪ The request link is in the first question  
  • **Shared governance vision**  
  o “Yes of course”  
  o President Smatresk’s feeling is that faculty, staff, and admin should always work together  
  ▪ Communication is key  
  o **Concerns**  
  ▪ Transparency and communication is available at this level, but those values are not shared at every level  
  ▪ The President and Provost communicate down to lower levels, but they know some things do make it all the way down to faculty  
  o There are some exceptions to open communications  
  ▪ When hiring top candidates, they might need confidentiality  
  ▪ There are also reasons to help people not feel bad  
  o When communication does not happen, faculty can feel disempowered  
  ▪ It can also make faculty feel disconnection from the institution because they are not being listened to  
  o There are ways to communicate the need to share information to
chairs and other levels of administration
- Failure to provide any feedback is a big pet peeve of the President’s
- Workload policy dean and chair discussion
  - The Provost will send out communication and guidance at the end of summer
  - The due date for these are mid-April
  - Some departments will turn in drafts
  - The Provost’s office will review them all and return them to the departments
- Post-tenure termination clause in P&T policy
  - The termination clause comes from the Board of Regents
  - The policy is loose to allow for interpretation
  - This could be gross incompetence, but would not have to be
- Mike McPherson has accepted the position of Vice Provost of Academic Affairs
  - There will be an internal and external search for a permanent head of the office of faculty success
  - We should be able to announce the new polling place on campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV.</th>
<th>Faculty Policy Oversight Committee Updates (Adam Chamberlin / Terri Day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Second Read [vote]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Titles and Appointments (06.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The title names are being removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- They will be stored elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Motion to approve as presented</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Senator Mehta moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Senator Aviles-Diz seconded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Vote</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>For – majority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Abstain - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student Academic Integrity (06.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Changed to reflect new online process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Motion to approve as presented</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Senator McAfee moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Senator Kalin seconded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- It is at the discretion of the faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is none in policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- We all agree that if there is a problem it should be reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is seeking advice reporting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is this information protected since it is about students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Faculty can help ID larger issues happening elsewhere when they report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Keeping records deal with retaliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Vote</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>For – Majority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Abstain - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Substantive Change (06.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Motion to approve as presented</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Senator Kalin moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Senator McAfee seconded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Vote</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **For - unanimous**
  • Non-tenured Track Faculty Reappointment and Promotion (06.005)
    o **Motion to accept as approved**
      • Senator McAfee moved
      • Senator Warren seconded
      • **Discussion**
        • Verbiage in paragraph A is confusing as to who can request what
      • **Secondary motion to postpone the vote**
        • Senator Lane moved
          o Senator Wickstrom seconded
        • **Discussion**
          o None
      • **Vote**
        o For – 14
        o Against – 16
        o Abstain – 1
  • **Discussion on original motion**
    • What protections does a long term lecturer have?
    • Lecturers can be let go at the end of the contract
    • Lecturers can be let go for cause
    • What about multi-year appointments renewed annually?
      o The Provost will comeback better prepare for this discussion
      o Lecturers do have more protections than staff
  • **Motion to postpone the vote**
    • Senator McAfee moved
      o Senator Wickstrom seconded
    • **Discussion**
      o None
    • **Vote**
      o For – Majority
      o Against – 2
      o Abstain - 1

• Faculty Grievance (06.051)
  o **Motion(1) to accept as presented**
    • Senator Peters moved
      • Senator Mehta seconded
      • **Discussion**
        • The Women’s Faculty Network came to the last EC meeting
          o There should be Non-Tenure Track Faculty on this committee because this committee can hear anything other than reappointment grievances by Non-Tenure Track Faculty.
          o They would like to add in language to include Non-Tenure Track Faculty.
        • Would it be easier to just have them as regular members of the committee and define who can vote on what cases?
          o This would increase members and increase quorum
          o This would be easier than having to find them ad hoc
        • Everyone can have appeals on level above the person who decides appointment
• Reappointment decisions are the only thing that non-tenure track cannot bring to this committee. Everything else is OK
• Reappointment and promotion are different
• Motion(1.1) to approve this policy with amendments and bring it back to this committee for a third read
  o Senator McAfee moved
    ▪ Senator Peters seconded
  o Discussion
    ▪ The definition of a grievance is defined by the Office of General Council
    ▪ 10 business days for filing
      • There is a shock period and people might need more time
      • The timing would be difficult to change
      • People receive information that they can grieve frequently
      • The timelines are lined up with other processes
    ▪ What does it take to file?
      • In terms of tenure, it is just an email notification
      • Could it just say notice of grievance?
  o Vote (1.1)
    ▪ For – 10
    ▪ Against – 17
    ▪ Abstain – 3
• Motion(1.2) to approve policy with amendments and move it forward with no third read
  o Senator Peters moved
    ▪ Senator Yeatts seconded
  o Discussion
    ▪ Why not bring it back for third read?
      • We can trust Vice Provost Day to make the changes
  o Vote(1.2)
    ▪ For – majority
    ▪ Against – 1
    ▪ Abstain – 3

V. Access Day One (Mike Simmons)

VI. Committee on Committees Update (Jodi Philbrick) • No nominations from the floor
• No nominations to vote for
• Please help fill empty slots in committees
| VII. | Other Standing Committee Updates [vote] | • Postpone for time  
  o UUCC Report/Minutes (Jaymee Haefner / Julie Leventhal)  
  o Graduate Council Minutes (Denise Catalano) |
| Vlll. | Executive Committee Report | • Acceptance of mid-year committee reports: (Denise Catalano) [vote]  
  o Faculty Mentoring Committee  
  o Evaluation of University Administrators Committee  
  o Committee on the Status of People of Color  
  o **Motion from committee to accept these reports**  
    ▪ Discussion  
    • None  
    ▪ Vote  
    • **For – unanimous**  
  • Majors/Field of Study issue presented by Texas Council of Faculty Senates (Sheri Broyles)  
    o Postponed  
  • Next administrator evaluations will come out soon and be complete by the end of April |
| IX. | New Business | • None |
| X. | Old Business | • Accessible parking in Lot A (Kevin Yanowski)  
  o From conversations with Christopher Phelps, there is not an easy answer  
  o If there are specific issues, please bring them forward and he can address those more clearly  
  o Overall, the understanding is:  
    ▪ If there are accessible spots in an A-lot, you have to be a permit holder for that A-lot in order to use those accessible spots  
    ▪ If there are accessible spots in a mixed lot (A, FS, Eagle, etc.) than anyone with the appropriate permit or higher can park in those accessible spots  
  o Discussion  
    ▪ This seems odd and possibly illegal  
    ▪ Conversations with Christopher Phelps and the committee will continue about this and other issues and information will be brought back on anything found out. |
| XI. | Comments for the Good of the Order | • Office of Faculty Success  
  o Thanks to Linda Holloway for serving as interim Associate Vice Provost for faculty  
  • Evaluation of Administrators participation is up  
  • US News ranked College of Education #3 in the state  
    o Almost everything we have here went up in ranking  
  • We have a polling place on campus for the upcoming elections  
    o Please make use of it and get the word out to students to make use of it |
| XII. | Adjournment | • Adjourned at 4PM |