



FACULTY SENATE MEETING
March 9, 2016
MINUTES

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

- Meeting: Faculty Senate Meeting March 9, 2016, Wooten Hall 322
- Present: Brian Ayre; Kim Baker; Kathryn Beasley; Glen Biglaiser; Sheri Broyles; V. Barbara Bush; Jennifer Callahan; Douglas Campbell; Denise Catalano; James Conover; Shelley Cushman; Elliot Dubin; Morgan Gieringer; Kamakshi Gopal; Paul Hutchison; John Ishiyama; Smita Mehta; Reza Mirshams; Saraju Mohanty; Maria Muñiz; Divesh Ojha; Phil Paolino; Jeffrey Snider; Srinivasan Srivilliputhur; Jessica Strubel; Phil Sweany; Beth Thomsett-Scott; Manish Vaidya; Mary Ann Venner; Karen Weiller; Oksana Zavalina; Tao Zhang
- Absent: Lee Hughes; Jennifer Lane; Andrew May; Dan Peak; Emile Sahliyah; Jyoti Shah; Steven Slottow; Guido Verbeck.
- Guests: Neal Smatresk, President; Finley Graves, Provost; Christy Crutsinger, Provost Office; Mike McPherson, Provost Office; Margaret Vestal, Provost Office; Melinda Lilly, Provost Office; Brian Lain, UUC and QEP; Sian Brannon, UUC; Adrienne Nettles, URCM; Ernestine Bousquet, URCM; Douglas Root, Biology; Scott Hobbs, Athletics; Michelle Jack, Athletics; Jane Himmel, CLEAR. Lisa D., North Texas Daily.
- I. Welcome and Introductions Chair Guido Verbeck is not here today. Vice Chair Barbara Bush is filling in.
- II. Approval of Minutes
(February 10, 2016) [Vote] Motion to approve minutes
Moved by Senator Broyles
Seconded by Senator Hutchinson
Discussion: None
Motion passes unanimously.
- III. Faculty Senate Discussion
Discussion • Course fees and fee structures-Have student course fees been raised or lowered in your department or college? Has there been feedback from students?
Discussion: None
(Comments scrolled along the board.)

Question: Course fees are limited for Eagle Express students and this has led to non- Eagle Express students having to pay more. Is this the case?

Answer from President: No, we said we would reimburse any departments impacted by this.

Comment: A constituent congratulated the President on his raise and that he is not subject to compression.

Answer from President: He did not get a raise even though the Board of Regents wanted to give me one. The Board was interested in providing a bonus structure for the President. The President said he is not comfortable with that. This year we will have more new hires and more high impact hires. Told the Board if you are going to offer incentives, I would like to pass those on to people that help us achieve our goals.

Comment/Question: What is the reporting of available course fees? It is not an accurate accounting of what is available to be spent on supplies for courses until the middle of the semester.

Answer from President: With the new accounting system there will be some changes. Biggest issue with course fees is when we collect them and when they are assessed. We know within reason what our fees are going to be. Course fees are a necessary evil. Every place has had this problem. We are looking at options. I will bring it forward to Bob Brown. I appreciate the suggestion.

IV. President Neal Smatresk and Provost Finley Graves

- What is the status of the policies 15.0 and Academic Workload?

15.0: News is not good. We had a conference call with the Office of General Counsel. He read student attendance and academic appointments policies. Academic appointments was found to be legally insufficient. Student Attendance is legally sufficient.

Two things he was not happy with: The writing is open to too much interpretation, merit and tenure promotion in the document conflates two things. We pulled 15.0 back and talked about meeting with him and going through a workshop to work through it. The Deans are not happy with 15.0. They like the old one and not the new one. Academic workload is in the same condition, but can be worked on in a shorter time. We want to do it quickly.

Comments: Vice Chair Bush: I met with Christy to go over some of the major issues. Basically there are things we can address within the next few weeks. In essence Legal had made some comments about legal sufficiency that were not noted. We are going to look through the policy again to see if suggested changes have already been made. We are very optimistic that there will be a process where the Senate is involved sooner rather than later.

Question: Does Renaldo attend the meeting with people on the issues?

Answer: We give the policies to Renaldo to read. We did have a conference call and talked at great length with him about the issues. We know the core of his concerns and how to address them. Turns out we weren't great at writing policy. There is general dissatisfaction with the policy. There are so many conflicts between departments. At some point we're going to have to

take a hard look at the conflicts we have. If we can separate merit and tenure/ promotion, that would be good.

- Where are we now with completing equity and compression issues? We will chip away at this when we have money. It is difficult to take care of in one bit. We talked about a salary floor. We are losing people because we aren't hiring at market. I don't want to hire junior faculty at a lower level because it will cause problems down the road. We are trying to address the compression level as best we can. This is a tough issue but we are making progress on the issue. For equity we put a significant pot of money into it. That money has been spent. We will have more challenges coming forward and we will do our best to address them. We have tried to be consistent in budgeting larger raises and reinvesting in our academic programs, particularly with our hires. We are committed to growing numbers as our student population grows. The more revenues we receive, the more we will give back to the colleges to fund initiatives. The Deans and Provost have been managing things well.

Update: There is 3% budgeted for increasing faculty and staff raises. We are still going through the job grading exercises. There has been far more adjustment around staff salaries. Compensation occurs on a rolling basis for staff positions. We were losing advisors to community colleges. We have made adjustments to those salaries. We had the same issues with admissions and enrollment staff. As we complete job grading, we will look at how we can address things. For faculty, we get one big monetary exercise a year (equity and merit). This year we are not going to give up on any of those commitments. We have to address compression and it will take a lot of funds to address. It is most egregious at the lower ranks. We will continue with the 3% merit. It shows we are dedicated to doing this. Over the next few years we will continue to make progress in this domain. If you continue to see gross inequities please voice them through your deans. We will address it where we can.

Question: Last year equity was addressed across everybody. It went forward to administration and the equity part was addressing gender and people of color but the decision making process was not clear. What happened?

Answer: Some deans did not follow the instructions because they felt it was important in the context of their college. It was clearly a misunderstanding.

Question: When one looks at market adjustment, it is a complex process. What principal component goes into the decision process of where the money goes?

Answer: Time and rank analysis isn't always informative. Females and males were consistently either over or under paid. There was about a \$600,000 differential in some areas where males were being paid more than females and \$300,000 in some areas where females were being paid more than males. We have put this exercise in the hands of Chairs and Deans to get their feedback.

We asked them to address specific equity issues. There are other issues that

need to be addressed. I am interested in the analysis to see where more issues exists. We are anxious to see the data. There is a competing interest between equity and merit. We can't take care of the whole thing at once especially for example if a modest sized department is low on target salaries- (includes merit, equity, and compression). If you have new money in the system, we want to accelerate everyone half the way towards their target salary. Everyone is accelerated at the same way of achieving a target at the same rate. This process I think would address salary issues better.

Question: Within my group we tried to put forth names to address gender and race salary issues. The largest raise went to a white male because of a competing industry salary.

Answer: If I knew about it I probably wouldn't have approved it. I want to compare apples to apples. We want to be competitive on the same level. This could set a better situation it helping set target salaries.

Follow up question: There was also another situation where another faculty person who was out-performing consistently, but didn't get her salary increased.

Answer: It is difficult to sometimes modify a compensation package. We are now an R1 institution primarily because of our doctoral student production. We have to continue to be competitive and analyze the market. There are so many variables, but we try to be as fair as possible. Sometimes it doesn't always work out but our intentions are good.

Question: We heard 5 years ago we were behind in compensation. We have been working on it, but we have shifted away from compensation benchmarks. Are the deans making arguments that may derail the 3% plan?

Answer: No, I don't believe so. The main focus of conversations in budget meetings is what new monies will be invested. We want to hire the number 1's on the list every time if we can. It shouldn't be our compensation package that prevents us from hiring the best candidate. I will insist that we hire faculty at a good, competitive rate. What we haven't gotten yet is a real analysis using the target approach.

Question: We moved away from hiring tenure track faculty and hired more lecturers. How has that impacted us?

Answer: We are always looking at ways to reprioritize. With new money you may ask for a variety of things. It is situational and depends on college needs. There is a need for part timers, but the deans have made some progress in converting these type of positions into more full time positions. We have a growing need to address so many resource needs. We need a balanced model using reputation to drive growth and growth to drive reputation. We are doing the best we can to manage resources but welcome feedback.

Question: The graduate waiver program, will it continue?

Answer: Yes, the program will still continue. We are doing more localized approaches. They need to be doing something in their field of work that is genuine. People will need more tuition money. We have distributed 10% from block grants. Masters students 3-6 credit hours, Doctoral students 6-9. Up to the colleges. We do not want to use state money for RA's tuition

support.

Question: Constituent concerned that RAs cannot get the support.

Answer: So noted.

Question: Do other colleges utilize grants? When you pay a graduate student a stipend it takes a while for them to be productive.

Answer: I expect they will be put on a TA line. They need to support classes. I encourage the deans to think creatively.

Comment: There is a push to increase enrollment and grants. We have raised the issue with the dean. We need to support the educational mission of the college. If it's offered in a compensation package, that is different. All of it is negotiated with the dean. We're willing to expand the number of doc lines.

Motion to expand the President's time by 10 min.

Moved by Senator Chamberlain

Seconded by Senator Thomsett-Scott

Motion passes.

Question: Formula funding is different for programs. For doctoral programs it is less than the master's program. Why?

Answer: We are coding doctorates in a different way than other colleges. Coding is affecting revenue. Bob Brown can help investigate.

Question: What will the tuition program be covering in the fall? Instructor fees were not covered and had increased.

Answer: We are just covering tuition and mandatory fees, not instructional fees. There is no set number of hours-it is a local decision. The program is not changing now. We messed up in the beginning. We hope you will be spending allocated funds to help doctoral students.

Follow Up:

- Should we develop target salaries?
- Communicate structure of graduate tuition plan
- What are the statuses of graduate and undergraduate course fees?

V. Policy Status Update (Christy Crutsinger)

Campus Carry: An administrative announcement went out. A comprehensive response to being prepared in the classroom is being developed. The campus police and the Provost Office are collaborating to provide training at the departmental level. They are going to also address active shooter and weather related emergencies. We are taking it seriously. Be on the lookout for messages from the department chair regarding training.

Question: The number of meeting we are expected to go to seem to be growing. Why?

Answer: Protecting students in the classroom is important. We want faculty to be a leader. The training will be one hour. (There have been many requests for this training from faculty.)

15.0 and Academic Appointments: We did receive great training from Deena Merrill regarding policy training. She is the go to person to help with policy writing so we make sure we are doing things correctly.

Policy update sheet sent out. (We have three up for votes in March, (18.1.20, 15.1.9 and 15.2.17).

- VI. Election Results (Adam Chamberlin) We are just waiting for verification from the senator-elects. Then we will make an announcement. We are looking at 19-20 open senate seats for election in the future. We need your help in publicizing the vacancies. We will be moving forward soon with nominations for 2016-2019 senate seats as well as open elected seats on committee.
- VII. Committee on Committees Update Motion to treat uncontested elections as blocks Moved by Senator Broyles, seconded by Senator Chamberlain Discussion: None Motion carries.
- Motion to elect Group III Academic Affairs Committee: Matthew Dulock Senator Chamberlain seconds Motion passes.
- Motion to elect Group II: Faculty Salary Study Committee: Julie Judkins, Senator Thomsett-Scott seconds Motion passes.
- VIII. UUCC Update [Vote] Brian Lain: Our new chair is Wendy Watson (Aug. 2016). A website proposal is going to the Provost Office. We will have a new major: Japanese. Core changes: Capstone not being included
- Motion to approve minutes Moved by Senator Vaidya **Discussion:** What is the website proposal? **Answer:** It centralizes suggestions for curriculum changes and includes forms and workflows. For example, if you want to propose a new course or change an existing course there is an accessible form you can fill out. **Question:** Can we use the same site for grad classes? **Answer:** It is just for undergrads right now. We suggest though they add on to the site.
- Motion to approve the minutes passes.
- IX. QEP Update SACS visitors are coming March 22-24. Can you make the university a better institution with your QEP? It is called Career Connect. Connect undergraduate student learning outcomes with communication, critical thinking and teamwork. Matches up curricular and co-curricular processes. Implements an e-portfolio system. Can track activities inside and outside of the classroom. It is community related. It partners students and community partners, impacting high-learning experiences. This plan will coordinate and connect those activities: internships, course project, service learning courses and research endeavors. Learning outcomes, community service and co-curricular/curricular activities are the basics of Career Connect. Students get skills employers and graduate schools want. We give the highest quality of learning to our students. More details can be found at qep.unt.edu.

Question: Is the university going to support the e-portfolio system for 37,000 students? How?

Answer: We don't have specifics until the plan gets approved. Of the 14 or so possible systems they have narrowed it down to four.

Question: What if students already have one for a particular program?

Answer: That's okay.

Question: Is it mandatory for graduation?

Answer: No.

Question: Will we have assessment for the QEP?

Answer: Yes. It will be tracked through the Career Connect Office which will be created if the QEP is approved.

Question: Are there any plans to expand the program to graduate students?

Answer: Graduate students who want to use the e-portfolio system can.

X. Committee on
the Whole

Question: Grad Track Pathways program is in place? Until SACS approves it it's on shaky ground. We went through the Grad Council but we have to wait for SACS approval.

Answer: We will look into it. (It was approved by the coordinating board.) SACS will be primarily looking at the QEP.

XI. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn

Moved by Senator Thomsett-Scott, Seconded by Senator Catalano

Meeting adjourned at 4:05pm.