

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

January 30, 2008, 2:00 PM, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Board Room UNT Administration Building

### Executive Committee Members:

Name	Group	Dept.	Term	Present
Dornith Doherty	I	CVAD	2008*	
Elizabeth Figa	II	SLIS	2008*	
Dennis Mueller	III	PHYS	2008*	X
Emile Sahliyah	IV	PSCI	2010*	X
Steve Cole	V	FIRL	2008	X
Cynthia Chandler	VI	CHE	2010*	
Jim Swan	VII	AGER	2008	X
John Holt	VIII	MUSIC	2008*	
Michael McPherson	Chair	ECON	2008*	X
Richard Wells	Vice-Chair	JOUR	2008	X
Beth Thomsett-Scott	Secretary	LIBR	2008	X
Marcia Staff	Immediate Past Chair	FIREL	2008*	

Guests: Belinda Newman, Doina Farkas, Richard Fossey, Kimi King, Michael Nieswiadomy

- I. Welcome. Senator Wells welcomed attendees and requested that the agenda be suspended to allow the guests to present first. EC members agreed to this. Attendees introduced themselves.
- II. Belinda Newman, Ombuds. Dr. Newman thanked the EC for the opportunity to meet with them. She noted that she has created a new brochure for the Ombuds office highlighting the office's new role in serving both faculty and staff. Twelve cases have been received since she started on December 10. The cases are evenly split between faculty and staff, and involved providing some options for situations and some facilitations/interventions. There was one case involving a student bringing a complaint against a staff member. After discussion with Bonita Jacobs, it was agreed that Dr. Newman could use her discretion as to whether to accept the case or refer it to another venue. Dr. Newman's goal for the next while is to highlight the services of the office, especially to staff groups who may be less aware of the change in

focus. She added that she meets with President Bataille twice a month to provide updates, and that an annual report will be created. Dr. Newman has initiated the use of an intake form to record demographics of those who use the office. This will assist in knowing whether there are populations who may not be aware of the services. Senator Wells noted that there are currently only 2 trained mediators on campus and that he had been informed that one of the Ombuds' roles was to assist UNT employees access mediation services. Dr. Newman suggested that Steve Hill, Director of Institutional Compliance, be invited to speak at the February Senate meeting along with Gilda Garcia and herself. The three offices have slightly overlapping concerns and they have found it useful to speak as a group.

### III. Committee Reports

- a. Ad Hoc Legal Committee. The committee broke their tasks into chunks and noted that their current report deals with the various contract delays and related issues experienced by faculty. They began their work in August with an e-mail to faculty requesting specific instances that could be investigated. A very low response was received, likely due to concerns over being identified. However, the committee went forward, including having several discussions with Nancy Footer. Overall, the response was positive and things are changing. There is a new policy handbook, 3 paralegals have been hired to work in the purchasing office, and more flexibility and exemptions concerning which items and dollar values need to go to the legal office for approval. The committee was requested to follow up on the possibility of training faculty and staff involved in purchasing items and working with contracts. EC members also asked for minimum and maximum values on contracts and purchasing as averages don't usually tell the whole story when reporting. Senator Wells requested that the committee consider whether it should become a standing committee. Senator Mueller asked whether service contracts were exempt, especially if other universities in the area used the same provider. The Ad Hoc committee will follow up on this question. The contracting handbook will be linked to the Senate web site and marketed to faculty and staff. The Ad Hoc committee will be meeting with the Chairs Council to gather more information that they can follow up on. The next phase of their task involves working on the relationship between the Legal Office and the faculty, especially in such issues as tenure denials.
- b. Committee on the Status of Women, presented by Dr. Kimi King, chair. Dr. King emphasized several recommendations:
  - i. Faculty Senate should establish a Committee on the Status of Persons of Color
  - ii. Many of the concerns discovered through the work of the committee show issues with junior faculty being

overloaded and a lack of support for Associate Professors

- iii. Faculty Senate should request a response from the Provost regarding the 2002 report from the Committee on the Status of Women

Dr. King noted that there needs to be transparency in the grievance process to allow faculty, especially junior faculty, an opportunity to improve their situations. She noted that workload in general was a major concern. Senator Mueller suggested that she contact the chair of the Faculty Senate Workload Committee and determine how the committees could work together to resolve the concerns.

- IV. Report from the Core Curriculum Forums, Celia Williamson. Dr. Williamson noted that the forums were successful. The Ad Hoc committee on the Core Curriculum is currently categorizing the data from both forums and will create draft objectives using these categories. These will be available on the Core Curriculum web site by Friday. She noted that a wiki will be available to allow “virtual discussions” on the draft objectives. In response to questions, Dr. Williamson noted that the wiki will be monitored to remove inappropriate comments and also to create additional discussions should they be needed. The wiki will be EUID protected. Senator McPherson asked how the Faculty Senate could help get the word out. Dr. Williamson requested (and was granted) an opportunity to present the work at the February Senate meeting and a link from the Core Curriculum’s working site will be added to the Faculty Senate web site. She added that comments will be received until the end of February. The committee would be willing to meet with small groups as well. During March the committee will work on creating a draft mission statement and draft objectives which will be presented at the May and June Senate meetings for approval. There was some concern about presenting such important information at meetings that are generally less well attended. Dr. Williamson will try to have the information available for the April and May meetings. She noted that there should be enough flex time in the schedule if the discussion on the mission and objectives had to take place in the fall. However, the committee is hoping to have the fall to discuss how the objectives will be fulfilled – through new or modified courses and which courses. Concerns were expressed that the Curriculum Committee and the Oversight Committee on the Core Curriculum has sufficient time to evaluate the syllabi for the courses. Senator Wells emphasized that there should be rewards for faculty who create cross-disciplinary courses.
- V. Approval of Minutes from December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2007. Motion to approve by Senator Swan and seconded by Senator McPherson. No discussion. Approved unanimously.
- VI. Questions for Administrators.
  - a. (for President). Please provide an overview on the budget. What are the plans for faculty raises?

- b. (for President). Given that 2008 is a base year, will there be any changes to the summer school policies? The Executive Committee is also interested in having an open dialogue about this issue with you and Andrew Harris and to offer some solutions to the ongoing issues around summer school. Note: there was a lot of discussion on this topic with strong feeling that faculty should be involved in offering solutions to the issue where possible.
  - c. (Provost) Q as written on faculty development leave
  - d. (Provost) What are your plans for the results of the Delaware Study? Some faculty are concerned that the results will be used against them.
  - e. (Provost) Please provide an update on the Graduate Education external review process you are planning. Note: there was a discussion about how this will differ from the usual 7 year review process and what input faculty would have on the results.
- VII. Senate Dialog
  - a. Faculty Senate agenda. EC agreed to add Steve Hill to the introductions, and he, Gilda Garcia, and Belinda Newman were added under the Welcome and Introductions item. Group caucuses were removed as they are not needed. The Ad Hoc Legal Committee and the Core Revision Task Force were added under committee reports and the time increased to 30 minutes. The Coalition for Intercollegiate Athletics was added as a bullet point under Unfinished Business.
- VIII. Chairs Report. Senator McPherson noted that most of his items had to do with updates on policies and items that the Provost will be speaking about next Wednesday. There is a policy on the status of lecturers in draft form that is currently at the Deans level. The policy provides for 5 year contracts, possibility of faculty development leave and more formal evaluations – either through the current PACs or PACs constituted by lecturers. There was some concern about granting 5 year contracts without conducting national searches. The Workload and Promotion and Tenure revised policies are undergoing a second review by the Provost and the Chairs of the UTC and Workload committees. The revisions to the Faculty Development Leave Policy approved by the Senate last year are moving forward.
- IX. Unfinished Business.
  - a. Budget Hearings. Deans received the preliminary budget in the morning. Dr. Bataille will be asked to provide an overview at the EC meeting next week.
  - b. Space Allocation. There are concerns that the committee members are not being given sufficient time to review the information before meetings and that full details are not being provided.
- X. New Business

- a. "Impediments to Progress" report written by Gary Krahenbuhl. There were concerns about the document and how it might be perceived and used.
- b. Surveys. Senator Thomsett-Scott reported that the University Survey Committee was interested in determining whether survey results were being sent to faculty by their Deans, would the information be useful, and whether a presentation on current results at a Senate meeting would be useful. EC members did not recall seeing the recent data but would be interested in reviewing it and potentially using the data, and thought a presentation would be useful.

XI. Comments for the Good of the Order. None.

XII. Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Beth Thomsett-Scott, Faculty Senate Secretary.