



Meeting: Faculty Senate Meeting, 9 April, Wooten Hall Room 322

Present: Atkinson, Babcock, Baker, Benet, Bratton, Chandler, Chen, Cole, Conover, Donahue-Wallace, Emmanuel, Figa, Harrell, Harris, Hayes, Heidelberger, Hill, Johnston, McPherson, Mueller, Nagoaka, Oldmixon, Pavur, Perez, Plummer, Pohlen, Sahliyah, Seligmann, Swan, Thomsett-Scott, Todd, Turner, Wallace, Wells, Windsor,

Absent: Catalano, Clower, Cox, Cushman, Doherty, Eddy, Holt, Jagadeeswaran, Mikler, Packard, Peters, Reidy, Weiller,

Guests: Michelle Mears, Margie Lagledger, Celia Williamson, Dan Peak, Richard Fossey, Frances van Tassell, Michael Nieswiadomy, Jacque Lambiase, Carolyn Bobo, Donna Keener, Bill McKee

Opening: Michael McPherson, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 2:01 PM

- I. **Introduction and Welcome.** Chair McPherson welcomed attendees and noted that the music was provided by Mark Ford and Panama Steel from the album PanMan.
- II. **Approval of Minutes** (March 12). Approved unanimously.
- III. **Committee Reports**
 - a. No report from the Committee on Committees.
 - b. No report from the UCC
 - c. **Core Task Force Committee.** Dr. Celia Williamson presented the report of the Core Task Force. The activities of the committee were provided along with a motion to accept the objectives for the core as described. Dr. Williamson noted that the objectives were developed from the faculty and UNT community forums, input from the faculty survey, and comments on the wiki. She added that the motion is to accept the objectives and that the fall will be used to identify and propose courses to meet the objectives. The report was accepted unanimously. Senators Swan and Sahliyah motioned and seconded to accept the objectives. A Senator asked about the intent of the word "English". Dr. Williamson responded that it was intended to include communication, language, and rhetoric. Another Senator questioned whether there would be sufficient courses to cover all the objectives. Senator Swan responded that he believed it to be doable as did Dr. Williamson. The motion to accept the objectives was passed with four abstentions.
 - d. **Faculty Handbook Committee.** Dr. Williamson noted that the committee is essentially on hold until the policy manual has been updated. However, they have had several online meetings to review what other universities are doing and all members participated. The report was approved unanimously.
 - e. **Teaching Assistants/Teaching Fellows Committee.** No committee members were present. Senator McPherson noted that he is a colleague of the chair and is reasonably knowledgeable about the activities of the committee so volunteered to present the report. The one charge that the committee was not able to complete was the development of a university-wide pedagogy sessions for TFs. When schools and colleges were surveyed about this option, there was overwhelming disagreement as they feel that each discipline is unique enough to warrant its own pedagogy session. There was some discussion that there were sufficient similar principles to have a common session. Senator McPherson noted that there is a general sense from the committee that every school and college will soon have their own course. Report was accepted unanimously.

- f. **Faculty Senate Budget Committee**. The report was postponed until the May Senate meeting.
- g. **Ad Hoc Legal Committee**. Richard Fossey, chair of the committee, presented the report. This is the second part of their charge to investigate the relationship between the Office of the General Council and faculty at UNT Denton. The report focused on the tensions due to the 2004 promotion and tenure issues with the core controversy over whether the Provost should have provided written rationales for denying tenure. The recommendation was that the Provost should provide written rationales for denying tenure in a timely manner and that this should be written into the promotion and tenure policies. There was a discussion that since the Office of the General Council (OGC) represents the university, it cannot effectively represent faculty without the appearance of a conflict of interest. It was suggested that when there is conflict between the University and the faculty, the URC should have separate counsel. It was noted that there have been issues of the OGC offering advice to faculty and then acting contrary to the advice in later matters. Additionally, there are cases where the faculty member should be represented by an independent council experienced with academic law rather than by another faculty member. There was a concern that if faculty have legal council then the situation may become more adversarial. It was also reported by a Senator that there is concern over a lack of response from a Freedom of Information Act requested until forced. Dr. Fossey noted that the policy manual currently indicates that the OGC should represent faculty. Another Senator discussed a concern that the OGC did not provide full information on the tenure cases to all parties which put faculty at a disadvantage. Senator Seligmann noted that the OGC had acted more as an arbitrator in previous years and had fairness at the top of their concerns. He suggested that the University should formally apologize to the faculty involved in 2004. Senator McPherson requested a motion to accept the report to allow it to be passed on to the Provost for action. Senators Swan and Sahliyah motioned and seconded. In response to a question, Dr. Fossey noted that the committee had received documents related to an appeal and responses from the OGC and that these would be included in the final report which will be posted on the Senate web site. Dr. Dan Peak was recognized by Senator Cole. Dr. Peak noted that the Public Information Office appeared to consider the University as their client rather than acting in an unbiased manner. There was then a discussion about the need for pulling out recommendations from the report or having the committee continue their work by providing other recommendations. Michael Nieswiadomy was recognized as a member of the Ad Hoc Legal and the Chair of the UTC. He reported that the revised Promotion and Tenure Policy will be presented at the May Senate meeting and he welcomed suggestions to take back to the committee relating to the report under discussion or any other issue. It was clarified that the UTC's work is subject to the approval of faculty, although it was unclear whether a Senate vote would be sufficient or whether the revised policies would need to be approved by a faculty referendum. It was noted that some parts of the current policy are decided ambiguous and need rewriting. There was a friendly amendment to include all relevant attachments related to the report. This was accepted by Dr. Fossey. The motion to accept the report carried with one abstention. Several Senators discussed the role of an Office of Inspector General which is an independent entity and ensures that all policies are followed by all members of the organization. It was asked whether the Compliance Office would help with the issues. However, it was believed by several members that faculty issues are beyond the purview of the office. There was a motion to charge the Ad Hoc Legal Committee to develop explicit recommendations for action items related to the behavior and representation of faculty by the Office of General Council. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

h. **Charter and Bylaws Committee**. Richard Wells. Senator Wells presented the report. He noted that the only charge not completed was that of creating a Senate Operating Procedures manual due to lack of time. The report was accepted with one abstention.

IV. **Report of the Provost**. Dr. Wilkins was unavoidably absent. Dr. Williamson offered to respond to any questions after she noted that the Workload and Promotion and Tenure Policies would be presented at the May Senate meeting. A question was asked concerning the release of the current promotion and tenure decisions. Senator McPherson replied that he had discussed this with the Provost earlier and the information is expected out by the end of the month. In response to a question, Dr. Williamson reported that the results of the external graduate education review team are in the hands of the 5 member internal review team. There was a discussion of the annual report required from all centers and institutes. Several Senators noted that the data asked for is very specific and frequently difficult to break out from current data. While some centers have employees to help with this process, others do not and the burden is placed on faculty. Dr. Williamson suggested that they e-mail the Provost with their concerns and added the Provost is aware that this is a new process and some issues may be encountered. Senator McPherson suggested that the Provost could send out group e-mails when similar concerns were experienced by several centers or institutes. Dr. Williamson noted that there is an official list of centers and institutes involved in this annual report process. The Sunset Review process occurs every 7 years and the administration felt that this was not frequent enough to provide timely intervention with any issues. The goal is to have the annual report process identify any issues, provide opportunities for known excellence, and to ensure the good working of UNT institutes and centers. The annual process should also increase awareness of these areas and provide more opportunity for rewards for efforts. The question was raised where the sunset review was a policy and if so why was the policy changed to the annual report without notice and without a new policy in place. Dr. Williamson will take this concern back to the Provost.

V. **Report of the Vice Chair**. Senator Wells presented his report. In addition to the report provided, he noted that the Development Leave policy recommendations from several years ago are being looked at by the Provost and the revised policy should be presented soon. He requested more data and feedback on issues with textbooks. There was some concern over the results of the Delaware Study being used in place of the normal departmental annual report since it was unclear if all faculty responded and that several noted that they completed as a "questionnaire" rather than as a comprehensive review of their activities. In addition, it had been noted that the questions did not represent some of the activities faculty participate in and did not cover some of the disciplines very well. Dr. Williamson noted that there is a new system for faculty evaluations which should be available in the fall or early spring. This system would allow faculty to keep a database of their activities which can be used to create resumes and annual reports. The initial data entry will be completed by students, then faculty will be responsible for keeping the data current. A question was raised concerning the policy on modified service. The current policy is ambiguous and not being followed. Senator Wells responded that it is being revised and will be available shortly. There was some concern that the benefit of modified service will not be available to all faculty or that it would be unequally applied. The concerns will be taken to the Provost. The Partner Accommodation policy will be verified that it includes "partners" in the broadest sense.

VI. **Report of the Senate Chair**. Senator McPherson presented his report. He encouraged Senators to review the revised forms from the Research Office and noted that there are small research grants available up to \$1000 and matching funds for travel for grant achievement purposes such as NIH visits. Senators were encouraged to complete the evaluation of administrators. It was noted that some administrators can review themselves.

There is no “desired” response rate per se although there needs to be “sufficient” responses from each department for department responses to be used.

VII. **Unfinished Business.**

- a. **Charter and Bylaws Revision.** The second reading of the Charter changes to provide a mechanism for lecturers to sit on Senate took place. There was a lot of concern about lecturers being considered “faculty”, although there was support for them to be represented on Senate and general agreement that they need governance and protection; however, the wording needs to be adequate to provide for some representation but sufficiently strong to avoid the appearance that lecturers are “faculty”. There was also concern over not including Chairs in Senate activities as they are considered faculty by the State of Texas and may contribute valuable insight into some issues. There was a motion to table the revision which was seconded and passed with 4 opposed votes. Bylaws section 2 was tabled as it related to the previous section. Motion passed unanimously. Section 29 of the Bylaws relating to the creation of a Committee on the Status of Persons of Color received first reading.
- b. **Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics.** Dr. Bill McKee presented his perceptions and described his experiences with COIA. The NCAA is working effectively to ensure that academics are an integral and essential component of intercollegiate sports. Dr. McKee added that COIA tends to promote members as agreeing to all of COIA’s agendas and principles. There are no benefits to joining. Dr. McKee noted that there several Texas organizations who are members of COIA but did not remember who they are. Senator McPherson noted that he will entertain a motion to join COIA when desired. No motions were made at this time.

VIII. **New Business.** No new business

IX. **Committee of the Whole.** Senator Seligmann noted that there are two sessions offered as part of the Seminars in Texas History. The Green and White Football game will be held on Saturday.

X. **Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.

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