

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 8, 2008

Transcription

Chair Clower: Good afternoon everybody. It's a bright sun shiny day, mild temperatures and the ragweed is in full bloom. So we're doing good today, right? It's a lovely Texas fall day.

We're going to have what we hope to be a comparatively brief agenda compared to last time. We won't try to keep you too long. We will move right on into our agenda. We're going to start today with a little briefing by Dr. Belinda Newman. Dr. Newman joined us about a year ago as Ombuds, and I think she's going to give us just a brief update on what all she's been doing and what she does.

Belinda Newman: Thank you, Terry. Thank you for inviting me today. It seems like just a few months ago I was here for the first time. What I would like to do is give you, as Terry said, some brief information about what the Ombuds office does. I think most of you probably know that. Then I want to give you some snapshots of aggregate data from last year's cases.

The Ombuds is a safe place to seek guidance and to talk to someone about workplace concerns or issues. The Ombuds that we have set up here at the University of North Texas follows the International Ombudsmen Association Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice. The four main tenets of that are confidentiality, neutrality, informality and independence. It's extremely important when a visitor comes to visit me for the first time I spend time explaining what each of those four tenets mean. I would say confidentiality is the most important of those, but also informality. I go to great lengths to explain that the process and opportunity of coming to the Ombuds is not one of the formal processes provided by the university, such as filing a complaint or grievance, pursuing legal action. It provides the visitor with an opportunity to informally address their concerns or issues.

Why an Ombuds? I also do presentations on conflict, conflict resolution and conflict management. As you all know in an organization, especially one of this size, conflict is inevitable. The Zen sarcasm is one of my favorite explanations as to why conflict is inevitable. To use the example, we have conflict with people we like even. Conflict is something that is very normal among people in an organization. I think it's also important when we're talking about the informality to distinguish what an Ombuds does and what an Ombuds will not do. Some examples, an Ombuds is there to listen to faculty and staff concerns, to help the visitor identify options to resolve problems informally, to explain university policies and procedures, to gather information. Sometimes I'll make phone calls, assisting people to find out more information about their situation. I do coaching for people, especially about having difficult conversations. I think the philosophy is that it's always better if you can handle the conflict or the issue at the point of first contact. What an Ombuds does not do is, number one is, take sides. An Ombuds is a neutral or impartial person.

As the Ombuds, I do not keep official records. In fact I hardly even keep notes other than very basic demographic information. I don't make decisions for anyone. Although I will tell you many times while visiting with people, we will talk about multiple options and some people will still say, "What should I do?" I'll say, "Well, let's talk about those options again and what each of those mean for you." I don't make or enforce university policy and certainly don't serve as a place to put the university on notice. I can tell a visitor what those processes might be, if that's something they decide they want to pursue. I don't serve as an advocate for any one site.

Most people that come to the Ombuds office are mostly concerned with privacy and confidentiality because of the types of issues they want to talk about. The Ombuds office does assure confidentiality. The exception to that would be if there was risk of imminent harm to a person. The Ombuds office as of now, across the nation, does not have absolute privileges to absolute confidentiality. That is some legislation that we're working on. But in reality we work with the President, with the Legal General Council to assure that from the organization stand point that they would not use the Ombuds office to subpoena and gather information. Again, that's why we go to such great lengths in terms of the practices of not taking notes and not keeping records.

As you, I think, probably know the first Ombuds we had at UNT was actually a faculty Ombuds. It was started I think by the actions of the Faculty Senate in getting that accomplished. The university Ombuds reports to the President, again not about any individually identifiable information, but I provide aggregate data on the types of cases and numbers that I have dealt with over the year and also provide trend information and suggest any policy recommendations. There have been several that have come up just over the past year. For example, I actually started a few cases in December when I came on late in the semester. I think there were about 68 individual cases last year. Not surprising, the majority of the cases that visitors had issues with were supervisory relationships. Second to that were peer and colleague relationships and the next one was career progression. That could be someone looked over, it could be someone not having opportunities that they think they should have. Again in these faculty and staff are lumped together. As I shared with the Executive Committee, as I have more cases I'll be able to give a little more detail and breakout what were the faculty's main issues versus staff. My main concern is protecting that information that is individually identifiable. As the number of cases is larger I'll be able to break that data out in even more detail.

The classifications: Actually through the spring semester the visitors that came to the Ombuds office were fairly evenly distributed among faculty and staff. In the summer, not surprisingly there was more staff that availed themselves to the service. I have students there, even though as it's set up the Ombuds technically doesn't see students, I have to use my discretion on this. There were a few cases that involved staff, it wasn't just a student issue. The nature of the case was such that I agreed to help with that.

Types of actions that we're taking this year: Number one is what I label "self" in coaching. My goal as the Ombuds is to help the person and address the issue at the point of contact and see if they can't go back and deal with the person they have the conflict or

issue with. Sometimes it's a facilitated communication, sometimes people just need information, and sometimes it's a referral to another office. An example of that may be sexual harassment. If someone comes to me and they want to report that, obviously the Ombuds office doesn't take notice but I'll refer them to HR, to the Office of Equity and Diversity, or to the Office of Compliance, maybe another one.

The primary method of communicating is people make appointments and come to the office. Thirty-four percent of the visitors have the meeting over the phone or discussion over the phone. The one thing I do discourage is email. I'll say it time and time again. Email is appropriate for information about the Ombuds office, to set up an appointment if you would like, but please if you know people are coming or if you are suggesting they come visit the Ombuds, please encourage them not to send content about their visit via email. Here is the contact information. I now have an assistant in the office, Melody Parlett, who is actually a former student of UNT. She's doing a fabulous job.

That's the very brief presentation. If there are any questions, I'll take two or three. Help y'all stay on schedule. Any questions? Any comments? I cautiously say, "Any suggestions?" After this if any of you would like to call me with any questions you may have, I know that several of you as faculty have encouraged your colleagues to come. I don't know specifically who that is, but people have said, "A fellow faculty member has encouraged me." Some faculty have said their dean encouraged them. So I appreciate that. This service is here as yet another opportunity that we can create a work place that is safe and productive and people enjoy their job. I'm going to leave a few brochures up here. You don't have to take them, but you may know someone who should.

Chair Clower: Great. Thank you. Let's see. I do not see anyone here from Institutional Compliance so we'll skip over that section and come back to it if we need to. Next up we're going to have a quick presentation by Joseph Oppong on the Graduate Review.

Joseph Oppong: Thank you very much, Terry, and good afternoon. Thank you very much for allowing me this time to appear before the Faculty Senate. I'm Joseph Oppong, a professor in Geography. I chair the Graduate Review Committee. Clearly this semester at UNT graduate education is at the forefront of everything else, and you are probably going to receive some emails from me announcing different things we're going to do to get your input on the whole reform that is taking place within graduate education at UNT. In the spring last semester we had an external Graduate Review Committee that came and looked at our program and provided a report. Subsequently we posted that report on the web and allowed faculty members to post comments on that report. Provost Wendy Wilkins then appointed an internal Graduate Review Committee to "be her eyes and ears" as she tries to implement that report. Our job is to try to look at that report, gather input from faculty and graduate students, and provide input for her as she tries to reconstruct our graduate school and take us where we want to be at a research university. What we have done as a committee, which comprises of: Ana Cleveland, David Schwarz, Kathleen Whitson and Ruthanne Thomas. We are regular faculty just trying to give input to the Provost as she tries to restructure our graduate education. The idea here is that all the frustrations you have had, concerns you've had about graduate education, this is the

time to air them. My committee is going to try to do everything we can to get as comprehensive input as possible for the Provost.

My idea, my goal is that you will not make decisions in darkness, in a vacuum. Your opportunity is to provide input to us so that we can provide feedback for the Provost. We have provided several opportunities. Number one we posted the report on the web. Right now we have created an email address, igrc@unt.edu. That comes only to the committee. No one else sees it. We're going to have two open forums, and you probably should have received an email about that. Thanks to Kathy Nichols, she helped me to send that email. There's Monday October 13, 11- 12:30. To cater to the faculty that teaches Monday-Wednesday-Friday. Then Thursday October 16, 3:30- 5pm. That is for those that teach Tuesday-Thursday. We're trying to make it possible for you to provide some input. In order to do that, we have selected multiple locations. We are going to use modern technology so you can go to any of these three centers: Chilton Hall, Gateway, and Discovery Park. We listed all that in the email we sent. Please, please, please, this is your opportunity to provide input. In addition to that we have focus groups. Within the department forums we might not be able to capture everything, so we have two focus groups for graduate students. We have one for department chairs, and then we have one for graduate program advisors. We think we will have about ten people in each focus group, again to try to get some in depth information from that. In addition to that, we have created a wiki. [Note: Graduate Education Review wiki address: citc.unt.edu/untranet-SharePoint] Faculty will be able to go to that wiki and provide input on there.

Our committee, the Internal Graduate Review Committee, is going to do everything we can to represent our view point as faculty to the Provost so that she can make some important decisions. That's about all I have to say. Are there any questions for me before I run away? He said only five minutes, so we have to make it quick and snappy.

Senator Cherry: This wiki is on the Faculty Senate website?

Joseph Oppong: We will connect it to that, but we'll send an email to the entire faculty. Thanks to Kathy again, so that you have access to that. What we're going to do, the forums on Monday and Thursday of next week, we're going to tape it, we're going to review it and destroy the tapes within 48 hours. That's our commitment to you. We know that confidentiality is important to many of us. So it's our commitment to you that we'll do it. We'll have to sit up late and review the tapes, but that's what we're going to do. We want to try to remove every obstacle to you participating in this restructuring. This is something we're going to live with for a long time. You know we are searching for a new Graduate Dean. The idea here is whatever structures we are changing will be in place so we can live happily ever after with whoever comes in.

Chair Clower: Any other questions for Joseph? Alright, well thank you very much. You like a man who has high ambitions, we'll be happy forevermore, right? Now Foster Roden and Hillary Talatzko, who are respectively the Faculty and Staff representatives

for the State Employee Charitable Campaign, are going to come and tell you why you need to open up your pocket books.

Foster Roden: If there's anything left in them after the month we've been in.... Hillary and I are excited about working with you this year for the SECC. Let me just start out by saying, "Que dia precioso." See what a lovely day outside and here you are doing the work of the university and the faculty. I like that, but you have to remember things could be worse, couldn't they? We could be employed in the financial sector. Think of the parable of the tortoise and the hare. We're tortoises; we haven't made the big bucks lately. Some of you may have. Just think of the people in New York and the financial sector now who are incurring a great deal of cost. Hillary and I are excited about what's going on here on the campus, even though our 401b's have been devastated, not just decimated. Decimated means reduced ten percent, right? I wish my 401b had been decimated but alas it has been devastated. At any rate, our income hasn't been affected yet, though Hillary and I were wondering when the university would ask us as individuals if we would accept a pay cut of thirty percent in order to stay employed as we struggle through this depression.

The idea here is we want to get you to plug in to helping others. Maybe the pain, the cost of helping others has gone up as a result of what's happened to your 401b, and now you know you're going to have to work another 17 years rather than another three years before you can retire. Yeah, me too. We are interested in getting you plugged in, and I want to point out right now that each one of you may be a representative to the SECC or if not, that you do have a representative to the SECC.

Where we stand right now, we started on October 1, we presently have 44 faculty members who have donated and alas the staff 179. It's interesting to me as a fac-type (that's faculty, not factoid) that as a faculty member, the staff doesn't just decimate us, it devastates us, right? The number of staff people who donate to this, it's just remarkable. Here on the campus we have several areas on the campus who have donated nothing. They're contribution of all of the members of their area, some are departments, some are centers, no matter how many people they have, 500 or 26, zero contribution. What Hillary and I are trying to do is - we're trying to get these people to step up to the plate and not give \$1000 each. Hey, give me a break, but you can give as little as a \$2 single donation or \$2 a month. What we're interested in is getting these people to give at least \$2 a month. Hillary has something that she designed. Hillary, what is this?

Hillary Talatzko: Basically, each departmental area has a coordinator and we compiled the totals of how much you gave last year, and we had each area coordinator to set a goal, because we know that \$190,000 is a huge goal for us to look at for a small department. If you just look at what you gave last year and up that a little, then we'll meet our \$190,000 with no problems. You might look for this in your department. We're going to be inching it up every week. We'll let your coordinator know where each department stands. Hopefully we can meet at least our last year's actual. If we do that we can meet our goal.

Foster Roden: I started to say this should be displayed in a prominent place in your departmental area, but probably not because some of them are going to say that we gave zero last year. We're concerned about increasing. The percentage increase on zero would be what, Mike? Anything divided by zero would be a lot. I don't remember. It kind of blows my mind. At any rate, I want to try to get everyone to give something. I want us as factoids, not faculty types, to annihilate the staff. I want us to go up and have 80% of the faculty give something. Now, Jonathan Swift, one of my favorite poets, said, "*Self love but serves the virtuous mind to wake, as a small pebble stirs a peaceful lake.*" I want to toss a pebble into this group, and I want your self love to motivate you to do something tomorrow because tomorrow we have an event. What's going on tomorrow, Hillary?

Hillary Talatzko: We're doing the Celebrity Waiter event again this year at the Avesta. Every Thursday we'll have some celebrity wait staff that will be there. This week it's the administrators. It will be tomorrow from 11-1:30 pm. You get a dessert this year with your meal, which is unusual. All the tips from the day will go to the SECC. We're going to try to make a competition between administrators, staff, faculty and students to try to see who can raise the most.

Foster Roden: Tomorrow is the administrators. Keep in mind that it would be great if the proceeds went to SECC. There are some events on campus where that's going on. Alas here not even the profits go to the SECC, which you know you can always make it to where your profits are zero, certainly for tax purposes, but what we're looking at here are the tips that will go to the SECC. We're going to have some administrators over there working. Gloria Cox for one, I don't know, some of the others are going to be there tomorrow, walking around serving water and getting your dessert and shaking the jar for tips right in front of your face. So if you can be there tomorrow starting at 11 am. It's a good excuse for you to go over to the Avesta and enjoy a good meal, but also to kick in a couple of bucks for the SECC. What else Hillary?

Hillary Talatzko: One more thing we want to stress is the NT Foundation is one of the charities you can give to. You cannot designate to a specific scholarship fund or if you wanted to give to a specific area, like your department, you can't do that, but it does go to the President's General Cornerstone Fund. That is an option for you to give as well.

Foster Roden: If that doesn't sound like financial incest, I don't know what does. North Texas people give to the SECC campaign but designate it for the NT Foundation, but what the heck! That's part of it. "Self love but serves the virtuous mind to wake." Thank you for your attention.

Chair Clower: Thanks very much, Foster. One of the things that's important if you're donating through the SECC or choose to donate some money to the Foundation if you don't mind, identify who you are. Now when that becomes important is when we go to foundations, like a Meadows Foundation or somebody like that, seeking donations for the university, the degree to which, the percentage of our faculty and staff give to the university is one of the metrics they use in deciding whether or not you're worthy of getting funds from them. That is one way that we can help boost up that number. There

are other campaigns that Development will be issuing about that. Foster had to leave, of course, but I'm reminded my colleague Bud Weinstein has been talking about the markets a lot recently, maybe you've heard him on the news. What you've observed is they kept telling him he had to rebalance his portfolio, and he says, "Well, it's rebalanced now. It's no problem." Let's move along then.

You have before you the minutes of the last Faculty Senate meeting in September. Do we have any comments or obvious corrections we need to make? Can I have a motion? Senator Turner moves to accept the minutes. Do I have a second? Senator Swan seconded. Can we have a vote then? All in favor say "aye."

Senators: Aye.

Chair Clower: Any opposed? Thank you very much.

We have a report today coming from Celia Williamson Williamson, who is going to share with us all of the thoughts from the Administration Building, right? Now if you would please. She's going to talk to us a little bit about the core forums. And, if you would, anything new in the Academic Integrity Initiative or any of that.

Celia Williamson Williamson: I've noticed that everyone who has stood up here has talked about what a beautiful day it is outside and the meeting is already ten minutes ahead of schedule. I'll try to keep on that roll. As you are aware from our reports periodically here we are working on the core revitalization. We are in the process this semester of holding a series of "fora." I know I've been calling them forums, but I have a linguist as a boss and an English prof as a boss's boss. So it's fora. We've held one on Political Science, one on History, one on Math, and one on Natural Science. The purpose of those fora is to establish the required learning objectives for a course to be in the UNT core in that particular area. So far those have been fairly targeted areas. They have been attended by those out of the particular disciplines although there has been a scattering of other individuals. As we work our way through the semester the categories get a little bit broader. Towards the end we'll have visual and performing arts on Wednesday the 22nd of October. Also we'll have humanities on that day. We have an hour and a half set aside for each of those. October 29th, we'll have English and the Social and Behavioral Sciences. Starting at least, on November 5th, we'll be talking about the Institutional Option, which of course is the broadest category and the one in which we have the most flexibility. We put that at the end for a couple of reasons. One is as we're working our way through we will know what areas of our UNT core objectives have been claimed by those areas and we'll know what's left over that we need to attend to in the Institutional Option. It also allows us to extend the discussion of the Institutional Option beyond a single forum if we need to, so we can have plenty of time to hold that discussion. The goal though is by the end of this semester we will have proposed the required learning objectives for a course to be in the UNT core in any of the various areas that it might make application. Then in response to that, the fora recommendations and any comments gathered in relation to that go to the University Curriculum Committee. They review those proposals and send forward a proposed set to the Faculty Senate, and the Faculty

Senate has the final word on that. That's kind of how we're progressing through that. Because of the lag time in the UCC meetings and the Faculty Senate, we'll be taking the Faculty Senate action on those at either the very end of the semester or the early part of the spring semester. Then courses can say I know what the required learning objectives are. They take a syllabus, illustrate how they are attending to those and teaching those required learning objectives and take that syllabus to the Core Oversight Committee. The Core Oversight Committee will give a recommendation to the UCC for inclusion of those courses that meet that requirement, and then that comes forward. We should work through this whole process on an interim basis through this year and be ready to have them published in the catalogue for the 2010-2011 academic year. We talked about this before, but I'm glad to come and glad to encourage folks to attend those fora and also if you wanted to attend the UCC meetings where the discussions will also take place. Questions about that?

Senator Thomsett-Scott: What has the attendance been like?

Celia Williamson Williamson: The attendance so far has been relatively sparse, about eight individuals per session. But so far it's been very specific areas, Political Science, History, Math and Natural Science. They've been relatively sparsely attended. I'm anticipating that as the categories get broader, the participation will get broader. I saw another hand, YES –

Senator Miksa: Has information been put online as to what will be discussed at each one?

Celia Williamson – Yes, thank you – there is a website on the VPAA webpage. You scroll down, it says “Revitalizing the core” you can go in to that and it explains both the process and there is a link for each of the fora. And those that have already been done you can link in and see what the proposal is for those that have yet to be done you can link in and see what the options you might chose from are in those areas.

Senator Miksa: There will be a discussion period on the proposal. Those that are already on there – we will be able to comment on those?

Celia Williamson – you can send comments in. We have the for a – they are streamed through the following Monday, you can send comments to the faculty senate office and they will gather them or you can come to the UCC meeting, where they will be discussed and add comments there if you chose. YES

Senator ??----- This will go into affect you said in 2010?

Celia Williamson – Yes, 2010, Yes ---- Course as you are aware, we have to walk things through enough time to get the publication in hand and that sort of thing. Other questions in that regard?

Then I was also asked to touch base on the academic integrity work that is being done. This is also kind of an update I think from the last faculty senate meeting. Bill McKee is heading up a committee that looks at this. The challenge for us has been, that under our code of student conduct – Academic integrity issues ended up and their final reporting mechanism going to the VP for student development, rather than to the provost, because the student rights and responsibilities report under there. And that came really strongly to our attention a couple of summers ago when we had a graduate student who plagiarized on a thesis. The graduate school took action to remove that. The student appealed it and the final decision for that appeal went to the VP of student development. Now, of course, she worked carefully with the Provost and it wasn't that she usurped that authority, but it made it real clear to us that we needed to pull the academic integrity issues into academic affairs. So Bill McKee is heading up a committee to do that. We are approaching it in a step wise fashion. In fact, this is a little bit of a new development. We can immediately stop academic integrity issues from going to CSRR (Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities) by simply not referring them there. The policy allows that to occur. And we talked to the attorney's office and that is cool. So, we can immediately say, in fact we are recommending immediately, that faculty members not refer those on to CSRR. And handle those according to the standard grade appeals process and there are appeal processes in place in the departments. And we can do that immediately within our current existing set of standards. Okay.

Senator Cherry: The problem is there is no place that keeps any record, so if it is repeated behavior there is no record of that.

Celia Williamson: You are precisely right and that has been the reason that those have been going over there. And one of the things we are going to be doing – we don't want to set a new process in place mid semester – and so we have a new policy that will be – it is going through it's final approvals with the Provost, President and the legal office. We will have those out and ready to present and begin in January. But, we did not want to be mid-semester and do a change in terms of policy in that. Yes

Senator ?? : I'm sorry you said that you are recommending to faculty to NOT recommend students to the CSRR?

Celia Williamson: YES, and this is exactly the problem. Here's the "catch 22" we have on that, okay? Anyone that is referred to the Student's Rights and Responsibilities goes in to that current existing process and the resolution of that rests with Student Development. Okay? Which they and academic affairs feel like that is a little bit off kilter. We can avoid that by not referring those cases there and just handling them in the department and that is perfectly legitimate. The problem with that is that right now as the policy sets there is no way that a person who reports an academic misconduct issue in Political Science to know that that same student had a problem in science. And so we don't have that kind of cross-reference. That is one of the things that is immediately going in to place in the January proposal. So, and the policy allows that discretion of referring or not referring at this point in time. We will sit with that current policy through this semester with the recommendation that if the faculty members feel comfortable with

handling that within the department – they can keep that in academic affairs and not have to send it on. Come January this new process will be set in place. Actually a new interim process, in that the attorney’s office has developed a legally appropriate mechanism that we can put in place in January, but Bill McKee’s committee then will take a much broader look at it. We will look at how that policy is unfolding. We will look at if there are other ways that we want to do it and we will also work really carefully to assure that we are paying as much attention to educating in academic integrity as we are on dealing with academic misconduct. And there is a lot of discussion to be had around that because as the educational capacities of technology and that sort of thing evolve, and as we move more and more to encouraging students to do team projects and joint projects and that sort of thing. The area in our heads that sometimes seem really clear, it falls over here, we haven’t worked that nuance with our students to understand – How you fair it out – appropriate attributions, appropriate joint work, all of that sort of thing. And so the committee will help to address ways that we can educate the students early on. The early discussions of the committee will be that there would be some resources in place so that, early or first offenders can be given an educational option rather than a punitive sanction. But then, we go ahead and record that fact, they have had their – what is it, that drivers ed thing that you don’t get a ticket and you go to a – you get one of those, but we would know that you had one and so that we can deal with those sorts of things. And that broader nuance of how to handle it from an educational and supportive function but also so that we know what is going on on campus. Also so that we maintain what communication is appropriate to know that for example – a student is having issues with academic misconduct and also having issues with anger in their dorm. So there needs to be some carefully designed and controlled communication around those sorts of issues. And that’s the kind of nuance that Bill McKee and his committee will be addressing. And if that takes them a year to do that, we will have this interim already – approved interim process that can hold us in place until we can get the more nuanced version out. Does that make sense? Are there questions? I will be communicating, as soon as we get the final nod from the President and the Provost about the – a request from the faculty to consider keeping the academic misconduct issues in house for this semester, I’ll send a letter out to all the chairs and we will contact all the faculty members who either have made a referral either this semester and there are 2 or who made a referral last year. So that those people who have been most active in that system will get a personal notification about that and then towards the end of the semester we will send out the new procedures that will go into affect in January.

Senator Cherry: Could you explain why the urgency on that, that you are recommending the changes right away rather than waiting for the changes?

Celia Williamson: The urgency came out of a case that occurred over the summer.

Senator Cherry: But you said that got resolved satisfactory?

Celia Williamson: That particular case got resolved satisfactorily, as satisfactorily as we could manage. And so the since was that, as quick as we could responsibly handle it within academic affairs, that would be the thing to do. But, there will be no requirement

that faculty members not send it. The faculty member can make that choice this semester under the current policy. Thank you.

Chair Clower: Alright – thank you Celia Williamson. Okay, so, now I’m going to ask Beth to come up and deal with the committee reports, please.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Everybody should have the Fine Arts Committee report, which I don’t have a copy of right now

Celia Williamson: Yep, I accidently picked that up –

Senator Thomsett-Scott: I thought I was just doing the Committee on Committees but, my mistake. And this comes as a written report from the committee; it does not need a second. Is there any discussion on the report? All in favor of approving – say “aye”

Senators: Aye

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Abstentions? Negatories? Approved. Thank you.

Committee on Committees – I am very happy to report that we have all but one group with committee on committee reps, so I appreciate everybody stepping forward. And now that we have almost a full committee, we will be looking for a chair. So, hopefully next month you will see someone else other than me, as much as I have enjoyed it. The, let’s see, the report is in front of you. I have 2 write-ins : for Faculty Participation in Governance – Noreen Goggin from Group VI and Faculty Research Committee – Alan Mayper from Group V. Are there other nominations? And please note that I have listed – the executive committee gets to make several appointments to various committees. We are looking for someone to represent the faculty on behalf of the student government association and that involves attending their meetings which are held after this meeting. We are looking for a graduate council rep from the Category III segment. We will be initiating an ad hoc textbook committee. We are looking for about 3 faculty for that and also here in the Vice-chair’s report coming up, we have been asked to do sort of an ad hoc college and school charter review committee and we are looking for about 8 faculty members for that as well. So you may either, nominate yourselves or please take this back to your groups or departments and encourage people to come forward if they are interested. Are there other nominations? Okay. This report comes forward from the committee as well, so it does not need a second. All in favor of accepting?

Senators: Aye

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Opposed? Abstentions? Carried – Thank you!

And that brings us to the Vice-chair’s report. Whoa – I’m up here almost as much as Terry is – that’s bad.

Chair Clower – on purpose

Senator Thomsett-Scott: I - ah – see!

Our first item – we had an interesting discussion with the provost and the chair of the SGA, Jeff Kline. There are continuing issues with textbooks. This came up last year and also the year before. And what we are proposing to do again is to create a committee to look at this. The President herself has been involved in two textbook review committees at different organizations so she strongly supports this and you can see it is cost, availability, so it's not just a bookstore issue. But, it is also the whole cost and edition issue as well. Every 2 or 3 years textbooks come out with a new edition and that is another \$100 to \$200 dollars students have to pay for – do we really need the newest edition? What has really changed? And that is something for faculty to think about – is – if there is a 7th edition, is the 6th edition still valuable?

The SGA is working on a sales tax exemption and so that is a good move for them. And also, you may have seen it already, they also are working on a grant system where you can apply and have a book placed in the library system, whether it is Willis or Cytech for your course. How many people have heard that before, I just want to get a feel for – okay, so it is not as broadly known as I would have hoped. We actually have the grant and we will send it out to the faculty senate list serve and you can pass that along. A number of faculty have already applied and of course the libraries are very happy to have those books on reserve for the students. John?

Senator Windsor: Might I suggest that we investigate the ebook option? To investigate the ebook option/capabilities. UTAustin just started using this last week – you just put it on the list – it might be way too expensive for the university but a lot cheaper for the students.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: absolutely. There are different ways, different options and that will certainly be investigated.

Senator ????: Switching editions is hard on the professors because they have to re-prepare the course to some extent. But, it is my understanding that when the edition changes you can no longer get a hold of the old edition.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: That is another issue that is being raised as well. Good point. Yes, John, Jack, Senator Peters.

Senator Peters: Mine is just in response to that – sometimes students can get copies of the old edition and will faculty allow them to use a different edition if they can get a copy of it? So, that was a suggestion that faculty be more flexible – allowing students, if they can get a different edition, to use that instead of the most current edition.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Absolutely. And I think that does vary across disciplines. I think some disciplines textbooks are easier to get a hold of – or books – for example, in the literature section. While others do tend to go away after another edition comes out.

Any other thoughts or comments on that? Anybody interested in joining the committee? Okay, we'll move on. I just had to try.

We asked the President for an update on the Hurricane evacuees situation for UNT. There were 358 people served through our services. That is a good number. And lessons learned from Gustav provided smoother transitions for Hurricane Ike. And that was also good. There were 141 on-site and behind the scenes people who were involved including a number of students who came forward when a message went out – I believe at 2 am – suddenly there were 200 students, about ½ hour later willing to set up cots and services for the evacuees. So, that is wonderful. There were also recreational sports, children programs, library services, computer services, a lot of good activities. Costs for UNT will be reimbursed by FEMA. And the President wanted me to convey her thanks to everybody for helping out with this and she thought it was a really good heart thing to see UNT involved in. Comments/questions?

We Mean Green efforts: We asked about this item as well. They are hiring a Sustainability Coordinator. If you know anyone suitable for that, please send them forward. The Sustainability Council, headed up by Sam Atkinson, will provide a report to President shortly. Students are very enthusiastic. You see the “We Mean Green” shirts all over the place and refillable water holders. We had an interesting discussion about sort of environmental things on campus, and one of those was bicycles. There will be 250 to 500 spaces added over the next year. It sort of lead into a discussion about “should we have bike paths for the bikes instead of having them on the sidewalks where there have been several near misses”. Just to emphasize, that was just brought up so don't expect a whole lot of action on it. It was just a thought kind of thing. Thoughts? Comments on this issue?

Senator ????: Can I say something?

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Sure.

Senator ????: Just real quickly. This Friday and Saturday will be the first ever Annual Energy and Environment Forum at UNT. It'll be Friday afternoon and all day Saturday in the Environmental Building.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Excellent. So look for that. Yes?

Senator Guzman: I think it should be added that it is initiated by students, by North Texas Energy and Environment student group. We should recognize the student actions.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Thank you. The students have been, as was said, I think they are more enthusiastic than we are. They are very, very good at recycling. I've noticed that we have containers in the library and they're always full. That's good.

UNT a smoke-free campus? This was a question we were asked to bring up. This was just brought up so don't expect action on it. This does not mean the Faculty Senate supports it. It does not mean the President is going to act on it. It was just a very brief

discussion, and it's about UNT being a smoke-free campus. As you can see, the President reported that there have been no formal discussions on this issue and anything will have to be considered carefully. It will have to involve the Staff Council, Student Council, SGA. Given how involved the major discussion would be, we talked a little bit about making sure the ashtrays were moved 20 feet away from the building. As you know, there is a 20 foot limit when they're smoking. But if the ashtrays right by the door, where are you going to smoke? We were working to see if the Staff Council would be interested in bringing this up. I have to emphasize that this is a very small discussion.

Senator ????: Can you explain the tentativeness behind it? It is politically or economically...?

Senator Thomsett-Scott: The tentativeness of it?

Senator ????: Yeah, it is that charged an issue?

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Well, first of all, is it was just brought up to us to ask the President. It's not as if she's bringing it down to us as some kind of discussion. It may not have been the first time that she's heard that UNT should consider it, but it was the first time that we'd brought it up to her. There have been other campuses that have been made smoke-free, and there have been a lot of political issues around that. That's why if she does consider anything it will be fairly slow and broad consultation. Also, the smoking cessation programs, we thought that if we ever wanted to reduce smoking that would be a good way of getting something started. And again, to emphasize, it's just a question. Thoughts? Comments?

Senator ????: We have two faculty in the Psych department, one whose research area is smoking cessation and has a lab, and then one of our counseling psychologists at the Counseling Center has done grant work on smoking cessation. So we have two with experience already.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Excellent. New buildings on campus: As you know the CVAD will be getting a new building. We've been asked, "Why CVAD and not others?" Generally, it comes down to number of classes taught, where the faculty are located. I think CVAD has staff or faculty in four or five buildings.

Senator ????: What is CVAD?

Senator Thomsett-Scott: College of Visual Arts and Design. They're out of classroom space and student space. They have great needs. One of the things the President noted, if you are concerned that your department, college or school should be getting a new building, you need to be a strong advocate. We also raised the question of student study space. That's a major issue on campus right now, and that's one of the things that will be considered. Thoughts? Comments?

Other topics the President brought up: External funding has increased significantly. It's currently up 15.4% from last year. That's great, and that's just this fiscal year. As you heard the SECC is beginning its annual campaign. I also encourage you to participate where you can.

Provost Dr. Wilkins has asked us as Faculty Senate to develop a new group to do a periodic review of college and school charters. With the number of policies that have been added or substantially modified, she just wants a committee to be looking at whether schools and colleges are updating their charters to reflect the changes. Again, that is a new committee so if people would like to volunteer we welcome your names. Thoughts? Comments? Also, the Faculty Handbook Committee will be very active is developing a revised Faculty Handbook.

Non-academic appointments at Assistant and Associate Dean level: This was raised as an issue. There are some Assistant Deans, especially, who are not tenure-track faculty. If they are not faculty in those positions, they should be doing a fairly administrative job not working on anything related to academics. That lead into a discussion on where lecturers will fit into departments and administrative roles. The Provost's ultimate thought is that putting anybody into a position should be related to the skills needed for that position and the skill set of the people, whether it needs tenure-track faculty or needs a senior faculty member or not. Thoughts? Comments?

Adoption of the Lecturer Policy: We asked about this. All but one college has their own lecturer policy adopted. Schools and colleges should now be defining the rules of those lecturers, seeing where they fit in because there is a new promotion system for lecturers. They need to be developing rules for when lecturers should be promoted, what the requirements are, and those sorts of things.

Senator ????: So what you're saying in that last bullet is that policies regarding lecturers are not the same across the university?

Senator Thomsett-Scott: There are guiding principles that are laid out in the policy itself at the university level; but because the needs of the different schools and departments vary, there is some flexibility.

Senator ????: unclear question

Chair Clower: I don't think that was the central issue. I think that would be within their ranks of moving from a lecturer to a senior lecturer to a principle lecturer, allowing the college to set their own standards just as you would with differences that colleges might have regarding movement from assistant to associate professor or associate to full professor. That's the level. It's saying there will be an overarching policy at the university level, but there will be implementation issues decided at the college level.

Senator Cherry: There are some issues though. It would be nice to know whether they would be able to serve on Faculty Senate committees, for instance.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: That is an issue that will be addressed soon.

Senator ????: Those issues are addressed by this body.

Chair Clower: Yes, those will be addressed by us, not by these groups.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Whether lecturers are faculty and can sit on the Faculty Senate or Faculty Senate committees will be addressed by the Faculty Senate. But within your own school, your own college, how you want to manage when a lecturer should move from a one-year contract to a three-year contract to a five-year contract or a promotion from lecturer to senior to principle that is something that each college/school needs to think about. It's very different for someone in the sciences versus someone in the humanities; that's why it's not prescribed. Other questions, comments?

And then we have exceptions to the revised dead week policy. And short answer is, it has been looked at and there does not seem to be any conflicts with the academic calendar. So, should something arise it will be handled as needed. Thoughts, comments? Thank you.

Oh, Interdisciplinary hires, I have been up too long I think. And as you all know, this is not widely done at UNT and the Provost asked us to start thinking about multi-interdisciplinary hires, across departmental hires, across college and school hires. Just start thinking about it. Start looking at why it is not done and what may be done to promote it. And we do work towards a more multi-disciplinary nature, we do need to be able to hire faculty into those positions.

Senator Guzman: This is an issue that was committed on many times when we were developing Research Clusters. None of the ones that I participated was locally funded but one of the big let's say questions we had was say we need someone who is actually creating the link between area A and area B, where - who pays for that person?

Senator Thomsett-Scott: That is exactly right

Senator Guzman: I supposed that is where this proposal or this request is maybe thinking about.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: Exactly, and with research clusters it came up a lot. So it is definitely something on the radar and that is why we have been asked to start considering it.

Senator Turner: One of the challenges I guess in the review process for promotion and tenure. The ground rules can be vastly different from one location to another.

Senator Thomsett-Scott: exactly, there are a number of differences across colleges and schools and within the different disciplines. So it is a big issue. Thank you both for both of those comments. Other thoughts, comments? Thank you.

Chair Clower: Those are obviously issues that we will be taking on as we go through this academic year. Some of these will come up for some action or input by the faculty senate and in some cases we will be asked to have a substantial role. So we will want to – we will keep up with that as we move along. Largely today you have had a lot of informational items, just so you won't be surprised when these things come up.

We now have our director of compliance, Steve Hill who has joined us and I am going to ask him if he will to come up and give us a brief presentation. Uh, Steve just to let you know that we have had some hand out materials here for some of your stuff so the senators do have some of your handouts. In fact if you want one, I will let you have those, alright, you have all this memorized I know by now.

Steve Hill: Good Afternoon everybody. Alright – does everybody have – there is a couple of handouts that I am going to be discussing. At the top of one of them it says, Institutional Compliance Program – does anybody not have that? The other one is a document with the Attorney General of Texas Seal and name on it – Greg Abbott. Does anybody not have that? Okay.

Alright – it is a pleasure to be here with you. I think the last time I came to the Faculty Senate was back in February. I had only been here about 60 days. So, I am back here to continue a little propaganda about Institutional Compliance and also to make you aware of a couple of issues. First make you aware of it and then ask for your assistance in trying to resolve a couple of challenges that we have.

That second document with the attorney general on it, I'll be talking about that last. So, the first document will be the institutional compliance program and we always start out with just an overview of what the mission of the institutional compliance office is. And basically what we like to do is remind folks that we are actually a part of management. We are an independent part of management. We are charged with putting together an institutional compliance program that clearly demonstrates the universities commitment to compliance and ethics in conducting their business. The highest standards of ethics and compliance. A couple of things that we really are, the bottom line is – promoting compliance with all regulatory requirements. Now we actually, we actually promote compliance with all regulatory requirements but because we have limited resources and we can't look at everything. We really focus on federal and state requirements. That doesn't mean we ignore local or ordinances or anything like but if you can't do everything, you want to focus on the things that are going to get us in the most trouble. So, those tend to be federal and state requirements. But, we do promote compliance with ALL requirements. Our institutional compliance program should prevent accidental or intentional non-compliance. So, we don't care whether the non-compliant act was intentional or not we should have processes and monitoring procedures in place to detect it either way. And then once we do find that there is a non-compliant behavior, we insure

that that behavior is addressed appropriately and then also make sure we have processes and procedures in place to prevent that situation from happening again.

I've got two topics that I would like to share with you that we really need your assistance with – we have a challenge in meeting the requirements associated with the I-9 processing. An I-9 is basically the verification of eligibility and identity of new hires and we have a challenge in that. There is a couple of requirements from the immigration reform and control act that places a couple of time constraints on a couple of actions and we are having difficulty meeting those and I will share what those are. Back in November of 1986 is when this act was passed and basically it indicated that US employers had to verify the eligibility and identity of new hirers and also of current employees. In some industries you have jobs that terminate or they end. And when that contract ends and a new contract may begin and some of those folks have to reestablish their eligibility and identity. So, there are a couple of requirements here. On the form I9 there are basically the requirements are Section 1 of the I9 form needs to be completed by the new hire on the day that they start – their first day of employment. That is what the requirement is and in fact it indicates that it must be done at the time of hire. That means the person comes in with their required documents – on the form itself it tells you which documents you can use for verifying the identity and eligibility – it gives you a choice. So, in the actual process of hiring the person, you can communicate with the person and make them aware of the I-9 form and they can, before they even come in for their first day, can determine which documents they're going to use. When they come in on the first day, what we want you to do, the people responsible for handling processing, is to have that individual fill out that documentation the first action. Before we figure out where they're going to sit, before we start introducing them to anybody, we want them to fill these documents out. Produce the documents, fill it out, and then we can verify those. What we don't want is somebody that's not eligible to work to be working. What's happening in some cases now is it may even be well into the month before we find out that the person didn't complete the I-9. Now if we found that the person was ineligible, then we'd have a problem. I'm not even sure what kind of problem. We'd have to get with legal and figure it out. We've got a non-eligible person working for us. So the fact that they work for us, we're obligated to pay them based on the Fair Labor Act. Now we have an ineligible person. It's a mess. What we need to do is establish that right up front. As soon as they walk in the door, look at the documentation. If there's an issue we identify it right then and there, maybe we're twenty minutes into the day and that's not much of an issue. What we don't want to be is two, three weeks into the month and then we find out. In some cases, some people don't find out until they don't get a check. They want to know why. Well, you didn't do an I-9. Luckily if the person is eligible, you know, then it's not as bad. But if they were not eligible, then we would have a problem.

The act has a couple requirements. First is Section 1 must be completed by the individual new employee. It is our responsibility to make sure they do that. That's one requirement and it must be done the first day. The second requirement is Section 2 of the form must be completed within three business days. To complete that, that's the representative, whoever is responsible in your unit for in-processing people, they will review those documents, sign their name that they've reviewed them (the original document), and then

that document has to go over to Human Resources. It has to reach Human Resources and be accurate within three business days. That's the primary time table that we're missing there. Some of the examples of what's going on are we'll have an I-9 form that's taken over to HR, there's an error but there's nothing on the document to indicate where the individual works at because the person's not in the system yet. No stamp, nothing to indicate where the individual works. Now HR doesn't know who to contact to try to get the error corrected. One of the suggestions I'll have later on is maybe to put a stamp or write your business unit on there with a point of contact. That way they'll have a clear point of contact to get back with. The other issue is what we're going to try to do, even though we have three business days to get this over to HR, what we're asking folks to do is when the individual comes in and you have them complete the document, verify the document right after that, and that day, day one, get that over to HR. Not through campus mail, because we only have three business days. We can lose that in campus mail by itself. We're not allowing ourselves any leeway if there's an error in the document. Hand carry that document over to HR. What HR has agreed to do is that if you offer to bring that document over, hand carry that document to somebody over in Records, they will hand check that document on the spot while you're there. They have promised that they will be available, so you're not there waiting for twenty minutes for them to track down somebody. They said if you come to the front desk, let them know you have an I-9 form, you need somebody there from Records to verify the document, they'll do it on the spot. That way it's correct and we've met the requirements. The individual should have any issues with Payroll or anything like that. Although, Payroll is a separate issue. Some folks have tied I-9 processing with Payroll. I know when Payroll is, I know when the deadline is, so that's when they're going to get the I-9 in, but there's a three day turn around time on the I-9.

What is non-compliance? Non-compliance with the I-9 process is improperly completing the form. If the form's not completed properly then that's non-compliance. Next bullet item says non-compliance is improper retention. What they're referring to there is that you can have officials, either Homeland Security or Immigration officials that can come in at any time and request to see the documentation. That's what they mean by retention. The retention period for Form I-9 is three years from the date of hire or one year after termination of the employee. If they come in and ask, we're required to be able to show them that documentation. That's what this bullet right here refers to in reference to improper retention. Non-compliance is a failure to complete an accurate I-9 within the prescribed period of time. What we're looking to do is put more of an emphasis on getting that document, even though we have three working days, getting the document filled out first of all on the first day, so we don't have any eligibility issues, and then that document hand carried to HR the same day, and then that will clearly put us within the limits of the act.

Some of the penalties for non-compliance: an employer can be fined. These figures, I saw different figures in different documents. I looked in Regulation and that's where these figures came from. I saw a document produced by Homeland Security that had some slightly different figures. I put approximate in here. An employer can be fined \$100 up to \$1000 per violation for certain types of violations. Those actually pertain to a document

being incorrectly filled out. The person, let's say, is eligible but there was an error in the document. Based on the error in the documentation you could be held accountable to the tune of \$100-\$1000 per violation. An employer can also be fined anywhere from \$250 to \$10,000 for having an ineligible individual actually working, if you're allowing an individual who is not eligible to be working. Now some of those higher figures, like the \$10,000 figure, actually come into play when you have an infraction, you've been notified and then you have a repeat violation. That's when you can get up into that \$10,000 per violation. Also individuals that submit a false or forged document or knowingly falsely complete the I-9 form may be fined and/or imprisoned. So, we don't want to get into any of that.

How can we continue to ensure compliance? These are some suggestions that we've come up with in order to meet the requirements. Employees responsible for in-processing new employees, I don't know in your business area if you have a person that is designated to handle in-processing or handle filling out the documentation of new hires, but anyone who is designated to do that needs to have new hires complete the form, as we mentioned, on the first day and the first action of the day. This needs to be completed before anything else, as I mentioned before. You can incorporate this in conjunction with W-4 and other important documents. Now there's not a requirement on the W-4 or those kinds of documents, documents for direct deposit, but you can have them fill all of that out and then take all of that over there. Remember the requirement is on the I-9. We've got to get that over there, but there's no need to go over there twice. Just have them fill out all the documentation and take it over there once. Form I-9 needs to be delivered to Human Resources same day, preferably in the morning. The last bullet here is just a suggestion as I mentioned before. Since HR gets documents and they don't have a contact, don't know who to contact, if we can put a stamp on the I-9 form or just write in the business unit and a point of contact with an extension, would be very helpful. In case, say you get over there and someone's not available, they can't check it on the spot, then they will be able to contact you; and if there is an error, get that corrected and still be within the three business days. What we're going to do, Institutional Compliance is going to get with the Office of the President to ask at the President's Cabinet meeting to put out to all the VPs and just see. What we're trying to draft now is a diagram that will show every unit that falls under each Vice President. I mean all the way down, every unit. I don't know if we have a document. I haven't seen a document like that. But we're working with the budget folks to create a document that would identify every unit. Because what we want to do is make sure that every unit has someone that is designated essential in-processing point. Some of the things we've been told as we go out... HR is providing I-9 training right now; it started this week and is going to continue through the month of October. Some of the reports that we've seen, there are folks that are working for two or three weeks and the individual that is responsible for in-processing people and making sure the documentation gets filled out initially didn't even know who this person was. The person is already working. That's a problem. Hopefully the person is eligible to work. If not, we have a problem. We're thinking if we can identify all the units and give the Vice Presidents a list of all the areas that are under them, because we have some Vice Presidents with a lot of areas under their control, we just want to make sure we do that. Plus we have something coming up the road; I'll mention that to you in just a little bit;

where we really need to identify each unit. From a records management standpoint we have some initiatives that we want to pursue. That's basically it for I-9. For me, I'm a US citizen. It's pretty simple. Yes, hit the box. Sign it. But there are some situations for some folks that do require some reasoning and some analyzation of the documents. That's why HR is going out to provide the training to the folks responsible for in-processing people.

The next issue is disposal of personally identifiable, sensitive and confidential information. The problem here is some years ago, it was decided at UNT that we would do our own recycling. We used to outsource and it was very expensive. I forgot exactly how much it was. I think somebody told me \$42 per every few minutes or something. I'm like, that's crazy. They decided to do it in house. We have facilities that are responsible for that. We have a guy named Doug Turnage in charge of the program. Well, what happens is when his folks go around, we have recycle bins, some of them are locked, some of them are not locked. In theory, the locked boxes, we should be able to put sensitive information in there. That's why the lock is on there. It's supposed to be protected. But the problem with that is we don't know, in many cases, where those locked bins are. They're not in controlled areas. The only way that works is if that locked recycle bin is in an area that's controlled. What do we mean by controlled? It means that if I go in and I can take that bin and roll it out without anybody telling me anything, that's not controlled. And really that lock on there is only protecting you from us, people that are not going to do you harm anyway. Someone that really wants to do you some harm, the lock on that box is not going to help you at all; they're going to roll that out to their vehicle. They're going to take it wherever they go, bust the lock and then try to get your information. Now when we talk about identity theft, almost always it's mentioned and tied to something financial. They steal your identity so they can create accounts and charge things to you. Sometimes the goal of the crooks is to just gain access to the network at UNT. I just need enough information to get access to get into the network at UNT, and then I can go and surf and get the information that I'm looking for. So sometimes the goal is just information to get in the network. You'd be surprised how little information you need to be able to do that. The old days of dumpster diving, now they do it electronically instead of going in the dumpster. Well I guess they still do that too. We don't want to provide a hard copy. It's already hard to protect electronic information; we don't want to provide hard copy information. In general, most records require some kind of documentation of disposal. The retention period for a record must first be determined. We've had some individuals who clean out their desks and just take them and throw the documents away. But if the document is a record, there is an established retention period for it. We have a records retention schedule. On this document here, where you see these links, what I will do is I will make sure that we get this document to you electronically and then you can go ahead and click on the link without having to type all this information in in order to get it. There is a records retention schedule that will tell you for the most part when that document is to be disposed of. Documents containing personally identifiable, sensitive and confidential information, and we've got down here including student grades, grade reports and transcripts, need to be shredded instead of being placed in a recycling bin. Now, I guess, grades are available through EIS. Now there are some folks who put together spreadsheets, and they take the place of grade books, I've been told. What we're seeing,

the recycling folks will go in and empty a recycling bin, either locked or unlocked, and if they find in the unlocked box information in there that they consider sensitive information, they will bring it to Compliance. What we're doing is we're taking it back to whoever is in charge of that department to share what we found. We're finding grade documents with names and socials and student IDs and employee IDs. We found one document in one area that I was just amazed at the amount of information they had on the individual. If we sat down in this room and tried to come up with one document that would cover about as much information as you could find out about an individual, we would probably still have missed one of the items that was in this document. I mean everything: name, social, address, parent's information, next of kin, picture of the driver's license, copy of a credit card. I mean amazing! Just amazing! It was just thrown in the recycling bin. These documents basically once they reach their approved retention period it's okay to get rid of them, but you have to look and see if there is any sensitive information on there.

At the bottom of page 2, there are examples of what could be considered personally identifiable information. We stress on here "could," because some of this information, going on to the top of page 3, folks have told us that some of this information is directory information. So why is that confidential information? What I say is, "If a document can be tied to an individual, even by name..." Like I said, I don't know what the crook's after. I don't know what the crook is after. We have no idea; maybe just to identify an individual. If you can identify an individual, then I would be careful about the information whether it's directory information or not. What we wanted to do was give some examples. Whenever we cover this, sometimes it irritates a few people. "That shouldn't be on the list." Usually what we're fussing about is not even the issue. It's the other thing with the credit card, social and all that. That's really the full thing. What we did was found in some federal examples of what could be considered. What was in there was full name if it's not a common name. If it's some name that's not common, then that individual could be identified just by name only. Again, it depends on what the individual is looking for. Social security number definitely, student ID number, employee ID number, and what we've seen in the past, I think almost everybody knows except whoever threw that document away the other day, you know safeguard a social security number, but maybe not so much an employee ID or a student ID. But for our purposes at UNT it's the same thing. To get access into our system all you need is an employee ID and a date of birth, and you're in. So, that's what we're looking at.

Sensitive items: If you do have any sensitive items and you need them destroyed or disposed of, on page 2 this is the information, all you have to do is call Recycling Services. They will come to your desk and pick the information up. It doesn't get any easier than that. Doug Turnage's crew will do that. There's also a web link to that. Just give him a call and they'll come get it. Are there any questions?

Senator Kaminski: Is that an absolutely secure system? How do they transport that?

Steven Hill: We followed them; we went with them one day. They came and picked up some stuff from us and then we went back. They lock their truck. They come in and get

the items. They carry the items with them, unless it's too much to carry and they'll take it back to their truck, lock the truck and keep going back and forth. Once they're finished they take it straight back to the Facilities area and they have an actual caged area. If they don't destroy it on the spot, then they will put it in this locked caged area until they can get to it. Normally, once they finish their runs they actually start destroying the items right away. They have a conveyor belt driven shredder. They just put the documents on there and put them right through.

Senator Kaminski: Speaking of small and large quantities being put in not locked bins, we have counseling files that periodically we need to destroy according to the records. We generally have a lot accumulating in a locked room.

Steven Hill: Access? There's no way?

Senator Kaminski: They're in a locked room until we're ready.

Steven Hill: The test is can somebody get in there and get it by? If they go in there and put their hand on it, as soon as their hand gets on it somebody should be addressing them. That's really the test on whether it's truly controlled. Let Doug's folks know this is sensitive information. I need for this to be destroyed immediately. If you let them know that, then even if they have other stuff they'll front load that. So when they get there, they'll destroy that. Let them know that it's sensitive. Now tests, if there are some folks that don't want tests, then you have to figure out. You could even take your documents over there and have them destroy it instead of trying to feed it into some of these small feeders and tearing them apart. You can coordinate with them and take it over there and watch them. They'll do it right there in front of you.

Additional safeguarding concerns: If you read some of this stuff right here, this is just safeguarding information. If you store information, more and more we're going to electronic information. If you store it, we'd like for you to have it on the network. Put it on the network, not on your PC. Store on the network, so we know there is appropriate firewalls, appropriate backup for it. Access to trying to get it is going to be a lot tougher than it being just on your hard drive. So, no sensitive information on anyone's hard drive. Make sure that it's on the network. If you have any questions about that just call your tech support folks, and just say, hey, I've got some stuff and I want to put it on the server, the network server. They'll help you.

Senator Swan: Are you including grade books?

Steven Hill: Ok, the information now on grade books. What's in them?

Senator Swan: A person's name and grade. I suppose some still have the student ID.

Steven Hill: Now that information.... Your question is in reference to?

Senator Swan: About network or PC.

Steven Hill. Ok. Yeah, I would keep everything on the network, on the server. Mine is an H drive or S drive. I would keep it on the network. I wouldn't keep it on my hard drive. Just so somebody does not get access to that information. Question?

Senator ??????: In my experience the hard drive is really limited in terms of data sets. Sometimes you're a part of a treatment outcome study where you have the client's name but you continue research. There's a date of birth and sensitive information, but I run into the issue that there's not enough storage on the network for the data. Especially if you video tape research, too, and it takes up a lot of space. I ask and ask and they give me as much as they can and then it becomes a money issue.

Steven Hill: It boils down to do you have anything on there that could be removed?

Senator ??????: I think sometimes folks don't realize how much research we collect.

Steven Hill: I would at least bring it to their attention. If you do have an issue, then give Institutional Compliance a call. If you go to your IT folks, and they say, "I'm sorry. We can't do anything about it." I don't want to put it on my hard drive. You're telling me you can't do anything, give us a call and we'll come over. Records Analyst Chris Foster will come over or myself or Dr. Breaux-Schropp, whom I work with, the UNT Compliance officer. We'll get involved and help get that squared away.

Chair Clower: Maybe just one more question and then wrap. We have other things on the agenda.

Steven Hill: Okay, alright. If you can just read the bottom the UNT Records Management Initiatives on the Horizon, that will tell you what we have in the area of Records Management. Then, our contact information is on the last page. If you need us for anything, please don't hesitate to call. Question?

Senator Cherry: Can I just make one comment? It's always kind of disturbing that I can go on EIS and look up some employee at Health Science Center and find out who the head of their program is, how many credits they have on their health insurance, and all this other sort of personal information about them. Is there going to be any effort to try to reign in faculty or staff access to EIS records that anyone can look up on any other employee?

Steven Hill: Yeah. Let me get with you offline on that. Let me see what you're talking about. I don't like the way that that sounds at all. That doesn't sound good. Last question.

Senator Windsor: Everyone who has access to EIS was supposed to receive training on Ethics of Information and the Gathering of that Data. Despite the fact that you have access, you were supposed to have training that says you don't go in unless you have permission.

Senator Cherry: Yeah, but that's not very good protection.

Senator Windsor: It depends on how honest you are.

Steven Hill: Well let's talk and we'll see. I understand what you're saying. Ok. Thank you. Oh, hey, last thing. Just take a quick peek at that second handout, the Attorney General. That will tell you that the Attorney General is going after a San Antonio firm for improper disposal of confidential information. That's about \$50,000 per violation in one of the cases and they had 44. It can add up, and it shows that the state is serious about it.

Chair Clower: Thank you, Steve. Senator Cherry managed to get that.... I saw that whole ridge of hair on the back of your neck go up. Any case... Alright. We're going to go through a couple of things. My report this month is rather brief. We are working with the office of the University Relations and Communications, Debra Lilliard's office, to continue our webcasting and video recording of these meetings. The Deans will be distributing, if you have not seen it already, membership list for the Research Council. Faculty have about nine out of about 16 appointments on that council. We were well represented on that, a variety of different faculty from different areas. I think we have one additional appointee that the President has asked us to make. That will be somebody from the Humanities. So, we'll be seeing about taking care of that. We're going to talk about the next item in just a couple of minutes so let's skip over that for now.

The Evaluation of Teaching Committee has submitted a draft report to the Provost. This deals specifically with evaluation of teaching and a portion of the form that we might use from a University standpoint. Note: I say "might use." It would be a part of the student survey. There are other efforts going on. This is a part of an overall evaluation process and is being handled through the Provost's office. So, we are making progress on that, and the next two to three committees on that will be addressing other components of this. Have they been formed, Celia Williamson?

Celia Williamson: They're in the process of being formed. You may get a tap on the shoulder if you said you might be willing.

Chair Clower: Recently, this is just, I think, a piece of exciting news. The Deans formally approved the creation of a new center on campus, the Center for Advanced Scientific Computing and Modeling. Really, I think, it comes out of Computational Chemistry but is an interdisciplinary effort and really shows a lot of promise. This is a case where they've been a center kind of already but now they have official center status. It's a great process. If you're interested, look into that.

Next one, I just wanted you to have some dates. These are the early dates that have been released by the Provost's office. Do that for your long term vacation planning if you will. Then we'll end up with just a little one. This region now, the North Central Texas Region, now as the end of summer, as I understand the numbers got updated, has about 112,000 alumni living in this region. If you look at estimates of their household income,

those households associate with UNT have about a \$10 billion impact on the economy, just the spending of their household. UNT is having not only the direct impact from our own spending, we're seeing a lot. So, just a little piece of information for you. Are there any questions about any of the topics we've covered other than the Bylaws issue? Thank you very much. We're moving right along then.

Is there from the floor any unfinished business we need to discuss? Hearing none, seeing no hands then we will move along to the next agenda item of new business. I'm going to ask the chair of the Bylaws Committee, Terry Pohlen, to come forth. What we're doing here, it's become clear that with the recent changes in promotion and tenure policy and the UPTC policy, we need to do some changes to the Senate Bylaws. It's meant to just bring these together. This will be what is termed as a "first reading." We will not have discussion on the issue at this time. Next month, we will have the second reading where we will have discussion and entertain motions. I believe is how it works. If I would, I ask Dr. Pohlen to please do the reading.

Dr. Pohlen: You should all have the proposed change. The first one is to Article I: Role and Competence of the Faculty Senate. Four words are deleted. I'll just read the first sentence.

"The Faculty Senate shall decide and promulgate academic policy for the university, acting with due regard to the requests and needs of the specific departments, divisions, schools, and colleges, to the advice of the president and vice president for academic affairs (as amended May, 1998) of the university, and to the regulations of the Board of Regents of the University of North Texas and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board."

We'll go to the next page. To Article IV: Status of Existing and Other Faculty Governmental Bodies, Section 2, I'll read the entire paragraph since there's several changes.

"There shall be a University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC) whose members shall not be appointed by the Committee on Committees but shall be elected by the faculty at large. The UPTC shall be responsible for developing reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies for the University, subject to ratification by the Faculty Senate and the President of the University of North Texas. Reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies cannot be changed without approval of the UPTC, the Faculty Senate, and the President. The UPTC has responsibility for creating procedures for handling specific complaints or grievances concerning reappointment, promotion, tenure and academic freedom."

Chair Clower: Thank you, Senator Pohlen. While we will not have discussion on that today per our Rules of Order, after today's meeting our chairman in perpetuity for the UPTC Mike Nieswiadomy has graciously been sitting with us today. Once the meeting is over with, if you have a particular question on the content of this reading, he'll be here

and some of us will be around to ask a question if you need to. Be ready to have a full discussion of this at our next meeting.

Senator Cherry: Can you repeat where this report is coming from?

Chair Clower: Yes. It came from the Bylaws Committee, and that was done in cooperation with the UPTC. Alright, so, as we move onto the next one, are there any other business items from the committee as a whole that we need to address? Hearing none then we'll move on into Announcements. In your packet there is a form that Beth mentioned earlier for the Student Government Association grant program for textbooks. If you would like one of your textbooks to be available as a reference book in the library, fill this out and this grant money then provides funding for that. Another trick that some faculty use, I say "trick," another way of going about this is that often times we have an extra copy maybe we have gotten as a desk copy sometimes, and that could be used as well for references. This gives those students who may be having financial difficulties in any given semester an opportunity to have access to a textbook. They can't check it out, but they can go and do their readings each week in the library. Alright, any other business items that anybody wishes to bring before the group. Can I have a motion to adjourn?

Senator Swan makes a motion. Senator Bratton makes a second.

Can I have a call for an affirmation of our adjourning this meeting? All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Clower: Please, any opposed? Alright, we are done. Thank you. And before 4 o'clock mind you.