



FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes for September 30, 2009

Attendance:

Name	Group	Dept	Term	Present
Will Derusha	I	FORL	2012	
John "Jack" Peters	II	ENGL	2011	X
Jose Perez	III	PHYS	2012	X
Emile Sahliyah	IV	PSCI	2010*	X
John Windsor	V	ITDS	2010	X
Cynthia Chandler	VI	CDHE	2010*	X
James Swan	VII	AGER	2011*	X
Donna Emmanuel	VIII	MUSIC	2011	
Karen Weiller-Abels	Chair	KHPR	2010	X
Beth Thomsett-Scott	Vice-Chair	LIBR	2010	
James Conover	Secretary	FIREL	2010	X
Terry Clower	Immediate Past Chair	APEC	2010	

Time at Which Discussion Begins

2:07 I. Welcome

2:07 II. Chair Weiller-Abels called the meeting to order. Brief introductions of members. Approval of minutes from Sep. 2, 2009. Senator Windsor moved acceptance of minutes as distributed. Senator Swan seconded. Brief discussion. Motion carried.

2:08 III. Frances Van Tassell – Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching Excellence

- Chaired the committee
The committee was formed and charged by Deputy Provost Celia Williamson in late November early December 2008. This is an ad hoc committee that concludes this semester.
- The goal of the committee is to develop tools and documents for teaching excellence. The recommendation is to create a process for helping faculty teach.
 - The committee concluded that they needed to prepare documents that separate two functions
 - evaluation of teaching excellence

- support for creating or maintaining teaching excellence
 - Process of vetting includes
 - many iterations of the two tools being presented today inside the committee
 - in August 2009 a sample of department chairs made excellent suggestions that were all implemented
 - presentation today for faculty Senate executive committee
 - discussed the documents with Allen Clarke to see which parts of the evaluation document could be automatically populated from EIS data-some cells could be populated.
 - Attachment A -- an Excel document titled Instructional Activities Summary -- Year
 - one page data collection for evaluation of teaching excellence
 - several questions arose about the SETE column -- it was resolved to ask this as a question for administrators.
 - A suggestion to remove grades of F from the drop incomplete withdraw column was made.
 - Attachment B -- a Word document titled Annual Assessment of Teaching
 - self evaluation assessment of teaching excellence items to support development or maintenance of teaching excellence that should be completed by all full-time instructional faculty for each year
 - Part A: Self-Assessment
 - Part B: Use of Instructional Strategies
 - Part C: Teaching Philosophy
 - The next step will be to present these documents at the October faculty Senate meeting.
 - Feedback is to be given to the committee by the general faculty.
 - The step after that is to present to all department chairs at the Chairs Council meeting -- faculty are encouraged to provide feedback to their department chairs as well as to the general committee
- The last teaching excellence document -- a classroom observation instrument -- prepared by the committee will be presented to the faculty in early November.
 - The committee strongly recommends that the proposed classroom observation instrument never be used for evaluation.
 - The classroom observation instrument is to be filled out by peers. The current suggestion is only to reveal that the assessment instrument was used when documenting classroom observation activities. The classroom observation instrument's results are not to go any further than the faculty member that seeks to improve their teaching excellence.

2:51 IV. Carolyn Bobo -- faculty/staff website

- The purpose of the faculty staff website is to get good internal communication.
 - It should engage employees.
 - It should have both broad and strategic goals communicated as well as narrow goals and information about local events such as where is that concert?
 - Overall, the idea is to see what is going on at UNT right now.
- Discussion ensued. Questions, comments or suggestions are to be sent to

Carolyn. Good examples of internal websites are at Clemson, Duke, Michigan State, and UT San Antonio.

(in a follow-up e-mail from Carolyn, the following websites were suggested as examples for us to possibly brainstorm a set of suggestions or ideas at a later meeting):

- Here are examples of internal communications sites :
 - <http://www.utsa.edu/today/>
 - <http://www.clemson.edu/faculty-staff/index.html>
 - <http://einside.kent.edu/>

3:04 V. Committee updates and other committee business

- EC members reported that several committees for which they were serving as liaisons were having their first meetings and functioning. Others haven't yet started for various reasons.
 - Senators Swan, Sahliyah, Perez, Windsor, Peters, Chandler, Conover, and Weiller each made brief presentations
- Senator Swan discussed the UCC/Core Oversight recommendation for a one-year extension of the existing core as a matter for EC action
- EC members requested an introduction letter be sent to each committee and each committee member from the Faculty Senate Chair and Faculty Senate Vice-Chair. This letter is to explain the function of the liaison and introduce the EC liaison to the committee members. The EC liaisons can then have credibility with the committee members and the committee chairs. This is important for all faculty senate elected and administrative committees.
- Core Oversight Committee/UCC committee charges/procedures
 - EC informed that faculty senate officers are to discuss this topic with Deputy Provost Williams on October 5.
 - EC members provided suggestions and insights from their observations at the joint meeting of the committees.
 - Senator Seligman's letter to Chair Weiller-Abels on faculty senate decisions regarding the core discussed.
 - EC recommends that the letter has specific suggestions for an existing faculty senate process and should be sent to the Core Oversight Committee for discussion
 - Discussion of assessments being done/not done at the course level for the last round of the core oversight process
 - Assessments of courses likely unavoidable
 - EC wishes a report on the meeting and from the discussion of Senator Seligman's letter at Core Oversight
 - Charges to Senate Officers and Core Oversight Chair Conover to report on these matters

3:45 VI. Committee Reports

* Fine Arts Series Committee

- Report was read – discuss at next EC meeting?

3:46 VII. Topics for Administrators for October 7, 2009

1. Faculty members have noted that there is quite a bit of paperwork required

recently.

- a. In particular the grad school is requesting paperwork for thesis defenses and assessments of graduate students. Some of these requests are coming months after the student has defended. Is this necessary?
 - b. The oversight committee is requiring quite a bit of assessment.
 - c. The SACS accreditation is requiring quite a bit of faculty input.
 - d. Is there any way to streamline this?
 - e. Why are all of these reports now starting to become required?
 - f. Is there a way to prioritize any of this?
 - g. Is there any way to remove unnecessary paperwork.
 - h. Is the administration aware of this changed use of faculty time?
2. The 3% cut process has continued for several years. Is this incremental process going to continue? What direction are we taking with this? It looks like most of the fat if there was any has been cut out of the budget. Most of the hits seem to be from the part-time budget. We don't think there is much left to cut. Is there?
 3. What is the status of the student evaluations of teaching effectiveness form? How is this going to be handled? Many classes should have paper forms to get adequate participation. Are there any plans for this?
 4. Does the University have a plan to address any issues about the neighborhood impact discussions raised in the Denton Record Chronicle about the football stadium?
 5. In the previous Faculty Senate meeting, it was mentioned that the nepotism policy of the University will be revised. What is the motivation underlying the need for the change in the nepotism policy? Are there issues in departments or colleges or the University that have caused this policy issue to rise to the top?
 6. What is the status of the vice president for advancement search?
 7. Are there plans for a University officer for international development efforts?
 8. A general topic for the Provost: what are the 3 to 5 top issues that she is dealing with right now? The Senate executive committee would like to provide information about these issues in an unstructured question and answer format, if appropriate.

4:05 VIII. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda for October 14, 2009

- Move Carolyn Bobo's update to a later meeting
- Frances Van Tassell's report (25 minutes)
- Change SECC update time to 5 minutes
- Find out if Dean of the Emeritus College could address the information about the Emeritus College instead of the Dean of the Honors College

4:18 IX. Chair's Report

Written report – no additional questions as elements already covered in committee activities earlier in the meeting

4:25 X. Academic Integrity – update on feedback and committee

- Hold for next meeting

4:26 XI. Unfinished Business

- Professor Swan shared updates in Applied Gerontology/Sociology.
- Some faculty may take a less active role in university service in the future due to focus on new academic priorities

4:27 X. New Business

4:27 XI. None
Comments for the Good of the Order

- Senate Chair Weiller-Abels expressed her sincere appreciation for the goodwill and forthright discussions by EC members in all meetings.

4:28 Adjournment
Respectfully submitted by James Conover