

Meeting: Faculty Senate
 Date: October 1, 2019
 Time: 2:01 p.m.
 Location: BA 290
 Adjournment: 3:03 p.m.

Minutes

Members present: Hongmei Jia, Annette Taggart, Gerard Huber, Johanna Delgado-Acevedo, Stephen Starnes, LaVelle Hendricks, Laura Isbell, Julia Ballenger, Vipa Bernhardt, Dimitra Smith, John Smith, Jason Davis, Sandy Hayes, Susan Stewart, Yasemin Atinc, Brandon Randolph-Seng, Thomas Boucher, Brock Johnson, Debra Mahoney, Cheri Davis (for Matt Wood), Robert Rodriguez, Benton Pierce, Gracie Brownell, Andrea Williams

Members absent: Bob Williams, Bilal Abu-Bakr, Vivian Dorsett

Issue/Topic	Summary of Discussion	Decision/Action
<p>Invited Speaker:</p> <p>Dr. John Humphreys, Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs</p>	<p>The September 3, 219 Senate minutes were discussed and are being emailed to senators for approval.</p> <p>The meeting opened at 2:01 p.m.</p> <p>Sandi Patton, Director, Student Disability Resources and Services was unable to attend as planed and will be rescheduled.</p> <p>Dr. Humphreys had 2 things to bring to the Senate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He is still looking for opinions and thoughts on the proposed new college “Health and Human Services” (working title) 2. He proposed a change for term of Department heads on behalf of Dr. Rudin – should they serve 3 years and then rotate out (or something to that effect). Senator Hendricks posed the question about being able to keep the current head longer than 3 years if everyone in the department agrees on it. Senator Ballenger proposed looking at models from other schools to write up procedures to make them clear and precise. Several senators brought up concerns and questions about the deans having so much authority over department head appointments with nothing being resolved beyond questioning it. Dr. Humphreys pointed out that the department heads serve at the discretion of the Dean. The senate overall seemed to be in favor of this plan as it is felt that it will help with power/authority issues in some departments. Senator Atinc brought up a point about external searches for dept. heads. It was pointed out that it can be used to bring in someone with little to no faculty input. Is this something that can be addressed as well when looking at writing a procedure for a new model? Senator Huber also posed a question about incentives for external searches – are they the same as for internal, if not where 	

	<p>does that money then go? It was agreed that models should be looked at and brought up at the November meeting.</p>	
<p>Communications</p>	<p>Dr. Starnes shared the following with the Senate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The final faculty participation in Early Intervention reporting was 78%. IER sent a report to the Deans letting each Dean know the % of their faculty who had responded. Individual departments or faculty members were not singled out. Senator Ballenger asked how the percentage was aggregated as the graduate students were not included in the reporting. 2. As part of the summer planning taskforce compensation subcommittee, a survey was developed to help gauge faculty's opinion on the current compensation model and a faculty member's interest in teaching. As of this meeting 128 faculty have responded (25 COB, 52 COEHS, 28 CHSSA, 20 COSE, 1 CASNR, 2 CID). Of the choices given between the current compensation model versus a flat rate model, 76% of faculty prefer the current model. Summary of the comments for a general feeling of the faculty is: A. the current compensation model is fine (but the rate should be increased from 7.5 % base salary to 8% or even up to 10%) B. faculty are not given equal opportunity to teach a course – favoritism may be at play in some departments in the summer teaching assignments. C. the threshold to receive full pay for a course is too high, especially considering that it takes the same effort on the faculty members part to teach 5 students or 20 (with the exception of grading). D. there must be more effort placed on attracting students to take summer courses to boost enrollment. E. Main deficiency with the current model is that it is not dependable. It is impossible for a faculty member to long-term budget with summer salary included. F. The opportunity to teach in summer must be available (but not required) in order to offset low faculty 9-month contract salaries. Each college has a budget coordinator who can give greater details about the current model for summer compensation. 3. The university has contracted Dale Carnegie North Texas to conduct Civility Evolution Training Events on campus this year. There will be 3-4 different day long offerings. Today, many senior level administrators are in the training along with members of the Diversity, Equity & Inclusion committee. Dr. Starnes was to attend today but was rescheduled due to the Senate meeting conflict. Four Senators are on the DE&I Committee and are in training today (Ballenger, Brownell, Hendricks, Atinc). Senator 	

	<p>Hendricks shared that there will be 4 stages so far to the training. Stage 1 was today. Stage 2 will be on October 30th from 8am-5pm in the tradition room. It will be for Faculty Senate and staff council, lunch and snacks provided. Stage 3 will be for academic and student affairs department heads. Stage 4 will be a random selection of 50 people.</p>	
<p>Committee Reports</p>	<p>Academic Life: Senator Hendricks reported that the Texas Association of Black Professors in Higher Education, with Faculty Senate support, have selected 10 junior faculty members (2 per college) for awards due to their achievements in research, teaching or service. The recipients are; Dr. Andrew Baker, Dr. Robynne Lock, Dr. Alexandria Babino, Dr. Ramya Aroul, Dr. Yuying Shi, Dr. Clay Bolton, Dr. Burchan Aydin, Dr. Hsun-Yu Chan, Dr. Douglas Eborn, and Dr. Henry Ross. The awards will be presented at a ceremony October 8, 2019. It was also noted that this falls in line with the civility training about showing appreciation. Also the employment engagement survey results are in and there was a 38% return rate on the survey. There is a meeting at 5pm today with President Rudin to go over the results. There are 24 pages of comments in size 6-8 font that are very detailed to the point that names are mentioned. The plan is for the information to be given out to be transparent and if the individual name is removed then the department will be named. The President agrees with this level of transparency.</p> <p>Academic Practice: Senator Ballenger reported that the committee will examine the different faculty titles to better clarify what the different lines are and what makes up the qualifications of each.</p> <p>Admission and Retention of Students: Nothing to report.</p> <p>Budget: Committee has 5 members and are working to align schedules so they can meet. Their goal (per Dr. Humphreys) is to determine how the senate can be involved with the budget. As a start, the committee will meet once a month with Tina Livingston for updates and input.</p> <p>Curriculum: Nothing to report.</p> <p>Faculty Awards: Nothing to report. Senator Gracie Brownell will chair and is still looking for members. Piper Awards nominations are due October 16th. The list of last year's committee members will be given to Senator Brownell as a starting point to find members for this year.</p> <p>Organization of the Senate: Nothing to report.</p> <p>Scheduling and Facilities: Nothing to report. This committee still needs a chair.</p>	

<p>Unfinished Business</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affiliate Faculty. The Library wants more information on which services will be offered for use. This could have impact on the library, where some vendor contracts for services are for full time faculty, staff, and students. Would these individuals be covered by university insurance if doing research in a science lab for example, or for any accidents on campus for that matter? Is there a rough estimate of how many Affiliate faculty could be on campus at any one time – how would this impact parking? Would the number of permits be capped or would they be designated to student parking? 2. T&P Policy: The Deans want to eliminate the 2nd, 4th and 5th year review and only keep the full 3rd year and 6th year review for tenure track probationary faculty. The 2nd, 4th and 5th year tenure review would wrap onto an annual report instead of the usual full review process. Thus, the 2nd, 4th and 5th year review would stop at the department level. Per the desire of the faculty the executive committee asked the deans why they wanted the change. Reasons given were less paperwork for all involved, and that the annual review would now include information on cumulative work. Senators asked the question about digital portfolios, why has talk of them faded as that would eliminate paperwork and would that then change the mindset on eliminating these reviews? Senators asked to see what the modified annual review would be. Would there be the option to voluntarily do these reviews if they are no longer mandatory? Senator Delgado-Acevedo expressed concerns about eliminating these reviews as they should be used to hold administrators accountable for employment decisions and we should be getting feedback from the department and the dean every year. The question was also raised as to why the evaluations, especially in the first year, happen mid academic year and not the end of the academic year? (answer being pursued). 	
<p>New Business</p>	<p>Questions were raised about pay for the mini winter courses (and subsequently other mini courses) and put towards the budget committee as questions for their meeting.</p> <p>Asked to figure out how to recognize colleagues for their long service more college wide. Is there something the faculty senate can do to acknowledge those with long tenures of service to the University?</p> <p>Question raised about the financial strain of the University but yet wanting to add a new college with new administrative positions?</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 3:03pm.</p>	