

**Minutes**

		Present
Presiding Officer	Janiece Upshaw	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Associate Presiding Officer	Gwendolyn Johnson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Secretary	Joshua Goodson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parliamentarian	Priya Eimerbrink	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator, Permanent Non-Tenure Track	Gabriel Otteson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senator, Tenure-Track	Corron Sanders	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senator, Tenured	Iftekhar Amin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senator, Business Place One	Patricia Wynn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senator, Business Place Two	Warren Nagumo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senator, Business Appointed	Yonas Lemma	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator, Education	Victor Lozada	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator, Education Appointed	Deanne Paiva	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senator, Human Services	Nedra Washington Goss	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator, Human Services Appointed	Bonique Morton	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator, LAS Place One	Stephen Womack	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator, LAS Place Two	Kieth Gryder	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senator, LAS Place Three	Noureen Khan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator, LAS Appointed	Razan Albanna	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senator, College of Law	Eric Porterfield	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senator, College of Law Appointed	Korin Munsterman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- I. Call to Order – 10:03 a.m.
  
- II. Approval of Minutes
  - Public Comment re: Minutes
    - Motion to approve minutes from the previous meeting.
    - Amin moves
      - Nagumo seconds
        - Yes: 11
        - No: 0
        - Abstain: 0
  
- III. Budget Report
  - Budget Report – Faculty Senate (3')
    - Only money spent recently is when senators go to Starbucks.

- Upcoming expense is TCFS meeting at the end of February.
- Dues to TCFS for next year will come from this years budget.

IV. Tenure Track Guidelines Taskforce – Aaron Bartula

Public Comment re: Tenure Track Guidelines

- Feedback
  - See attached

V. Apportionment

Public Comment re: Apportionment

- Keep current apportionment. Take out “school” from document since we are going to colleges.
  - Vote at future meeting.

VI. Presiding Officer’s Report

- Curriculum/Syllabi Review – Forums with Renaldo Stowers, OGC
- Quality Matters Review
  - In our SACs report, our online students are getting equivalent education to face-to-face.
  - We have not been documenting that our faculty are qualified to teach online or that our online courses meet a standard.
  - Need to get faculty and courses up to standard by the Spring of 2027.
- Faculty Earnings by Job
  - Tabled

VII. Unfinished Business and General Orders

- Faculty Senate Mtg. – Date/Time/see below
- General Assembly Mtg. – February 6

01/09/26	10:00 AM- 12:00 PM	FS Meeting, FH 208
2/06/26	10:00 AM- 12:00 PM	FS Meeting, FH 208
02/06/26	9:00 AM – 10:15 AM	TBD
03/06/26	10:30 AM- 12:00 PM	FS Meeting, FH 208
04/03/26	10:00 AM- 12:00 PM	FS Meeting, FH 208
05/01/26	10:00 AM- 12:00 PM	FS Meeting, FH 208

VIII. New business

- Provost would like FS to approval
  - Hiring an internal candidate for CITL
    - MOU: Since the position requires teaching (faculty though), this faculty member keeps their 2-2 but one of their teaching assignments is teaching the faculty. Technically will be 1-1 teaching to students. This way they keep their designation as faculty.
      - Munsterman moves to draft an MOU to be
        - Otteson seconds
          - Yes: 11
          - No: 0
          - Abstain: 0
- Faculty were not respected when considering the schedule for the first week. Faculty were not informed until mid-December. No accounting for time for faculty with kids going back to school. Provost said meetings were optional but emailed said that it was expected that faculty would attend.

- Meetings already being planned for May after graduation.
- Can students see Canvas before the semester starts?
- AI Committee
  - Munsterman, Nagumo, Washington, Khan, Morton, Noyes, Srinivasan

IX. Adjournment – 12:25 p.m.

**UNT Dallas Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for Tenure Track Faculty Tenure and Promotion Review  
Beginning Fall 2026 Clarify for both Assistant/Assoc. Professor**

Included in this document are the current expectations for review of tenure and promotion in the following areas:

- 1. Teaching**
- 2. Scholarship**
- 3. Service**

**Each candidate is expected to achieve excellence in teaching and in one of the two other categories and must meet or exceed expectations in the other.**

**Feedback: Clarify above by using bullet points**

**Discussion of meeting expectations, exceeding expectations vs. Excellence (Is Exceeding the same as Excellence?)  
Excellence is based on a decision from reviewing faculty member's portfolio**

**Guidelines for Excellence in Teaching**

Excellence in teaching elicits students' learning that makes sustained, substantial, and positive improvement in students' ability to demonstrate content knowledge, engage in critical thinking, and apply skills in work settings.

**Teaching Excellence Components**

Input of Standards:

- Aligned with discipline related standards
- Aligned with SACS & university standards

Teaching Process and Strategies:

- Discipline Expertise (content knowledge and skills knowledge)
- Curriculum Design and Development (Syllabi, rubrics, learning activities)
- Teaching instructional practices and performance (teaching methods and assessment instruction)

- Learning and Teaching environment (leadership style, interpersonal communication)
- Reflective practice (instructor reflection)
- Professional Development in discipline and pedagogy

Outcome:

- Student achievement of Student Learning Outcomes (documents)
- Peer-reviewed achievements
- Field supervisor feedback and student accomplishments

Recognizing that faculty members have strengths in different areas, this rubric provides flexibility in the types of evidence submitted. The evaluation includes two distinct requirements.

1. Baseline Requirement for All Faculty

It is highly encouraged that all faculty members demonstrate meeting expectations in every category. Meeting expectations is defined as demonstrating impact on at least one listed item within each category. Question as to if faculty are delving into 3 categories, is this necessary? Impact typically refers to evidence that your actions made improvement in student learning. High impact practices can be defined by AACU ([High-Impact Practices | AAC&U](#)). if high-impact practices are not required in every course, could a professor be penalized if they taught a course that did not include high impact. The categories on the teaching evaluation do not mention high impact practices -

2. Evaluation for Excellence

Faculty members should demonstrate Excellence in at least three categories. Excellence in Category Three (Student Evaluations) is required, and faculty must select two additional categories in which to be evaluated for Excellence. Excellence is defined as demonstrating impact on at least three listed items within the selected category. To be evaluated as excellent, faculty must achieve the baseline requirements for all faculty.

Faculty are not expected to address every item in a category. Instead, they should provide evidence for the specific items they choose to highlight. It is understood that appropriate evidence will vary based on assigned courses, program responsibilities, and instructional context. It is the faculty’s responsibility to justify any areas that they may not meet standards.

Ratings:

- Excellence in Teaching

CATEGORY	Items that demonstrate Excellence
<p><b>1. Curriculum Improvement</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum improvement</li> <li>• course improvement (suggest separating)</li> <li>• Advising and/or mentoring students</li> <li>• Curriculum improvement based on number of students, course(s) level, number of course credit hours, unique course preparations, and modality of the course(s)</li> <li>• Course development and implementation</li> <li>• Submitted proposals of courses approved by curriculum committees (suggested change)</li> <li>• Scholarly based re-formation of curriculum/courses</li> <li>• Successful teaching innovation that led to improved student learning</li> <li>• Providing extensive student feedback in courses Does this belong in this category/could it be broadened to showcase</li> </ul>

	<p>high impact practices ??? (Demonstration of high impact practices)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experiential and/or service learning within courses</li> <li>• Scholarly activities with students should this be further defined or left to faculty member-what counts?</li> <li>• Continuing education</li> <li>• Other</li> <li>• Justification for lack of curriculum improvement</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Teaching Evaluations from Supervisor and/or Peers and Self Evaluations</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent supervisor evaluations of <u>4.0</u> or above on a 5-point scale or justification for a lower score or trend of positive qualitative feedback for other types of supervisor-evaluation of teaching activity There are no scores on peer teaching observations (not called evaluations) law school DOES have scores on their peer evaluations.</li> <li>• Peer teaching evaluation of <u>4.0</u> or above on a 5-point scale or</li> <li>• make this a separate bullet point trend of positive qualitative feedback for other types of peer-evaluation of teaching activity</li> <li>• Other types of teaching evaluation</li> <li>• Justification for lower scores and/or qualitative feedback</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Student Evaluations</b>  <b>4. Will be difficult from this list to find 3 to document excellence.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student teaching evaluation scores trend equal to or above 4.3 on a 5-point scale (Why 4.3 vs. 4.0/) Concern of emphasis on score vs. comments. Also research indicates certain demographic groups score higher than others – all things being equal.</li> <li>• Add as separate bullet:Trend of positive student qualitative comments on student teaching evaluations.</li> </ul> <p>Make this a separate bullet: *Course innovations that impact student evaluations  Example: Did you make a change in your courses based on trends or comments? Showcase changes made based on student evaluations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of other positive student evaluation feedback (e.g., emails from students</li> <li>• Other (add bullet point)</li> <li>• Justification for lower student evaluations scores. These may include course structure that impact student evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of courses</li> <li>○ Types of courses (core versus electives)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of students</li> <li>○ Number of course credit hours</li> </ul>
<b>5. Professional Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance and/or leadership at teaching workshops leading to successful pedagogical innovations make separate bullets Attendance; Leadership</li> </ul> <p>Should leading workshop and leading conferences be placed under Scholarship vs. Teaching – to avoid “double-dipping?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance and/or leadership at academic conferences leading to successful pedagogical innovations Separate into 2 bullets</li> <li>• Conducted teaching focused workshops and/or trainings</li> <li>• Other</li> <li>• Justification for lack of professional development     Ie. Lack of university funding fto attend professional development conferences</li> </ul>
<b>6. Outcome based Evidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated student achievement</li> <li>• Documented student and/or alumni testimonials</li> <li>• Evidence of student career achievement</li> <li>• <del>Evidence of successful student graduate/professional school admission</del> This seems more like a program recognition rather than an individual faculty.</li> <li>• Trend of positive field supervisors’ or employers’ feedback</li> <li>• Evidence of Classroom to Career impact</li> <li>• Implementation of university values in teaching</li> <li>• Service as a peer mentor/mentee</li> <li>• Award/recognition for teaching effectiveness</li> <li>• Other</li> <li>• Justification for lack of outcome-based evidence</li> </ul>

**Teaching Narrative**

- 1. Discuss your Curriculum Improvement (Hyperlink documents)**
  
- 2. Discuss your Teaching Evaluations (Supervisor and/or Peer) and Self Evaluations (Hyperlink documents)**

- 3. Discuss your Student Evaluations (Hyperlink documents)**
  
- 4. Discuss your professional development. Include your teaching philosophy appropriate for your discipline. (Hyperlink documents)**
  
- 5. Discuss your Outcome based Evidence (Hyperlink documents)**

## Guidelines for Excellence in Scholarly and Creative Activity

A university's professional faculty is the core of an institution that must contribute to the good of society. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members carry special responsibilities with respect to creation and maintenance of high-quality scholarly and creative activity. This includes basic/discovery scholarship, applied/practice scholarship, teaching/pedagogical scholarship, other intellectual contributions, and academic engagement activities. Because of respect for the uniqueness of each faculty members' scholarly interests, creativity, impact, and accomplishments, it will be up to the faculty member to make their case for the quality of their scholarly and creative activity to the Tenure and Promotion committee(s) through a university designated form that includes a narrative so the faculty member can clearly highlight and document their body of work. The university does not support a numerical approach only to scholarly and creative activity evaluation, but rather a holistic approach based upon the quantity, quality and impact of documented evidence of excellence. Individual colleges or departments may have additional guidelines built upon expectations from discipline-based accreditations held or sought. These expectations should be approved by the respective dean and the provost. The following guidelines are meant to direct the path to documenting evidence of excellence.

Redo paragraphsto first discuss meeting expectations; then paragraph to discuss excellence; then paragraph to discuss full professor. Excellence in scholarly and creative activities can be achieved through meeting base expectations of five (5) intellectual contributions in the **preceeding** correct; be more specific years for tenure and promotional review or, in the case of promotion to full professor, since the last promotion of the faculty member. Separate for a full professor High-quality scholarly and creative activity includes intellectual contributions from the basic/discovery scholarship, applied/practice scholarship, teaching/pedagogical scholarship, other intellectual contributions, and academic engagement activities. For excellence, typically at least two of the intellectual contributions should come from the basic/discovery scholarship, applied/practice scholarship, or teaching/pedagogical scholarship categories and at least one should come from the other intellectual contributions category or a third contribution from the basic/discovery scholarship, applied/practice scholarship, or teaching/pedagogical scholarship categories.

Put into separate paragraph. To meet expectations, one contribution should come from the basic/discovery scholarship, applied/practice scholarship, or teaching/pedagogical scholarship categories. (Reads densely – # the categories – similar to teaching -

### Scholarly and Creative Activity Categories

Basic/discovery scholarship	Peer reviewed scholarship directed toward increasing the knowledge base and the development of theory. In most disciplines, this will be represented by a peer reviewed journal article.
Applied/practice scholarship	Peer reviewed scholarship that draws from basic research and uses accumulated theories, knowledge, methods, and techniques to solve real-world problems and/or issues associated with practice. In most disciplines, this will be represented by a peer-reviewed journal article or book chapters or books.
Teaching/pedagogical scholarship	Peer reviewed scholarship that explores the theory and methods of teaching and advances new understandings, insights, content, and methods that impact learning behavior. In most disciplines, this will be represented by a peer-reviewed journal article or book chapters or books.
Other intellectual contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer reviewed scholarship that does not meet the quality guidelines of the above categories or is sufficiently influential with public policy, government, or industry.</li> <li>• Wide variety of scholarly outputs such as presentations and proceedings at academic or professional meetings, research workshops led, invited talks, etc.</li> <li>• Significant grants awards (typically greater than \$5,000) by bodies external to the university. (Internal grants? Do they fall under teaching/service? Other?)</li> <li>• Submission of large competitive grants (suggested add)</li> <li>• First edition published textbooks</li> <li>• Other (add)</li> </ul>
Academic engagement activities	Activities consistent with the faculty member's role and the school's mission, vision, strategies, and expected outcomes. Examples of academic engagement activities include:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in research workshops and/or academic conferences that enhances the faculty member's research agenda ???</li> <li>• Relevant, active editorships with academic journals or other business publications</li> <li>• Academic leadership positions outside the university</li> <li>• Significant participation in recognized academic societies and associations</li> <li>• Scholarship awards</li> <li>• Academic fellow status</li> <li>• Invited presentations</li> <li>• Formal peer-review of at least three journal articles or five conference submissions</li> <li>• Documentation of extraordinary impact of scholarship</li> <li>• Published textbooks beyond first edition</li> <li>• Other Published case studies</li> <li>• Published book reviews</li> <li>• Active professional certification that enhances the faculty member's field of teaching should this be under professional development for teaching as opposed to scholarship</li> </ul>
--	---

Quality scholarly publications are vital to the health of the academic community and university. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to document the quality of their contributions. Contributions from the basic/discovery scholarship, applied/practice scholarship, and teaching/pedagogical scholarship for all faculty must be of sufficient quality. Scholarly contributions should never be represented in predatory outlets. A primary tool to identify predatory journals is Cabell's Predatory Report.

Scholarly contributions accepted, forthcoming or published should meet at least one of the following criteria.

- 1) Acceptance rate of 50% or lower according to Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities.
- 2) Journals listed in the Thomas Reuters Social Sciences Citation Index, Scopus, or Schimago (Check with Deans to see if there are other indices that should be included)
- 3) UNT Denton or a comparable University Department Journal List.
- 4) Documented peer-reviewed book or book chapter
- 5) Documented quality and impact of media products that have been through a peer-reviewed process
- 6) Federal or Texas State grant awards linked to research
- 7) College approved lists of journals (these lists must be approved by the respective dean and provost). (Does UNTD have an approved list -are Dean's keeping a list?)

## Guidelines for Excellence in Service

The following document provides guidelines for assessing a tenure-track faculty member's work in the Service category for tenure. Service work must be well-documented by faculty in their promotion and tenure portfolios through the creation of detailed narratives of their work, along with supporting documentation where appropriate and available. Service to the university, profession, and community are highly valued.

### Levels of Service Activities

To aid in the determination of level of Service for tenure and promotion, Service activities may be broken down into three categories: leading, supporting, and routine. A partial list of examples of service activities may be found below.

### Categories of University Service

Service work may occur in three types: 1) Service to University and Student Success; 2) Service to the Professions; and, 3) Service to the Community.

### Service Requirements for Tenure

Excellence – In order to be ranked as “Excellent” in Service for the purpose of tenure, a faculty member must achieve the equivalent of two leading service activities at the time of tenure. Service to the University is required during each year. An aggregate of multiple supportive and routine activities may replace one major leading activity in any given year.

#### 1) Service to the University and Student Outcomes

A leading or major contribution to service shows evidence of highly impactful outcomes on Student Success and/or on the reputation of the university.

Student Success Outcomes are defined as:

- Increases in completion rates
- Increase in job placement or graduate school attendance
- Increase in student acquisition of competencies
- Student impact on the community as a direct result of experiential learning

Examples of a Leading Service Role in Student Outcomes can be achieved by:

- Developing and/or overseeing a disciplinary program that results in Student Success
- Developing and/or overseeing a student support or student affairs program that results in Student Success
- Eliminating barriers to student success, as in leading a policy audit
- Chairing a task force that leads to positive results
- Serving as faculty advisor for a student organization

Examples of a Leading Service Role in the Reputation of the University can be achieved by:

- Bringing into being and/or overseeing a partnership that results in Student Success and progress towards a career
- Securing grants that support students
- Securing Regional or National recognition for the University
- Chairing or writing an accreditation self-study
- Organizes a symposium or other in-house event

A supporting service activity may be characterized by supporting the above activities and shows evidence of impactful outcomes. For example:

- Is a member of a standing school- or university-wide committee that produces a positive impact on student success of on a university initiative whereby individual impact can be shown and whereby others members vouch for the individual's effectiveness
- 
- Serving on a search committee
- Acting as an internship or experiential learning coordinator
- Sustained participation in student recruitment or outreach activities
- Consulting project related to the faculty members teaching discipline

- Professional certification related to the faculty members teaching discipline (obtain/maintain)

Routine service activities are those that are regular expectations of every faculty member, such as attendance at Department or School meetings, Faculty Alliance meetings, Commencement and Convocation ceremonies, and serving on a search committee as a member.

## 2) Service to the Professions:

A leading service activity may be characterized by:

- Holding a leadership role in a professional association
- Leading a regional or national symposium or conference
- Founding a professional or advocacy organization
- Serving as an Editor or member of the Editorial Board of a journal

A supporting service activity may be characterized by:

- Reviewing conference proposals
- Reviewing journal articles
- Delivering in-service workshops for a professional organization
- Respondent of discussant on a conference panel
- Participating in organizing a conference
- Serving on a regional or national committee
- Presenting to professional organizations, either by invitation or through a refereed process
- Serving as a committee member on a local professional organization
- Chairing a conference panel

A routine service activity may be characterized by:

- 
- Participating in professional organizations
- 

## 3) Service to the Community

A leading service activity may be characterized by:

- Representing the university or a discipline in public hearings
- Organizing a symposium or other external event for multiple community organizations or constituencies
- Bringing into being and/or overseeing a partnership that results in Student Success and makes a demonstrable substantial benefit to the community
- Leading a major fundraising effort for a community partner
- Serving as a Board member for an external entity related to university initiatives (Museum, Chamber of Commerce), commission at any level
- Orchestrating service learning at a location such as an agency, school, or community center

A supporting service activity may be characterized by:

- Serving as member of an advisory board or civic forum related to university initiatives
- Providing disciplinary expertise to a community-based organization, library, museum, or community counseling center
- Article or editorial role in trade publication
- Officer/Board member of a professional organization
- Significant role in local government

Community service related to discipline

A routine service activity may be characterized by:

- Serving on committees of a community organization related to university initiatives
- Contributing to a community organization newsletter
- Volunteering for local community organizations in a non-leading capacity