APPROVED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Senate. They have been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are the official minutes.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
February 18, 2009


ABSENT: James Bartlett, Santosh D’Mello, Juan Gonzalez, Jennifer Holmes, Kamran Kiasaleh, Dennis Miller, B.P.S. Murthi, Lucien Thompson

VISITORS: Hobson Wildenthal, Andrew Blanchard, George Fair, Inga Musselman, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, James Marquart, Chris Parr

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

In Dr. Daniel’s absence, Dr. Wildenthal called the meeting to order and asked if there were any announcements or questions.

Responding to a question on funding prospects, Dr. Wildenthal announced that there are no current budgetary changes planned but that no one really knows what the future holds. UT Dallas actually is in the best position of all other universities components. Enrollment is up and there seems to be an uprise in applications. Some of that could be due to the economy.

Dr. Wildenthal discussed the possibility of using temporary classroom buildings if enrollment exceeds capacity while our new buildings are still incomplete. Although no one really likes the look of them they would be a quick fix. The cost would be somewhere around $700k for 9,000 square feet and $250k for installation, sidewalk and water. His deadline is set for next week to have his analysis submitted.

Dr. Wildenthal discussed the admissions issues for graduate students. There seems to be a major delay in student’s information being uploaded into the system. The Academic units have been recruited to help Enrollment Services with the processing. There were some technical issues with the new PeopleSoft program, they have been identified and are being worked on.
2. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Dr. Scotch moved to amend the agenda to add new item 6, approval of a Special Senate meeting called by Dr. Daniel to discuss cost containment. Dr. Amin Gutierrez de Pineres seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Dr. Scotch moved to approve the agenda as amended. Dr. Amin Gutierrez de Pineres seconded the motion. The motion passed.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Dr. Kieschnick seconded. The minutes were approved.

4. **SPEAKER’S REPORT**

A. We are having continuing problems with the Senate website and with the Senate filing system that the website files are part of. This has needed attention for a long time. Marilyn is working on it. Evidently, we need more help—a student assistant was helping but has left and has not been replaced. If the person works only on the Senate, as opposed to other matters under the Provost, there should be no problem with confidentiality. Provost Wildenthal has asked for a memorandum describing the need.

B. The staff is very concerned about safety as a result of the recent knife attack in ECS. I met with Chris Dickson on Tuesday for over an hour. We agree that there is much more we can be doing, some at no cost, some at reasonable cost. The most conspicuous point is that there are many issues that intersect, and at the moment there is no one trying to pull them all together. The other conspicuous point is that this problem is almost exactly what the Security and Safety Council is designed to deal with. I therefore proposed to the Academic Council that we charge the Safety and Security Council with developing an overall safety and security plan. They have already taken upon themselves some of the elements of developing such a plan at their last meeting, which was focused on the same incident. Elements that the charge should include are on the handout. The Council and administration concur.

C. Along the same lines, I have been strongly advised by Tony Champagne that we should develop a policy requiring that faculty who take students on trips be advised when such students have a record of referral for disciplinary action. Please provide me with descriptions of any incidents you know about. It will help assure that the language of the policy is comprehensive enough.
D. *The Mercury* published an opinion by Alex Ransom, described as a “Mercury staff writer,” in favor of a law allowing concealed carrying of handguns on campus. The arguments were the usual pro-gun and anti-anti-gun rhetoric: criminals fear concealed weapons, and armed students in a class could protect the class before police arrive. My response was published in the issue of Jan 26. Responses in general have been worrisome, in part because they seem to indicate complete ignorance of the response procedures actually in place and in part because if such a law did pass it could make a clean and decisive response to an actual weapon-on-campus emergency much more difficult and risky. This seems to indicate a need to put up something like a links page to web and other information on this and other political issues that have immediate bearing on the quality of campus life.

E. Robert Kieschnick will replace Tim Redman as the backup representative for the Faculty Senate on the HOP stakeholders and policy committees.

F. We have received back from OGC our modified policies on titles for research faculty.

G. We have also received back from OGC a response on our elimination of the Student Life Committee, which we replaced with the Student Government Senate liaison two years ago. OGC says that we cannot eliminate the committee at this time. I discussed this briefly with Vice Chancellor Prior at the FAC Executive Committee; his response was that we should try to sort it out among ourselves. I will follow up. We will not appoint faculty to a committee that faculty have repeatedly said does not have a function that requires their time and effort.

H. Chris Dickson has submitted his resignation as President of the Staff Council. The Vice-President, Tricia Losavio, has assumed the duties of chair and a new election will be held for Vice-President.

I. The Retirees Association has asked if they can have a representative at the Senate meetings. Since Senate meetings are open and we have always promoted policies to retain retirees as active members of the university committee, this did not seem to raise any new policy questions and I said they would be welcome. Chris Parr will be attending for the rest of this year.

5. FAC REPORT

The executive committee met to set the program for the upcoming full meeting. We also had an extended discussion with Vice Chancellor Prior regarding Governor Perry’s “seven breakthrough solutions” for higher education, which he is trying to insist that the U T System should implement.

These “solutions” come right from the Texas Public Policy Foundation (TPPF), a right-wing lobbying organization founded by James Leininger and supported by members of the Hoch family, who are behind several prominent right-wing “think-tanks.” These are
the same ideas advanced in a “summit” of regents from systems around the state called by Governor Perry last May 21. A description is available on the TPPF website at http://www.texashigher.com/node/6. The demands include vouchers for students to take to whatever school they want to go to, “performance based pay for teaching and research,” measuring such performance by scoring teaching performance and publishing the results teacher by teacher and course-by-course, and, implicitly, the elimination of tenure and faculty self-governance. One of the responses we have decided on will be the development of a wiki produced and maintained within the UT community that will be accessible by the Regents, to convey a much better sense of what faculty actually does, and, for that matter, what universities actually do. Another will be a survey of faculty time management in faculty terms, rather than in the terms usually imposed.

The governor’s legal authority or political ability to impose such measures is of course doubtful. It was doubtful last May and is more doubtful now. The new Speaker of the Texas House, Joe Strauss, has appointed a majority of Democrats to the Higher Education committee, although it has a Republican chair, Dan Branch. The Vice Chair of the Committee, Joaquin Castro of San Antonio, is a Democrat and also understands what higher education actually requires. Representative Branch was a strong supporter of lifting the tuition cap, and it is reasonable to expect him and the committee to oppose reinstating it.

The administration of Texas A&M has embraced the Governor’s ideas and is trying to impose a system of pay based on the kinds of “performance measures” the TPPF proposes. The faculty is apparently in some stage of open revolt. An article describing it is on the web at http://www.bus.lsu.edu/accounting/faculty/lercmbHley/TAMUbonus.html

The proposal for legislation to establish faculty regents seems to be moving ahead slowly, but is complicated by a different and unrelated proposal by the Representative from Arlington to establish one for the UT system only. We will try to have her come to the meeting to discuss the issue.

6. DATE FOR COST CONTAINMENT SPECIAL SENATE MEETING

Dr. Leaf announced that Dr. Daniel was calling a special Senate meeting to discuss budgetary restrictions as he projects for the faculty. The dates were Monday, February 23rd at 1:00 p.m., Tuesday, February 24th at 2:00 or 3:00 p.m., or Thursday, February 26th at 11:00 a.m. Twenty voted for Tuesday, February 24th at 2:00 p.m. therefore this was the date and time the meeting was set for.
7. PM-30 ANIMAL CARE & USE REVISIONS (HOP)

Dr. Leaf presented the proposed changes received from OGC include the following:

- Deletion of #2 ("Maintain training programs . . .")
- Moved items from the duties list that referenced Committee charges to the 2nd paragraph of the policy, specifically #1 ("maintain oversight . . .") and #8 ("annually advise . . ."). This seems to make more sense given that the list of items below the second paragraph are the "duties" that the Committee is charged to perform. The proposed revision ensures that this list is composed of specific actions that the Committee must perform and that the 2nd paragraph contains the overall guidance for the Committee’s charge.
- Deleted from #3 (old #5) specific reference to recommendations for "facilities or personnel training" as these are covered under recommendations for the "University’s animal program".

In our opinion, the only substantive change in this revision is the deletion of the requirement that the Committee maintain the University’s animal use training program. All of the other items that have been changed are for the sake of clarity or logical organization of the policy.

Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the changes as submitted from OGC. Dr. Ishak-Boushaki seconded the motion. The motion carried.

8. WELLNESS COMMITTEE CHARGE (HOP)

Dr. Amin Gutierrez de Pineres moved to approve the charge. Dr. Scotch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

9. CHANGES TO SENATE BYLAWS

Dr. Leaf outlined the changes to the bylaws. Vice Chair is changed to Past-Speaker; the Caucus is now past and new members. Senior Lecturer number of appointments changes from year to year. This is based on ten percent of the total number of tenured faculty positions elected.

Dr. Kaplan suggested that there be a Speaker-Elect instead of a Past-Speaker with a one year term.

Dr. Redman moved to bring the discussion to the floor. Dr. Kieschnick seconded the motion.
Dr. Redman noted that the Speaker has become a very complex position in the past 20 years. The idea is that possibly the Speaker-Elect could officiate the meeting to take some of the burden off the Speaker.

There were discussions regarding two year terms. Dr. Leaf asked for a straw poll. There were six votes for them. Twelve votes against. Further suggestions involve the possibility of a Speaker-Elect for a year?

In view of the lack of consensus on appropriate action, Dr. Redman withdrew the motion. Dr. Kieschnick withdrew his second.

Dr. Redman moved to send the bylaws back to the Academic Council for more discussion. Dr. Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

10. INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES BYLAWS

Dr. Fair reported that the bylaws were bring brought forward for approval. The school was under the impression that they had been approved by the Senate in the past but there was no record showing this so they are actually being submitted as new bylaws.

1.0 THE SCHOOL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.
The School of Interdisciplinary Studies (hereafter “The School”) is an academic and administrative unit of The University of Texas at Dallas (hereafter “The University”). The mission of the School of Interdisciplinary Studies is to create and sustain an interdisciplinary environment that advances the integration of knowledge from the liberal arts and sciences tradition with advanced skills in business, technology, and other professional fields. The School uses the curricular resources of the University to build interdisciplinary degree programs on an individualized basis. Advisors work with students to identify their intellectual interests, needs, and professional goals and to design innovative degree programs that will satisfy them. To assist students in putting their unique set of skills to work, the School’s Internship Program arranges professional work experience in diverse career settings.

The School is the administrative home of the Teacher Development Center.

2.0 THE FACULTY
The faculty of the School consists of tenured and tenure-track professors and senior lecturers who are employed full time. The faculty are appointed to the School of Interdisciplinary Studies, with specific roles and rights as specified by the University’s Faculty Handbook and these By-Laws.

2.1 Responsibilities of The Faculty
The faculty collectively, and each individual member thereof, are responsible for the maintenance of high standards of scholarship and teaching and for the conscientious
performance of their assigned duties and observance of the regulations and policies established by the Regents of the University of Texas System. Each member of the faculty accepts the obligation to treat students and colleagues with courtesy and dignity, and to accept a fair share of responsibility for the conduct of the affairs of the School and the University by service to the institution, to the discipline or profession of which he/she is a member, and to the public.

Consistent with the policies of the University, the faculty shall establish and/or approve: (a) educational policy for the School, including approval of academic units, curricula and requirements for degrees or certificates offered by the School; (b) standards and procedures for the appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty; (c) the strategic plan of the School; and (d) other procedures and policies as may be necessary or desirable, from time to time, for School governance.

2.2. Meetings and Voting
All members of the faculty may participate in discussion at faculty meetings, and vote on matters within the cognizance of the faculty of the School or the University.

The faculty shall meet in general session at least once each semester, at the request of the Dean. The Dean may request a meeting of the faculty at any time on 48 hours’ notice. The Dean also may call a special meeting of the Faculty on petition by one third of the voting faculty. All faculty meetings shall be open except in cases involving personnel or other matters authorized by law to be discussed in executive session.

The agenda for a faculty meeting shall be published at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, except in cases when notice and publication of an agenda are not feasible due to the urgency of the occasion or the purpose is solely to provide information as quickly as possible. Except as otherwise provided in these By-Laws, Robert’s Rules of Order shall be used in conducting the business of the faculty.

All meetings of the faculty shall be meetings of record. The Office of the Dean shall maintain an open record of these meetings, including the agenda and actions taken at each meeting. Minutes also will be maintained in the Office of the Dean.

3.0 THE DEAN AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL
The Dean of the School is appointed and serves at the pleasure of the President of the University (Regents Rules 20102, Section 1). The Dean reports to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and is a tenured member of the faculty with rank of professor.

The Dean is responsible for enhancing the quality of the School’s programs of instruction and research, for enriching the School’s resources and reputation, and for establishing a stable environment of planning and decision making. The Dean is further responsible for the administration of the School, including preparation and execution of the budget; approval of all personnel actions; scheduling of courses and assignment of duties to members of the faculty; appointment, discipline, and removal of staff and administrators
within the school; recommendation to the Vice-President/Provost of _ad hoc_ committees for review of tenure and promotion cases; annual review of the performance of faculty; and representation of the interests of the School both within the university and externally. Under provisions of Regents’ Rules Series 20102, Sec. 2 and University Policy Memorandum 96-III 30-68 rev. September 16, 1999 Section II A1, the Dean may delegate responsibilities to other officers of the school, including the Associate Deans and the Program Heads. The appointment of the Program Head is made by the Dean after consultation with the program faculty.

4.0 THE UNITS OF THE SCHOOL
The programs and the Teacher Development Center are the academic and administrative units of the School of Interdisciplinary Studies at The University of Texas at Dallas. They are responsible for developing and implementing instructional plans. These units provide the primary administrative base and a source of intellectual community for faculty. More specifically, these responsibilities may include assistance to the Office of the Dean in annual review and periodic performance evaluations of the faculty, and the discharge of graduate and undergraduate program scheduling and, as appropriate, admissions, advising, and monitoring of student, performance.

Under the leadership of the Associate Dean or Program Head, the academic unit faculty is responsible for: (a) maintenance of the academic quality of the unit that is consistent with standards of the relevant accrediting body; (b) approval of lecturers employed to teach courses in the unit; (c) development and maintenance of an appropriate schedule of courses; (d) recommendations to the Associate Dean or Program Head and thereby to the Dean for improvements in the structure, operation, and development of the unit; and as appropriate; (e) selection of students in the unit for special awards.

5.0 STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY
Standing committees of the School of Interdisciplinary Studies may be established pursuant to University rules, by action of the faculty, or by action of the Dean, as provided herein. The Standing committees are:

5.1 The School Executive Committee
The School Executive Committee is chaired by the Dean and consists of the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs, and the Associate Dean for Teacher Development. The duties of the committee, but are not limited to: (a) providing advice to the Dean on matters of educational and faculty policy and practice; (b) providing assistance to the Dean in strategic planning for the School; (c) ensuring effective coordination of practices and maintenance of standards among the academic units; (d) approving committee membership other than those committees provided for in these Bylaws; (e) providing assistance to the Dean on matters pertaining to day-to-day management of the School.

5.2 The Unit or Program Committees
Each unit shall have a Unit or Program Committee chaired by the Associate Dean or Program Head. The Committee shall consist of unit faculty. Part time Senior lecturers may be invited to participate ex officio.
Unit Committees shall meet at least once per semester. Unit faculty as a whole shall meet at least once per semester with the Unit Head and the Unit Committee.

A Unit Committee, as chaired by the Associate Dean or Program Head, is responsible for: (a) matters of educational policy and practice that affect a unit’s undergraduate and/or graduate instructional responsibilities; (b) matters of student career development (c) other aspects of unit development and administration and operations.

5.3 The Faculty Personnel Review Committee
The Faculty Personnel Review Committee carries out the responsibilities outlined in the University Policy Memorandum 75-III. 22-3. The committee is chaired by the Dean. It consists of tenured faculty appointed by the Dean with approval by majority vote of the faculty. The duties of the Committee include: (a) review of the files of all associate professors annually to determine whether to recommend that ad hoc committees be appointed to consider promotion of any associate professor to professor; (b) advice to the Dean concerning appointment to ad hoc committees for third-year review of assistant professors, promotion and tenure of assistant professors; (c) review of the qualifications of non-tenure-track special appointments and research associate appointments as provided for in procedures adopted by the faculty; (d) advice to the Dean regarding selection of faculty for faculty development leaves; and (e) assistance to the Dean in providing advice to faculty on progress toward tenure and promotion. The Dean may undertake to consider such recommendations and advice in consultation with one or more Heads of affected programs.

5.4 The Committee on Effective Teaching
The Committee on Effective Teaching is mandated by Policy Memorandum 96-III.21-70. Its membership shall consist of the faculty by the Dean in consultation with the Associate Deans.

The Policy Memorandum requires that the Committee develop and administer a teacher evaluation procedure; that it use written objective standards for evaluating teaching performance, including course evaluations, teaching load contributions, consideration of the diversity of courses taught along with course development, and consideration of thesis and dissertation supervision. The Committee shall also develop procedures for collection of reliable and verifiable information related to teaching performance that includes periodic classroom visits to gather direct information that supplements information taken from sources such as course syllabi and course evaluations. Finally, the Committee shall develop mechanisms for faculty to comment on their evaluations and to provide information they feel is pertinent to teaching evaluation process.

5.5 Other Faculty and Functional Committees.
Such other committees as may be needed to carry out faculty or other functions not assigned to the committees established herein may be established or modified as needed by the Dean with the approval of the Executive Committee. The Dean will maintain and
post a complete list of such committees, their charges, and their membership in the administrative offices.

6.0 Standards and Procedures for Review of Non-tenure-System Faculty
   a. Non-tenure-System faculty will be reviewed for promotion after 3 years by request of the faculty member only.

   b. An independent faculty committee, appointed by the Dean for each faculty member requesting review, will review the credentials of the non-tenure-system faculty.
     - The faculty committee will consist of three faculty members.
     - The faculty committee will consist of either tenured faculty in The School of Interdisciplinary Studies (SIS), higher ranked Senior Lecturers in the SIS or other schools, or tenured faculty members in other schools.
     - The Senior Lecturer being reviewed will submit five names of possible committee members to the Dean.
     - The Dean will appoint at least two committee members from the list submitted by the Senior Lecturer being reviewed.
     - The Dean will appoint at least one committee member from the tenure track faculty in SIS.
     - The Dean will appoint at least one committee member who is a Senior Lecturer of higher rank.

   c. The teaching evaluation procedure administrated by the independent faculty committee appointed by the Dean and will consist of:
      1. Teaching Portfolio
         - Course syllabi for the last three years
         - Examples of teaching materials
         - Statements by students or faculty
         - Other materials selected by faculty member
      2. Teaching narrative statement.
      3. Three years of student evaluations.
      4. Committee reports of classroom observation.
         - Two of the three committee members will each conduct a classroom observation using procedures that are recommended by the committee after consultation with the Senior Lecturer and the attached classroom observation form dated 1/16/09.
      5. Internal letters from faculty members and students are optional.
d. Administration, research, or professional service may be areas that are considered by the independent faculty committee as the duties of the Senior Lecturer require.

e. The independent faculty committee will make a written recommendation to the Dean.

f. Non-tenure system faculty recommendations for promotions will be approved by a vote of the tenured faculty of the SIS and those non-tenure system faculty of higher rank if they do not serve on the independent review committee.

g. The Dean will review the materials submitted by the committee and any other relevant information and make a written recommendation to the Provost.

7.0 AMENDMENTS.
These By-laws may be amended by two-thirds or more of those present and voting at any regular meeting of the faculty, provided that full notification of the proposed amendment has been circulated to the entire faculty of the school not less than two weeks in advance of the meeting. These By-Laws will take effect upon a favorable vote by two-thirds or more of the faculty members present and voting at a regular faculty meeting.

Dr. Salter moved to approve the Interdisciplinary Studies Bylaws as amended. Dr. Dowling seconded the motion. The motion carried.

11. CEP-NEW PROGRAM REQUEST FOR BACHELOR IN GIS

Dr. Cantrell provided a brief description of the program and the educational objectives and stated that jobs do exist for this degree:

In recent years, powerful new technologies and techniques have emerged that greatly improve our ability to acquire, archive, analyze and communicate information regarding the Earth’s surface. These same technologies and techniques (which are typically termed the Geospatial Information Sciences or GIsSciences) allow us to combine physical data regarding the Earth’s surface with social, economic, ecologic, or other types of data that can be mapped to the Earth’s surface. Once a multi-tiered database of physical, social and other data layers is produced, it can be analyzed in novel ways that take the data’s spatial nature into account. The insights produced by these sorts of databases and analyses are revolutionizing many fields of science, government and business, and through now-commonplace consumer products such as web-based mapping systems and GPS units, are directly impacting the everyday lives of ordinary individuals.

Graduates of the Bachelors Program in Geospatial Information Science will understand the logical, mathematical and technological underpinnings of GIScience, and be skilled in solving geospatial problems to the point where they will be able to move into professional roles handling the geospatial needs facing typical corporate, government,
and nonprofit organizations. Their level of understanding will transcend simple familiarity with common GIScience software packages; while these graduates will be skilled in the use of such systems, they will also understand the underlying principles upon which software systems are based. This will allow our graduates to transfer their knowledge from one software system to another, and more importantly, to view geospatial problems as issues that can be solved by applying basic theories, techniques and methodologies, and not be limited to solutions encapsulated in particular software systems.

Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the GIS degree program as submitted. Dr. Scotch seconded the motion. There was one objection. The motion carried.

12. CEP-2008-2010 GRADUATE LIST CHANGES

Dr. Cantrell stated that the Graduate Council has approved the proposed graduate catalog supplement. The proposed changes are appended. As a result of prior GC approval, CEP’s action on the proposed changes will be all that is required prior to Senate approval.

Dr. Scotch brought forth a concern that the online version appears with track changes which looks messy. Dr. Cantrell will address the issue with the Graduate Dean.

Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the changes as circulated. Dr. Redman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

13. CEP-ECS CATALOG COPY CHANGES

Dr. Cantrell outlined the urgent changes that were needed. The discussion revealed that the new courses that are required, and that have not already been approved, are MECH 1108, MECH 1208, MECH 3151, MECH 3351, CS/SE 3376, CS 4395, EE 3343, ECS 3301, ECS 3310 and ECS 4378, most of which are necessary for new degree programs or to meet new degree requirements in existing programs.

Dr. Cantrell moved to the adoption of the changes to the ECS catalog copy as circulated. Dr. Scotch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

14. PM-04 TEACHING ASSISTANTS, TEACHING ASSOCIATES & RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

Ms. King outlined the changes as submitted by OGC. In the document the changes in red and blue print have been previously approved by the Senate and are now also approved by OGC. The yellow highlighted section has been added by the Graduate Dean and now will require OGC approval if the Senate approves it.
Dr. Scotch moved to approve the changes as submitted. Dr. Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Cantrell moved to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Amin Gutierrez de Pineres seconded the motion. Dr. Wildenthal adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED: [Signature]
Speaker of the Faculty
Murray J. Leaf

DATE: 22 Apr 09