MEMORANDUM
September 6, 2011

TO: Academic Council*

COPY TO: David Daniel
Hobson Wildenthal
Andrew Blanchard
Calvin Jamison
Abby Kratz
John Wiorowski
Austin Cunningham
Sheila Amin Gutierrez de Piñeres

FROM: Office of Academic Governance
Vicki Carlisle, Academic Governance Secretary

SUBJECT: Academic Council Meeting

The Academic Council will meet on Wednesday, September 7, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Osborne Conference Room, ECSS 3.503. Please bring the agenda packet with you to the meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at vicki.carlisle@utdallas.edu or x6751.

Attachments

2011-2012 ACADEMIC COUNCIL

R. Chandrasekaran
David Cordell**
Murray Leaf*
Dennis Miller
Tim Redman
Richard Scotch
Tres Thompson
Sharkey Anderson, Student Government President

*Speaker
**Secretary
AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
September 7, 2011
Osborne Conference Room, ECSS 3.503

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  DR. DANIEL
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  DR. LEAF
3. SPEAKER’S REPORT  DR. LEAF
4. FAC REPORT  DR. LEAF
5. DISCUSSION ON NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES  DR. LEAF
6. SENATE RESIGNATION – JOHN BAMBACH  DR. LEAF
7. ADDITION OF DAN BOCHSLER TO DISTANCE LEARNING COMMITTEE  DR. LEAF
8. DISCUSSION OF TRANSITION TO PEOPLESOFT  DR. LEAF
9. CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW  DR. LEAF
10. ADJOURNMENT  DR. DANIEL
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Council. They have not been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are not the official minutes.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
August 3, 2011

PRESENT: Hobson Wildenthal, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Murray Leaf, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson

ABSENT: Dennis Miller, Tim Redman

GUESTS: Calvin Jamison, Abby Kratz,

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS

Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order. There were no announcements, but Provost Wildenthal offered to answer any questions the Council might have. David Cordell said that he had received an email from Liz Salter concerning senior lecturers who are just now finding out that they will not be teaching in the fall semester. Dr. Salter’s understanding was that this issue had been discussed in the past and people would be given at least a year’s notice to know that they needed to look for a job. Provost Wildenthal replied that all senior lecturers receive an appointment letter and that most of those state that the appointment is for a one year period and that there is no implication of employment beyond that period. He further stated that anytime there are cutbacks or people are not reappointed, people will be unhappy. As far as he is aware, the university has rigorously followed policy in these matters. In many cases budget issues are not resolved until the last minute. Richard Scotch expressed his opinion that this was handled in the worst possible way with no regard for the people involved, some of whom had been with the university for decades. He feels that the morale of those left in the school has suffered and that the school will suffer as well. Speaker Leaf expressed his opinion that if a senior lecturer had been here for many years they should be on a two or three-year contract. Provost Wildenthal disagreed. He was empathetic with Dr. Scotch’s concerns but said again that as far as he knew everything was handled correctly and there is no good way to terminate someone.

Speaker Leaf asked Dr. Jamison if he would address the payroll problems that have been occurring since the PeopleSoft conversion. Dr. Jamison explained that when the conversion occurred in February all of the payroll data was not successfully transferred and that is the cause for the ongoing problems. This poses a particular problem for faculty because some are paid on a nine-month basis and some on a twelve-month basis. He recently sent an email to all faculty asking them to check their paystubs to ensure that the information is correct. Dr. Chandrasekaran mentioned that he cannot print his pay information – he is able to view it but cannot print. He has had continuing problems with insurance payments being taken out incorrectly. Tres Thompson noted that he also has had this problem. Dr. Jamison assured everyone that they are working very hard to correct these issues. David Gleason in Human Resources is working on this as well. Richard Scotch mentioned that Mr. Gleason had gone...
above and beyond to meet him here on a Saturday and give him a paycheck when he was not paid correctly. Anyone who is having problems with payroll should email Dr. Jamison and he will see that it is resolved. Speaker Leaf asked Dr. Jamison if he would attend the Senate meeting to address this issue. Provost Wildenthal asked that if anyone hears of a student or staff member who is not getting paid or does not receive their complete pay, please let someone in Payroll or Dr. Jamison’s office know immediately so that the mistake can be corrected.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
There were no additions or corrections to the agenda.

3 SPEAKER’S REPORT – MURRAY LEAF
1. Policy defining the process for dealing with charges of academic dishonesty on comprehensive examinations, master’s theses, and dissertations
   Speaker Leaf had circulated a draft last October. Since we have now approved the revision of Chapter 49 of the Handbook, dealing with dishonesty in the classroom among other matters, it is now more urgent to approve this policy on comprehensives, theses, and dissertations. Otherwise, the default option will be to use the chapter 49 policy for these as well, although it will not be as appropriate. In view of the revisions to Chapter 49, Speaker Leaf has revised the comprehensives, thesis, and dissertation policy and submitted it again to the CEP and the Graduate Dean for the Graduate Council. Dr. Cantrell has responded that he thinks the CEP will agree, and does not have modifications. Speaker Leaf has spoken to Dean Cunningham but so far he has not had the Graduate Council consider it.

2. Candidates for Graduation
   The list of candidates for degrees is being prepared, and will be circulated to the Senate for email approval as the Senate has previously authorized. We should not let it wait for the Senate meeting.

3. ELS
   Many large universities have a capacity on campus for taking in students who need to improve their English proficiency before beginning classes, either after enrolling them or as a precondition to considering them. We have no such facility, and since such instruction would be non-credit we could not afford to build one up. Provost Wildenthal has been looking for a way to provide this ability in order to help with student recruiting and performance, particularly graduate recruiting and performance. ELS is a for-profit educational institution, owned by Berlitz, that Provost Wildenthal has identified as a possible solution, and has asked Curt Ely to look into a possible relationship, which he has done although these discussions did not involve the Senate. When we were brought into them, we were initially somewhat alarmed. As a consequence of the recent GAO report exposing the unethical practices of a number of prominent for profit institutions, some of them have now begun to seek relations with public universities—essentially recruiting for money—and we wanted to be sure that nothing like this, and none of these firms or individuals, was involved in this case. Accordingly, Curt Ely met with the Graduate Council, me, and a few others to review the information he had obtained and
the arrangement that was being considered. Several of us also explored the ELS website and relevant literature.

Our conclusion is that ELS is not among the firms that the GAO report covers, and has not engaged in dishonest and deceptive practices such as the report describes. It was formed in the 1960s, before the for-profits became eligible to use students to apply for loans and grants from federal sources, and does not utilize such funding. It is not degree-granting. Students pay their own way.

At present, our foreign graduate students come mainly from two regions: South Asia and China. ELS seeks students world-wide and offers them two things: intensive instruction in English as a second language, and access to American universities that the students can apply to, with counseling for cultural adaptation and to facilitate applying to those universities for admission to their programs. What they are seeking is a presence on our campus and an agreement with us whereby students they attract will be able to apply to us for conditional admission to our programs. By conditional admission, they and we basically mean that we say that they are admitted or eligible for admission except for the language deficiency, which will be met by the student completing their English course at a designated level. Their course exam is accepted as equivalent to TOEFL but we can specify TOEFL as well or instead if we want to—details can be worked out. No one is proposing that we change our admissions standards.

ELS has a very little presence in Texas, and none in North Texas. They would like more. We can offer them space on campus on an arrangement like that with the International School, and they can provide us with the capacity for ESL instruction at the student’s expense, and also a wider international recruiting reach. The Graduate Council agrees that they are legitimate and the program looks beneficial. We also agree, however, that there is a problem with the presentation on their website. It makes it appear that the relation between ELS and the graduate programs the students may apply to is closer than it actually is, so that applying through ELS might give a student an advantage over a student applying some other way, or that acceptance by ELS might be tantamount to acceptance by one of our graduate programs. We want it to be absolutely clear that acceptance to ELS does not entail acceptance by us, and conversely that when we set the requirements for conditional admission we alone will determine whether those requirements are met. At present, the links from ELS’s website to the universities they list as participating go directly to those university websites, just in the same way one would encounter those websites by independent browsing. They therefore do nothing to clarify this particular relationship.

Accordingly, we have agreed that we (UTD) should go ahead with the relationship, but that applications for admission coming from ELS should go through a dedicated UTD portal that will make the relationship absolutely clear. We have also agreed that the ad hoc liaison group that worked with Curt Ely on the graduate admissions website could work on this, with Dr. Cantrell as coordinator. I will write to the members, explain the situation, and ask them to take up the task.

Post Tenure Review

In response to demands of the Regents, the Chancellor has convened a working group to revise the Regent’s Rules dealing with Periodic Performance Evaluation (Post Tenure
The group consists of Vice Chancellor Prior, Dan Sharphorn from OGC, Dr. Pedro Reyes, and the FAC Executive Committee. We met once, hurriedly, in June, and have continued discussion by email. As of about a month ago, the draft was circulated to Presidents, so the circle of widened, and from the Presidents has gotten back to the wider FAC. There are still disagreements. The main change being discussed that will affect UTD policy is that peer review will become mandatory instead of optional. Another change will be that the Rule will include the possibility of reducing salary and/or renegotiating work expectations, which our local policies already include. This will not be on the agenda for the Regents meeting in August, so we have more time to continue the discussion. It will certainly be on the Agenda for the FAC meeting September.

All other items that have been under discussion over the summer are reflected in the agenda.

4. FAC REPORT— Murray Leaf
Speaker Leaf reported that the present unfortunate relationship with the Regents continues. The Regents put pressure on the Chancellor to tighten up the policy on post-tenure reviews. This will be discussed at the September Faculty Advisory Council meeting. Speaker Leaf thinks this can be useful. Our post-tenure review policy and ways of operating are left over from a time when there were fixed retirement ages and now it is left up to the individual to decide when they should retire. The effect of this policy, if it goes the way he thinks it should go, would be to provide some type of faculty review that could advise people, in a graceful yet authoritative way, when they should consider retiring. The main change between the current Regents’ Rule and what is being proposed is that it would make all post-tenure reviews peer reviews. If this change is approved we will need to rewrite our post-tenure review policy somewhat.

Speaker Leaf will serve as president-elect of the Faculty Advisory Council this year.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES— Murray Leaf
Speaker Leaf presented the recommendations for committee appointments from the Committee on Committees. During the discussion that followed some corrections and additions were made to the appointments. Cy Cantrell moved to approve the recommendations and changes and place this item on the Senate Agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

6. REVISIONS TO THE CHARGE OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH— Murray Leaf
The recommended change to the charge of the Advisory Committee on Research is to include the deans of Arts and Humanities and Economic Political and Policy Sciences as members all years (instead of alternating) or their designees as members. Richard Scotch moved to approve this change and place it on the Senate agenda. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried.

7. REVISION TO THE CHARGE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY— Murray Leaf
The proposed change is to add a member of the faculty judicial panel in addition to the Dean of Students. This faculty member will be recommended by the Committee on Committees. Cy Cantrell moved to accept this change. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

8. REVISION TO THE CHARGE OF THE DISTANCE LEARNING COMMITTEE— Murray Leaf
Speaker Leaf presented this change. This change deletes reference to the Distance Learning Coordinator since this position no longer exists. The wording gives the Office of the Provost
flexibility in appointing appropriate ex-officio members. Cy Cantrell moved to place this item on the Senate agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

9. **Considerations Related to the Committee on Academic Program Review – Murray Leaf**
   After a brief discussion it was agreed to postpone further discussion on this topic until more information is received regarding the changes in degree assessment and reporting that will be required by the changes to the Texas Education Code and the new Coordinating Board policies.

10. **Revision to the Charge of the Committee on Effective Teaching – Murray Leaf**
    Cy Cantrell moved to approve the change and place it on the Senate agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

11. **Policy on Panels for Evaluating Charges of Academic Misconduct – Murray Leaf**
    R. Chandrasekaran moved to place this item on the Senate agenda. Cy Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

12. **Addition of the Chief of Police as Ex-Officio Member of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee – Murray Leaf**
    Cy Cantrell moved to place this item on the Senate agenda. Richard Scotch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

13. **Annual Report from the Committee on Qualifications – Murray Leaf**
    Tim Redman was not present to present this report and Speaker Leaf did not receive the report prior to today’s meeting. The Council agreed to place this item on the agenda if it is available.

The agenda for the August 17, 2011 Academic Senate will be as follows:

1. Recommendations from the Committee on Committees
2. Revision to the charge of the Advisory Committee on Research
3. Revision to the charge of the Committee on Academic Integrity
4. Revision to the charge of the Distance Learning Committee
5. Revision to the charge of the Committee on Effective Teaching
6. Policy on panels for evaluating charges of academic misconduct
7. Addition of the Chief of Police as ex-officio member to the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
8. Annual report from the Committee on Qualifications

Cy Cantrell moved to approve the Senate agenda as read. R. Chandrasekaran seconded the motion. The motion carried.

There being no further business, Provost Wildenthal adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED: ____________________________ DATE: ____________________________

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Senate