AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
September 21, 2011

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  DR. DANIEL
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  DR. LEAF
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
   August 17, 2011 Meeting  DR. LEAF
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT  DR. LEAF
5. FAC REPORT  DR. LEAF
6. STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT  DR. CORDELL
7. STATUS UPDATE OF PEOPLESOFT IMPLEMENTATION  DR. JAMISON
8. ADDITION OF DAN BOCHSLER TO DISTANCE LEARNING COMMITTEE  DR. LEAF
9. APPOINTMENT OF HEARING POOL FOR STUDENT MISCONDUCT CASES  DR. LEAF
10. DISCUSSION OF MISSION STATEMENT – URGENT  DR. DANIEL/DR. LEAF
11. ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY  DR. LEAF
12. INCENTIVES FOR TEACHING EFFORT AND BETTER EVALUATION OF TEACHING  DR. LEAF
13. DISCUSSION OF NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES  DR. LEAF
14. DISCUSSION OF PhD GRADUATION RATE  DR. LEAF
15. ADJOURNMENT  DR. DANIEL

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
AUGUST 17, 2011

PRESENT: David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Shawn Alborz, Poras Balsara, Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia, Dan Bochsler, Judd Bradbury, John Burr, R. Chandrasekaran, Daniel Cohen, David Cordell, John Ferguson, Lev Gelb, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Joe Izen, Ganesh Janakiraman, Kamran Kiasaleh, Murray Leaf, Sumit Majundar, Stanimir Markov, Dennis Miller, Jessica Murphy, Steven Nielsen, Monica Rankin, Tim Redman, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Lucien Thompson, Mark Thouin

ABSENT: Bobby Alexander, Peter Assman, Charles Bambach, Gail Breen, Cy Cantrell, Gregory Dess, Gregg Dieckman, John Geissman, Jeremy Hall, Linda Keith, Syam Menon, Neeraj Mittal, Peter Park, Ravi Prakash, Michael Rebello, Venus Reese, Lakshman Tamil, Zhenyu Xuan

VISITORS: Andrew Blanchard, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Chris Parr, Richard Golden, Darren Crone

Speaker Leaf introduced Tracy Dorsey, who made a brief presentation on the City of Richardson Corporate Challenge, benefiting Special Olympics.

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

President Daniel called the meeting to order. He apologized for missing meetings in the spring and summer and explained that the Legislature’s Higher Education Committee meetings were always held on Wednesday and many UT System meetings are held on Wednesdays as well.

President Daniel noted that we will have a record enrollment this fall. He expects enrollment to be between 18,000 and 19,000 students this year. He commended Dr. Wildenthal and all the academic units for the excellent way they have managed the growth.

We will have a record year in research funding this year as well with $100-$120 million in funding. This is ahead of schedule in our strategic plan. We have 52 National Merit Scholars in our freshman class, which should place us in the top fifty universities in the country.

Construction on the third residence hall has begun. This will add another 400 beds. The waiting list for residential housing is greater than 400, so plans are underway for a fourth residence hall.

We have an important agenda item on the Board of Regents meeting next week and that is the authorization of a $25 million expansion to the School of Management. Our enrollment growth has been particularly acute in the School of Management.

At the moment, perhaps the greatest concern is with PeopleSoft. Dr. Daniel commended everyone on the tremendous effort that has been put into the software conversion while noting that no one is satisfied with where we are right now. There are a number of very substantive problems that are currently being worked on.
Dr. Daniel said that there has been a lot of discussion about productivity within higher education and what some people perceive as the rapidly escalating cost of public higher education across the nation. He has planned a planning retreat for the end of August to address how this might impact our thinking on achieving excellence in a period of constrained resources.

A comment was made that perhaps we are not using the available online capabilities to the best possible use. Dr. Daniel acknowledged that it is always a challenge to balance putting the majority of our resources into the schools and faculty while minimizing administrative costs. He suggested that at some point this year the Senate invite Susan Rogers, Vice President of Communications, to one of the Senate meetings to hear any concerns that the faculty may have. The University has begun using Facebook as one low-cost way of getting our story out.

Speaker Leaf asked how many people had checked their pay stubs and if any mistakes had been identified. Dr. Daniel stated that this is one of the ongoing issues with PeopleSoft and that it will be several months before we know and have confidence that all of the payroll processing problems have been addressed correctly. Dr. Jamison stated that he has a group of people working on these problems. They are working on closing the end of the fiscal year now and will spend a great deal of time for the remainder of the year making sure that the W-2 forms are issued correctly.

Jessica Murphy said that in her experience the staff in Human Resources has been very responsive in addressing problems when they have arisen.

Dr. Jamison was asked if there would ever be a format where an employee could check the paystub information and have it accurate on a consistent basis. Presently some records show year-to-date totals while others do not. Dr. Jamison responded that programmers are working on how to normalize the process.

It was also noted that with the new system it has become increasingly difficult to track and manage research accounts. Dr. Daniel is aware of the problem and is working especially hard to make sure that federal funds are tracked correctly.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Speaker Leaf noted that Richard Golden was present to give the Library Committee report and the Learning Management Systems report to the Senate and asked that this be added to the agenda. Joe Izen moved to make this change and Richard Scotch seconded. There were no further additions or changes to the agenda. Kurt Beron moved to approve the amended agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The agenda was approved as amended.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Kurt Beron moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Tim Redman seconded. The minutes were approved.

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT

1. Policy defining the process for using faculty panels to deal with charges of academic dishonesty on comprehensive examinations, master’s theses, and dissertations. Speaker Leaf circulated a draft last October, reflecting his conversations with the Academic Council and others. Since we have now approved the revision of Chapter 49 of the Handbook, which is implicitly focused mainly on problems in the classroom, it is now more urgent to approve this policy as a logical complement. 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, I have 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 has not had a response from the Graduate Council.

2. **Candidates for Graduation.** The list of candidates for degrees was circulated for an email ballot last week. The final vote was 37 in favor of both motions, none opposed. This constituted a quorum, and the registrar has been notified of the results.

3. **ELS—foreign student outreach.** 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. He asked Curt Ely to look into a possible relationship, which Mr. Ely has done. These discussions did not initially involve the Senate. When we were told what agreement was being considered, we were initially somewhat alarmed. As a consequence of the recent GAO report exposing the unethical practices of prominent for-profit institutions, some of them have now begun to seek relations with public universities—essentially recruiting for money under cover of the university’s name rather than their own. 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 possible arrangements. 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; the federal loan and grant programs that the for-profits have been exploiting are for degree programs. ELS students pay their own way, or (very often) have their way paid by their governments.

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 concluded, however, that there is a problem with the presentation on their website. It makes it appear that the relation between ELS and the 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 our undergraduate program or 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 participating universities they list 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 between ELS and the UTD admissions process 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 have written to the members explaining the situation and asked if they would agree to serve. All have agreed, and Curt Ely has set August 31st for a first meeting.

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

5. **UT System Faculty Advisory Council Report**
   **1. Post Tenure Review.** In response to demands of the Regents, the Chancellor has convened a working group to revise the Regents’ Rules dealing with Periodic Performance Evaluation (Post Tenure Review). 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 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. This is already in our local policies. 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.

6. **Student Government Liaison Report**
   David Cordell had nothing to report.

   Richard Golden reported that the current BlackBoard system that we are using will be discontinued in January 2013. His committee is recommending that BlackBoard 9.1 be used for the new system. The full report from the committee is attached to these minutes. Tim Redman moved to accept the report of the committee. R. Chandrasekaran seconded. The report was accepted.
Richard Golden presented the report from the Library Committee (copy attached.) Richard Scotch moved to accept the report. Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki seconded. The report was accepted.

8. **Recommendations from the Committee on Committees**  
   Richard Scotch moved to review all the committee appointments as a group. Tim Redman seconded. It was noted that Rhonda Blackburn should be removed from the Committee on Effective Teaching. Richard Scotch moved to approve the Committee on Committees recommendations. Dan Bochsler seconded. The recommendations were approved.

9. **Revision to the Charge of the Advisory Committee on Research**  
The proposed revision would add the Deans of the Schools of Arts and Humanities, Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Economic, Political, and Policy Sciences, Engineering and Computer Science, and Natural Sciences and Mathematics, or their designated representatives, as ex-officio voting members of the committee. Tim Redman moved to approve the change. Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki seconded. The motion carried.

10. **Revision to the Charge of the Committee on Academic Integrity**  
The proposed revision adds an additional faculty member who shall be appointed from among the faculty who serve on the “discipline committees” as described in Section 49.12 of Chapter 49 of the Handbook of Operating Procedures. It was noted that administrative change needed to be made stating that the Library Representative will be designated by the Library Director rather than the Dean of Libraries. Richard Scotch moved to approve. Jessica Murphy seconded. The motion carried.

11. **Revision to the Charge of the Distance Learning Committee**  
The proposed revision replaces the Distance Learning Coordinator with the Vice Provost as a voting, ex-officio member of the committee. Jessica Murphy moved to approve. Dan Bochsler seconded. The motion carried.

12. **Revision to the Charge of the Committee on Effective Teaching**  
The proposed change adds the following to the committee’s duties: *It will, on a continuing basis, refine the definition and measurement of excellence in teaching, review the effectiveness of university-wide programs and facilities to support teaching and learning, suggest new programs and facilities in support of effective teaching that might be developed, and advise the University and Academic Senate of needs for and availability of new technology and training for teachers.* Richard Scotch moved to approve the revision. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.

13. **Policy on Panels for Evaluating Charges of Academic Misconduct**  
   Kurt Beron moved to approve the policy. Jessica Murphy seconded. The motion carried. Richard Scotch moved to approve the enabling motion included in the policy. Judd Bradbury seconded. The motion carried.

14. **Addition of Chief of Police as Ex-Officio Member of Institutional Animal Care & Use Committee**  
   Speaker Leaf reported that OGC has reviewed this change approves of this addition. Tres Thompson moved to approve. Dan Bochsler seconded. The motion carried.

15. **Annual Report from Committee on Qualifications**  
   Tim Redman presented this information. The Committee is recommending that the letters of appointment for next year include the stipulation that members must be available to meet on
Friday mornings for a period of about six weeks to complete their work for the faculty review process. Joe Izen moved to approve the report. Richard Scotch seconded. The report was accepted.

Dr. Jamison announced that the City of Richardson is going through water conservation steps. Our goal is to reduce our water usage by ten percent. He also announced that the new Bookstore has opened and we will be breaking ground on the new Arts and Technology Building in September.

Speaker Leaf reminded all committee chairs that their annual reports are due.

There being no further business, President Daniel adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED: ___________________________  DATE: ____________________

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate
HEARING POOL FOR ADMINISTRATIVE DISPOSITION OF CASES OF STUDENT MISCONDUCT

The University of Texas at Dallas will maintain a list of 15 faculty members to serve as faculty members of the “Discipline Committee” as described in Section 49.12 of Chapter 49 of the Handbook of Operating Procedures.

Any member of the voting faculty or the non-tenure track faculty on full-time, annual or multi-year contracts may serve in the pool. Nominations will be sought each year at the beginning of April. Self-nomination should be encouraged. The list of those who accept their nomination will be compiled by the Academic Council and presented to the Senate for approval at the following May meeting. Additional nominations may be made from the floor.

Terms are for two years and are renewable.

The pool should include faculty who teach courses at all levels and across all schools, but especially undergraduate courses.

Before members of the pool are asked to serve on a discipline committee, they will be provided training by the office of the Dean of Students. Being in the pool and receiving training does not require a faculty member to serve on a panel in any particular case if the faculty member considers such service to be inappropriate.

Enabling motion to implement the policy:

To initiate the pool in the Fall of 2011, appointments will be made at first possible Senate meeting after passage of this policy, with half the appointments being for one year and half for two.
UT Dallas Mission Statement

The University of Texas at Dallas provides the state of Texas and the nation with excellent, innovative, education and research.

UT Dallas is committed to graduating well-rounded citizens whose education has prepared them for rewarding lives and productive careers in a constantly changing world; to continually improving our major educational and research programs in the liberal arts and sciences, engineering, management; and to assisting the conversion of the intellectual capital generated by our students, staff, and faculty into commercial realities that directly benefit the cultural, social, and economic lives of Texas citizens.