MEMORANDUM
April 27, 2012

TO: Academic Council*

COPY TO: David Daniel
Hobson Wildenthal
Andrew Blanchard
Calvin Jamison
Abby Kratz
John Wiorkowski
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, May 2, 2012 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
Cy Cantrell  R. Chandrasekaran  David Cordell**
Murray Leaf*  Dennis Miller  Tim Redman  Richard Scotch  Tres Thompson
Sharkey Andrews, Student Government President

2012-2013 ACADEMIC COUNCIL ELECT
Gail Breen  Cy Cantrell  R. Chandrasekaran  David Cordell**
Murray Leaf*  Dennis Miller  Ravi Prakash  Tim Redman
Liz Salter  Richard Scotch  Tres Thompson
Raj Dwivedi, Student Government President

*Speaker
**Secretary
AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
May 2, 2012
Osborne Conference Room, ECSS 3.503

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS       DR. DANIEL
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA                               DR. LEAF
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   April 4, 2012 Meeting                                DR. LEAF
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT                                    DR. LEAF
5. FAC REPORT                                          DR. LEAF
6. DISCUSSION ITEM – CONCERNS FROM SENATE CAUCUS REGARDING
   APPOINTMENTS TO CHAIRED PROFESSORSHIPS               DR. LEAF
7. 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
APRIL 4, 2012

PRESENT:  David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasakaren, David Cordell, Murray Leaf, Tim Redman, Richard Scotch,

ABSENT:  Dennis Miller, Tres Thompson

VISITORS:  Andrew Blanchard, Abby Kratz, Sharkey Andrews

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS:
   President Daniel called the meeting to order. He had no particular announcements, but said that he was going through the process of annual reviews for all the vice presidents and looking at the new budget cycle for next fall. He remains somewhat worried about our rapid enrollment growth along with the ongoing PeopleSoft issues.

   Dr. Daniel was very pleased that the students had approved three new student fees in their recent Student Government election. Dr. Daniel asked Sharkey Andrews, Student Government President, for her opinion of the results. Sharkey indicated that she was somewhat disappointed – she had expected a higher voter turnout and a larger number of positive votes for the referenda. She felt like misinformation regarding when the increased fees would go into effect fueled the majority of the negative votes. Ms. Andrews also stated that she had spoken to some students who were uncomfortable voting on a fee increase that would not affect them but would burden future generations of students.

   Speaker Leaf asked Dr. Daniel if he had a status update on an acceptable Research Conflict of Interest policy.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   Speaker Leaf asked for a motion to move Item 8, Discussion on CQ Policy on Recusals, to the first order of business following the FAC report. Ramaswamy Chandrasakaren made the motion. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried and the agenda was approved as amended.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Cy Cantrell moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Tim Redman noted several corrections. Richard Scotch seconded the motion to approve the minutes pending the noted corrections. The minutes were approved as amended.
4. **SPEAKER’S REPORT (Murray Leaf)**
   1. The Caucus meeting of the incoming Senate will be held this month, at 1 pm before the Senate meeting.
   2. Speaker Leaf asked Dr. Cordell and Abby Kratz what the status was of the amendments to the resolution on the HOP approved by the Senate at its last meeting. The members representing other constituencies had suggested a change in wording regarding the way the document will assure Senate representation when matters of academic policy are being considered. These will come back to the Speaker to assure that they are non-substantive, and if they are non-substantive (with respect to the concerns of the Senate) it will go forward to System. If they are substantive, it will come back to the Senate.
   3. The letter to the 3+4 committee to revise the policy on peer review for non-tenure system faculty has not yet been sent out. It will be soon.

5. **FAC REPORT (Murray Leaf)**
   The “blue ribbon panel” on revising the Rule and Policy on Conflicts of Commitment has met twice. The general drift is to be clearer about what kinds of activities are to be encouraged as complementary to or synergistic with faculty obligations to the university, and to provide clearer guidance on what may be inconsistent with such duties, and how to manage the latter. This will involve proposing a new Regents Rule; there presently is no rule that addresses conflict of commitment explicitly so called, and hence also no rule that defines what this is. Speaker Leaf was asked what occasioned the concern with the policy. He responded that it was unclear. The Chancellor, apparently responding to some Regents, felt that the conflict of interest policy was unclear, so they worked on that and now think that is done. So the conflict of commitment is a logical next step, since the two policies should be aligned. Speaker Leaf is optimistic that the outcome will be constructive, and not result in an additional burden of needless documentation.

6. **DISCUSSION ITEM – CQ POLICY ON RECUSALS**
   Tim Redman, chair of the Committee on Qualifications, brought up for discussion an issue that CQ faced during the just completed review cycle. A faculty member going up for promotion to full professor approached Inga Musselman with the concern that one of the members of CQ was biased against the faculty member in question. Inga suggested that the faculty member speak with the Chair of CQ. After their discussion, Tim spoke with the CQ member being accused of the bias and suggested that this person might consider recusal. The CQ member agreed and left the room for the discussion of this particular case. Dr. Redman did not insist on the recusal, but merely suggested it. In retrospect, he is not certain that this was the right decision. He stated that he would be in favor of a policy modification stating that CQ members can always abstain from voting or recuse themselves at their discretion, but will not be required to do so for any reason. CQ members are considered to be completely objective and impartial.

   In response to a question, Dr. Redman stated that had he not had the conversation with the CQ member in question, he did not feel that this person would have recused themselves.

   There was further discussion on the guidelines for eligibility for serving on CQ and for chairing an ad hoc review committee. Dr. Daniel said that he felt that one reasonable
criteria for voting on review cases in CQ would be that the person had not voted on the case at a lower level anywhere within the institution. This is not a rule now and Dr. Daniel said that he feels this is a serious flaw.

Dr. Wildenthal expressed the opinion that we should consider going to a department or school-based committee for mid-probationary reviews, for tenure reviews and for promotion reviews to avoid potential problems.

Tim Redman will work with Inga Musselman to revise the CQ guidelines and write a draft for the new procedures.

7. APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATION
Tim Redman made the motion to place this item on the Senate agenda. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried.

8. CEP PROPOSALS:

PROPOSED CEP RESOLUTION ON MINIMUM GRADES IN PREREQUISITE UNDERGRADUATE COURSES
Cy Cantrell stated that this report was approved unanimously by the CEP Committee and asked if there were any questions. There was general discussion on how the use of prerequisite courses differs from school to school – some schools adhere strictly to the use of these courses to determine if a student is ready to move to the next level of instruction while others are using prerequisites more as a list of suggested courses that should be taken.

President Daniel said that if in fact our catalog lists prerequisites to courses that don’t actually need to be there, we could theoretically be slowing some students down in their progress to graduation.

Some minor wording changes were suggested. Dr. Cantrell will make these changes in the version of the policy that will be brought before the Senate.

President Daniel expressed concern for the process of implementing this policy. All instances of required prerequisite grades would need to be stated clearly in the catalog so that students could not be caught by surprise thinking that a passing grade had been received in a particular course only to find out later that there was a different prerequisite grade that was not adequately communicated.

Cy Cantrell moved to put the revised report on the Senate agenda. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

EXERCISE SCIENCE MINOR
Cy Cantrell moved to place the Graduate Certificate in Healthcare IT, the Minor in Public Health, the B.S. in Healthcare Studies and the Exercise Science Minor proposals on the Senate agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried with one abstention.
There being no further business, Dr. Daniel adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED: ______________________________ DATE: ______________________________

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Senate