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AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
June 6, 2012
ECS Conference Room, ECSN 2.704

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  DR. DANIEL

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  DR. LEAF

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   May 2, 2012 Meeting  DR. LEAF

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT  DR. LEAF

5. FAC REPORT  DR. LEAF

6. DISCUSSION ITEM – REVISIONS TO SCHOOL BYLAWS AND RELATED
   CONCERNS  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
MAY 2, 2012

PRESENT: Gail Breen, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Murray Leaf, Ravi Prakash, Tim Redman, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson

ABSENT: Dennis Miller

VISITORS: Abby Kratz, Raj Dwivendi

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   Tim Redman asked to add a concern from the Committee on Qualifications as a discussion item prior to the other business on the agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Cy Cantrell move to approve the minutes of the April meeting as circulated. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

3. STUDENT GOVERNMENT REPORT
   Raj Dwivendi, new Student Government president, introduced himself. Student Government held their first meeting yesterday, but he had nothing to report.

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT (Murray Leaf)
   1. The veterans group is moving ahead. Darrelene Rachavong is preparing a space for them, and it looks like it will meet all of their needs. Everybody seems quite happy with the way things are going.

   2. The Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct is still working on the annual review policy, but at the moment is also having to deal with a grievance.

   3. The administration has interviewed six candidates for Vice President for Human Resources, and of these has invited three to campus. These interviews have also been completed. Cy Cantrell and I participated for the faculty. We think two of the candidates are outstanding. Among other things, there was substantial attention paid to the possible expansion of the role of this office in leadership training, to build the kind of program we have been talking about for several years, and either of these two possible individuals would probably do a very good job with it.

5. FAC REPORT (Murray Leaf)
   It was a busy meeting, in part because the Chancellor has involved the FAC in a number of important initiatives developing new policy.
1. **Annual Reviews and Periodic Performance Evaluation.** The FAC approved a model policy, or template, essentially similar to the one I circulated here about two months ago. The main difference between what was adopted and what was circulated was that the FAC wanted to delete most of the specification I had suggested regarding the use of the four categories for evaluation. For example, they did not like the idea that “exceeds expectations” should be applied only rarely. They felt that there were many units on their campuses where it was quite likely that most of the faculty would be judged to exceed expectations most of the time. The other main difference was that they wanted to delete the discussion of possible remediation in response to the category “fails to meet expectations,” reserving it only for the category “unsatisfactory.” This will not prevent us from offering help to those who fail to meet expectations here if we wish to do so.

I had circulated the draft to Dan Sharphorn, for OGC, before the FAC discussed it. Mr. Sharphorn thought it was good from a legal point of view. So even though the FAC made some changes, I do not think there were be a problem getting System approval as well.

2. **HOP Revision Policy.** Mr. Sharphorn, in discussion with the FAC, indicated that the system is also thinking of modifying the HOP template. He knows that the FAC has previously suggested changes, and I told him that UTD had also amended its policy and was sending it forward for approval. When I got back from the meeting I spoke with Abby Kratz. Our amended version had not yet been sent forward. Abby was waiting for a response from me. I have provided the response, and it has now been sent.

3. **Conflict of Commitment.** We discussed the draft by the Blue Ribbon panel. The FAC generally agreed with and approved the report of the panel. The next step is to convert the recommendation into a Regents’ rule, a specific U T System Policy, and a template. The conflict of commitment policy raised issues with the current Regents Rule on Standard of Conduct. I have made suggestions. These are being discussed in OGC.

3. **“Stars” Problem.** I reported the concerns expressed regarding stars and chaired positions at the FAC and asked if others were experiencing the same phenomena and the same sense of reaction to it among the regular faculty ranks. The answer is that the problem seems to be widespread, and we will place it on the agenda for discussion next year.

4. **We met with Regent Cranberg.** Among other things, Regent Cranberg emphasized that the cost of research is not just reflected in money received for research grants. It also consists of the part of faculty maintenance and the university infrastructure that allows that grant money to be sought and utilized. Regent Cranberg also stressed that he is a “data person” and that he thinks we should have a lot more data available reflecting what we do. The other major theme seemed to be that there was a great deal of “mythology” and “stereotypes” about his position that he would be happy to hear and address. No one actually took him up on his offer, however—doubtless in part because it was not properly within the scope of the FAC meeting, but also probably because the FAC was more interested letting him speak for himself directly, which he did. In general, we felt that it was an informative discussion that should be continued.

5. **Department Chairs.** As some of you may have heard, in one way or another, the Chancellor is also interested in the problem of department chairs. His main foci are transparency and clarity of expectations. He recognizes that this is a crucial
administrative level. He also recognizes, as the FAC also has over the years, that there is much problematic about it. There is little standardization of expectations or, indeed, of how one gets to be a chair. There is no regular training for chairs, and no consistent policies on what they do and how they do it. Generally, the FAC agrees that this is an area that could use some clearing up, but asked for assurances that this will not be done in a top-down way that sidesteps faculty governance. The Chancellor was clear that governance would be fully involved. This interest absolutely should not be construed as meaning that the System, in any form, is interested in imposing departmentalization throughout the System.

6. DISCUSSION ITEM – CONCERNS FROM COMMITTEE ON QUALIFICATIONS
Tim Redman addressed a problem that the Committee on Qualifications faced in the recently completed faculty review cycle. There were 49 cases that CQ had to review in the last cycle. It is the responsibility of the CQ chair to write the reports. There was one Dean who was approximately two months late in getting the information to CQ. Dr. Redman’s question to the Council is what CQ’s response should be in this situation.

A more pressing issue for CQ is urgent new hires, which is related to the hiring of “stars” and the granting of chaired professorships. CQ has worked to develop a rapid response procedure to accommodate those instances when a Dean has an outstanding candidate and must move quickly in order to make a timely offer to the candidate.

CQ will not review cases if an offer letter has already been sent to the candidate. Tim is asking Inga Musselman to certify that no offer has been made before CQ will begin their review. These reviews are done electronically and they are making every effort to turn cases around in 48 hours in most cases, or at the most a one week turn-around time. Dr. Redman asked if anyone knew if EEPC guidelines were being followed in the cases of these opportunity hires.

Dr. Redman is proposing that CQ guidelines be changed to reflect this new policy on urgent hires.

Dr. Chandrasekaran suggested that each school should elect a small group of faculty which would process these targets of opportunity and get the files to CQ quickly. This would ensure that there would be some level of faculty involvement in these types of hires.

7. DISCUSSION ITEM - CONCERNS FROM SENATE CAUCUS REGARDING APPOINTMENTS TO CHAIRED PROFESSORSHIPS
Speaker Leaf distributed a list of policies and issues relevant to the appointment of chaired professorships.

1. Policy on Merit Salary Increases for Faculty - UTDPP1059
   http://provost.utdallas.edu/policy/utdpp1059.1

One of the concerns raised in the Caucus meeting was the issue of salary compression and inversion. Speaker Leaf has asked President Daniel if there is a possibility of setting aside some of the money available for merit raises to correct inequities. There currently is no policy to address this issue.
Richard Scotch said that the Advisory Committee to the University Budget will meet next week. He will bring this item up for discussion at a future meeting. The Budget Committee will report back to the Senate and discussion will be held at that time to determine what the next step should be.

2. Policy on University Research Units and Organized Research Units - UTDPP1010
   [http://provost.utdallas.edu/policy/utdpp1010.1](http://provost.utdallas.edu/policy/utdpp1010.1)

   This may need to specify oversight of faculty appointments to such units and the use of different types of funds to support them, in connection to the possibility or practice of making centers parts of packages to hire chaired professors.

3. Policy on Chaired Professorships (to be written).

   Speaker Leaf asked if the Council agreed that research should be done to determine if other universities had a similar policy to address this issue. Abby Kratz volunteered to do some research and report back to the Council.

   Speaker Leaf said that he would ask Dr. Wildenthal for a report on how many people had been hired as chaired professors and what type of agreements were made at hiring.

4. Policy or statement on target of opportunity hires. This is apparently not a listed policy, although we did develop a document about ten years ago.

   All of these items will be placed on the Senate agenda.

   Tim Redman asked when the Committee on Committees would be appointed. There was discussion about how the Committee on Committees was appointed, and why faculty were not given the opportunity to volunteer to serve on this committee.

   After discussion, it was agreed that the Council should go ahead and appoint the members of the Committee on Committees and not have the Senate meet in June to discuss this issue. The following members were suggested:

   Cy Cantrell (ECS)
   Dennis Miller (NSM)
   Tim Redman (AH)
   Sheryl Skaggs (EPPS)
   Robert Stillman (BBS)
   R. Chandrasekaran (SOM)
   Murray Leaf, Chair (EPPS)

   This item will also be placed on the Senate agenda.

   There being no further business, Speaker Leaf adjourned the meeting.

   APPROVED:_____________________________   DATE:_____________________________
   Murray J. Leaf
   Speaker of the Senate
Changes needed to bylaws:

**Appointment of Dean.** Bylaws should provide that candidates for the office of dean will be voted on by the entire voting faculty of the school. No one will be appointed as dean who has not been approved by the faculty, unless the faculty is unable to come to agreement and the appointment is approved instead by the University Senate.

**Appointment of chair.** Candidates for appointment as department chair will be voted on by the department faculty. Chairs are appointment by the dean. No one will be appointed as chair who has not been approved by the department faculty, unless the appointment is agreed to by the school faculty. The school faculty will vote only if the department faculty cannot come agreement.

**Appointment of program head.** Candidates for appointment as program head will be voted on by the program faculty. Program heads are appointed by the school dean. No one will be appointed as program head who has not been approved by the program faculty, unless the appointment is agreed to by the department faculty or the school faculty. The school faculty will vote only if the program faculty and department cannot come to agreement.

**Caucus meetings.** Bylaws should provide for caucus meetings of the faculty without the dean being present. Rules for the caucus may also exclude associate deans. If there are departments, bylaws should provide for caucus meetings of the department faculty without the department chair being present.

Each school faculty should elect a convener, comparable to the speaker of the faculty, who shall call meetings of the faculty if the dean does not, and also call such meetings as the bylaws may provide for at which the dean should not be present.

Meetings of the school faculty should be held at least once each semester. Additional meetings may be called by either the dean or the convener; the bylaws should describe required notice.

**School Executive Committee.** The previous Senate guidelines did not require school executive committees. For schools that do not have departments, we should require an executive committee, probably made up of program heads. For schools with departments, they can be department chairs and perhaps additional members elected from the departments. Executive committees should meet with the dean regularly and review all actions implementing the budgets and personnel matters.

**Budget review and approval.** The dean should present a prospective budget to the faculty at the beginning of each, and the faculty should indicate approval or disapproval by majority vote. The budget should include at a minimum all arrangements made or proposed for faculty to teach less than the require minimal teaching load, all plans for hiring, provisions for staff, and allocation of funds for student support to departments or programs. Plans for hiring should include proposed members of the concerned ad hoc
committees. Bylaws should specify the conditions under which a dean may act on a budget that the faculty has not approved. (If this cannot be done in the bylaws it should be in a university policy).

At the end of each spring term, the dean should report what was actually done under the approved budget, and the faculty should again vote its assessment and recommendations for the year to follow.

**Appointments of tenure system faculty.** The bylaws should provide for faculty involvement in making up appropriate ad hoc committees for opportunity hires that become possible but were not included in the approved budget. Bylaws should specify a procedure for seeking faculty approval promptly if such an opportunity becomes available.

The dean is not authorized to hire tenure track faculty for positions that the faculty has not approved.

**Appointments of non-tenure-system faculty.** Bylaws should specify conditions for hiring and reappointing non-tenure track faculty.

**Criteria for promotion, tenure, and periodic performance evaluation.** University policy requires that the several schools develop their own supplementary guidelines to implement the general university criteria for promotion and tenure. The bylaw guidelines, however, have not specifically required that these be in the school bylaws. The new bylaw guidelines should require that they be in the bylaws or attached to them as an appendix, so that they may be readily available to all faculty.

**New Degree Programs.** School faculty should vote to approve new degree programs in the school

If there are departments, department faculty should vote to approve new degree programs in the department. If the program involves faculty or disciplines from several departments, faculty in all the concerned departments should vote.

**Existing Degree Programs.** Combining or eliminating degree programs and transferring their faculty to other programs in the school should require votes by the program faculty and school faculty. Voting procedures should be specified; results of any lower-vote should be made available to higher-level bodies considering the actions. Elimination of programs without concurrence of the program faculty requires conformance to Regents Rule 31003, Section 2, Elimination of Academic Positions of Programs: Elimination for Academic Reasons.

**Curriculum development and catalog copy.** There should be a clear assignment of responsibility for designing programs and preparing catalog copy, with the obligations of the programs, departments, and associate deans and dean clearly delineated.
**Course schedule.** There should be a clear assignment of responsibility for scheduling classes: what is done by programs, departments (if any) and associate deans of the school. This should include a schedule of deadlines.

**Room assignments.** There should be clear designation of which officer to go to for problems with room assignments for classes, or if this is too variable to include in bylaws the bylaws should clearly say who should indicate who this person will be for any given term.

**Minutes.** Minutes of faculty meetings should be posted on the school website. Minutes of the department meetings should be posted on the department website. All faculty of the university should have access to all minutes.

**Websites.** All members of school committees should be on the school website. All chairs of department committees and programs should be on department websites. If there are no departments, program websites should list program officers.

**Teaching effectiveness committees.** Current bylaw guidelines strongly suggest but do not require that this committee be elected. This should be clarified. Teaching effectiveness committees should be elected, and their charge should include compiling information on teaching effectiveness that is required for annual reviews and comprehensive periodic performance reviews for tenured faculty.
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Preface

This is a template for advisory purposes. It is not intended to impose a uniform pattern on all
schools but rather to raise issues that all schools should probably either address for themselves or
have a reason not to. Nor is it aimed at saying how such issues ought to be addressed so much as
suggesting options to sharpen the issues. Uniformity is desirable because it makes it easier for us
to understand one another and reduces the possibility of being accused of arbitrariness, but it
should not come at the cost of recognizing real differences in the situations our several schools
are responding to. The Senate does, however, wish to urge that the bylaws should be clear,
concise, and constructive. They should be process oriented rather than legalistic, representing a
joint effort on the part of administration and faculty to arrive at mutually satisfactory ways to
discuss and resolve common problems.

In general, academic tradition and Regents’ rules assign primary responsibility for the
curriculum and curricular and related policy to the faculty and responsibility for safeguarding the
fiscal and property interests of the university, as well as assuring conformance to law, to the administration. At the University level, this division is represented by the rules and policies establishing the distinction between the faculty governance organization and the administration. The bylaws should indicate how this division of responsibility is worked out at the school and department levels.

According to the amended Handbook of Operating Procedures, the Bylaws are to be approved by the Senate and the President.

The bylaws should be submitted to the Senate by January, 2003.

The general elements that school bylaws should contain or should address are:

**PREAMBLE**

1. **Purpose and strategy.** State the general purpose and strategy of the document—the way it attempts to accomplish what it is aimed at.

**FACULTY**

2. **Faculty.** The faculty should be defined. Who is to be considered a member should be clear. How disputes on membership might be resolved should be at least suggested. The faculty may be distinguished from a voting faculty. As a general matter of academic policy, voting should be restricted to full time faculty whose continuation in employment is subject to peer review. Since in principle all our meetings are open, if there is a distinction between voting faculty and faculty, the latter must be able to attend meetings. Whether or not there is a distinction between faculty and voting faculty, the bylaws should be clear about how to regard lecturers, senior lecturers, and other non-tenure track faculty with respect to being able to participate in faculty decisions. Are part-time faculty (less than 1/2 time) distinguished from full time faculty for purposes of governance?
3. **Meetings and Voting.** For general faculty meetings, the bylaws should specify the minimum number of meetings per year or term. They should specify who chairs, what constitutes a quorum, what kinds of actions they can take, who records the meeting, how the records are kept, what notice is required, and who can call a meeting. With respect to the latter, if the Dean calls the meeting, what notice is required? If the faculty can call a meeting, what is the procedure? They should describe the requirement for publishing an agenda and for having an item placed on that agenda. They should indicate who has privilege of the floor and it should indicate who can vote. They should indicate whether proxy votes are allowed or not, and if they are allowed the situations in which they can be used and the manner of their submission should be described. In general, proxies should be discouraged and the bylaws should to everything possible to encourage all faculty to participate in faculty deliberations.

Major policy decisions should be confined to meetings held in a period that corresponds to the nine month terms for which most faculty are appointed.

4. **Conduct of business.** Generally, there should be a statement that the school follows Roberts Rules of Order unless otherwise provided for in the bylaws. An example of “otherwise” would be the Senate’s use of email ballots.

**OFFICERS**

5. **Dean.** The duties and responsibilities of the Dean with regard to academic policy should be indicated. In general, the Dean is the person clearly responsible for the finances and physical resources of the school, while the faculty is responsible for setting and administering the curriculum. The section on the Dean should address, explicitly or implicitly, the way the balance between these two sets of responsibilities is maintained, respecting the integrity of each. The general duties of the Dean with regard to financial and other administrative policies should be indicated. Although it is understood at UTD that the Dean serves at the
pleasure of the President, and processes for selecting Deans are set by university and not school policy, there is no harm saying this. The common practice at UTD has been that the deans appoint the members of the school faculty committees. These appointive powers and the procedures for appointment should be indicated—who is appointed and by what process. Here or elsewhere, the role of the Dean in hiring should be described, distinguishing the positions that should be filled with faculty consultation and involvement from to positions that the Dean can fill at his/her discretion.

4. **Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education.** Having evolved from the Masters, these have more or less established roles in coordinating the undergraduate program, preparing catalog copy, and communicating with the scheduling office on course scheduling. These responsibilities should be delineated. In addition, the bylaws should specify how they are appointed (for example by the Dean or by the Dean with approval or confirmation of the faculty) qualifications, powers and duties. For example, must they be tenured? A persistent weak spot in the administration of our undergraduate programs has been supervision of lecturers. Is this officer responsible? (If not, someone else should be).

5. **Associate or Assistant Dean for Graduate Education.** Parallel to the Masters, in most schools these have established roles in coordinating the graduate programs, preparing catalog copy, and communicating with the scheduling office on course scheduling. If the current proposal for the Graduate Council is adopted, they will be ex officio members of that Council. Where these functions have devolved on programs, as in NS&M, the relation of the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies for graduate studies to whoever does it in the programs should be indicated. Does the Associate Dean for Graduate Education have no responsibility at all (does copy go right from programs to the Dean?) or is there some limited responsibility?

The bylaws should specify how the Associate Dean for Graduate Education is appointed (for example by the Dean or by the Dean with approval or confirmation of the faculty), their qualifications (tenured only?), powers and duties. Is the Associate Dean for Graduate Education responsible for assigning TAs? Is the Associate Dean for Graduate Education
responsible for hiring and supervising lecturers? (If not, the bylaws should somewhere else say who is.) What is the role of the Associate Dean for Graduate Education in setting up ad hoc committees for dissertations?

6. Other Officers. If there are other academic officers, apart from staff and the like who act under the authority of the Dean or either of these Associate Deans, they should also be named and the bylaws should indicate the way they are appointed, their powers, their duties, their terms, and what kind of review they are subject to.

In the School of Management, there is one Associate Dean for both Graduate and Undergraduate Education, under whom is an Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Education and an Assistant Dean for Graduate Education. In this case, the duties and responsibilities associated with all three positions should be indicated.

STANDING COMMITTEES

7. Faculty Personnel Review Committee. This is a standing committee mandated by U T Dallas Policy Memorandum 75-III. 22-3. The operant portion of this is:

Faculty Personnel Review Committees are chaired by the Dean of the School and must include at least four tenured faculty members from the School appointed by the Dean or elected by the faculty. If appointed, service on the Personnel Review Committee should rotate among the tenured faculty on a staggered annual cycle with no appointment to exceed two years. If elected, terms should be for two years with no member succeeding themselves. Only tenured faculty may serve on this committee, and recommendations regarding tenured Associate Professors may be made only by tenured Professors.
All faculty members other than Professors will have their previous year's work reviewed annually by the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. This annual review will lead to one of three recommendations:

1. To retain the faculty member for another year without review, or

2. To recommend that an ad hoc committee be composed to assess the faculty member's suitability for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, or

3. In the case of faculty in their first or second year of service, to not reappoint the faculty member.

Note that this says “at least” four faculty. There can be more. Note also that nothing specifies how the appointment is to be made. It can, for example, involve nomination from the faculty or confirmation by the faculty. Note also that it reviews “all faculty,” not just tenure track. How this is done might be spelled out. For example, does it include reviewing the files of lecturers who may teach just one or two courses? If so, what input or advice is required? (If not, who does review these should be indicated elsewhere.) Note also that nothing precludes assigning additional duties, such as to review applications on opportunity hires.

Finally, our UTD policy on faculty development leaves, adopted last year, charges the Personnel Review Committee with reviewing applications for such leaves and making recommendations to the Dean. It was the intent of this charge that the committee meet together as a body and make its recommendations independently of the Dean. Bylaws should note this and can specify the process.

8. Executive Committee. The general function of executive committees is to advise Deans or Chairs and to approve such actions of these officers or faculty policies as are delegated to them to deal with. UTD schools and departments have not had executive committees up to now, although they are common elsewhere. It is a common practice in
UTD schools, however, to have the Associate and or Assistant Deans form a council with the Dean to provide advice of important matters, although this arrangement has not been formalized in any school. The present draft bylaws of the School of Social Sciences makes provision for one, with six members elected from the faculty for staggered two year terms. There are at least three advantages to this. First the committee can meet more frequently than the entire faculty can. Second, the committee can be delegated matters such as approval of routine, minor, or relatively transient committees and changes in administrative assignments without having to detail them in the legislation of the entire school, including the bylaws. Third, the executive committee can resolve disputes that might arise in individual faculty groups or that might concern the interpretation of the bylaws as a representative body of the faculty, instead of in effect having to leave them to the Dean as an appointee of the administration. In general, the executive-committee-and-Dean decision-making structure ought to provide a more open and public way to resolve issues than the Dean alone or Dean-and-Dean’s cabinet type of organization.

If a school has an executive committee, the bylaws should specify its membership, how they are selected or elected (if elected, for example, by plurality or by a weighted vote such as is used for the Senate elections), their areas of authority, their duties, terms of office, and qualifications for office.

In other universities, the functions of the personnel committee and the executive committee are often combined in an executive committee that is elected by the faculty. At UTD this would be difficult if the PRC is elected, but could be done if the PRC is elected. In this case, it would only be necessary for by-laws to assure that at least four of the elected members meet the requirements for the PRC in regard to rank and terms of service. If a School submits bylaws that combine the functions of PRC with an executive committee along these lines, the Senate will consider this to be consist with its intent in 75-III. 22-3.

A School Periodic Performance Evaluation Committee (or School Peer Review Committee) is mandated by U T Dallas POLICY MEMORANDUM 97-III.22-79. Section VIII.A of that memorandum specifies that:

The School Peer Review Committee (SPRC) is appointed by the Dean in accordance with an election by secret ballot with a nominations procedure decided by the School and restricted to the tenured faculty in the School. The SPRC is not identical to and may be a different committee than the Faculty Personnel Review Committee as described in Policy Memorandum 75-III.22-3 (which deals with promotion, reappointment, and tenure), though some or all of the members of the SPRC may be members of the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. But in all cases, the SPRC will be an elected body.

The procedures of this committee are set out in the memorandum in substantial detail. The School bylaws must be consistent with the Policy Memorandum, but should specify further details such as exactly how the election is to be carried out, who is to be eligible, the way their meetings are to be conducted, and their terms. For example, in a school like ECS it might be advisable to specify the representation by discipline.

10. Committee on Effective Teaching. A school Committee on Effective Teaching is mandated by POLICY MEMORANDUM 96-III.21-70, which requires in part:

A. A teaching evaluation procedure developed and administered by an independent faculty committee.

B. Written objective standards for evaluating teaching performance. These standards must include student course evaluations, teaching load contributions, diversity of courses covered, course development and administration, and factors such as thesis and dissertation supervision.
C. Procedures for periodic collection of reliable and verifiable information related to teaching performance including periodic classroom visits by designated faculty to gather direct observation information that supplements information taken from sources such as course syllabi and student course evaluations.

D. Some mechanism for faculty to comment on their evaluations and provide information they feel is pertinent to the teaching evaluation process.

Although the policy memorandum does not specifically say that such committees should be elected, “independent” was clearly meant to mean independent of the Dean, so election is at least strongly suggested. In any case, the bylaws should specify how the membership is constituted, the terms, how they report their results and to whom, and how their procedures are established, whether by the committee, the school, or both in some combined process.

11. Committee for Undergraduate Studies. In general, the bylaws should indicate the process by which the undergraduate program is developed and implemented, specifically describing who is responsible for planning, preparation of catalog copy, and scheduling courses. If this is done by an undergraduate program committee, then the bylaws should specify the who the members are, how they are appointed or selected (for example, appointed by Dean, or appointed by Dean upon nomination by faculty in the school or disciplines, or appointed by Dean and confirmed by faculty), their terms, their duties in relation to these functions, and the conduct of the meetings (eg: chaired by Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education?, some number per term?).

If there is no school committee, then the bylaws should indicate what does the work instead. If, as in NS&M, it is done in the departments, the details can be in the department bylaws, but the way it works and is brought together at the school level should be in the school bylaws.
12. **Committee for Graduate Studies.** In general, the bylaws should indicate the process by which the graduate program is developed and implemented, specifically describing who is responsible for planning, preparation of catalog copy, and scheduling courses. If this is done by an graduate program committee, then the bylaws should specify who the members are, how they are appointed or selected (for example, appointed by Dean, or appointed by Dean upon nomination by faculty in the school or disciplines, or appointed by Dean and confirmed by faculty), their terms, their duties in relation to these functions, and the conduct of the meetings (e.g., chaired by Associate Dean for Graduate Education?, some number per term?).

Does the Committee on Graduate Education have a role in setting up dissertation committees? Does it have a role in evaluating or assigning TAs?

If there is no school committee, then the bylaws should indicate what body has this responsibility instead. If, as in NS&M, it is done in the departments, the details can be in the department bylaws, but the way it works and is brought together at the school level should be in the school bylaws.

13. **Other committees.** Each school has a library representative and most have a library committee. As of a couple of years ago, the relations between these were coordinated and now the library representative should also be the chair or at least a member of the library committee if there is a library committee. The bylaws should describe whatever the arrangement is, again giving mode of appointment, powers, duties, and term of office. A & H has a development committee to assist in fundraising, which other schools might want to consider emulating, and a nominating committee analogous the Senate Committee on Committees that nominates faculty for appointment by the Dean to the various committee positions. While the University Cleanroom Committee is not a school committee, because of its importance the ECS and NS&M bylaws might want to notice it. As with the listed committees, bylaws in general should say what the committee is, what its membership is, what the qualifications for membership are, what the method of appointment or election is, and what the term of office is.
The bylaws may provide for individual program committees associated with the various degree programs in the schools or combinations thereof, or they may provide a general pattern for all program committees. In either case, however, there should be clear provisions for who is to be on such committees, how disputes about who is to be on them are to be resolved, who chairs them, and what their relation is to the school committees.

For committees of a temporary nature, the bylaws should provide a way to form them, establish their operating rules, and dissolve them.

14. Provisions for amending the bylaws. All bylaws should include a provision for amending the bylaws. The A & H requirement is that a simple majority suffices if the amendment is circulated well in advance of the meeting, but 2/3 is required if the amendment comes from the floor during the meeting. The social science draft calls for 2/3 and requires advance notification. When we see what we get, we might discuss whether there should be a uniform rule across the university.

HIRING ISSUES

15. Hiring. Somewhere in either the school or departmental bylaws, clear procedures should be laid out for establishing ad hoc committees with appropriate expertise for hiring new full time faculty. Responsibility should also be assigned for hiring part time faculty, adjunct or associate faculty, and for making non-tenure-track special appointments, with definitions of each. There should also be provisions for the evaluation and dismissal of part time faculty, since these are not covered in the general University policies on promotion and tenure. Who has to find a remedy if a lecturer fails to show up in the middle of a semester? The bylaws need not spell out the whole policy, but they should indicate who is in charge of developing it and it should be done in such a way that if that responsible person or group fails to do what is required it will come to general notice.