APPROVED AND CORRECTED 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
JANUARY 16TH 2013

PRESENT: Hobson Wildenthal, Robert Ackerman, Shawn Alborz, Peter Assmann, Poras Balsara, John Barden, Dinesh Bhatia, Gail Breen, John Burr, Cy Cantrell, David Cordell, Gregg Dieckmann, John Ferguson, John Geissman, Lev Gelb, Tobias Hage, Jennifer Holmes, Joe Izen, Murray Leaf, Jessica Murphy, Ramachandran Natarajan, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Michael Rebello, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Zhenyu Xuan,

ABSENT: David Daniel, Kurt Beron, R. Chandrasekaran, Simon Warren Goux, Umit Gurun, D. T. Huynh, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Kamran Kiasaleh, Nicole Leeper Piquero, Syam Menon, Dennis Miller,B.P.S. Murthi, Monica Rankin, Tim Redman, Robert Taylor, Kang Zhang

VISITORS: Nate Fairbank, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Emily Tobey, James Marquart, John McCaskill, Inga Musselman, Rochelle Pena, Sheila Pineres, Mary Jo Venetis,

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS
   Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order. There has not been any negative news come out of the legislature. One of the University’s special items has been institutionalized. The university no longer is required to apply for it. The state matching money fund has been reauthorized. If the state financial situation for the past six months was good then one could anticipate no more damage. The follow up question would be, ‘how much of the prior damage could be repaired.’ The answer from neutral parties is that there is plenty of money to repair the prior damage with possibly a little left over.

   The president will be presenting a variety of building projects, in particular a request to the regents to present to the legislature a tuition revenue bond for a major building. The regents are not in session and it must go through the regents before it goes to the legislature. What the legislature does from there is still up in the air. There were no questions.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   Speaker Leaf asked for a motion to change the agenda to add the appointment of the ad hoc election committee and to move the presentation on the UTD Handicap parking policy to before item seven on the agenda. Cy Cantrell made the motion. Joe Izen seconded. The motion passed.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Speaker Leaf presented the previous minutes. Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Cy Cantrell seconded. The minutes were approved as circulated.

4. **SPEAKER’S REPORT – MURRAY LEAF**

1. The most prominent item we talked about at the beginning of the year that we have not yet addressed is stating clearly that a chaired professor is a professor with a chair. Being appointed with a chair does not relieve one of the obligations of one’s peers of the same rank who do not have chairs, unless there is a specific contractual arrangement to the contrary associated with the chair. As we get through other related matters, the focus on this should get clearer.

2. I have redrafted our suggested changes for the guidelines to university school bylaws to include the changes the Council agreed on, and circulated it to the Council. The Council has tabled discussion until next month. In the meantime, Provost Wildenthal will fill in some information related to annual administrative cycles that faculty and administration need to work together on, and circulate it to the deans for feedback. We should then be able to decide whether to bring it directly to the Senate or first form a Senate and Dean working group to go over it. The first bylaws guidelines were focused only on the faculty organization in the schools. These will say much more about the relation between faculty and administrative bodies and functions, so we need to have wider agreement.

3. The Council also tabled discussion of a proposed charge for a Faculty Personnel Review Committee, and a small amend to our policy on promotion and tenure that would be necessary if the Faculty Personnel Review Committee charge were approved. We should have them ready for consideration next month.

4. A problem came up since our last meeting concerning a student who was clearly erratic and somewhat disruptive, although apparently not dangerous. The question that this raises is whether such a circumstance will activate the BAIT. I have discussed this with Dr. Rachavong. Her answer is that they are involved. They appear to be doing all they can. This may be a situation in which the main problem is insufficient feedback to the concerned faculty. When we discussed in Council last week, my sense was that we needed to form a working group to develop some more detailed protocols—what to do when. Dr. Rachavong has offered to join the next Council meeting to discuss these issues, and I have agreed that it would be helpful. So it will be on the next Council agenda.

5. With the Council’s agreement, I have asked Ravi Prakash to take charge as chair of our Information Security Advisory Committee, to call them together. Ravi has set the first meeting January 22, at 11 am. Please communicate with him if you have matters the committee should recognize and be concerned with.

5. **FAC REPORT – MURRAY LEAF**

a. I have circulated my paper on Issues Related to Encryption to the FAC and to the System administration. As I noted in an email I sent to you earlier today, Tim Allen and I met with Pedro Reyes and others concerned this past Friday, January 11, in Austin. Tim is at UTHSC Tyler, past Chair of the FAC, and has a JD. I have circulated a response to my issues paper that Barbara Holthaus provided at the Friday meeting. We can talk about when we discuss the issues paper on the agenda.

b. The FAC has also been asked to join the Chancellor for a conference call tomorrow, the 17th. The topic is that the Chancellor wants to combine the Conflict of Interest Policy, the Conflict of Commitment Policy, and the outside employment policy. I think this is a good idea, if the combined policy can be simplified and made more manageable. There seems to be some confusion, however, if the purpose is to begin a discussion of how to do this or if it has somehow already been done at the system level. We will see.
6. **Student Government Liaison Report**
   Raj Dwivedi was unable to attend. Nate Fairbank, Vice President of student government reported the Pub hours were extended. On February 1, they will be open Monday through Thursday until 1 AM. On Friday, they will be open until 11 pm. On Saturday, they will be open 3-8 pm. In general, the student body is getting back into the swing of things.

7. **Presentation on Disabled Sticker Policy**
   Dr. Jamison presented an update on the current UTD disabled parking registration policy. Previously, disabled students, faculty, and staff were required to register in person at the parking office to obtain a UTD disabled parking permit. The registration process consists of providing a valid driver’s license and a state issued disabled placard in the name of the person requesting the disabled permit (the state placard is obtained at any State of Texas DMV office). The placard number and associated license information is kept at the parking office. The UTD registration expires on the date that the state issued disabled placard expires. Disabled users do not have to pay additional fee to register. If users have purchased a UTD parking permit, they may return the permit and obtain a refund if the price of the original permit exceeds that of the disabled permit, $93.

   The proposed policy that is expected to be implemented on January 31 will be that disabled students, faculty and staff will be able to register with the parking office and purchase disabled permits online. The system will allow the user to attach a copy of the driver’s license and state issued disability placard. The user will be able to pay via credit/debit card. The permit will be mailed to the UTD office mailing address within 2-3 business days. Dr. Jamison noted that because the numbers are so small his office has been hand delivering them.

   The reason they are doing this process is that the demand for disabled permits have gone up, as have abuses. The most common is that a person drives up to a disabled spot, uses their parents/grandparents placard, and runs to class. This causes a shortage of spots for those that really are disabled. In their study, they have found the abuses with not only students and staff, but also faculty. If the policy says, ‘state has responsibility for ____.’ The university is the ‘state’ in that instance. This policy will be enforced, and all fines that it entails will be carried out.

8. **CEP Proposals**
   A. Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the Undergraduate catalog. Jessica Murphy seconded. The changes in the catalog were just clean up and the medical withdrawal policy added. The CEP had no objections to the changes. The motion carried.
   B. Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the undergraduate teacher certification. Richard Scotch seconded. The only changes to the document were in regards to cleaning up the process. There were no issues in the CEP. The motion carried.
   C. Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the UNIV Courses. There were no problems. The only changes were to replace the RHET 1101/ general courses. The honors college wanted reading courses so that students in C5 could meet their honors requirements. Courses were added under a university wide prefix. The CEP noted it was a desirable change as the function was added to the label. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.
D. Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the Graduate catalog as circulated. Currently the maximum number of semester credit hours a graduate student may register for is 12. They would like to raise the limit to 15. There are two reasons. The first is that it will reduce the time to graduation and enhance the graduation rate, especially in some areas such as the management degrees. The second is that it will take significant load off the graduate dean’s office, as he will have far fewer waivers to the 12-hour rule. Peter Assmann seconded.

The other change of note was the changing of the definition of part time graduate student from 4.5 credit hours per semester to five credit hours. The university does not offer half credit hour courses, and thus the change was made.

Ravi Prakash requested for further clarification on the 15 credit hours. Dr. Cantrell assured him there were students who were routinely requesting for permission to additional graduate hours. There are doctoral students in engineering who are taking 12 hours, getting an A and are saying they are ‘bored’.

Jessica Murphy was concerned that this will make students take more classes. There are a number of graduate programs in which students could easily over-load themselves. A student may wish to graduate faster by taking more classes not be capable of managing the higher course load. She recommends that there be someone knowledgeable of the program to prevent students from overloading themselves. Speaker Leaf recommends that the graduate advisors handle it. An advisor is responsible to inform students that normally they should only take X many hours per semester. Richard Scotch commented that Graduate students might enroll on their own without visiting an advisor. It is plausible for an unwise student to take 15 hours unless there were restrictions put on them by the advisor. Could an advising office routinely say ‘in this program a student needs our permission to take routinely more than 12 hours?’ Dr. Cantrell responded by saying yes, the advisor can. They can also put a registration hold until the student meets with them. Richard Scotch agreed as long as that is done, it should not be an problem. There will be a program director or someone who can say ‘you cannot do more than so many hours your first year without consulting with an advisor.’ Speaker Leaf noted that ultimately it is the student’s choice to take a number of hours. The advisor may advise them but the student has to decide whether to take the advice. Dr. Cantrell feels that it is a degree program decision.

The motion passed.

9. Amendemnt to UTD 1064 Concerning Procedures Governing PPE
Speaker Leaf noted that the changes were mainly incorporating the new language from the regents’ rules requiring four levels of evaluation instead of just two. The one other change is that it now links to the annual reviews so that they are taken into account in the to the periodic performance evaluation (PPE). This translates into the general position that if someone has been getting good annual reviews it should be a surprise if they had a bad PPE, although this is not a rigid requirement. There could be legitimate reasons for such an apparent change in evaluation, but now it is clear requirement that such a change should be clearly explained.
Another change concerns the peer review component. In the current policy there is a requirement for an elected School Personnel Review Committee. This provides faculty review of the dean’s preliminary findings in PPE and serves as an appeal body if the faculty member objects to the PPE. In the new policy these functions were assigned to the Faculty Personnel Review Committee (FPRC). The FPRC is a very similar committee that is called for in our promotion and tenure policy. It is also an elected body of faculty. Its responsibility is to look over the faculty and make recommendations for who to consider for tenure or promotion. The current allows the schools to assign the FPRC functions and the SPRC functions to the same committee but does not require it. We are recommending that there be just one committee, and that it will be called the FPRC. With both functions combined, the FPRC will necessarily become a single elected faculty body in each school that provides oversight for the entire system of administrative review.

Cy Cantrell supported the role of the faculty in this process. Faculty concern with faculty involvement in the post tenure review process goes back to 1997, when post tenure review was first discussed. The routine involvement of the faculty is very important, particularly if there is an adverse finding.

Speaker Leaf commented that adverse findings, i.e. ‘unsatisfactory’, should be rare and documented very carefully. Such a finding, under this policy, does not in itself result in termination. Consideration for termination requires a different procedure, defined by a different policy. But it could result in remedial recommendations, renegotiating or reestablishing contract obligations, or beginning the process that could lead to termination.

Cy Cantrell noted that in other discussions it has been argued that faculty might need additional warning before a finding of unsatisfactory is triggered. The intent of the present wording, as he understands it, is that a finding of “below expectations” is supposed to be that type of warning. He feels that the annual reviews should be done in a way if it looks like a faculty member is heading towards a “below expectations” evaluation at the PPE, the annual review needs to anticipate that. The annual review needs to identify the problem and begin corrective procedures at that time. Joe Izen asked if this has this been the case historically. Dr. Cantrell responded that it has not. This policy does not change much except for including the System mandated changes, but we also have the new annual review policy and with the two policies taken together there should be a concern with doing the annual reviews more carefully.

Speaker Leaf said that a major reason for the annual review and the PPE together is to provide ongoing feedback to faculty without dissolving into periodic Borgia courts characterized by sudden assassinations. Under the the policy, the faculty is constrained to be helpful to each other and is formally committed to be helpful to each other. If there is a problem, we are committed to straightforwardly say there is a problem, and to do the best we can to help do something about it. As with our promotion and tenure policy, in the end the faculty cannot make decisions for each other. Faculty members have to make their own decision, but if we can give an individual what seems to be good collective advice, we should do so. Richard Scotch moved to accept the policy as circulated. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion passed.

10. **Issues Regarding Encryption**
Speaker Leaf had circulated his statement on the issue as well as Barbara Holthaus' response. Her response does not call for an action. Cy Cantrell moved to endorse the recommendations on encryption as circulated. Jessica Murphy seconded. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

11. **AD HOC ELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBER NOMINATIONS**
Speaker Leaf moved that an Ad Hoc Election committee be formed. David Cordell is to be the chair of the committee. R. Chandrasekaran, Dinesh Bhatia, and Jennifer Holmes were volunteered to be committee members. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried.

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

**APPROVED:**

Murray J. Leaf  
Speaker of the Academic Senate  

**DATE:** 20 Feb 2013