APPROVED AND CORRECTED MINUTES
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ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
NOVEMBER 28, 2012

PRESENT: David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Robert Ackerman, Shawn Alborz, Poras Balsara, John Barden, Kurt Beron, Gail Breen, John Burr, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Gregg Dieckmann, John Ferguson, John Geissman, Lev Gelb, Umit Gurun, Tobias Hagge, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Joe Izen, Murray Leaf, Dennis Miller, Jessica Murphy, Ramachandran Natarajan, Simeon Ntafos, Michael Rebello, Tim Redman, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson,

ABSENT: Peter Assmann, Dinesh Bhatia, Simon Warren Goux, Jennifer Holmes, D. T. Huynh, Kamran Kiasaleh, Nicole Leeper Piquero, Sumit Majumdar, Syam Menon, B.P.S. Murthi, Ravi Prakash, Monica Rankin, Robert Taylor, Zhenyu Xuan, Kang Zhang

VISITORS: Marilyn Kaplan, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, James Marquart, John McCaskill, Inga Musselman, Emily Tobey, Raj Dwivedi,

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

President Daniel called the meeting to order. The biggest issue right now is the need for more academic space. The board of regents has approved the design development for the addition to the school of management. That is the most immediate need in regards to permanent space issues. The University is moving forward at an accelerated pace on the bio engineering and science building. They are trying to fast track that process. There is currently in desperate need of wet lab space. We have looked into temporary spaces, but there are no reasonable temporary options.

There has been a request for additional academic buildings through the state of Texas, specifically an engineering building. Wishful thinking that there would be a capital funds program by the state legislature to fund this project. In the past there has not been a correlation between justifiable need, and those that actually get funded. There does seem to be an actual alignment and the districts that are represented within the committees. However, we continue to pressure them for more academic space. When Arts and Technology moves out of their current ATech and into the new ATech it is to convert it to academic space. We have invited the physics department to occupy that space. One day we can hope to get a $100 million science or physics building but until that time, we will make the best use of the space that we have. A committee will be developed to plan for that space so that soon as the ATech group is ready to move out a plan is in place for that space. There is pressure to add more space; therefore any space in the core should be reserved for academic space.
The UT system has formed several task forces. One of the task forces is on engineering education. It is focused primarily on UT Austin. There is a question to what extent that UT Austin's engineering program ought to or ought not to expand its graduate degree program versus PhD program. Our university is growing as quickly as we can accommodate the growth. He would welcome any impute from the senate members on this issue.

Recently there has been an appointment of a new Dean of Economic, Political, and Policy Sciences, Denis Dean. The school will be naming a new permanent Vice President of Budgets and Finances shortly. They will be making a public announcement soon. He would like to public thank Dr. Wildenthal and those who served on the search committee. President Daniel opened the floor for questions and concerns.

Joe Izen spoke on the recent article on the 'Cotton Belt' railroad. UT Dallas was not mentioned in the article. Does the university have any input on the subject?

The Cotton belt is the rail line that runs 100 meters north of Callier Richardson. The vacant land north of Renner is reserved for a rail station on the Cotton belt. The Cotton belt runs east 30 miles through Garland and runs west to DFW airport and even down to southern Fort Worth. It is owned by Dart, but they have limited means to borrow money. They have a list of which lines get built when. Currently the building of the proposed rail line is scheduled to open in the 2030's. In the old days when you could get multi hundred million earmarks from Congress it was possible to fast track that but that is not highly feasible at this time. The default position is it will eventually get developed; we will have a DART station sometime around 2035. To fast track it a number of civic leaders want to try to do a toll road analogy. Instead of building it using public funds, get a private investor to come and build it. It is common knowledge you do not make money off of a transit line in a city from the rail line itself. They are all subsidized. You only make money off of the retail and hotels near the station and the stations themselves. It is quite complex. There is a group that has been working vigorously working through council of governments and certain leaders including strong advocates from Richardson to get this done. This means to get a private investor, most likely a foreign investor, to come with three billion, let's say, and build this out. But I have always been skeptical about how quickly this could be done because it crosses eight cities, and UT Dallas. We would have to work out some sort of a deal, and then take it to the board of regents, as would Richardson, Garland, Addison and everyone else. The advocates for this line are pretty confident that they can get this done. Not sure if this is confidence born of rational justification, optimism or confidence born by self-selection of personality's traits in that job category. That is the long winded answer. I hope it gets developed. I have testified a couple of times publicly and steered away from the controversial issues. There is a big controversy in former council man Natisnlie's district about the noise in the north Dallas suburbs from the trains going nearby. And the proposal was to take the rail line 30 feet underground to avoid the noise to the neighborhood. This would significantly increase the cost by an estimated 50 million dollars. We he gets asked about that he steers clear of that. All he says is that from the universities stand point. We would love to be connected to DART. It would enable students from south Dallas to take public transportation to get here. It would open up UT Dallas to more prospective employees who
could access the university. We would love to go to DFW airport. It would be a great thing for visitors to the campus. From our point of view, this would be beneficial to the university and anything that is beneficial to the university is beneficial to the community, notwithstanding the pros and the cons of finances, air pollution, and all of that. There is a reasonable chance that it could get built within this decade.

Joe Izen brought up another point regarding access to the campus. He was talking to Phil Dyer, the Mayor of Plano, regarding hooking up UTD to the bicycle trails with in Richardson and Plano. Mayor Dyer followed up with this conversation and found that Plano is unaware of any efforts to do that. In fact, he was unaware of any effort on the part of Richardson to connect up Richardson trails to the trails across George Bush Turnpike. Mayor Dyer is in favor of this proposal. Work needs to begin on this proposal. Dr. Izen was under the impression that UTD was already speaking to Richardson on this subject.

Dr. Daniel responds that the University is already speaking with Richardson but unfortunately it is going slowly. Part of the loop road deal that was done two to three years ago with the city of Richardson, tax payers voted 3 or 5 million to help build the loop road. One of the things UTD had included in the deal was to finish off the hike and bike trail around the perimeter of campus. It currently does not go all the way around. It goes down Campbell, the makes its way into a U shape, which goes up both sides of campus. When we have that conversation with Richardson it would be an excellent time to speak with Plano. President Daniel requested that Dr. Izen send an email to remind him of the ‘Plano Bike Trail’ discussion, so that he can speak with Calvin and the city of Richardson about this topic. The University would love to have the trails connected. Dr Izen will send additional emails that he shared with Mayor Dyer.

Tim Redman observed an issue in regards to the parking at the Callier satellite center while observing a student who is teaching a course there. He discovered there was not much parking available. He has an orange parking pass, and even with that high level of parking access he had great difficulty finding a parking space. He was curious if there were any plans to expand the parking for the Callier center.

President Daniel responded that he suggested to Dean Moore that those open spaces between those lovely trees would be a great place to add additional parking. This issue has been noticed by President Daniel there and at the facilities building. Callier Center is moving forward with some plans to expand the Callier of Richardson building, and do not wish to ‘screw up’ the adjacent land with parking spots. The University is building a new parking garage next to NSERL 2, and there will be plenty of parking a short distance away, but that is two years away. It has been discussed, but there is currently not a very good solution to the problem. They will look at temporary solutions for this issue.

Emily Toby also noted that it is difficult to walk from Lots E, L, O and P to those two locations. She observed ten students coming through the grass and then daring to cross the narrow bridge that goes to Ruthford. It is a one lane bridge and is dangerous for pedestrians. This needs to be considered as this is an issue of student safety.
The main lots (Lot A and B) by Floyd are poorly connected. Those are the closest big lots to those locations. In fact there is plenty of parking on the north ends of those lots closer to those locations but the pathway is not a good one. That is where our loop road will go. The two lane bridge will become two bridges with sidewalks when the loop road is finally completed. We did install a gravel path between Insural and Callier Richardson. It was created so that there was a path from the bus stop to campus. It is a fairly inexpensive to build a crushed stone path. The University would be happy to build one of those if needed. We need a volunteer to sit down and with someone who knows the footpaths (official and unofficial) that students and faculty take around campus. President Daniel requested an email reminder from Emily Toby so that this issue may be addressed.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
Speaker Leaf asked for a motion to change the agenda to add the approval of Graduates and a presentation by Colleen Dutton. Cy Cantrell made the motion. Tim Redman seconded, with the understanding that we move the Replacements for the Committee on Qualifications from point 6 to point 4. The motion passed.

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

4. REPLACEMENTS ON COMMITTEE ON QUALIFICATIONS
Speaker Leaf stated that the Academic Council recommends that the Senate appoint Daniel Griffith and Robert Lowry from the Economic Political and Policy Science. They will replace Denis Dean, who has been appointed Dean of the School, and Rachel Croson, who has is leaving the university. Speaker Leaf also moved that Mohammad Ali Hooshyar be appointed to replace Juan Gonzalez. Dr. Gonzalez declined to accept his appointment to CQ last Semptember, expressing the view that the members from the School of Natural Sciences should represent a wide spread of disciplinary backgrounds. The Committee on Committees and Academic Council recommend Dr. Hooshyar’s appointment at that time, but the the recommendation was inadvertently left off the Senate agenda. Tim Redman seconded. It was approved.

Tim Redman moved that if a vacancy occur on the Committee on Qualification between now and the next Senate meeting, the agenda committee shall be authorized to use an email ballot to name a replacement. Cy Cantrell seconded. It was approved.

5. SPEAKER’S REPORT — MURRAY LEAF
a. The main item not on the agenda is the revision of the school bylaws guidelines. I have not been able to incorporate the approved changes in the present language. I expect to have it ready for the January Council meeting.

b. Closely related to the bylaws changes, we have also been working on amendments to the policy on Periodic Performance Evaluations, Promotion and Tenure, and Evaluation of Administrators, all of which are interrelated. As part of what we have been doing, we are planning to consolidate the Faculty Personnel Review Committees with the School Personnel Review Committees and provide a new and clean charge that will incorporate both functions.
c. About a month ago, Maggie Wilenski left her position as University attorney. We are conducting a search for a replacement. I am on the committee. We have now selected three candidates and they have visited the campus. They all looked very good. We should have a decision very soon.
d. I think everything else is on the agenda.

6. FAC REPORT – Murray Leaf
   a. At the FAC level, there has been ongoing discussion of several issues. First on the list is the same bundle of concerns raised by the demand to encrypt laptops on this campus, and the reaction is the same. I have circulated the conceptual framework described in item 9 among the FAC executive committee, and they also are in agreement. So we will go ahead on that basis at the System level as well.
   b. There is also an issue regarding faculty involvement in teaching assessment. Dr. Cordell was on a system committee that made recommendations. This has resulted in an apparent initiative from VC Reyes that went beyond what the Committee thought they were dealing with. The committee recommendation was only for faculty observation, not assessment. This has been clarified with a further exchange of communications, but as yet there is no final resolution. I think there is a role for the FAC to develop some simple guidelines that should resolve the faculty concerns.
   c. There was a special meeting of the regents in Tyler on November 14. Tim Allen, Past President, attended for the FAC. Business conducted was almost all financial and did not pose problems with respect to the concerns of the faculty.
   d. As a follow-up from the discussions with Barbara Holthaus and Lewis Watkins in the FAC meeting, I have received a letter inviting FAC participation in discussions of the issues relevant to the encryption requirements that System has been trying to impose. The letter also reasserts the position that the “Board of Regents continue to own all intellectual property that faculty create in the course and scope of their employment—expressly including research data.” I have not yet replied but the position is obviously not acceptable, or even meaningful.

7. TCFS Report
   The Texas Council of Faculty Senates met in Austin on Oct 26 and 27. The topics for the meeting were much the same as for the previous FAC meeting: low producing programs, the new Core requirements, and the CB in general. Faculty views are quite consistent across the state. The low producing programs initiative is a very time consuming effort with no clear academic or economic value.

   The changes that the CB has mandated in the core curriculum have attracted same reaction as on the UTD campus: the statewide need for greater competence in STEM subjects is not likely to be met by reducing STEM requirements. Apart from this, our relations with the CB remain cordial.

8. Student Government Liaison Report
   Raj Dwivedi reported that the student body just returned from a full week fall break. He cannot confirm nor deny that students were leaving campus starting Wednesday or Thursday of the previous week. Before the break they had a tailgating event to celebrate homecoming. The students enjoyed it and got a lot of popular feedback. They are hoping that this could be a tradition for the school. On November 27th, the student regent applications and Texas higher
education coordination board applications were due to him. He received two applicants, one for each of the two applications.

Two weeks prior, Ravi Dwivedi went to Austin for second Student Advising council meeting. The core committees discussed prospective student issues that all the sister schools are facing. Some of the issues that were raised were: More financial support from Legislature to fund the Afold Act. The most controversial and important one was the proposal on carrying of concealed hand guns. Predominant opinion was there was no place for guns on college campuses. Yet a few campus leaders were in favor of allowing students with concealed handgun permits and licenses to carry guns onto campuses. In the end the committee agreed the ideal scenarios will be for the legislature to leave the laws as they are currently; though if they rule differently, the ideal decision would be to leave the final decision to the individual campuses rather than a wide umbrella policy. There was a great deal of discussion of what could potentially happen should this proposal pass. They felt the resolution should be worded so that it was understood that they convey to the legislature that the committee was against this proposal; although it is still being crafted and worded by Dr. Mercer Manning Savior, who is the chair of the student advisory council. He is sure that that the resolution, as it stands, could be opposed though that is going to be brought up, and given its full attention.

9. CEP PROPOSALS
Dr. Cantrel moved to approve the proposal for Master’s program in Actuarial Science at UTD. Dr. Cantrell noted that the motion was passed enthusiastically by the CEP. There is very strong support in the mathematical sciences for this program. The program would be one of the few programs in the country that prepare the students for all seven of the required Actuarial exams. CEP moves to have the program approved.

Tres Thompson seconded the motion.

During the discussion President Daniel noted that blue cross and blue shield have thousands of employees a short distance away. In fact the insurance industry is tremendous in Dallas. The University needs to relate their curriculum and programs to the needs of the local community. Developing programs that align with existing curriculum to meet the needs of local industry but are of global significance would be perfect for the university. This is a perfect example of how the university provides that. It was approved.

Dr. Cantrell, for the CEP, moved that the Senate approve the recommendations of the Committee on Undergraduate Education to modify the requirements of the core curriculum. Dr. Cantrell noted that the prescribed core curriculum has been redefined by the state. This redefinition is not subject to approval or disapproval by the UTD Senate. All the Senate can do is to say how we are going to define the Component Area Option (CAO). The CEP voted unanimously to allow the component area to be discipline specific.

Poras Balsara seconded the motion.

Serenity King summarized the changes for the Senate. She noted that there has been an enormous amount of misinformation about the new core curriculum regarding what is required
and what is not. The hand out in the packet provides a side by side comparison. It details what the old core curriculum looked like at the state level compared what is there now. In the past we had more institutional flexibility than we have now. What we have now is only an option to change where we allocate six credit hours. We can mandate that those be done in particular areas, such as mathematics or communications, or we could allow the flexibility within the discipline so that particular major, especially those that have a hard time getting their curriculum within 120 hours, has more flexibility to use those hours. There was something that she also wanted to point out regarding over flow hours. She gave an example where a math course here at UTD is four credit hours, while the new core curriculum requires only three. The overflow could be applied to the additional six CAO hours or applied to the degree requirements. This is another reason that allowing disciplines flexibility is beneficial because different programs can decide to count that with in their degree or CAO.

Dr. Cantrell noted that that the CEP recognized that this is an issue which people feel deeply about. It is not something that CEP took lightly. They do believe that the faculty should be responsible for individual degree programs. They should be able to define how core looks in their degree programs; which is why CEP voted as they did.

Tim Redman requested clarification. He wanted to confirm that, per the hand out, the proposed core was the way it was regardless if they approved it or not. Dr. Cantrell confirmed. Dr. Redman then requested further clarification on what the Senate was being asked to approve. Dr. Cantrell confirmed that the Senate was being asked to approve how the COA would be managed. The CEP was proposing that the additional six credit hours be decided upon by the individual programs themselves.

Emily Tobey asked how this will affect the transfer students, especially the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology students. Over half of the students in the program are transfer students. They come to the school with their core already completed; therefore the university cannot make them take additional core classes. Dr. Cantrel described an example that three of the six CAO semester credit hours are used for a specific course in the degree program. That course is required for the major. The student would be required to take that course.

Speaker Leaf noted that there is nothing in the proposal that says that disciplines could not cooperate with each other in order to allocate or proscribe those six hours.

President Daniel added additional comments. Several years ago he spoke to a dean, possibly Dean Kratz, who commented on the core and stated that he felt that it was too mathematically intensive for some non-mathematically inclined art programs. He was curious if this proposal could eliminate that concern. Dr. Cantrell confirmed that it would.

President Daniel had additional question directed to Serenity King and the Provost. On average when students graduate from UT Dallas in a 120 hour degree program, the students actually are graduating with 144 credit hours. At UT Austin it is averaging 120-128 hours. The Board of Regents suggests to President Daniel to remove additional hours by improving our student advising. He had two questions. The first, we have a number of four hour math courses, but core curriculum only requires three hours. So why are the four-hour courses necessary? Are we unnecessarily adding additional hours?
Serenity King could not address why it was there, but she could say that part of the Core Curriculum report which is due to the Coordinating Board by November of 2013 they have to recertify all of UTD’s core classes into the new component areas. As they go through the process an electronic form will offer recommendations such as that a course needs to be renumbered from a higher division course to a lower division course, or it is a four credit hour course when it should be three. The associate deans are working with the faculty in their various areas to meet this goal.

If the core curriculum requirement is three hours President Daniel would be disappointed if any student were ‘forced’ to take a four hour course rather than a three hour course because it is driving toward inefficiency. Someone is paying for something that is not necessary.

Dr. Cantrell responded by stating that there are degree requirements that not everyone takes. The school would not ‘force’ a student to take that course, but it is a requirement for a specific degree program. The example Math course, Accelerated Calculus, which was provided by Serenity King is actually a course that is taught in two semesters instead of three. That is one of the reasons why it is four credit hours instead of three.

President Daniel agreed that if a course is four hours and all four hours count toward a degree program he does not have a problem. The problem he does have is when a student only needs three hours for the degree but the student is only able to find a four hour course, they are being forced to pay for an hour they don’t need. President Daniel requested we want to make sure we do not run into this problem. Cy Cantrell noted that this is a wide spread problem. One of the reasons why students graduate with excess hours is that they choose their courses poorly, especially before they transfer to this university or change majors. The university cannot stop them from choosing poorly.

President Daniel noted that the university may be asked why the university doesn’t advise better in the community colleges, which brought him to his second point for Serenity King and the Provost. Is there a risk that by leaving the degree component options up to the degree programs themselves we might have a situation such as student starts out in electrical engineering takes the six hours CAO, as suggested by the EE major, but decides to switch to business administration. The school of management will not allow the six hours of CAO they took, so they must take additional courses. This adds to the problem of too many additional hours. He asks that the faculty construct the curriculum in a way that minimizes students taking unnecessary hours. If a student was forced to take additional hours, this would suggest that the original hours were not actually “core” curriculum. It is more like the antithesis of the core curriculum, in the sense of what all students should have. He is concerned about the risk which causes an unintended consequence of going in the wrong direction on the parameters. To what extent, by leaving it to the degree programs, are we making it a necessity for students who change degree programs be forced to take additional hours. If we do not have that problem, that is wonderful.

Speaker Leaf noted we had a long standing attitude towards our policies and how we handle advising. It is to not waste students’ time and not impose unnecessary hurdles. Marilyn Kaplan
stated the bigger issue is the transfer students from community colleges who have been taking courses that don’t apply to any degree program. Currently she is working with local community colleges toward ‘integrated pathways’. She is meeting with Richland Community Collage to bring to them UTD’s degree programs. This will enable them to know what UTD expects them to take from them. If they follow that, there should not be any excess.

President Daniel will need to meet with the Provost and Larry Redlinger to discuss if the rationale behind why students graduate with more hours that what is required for the degree program. The common answer is that it is due to the community colleges. President Daniel will meet with Larry Redlinger to run the data base without the community college transfer students. He is confident that once the data is pulled, it is going to show that the UTD is significantly worse than UT Austin. That brings up the question of why.

Marilyn Kaplan noted that it is not uncommon for UTD to have students coming in with 90-120 credit hours and still have three years to go on their degree program due to having a ‘mish-mosh’ of courses that apply to nothing. President Daniel responded by saying that first time in college freshmen needs to separated from transfer students in compiling this kind of the data. The President requested that should the proposal be approved, the Provost office give him a report to assure him that this will not add additional hours.

The motion carried.

10. PRESENTATION BY Colleen Dutton, “Improvements to Human Resources”
She believes it is HR’s mission to enable the success of others. What HR does should help others be their best at what they do best. The HR department should be a value added department. How they will go about doing that will be:

- Makes it easier for people to get their job done. Reduces unnecessary roadblocks that derail the flow of teaching, research, and service to students.
- Proactively partners with schools and divisions on recruitment and retention activities that will recognize and develop high performers, and in anticipating future staffing needs.
- Promotes competitive pay and benefits that are of value to faculty and staff. Provides on going benefits education so employees fully utilize and understand the total rewards offered at UTD.
- Partners with schools and divisions to raise the performance standards across campus to encourage and support positive employee relations and career development.
- Develops faculty and staff leaders to advance the strategic plan of UTD.
- Serves as a role model for customer service excellence.

The HR department is currently leading the cultivation and pruning of the UTD Management Tree. This is being in a holistic approach to achieving the goals.

- Total rewards – (Health/ Dental Insurance, TRS/ ORP, LOA’s, Vacation/ Sick Pay)
- Recruitment, Retention & Recognition- (4 C’s)
- Excellence in Performance- (Management/ Supervisors Certificates)
- Employee Engagement- (Catch Comet Pride, Staff Council, Corporate Challenge)
HR TREE- 5 year plan

- Identify opportunities for electronic processing – Essential, Effective, Efficient, & Eyes?
  - Incorporate best practices for HR review where necessary.
  - Streamline administrative processes:
    - employee accommodation request
    - employment/hiring & termination processes
    - leave administration
- Establish effective partnerships with departments that are proactive and consultative vs. reactive and transactional.
  - Develop HR subject matter experts that function as a team servicing the campus
- Thorough review of managerial responsibilities before adverse action is implemented
  - Holding managers accountable for coaching and counseling poor performers
- Reduce turnover with better hires and improved on-boarding of new employees
- Serve as resource on departmental re-orgs, job restructuring, staffing plans
- Continual review of policy & procedure to balance efficiency and compliance
- Revise staff compensation structure and practices.
  - Alignment with current trends and future needs – recruitment & succession planning
  - Best practices in support of internal equity and to stay competitive
- Develop a Human Capital report for succession planning and workforce planning.
  - Establish career ladders for staff positions
  - Create training programs for faculty and staff that address the technical and leadership skills necessary to succeed
- Revise involuntary termination protocol and exiting process to include HR collaboration and service to employee, supervisor, and university.
- Commitment to increase diversity in the workforce and creating a culture of inclusion
  - Track and trend recruitment and retention activities impacting diversity of applicants and employees
  - Balance education and awareness with regulatory and compliance responsibilities
  - Continually serve as an agent of change with a sense of calm.
  - Establish standard metric reports to track progress & impact of HR actions

11. REVISIONS TO UTDPP1028-LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS COMMITTEE CHARGE
   Cy Cantrell moved to approve the revisions. Richard Scotch seconded. It was approved.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP ON INFORMATION SECURITY COMMITTEE
   Cy Cantrell moved to approve the nomination of Joe Izen, Kevin Hamlen, Ravi Prakash, Dinesh Bhatia, Timothy Redman, and Tres Thompson. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried.

13. REPLACEMENT FOR THERESA TOWNER ON CAMPUS FACILITIES
Speaker Leaf reported that he had requested recommendations from the Committee on Committees but they did not have any recommendations. Speaker Leaf opened the floor for nominations from the Senate members. Joe Izen volunteered to be on the committee but could not be the vice chair. The Senate recommended that another person be found to be the Vice Chair from among the committee members. Speaker Leaf moved that Joe Izen be appointed to fill Theresa Towners’s position on the Campus Facilities committee. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

14. APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATION
David Cordell moved that these students have applied for graduation and have been reviewed by the Office of Records. The Office of Records declared that all of these students will be eligible for graduation upon the completion of the current semester’s work at the necessary levels. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to graduate upon receipt of final grades, and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades are consistent with the standards for graduation prescribed by this University. He also requests that the Academic Senate certify those students designated as eligible to graduate with honors upon completion of coursework and requirements consistent with the standards for honors at the levels offered by this University. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

David Cordell moved that these students have applied for graduate degrees and have been reviewed by the Graduate Dean. The Graduate Dean certifies that all of these students will be eligible for the degrees indicated upon satisfactory completion of the current semester’s work. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to receive the degrees as indicated upon receipt of final grades and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades received are consistent with the standards for credit prescribed by this University. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

Speaker Leaf noted that one of the students on the undergraduate list was recently deceased, having completed all the requirements to graduate. We have approved the graduation of such students in the past. The family would be very happy to have the degree, and would be upset if it were denied. The student was most of the way through their last semester when they died. According to Sheila Gutierrez de Pineres, it has been historical precedent that if one is that close to graduation, the university goes ahead and awards the degree posthumously.

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

APPROVED:  
Murray J. Leaf  
Speaker of the Academic Senate  

DATE: 16 June 2013