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
April 21, 2010

PRESENT: Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia, Denise Boots, Gail Breen, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Dreg Dieckmann, Kelly Durbin, John Hoffman, Karen Huxtable-Jester, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Joe Izen, Marilyn Kaplan, Nanda Kumar, Murray Leaf, Dennis Miller, Steven Nielson, Simeon Ntafos. Tim Redman, Richard Scotch, Chelliah Sriskandarajah, Robert Stern, Tonja Wissinger

ABSENT: Mark Anderson, Titu Andreescu, John Burr, Jay Dowling, Jennifer Holmes, Shayla Holub, Syam Menon, B.P.S. Murthi, Ravi Prakash, Mark Rosen, Young Ryu

VISITORS: Hobson Wildenthal, Calvin Jamison, Daniel Bochsler, Donna Riha, Rick Dempsey, Kamran Kiasaleh, Chris Parr, Diana Kao

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS
   Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order and reported that Dr. Daniel was in Austin attending a National Research University Fund (Tier 1) meeting. Dr. Wildenthal noted that regarding achieving the Tier One status, one criterion which seemed to not be in our favor was the attrition rate of doctoral students. He reminded everyone that the criteria are multi-stage: first, an institution must have $45 million of restricted research in each of the two years ending with the meeting of the legislature. Once that is met, four of the following criteria must be met:

   - $400 million endowment;
   - 200 Ph.D.s awarded annually;
   - freshmen class with high academic achievement;
   - membership in Association of Research Libraries, Phi Beta Kappa or equivalent national recognition;
   - good quality faculty;
   - commitment to high quality graduate education.

   Dr. Wildenthal noted that work was continuing on finalizing the budget for the coming year.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   Joe Izen made a motion to approve the agenda as distributed. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried.
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Cy Cantrell made a motion to approve the minutes as circulated. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT
Speaker Leaf reported that he and David Cordell attended the spring meeting of the Texas Council of Faculty Senates in February. At this meeting there was considerable concern over the state leadership’s request for plans for budget reductions. The reaction of larger campuses was to make university-wide cuts while smaller campuses were focused on eliminating non-essential services. No campuses except Texas Woman’s University were discussing faculty firings or serious faculty freezes. (TWU is a special case, in that sense that their President has substantially overspent the appropriation for the last several biennia, and has consistently gone back to the legislature for more and received it. This year, the legislature was non-responsive. The faculty Senate has passed a resolution of no-confidence.) Some campuses were considering incidental staff freezes.

Our HOP Committee has had difficulty trying to fit the IRB policy into the standard format, so they have decided to leave the policy in its current format.

In the last Academic Council meeting, Professor Redman, who is a member of the CQ, raised a concern regarding our policy on the availability of third-year evaluations to the CQ in tenure evaluations. Evidently, the CQ was initially told this year that the files would not be available. Subsequently they were told that using them was not recommended. Council members present discussed their understandings of the peer review policy. The Council agreed that the basic idea of the requirement for the third year evaluation was that there be a look ahead and a set of recommendations on what would help or not help attain tenure. This necessarily implied that the recommendation could or would be looked at later. However, the authors of the rules never intended that these recommendations should constrain the subsequent review for tenure – that the tenure review should be carried out only in terms of the framework of the third-year review or that the third-year review should in any way bias the tenure review. The advice was only advice, not command. The tenure review should stand or fall on the merits of the case at the time of the review. Accordingly, the Council decided that the implication of the policy as it stands is that the third-year review file will not be automatically provided to the CQ in tenure considerations but will be provided if the CQ requests it. Since everyone agreed that this is the meaning of the policy, no Senate action was considered to be required. Speaker Leaf agreed to include this information in his Speaker’s report so that the minutes will reflect the interpretation. He also noted that CQ will be revising its bylaws this year to take into account the new procedures with the online evaluation and the Council asked Professor Redman to try to make sure that CQ puts this in the bylaws as the understanding.

Another set of questions came up regarding the eligibility for nomination and voting in elections for the Senate for the non-tenure track positions. Speaker Leaf has agreed to write a brochure to state and clarify the bylaws on this issue that can be distributed to non-tenure track faculty.
Speaker Leaf reported that the Speaker, Secretary and members of the Academic Council for the coming year were elected in the Caucus immediately preceding this meeting. The results of that election are:

**SPEAKER:** Murray Leaf  
**SECRETARY:** David Cordell

**ACADEMIC COUNCIL:**
- Cy Cantrell, Dennis Miller  
- Richard Scotch, Liz Salter  
- R. Chandrasekaran, Tim Redman

Speaker Leaf also reported that the Council has been asked to have lunch with Chancellor Cigarroa, Executive Vice-Chancellor Prior and Regent Longoria, who is chair of the Regents’ Academic Affairs Committee. This will be May 5th, just before the May Council meeting.

5. **UTD SUSTAINABILITY POLICY**

Donna Riha, Energy Conservation and Sustainability Manager, reported that in 2009 a System-wide sustainability policy was adopted. Because of the diversity of campuses, each President was asked to further define their institution’s sustainability policy. The UTD policy is very broad – allowing us to go in different directions, but follows the UT-Austin policy very closely. Ms. Riha feels that the policy would best be implemented by a committee that meets regularly to give recommendations. Speaker Leaf noted that one possibility would be to reorganize the Facilities Oversight Committee to include the Sustainability Policy as a part of its charge. The other possibility is to have a separate committee. Ms. Riha acknowledged that while we are headed in the right direction, there is still a long way to go. A sustainability website is being developed with a target date of being operational by summer. The lack of recycling receptacles for cans and bottles was raised, and Ms. Riha agreed that was a need. With so many projects to work on, she is trying to prioritize projects with the most visible and cost effective projects addressed first. Joe Izen asked if Ms. Riha could investigate the possibility of beginning some type of acceptable disposable for batteries. It was also suggested that there be regularly scheduled pick-up times for recycling in offices. Speaker Leaf suggested that it might be helpful for Ms. Riha to be placed on the Safety and Security Council; it was Rick Dempsey’s opinion that this was a matter for the Provost to decide. It is Speaker Leaf’s opinion that it might be helpful for Ms. Riha to attend at least a few of their meetings. He will ask Larry Overszet to include her on the mailing list for meeting notifications. Cy Cantrell made a motion to approve the policy. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.

6. **DRAFT UTD POLICY ON FINANCIAL EXIGENCY**

Speaker Leaf stated that the overall concerns of both the Regents’ rule and the UTD policy are faculty involvement and transparency. The trigger for the policy is a financial emergency to the extent that it is necessary to consider firing tenured faculty. In the past, Regents’ Rules called for faculty involvement without defining faculty. It did not specify that faculty was represented by the governance organization and it did not really describe either what would provide transparency or what the steps in the process would be. Regents’ rules now make it essentially a three-step process. First, in consultation with the
faculty, meaning the governance body, the campus decides what the emergency is that has to be resolved. Along with the President, they develop a plan to address the problem. This may involve closing programs or firing faculty. Once the general definition of exigency is done, the governance body also recommends faculty to serve on a faculty committee to draw up a detailed plan on what is to be cut. Once that is written and accepted by the President, that committee, or a second committee, actually applies that plan and designates people to be terminated. Those recommendations are also provided in writing to the President and the Senate. Then, presumably, the President acts.

There is an appeals process for those who are terminated. The appeals process again requires committees to be formed, and our policy states that those committees would be faculty from the list of people who we designate to serve on panels for tribunals. Our tribunal panel actually has two components – Presidential appointees and Senate appointees. These would be from the Senate side. When the appeals are heard, those recommendations are again submitted in writing. The entire process is recorded in writing; there is a step between each stage that is subject to review and oversight. The purpose of this is to make the legal liabilities clear rather than hiding them. The idea, then, is that people making these decisions will make them more carefully.

In our particular version of the policy, we concretize the rule. Our policy states that the faculty has the major voice in this process, although nothing impedes the President’s responsibility for making the final decisions. We further specify that the term “faculty committee” shall be understood to mean a committee established of the Academic Senate or with the Academic Senate.

Rather than reviewing the policy paragraph by paragraph, Speaker Leaf asked if there were any questions or concerns. Richard Scotch made a motion to approve the policy. Cy Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

7. CEP PROPOSALS –ACADEMIC CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN PRODUCT LIFECYCLE AND SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT; BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING; FIRST FORTY PAGES OF UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG

Cy Cantrell introduced the proposed Academic Certificate program in Product Lifecycle and Supply Chain Management and asked if there was anyone from the School of Management who wished to address this. He reported that in CEP it was widely thought that this would be a highly successful program given the existing efforts in Product Lifecycle and Supply Chain Management. Cy Cantrell moved that the Senate approve this certificate program. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

The next item was a degree proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering. Dr. Cantrell noted one of the unique features of this degree program is that there is twice as much undergraduate science in this program as there is in any other engineering program that we now have. There are three one-year courses of introductory science. The total number of hours in the program is 126. It is anticipated that graduates of this program will go on to medical school or graduate school. To help students prepare for medical school, we have to provide a way for them to take organic chemistry. This can be accomplished with a summer or two of chemistry courses. The core faculty for this program are currently in place. Additional faculty will be added as needed. Cy
Cantrell made a motion to approve the proposal. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried.

The final item was approval of the first forty pages of the undergraduate catalog. Dr. Cantrell noted that all substantive changes of the catalog have previously been reviewed and approved by the Senate. Cy Cantrell made a motion to approve the catalog. Richard Scotch seconded the motion. Dean Michael Coleman noted that the changes that have been made were small procedural changes. There has been a small change in the probation/suspension policy. One additional change that was received by Dean Coleman yesterday was a new section from Financial Aid which corrected some inaccuracies due to federal regulations, but do not represent any change in policy. The motion carried.

8. **SUBMISSION OF CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATION SPRING 2010**

The Secretary of the Faculty presented the lists of candidates for undergraduate and graduate degrees for the spring commencement.

**CANDIDATES FOR UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES:**
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. I also request 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.

David Cordell moved to certify the list of undergraduate candidates for graduation. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried.

**CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATE DEGREES:**
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.

David Cordell moved to certify the list of graduate candidates for graduation. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried.
9. **RESULTS OF SENIOR LECTURER ELECTION**

David Cordell announced that Kelly Durbin had been elected to the final open position for senior lecturers serving on the Senate.

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

APPROVED: [Signature]

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate

DATE: 16 June 2010