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 official minutes.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 21, 2011

PRESENT: David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Poras Balsara, Dan Bochsler, Judd Bradbury, R. Chandrasekaran, Daniel Cohn, David Cordell, Greg Dess, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Joe Izen, Ganesh Janakiramam, Kamran Kiasaleh, Murray Leaf, Sumit Majundar, Stanimir Markov, Jessica Murphy, Peter Park, Monica Rankin, Michael Rebello, Tim Redman, Venus Reese, Liz Salter, Lucien Thompson, Mark Thouin, Zhenyu Xuan

ABSENT: Shawn Alborz, Bobby Alexander, Peter Assman, Kurt Beron, Gail Breen, John Burr, Cy Cantrell, Gregg Dieckmann, John Ferguson, John Geissman, Linda Keith, Syam Menon, Dennis Miller, Neeraj Mittal, Ravi Prakash, Richard Scotch, Lakshman Tamil

VISITORS: Andrew Blanchard, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Kayla Klein, Austin Cunningham, Blair Flicker

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS
Speaker Leaf called the meeting to order and asked for a motion to move Agenda Item #7, Status Update of PeopleSoft Implementation, to item #4. The motion was made and approved and the amended agenda was approved.

Following the PeopleSoft presentation, Dr. Wildenthal announced that construction on the new ATEC building is moving along. Work has also begun on the third residence hall. The laboratory space on the third floor of the Founders Building is also undergoing renovation. The School of Management parking lot will likely be completed and open for use by the end of next week.

Staff is working to make sure that the October payroll is correct.

President Daniel is in China visiting Three Gorges University.

With the growth of student enrollment we are at the boundaries of classroom space. This demands a great deal of coordination in order to utilize the available space.

The dedication of the new bookstore and visitor center will take place soon. Remodeling is also taking place on the ground floor of the Student Union Building. Dr. Wildenthal also noted that we have been requested by the Regents to amend the University mission statement. This item is on the agenda for today’s meeting.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Greg Dess moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki seconded. The minutes were approved.
2. Status Update of PeopleSoft Implementation

Dr. Jamison and Jim Gary were present to discuss this information. Dr. Jamison gave a brief overview of some of the problems that have occurred during this transition period. The slides from the PowerPoint presentation that was given are attached to these minutes. There was particular concern about grant accounting with the new system. Dr. Jamison’s office will be offering a training session specifically geared toward faculty members who need to monitor finances associated with grants and research projects.

3. Speaker’s Report

1. The proposed policy for assuring academic integrity in comprehensives, theses, and dissertations is still under discussion. Speaker Leaf asked Daniel Sharphorn, of OGC, to review it. He has responded. There are no legal problems with it and the procedure comports with Regent’s Rules.

2. The liaison group to work on a web portal for applications from ELS has met with Curt Ely and agreed on a work-plan.

3. Speaker Leaf has instructed Vicki Carlisle to send the amended charges in the letters of appointment to new committee appointees. It is not likely that the changes will require legal review, and if they do it is even more unlikely that they will be considered problematic.

4. Charles Bambach has submitted his resignation from the Senate, and it has been accepted. He is recovering from surgery and has to reduce his activity. Since we did not have more candidates for the Senate election than we have positions, we have no alternates available to fill the position he leaves vacant.

5. President Daniel’s planning retreat on Monday, August 29, was primarily intended to set priorities for the administration, but a number of the initiatives and priorities that emerged will concern the Senate. Probably the most prominent is the need to coordinate plans for faculty hiring with planning for infrastructure development. At present we have no formal mechanism; it is essentially left to the schools and the Provost. This may in fact be the best way to handle it, but I think the sense of the discussions was that it might be better to elevate it to a recognized plan or process at the university level.

Another general theme or conclusion, which President Daniel emphasized in his summary, was the need to add new programs—in part as a necessity in order to grow at all, but also as an efficient way to attract funding for nationally and internationally recognized scholars, as with the U T STARS program. The discussion consistently emphasized the essential role of the Humanities. For the Senate, this underlines the importance of revisiting the Mission Statement. Vicki Carlisle says she can manage a discussion group on the Senate website. Unless there is objection, I will ask her to set one up—initially for the Senate to see how it works, and then for everyone.

A third theme concerned performance evaluation. The Senate is already addressing part of this in working on the online course evaluation system, but there is another aspect that was prominent in one of the breakout sessions but did not wind up in President Daniel’s summary. This is post-tenure review and annual reviews. We need to find a way to responsibly, gently, and respectfully advise each other when we are no longer productive, and to suggest that we clear the way for others. When the Regents finish their current review of the Rule concerning
periodic performance evaluation, we will almost certainly have to revise our current policy on periodic performance evaluation (post-tenure review), and will need to write a policy on annual performance evaluation. We can do it with a view toward narrowly meeting the requirements of the specific relevant laws and Regent’s Rules, or we can do so with a broader view toward providing for a career path that extends beyond full-time, fully-active, employment. I think we would be wise to consider the latter.

A fourth theme concerned increased use of online and blended teaching methods. Blended learning means courses conducted partly online and partly in the classroom. At present, state rules for payment of state support for instruction include fixed requirements for classroom contact hours. There are also procedures for accounting for fully online instruction, but nothing in between. The last time Speaker Leaf asked about this, which was about five months ago, the System person in charge of online learning said that she was engaged in discussions at the state level to relax this dichotomy. When the rules are changed, we may need to write or review our own policies and practices.

Finally, there was a general concern with raising our research funding as a way to support additional very good students. One implication of this is to underline the importance of reviewing our current tenure and promotion policies in the several schools. We agreed in Council last month that the schools should do this. Perhaps we should think of way to make this suggestion more forceful. Another possibility, which was actually not discussed, was to make more of an effort to help students apply for their own support.

4. **UT System Faculty Advisory Council Report**

1. Regent’s meeting. The Regents met August 24 and 25. The FAC leadership has decided that we should try to have a faculty presence at all Regents meetings, preferably with at least one person from a health campus and one from an academic campus. The default will be that the person attending will be the President, President Elect, or Past President, depending on availability. For this meeting, since the agenda including introducing all of us, we all attended. It was an extremely interesting meeting.

This was the meeting in which the two Regental “task forces” were originally supposed to provide their recommendations. One was the Task Force on University Excellence and Productivity, chaired by Regent Pejovich. The other was the Task Force on Blended and Online Learning, chaired by Regent Hall. Both chairs were Governor Perry’s recent appointees, who were clearly dedicated to forcing the System to pursue Governor Perry’s “seven breakthrough solutions” first presented at the governor’s “Higher Education Summit” in May 2008. The recommendations originated in the Texas Public Policy Foundation, who also organized the summit. Regent Pejovich is on the TPPF Board of Directors. These were the committees that initially began by hiring Rick O’Donnell to act as their data analysis expert. O’Donnell is also associated with the TPPF, and among other things had argued that universities should not do research.

The TPPF regents and O’Donnell are responsible for the preparation and publication of information on all of our salaries, course loads, and research funding, as what they tried to argue was the logical basis for assessing the costs and benefits of retaining us.

The possibility that this level of shallowness might be imposed on the system was a very serious threat to both our working conditions and our international reputation. When the new
appointments and the formation of the Task Forces was brought to public attention, the result, among other things, was a massive and heartwarming public backlash against their arguments and assumptions, and in support of what I think we all recognize as basic values of research universities and the mainstream of American higher education more generally.

Now, six months since the troubles began, the upshot was presented in the open meeting session on Thursday afternoon. The meeting was webcast, but when I looked this morning I could not find the webcast online. As it turned out, neither committee actually had a report. Chancellor Cigarroa presented what he described as his “dashboard” to provide data on ongoing university operations under the panoply of heads, and outlined a nine-point “framework action plan” to use the information effectively in accord with a series of stated priorities. The two chairs were then called upon, and they each gave a brief statement saying how effective the committee members had been, how much they had learned, and that they considered their recommendations to be incorporated in the Chancellor’s plan. This was followed by a brief statement by Melinda Hill-Perrin, one of the organizers of the Texas Coalition for Excellence in Higher Education that formed to respond to the TPPF influence and arguments. Her remarks are on the web at http://s3.amazonaws.com/assets.polyepitome/Tcec/ media_documents/323/08-25-11_Perrin%20Remarks%20to%20UT%20BOR.pdf?1314385295. A Times of Texas news story with other links is at http://timesoftexas.com/tag/melinda-hill-perrin/.

Tim Allen, the current FAC President then spoke briefly along the same lines, in fact agreeing with the Chancellor’s position although his remarks had been prepared in advance without knowledge of what the Chancellor would say.

Regent Hicks then called for a roll-call vote to accept the Chancellor’s recommendation. The vote was unanimous in favor.

Six months ago, just before the changes in the Board of Regents had been made and the threat of imposing these “reforms” had materialized, the FAC and the System leadership had reached an unprecedented level of effectiveness in cooperation that was beginning to yield a payoff in faculty morale on most of the campuses in the system. The next step would have been to think of ways we could publicize this exceptional working environment to enhance our ability to attract more leading scholars. Compared to the mood of faculty in the rest of the country, we thought we were in very good shape. Once the committees were formed, this became unthinkable; we were in a fight just to stay where we were. Now, it seems possible to say that we are where we were six months ago and perhaps even a little ahead. We have been subject to an attack that at times threatened to succeed, so we cannot say such attacks do not occur. But we have also withstood the attack, and we have done so with the help of an unprecedented public discussion of the real core values of higher education. We also have a more cohesive internal vision consistent with those values, and this vision is now backed not only by the Regents in a formal sense by a very muscular show of public support that the Regents’ vote recognizes.

3. In response to demands from the Regents, the Chancellor convened a committee to revise Regents Rule 31002, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty—otherwise known as post tenure review and periodic performance evaluation. The committee is composed of some members of the FAC Executive Committee, Daniel Sharp from OGC, Dr. Pedro Reyes, and V. C. David Prior.
We have had two meetings and a lot of intervening discussion by email. After the first meeting the proposed draft was circulated to the campus presidents, who in turn circulated it to their administrations and, sometime, faculty leadership. It looks like there will be four main changes.

First, the relation between post tenure reviews and annual reviews will be rationalized.

Second, both will have four distinct categories of evaluation: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, fails to meet expectations, and unsatisfactory. “Fails to meet expectations” will be able to trigger efforts at adjustment or remediation. “Unsatisfactory” may trigger remediation or, if there is a prima facie case for incompetence or other “good cause shown,” termination in accordance with the procedures in Regents Rule 31008.

Third, every campus will have to write its own policy implementing this rule. This means every campus will have to have a policy on annual reviews and on post tenure review. (FAC will develop templates, as we have with criminal background checks and exigency policy.)

Fourth, peer review will be mandatory, not optional as in the present Rule.

3. The next FAC meeting will be September 22 and 23: We plan to ask Melinda Perrin-Hicks and several key legislators to come to talk with us. The legislative hearings into the governor’s influence in seeking to impose his idea of higher educational reform will be on September 21, and will doubtless be a focus of discussion at the meeting. Another topic will probably be the changes to Regents’ Rules on post tenure review.

5. STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT
This report was given by Kayla Klein, Chair of the Student Government Academic Affairs Committee. Ms. Klein reported that the members of the student Senate are going on a planning retreat this weekend. They recently elected to change their policy on providing free Scantron sheets and blue books. In the past, both Scantrons and blue books were offered for free throughout the year. Blue books will continue to be free but Scantron sheets will only be given away during mid-term and final exams.

6. ADDITION OF DAN BOCHSLER TO DISTANCE LEARNING COMMITTEE
Speaker Leaf explained that Dr. Bochsler was left off of the list of committee members that was presented to the Senate for approval in August. Gregg Dess moved to approve this addition to the committee membership. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.

7. APPOINTMENT OF HEARING POOL FOR STUDENT MISCONDUCT CASES
The following people were nominated to serve in the hearing pool:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dinesh Bhatia</th>
<th>Jessica Murphy</th>
<th>Orlando Richard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Champagne</td>
<td>Alice O'Toole</td>
<td>Liz Salter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cordell</td>
<td>Bill Pervin</td>
<td>Janelle Straach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Dieckmann</td>
<td>Matthew Polze</td>
<td>Zhenyu Xuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamran Kiasaleh</td>
<td>Ravi Prakash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Miller</td>
<td>Monica Rankin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jessica Murphy moved to approve all of the nominations. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried.
8. DISCUSSION OF UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT
Speaker Leaf introduced this topic and stated that there were two issues in particular that the requested changes needed to meet. The first is to ensure that Arts and Humanities in particular is recognized and treated equally with all other programs. The second issue is that the Regents have asked us to include a statement about the commercial development of patents.

During the ensuing discussion Tim Redman suggested that the phrase “commercial realities” be replaced with the word “programs.” Dr. Wildenthal stated that there was a strong suggestion from System to use “commercialization.” He also noted that he was also concerned about the use of the term “liberal arts.” Several suggestions were made, including “arts and sciences” and “humanities, arts and sciences.” The point was made that “humanities, arts and sciences” was redundant. After discussion, it was agreed to use the term “arts and sciences.”

Speaker Leaf suggested that revisions to the University Strategic Plan would be the place to address some of the more specific concerns brought up in this discussion. After further discussion, the following wording for the revised Mission Statement was suggested:

The University of Texas at Dallas provides the state of Texas and the nation with excellent, innovative education and research.

UT Dallas is committed to graduating well-rounded citizens whose education has prepared them for rewarding lives and productive careers in a constantly changing world; to continually improving our major educational and research programs in the arts and sciences, engineering and management; and to assisting the commercialization of the intellectual capital generated by our students, staff, and faculty.

Dan Bochsler moved to approve the mission statement as amended. Gregg Dieckmann seconded. The motion carried.

9. ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY
Jessica Murphy moved to table this and the remaining agenda items until the next meeting. The motion carried and the remaining items will be placed on the agenda for the October Senate meeting.

10. INCENTIVES FOR TEACHING EFFORT AND BETTER EVALUATION OF TEACHING
Item tabled until the October meeting.

11. DISCUSSION OF NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES
Item tabled until the October meeting.

12. DISCUSSION OF PHD GRADUATION RATE
Item tabled until the October meeting.
13. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, Provost Wildenthal adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED: Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate

DATE: 23 Jan 2013