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
NOVEMBER 16, 2011

PRESENT: Peter Assmann, Poras Balsara, Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia Judd Bradbury, John Burr, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Gregory Dess, Gregg Dieckmann, John Ferguson, Lev Gelb, Jeremy Hall, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Ganesh Janakiraman, Kamran Kiasaleh, Murray Leaf, Sumit Majumdar, Stanimir Markov, Syam Menon, Dennis Miller, Jessica Murphy, Ravi Prakash, Monica Rankin, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Lakshman Tamil, Mark Thouin, Zhenyu Xuan

ABSENT: Shawn Alborz, Bobby Alexander, Dan Bochsler, Gail Breen, Daniel Cohen, John Geissman, Joe Izen, Linda Keith, Neeraj Mittal, Steven Nielsen, Peter Park, Ravi Prakash, Michael Rebello, Tim Redman, Venus Reese, Lucien Thompson

VISITORS: Andrew Blanchard, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Chris Parr, John Ferraris, Inga Musselman, Sheila Amin Gutierrez de Piñeres

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS
Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order and asked for questions. There were none.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
Speaker Leaf asked that the agenda be changed to move Item 7, Presentation and Discussion of Online Course Evaluation System, to Item 4 on the agenda so that Simon Kane could present his information and leave more quickly. Richard Scotch moved. John Burr seconded. The motion carried and the agenda was approved as modified.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried.

4. PRESENTATION OF ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM
Simon Kane of the Provost's Technology Group presented a demonstration of the proposed online courses evaluation system. He began by giving a brief background of the current course evaluation system. Since 1999 we have been using the Instructional Assessment System (IAS) from the University of Washington. This is a paper form with approximately thirty questions. There are several forms of the survey available resulting in over 250 possible questions. There are different scales and weights used in the evaluation of each form making the use of the data from the IAS form very challenging. The system we will be moving to is the Universal Evaluation System (UES).

The online UES form was used exclusively by the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences for the spring 2011 semester with a response rate of 65%. The response rate for the spring 2010 semester using the paper evaluation form was 66%.
The questions on the new online evaluation form are standardized and designed to be more general than those on the University of Washington form. The form has a separate block for evaluating multiple instructors for a single course. The system will store this data separately. The website for the course evaluations is http://eval.ualaska.edu

Students are encouraged to participate in the course evaluation by a series of three emails that will be sent using both UTD and personal email addresses. Once a student has completed the evaluation no more email reminders will be sent. Anonymous participation is achieved via randomly generated "tokens" which can be distributed automatically via email or in class in physical (paper or card) form. The course evaluation can also be reached through CourseBook. Login is not required to participate, and no attempt to identify a token holder will be made.

In the spring semester EPPS used a promotion where everyone completing course evaluations was registered for a drawing for a free iPad. There will be a university-wide promotion this semester as well and several schools are having their own promotions as well.

The proposed time frame for this semester is to have the evaluation period open from November 28-December 8. This period is designed to occur before grades are posted. Simon was asked if there would be communication to the students to let them know the schedule for the evaluation cycle. He will be sending out information to all students, but was waiting on final Senate approval before doing this.

Cy Cantrell moved to approve the use of the online course evaluation system. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried with 1 dissenting vote.

5. **Speaker's Report - Murray Leaf**

1. Everyone selected to be a member of the Hearing Pool for academic dishonesty cases has been notified and Gene Fitch has scheduled the first training session.

2. Student housing problems and related student morale issues. Sumit Majumdar contacted Speaker Leaf about a concern raised by a recent article in *The Mercury* about Indian students splitting leases in the University apartments and violating the number of allowed tenants in the apartments. The article evidently has some truth behind it, although there is no evidence that the practice is more prevalent among Indian students than others. It appears that there may be a more serious issue with housing than current plans recognize. When confronted with the issue administrators are telling students that there is no waiting list and everyone who needs housing has it. However, it appears possible that one reason why there is no waiting list is because of the increased loading in the apartments. Off-campus housing may also be more problematic for students than we recognize because of lack of transportation, safety issues and the quality of available housing.

Speaker Leaf has suggested that members of the Indian Student Association and the Chinese Student Association could address the Senate to present their views on this issue. In the Council meeting, Richard Scotch questioned what role the Senate could take in solving student housing issues. Perhaps instead of a presentation to the Senate perhaps the students should meet with the appropriate committee responsible for housing. Speaker Leaf responded that he had suggested the same thing to the students. Their response was that they have been meeting with the relevant administrative officers, with members of the Chinese Student Association. Dr. Jamison is continuing to work on expanding shuttle service to have more routes available and
running later. The Council agreed that if the students came forward with a presentation, Speaker Leaf would ask them to bring it to the Council to see what to do next.

3. Leadership Training: For at least the last six years, we have been talking about providing some guidance for people newly assigned to positions of leadership at about the level of a department chair. About four years ago, the FAC presented a plan to the UT System. The UT System took it up, and in 2008 announced the creation of the Leadership Institute, under the office of Geri Malandra. We reviewed the program here, in Council, and our conclusion was that it was too focused on compliance issues and not enough concerned with what we felt was most needed, which was the change in perspective that a person has to make when going from being an individual faculty member talking to a Chair or Dean to that of being a Chair or Dean talking to a body of faculty. The other problem with the program was that it was never big enough to reach down to the level we were most concerned with; it was forced by the demographics to focus on higher levels. So basically, the idea did not work as intended. Now, UTSA may be working out a successful alternative approach.

On October 14, Speaker Leaf attended a session of a leadership training program that UTSA has developed for its staff and faculty. They call it Leadership UTSA. They take 20 people, about equally faculty and staff, and conduct a year-long series of one-day sessions. This is their third cohort. Each meeting day they have substantial readings, then one or a few groups work up a presentation with their own analysis, and then they have some kind of exercise. For Speaker Leaf’s visit, the readings were Birnbaum, How Colleges Work, and Pawlak and Bergquist, The Six Cultures of the Academy. His job was to follow up with a one-hour presentation on organizing, organizational design, and how one writes good policy.

His conclusion was that it was a good class; the group was lively, the discussion on point, and practically everyone seemed to be getting something out of it and seemed to enjoy doing so. He thinks it would be a good model for us; certainly it is worth looking into. The individuals who are coordinating it for them are Mansour El Kikia and Gage Paine. They would be happy to come here to talk about it. They have a website: http://utsa.edu/today/2011/07/leadershiputsa.html

4. The policy the Senate recently approved to assure integrity on theses and dissertations went to the HOP Committee. In the committee, Gene Fitch raised a number of objections. The main objection was that he did not feel that it was necessary; the Dean of Students office could handle such cases under present policies. Speaker Leaf had not heard all of the concerns previously, and asked if he had discussed them with the Graduate Council. He said he sent them but did not get a response. Speaker Leaf thought it would be better if everybody concerned met face to face. Dean Cunningham arranged a meeting with the Graduate Council, which Speaker Leaf also attended. The Council did not succeed in convincing Dean Fitch to abandon his general view, nor did Dean Fitch convince the Graduate Council to alter theirs, but in the course of the conversation several reasonably important misunderstandings were exposed and some issues raised. It turned out, for example, that while we have revoked a degree for a plagiarized dissertation, we have not actually asked that the dissertation itself be withdrawn from the Proquest repository. Dean Cunningham’s office is now looking into doing so. Another interesting possibility that came up in discussion was that revocation of a degree should involve an action of the Senate, since the Senate is actually the faculty body that approved the degree. Speaker Leaf
is now looking into the way other universities deal with this possibility and expects to have his recommendations before the next meeting of the Academic Council. Dr. Wildenthal and the Senate indicated that they agreed that Senate action sounded appropriate.

6. **FAC REPORT (Murray Leaf)**
   1. Activity has mainly focused on a continuing effort by some members to approve an alternative wording to the amendments to the Regents policy on post tenure review. The proponents circulated a version and voted with a mail ballot; the vote was 17 in favor and 2 opposed. Since the total vote added up to a quorum (which is half of the total membership), the Chair has said it is in order and will forward it to Pedro Reyes.

   2. The second area of concern continues to be the resignation of David Prior and what to do about it. All but one of the Academic campuses was represented at the Texas Council of Faculty Senates meetings, so we talked about it briefly. We agreed that we will write a memorandum stating what we think the faculty requires, and also that we felt that David understood and was committed to this. We will also offer to help in going forward. I have circulated a letter and am now collecting signatures from members of the FAC. I expect to have the letter sent off tonight.

   Everything else is on the agenda.

7. **STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT**
   David Cordell had no report. Raj Dwivedi, Student Government representative, was present and announced that Student Government is working on a fundraising drive for victims of the wildfires in Bastrop. There will be donation jars at many of the upcoming Homecoming events.

   Students are already beginning to look for books for the spring semester. Mr. Dwivedi asked that faculty finalize their book selection for spring courses as quickly as possible so that students can find the best price for their textbooks. Student Government will be sponsoring the textbook swap again next semester.

   The UT System Student Advisory Council will meet in January.

8. **REVISION TO THE CHARGE OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE**
   Serenity King presented the proposed amendments to the charge. She explained that the Coordinating Board has passed a rule stating that all graduate programs must be reviewed every seven years. The policy has been reviewed to ensure that it corresponds with the new Coordinating Board rules. The majority of the changes in the policy are to clean up some language and to clarify the size and role of the committee. She noted that the number of members of the committee is no longer specified in the proposed new language, and that this is deliberate. There is also no mention of the term for membership. After discussion it was agreed that the membership term should be specified. The policy will be revised to reflect that terms for faculty members will be for two years renewable. Richard Scotch moved to approve the revised policy. Richard Scotch moved to approve the amended charge. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried. The approved wording is appended.

9. **APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATION**
   David Cordell read the following motion to approve 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. Cy Cantrell seconded and the motion carried.

David Cordell read the following motion to approve 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. Greg Dess seconded the motion and the motion carried.

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

APPROVED:

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate

DATE: 23 Jan 2013