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
MAY 16, 2012

PRESENT:  David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Robert Ackerman, Shawn Alborz, Peter Assmann, Poras Balsara, Kurt Beron, Dan Bochsler, John Burr, R. Chandrasekaran, Daniel Cohen, David Cordell, Gregg Dieckmann, John Ferguson, Jennifer Holmes, Kamran Kiasaleh, Murray Leaf, Stanimir Markov, Jessica Murphy, Simeon Ntanos, Nicole Leeper Piquero, Ravi Prakash, Monica Rankin, Michael Rebello, Tim Redman, Richard Scotch, 


VISITORS:  Andrew Blanchard, Gene Fitch, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Chris Parr, Rochelle Peña, Sheila Pineres, Mark Spong

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

President Daniel called the meeting to order. He expressed appreciation to the faculty for their help in dealing with the large enrollment growth in the past semester. He did not receive any complaints from students regarding classroom overcrowding or other related issues during the semester. The Regents have approved the construction of a third parking garage southwest of the NSRL Building. Student housing remains a big crunch for the University. We will have 400 more beds available this fall but we had a waiting list of 500 students last fall and had huge problems trying to accommodate all the students who want to stay on campus. No new residence halls will open in 2013, but the Board of Regents has approved another 600 bed residence hall to be opened in fall 2014. Dr. Jamison has been working diligently to find apartments within a 2-3 mile radius of campus that we might refer our students to and he is looking at expanding our shuttle bus service. The expansion of academic space remains a great concern despite the fact that we’ve got the ATEC building coming online next September. We have a significant expansion to the School of Management building. A new biosciences and engineering building has been approved. We remain acutely sensitive to planning for academic space. Dr. Daniel said that since he has been here, space has been the key limiting factor in hiring and expanding faculty. We may get some relief in the next 12-24 months. Dr. Daniel does not have any hard figures on what enrollment will look like next fall. Freshman admissions are up slightly over last year but the quality of the applicants is much higher. The main area of growth is in the Master’s students. He is predicting a 7% growth next fall. Most of the growth is in the engineering and business areas. Dr. Daniel reported that the Board of Regents approved our tuition increase request. The increased tuition applies only to new students because of our fixed tuition plan. They are going to try to make some funds available to mitigate some of those increased costs. There has been a change in leadership in the
Information Resources office, and Dr. Daniel anticipates that there may be some additional changes as well. Dr. Andy Blanchard is serving as interim Vice President and Chief Information Officer. He will be looking at technology issues related to PeopleSoft and working to get the right structure and people in place. There were no questions.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
Speaker Leaf asked to add two items to the agenda. Dean Gene Fitch would like address the Senate to request additional members to serve on the faculty panel for hearing student discipline cases.

Robert James from Human Resources has asked for time to point out some of the upcoming changes in health benefits for the coming year.

Speaker Leaf also noted that Item 7 on the Agenda, Appointment of the Committee on Committees, should be removed. This item will be discussed in the Speaker’s Report.

Richard Scotch moved to approve the agenda as revised. Dan Bochsler seconded. The motion carried.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Peter Assmann seconded. The minutes were approved as circulated.

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT – MURRAY LEAF
1. The veterans group is moving ahead. Darrelene Rachavong is preparing a space for them, and it looks like it will meet all of their needs. Everybody seems quite happy with the way things are going.

2. Faculty Standing and Conduct is still working on the annual review policy, but at the moment is also having to deal with a grievance.

3. The administration has interviewed six candidates for Vice President for Human Resources, and of these has invited three to campus. These interviews have also been completed. Cy Cantrell and I participated for the faculty. We think two of the candidates are outstanding. Among other things, there was substantial attention paid to the possible expansion of the role of this office in leadership training, to build the kind of program we have been talking about for several years, and either of these two possible individuals would probably do a very good job with it. We have reported our views to VP Jamison.

4. Program Closures in response to Coordinating Board demands. Serenity King has pointed out that while the Coordinating Board has assumed the power to tell us to close down degree programs that do not meet its standards for producing enough graduates; we have no policy in place that describes a procedure for such closures. There is also no Regents Rule that is clearly aimed at doing so. I also discussed this with Mr. Sharphorn. We agree that it is a problem, but at the moment the situation is very unsettled. The CB's last effort to increase the number of graduates a program had to produce was met with forceful and widespread opposition, and has evidently been withdrawn for rethinking. Among other things, it would have wiped out most of the STEM programs in the state. Our conclusion is that while the situation is too uncertain to merit consideration of a new Regents Rule, it is appropriate to consider what policies should be applicable at the campus level.
5. CQ has taken the position that they will not review files for new hires if offers have already been made. This is relevant to the issues on the agenda regarding hiring practices. In my view it is within the purview of the CQ to take this position under current policies. Dr. Redman discussed CQ's action with the Council and I think the Council also agrees that it is appropriate, although they did not take a formal vote. The CQ will include such actions in their annual report.

6. The India Enterprise Forum held on Tuesday in the SOM was excellent. If you had attended you would have gotten a window on issues and emerging patterns in international relations that will be extremely important, quite possibly dominant, in world affairs over the next fifty years, namely the social, economic, and political, relationships between the United States, India, China, the EU block, and a handful of other countries. Topics discussed ranged from changes in the American energy market to the composition of the United Nations Security Council, and the presentations were concrete and clear enough to show how they were interrelated. I was disappointed that UTD faculty and students were not a larger part of the audience. These are the sorts of developments in world affairs we should be on top of.

7. Everything else is on the agenda.

Dr. Jamison reported that a new assistant vice president of human resources has been hired and will begin work on June 4. Her name is Colleen Dutton. She is currently at Rice University in Houston.

5. **FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FAC) REPORT - MURRAY LEAF**

   It was a busy meeting, in part because the Chancellor has involved the FAC in a number of important initiatives developing new policy.

1. Annual reviews and Periodic Performance Evaluation. The FAC approved a model policy, or template, essentially similar to the one I circulated here about two months ago. The main difference between what was adopted and what was circulated here was that the FAC wanted to delete most of the specification I had suggested regarding the use of the of four categories for evaluation. For example, they did not like the idea that "exceeds expectations" should be applied only rarely. They felt that there were many units on their campuses where it was quite likely that most of the faculty would be judged to exceed expectations most of the time. The other main difference was that they wanted to delete the discussion of possible remediation in response to the category "fails to meet expectations," reserving it only for the category "unsatisfactory." This will not prevent us from offering help to those who fail to meet expectations here if we wish to do so.

   After the FAC meeting ended, the Executive Committee approved some further editorial changes as being consistent with the consensus of the meeting. I then forwarded the text to Dan Sharpnorn, for OGC. In a conversation last Tuesday, Mr. Sharpnorn suggested some further modifications, and we have agreed on further amendments. When I get these in final form from him I will recirculate them to the Executive Committee to see if they agree that they are still consistent with consensus of the meeting.

2. HOP revision policy. Mr. Sharpnorn, in discussion with the FAC, had indicated that the System is also thinking of modifying the HOP template. He knows that the FAC has previously suggested changes, and I told him that UTD had also amended its policy and was sending it
forward for approval. When I got back from the meeting I spoke with Abby Kratz. Our amended version had not yet been sent forward. Abby was waiting for a response from me. I have provided the response, and it has now been sent. Dan Sharprom and I have talked about them briefly this past Tuesday, at the same time as discussing the annual review template. However, at that time he had received but had not read our modifications. He will do so and we will decide where to go from there.

3. Conflict of Commitment. We discussed the draft by the Blue Ribbon panel. The FAC generally agreed with and approved the report of the panel. The next step is to convert the recommendation into a regents' rule, a specific U T System Policy, and a template. The conflict of commitment policy raised issues with the current Regents Rule on Standard of Conduct. I have made suggestions. These are being discussed in OGC.

4. Science and Technology Acquisition and Retention Program “STARs” problem. I reported the concerns of our caucus of the Senate-elect regarding STARs and chaired positions at the FAC and asked if others were experiencing the same sorts of problems and reactions. The answer is that the issue seems to be widespread. We have agreed to place it on the agenda for discussion next year.

5. We met with Regent Cranberg. Among other things, Regent Cranberg emphasized that the cost of research is not just reflected in money received for research grants. It also consists of the part of faculty maintenance and the university infrastructure that allows that grant money to be sought and utilized. Regent Cranberg also stressed that he is a “data person” and that he thinks we should have a lot more data available reflecting what we do. The other major theme seemed to be that there was a great deal of “mythology” and “stereotypes” about his position that he would be happy to hear and address. No one actually took him up on this offer, however—doubtless in part because it was not properly within the scope of the FAC meeting but also probably because the FAC was more interested letting him speak for himself directly. He did so. In general, we felt that it was an informative discussion that should be continued.

6. Department Chairs. As some of you may have heard in one way or another, the Chancellor is also interested in the problem of department chairs. His main foci are accountability, clarity of expectations, and transparency. He recognizes that this is a crucial administrative level. He also recognizes, as the FAC also has over the years, that there is much that is problematic about this position—by whatever name. This does not mean necessarily departmental chairs explicitly so called but whatever the base level administrative officer is, which for us is most often the school dean. There is little standardization of expectations or, indeed, of how one gets to be a chair. There is no regular training for chairs, and there are no consistent policies on what they do and how they do it. The FAC generally agrees that this is area that could use some clearing up, but asked for assurances that this will not be done in a top-down way that sidesteps faculty governance. The Chancellor was clear that governance would be fully involved. This absolutely should not be construed as meaning that the UT System, in any form, is interested in imposing departmentalization throughout the System.

6. **UPDATE ON EMPLOYEE BENEFITS FOR 2012-2013**

Robert James, Director of Benefits Services, highlighted some of the changes in benefits for the upcoming fiscal year. The annual enrollment period will be July 15-31. All employees will receive an email from the UT System with a coverage option letter that will contain all the
information and instructions on using the online system to update selections. Enrollment will be
done through the MyUTBenefits website. Some highlights of the plan changes for the 2012-
2013 plan year are:

Blue Cross/Blue Shield will remain as the carrier. Out of pocket premiums will increase
by 4.5%. The University will continue to cover the cost of employee-only coverage.

The Tobacco Premium Program is a new monthly cost of $30 per month per individual
UT SELECT Medical participant (age 16+) who has used tobacco products in the past
60 days. There is a family maximum of $90 per month. This can be changed at any time
during the year, so that if an individual quits smoking and remains tobacco-free for
sixty days, the $30 surcharge will be removed for the remainder of the year.

The Assurant dental HMO option will no longer be offered. It will be replaced by an
HMO plan with Delta Dental. This will offer lower premium rates and an expanded
service area. There will also be a buy-up option to increase the yearly maximum benefit
from $1,250 to $3,000.

7. FACULTY PANEL FOR STUDENT DISCIPLINE CASES
Gene Fitch, Dean of Students, reported that there was a need to replace some members on the
faculty panel for hearing student discipline cases and asked for volunteers. There were 15
members last year. The following people volunteered to serve:

   Peter Assmann       Jennifer Holmes
   Dan Bochsler       Jessica Murphy

The remaining members of the committee are:

   Kamran Kiasaleh     Janelle Straach
   Dinesh Bhatia      Monica Rankin
   Ravi Prakash       Matthew Polze
   Anthony Champagne  Gregg Dieckmann
   David Cordell      Zhenyu Xuan

Kurt Beron moved to approve these appointments. Nicole Piquero seconded. The motion
carried.

8. STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT
Raj Dwivendi, Student Government President, reported that Student Government has been
successful in getting the McDermott Library hours extended on Saturdays. The Comet
Cruisers will also be operating with extended hours on the weekends.

9. DISCUSSION ON POLICIES & ISSUES RELEVANT TO CHAIRED PROFESSORSHIPS
Since all of these policies are intertwined, Speaker Leaf asked the Senate if there was a
preference for establishing a 3+3 committee that would be responsible for reviewing all the
policies or if the Senate would prefer to review each policy separately. The consensus was to
discuss each policy separately.
(A) **Merit Salary Increases for Faculty**
Tim Redman suggested that the Advisory Committee for the University Budget should consider this issue. Richard Scotch, chair of this committee, said that they are willing to discuss this. Tim Redman moved to refer this item to the Advisory Committee for the University Budget for further review. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

(B) **Policy on University Research Units**
Speaker Leaf noted that at one time we had a policy on Research Centers and that they were initially set up not to receive any University money. This was changed and Centers now do receive some university funds. After some discussion Dr. Daniel suggested that a group be formed to review some of the larger centers. Speaker Leaf said that we currently do not have a policy on reviewing centers and said that perhaps this item could be referred to the Advisory Council on Research. Tim Redman moved that the item be referred to the Advisory Committee on Research and that the Committee report back to the Senate. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

(C) **General Standards for Tenure and Promotion**
Tim Redman addressed this issue since it is something that the Committee on Qualifications is dealing with. Associate Provost Inga Musselman is currently working on a revision of this policy, which she will send to Tim Redman for his review. The draft will then be sent to the Provost for his review and input.

(D) **Policy on Chaired Professorships, Science Technology Acquisition and Retention “STARS”**
There was general discussion regarding whether or not the hiring procedure is the same for a chaired professorship as for any other faculty position and whether being named a chaired professor is regarded as a promotion. The suggestion was made that this issue should be referred to the Committee on Qualifications and incorporated into the revised tenure and promotion policy. Dan Bochsler made this motion. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried.

(E) **Changes Needed to School Guidelines**
Dan Bochsler moved to refer the discussion on revision to school guidelines back to the Academic Council for further discussion so that the issue could be brought back to the Senate at a later date. Tim Redman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

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

---

**APPROVED:**
Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate

**DATE:** 3 Jan 2013