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AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
May 6, 2009

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  DR. DANIEL

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  DR. LEAF

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
   April 1, 2009 Meeting  DR. LEAF

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT  DR. LEAF

5. GUEST SPEAKER MAY SENATE MEETING  
   Rhonda Blackburn, Associate Provost  DR. BLACKBURN

6. DISCUSSION OF BYLAW CHANGES  
   DR. LEAF & DR. NTAFOS

7. SENATE RESOLUTION ON FIREARMS  DR. LEAF

8. PROPOSED UNIVERSITY TESTING CENTER  
   (For Senate Endorsement)  DR. PIÑERES

9. APPOINT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE MEMBERS  DR. LEAF

10. CEP  DR. CANTRELL

11. HEARING TRIBUNAL SELECTION  DR. LEAF

12. ADJOURNMENT  DR. DANIEL
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Council. They have not been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are not official minutes.

Academic Council Meeting
April 1, 2009

PRESENT:  Cy Cantrell, Jennifer Holmes, Marilyn Kaplan, Robert Kieschnick, Murray Leaf, Dennis Miller, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Tim Redman, Liz Salter

VISITORS:  Hobson Wildenthal, Andrew Blanchard, Serenity King

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS, QUESTIONS

In Dr. Daniel’s absence, Dr. Wildenthal called the meeting to order. Dr. Daniel is in Austin today speaking on tuition.

Dr. Wildenthal spoke regarding the new Time and Effort reporting system. He also discussed the contract for prefab space for the painting studios and rehearsal space, to be located by the classroom building west and the power plant.

The overall construction schedule is more or less on track, although there is a concern that the dining hall may not be complete at the start of the Fall semester. Dr. Wildenthal said that there may be available apartment space in the University Village apartments that could be utilized as temporary faculty offices. Dr. Salter wondered if the space could be used for visiting faculty. Dr. Redman mentioned the national endowment for the humanities offers grant programs for summer courses and workshops, and that extra housing space would facilitate UTD’s participation in this program. There was also discussion of reserving space for foreign Teaching and Research Assistants. Dr. Wildenthal commented that the new residence hall will be a very useful space.

The Texas Senate has produced a budget; Dr. Wildenthal has not seen the budget.

Dr. Kieschnick asked about funding for Tier One schools. Dr. Wildenthal explained that this is Dr. Daniel’s bill and he has accepted the designation of UT Dallas as one of the seven emerging Tier One schools.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Most of the items on the agenda were carried over from the previous Senate meeting, which did not act on them because a quorum was not present. Dr. Leaf proposed replacing item 7 on the agenda, consideration of changes in By-Laws, with consideration of the revised rule on repeating courses for credit, from the CEP. Consideration of the By-laws should not carry over to the next Senate meeting because it was a discussion item on the previous agenda and the topic was in fact
discussed at the Senate meeting. The consensus was that there was no consensus on any possible amendment. Item 9 on the current agenda, the change in instructions for titles of theses and dissertations, was an information item only. The Council agreed. Dr. Ntafos then asked that item 7 be retained. It was agreed, therefore, that 7 would be 7 and the By-Laws discussion would be 7b.

Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the agenda as amended Dr. Redman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Dr. Kieschnick made the motion to approve the minutes of the March 3rd meeting. Dr. Redman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

4. SPEAKERS REPORT

Academic Council Speakers Report April 3, 2009

1. Presentation of Dr. Cary Israel at Collin County Democratic Party General Meeting, Saturday, March 25, described his plans for “Collin College” and the Collin Higher Education Center to be completed in McKinney in 2010. The plan is not only to offer four year degrees. It is also to offer about eight master’s degrees and four PhDs. Plan is on the web at:
   http://www.ebuilder.net/cccc/e_article001204987.efm?x=bf7f5CK_0

Some of the degrees match our own, most do not. The general orientation is “professional”, very job oriented or more likely probably job-advancement oriented. The intention is that these will be offered as cooperative programs with four year and graduate degree granting institutions—they will be their degrees, not Collin College degrees. We are one of the institutions he is cooperating with. UNT and SMU are others. If this is something we would want to look into as faculty, it should be possible to arrange a meeting with their Faculty Council or some type of delegation. The faculty may not have all the details of the plan, but will certainly have ideas about how the courses will be offered and have some views on how other programs would be integrated.

Dr. Leaf argued that if we view the our common situation in terms of tracking or guiding streams of students with different abilities and interests rather than one of institutional turf, the idea can be much more complementary to what the UTD faculty wants to do than competitive or disruptive of it. Dr. Israel is very interested in making CCCC an academically sound institution and has good judgment about the relative merit of other institutions in the area. About 50% of the CCCC students are getting associate degrees (which are transferable). For the DCCCD campuses, the number used to be around 12% to 16%. We are the leading destination of their transfer students. According to the CCCC website, transfers to UTD averaged 768 a year over the four years 2002-2005. UNT was next with 616.
The consensus in the Council was that for now it was more important to ask President Daniel for a report on the current state of our relationship with the CCC, and especially what their standards are for the UTD courses that will be offered there and the faculty that will be hired to offer them.

2. Meeting concerned with safety and security. Apparently partly in response to my memorandum to the Safety and Security Council, Vice President for Student Affairs Darrelene Rachavong called a meeting on Thursday, March 31, of the key concerned individuals with Priscilla Lozano, the lawyer in OGC who has been working most closely with Donna Rogers, the Dean of Students. Everyone there seemed to feel that it was a very productive and helpful meeting. Those attending were Dr. Leaf; Larry Overzet, Chair of the Safety and Security Council; Dean Michael Coleman; Professor Anthony Champagne; Dr. James Cannici, Director of the Counseling Center; Captain Steve Finney of the UTD Police Department, Dean of Students Donna Rogers, Dr. Rachavong; and Ms. Lozano. We reached an important consensus, and made several specific decisions that should substantially enhance the sense of safety on the campus.

The consensus was that while we have generally good arrangements in place, we need to devote much more effort to making the general campus population aware of what they are and how they interface with one another.

The first specific agreement was that we would develop a system for assuring that faculty taking students on class-related trips would be informed if the students had a record of violation of the campus code of conduct or criminal activity off campus as would be reported in a criminal background check. A record in these cases would not lead to automatic prohibition of the travel. The information would be provided to the faculty member in charge, who would make the judgment. The procedure will be based on a modification of that currently in place for the Archer Fellows program, in which a group of students spends a semester in Washington, D. C., such that the student we vet are subsequently vetted by the federal government.

The second agreement was that the Dean of students will provide notice of disciplinary action for students being considered for RA and TA ships. This will be based on a process in which the hiring authority will submit a list of candidates and get a response indicating what actions have been taken. The Safety and Security Council will take initial responsibility for drafting the form to ask for such information and outlining the process, and then we will involve other stakeholders.

The third specific agreement was that the Counseling Center will publish on their website the criteria by which it decides whether a person is an “imminent threat” to themselves or others. The Counseling Center will also expand its Annual Report. The Safety and Security Council will take initial responsibility for stating what sort of details the campus community would like this report to contain. Dr. Cannici reported, for example, that no student under the care of the Counseling Center has ever engaged in a violent attack on any other student on campus.

There is a continuing disagreement regarding the scope of FERPA. This turns on the meaning of the phrase “educational record maintained by” the university. Dr. Leaf’s view, which he thinks Daniel Sharp Horn agrees with, is that it should be concretely and narrowly construed to mean the
official record that would be passed on to other institutions that ask for it—the transcript. This would, for example, exclude emails sent by faculty to each other or to administrators. Ms. Lozano took the view that since an email was on a university server, it was “maintained” by the university and was also an educational record. The only document that would be excluded would notes by a faculty member strictly for their own use. Dr. Rachavong will follow the advice of Ms. Lozano. Ms. Lozano will, however, take up the question with Mr. Sharphorn.

Finally, Dr. Rachavong reported that after the knife attack on campus about six weeks ago, she called her staff together and asked everyone to review their records to see if they had received any reports that would have led them to anticipate such behavior on the part of the perpetrator. There were none. She said this because, evidently, there were reports that a faculty member had in fact notified them or warned them of such a danger. This faculty member had indeed made a call, but it was not a warning and when asked directly if the student posed a danger to themselves or others the response was he did not.

3. Meeting between Dr. Leaf and VPBA Jamison. The university is about to let a new contract for the bookstore, and Dr. Jamison wanted to be sure to do so in a way that would be consistent with the UT System’s commitment, and our own commitment, to hold down textbook prices. To do this, Dr. Jamison’s general strategy is to allow the bookstore an expanded scope of operations, perhaps including food service and a visitor’s center, to make it a place where campus visitors would naturally and normally come to browse, relax, and perhaps by a few things. In this context, a further part of the strategy is to support the market for used textbooks by not continually ordering new editions where this was not necessary. Dr. Leaf indicated that while faculty would not be amenable to a blanket agreement stay with any given textbook for a fixed number of years, they would certainly not want to switch to a new version if it was not intellectually justified, and that most of the switching is apparently not done by faculty deliberately but either by inadvertence in failing to specify an edition or by the bookstore itself. We recommend strongly that the new contract address these problem, and also assure that the ordering information provided to the bookstore be made public immediately, and not kept as proprietary information of the bookstore itself. Further, if the ordered edition is not available, the bookstore should be obligated to communicate this to the faculty member who placed the order, rather than select an alternative edition on their own. In addition, with respect to notifying the bookstore of plans to reuse the text, the ordering form could be redesigned to allow the faculty member to state his intention—indicating perhaps a number of years or repetitions. Dr. Leaf offered to bring together a faculty group to review the contract and advise on what it should contain. The Council agreed that we should do something like this—perhaps before the actual contract is drafted.

4. Dr. Leaf reported several reactions to the presentation by Curt Eley at the last Senate meeting. There is a strong sense that communication has not been adequate and that the Senate should follow up, keeping attention focused on the graduate admissions portion of the website. Certainly something like an annual report would be good but we probably need more. He asked the Council if we should consider an expert support or advising committee of a few especially knowledgeable faculty, such as Drs. Cantrell, Pineres, Kieschnick, and Prakash? The Council agreed that we should.
5. Serenity King reports that all of the policy changes that required OGC approval are now back. Nothing more is pending. This is a first.

6. There is evidently a mandate from the Office of Sponsored Projects on time and effort reporting. Should we ask the Research Advisory Committee to take a hand? Dr. Leaf has sent an email to the Chair and Co-Chair (Alain Benoussan and Philip Loizou) to ask if they have been involved in developing the rules up to now.

7. Last Tuesday, Cy Cantrell called a meeting with Dr. Leaf and Dr. Overzet, preliminary to the meeting called by Dr. Rachavong, to discuss the possible relationships between policies regarding security and policies regarding academic integrity. Dr. Leaf agreed that no decision would be taken on security policies without review including CEP or the Committee on Academic Integrity. He also agreed to write a brochure summarizing the faculty role in referrals for academic dishonesty, reaffirming and underlying the key points of current policy. The group also discussed the possibility of initiating a policy that all judgments of plagiarism regarding Master or PhD theses would be made by faculty panels, rather than by the Office of Judicial Affairs. Dr. Cantrell will ask Academic Integrity to draft a policy. Dr. Leaf mentioned this possibility in the meeting called by Dr. Rachavong. Her response was that she would welcome it, and that from her point of view judicial affairs need not be involved at all.

A motion was made by Dr. Kaplan to place as discussion of the charge to the Committee on Academic Integrity on the Academic Senate agenda. Dr. Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion passed to place on the agenda.

5. FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT

No news

6. APPOINT VAN MILLER, SENIOR LECTURER IN BBS, TO PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE TO WORK ON THE BICYCLE SUBCOMMITTEE

There has been a request for a faculty member to serve on the Bicycle subcommittee. Van Miller was the first to agree to serve.

After some discussion of the precedent involved, since Dr. Miller is to serve only on the subcommittee concerned with this problem, it was agreed that the Speaker should appoint him specifically to the Bicycle Subcommittee.

7. REPEATED COURSE WORK

There was a discussion of the change in the regulation on repeated course work. Dr. Cantrell will rewrite the text accordingly. It was agreed to place the item on the Senate agenda with the amendments.
7a. SENATE BYLAWS

Dr. Ntafos provided a handout with suggestions for changes to the Senate By-laws. Dr. Leaf stated that reflecting the consensus in the discussion of the last Senate meeting, if elected Speaker again he will return the Council to its original six-member size and will focus its activities more tightly around the task of setting the Senate agenda, shifting the more general discussion and consensus-building activity between governance and the administration to the Senate. Dr. Redman suggested that Dr. Ntafos’ moved to table discussion to the next Council meeting, where it will be placed at the top of the agenda. Dr. Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

8. MS IN MANAGEMENT & ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES

Dr. Leaf asked for a general motion to place Items 8 and 9 back on the Senate Agenda.

Dr. Cantrell made the motion. Dr. Holmes seconded the motion. The motion carried.

9. INFORMATION ITEM ON CHANGE IN THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

The Council agreed that this is within the purview of the Graduate Council. It can be reported to the Senate and does not require Senate action.

10. CEP

Dr. Cantrell stated that the two CEP items he was aware of at this time were the Undergraduate Catalog and the degree program proposal for an MS in Latin American Studies. CEP has not yet but will review these items at the meeting to be held before the Academic Senate meeting. Dr. Cantrell asked that space be given on the Senate agenda for these items. The Council agreed.

11. COMMITTEE ON UTD’S 40 YEAR REUNION

Dr. Redman discussed UTD’s 40th Anniversary as a pivot point, looking back at 40 years and ahead to 50 years. The idea that the Anniversary Committee had settled on as a theme was “What has happened in your field in the last 40 years?” He feels this is a faculty role, one faculty member from each of the schools to be on a subcommittee to come up with “40 talks” about what has gone in “your” field. Dr. Redman asked Dr. Leaf and Dr. Kaplan to put out a call to the faculty for university-wide participation.

Dr. Leaf will ask for proposals. Dr. Kaplan mentioned that “iTunes University” is being examined as a source for podcasts.
12. SUBMISSION OF NAMES OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES

We will have the names of candidates by the Senate meeting. The council agreed to place the names on the Senate agenda for approval.

13. AGENDA FOR SENATE

Agenda items for the Academic Senate will be:
1. Discussion of Academic Integrity
2. Repeated Course Work (Dr. Cantrell will rewrite)
3. Information item on Change in the Instructions for Theses and Dissertations
4. CEP Items

Dr. Redman made the motion to accept the Senate agenda items as read. Dr. Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Wildenthal adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED: ___________________________ DATE: ____________

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Faculty
Dear Senators:

In the course of our discussions of possible modifications of our bylaws regarding Senate elections and officers over the last few meetings, I offered to survey other universities to see how their systems compare to ours. The attached spreadsheet is a tally of some of the results.

It turns out that this is not easy information to get. There is a lot of variation in what universities do, and perhaps even more in how they describe it. I won't trouble you with the details, but I should provide some information needed to interpret the attached table and some basic conclusions that are reflected in it.

First, I have not tried to focus on our "peer institutions." It seemed better to focus on institutions you are more likely to have some familiarity with, and but also that represent a spread of types. So I have included major U of California campuses, and also the U of Chicago and other major research universities. But as it turns out, most of these have both medical schools and law schools, and this makes a huge difference in their national standing, research volume, faculty size, and internal coherence. Where there are medical schools, they seem to usually involve about half the institution's total faculty. So I have also included a sprinkling of smaller campuses configured more like ours, and also our three major would-be models, or quasi-models: Cal Tech, MIT, and Rensselaer.

The faculty numbers mostly come from what is called the "Common Data Set", if the university used it and made the results available. Unfortunately, this classifies "teaching faculty" by full time vs. part time, but not tenure status. Where I could find the latter information, I used it also. The numbers are often widely apart. I have found the articles on the universities in Wikipedia helpful, in part because they use a more or less common format. They seem often (but not always) to reflect the numbers in the Common Data Set. The descriptions of the Senates (or comparable bodies) are from the Senate websites, usually the bylaws or equivalents. The Senate numbers sometimes come from the rules, and sometimes from counting members if they were listed and I could not find the rules.

I have not put in the Senate sizes for the California campuses other than San Diego because they all follow the same pattern, which San Diego represents. The committees are very important. The term "senate" means all the faculty and academic personnel of all the campuses. Each campus is a "division" of the senate. The Senate has a representative body at the system level, which actually makes overriding policy for all the campuses. On each campus, within this, there is a "division assembly" consisting of the committee chairs and others elected at large and by the units. The committee chairs are appointed by an elected Committee on Committees. The ratio between chairs and elected representatives seem to be about 1:1, but I could not find a statement. No other system is this distinctive, or this fully articulated.
The main conclusions are:

Our Senate is, comparatively, very large. Our ratio of electing faculty to representatives is 10:1. The usual ratios are anywhere from 20:1 to 40:1. Only Rochester has a ratio like ours, and the figure I have for their faculty number is from a 2001 study of faculty salaries and may understate actual total faculty. The Wikipedia article lists "staff" at 1225. No common data set.

Second, many senates list staff—which means they have them.

Third, in addition to being small we are lacking four of the six kinds of units that generate really big revenues, either through tuition or research funding. We have no agricultural extension system, medical school, law school, or national laboratory. We have an engineering school, but comparatively speaking its breadth is very limited (although we are huge for what we do), and we have the business school. The implication is that generating, say, 50 million dollars of research funding is on average a lot harder for us than for campuses with more capital intensive units. The relevance to the Senate is that this it makes it less surprising, and less worrisome, that faculty are focused on other matters as long as things are going reasonably well.

Fourth, on most campuses election is by unit, with a number of representatives proportional to the number of faculty in the unit. Units are usually things like colleges and schools (not departments).

Finally, I was struck by the fact that our two main reference campuses, MIT and Cal Tech, yielded no information on the Senate organization at all, although for two different reasons. With Cal Tech, the information may have been there but was behind their firewall. (I left the faculty size in the summary, although it seems not to include JPL.) For MIT, they actually do not have one. They have a newsletter. Apathy? They were, in fact, very concerned with trying to strengthen it.

If any of you want to add information to this, please feel free to do so. I started adding the student populations only at the end, because among other things it has a bearing on the meaning we can assign to the ratio between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

Bottom line: I was not very worried about the fact that we fairly frequently (about half the time) do not get more nominations for the Senate than we have seats to fill, as long as we were producing what seemed to be good policies and maintaining a good work environment. Now I am not worried at all. Does this raise the question of whether we ought to reduce the Senate size? If the reason is only to be able to reject some who would be otherwise willing to serve, this seems to me unwise. When we have something that evokes concern, more people come forward. Why not leave it so that they can?

Murray J Leaf,
Speaker of the Faculty
Professor of Anthropology and Political Economy
U T Dallas GR 3.128
Tel: 972 883 2732
Background: We have not had senate/council elections for a few years now (i.e., all nominated have been automatically “elected”). Some senators feel that we are operating outside the bylaws of the senate. Many faculty feel that serving in the senate is a waste of time. The “discussion” that we had scheduled for the senate meeting last Wednesday was DOA – it would not even have taken place if I did not try to get something going. There is a notion that all is well, apathy is typical in academic governance in most places, any “reform’ will make things even worse, etc.

Apathy breeds nothing else but more apathy. The current state of affairs could well be described as “the tyranny of the willing to serve”. The indifference, distain for changes is self-serving; after all, a competitive election may result in the unthinkable - some of us may face the indignity of not getting elected! Also, if we want to find out why there is little interest in academic governance, should we be asking those few that serve in the senate year after year or those (plenty) that are not interested? What about a survey of the faculty? Note that, as recently as a few years ago, we DID have competitive elections for both senate and council.

Proposal 1 (senate): (a) Term limits of 2 years for Speaker, Secretary (can run again after one year out). (b) Preference to new senators in senate elections; i.e., those that have served for the past x or fewer years (x to be determined) are elected automatically/competitively (depending on number of nominations). Senators that have served more than the past x years are elected automatically/competitively only as needed to make up a full senate roster. (c) Senate slots are allocated to schools according to their faculty size (but each school is represented in the senate as long as there is a nomination).

Proposal 2a (council): The current bylaws have the role of the council as setting the agenda for the senate; the bylaws are deafening in a clear absence of anything along the lines of “each school should be represented in the council”. A small council consisting of the Speaker, Secretary that consults/meets with committee chairs and a representative from the administration as needed is best suited to the role of setting the agenda. Presidents/speaker reports are left for the senate meeting (avoids repetition); real discussion/debate takes place where it should - in the senate.

Proposal 2b (council): A significant revision of the bylaws is needed if the council is to assume a larger role than the currently stated one. If representation from each school is deemed necessary for that role, the faculty of each school should elect their representative to council (either directly or indirectly through the school’s senators).
Resolution:

The Faculty Senate at The University of Texas, Dallas, believes that carrying firearms on the University campus by anyone other than law enforcement officers is detrimental to the safety of the students, faculty, and staff.
UTDallas Testing Center

Purpose: The purpose of the UT Dallas Testing Center is to provide the option for professors to conduct tests in a secure environment. For the courses scheduled to test in the lab the students have the flexibility of coming in within the timeframe set up by their professor. This flexibility also gives online classes (designated at the main campus) a central location for testing. With an emphasis on building relationships with the students, college constituencies, external partners and within our own staff, the Testing Center would support student success, enrollment services and college programs in a welcoming environment. The Center would provide professional testing and assessment services, and be committed to the exploration of evolving technologies and methods. Located near campus, with plenty of free parking and frequent bus service, the Testing Center is a facility with at least 300 high-performance dual-platform computers arranged in state-of-the-art workstations. In addition, they can work individually or in groups of up to eight students, giving all professors the opportunity to create the best match between their learning environment and their own learning style. Because the Testing Center would be open extended hours, seven days a week, professors can give exams on a less restricted schedule opening up class time. Additionally, this provides a new level of flexibility for students in test taking. Initial hours of operation: M-F 7am to 10pm; Sat (national testing, times TBD); and Sun 4-9pm. The Center would also offer accommodated testing for students with learning, mental, physical and sensory disabilities through a collaborative arrangement with Disability Services.

Why does UTDallas need a Testing center?

Resource Gains: The testing center provides an opportunity to capture resources and create efficiencies.
- TA support can be more efficiently allocated—reduced need for TA’s to grade and input grades
- Reduce paper cost and waste—no more printing of exams
- Address classroom shortages during peak examination periods (Can be used for final exams and be scheduled in advance/posted on syllabus)
- Increase capacity for distance learning offerings and examinations
- Eliminate need for scantrons
- Learning Resource Center can give GRE/SAT/LSAT/MCAT/DCAT and other similar exams there to larger groups (revenue source)
- CLEP/ESL/Language exam could be given to large groups or on individual basis (revenue source)
- Offer certification, licensure, board and other national and state exams
- Freshman placement tests given at one time in one location
- Use of WebCT allows room to be used by multiple courses/sections to utilize the same testing window
- More convenient for students as tests can be given over a range of hours or days
- Could be used for larger workshops or training
- Set aside one section for computerized language training - to meet needs of students
- Could be used to give proctored exams for fee to non-UTD students (revenue source)
- Pre-Health & Pre-Law could give practice tests
- Multiple section classes could give exams at the same time freeing up class room space
- Disability Services testing – reduce need for the disability staff to proctor
- Provide Enrollment Services with large-scale venue for application workshops

**Academic Integrity:** The testing center provides an opportunity to address issues of academic integrity.
- Better proctoring hopefully leading to reduced cheating
- Secure exams for online courses
- Eliminates “student test files”
- Instant grading through WebCT
- Integrity of exams improves as random sampling of questions is possible
- Reduces human error on grading and transferring of grades into WebCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity/Scope</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>30,000 ft²</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel costs</td>
<td>Carpentry, movable partitions, electrical, networking, lockers—depending upon existing protocol for general site renovations</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Staff</td>
<td>Center Director, IR Tech (2)</td>
<td>Dir. 48K; Techs 2 @ 30K</td>
<td>$108K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Staff</td>
<td>Student assistants (4)</td>
<td>9K each</td>
<td>$36K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers &amp; monitors</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1200 each</td>
<td>$360K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Stations</td>
<td>50 hexagonal w/ partitions; 6 chairs each</td>
<td>$600/ station; $300/chair</td>
<td>$120K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Office Suite, Deepfreeze, Faronics</td>
<td>$100 package for all 3</td>
<td>$30K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebCT Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockers</td>
<td>100 banked</td>
<td>$18K or repurposed from AC etc.</td>
<td>$18K or nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference room furniture</td>
<td>10-top table and chairs</td>
<td>$5K or repurposed from elsewhere</td>
<td>$5K or nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other furniture</td>
<td>5 facilitators’ stations, 1 reception</td>
<td>$600 each</td>
<td>$4K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650K to $700K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Committee on Committees is a Standing, Concurrent Committee of the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas. Members of the Committee are appointed by the President upon nomination by the Academic Council.

The Committee is charged to advise the Academic Council on faculty membership for the standing and ad hoc committees of the Academic Senate; to study the organization and operation of Senate committees, making recommendations with respect to improvements in the structure and effectiveness; and to advise the President on faculty membership for University-wide standing committees.

Annually, but no later than August 31, the Chair of the Committee provides the Academic Senate with a written report for the Academic Senate of the Committee’s activities for the prior academic year.

The Committee is composed of seven members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in Title III, Chapter 21, Subchapter B., Section I.B.1. of The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures), consisting of one person appointed to represent each of the six Schools, excluding the School of Interdisciplinary Studies, and the Speaker of the Faculty as ex officio (with vote). The Executive Vice President and Provost serves as the Responsible University Official.

The term of office for appointed committee members shall be effective June 1 to May 31, and members may be reappointed by the President for additional terms upon nomination of the Academic Council. The terms for appointed members shall be staggered so that no more than one-half of the terms expire in any one year. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President, upon nomination of the Academic Council, shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.
The Speaker of the Faculty serves as the Chair of the Committee. The term of office for the Speaker shall expire upon the selection of the Speaker-Elect, who serves until the next election.
May 8, 2009

Cyrus Cantrell  B.P.S. Murthi
Marie Chevrier  Robert Stillman
Juan Gonzalez  Daniel Wickberg
Murray Leaf

REFERENCE: Appointment to Committee on Committees

Dear Colleagues:

Pursuant to the U. T. Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures, Chapter 21, and with the concurrence of the Academic Senate, I am appointing each of you to the Senate Standing Committee on Committees, effective June 1, 2009. Pursuant to the same authority, the Speaker of the Faculty serves as Chairperson of this committee.

FACULTY
Cy Cantrell (ECS) (5/31/09)
Marie Chevrier (EPPS) (5/31/09)
Juan Gonzalez (NSM) (5/31/09)
Murray Leaf (EPPS) (5/31/09)
B.P.S. Murthi (M) (5/31/10)
Robert Stillman (BBS) (5/31/10)
Daniel Wickberg (AH) (5/31/10)

EX OFFICIO
Murray Leaf, Speaker

RUO
Executive Vice President & Provost

I hope you will accept this appointment. Please let me have your answer on the attached copy of this letter by May 29, 2009.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Hobson Wildenthal
Executive Vice President & Provost

BHW/ja
Attachment

ACCEPTANCE: I (accept) (cannot accept) the committee appointment outlined above.

SIGNED: _____________________________________________ DATE: __________________
HEARING TRIBUNAL SELECTION PROCEDURES

The Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents, in Rule 31008, Section 4 (http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules.htm#A4) provide for the use and appointment of a special faculty hearing tribunal in cases where the President has determined that allegations against a tenured faculty member or of a faculty member before the expiration of his or her appointment are supported by evidence that constitutes good cause for termination. Rule 31008, Section 6 further provides that tenure-track faculty whose appointments are not renewed or who are not granted tenure and are therefore given a one year terminal appointment as required by Rule 31007, Section 5 may be granted the right to have the decision reviewed by a special faculty hearing tribunal to determine whether the decision was made for reasons that are unlawful under the laws or Constitution of Texas or the United States. Procedures for the selection of a special hearing tribunal at U.T. Dallas are specified below.

The special hearing tribunal will consist of three members of the tenured faculty selected from a standing pool of tenured faculty chosen by the President and by the Academic Senate. The pool should reflect the diverse nature of the University and, to ensure fairness, should include members from all schools. Twenty members of the pool are to be selected by the Academic Senate via open nominations and a secret ballot during its last meeting of each academic year. Twenty additional members are to be appointed by the President to the pool by June of each year. The names of the faculty members selected for the pool (both those chosen by the Academic Senate and the President) will be published in the Academic Senate's June minutes.

In a case where a special hearing tribunal is required by the Regents' Rules and Regulations cited above, the President, in consultation with the Academic Council, will appoint three faculty members from the pool to serve on the special hearing tribunal. A minimum of one member must be selected from members of the pool selected by the Academic Senate.
2009-2010 FACULTY HEARING TRIBUNAL POOL

Herve Abdi (BBS)
Poras Balsara (E)
Duane Buhrmester (BBS)
  Lloyd Dumas (S)
  David Edmunds (A)
  Euel Elliott (S)
  Andras Farago (E)
  Donald Gray (N)
  Robert Marsh (N)
George McMechan (N)
  Simeon Ntafos (E)
  Karen Prager (G)
  Stephen Rabe (A)
Suresh Radhakrishnan (M)
  Ram Rao (M)
  Suresh Sethi (M)
  Dean Sherry (N)
Marianne Stewart (S)
  Hal Sudborough (E)
  Emily Tobey (BBS)