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
March 19, 2014

Present: Hobson Wildenthal, Naofal Al-Dhair, Shawn Alborz, Peter Assmann, Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Gail Breen, Gerald Burnham, John Burr, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Gregg Dieckmann, Vladimir Dragovic, Lev Gelb, Jennifer Holmes, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Murray Leaf, William Manton, Dennis Miller, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Michael Rebello, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch,


Visitors: Calvin Jamison, Mary Jo Venetis

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
The meeting was called to order by Provost Wildenthal at 2:02 PM. The President could not be at the meeting due to laryngitis. The Provost opened the floor for questions. There were no questions. The Administration was working on the FY15 budgets. The deadline for the final budget was two weeks previous. A second tuition increase proposal was being created for a sub-set of the board. The construction on campus is progressing well. There is a 2nd story on the parking garage, and the basement is dug out for the new science building. A concern has arisen over study space for students in the Library. The process has begun for the next phase on the Student Services building. The new phase will not be ready for two years. There is hope during the next legislative session that there will be an increase in state funding for higher education.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Four changes were made to the agenda. Provost Wildenthal will also speak on the Academic Program reviews, approval of the appointment of Fang Qiu to the Intellectual Property Committee, a resolution on uniform language on scholastic dishonesty, and the Student Government report was moved to item 4 on the agenda. Richard Scotch moved to accept the amended agenda. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
Kurt Beron moved to approve the minutes. Judd Bradbury seconded. The motion carried.

4. Student Government Liaison Report
Student Government president Liza Liberman announced that elections are starting. All positions are contested this year. There were debates between the president and vice president candidates on March 27 and 28 at the student union. Student Government has been working on a proposed mobile app for the university. Also student government is making a proposal for a monument of the three founders to go in the JSOM roundabout. They hope that is will become a tradition on campus. Lastly they have been working on an honor code for university students. They have two possible wordings. Option 1, "As a Comet, I pledge honesty, integrity, and service in all that I do." Option 2, "As a Comet I believe honesty protects character, service enriches community, and education guards society." This will be on the student government election ballot.

The Senate indicated a consensus in favor of option 1.

5. Academic Program reviews and Upward Evaluation of Administrators
Provost Wildenthal reported. Under the new requirements from UT System the university is required to review graduate degree programs—as opposed to other kinds of units. Because of how interdisciplinary most programs are it has become difficult to differentiate between some programs. Looking back on the reviews guidelines need to be developed to assist programs on how to do self-assessments. Also, there is a need for guidelines for outside evaluators to follow. This will guide them on what is and is not appropriate to put into a document.

In the past we have had several engaged, hardworking, distinguished outside reviewers give the university reviews that have provided results. In Spring 2013 the PhD and Masters in Material Science in Engineering; Aesthetic History of Ideas, Historic Ideas in Literature, and Humanities Masters and PhD programs were reviewed. Fall 2013 the Economics, and Political Science in EPSS; Cognition and Neuroscience in BBS; Interdisciplinary Studies Masters, and PhD programs; and the Library were reviewed. As the Library is an 'entity' of the university, it has to be reviewed as well.

The Academic Program Review Committee works with the outside reviewers. The entity does a self-study, and sends it to the reviewers. The reviewers come to visit the entity, and attempt to meet with everyone, including faculty, students and administrators. The review is written, and then they meet with the President and Provost. The review is then sent to the program, and then the program responds to the review. The leadership of the program then meets with the President and Provost. Actions are then taken. Due to some of these reviews, hiring actions were put into effect, and in other cases it was referred back to the program. An instance of this was PhD students were co-mingling in courses with Masters students. The course was the same, and was not effective for the PhD students.

The university has been evaluating deans, associate deans, and department heads for quite some time. Previously this has been optional by system that is no longer the case. The evaluation has been expanded downward to include deans, associate deans, and department heads. The current document has been used for several years; however, over time it has lost its effectiveness. It is too long and overlapping. When the document is used for the
associate deans many of the questions do not apply. It is recommended that the process be reevaluated, and a better set of instruments be created before the fall 2014 set of reviews.

6. Speaker's Report – Murray Leaf
1. The Academic Council talked with Jennifer McDowell about the academic calendar. Our particular concern was whether there could be more accommodation to faculty needs in submitting final grades and perhaps in changing grades soon after they are submitted without having to go the much more elaborate and slow process using paper petitions. Our conclusion was that there could be more flexibility for the final grade submission time at the end of the fall term but probably not the spring term. Also, Jennifer will try to see if the webpage for submitting grades can be clearer about what it means to "approve" and to "submit" the information entered. Jennifer will work with Dr. Blanchard to see what can be done and come back to the Council. It did not seem that it would add anything at this point to bring the issue to the Senate.

2. Senate resolution on UTSP 175. Those who made the motion and proposed amendments at the last Senate meeting have been discussing the best wording to capture what they think the Senate agreed to. There has been considerable discussion of whether the second proposed use of "perhaps illegal" would be better stated as "probably illegal." Meanwhile, I wrote a colleague who was formerly the NSF program direct for Anthropology to ask if they had experience with this type of regental action, and might have reached a conclusion. They had considered a parallel problem in relation the requirements for IRB's --essentially institutions "playing it safe" and interpreting the requirement to be far more intrusive and restrictive than intended. They had not treated this as illegal but as unwise, and they sought to discourage it. He referred me to Mark Weiss, current Director of the Division of Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences. I wrote him on 26 February, and have not had a response. In view of this, I have left both statements on illegality modified as "perhaps." I sent a follow-up email to Weiss today.

At the TCFS meeting, I discussed our action with the other UT campus governance leaders who were in attendance. They are interested in the resolution. It seems that, so far, none have actually complied.

Meanwhile, here at UTD, the administration is not going to try the send the proposed hybrid policy forward to OGC without Senate approval. Instead, OSP will try to rewrite it to comport with the resolution.

3. I am not hearing anything from the schools on progress on amending the bylaws. David Cordell will check with the deans.

4. Abby Kratz reports that we have heard back from the Office of General Council on our amendments to the Senate rules and bylaws. They found no legal objection.

We are still waiting for OGC's response on the bylaws for schools guidelines and the charge for the Faculty Personnel Review Committee that each school will have. This is creating a potential problem, because the Faculty Personnel Review Committee has responsibilities in our Promotion and Tenure process as well as in our Periodic Performance Review. My view
is that schools should go ahead and implement the new rules in the committee appointment process. The possibility that there would be a legal objection to the amendment charge is exceedingly small, while the danger from confusion in having the two personnel processes is substantial.

5. I have asked Christina to set up a section in our links page on the Senate website titled "Senate Policies Waiting for OGC approval." I have also asked her to change the title of the links page from "Links of Interest to Faculty" to "Important Links for Faculty."

6. Everything else is on the agenda.

7. **FAC Report**

The FAC executive committee met in Austin on February 7. They have placed consideration of a reaction to UTSP 175 (Conflict of Interest in Research) on the agenda. We discussed the UTD resolution; there was no disagreement. I will draft a resolution for the FAC along the same lines, which are also the lines of the FAC resolution previously adopted in regard to UTSP 180 (Conflict of Commitment).

We also discussed Regents Rule 90101, 90102, and 90103.

I think I have figured out what the rather strange section 9 in rule 90101 is intended to do, or should have been intended to do. There should be, somewhere, a provision for the preservation of research materials—not data—that faculty obtain using university funds, or using grant funds that obligate the university to keep custody and provide access. Common examples are specimens of all kinds, such as biological or geological samples, and documents that would normally be retained in collections or archives. This is a common responsibility for a university. Since it is not addressed anywhere else in Regents rules, I guess that this is what Section 9 was intended to do. We discussed this and agreed that I should try to draft language accordingly, so that it is clear what it actually is talking about without making sweeping and vague claims to own all "data" faculty produce of whatever sort.

8. **Texas Council of Faculty Senates**

The TCFS met in Austin February 28 and March 1, Friday and Saturday. Richard Scotch and I attended for UTD. The program was interesting, but there was nothing in it that would require action on our part. In a discussion of campus reports, the three topics that emerged as being of the greatest interest and concern statewide are shared governance, intellectual property, and post tenure review. We will have panels on all three next year. I will organize the panel on intellectual property.

9. **Senate Election Report**

The Senate election is ongoing. There were 56 nominees, with one nominee removing their name from contention. Voting for the 50 available positions opened March 17 and will remain open until March 28. At the time of the meeting only one case arose where someone who was eligible to vote had not gotten the link. Secretary Cordell indicated that the new membership minimums of 50% tenure system faculty and 10% non-tenure system faculty are assured.
10. **CEP Proposals**

A. Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs

All of the changes to the undergraduate catalog were listed in the overview. The automatic admission for transfer students was changed from a 2.5 GPA to a 2.7 GPA. Because that section is associated with admission, it must be approved by Board of Regents. Because the university is a Pell Grant institution the course load will be changed. Previously there was half time, now it has been changed to three-quarter time. Of the roughly 190 core curriculum courses that were submitted for 2014, only one A&H course was declined. It was an 0900 course (a component area course), which was only for A&H majors. It will be resubmitted for approval in fall 2015. An appeal was filed, and a response should be heard in April.

The first 40 policies of the Graduate catalog mirror what was approved for the undergraduate catalog. Mary Jo Venetis worked with each school’s program heads and assistant deans to make sure all the necessary changes had been made. 179 new courses were added, while 107 were removed from the graduate catalog. Mary Jo Venetis reviewed the courses and found that they match 2014 course inventory data. Every graduate course was updated to add the phrase “semester credit hour”. All together 2235 courses were updated. The CEP committee moved to approve the undergraduate and graduate catalogs. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried.

B. UTDPP 1001-Academic Certificate Programs

Members of the Graduate Council met with their Associate Deans to collect information on each school’s certificate programs. The feedback was submitted to Suresh Radhakrishnan. Based on the feedback, changes were made to UTDPP 1001- Academic Certificates. The changes made to the policy will allow academic certificates to be recognized on a student’s transcripts.

One problem found was that schools were closing academic certificate programs on their own. A school cannot close a certificate program without SACS approval. SACS considers certificate programs equal to majors in a full degree program. The University must certify to SACS a “teach out” plan. A teach out plan consists of the students who are already in the program and how many years do they have to complete the program. CEP moved to approve the policy. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

11. **Resolution for the creation of a committee to investigate breaches in school bylaws**

Richard Scotch moved to approve the University Committee on School and Department Procedures charge. Judd Bradbury seconded. The motion carried.

12. **Approve the appointment of Fang Qiu to the Intellectual Property Committee**

Jennifer Holmes moved to approve the appointment. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried.

13. **Resolution on Uniform Language on Scholastic Dishonesty**
Speaker Leaf read aloud a portion of text that was recommended to be included on class syllabi, "Be advised that you are required to comply with university rules forbidding academic dishonesty. Students who violate university rules on scholastic dishonesty are subject to a range of approved disciplinary penalties. If the instructor suspects dishonesty on your part he or she may meet with you to discuss the incident. Additional information on scholastic dishonesty and examples of such behavior can be found by visiting the Dean of Students website at http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpsp5003." Ravi Prakash moved to approve the wording. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

14. Annual Report from Effective Teaching Committee
Richard Scotch moved to approve the report. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried.

There being no further business, Provost Wildenthal adjourned the meeting at 3:20 PM
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