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ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
June 2, 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  PRESIDENT DANIEL
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  PRESIDENT DANIEL
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  PRESIDENT DANIEL
   May 5, 2010 Meeting
4. APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATION  PRESIDENT DANIEL
5. APPOINTMENT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES  DAVID CORDELL
6. NEW CUSTOMER SERVICE COMMITTEE CHARGE  SERENITY KING
7. CEP PROPOSAL  DR. CANTRELL
8. CHARGE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COMMITTEE  DAVID CORDELL
10. AGENDA FOR JUNE 16, 2010 SENATE MEETING  PRESIDENT DANIEL
11. ADJOURNMENT  PRESIDENT 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
May 5, 2010

PRESENT: Murray Leaf, David Cordell, Kurt Beron, R. Chandrasekaran, Karen Huxtable-Jester, Dennis Miller, Liz Salter

VISITORS: Serenity King, Richard Scotch, Grace Biewalski, Christine Moldenhauer

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS

Murray Leaf called the meeting to order and reported that since both President Daniel and Provost Wildenthal were in meetings with Chancellor Cigarroa, Executive Vice-Chancellor Prior and Regent Longoria, the Council would not have the discussion on compensation for the Speaker and Secretary and the possibility of having an office and dedicated meeting space for the Senate. Since the Council has been unable to address this issue, Speaker Leaf stated that he was considering emailing the President and Provost to let them know his thoughts rather than surprising them. He asked the Council if they agreed with this idea and there was agreement. Broad discussion followed regarding what the Council would like to see in this regard. It was agreed that there should be compensation for the Speaker and the Secretary of the faculty as well as a governance office with meeting space for committees. Currently the Speaker receives course release for two courses or summer salary. It was felt that course release for one course would be appropriate for the Secretary. Speaker Leaf will communicate this information to President Daniel so that possibly this item can be placed on the agenda for next month’s meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Tim Redman moved to approve the agenda as circulated. Dennis Miller seconded. The agenda was approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Tim Redman moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Dennis Miller seconded. The motion carried.

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT—MURRAY LEAF

Murray Leaf reported that he has received a memorandum from Rachel Croson, Chair of the Committee on Mentoring. The memorandum describes the practical changes in the mentoring program’s funding source (from the Office of Diversity and Community Engagement to the Provost’s office), and requests the ability as the Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Mentoring to add members of our working group (faculty and staff) as members of that committee.

Essentially, the Committee worked with a separate group set up by the Provost’s office, called the Faculty Mentoring Program Working Group, which had a budget and hosted a series of programs. Dr. Croson’s recommendation is that this now be folded into the Mentoring Committee proper, retaining the budget. I have responded that our general position is that committees can add additional members as needed on an ad hoc basis, and if they want these regularized we can modify the charge. But for the
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Moment, the Mentoring has two vacant positions, from faculty who had declined appointments, and
instead of having the Committee on Committees find more nominees the Senate last Fall that that would
be best left to the Mentoring Committee members themselves. So for the moment no Senate action
seems to be needed. The memorandum is attached.

Council discussed this. There was a general view that the Working Group should certainly be folded in, and perhaps the mentoring committee could be compressed as well. The budget and events were certainly good ideas, but could not be required by the Senate in the charge.

5. Faculty Advisory Council Report—Murray Leaf
Murray Leaf reported that The University of Texas System Faculty Advisory Council met for its last meeting of the year April 29-30, in Austin.

1. The FAC Chair, Dan Formanowicz of UT Arlington, reviewed what happened at the last meeting of the Regents as well as at Texas legislative hearing on the proposed revisions of the Social Sciences standard by the State Board of Education, which had occurred the previous day.

The Regents have invited him to attend the next meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee. Usually the FAC representative is only allowed to attend the meetings of the Campus Life Committee. We view this as a step in the direction of a more effective consultative relationship.

Attendance at the legislative hearing on the State Board of Education revisions of the social science standards was at the invitation of the Mexican American Legislative Caucus. The changes have been widely reported in Texas papers and in an article in the online New York Times Magazine of 11 Feb 2010. Members of the Board were also invited, but none appeared. Robert Scott, the Commissioner, testified and noted that the Board was trying to correct what it saw as a long-standing “liberal bias” in Texas schoolbooks. Our concern was mainly two pronged: the factual distortions that the new standards embodied and the effect that such ingrained misunderstanding would have on college readiness.

2. Chancellor Cigarroa had been scheduled as the first guest speaker, but was only able to come for a few minutes later in the day.

3. Kenneth Shine, Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs, described System activities for the Health campuses. Two main points were the continuing success of the STARS program in bringing notable new faculty to UT campuses, and an initiative between several health campuses and Texas Tech to pioneer implementation of the Obama administration’s effort to digitize and interlink medical records to create a national online health network.

3. Vice Chancellor Shine was followed by David Prior, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who joined us for lunch. A large part of the conversation was about the Texas Research Initiative Program (TRIP) and the Coordinating Board Standards for the National Research University Fund (NURF). The standards clearly represent the political process seeking to protect or advance the interest of candidate campuses, rather than what is actually most important to becoming a major research university. Discussion focused on two problems. First, the standards emphasize increased production of PhDs, yet the CB is reluctant to approve new PhD programs and is trying to shut down current programs. Second, there is no mention of international links or cooperative programs with other universities, which many of us have and which we think are important in increasing our intellectual reach and visibility. Dr. Prior noted that there was, in fact, a move in the legislature to tighten up funding for foreign students. Essentially, the attitude is “why are we giving degrees to foreigners and not Americans?” Of course many actually do become Americans, and Texans. System will work hard to respond to these concerns and correct the misunderstandings they represent.
4. After Dr. Prior we spent an hour with Representative Trey Martinez Fischer, of San Antonio. Representative Martinez was a leader of the Mexican American Legislative Caucus hearings on the State Board of Education. He is also a former student of Mansour El Kikhia, Professor of Political Science at UTSA and past Chair of the FAC. The discussion focused mainly on the SBOE and the legislative movements toward reducing the subsidies for foreign students. The new SBOE standards include non-naming of President Obama, inclusion of Phyllis Schlafly, requirement to discuss positive aspects of McCarthyism, no mention of Senator Gonsalo Barrientos, no mention of Eddie Bernice Johnson, and reduced mention of Cesar Chavez, *inter alia*. More generally, it is an effort to impose the distorted view of history and the world that thus far has been confined to private schools that describe themselves as “Christian conservative.” The MALC will organize more testimony, probably with the Black Legislative Caucus. Their next meeting will probably be in Houston. Commissioner Scott made some very significant gaffs, one of which was that the legislature has no authority over them. SBOE is now on the Legislature’s radar. Martinez thinks the Board should put off the vote on the new standards until January, when new and apparently more moderate members will replace some of the more extreme current members. Barring that, if the Board goes ahead and imposes the new standards, the legislative reaction is likely to be firm. Actually eliminating the Board would take a constitutional amendment, but legislative action could strip them of their control of the Texas Permanent School Fund and bring them under the same kind of transparency requirements as apply to the legislature. In any case, the extremist majority on the Board is surely overrating Texas’ national clout if it thinks that by changing the Texas standards it dictate changes to all of America.

5. On Friday the main discussions were with Dan Sharphorn and Pedro Reyes. Topics were a new draft policy on conflict of interest that had been circulated to members of the FAC for comment in January, and the changes to Regents Rules on exigency.

The conflict of interest policy draft was 13 pages long and, if implemented, would probably have required virtually everyone engaged in research to disclose, for one reason or another, all payments, gifts, or other benefits received or expected by them or their close relatives, as well as all pro-bono work—a more complete disclosure than even the IRS requires, with explanations. Reaction from the FAC was uniformly hostile. OGC recognizes that this was not the way to proceed and the effort will be started over.

The discussion of the exigency policy in Regent’s Rules focused on a conflict between the new wording and the AAUP standards in the view of several members of the UT law faculty, as well as by the UT president. AAUP says tenure should be protected as long as doing so does not result in “serious distortion” in the educational program. Regents Rules 3.2 says that decisions on what to cut should be made so as to produce “minimum effect upon the degree programs.” That is, AAUP “avoid serious distortion” is juxtaposed to Rules “with minimum affect.” Then section 3.4, specifically titled “tenure preference” says “If, in the opinion of the committee, two or more faculty members are equally qualified and capable of performing the same teaching, research, and/or clinical role, the faculty member or members having tenure shall be given preference over non-tenured faculty.” This appears to make tenure a tie-breaker; the AAUP position is that it should be protected if at all possible.

Janet Staiger, Chair of the UT Faculty Council, had also discussed this with Dan Sharphorn prior to the meeting, and with me. I said that it was not the intent of the committee to do anything in contradiction to the AAUP position. Tenure should be protected above all. Mr. Sharphorn said the same. His advice to UT was to write their local policies as they want. Since there is no real disagreement in intent, the System will seek regental approval for the present wording, and we can come back later to adjust it. UT will use the AAUP wording in their local policy. UT Dallas has taken a different approach, stating in the
policy that the notion of two positions being “equal” should not be construed overly literally. The Governance Committee decided that no action was required by the FAC at this point. The campuses should write their policies as their faculty sees fit on the assumption that AAUP guidelines and Regents Rules are not in conflict, and if rewording of Regents Rules turns out to be advisable we will work on it.

6. The final discussion was with Sandra Woodley, as Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives. This is the office that tries to collect data from the campuses on compliance, progress, and the like for reporting to the Chancellor, Regents, and Legislature. As such, the FAC has spent a lot of time trying to explain to its previous head how the information she was asking for was often either off the mark or outright misleading, and if acted upon administratively could be downright distorting. The most recent example is the last five or so years we have spent trying to explain why the four year graduation rate was not a good measure of “productivity.” It turns out that Mrs. Woodley is a virtual poster-child for what is wrong with such measures, as she explained in telling her “story.” She grew up in rural Alabama, and got married in high school with no thought of going to college. Two children “and a failed marriage” later, she figured out that college would be a good idea. Then she went to graduate school—I think she said the Public Administration program at Auburn. Since then she has worked on educational policy and related policy for a series of legislatures: Alabama, Tennessee, Arizona, and now Texas. She sees the politics and she sees the education side, and wants to help the two come together. The FAC was very pleased with her presentation, and we are optimistic about working with her.

7. Campus reports were given intermittently as time opened up through the two days. Several points were of interest. First, some campuses have committees to assess risk for international travel. System evidently has a guideline. This came out in the discussion of the recent order by the Regents to the System administration to pull all UT personnel out of the border areas in Mexico, unless they have permission from the campus committee.

With respect to the five percent cuts, medical campuses seem commonly to have had administrative prohibitions on travel, especially foreign travel—regardless of funding source. The main departure from this pattern was UTHSC Tyler, whose President has sent a letter ordering a 25% cut in research faculty. Faculty had no prior warning.

Three more campuses have finished their SACS re-accreditation and all have sailed through with no problems. I am reasonably sure that this reflects the change in presidential administrations. More specifically, it reflects the end of the Bush Department of Education’s effort to bully the accrediting bodies into supporting their legislative efforts to strengthen external testing (which would be done by for-profit companies) and weaken peer evaluation. That is, SACS has returned to its previous role and attitude, which is to focus on providing as much guidance as possible to the weaker schools in the region without imposing counter-productive “accountability” procedures on schools like the UT campuses.

6. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES – MURRAY LEAF

Speaker Leaf listed the current members of the committee: Murray Leaf, Marie Chevrier, B.P.S. Murthi, Cy Cantrell, Juan Gonzalez, Robert Stillman and Daniel Wickberg. Speaker Leaf’s suggestion is that the committee has been working well, and we should just reappoint these people as members. All have agreed to serve if reappointed. The question was raised as to how long these committee members have served and if there should be a rotation of committee members. It was agreed that since the Bylaws call for appointment of the Committee on Committees in June, it was agreed to wait until the next meeting to appoint members. Tim Redman made a motion to put a motion on the May Senate agenda revising the bylaws to appoint the members of the Committee on Committees in May rather than June. Kurt Beron
seconded the motion. The motion carried.

7. POSSIBLE INSURANCE PLAN CHANGES – MURRAY LEAF

Item taken out of order. Christine Moldenhauer, Human Resources Benefits Manager, attended the meeting to report that UT System has notified all the campuses that there will be significant benefits changes for the upcoming year. She has been asked to get feedback from the major stakeholder groups on campus regarding the proposed changes. Ms. Moldenhauer reported essentially we need to find an increase of funds of 14% for the System self-funded medical plan. Nine percent of that is the annual trend increase, and the remaining five percent is what we are in arrears for the current year. The System has proposed two options to address the shortfall.

1) We have a premium increase of 10% and make up the other 4% in benefit reductions.

2) A 12% premium increase and a 2% reduction in benefits.

Ms. Moldenhauer stated that a straight 14% benefit reduction would make the insurance plan completely unacceptable, so that is not an option.

Under the 12%-2% option, examples of possible changes would be a $5.00 increase in co-pays for primary care and specialist office visits (increase to $35.00 and $40.00 respectively). Deductibles would increase to $350.00 from the current rate of $250.00. The emergency room co-pay would increase to $100.00 to $150.00. The inpatient hospital stay co-pay would increase from $100.00 to $150.00. Another possible change would be the addition of a $5,000.00 co-pay for bariatric surgery, which is currently treated like any other illness.

In addition to those items listed above, the 10%-4% option would increase the outpatient surgery co-pay to $200.00 and add a co-pay for lab and x-ray tests. Essentially the feedback that Christine would like to get to report back to System is whether people would rather pay more per month and have fewer reductions in benefits or pay a little less per month with greater reductions in benefits. The premiums would still be taken from pre-tax dollars.

After discussion the general consensus was that the 14% premium increase would be preferable. If that is not possible, the 12% option would be the best choice. Council members were reminded to focus on how the changes will affect faculty and not to focus on how it would affect a department’s budget. Even though the deadline to get this information back to System will be past, it was felt that this issue was important enough that it should be placed on the Senate agenda for information purposes. Tim Redman made the motion to put this item on the agenda. Dennis Miller seconded. The motion carried. Ms. Moldenhauer will attend this meeting to address the issue and report any new developments.

8. EFFORT CERTIFICATION POLICY – SERENITY KING

Serenity King reported that this was a policy creation based on a System mandate requiring policies be in place to support existing procedures. The procedures for Effort Certification have been in place and the policy has been reviewed by the Research Advisory Committee. Tim Redman made a motion to place this on the Senate agenda. David Cordell seconded the motion. The motion carried. Rafael Martin has offered to attend the Senate meeting to address questions on the policy or the procedure. Ms. King will invite Mr. Martin to attend the meeting. Ms. King also reported that the Coordinating Board made a rule change at their meeting last week that has the potential to significantly impact Academic Affairs. The thresholds for low-producing programs have been re-evaluated. The new thresholds for graduates of
a program are: five per year for undergraduate; fifteen master’s students and ten doctoral students per program per year over a five-year period. In the past if these standards were not met there were very few repercussions. Under the new guidelines, if the thresholds are not met the School must either close the program or consolidate it with another program. You can request a waiver, which will now be similar to a degree proposal. The School must be able to show job market demand, how many students are enrolled in the program, and the cost of maintaining the program. One caveat is if all of the doctoral courses are taught within the master’s program – that is, if the master’s degree is just a pipeline into the doctoral program that master’s program will not be looked at. The rule will go into effect February 2011. This report will be placed on the Senate agenda.

9. **CEP PROPOSAL – DRAMA/DANCE MINOR; ASIAN STUDIES MINOR – MURRAY LEAF**

Tim Redman moved to place the Drama/Dance Minor proposal on the Senate agenda. Dennis Miller seconded. The motion carried. Tim Redman moved to place the Asian Studies Minor on the Senate agenda. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried.

10. **AGENDA FOR MAY 19, 2010 SENATE MEETING**

The agenda for the May 19, 2010 Academic Senate Meeting will be:

1. Report on Proposed insurance plan changes
2. HOP Effort Certification Policy
3. CEP – Drama/Dance Minor and Asian Studies Minor
4. Senate Bylaws Change to establish Committee on Committees in May and possible rotation of the terms of committee members

Kurt Baron made a motion to approve the agenda. Tim Redman seconded. The motion was approved. The May meeting will be the joint meeting of the old and new Senates.

The question was raised regarding the requirement to have a faculty or staff member accompany students on trips. It is the understanding that if the trip is for a student-sponsored organization Student Affairs requires a faculty member to accompany the students. For academic sponsored trips the requirement appears to come from the Provost’s office. Ms. King offered to check to determine if there was a Regent’s rule regarding this or if it is a local Provost’s office requirement.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Murray Leaf adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

APPROVED: ____________________________  DATE: ____________________________

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Senate
Resolution:

Whereas, the Customer Service Committee currently serves as an ad hoc committee at the University;

Whereas, the Customer Service Committee is currently supported by administration and staff members across the University;

Whereas, the Customer Service Committee is a committee that should be supported by all constituents of the University which include staff, faculty and students;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that by this Resolution of The University of Texas at Dallas Customer Service Committee, we join other interested parties across The University of Texas at Dallas in supporting the creation and establishment of a University-wide Customer Service Committee.
Request to: Create a new charge for a Customer Service Campus-wide Committee

Person/group making request: Customer Service Committee Members with the support of the Vice President for Business Affairs

Responsible University Official: VP Calvin D. Jamison

Suggested Stakeholder Review Plan:
Academic Affairs, Business Affairs, Research, Student Affairs, and Information Resources, Staff Council and Student Government

Background Information/Rationale for request:
The original Customer Service Committee was established with representation of 30 employees from across the campus to enhance the efforts of UT Dallas as an institution that provides excellent customer service to its students, faculty, staff and the greater community. The committee was asked to analyze and define excellent customer service, determine customer service issues that needed to be improved, and develop guiding principles along with recommendations on implementation of the program.

Over the past two years, the Committee has initiated several projects to assist students, worked with the Staff Council on wellness and staff appreciation events, developed Customer Service guiding principles, initiated certification training in customer service and developed a website. A survey is being designed to measure/provide a benchmark of customer service satisfaction at the University.

The original committee has served the University for over two years. They would like to see the committee be represented by not only staff members, but by student and faculty representatives as well. They are requesting that the Customer Service Committee be changed to a University-wide committee similar to the Wellness Committee.
Policy Statement

The Campus Customer Service Committee is a University-wide Standing Committee appointed by the President at The University of Texas at Dallas.

The Campus Customer Service Committee is focused on creating a culture of exceptional customer service at the University through education, support of programs that promote community service, employee appreciation and student assistance.

The Committee will implement the Customer Service program on the campus and provide a mechanism for training, community service, measuring the success of the program, and recognizing and rewarding outstanding customer service. Programs include but are not limited to certification training offered through Human Resources Management, Welcome Back Student program in the fall and spring, partnering with Student Volunteerism on the annual Trick or Treat food drive and other community support drives, partnering with Staff Council during Staff Appreciation Daze. The Committee will also provide information and resources via the Business Affairs Bulletin and the Customer Service website.

The Committee will be appointed by the President and composed of at least nine (9) voting members, including three staff members, three faculty members and three student members.

Committee nominations may be made to the President as follows:
- Faculty members by the Academic Senate
- First term staff members by the current Customer Service Committee; subsequent nominations by the Staff Council
- Student members by the Student Government

To ensure continuity, staff and faculty members will serve staggered terms, with one-third of the faculty and staff appointments expiring August 31 of each fiscal year. Students will serve one-year terms. All
terms are renewable. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

The Committee Chair will be appointed by the President annually. The Vice President for Business Affairs will serve as the Responsible University Official (RUO). The RUO shall convene the first meeting of the Committee each year. The Committee shall meet at least quarterly.

Policy History

Issued: (Issue date)

Policy Links

Government Code, Chapter 2114, Customer Service
Title and Purpose.

The Intellectual Property Advisory Committee is a concurrent committee reporting to the Senate and the President. Its purpose is defined in University of Texas at Dallas Intellectual Property Policy (UTDP P1002), and Regent’s Rule 90102, consistent with general law and practice. Accordingly, it has two main responsibilities. It shall “help administer intellectual property policy and make recommendations on such related matters as may be requested” and it “shall recommend to the President as to whether and how U. T. Dallas and the System should assert and protect rights in intellectual property covered by this policy.”

Membership

The committee shall have seven voting members appointed from among the voting faculty to provide broad representation of faculty research interests in the university. Members shall serve staggered two year terms. One voting member from the faculty will be Chair, one will be Vice-Chair.

Voting members shall be appointed according to the procedures in the Handbook of Operating Procedures III.21. IV. B. Vacancies that arise from resignation or departure shall be filled in the same manner.

Ex-officio members, with vote, shall be the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Vice President for Business Affairs or his designee, and the Associate Vice President for Research.

The President, at his or her discretion, may appoint up to three non-voting non-UT Dallas members to advise the voting members.

Reporting

The Responsible University Official is the Vice President for Research and Development. If a disagreement should arise between the Committee and the Vice President for Research and Development that cannot be resolved, the Chair of the Committee shall refer the matter to the Speaker of the Faculty. The Responsible University Official is similarly obligated to refer the matter to the President of the university.

Activities and Schedule

The committee shall meet at least once a semester and as called by the Chair.

Annual Reports

The Committee shall submit an annual report to the Senate and President. The report shall describe all cases in which intellectual property rights might have been asserted, the cases among these in which such rights actually were asserted, and any disputes that arose between the university and the inventors. The report shall also include any changes the Committee may recommend to University or System policy.