January 13, 2011

TO: Academic Senate Members

FROM: Office of Academic Governance
Vicki Carlisle, Academic Governance Secretary

RE: Academic Senate Meeting

The Academic Senate will meet on **Wednesday, January 19 at 2:00 p.m. in the T.I. Auditorium, ECS South 2.102.**

The revisions to the undergraduate catalog, Item #8 on the agenda, can be found on the Senate website, [http://www.utdallas.edu/senate/Meetings2.html](http://www.utdallas.edu/senate/Meetings2.html)

Please bring the agenda packet with you to this meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at x6751.
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1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  
   PRESIDENT DANIEL
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  
   DR. LEAF
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
   November 17, 2010 Meeting  
   DR. LEAF
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT  
   DR. LEAF
5. FAC REPORT  
   DR. LEAF
6. REPORT ON UPCOMING PEOPLESOFT SOFTWARE TRANSITION  
   JIM GARY
7. STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT  
   DR. CORDELL
8. CEP PROPOSALS –  
   UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG REVISIONS  
   PROPOSED ACADEMIC CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN CRITICAL  
   COMMUNICATION SKILLS  
   DR. CANTRELL
9. APPOINTMENTS TO STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP AND CORE CURRICULUM  
   COMMITTEES  
   DR. LEAF
10. SELECTION OF HEARING TRIBUNAL POOL MEMBERS  
    DR. LEAF
10(A). PROPOSED REVISION TO HEARING TRIBUNAL SELECTION  
    PROCEDURES POLICY  
    DR. LEAF
11. CONSIDERATION OF ONLINE VOTING SYSTEM  
    DR. CORDELL/  
    SIMON KANE
12. APPOINTMENT OF AD HOC ELECTION COMMITTEE AND APPROVAL OF  
    ELECTION CALENDAR  
    DR. LEAF
13. ADJOURNMENT  
    PRESIDENT DANIEL
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
November 17, 2010


ABSENT:  Indranil Bardhan, Dinesh Bhatia, D.T. Huynh, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Linda Keith, Syam Menon, Steven Nielsen, Orlando Richard, Lucien Thompson, Mathukumalli Vidyasagar, Yexiao Xu, Zhenyu Xuan, Harold Zhang

VISITORS:  Andrew Blanchard, Mark Spong, Serenity King, Lewis Chang

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS
President Daniel called the meeting to order. He stated that state funding and the budget is the dominant issue on his mind at this time. He referenced an article that appeared in Monday’s Dallas Morning News about further state budget funding cutbacks this fiscal year. This was the first indication that there might be additional cuts this fiscal year. At the State of the University address President Daniel announced the need to cut an additional $4 million in spending from this year’s budget. The cuts that were announced earlier this week will increase that amount to around $5 million. President Daniel has been talking with the vice presidents and they have begun the process of thinking about what type of impact staff reductions might have and to develop a plan on how those cuts might look. Dr. Daniel is insisting that the budget reductions in the administrative units be greater than the reductions in the academic units. At the moment the percentage reductions that are being reviewed are half the percentage of reductions in the administrative units. The President’s Office budget is taking the highest percentage of cuts. One area that is under consideration is changing freshman convocation. By making this a more serious academic convocation and eliminating the carnival and fireworks following the ceremony we could save $15,000-$20,000. Another cost saving move will be the elimination of serving wine at the doctoral hooding ceremony. He is still working on what the budget numbers might be for next September. President Daniel is writing a statement that will be distributed to the campus as soon as it is reviewed and receives System approval. Dr. Daniel remains confident about our situation and is not backing off his commitment to increase faculty in the next year. He stated that in a state of budget decline we cannot continue to do the same things we have done in the past, and have to look at not doing some things or doing them differently. One way of doing this might be to offer relatively small enrollment elective courses every other semester rather than every semester to make better use of our resources. Dr. Daniel still feels
that even though we have a difficult road ahead our fundamentals are really good and we are well-prepared as an institution.

President Daniel stated that some administrative changes are being made. One of those changes is that the Office of Enrollment Management is moving away from directly reporting to the President and is moving into the Office of the Provost. Curt Eley will now be Vice Provost for Enrollment Management. The reason for doing this is the function of enrollment management more closely aligns with the schools and if we are going to be asked to do more with fewer resources, it is vital that these groups talk with one another and find ways to aggregate and coalesce resources, especially with some of the technology. The Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement will retain this title but now have dual reporting to the Provost as well. Other changes are under consideration in an effort to find meaningful ways to bring groups that have some strong interconnectivity together from an administrative side to improve efficiency in the system. He welcomes any and all input.

Cy Cantrell asked what comment, if any, President Daniel had on legislation that had been introduced to abolish the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. President Daniel responded that he would rather not make a public comment.

Dr. Daniel was asked if he felt our guaranteed four-year tuition plan was having an adverse impact on us. On the contrary, Dr. Daniel feels this has had a positive impact for us.

He acknowledged that one big potential disadvantage to a guaranteed plan is that if there is a dramatic cut in state funding that necessitates a large tuition increase we would only be able to apply this increase to incoming students and could not apply the increase across the board. In that sense we could potentially be hurt by it. On the other hand, that is the very reason the plan is so popular in the first place. There are no sudden increases. UTD is uniquely well-positioned for a four-year tuition plan because we get a much higher fraction of new students every year than most universities, which is because we have such a rich Masters program and we have a large number of transfer students at the undergraduate level. In any one year approximately 35% of our student population is new. If there is an increase in tuition in any one year we will catch up much faster with a four-year plan than other institutions might. The Board of Regents has already approved a 3.95% tuition increase for 2011. Given the magnitude of state cuts, it seems certain that the Board of Regents may revisit this issue and consider higher tuition rates for 2011.

Another issue that the Provost is reviewing at this time is whether or not there will be any student fee increases for next fall. Any proposed fee increases must be presented to UT System by December 1. This is an area where arguably it has never been more important to collect legitimately defensible fees from students if it will help ensure that our educational offering is not harmed. President Daniel encouraged Provost Wildenthal to give him an aggressive recommendation regarding fees.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
Speaker Leaf had three additional items to add to the agenda—a revision to the Arts and Humanities bylaws; the revised financial exigency policy, and a request by the Committee on Faculty Mentoring to change the RUO of the committee. Cy Cantrell moved to approve the agenda as amended. Simon Fass seconded the motion. The agenda was approved as amended.
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Cy Cantrell moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Tim Redman seconded the motion. Jessica Murphy noted that in the paragraph at the bottom of page 3 the sentence indicating that she and Tim Redman would take the initiative in writing an article for the next issue of the UTD Magazine was inaccurate and should be stricken. The minutes were approved as amended.

4. ELECTRONIC VOTING FOR SENATE ELECTIONS
David Cordell presented this item and reported that the Senate has talked for some time about the possibility of using some type of online voting system. This is partly an issue of sustainability and partly an issue of enabling the governance secretary to use her time more efficiently. There were also some issues in the past with ballots and nominations not being received. Dr. Cordell introduced Simon Kane of the Provost’s Office to give a demonstration of a possible system that could be used.

Simon demonstrated a prototype of a web-based system called e-Vote which is based on the CourseBook system that is currently in use. He presented a brief overview of the system, going through both the nomination and voting processes. Simon has discussed this system with John Wiorkowski, chair of the Elections Committee, and John is satisfied that he will be able to get the voting data in a workable format.

There was further discussion regarding the pros and cons of electronic voting. The matter of preserving the anonymity of voters was of significant concern to several Senate members, as well as the possibility that the electronic nomination process would be too time consuming and was not as simple as signing a sheet of paper to nominate a candidate.

Speaker Leaf asked Mr. Kane if it would be possible for him to create a beta version of the software so that the Senate could have a mock election at or before its next meeting to test the system. Mr. Kane stated that this would certainly be possible. Cy Cantrell moved to ask Mr. Kane to continue to develop the system and have it available for the Senate to test in a mock election at the next meeting. R. Chandrasakaren seconded the motion. The motion carried.

5. SPEAKER’S REPORT
Speaker Leaf reported that the Sustainability Committee has met and is off to an enthusiastic start. Many of their recommendations will also have some cost-saving benefits, though probably not a significant amount in the short term.

The Committee on Committees still needs to appoint a chair for the Scholarship Committee. Speaker Leaf will continue to work on this issue.

Speaker Leaf received a reply from the Office of General Council on the last round of amendments for the exigency policy. Dan Sharphorn says the policy is fine. The revised Criminal Background Check policy has been sent back to OGC but we have not yet had a reply. This policy has also been sent to the Faculty Advisory Council.

In response to the Senate discussion last month regarding notifications of oral examinations for PhD candidates, Speaker Leaf reported that he has spoken with Jim Gary, Chief Information Officer, about the possibility of establishing an opt-in mailing list for people who wish to receive this information. Mr. Gary stated that we have the capability of creating such a list now. However, Dean Cunningham is happy with the way that notifications are being sent now and
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would like to continue with that method. His staff has reformatted the email notice that is used for these notifications so the information is more accessible.

Speaker Leaf raised the issue of whether or not the Senate should meet in December. R. Chandrasakaren moved that the Academic Council would meet in December but not in January and that the Senate would meet in January but not in December. The Council will decide at its December meeting if there is a need for an earlier Senate meeting. Tim Redman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

6. **TCFS REPORT**
Speaker Leaf reported that he and Dr. Cordell attended the Texas Council of Faculty Senates meeting in October. As expected, discussion at this meeting was focused on the impending state budget crisis. Speaker Leaf noted that we are in very good shape compared to other schools. The keynote speaker was Robert Nelsen, president of UT-Pan Am. They are expecting much greater losses because they are more reliant on state appropriations. Eighty percent of their students are on some type of scholarship. Speaker Leaf feels that we are possibly in the best shape financially of any school in the System. Another issue that commanded a great deal of attention was public relations and the need to generate as much public support for higher education as possible.

7. **STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIASION REPORT**
Lewis Chang, representative from Student Government, reported that they are working on a textbook swap program that they hope to have in place later this semester. He also noted that in their meeting last night, Student Government approved a resolution to expand the Student Union. President Daniel noted that this decision will require an increase in fees, but it is probably too late to be included in this legislative session, so it should show up in about 24 months.

8. **REPORT ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY CASES**
Speaker Leaf reported that Dean Fitch was unable to attend today’s meeting to address this report. He asked the Senate to review the information in their packet to determine if this format is adequate. It was pointed out in discussion that the numbers on the report do not add up to an orderly total. The view of the Senate was that the format should be a “balance sheet” in which the cases resolved under all the possible headings should add up to the cases referred. In conclusion, the Senate agreed that the report was acceptable with the following provisions:
(a) It should provide time-depth data trends.
(b) It should be a balance sheet so that the number of dispositions adds up to the number of referrals.
(c) The information should be disseminated to students.

Dan Bochsler moved to approve the report. Dinesh Bhatia seconded the motion. Cy Cantrell pointed out that the report should read Engineering and Computer Science, not Electrical Engineering & Computer Science. The report was accepted with the noted correction.

9. **APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATION**
The Secretary of the Faculty presented the lists of candidates for undergraduate and graduate degrees for the fall commencement.
CANDIDATES FOR UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES:
These students have applied for graduation and have been reviewed by the Office of Records. The Office of Records declared that all of these students will be eligible for graduation upon the completion of the current semester’s work at the necessary levels. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to graduate upon receipt of final grades, and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades are consistent with the standards for graduation prescribed by this University. I also request that the Academic Senate certify those students designated as eligible to graduate with honors upon completion of coursework and requirements consistent with the standards for honors at the levels offered by this University.

David Cordell moved to certify the list of undergraduate candidates for graduation. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATE DEGREES:
These students have applied for graduate degrees and have been reviewed by the Graduate Dean. The Graduate Dean certifies that all of these students will be eligible for the degrees indicated upon satisfactory completion of the current semester’s work. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to receive the degrees as indicated upon receipt of final grades and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades received are consistent with the standards for credit prescribed by this University.

David Cordell moved to certify the list of graduate candidates for graduation. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried.

10. DISCUSSION OF COST MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES
Speaker Leaf introduced this item as a continuation of the discussion President Daniel asked for at the previous meeting. After the discussion in the Senate, Speaker Leaf asked the Budget Advisory Committee to discuss concrete actions that the university might take to address future budgetary concerns. For the Committee, Richard Scotch distributed a memo to the Senate with a report of the committee meeting. The Committee’s recommendations are in the following three categories: cost reduction, revenue enhancement and structural changes. Dr. Scotch noted that the Committee had a strong feeling that different schools in the academic units have very different situations so that sometimes blanket measures may not be appropriate for all units. A summary of their suggestions is listed below:

Cost Reduction:

a) The Committee suggested that the university might further reduce its use of paper correspondence for announcements, etc.

b) Educate faculty about the fact that syllabi no longer need to include all the boilerplate to their printed syllabi that was adopted prior to the last SACS review, and that they can use a web address for some of it.

c) Encourage the use of community electric devices rather than individual electric devices (e.g., refrigerators in individual offices).

d) Reduce administrative bloat/overhead

e) Encourage the use of native plants (e.g., buffalo grass and reduced mowing, etc.)
Revenue Enhancement:
   a) The Committee suggested that the university might provide Principal Investigators more incentive to pursue grants by allowing them to retain more, especially when they produce RA positions.
   b) The university should advertise more of its masters programs, like the SOM does, to increase graduate enrollment in programs outside of the SOM.
   c) The university should appeal to its alumni to fund star faculty positions.

Structural Changes:
   a) The Committee felt that while increasing class size might be appropriate on a case by case basis, it also felt that these increases should be accompanied by increases in support (e.g., TAs, SIs, etc.). Also, these courses might rely more on tutorial sections.
   b) The Committee felt that the university should give thought to restructuring its delivery of some classes to a mix of online and on-campus delivery. For example, there might be master lecturers that deliver online lecture material and then different instructors for on-campus classes for discussion and interaction.
   c) The Committee discussed the increased use of SIs and TA apprenticeships as a way of improving the learning experience while at the same time reducing the use of more expensive supplementary instruction.

Speaker Leaf was asked if there is a way for the university to solicit funds for different sustainability initiatives such as motion detectors and automatic thermostats that might generate some cost savings. He replied that the Budget Committee did not discuss this issue but that it is a part of the ongoing work of the Sustainability Committee and noted that they will be pursuing such options in the future.

President Daniel expressed appreciation to the budget committee for the feedback and asked for continued input. On the issue of reduced printing costs, he feels that if an item is strictly for internal purposes and does not generate revenue it should not be printed. He acknowledged that there would be some push back from a policy of this sort but stressed that we need to have more careful thought about internally distributed items.

General discussion ensured regarding the current split of research funds and how they are currently distributed. Provost Wildenthal noted that one issue that needs to be under consideration is the fact that we are currently providing a powerful incentive to PIs to put RAs on their research grants by paying for RAs’ tuition and fees from university funds. Dr. Scotch stated that the lack of continuity in how RA tuition and fees are covered has been a matter of some uncertainty, confusion, and frustration on the part of some programs in the past and asked that this be taken into consideration before any changes are made to this program.

President Daniel stated that he welcomes suggestions on how improve the desirability of engaging in a research enterprise because it is consistent with the goals of the university.

During discussion the issue of the effective use of faculty was brought up. Speaker Leaf stated that each school has a teaching effectiveness committee. They have not at this point be charged with asking whether the faculty are being used effectively or efficiently or whether the best
faculty are doing the best things for the school. He asked if the Senate should make that charge to these committees. The Senate agreed that this is not the appropriate group to address this type of issue and that these decisions are best made in the schools between deans and department heads.

It was suggested that we need to have a uniform incentive program for all faculty and that perhaps we should not focus so heavily on PhD programs right now when more people are returning to school to pursue Masters degrees because that is what the current job market is demanding.

President Daniel stated that he feels very strongly that we need to reward teaching excellence and that we should have more teaching awards.

Dr. Daniel was asked if it was possible to renegotiate with our external stakeholders on our contractual commitments as a way of lowering costs. He stated that he will give this suggestion to Dr. Jamison and Jim Gary for their thoughts.

11. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS TO A&H BYLAWS
Dr. Tim Redman presented the item. The changes involve more formal procedures for reviewing Senior Lecturers, along the lines of those developed by Liz Salter for Interdisciplinary Studies, and giving some Senior Lecturers voting rights at the meetings of the A&H faculty (there will be spots available to 20% of the Senior Lecturers).

Tim Redman moved to approve the amended Arts & Humanities bylaws. Richard Scotch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

12. REVISED FINANCIAL EXIGENCY POLICY
Speaker Leaf noted that he circulated the latest revisions of the policy prior to the meeting and received some comments which indicated this item should be placed back on the Senate agenda. There was a consensus among the members of the Senate that this version of the policy was consistent with the last version that was approved and no further action was necessary.

13. CHANGE IN RUO FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY MENTORING
Speaker Leaf reported that at the request of the committee, Hlaing Minn, committee chair, is requesting that the Responsible University Official for this committee be changed to the Executive Vice President and Provost. The Provost has also agreed to this change. Cy Cantrell moved to change the RUO as requested. John Burr seconded the motion. The motion carried.

13. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, President Daniel adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED: ___________________________ DATE: ______________________
Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate
Proposed Academic Certificate Program
Title: Critical Communication Skills
Division: Undergraduate Education

Contacts: Sheila Pineres, Dean
Courtney Brecheen, Director

Implementation Date: Fall 2011 (if possible retroactive to Spring 2011)

Introduction/Description: The UT Dallas Certificate in Critical Communication Skills will demonstrate to employers and graduate school admissions personnel that students who successfully obtain this certification have the ability to succeed in their chosen profession or field of study.

Academic Focus of the Certificate: Interdisciplinary across all degree programs
Students targeted for this certificate are those who want to improve their chances of getting hired in a highly competitive job market, be recognized as a productive employee who merits advancement, or begin a competitive graduate school application process. Students may also pursue this certificate in order to improve the quality of their relationships and overall health. The skills provided by this certificate can increase the possibility of employment, advancement, graduate school admission, and enhance quality of life.

Job Market for the Certificate:
According to the 2010 National Association of College and Employers (NACE) "Job Outlook 2010 Survey," employers ranked communication skills as the most important attribute they look for in potential employees. However, a recent Conference Board study illustrates that approximately 30 percent of employers rate college graduates as deficient in written and oral communication skills. Additionally, 45 percent of those queried in a College Board survey listed writing as the skill most lacking among entry-level job seekers. Employees with poor writing skills tend to be perceived as unprofessional and less proficient than coworkers who write well; these perceptions limit career options and advancement. The top five reasons given for rejecting graduate school applications include poor writing skills, such as spelling and grammatical errors and application material weak in content and structure. Moreover, at the heart of good relationships is good communication. Whether we interact with colleagues, friends, intimate partners, or members of our family, effective communication can satisfy our need to affiliate with others, reinforce our self-concept, enable us to give and receive information, and improve our physical and psychological health.

---

Admission Policy: Available to all students

Organizational Arrangement: Undergraduate Education

Credit Hours and Degree Programs: To obtain the Certificate in Critical Communication Skills, students will:

- Enroll in 4 upper division classes (12 hours) designated as Critical Communication Skills courses (A list of designated courses can be found on the Office of Undergraduate Education Certificate in Critical Communication Skills web page):
  - One of the designated courses taken must emphasize oral communication
  - One of the designated courses taken must emphasize written communication and presentation skills
  - One course must be a designated capstone course
  - One course must be the major specific advanced writing course

- Receive a grade of B or higher in each designated course

- Submit a writing portfolio comprised of 4 writing samples in the designated capstone course

Course Offerings and Site Locations (note new courses with an asterisk): No new courses. Faculty must submit a request to have an existing course designated.

Faculty/Staffing (assign each course to a faculty member): No new courses

Additional Information: Request for Course Designation in Critical Communication Skills (see below)

Basic Course Information

Course Number and Title: ______________________________________________________

Department: ________________________________________________________________

Name of person initiating request: ________________________________

Phone: ________________

Email: ________________
Does the course meet any other requirements in the major?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Is the course accessible to a general student audience?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Does the course have prerequisites?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

*If yes, please list courses: ________________________________*

Attach a full explanation of how the course addresses stated requirements below.

Attach a syllabus that articulates the relevant aspects and includes the writing assignments.

Designation is sought for:

☐ The course as approved when taught by:  
    Instructor name: ____________________________

☐ All times the course is offered according to the guidelines submitted by these Instructors or others:

__________________________________________

**Please provide the following information:**

A. Indicate the range of writing and oral assignments you will use (i.e., their types and approximate number and/or length).

B. Explain the ways in which those assignments will both help students improve their writing and promote learning of class material.

C. Describe ways in which you will provide coaching for students, including guidance in the required revision of at least one substantial paper or other major writing assignment.

D. Explain how assessment of quality and improvement in students’ writing will be included in the final grade.

E. If designation is sought all times the course is offered as proposed, explain what will be done to ensure appropriate faculty preparation to maintain the integrity of the course.

F. A designated capstone course must be an upper division course that includes both written and oral communication.
RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENTS TO
STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE AND CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

1. Move to appoint Dr. Doug Eckel as Vice Chair of the Committee on Student Scholarships

2. Move to appoint Dr. Sara Maxwell as Vice Chair of the Committee on the Core Curriculum
HEARING TRIBUNAL POOL 2009-2010
Twenty members selected by the Academic Senate on May 20, 2009
*Twenty members selected by President Daniel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Herve Abdi</td>
<td>BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poras Balsara</td>
<td>ECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>James Bartlett</td>
<td>BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Farokh Bastani</td>
<td>ECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duane Buhrmester</td>
<td>BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anthony Champagne</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>R. Chandrasekaran</td>
<td>ECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marie Chevrier</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rockford Draper</td>
<td>NSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Frank Dufour</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lloyd Dumas</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>David Edmunds</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Andras Farago</td>
<td>ECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Juan Gonzalez</td>
<td>NSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Donald Gray</td>
<td>NSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Roderick Heelis</td>
<td>NSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Michael Kilgard</td>
<td>BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Moon Kim</td>
<td>ECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Midori Kitagawa</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jeong-Beong Lee</td>
<td>ECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>John Lin</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>David Mauer</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Adrienne McLean</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>George McMechan</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alice O’Toole</td>
<td>BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Karen Prager</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Stephen Rabe</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Suresh Radhakrishnan</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ram Rao</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Orlando Richard</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Suresh Sethi (SOM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Edwin Sha (ECS) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Dean Sherry (NSM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Melanie Spence (BBS) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Marianne Stewart (EPPS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Hal Sudborough (ECS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Tres Thompson (BBS) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Michael Tiefelsdorf (EPPS) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Theresa Towner (A&amp;H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Li Zhang (NSM) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hearing Tribunal Pool Members selected by President Daniel.
++Indicates member to be replaced
Hearing Tribunal Selection Procedures - UTDPP1055

Policy Statement

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.
Members of this tribunal panel will also be regarded as faculty recommended by the Senate to serve as hearing officers or to serve on panels to hear appeals regarding allegations of academic dishonesty. Appointments to such panels will be made by the Dean of Students. Members of the tribunal panel who agree to serve in these capacities will receive training by the Dean of the Students. The Dean of Students will report the number, membership, and activities of such panels to the Committee on Academic Integrity at the end of the fall and spring semesters.

Policy History

- Issued: May 4, 1999
- Editorial Amendments: September 1, 2000
- Editorial Amendments: April 6, 2006
# 2011-2012

## Academic Senate Election Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 19, 2011</td>
<td>Appoint ad hoc Election Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 2011</td>
<td>Distribute nominating petitions to Voting Members of the General Faculty and to full-time Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15, 2011</td>
<td>Deadline for Nominating Petitions for Academic Senate to be returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2011</td>
<td>Distribute ballots for voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11, 2011</td>
<td>Final day for voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2011</td>
<td>Academic Senate election results announced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| April 20, 2011  | Senate-Elect Caucus
|                 | Election of Speaker of the Faculty,
|                 | Secretary of the Faculty, and Academic Council                       |
| May 4, 2011     | Joint Meeting – Council/Council-Elect                                |
| May 18, 2011    | Joint Meeting – Senate/Senate-Elect                                  |