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RE: Academic Senate Meeting

The Academic Senate will meet on **Wednesday, September 15 at 2:00 p.m. in the T.I. Auditorium, ECS South 2.102.**
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## AGENDA

**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING**  
September 15, 2010

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td><strong>CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS &amp; QUESTIONS</strong></td>
<td>DR. WILDENTHAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td><strong>APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA</strong></td>
<td>DR. LEAF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **3.** | **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
August 18, 2010 Meeting | DR. LEAF |
| **4.** | **SPEAKER’S REPORT** | DR. LEAF |
| **5.** | **FAC REPORT** | DR. LEAF |
| **6.** | **STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT** | DR. CORDELL |
| **7.** | **COMMITTEE REPORTS** | DR. CORDELL |
| **8.** | **DISCUSSION ON CRIMINAL BACKGROUND POLICY** | DR. LEAF |
| **9.** | **REVISIONS TO FINANCIAL EXIGENCY POLICY** | DR. LEAF |
| **10.** | **SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE BYLAWS** | DR. LEAF |
| **11.** | **REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES** | DR. LEAF |
| **12.** | **ADJOURNMENT** | DR. WILDENTHAL |
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
August 18, 2010

PRESENT: David Daniel, Dan Bochsler, Cy Cantrell, David Cordell, Kelly Durbin, Murray Leaf, Jessica Murphy, Tim Redman, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch


VISITORS: Andrew Blanchard, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Dina Shahrokhi

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS
A quorum was not met. Speaker Leaf suggested that the meeting continue with any votes taken being advisory or provisional votes. An email will be sent to all Senators following the meeting giving everyone an opportunity to vote on the items discussed in today’s meeting. There was general agreement on this plan, and President Daniel called the meeting to order.

President Daniel reported that his main concern at the present time is explosive enrollment growth. Final enrollment figures are not out yet, but acceptance rates for the fall semester are running 12%-13% over last year. He has been told that 200 sections of classes have been closed and all the introductory mathematics courses were closed on the first orientation. There is no shortage of classroom space, but rather a shortage of instructors, and President Daniel has authorized whatever reasonable additional resources might be necessary to cover the need this fall. This is his highest priority, particularly when it comes to required classes. He will continue to monitor this situation very carefully.

At the recent UT System Board of Regents meeting there was discussion of the impact of a 10% state budget cut on individual campuses. Some are anticipating staff layoffs while others are being forced to eliminating some outreach programs. President Daniel has looked very closely at our budget for the year beginning September 1 but of greater concern is the first year of the next biennium assuming cuts take place. If we maintain fall 2010 status quo – with no new hires, no raises, etc. the budget will still be extremely tight. On the academic side, he has asked the Provost to review low enrollment non-
critical graduation path courses as a way of reallocating resources. That will continue to take place throughout the fall, but we are not in any type of desperate situation. He is hopeful that if we continue to grow it will be a question of not what we cut but what remains stagnant.

President Daniel reported that U.S. News and World Report published their university rankings. UTD is ranked 143rd in the country, tied with Arizona State and Rutgers. That makes us the #3 ranked public university in Texas, behind UT-Austin and Texas A&M. We are the highest ranked among the seven emerging research universities. President Daniel feels that there is a tremendous amount of momentum in our favor at this time.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
Cy Cantrell made a motion to approve the agenda as distributed. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
It was noted that the electronic version of the minutes from the last Senate meeting did not include the full list of candidates for graduation, but those that received a hard-copy of the minutes received the full packet. The electronic version posted to the web will be corrected. Cy Cantrell made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Page 2 of 6
Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT
Speaker Leaf reported the following:

1) The new charge for the Intellectual Property Advisory Committee was slightly revised by the Vice President for Research, after approval by the Senate at the June meeting and before being sent to OGC. The changes only involved changes of administrative titles reflecting recent adjustments in the administration. Accordingly, I regarded them as editorial, and asked the Assistant Provost to go ahead and sent the policy to OGC for legal review and approval.

2) The most important matter not on the agenda is the ongoing discussion at the System level of criminal background check policy. A second draft of the proposed system policy has been circulated. I drafted a response for the FAC, which the FAC agreed with and sent back to V. C. Prior and Barry Burgdorf, the main attorney working on it.

There are two main problems. First, it is too sweeping, possibly requiring checks on everyone the faculty at least every few years. Second, it would require each person subject to such a search to sign a release or be subject to dismissal. Mr. Burgdorf’s reason for insisting on such a release was explained to us in the meeting with the Chancellor as having to do with cost and comprehensiveness. Searches through the established agencies in the Texas Department of Public safety are low cost, but not thorough. System wants more thorough searches, which require private companies but cost more. To use a private company you have to have a release. Since court records are public documents, this did not make sense to me, so I looked for the relevant law. The explanation seems to lie in the Right to Privacy Act of 1974. This provides a strong set of safeguards against drawing information from multiple federal agencies together into personal profiles that could allow either official or unofficial abuse. But these safeguards can be abrogated in what the law calls a “consumer record check,” also described as a “credit check” by a
private company provided that the company doing the checking has the written permission of the person about whom the information is being sought. Essentially, once a person signs such a release, they allow an open ended search for anything with their name on it from whatever federal agencies have such information and have posted the fact that they have it in the Federal Register. This has nothing to do with criminal records, in the sense of court records. Court records are public documents, and do not require a release.

Combining these two features, the predictable effect of the policy as drafted was that each campus would obtain large amounts of questionable information on almost every member of the faculty every few years. This is in addition to the very questionable practice of requiring faculty and potential faculty to sign away their legal rights to privacy as a condition of employment.

The system Provosts and Presidents had much the same reaction as the FAC representatives. To facilitate a common approach, I boiled my objections down to a single page of bullet points, which we circulated to members of the FAC, some of whom in turn circulated it to their presidents.

Last Thursday, as a side-discussion to the Regents' meeting in Austin, the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor Prior, and Chief Council Barry Burgdorf meet with the Presidents to get their views. Then they met with representatives of the FAC: Dan Formanowicz (Chair), Mansour Al Kikhia (past chair), and me (via Skype on Mansour's laptop). The upshot is that the old draft, of twenty-something pages, has been scrapped and System will come up with a new paper of four to five pages--seemingly now pretty close to what Speaker Leaf suggested in his page of Key Points: based on public information clearly relevant to criminal activity (i.e.: court records), no release form required, hence no threat of disciplinary action against those who do not sign, staying with a narrower scope of who is checked and when, and providing clear guarantees that whatever information is collected will also be made available to the person being considered for their response. The System policy will require a local policy in the HOP, which means Governance will have to be involved in formulating this local policy--as we did with the exigency policy. There was even agreement at the end that this process--these kinds of discussion and the requirement for inclusion in the HOP --should be recognized as a model for all future policy problems.

3) Dr. Wildenthal has been working on his proposal for administrative salary supplements for the Speaker, Secretary, and Chairs of the CQ and CEP. We should be able to discuss them at the next meeting.

4) The Service Excellence Committee met with the full Council and others. There was substantial agreement on purpose and value, and no real dissent. The discussion mainly turned on language to avoid or qualify the “customer” metaphor while still retaining the work the committee had already done in developing the program. In Dr. Leaf’s opinion, the upshot of the discussion was that the committee would still be primarily focused on staff; we would not try to generalize the ideas or program to include faculty. Faculty already have much the same concerns, and we are implementing them, but not in the same way. The Committee will now discuss our suggestions and get back to us. If we can remove the problems in terminology, a charge for the committee can be drafted quickly.
5. FAC REPORT

1) The FAC Executive Committee will meet this coming Friday in Austin. Murray Leaf and David Cordell will attend. Speaker Leaf expects to have the new draft of the Criminal Background Check policy by then and will respond. We (the FAC) have also offered to provide templates for the several campuses. Speaker Leaf has offered our UTD policy as a starting point.

2) Speaker Leaf will be out of the country at the time of the September FAC meeting, September 23-24. David Cordell will attend as usual, and Richard Scotch has agreed to go as our alternate delegate. The agenda has not yet been developed, but the Criminal Background Check policy will surely be on it.

6. STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT

Neither Dina Shahrokh, Student Government representative, nor David Cordell had anything to report.

7. CHARGE – SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

Richard Scotch made a motion to approve the charge. Jessica Murphy seconded the motion. The motion carried.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Before entertaining an omnibus motion for approval, Speaker Leaf called the Senate’s attention to the following items:

Duane Buhrmester was appointed to the Committee on Educational Policy before he passed away. Karen Prager is being appointed to fill that position.

Tim Redman raised a question over the appointment of Pam Gossin to the Committee on Educational Policy. Dr. Gossin lives in Oklahoma and Dr. Redman says that she cannot guarantee that she will be able to attend the meetings since she is not on campus on Mondays. Speaker Leaf reported that Daniel Wickberg, a member of the Committee on Committees, had spoken with Dr. Gossin and she would be able to accept the appointment. Speaker Leaf agreed to review this issue and find a replacement if necessary.

Speaker Leaf noted that there are no appointments to the Committee on Effective Teaching. Last year the Committee had nothing to do and recommended the dissolution of the committee. The primary reason for this is that each School now has its own Committee on Effective Teaching. The Senate will review this matter further before a decision is made regarding the future of this committee.

Aria Nosratinia was recommended as chair of the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel, but has declined the appointment and does not wish to serve on the committee. David Mauer is recommended as Chair. Poras Balsara is recommended to replace Aria Nosratinia on the Committee. Xinchou Lou is recommended as Vice Chair.

There is some confusion regarding the proposed membership of the University Safety and Security Council. Dennis Miller is listed as Chair of the committee but not listed among the members of the committee. It was agreed to add Dennis Miller as a
member of the committee. He was previously a member of the committee and has been attending the meetings.

Cy Cantrell made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Committee on Committees with the above noted corrections. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

9. **CEP PROPOSALS:**
   **LEAN SIX SIGMA FOR HEALTHCARE MGT. YELLOW BELT CERTIFICATE**
   Cy Cantrell presented the proposed Lean Six Sigma for Healthcare Management Yellow Belt Certificate from the School of Management. This proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Committee on Educational Policy. This is an academic certificate. It does not call for the creation of any new courses. Cy Cantrell made a motion to approve the Certificate proposal. Tim Redman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

   **CATALOG COPY CHANGE – PhD IN POLITICAL SCIENCE**
   Cy Cantrell stated that this proposal was from Robert Lowry, program head in Political Science. These are amendments to the catalog copy that was previously approved. Dr. Cantrell acknowledged that these changes will not show up in the fall 2010 catalog. The changes represent modifications that have already occurred in the program. Cy Cantrell made a motion to approve these changes. Richard Scotch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

   At this time Chris Parr, Senate representative from the UTD Retiree’s Association, addressed the Senate. The group is looking for speakers for their meetings and asked anyone who was interested themselves or had a recommendation for a speaker to email him at parr@utdallas.edu

10. **REVISED CHARGE – BIOSAFETY COMMITTEE**
    Speaker Leaf stated that this revision came from the Biosafety Committee. The Committee and the Environmental Safety Officer agree with the change, which would add a chemist to the membership of the committee. Cy Cantrell made a motion to approve the charge. Dan Bochsler seconded the motion. The motion carried.

11. **REVISED CHARGE – FACULTY MENTORING COMMITTEE**
    Speaker Leaf reported that these changes were also recommended by the Committee and reflect the experience over the past year working with a working group from the Provost’s Office who worked with the Committee to host a series of events. The Provost’s Office also provided a budget for these events. The change would add two liaisons from the Provost’s Office and to subtract one member from the membership. The Chair of the Committee would have the authority to add additional members if it was deemed necessary. Tim Redman made a motion to approve the charge. The motion was seconded. Jessica Murphy asked for the following corrections to the charge: On page 2 replace the word “utilizing” with the word “using” and correcting the spelling of the word “liaison.” The motion as amended was approved.

12. **OGC REVISIONS TO FACULTY FITNESS FOR DUTY POLICY**
    Speaker Leaf stated that the OGC returned the amended policy with suggested revisions. The Academic Council has reviewed these and felt they were non-substantive changes, but that the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct should review them as well.
The Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct agrees that the changes were not substantive, but wanted the Senate to have the opportunity to review as well. Richard Scotch, Chair of the Faculty Standing and Conduct Committee made a motion to approve. Tim Redman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

13. **REVISIONS TO FINANCIAL EXIGENCY POLICY**

These proposed revisions were received by Speaker Leaf from Dan Sharphorn, in the OGC. Speaker Leaf has spoken with Mr. Sharphorn and made suggested changes. These were distributed to the Academic Council. The Council felt that these changes should be reviewed by the Senate. In the meantime, Mr. Sharphorn made additional changes to the policy. These changes are included in the copy which was distributed at today’s meeting. Speaker Leaf reviewed the changes made by Mr. Sharphorn. Speaker Leaf suggested either approving the policy with Mr. Sharphorn’s changes or approve the policy and wait to discuss some of the changes. Speaker Leaf feels that some of the changes are important. Tim Redman made a motion to table this item until next month’s Senate meeting. Cy Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion to table was approved.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED: ___________________________  DATE: ____________________

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate
MEMO

John Wiorkowski
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
The University of Texas at Dallas
800 W. Campbell Road
Richardson, Texas 75080

REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR COMMITTEE 2009-2010

The Academic Calendar Committee consists of the following members:

Austin Cunningham
Andras Farago
Sheila Gutierrez-Pineres
John Wiorkowski
Douglas Eckel
Caroline Crossley
Lye-Ching Wong
Rick Loeza

The Academic Calendar Committee did not meet during the Fall-Spring 09-10 academic year as its primary purpose is to provide a two year academic calendar (in this case for Academic years 2010 and 2011) and this had already been accomplished. The committee will meet during the upcoming academic year to create the 2012 and 2013 academic calendars.

Submitted,

John Wiorkowski, Chair
Academic Calendar Committee
TO: The Academic Senate  
FROM: Gregg R. Dieckmann  
Chair, Academic Program Review Committee  

I. Membership  
The Academic Program Review Committee consisted of Emily A. Tobey (Associate Provost and Callier Center), Hasan Pirkul (Dean of SOM), Myron B. Salamon (Dean of NSM), Mark Spong (Dean of ECS), Gregg R. Dieckmann (NSM and Chair), Andrea Fumagalli (ECS) and Robert Stillman (BBS).

II. Meeting October 2, 2009  
The committee convened October 2nd to review the list of academic programs, their last review dates, and the projected times for their next reviews (full table attached to end of this report). Important details from the meeting follow:

1. the next set of program reviews should occur in the 2011 calendar year:  
   - Engineering/Computer Science (UG only; review by ABET in 2011/2012)  
   - Management (by AACSB in 2010/2011)  
   - Molecular and Cell Biology (Fall 2011)  
   - Mathematical sciences (Spring 2011)  
   - Science/Mathematics Education (Fall 2011).

2. A set of new programs were added to the Review cycle:  
   - Materials Science and Engineering (Spring 2013)  
   - Mechanical Engineering (UG; Fall 2014)  
   - Mechanical Engineering (Grad; Fall 2014)  
   - Executive Education Programs (Spring 2015)  
   - Library (Fall 2014)  
   - Graduate Education (Spring 2015)  
   - Undergraduate Education (Spring 2015)

3. It was pointed out that one problem area for recent program reviews had been in obtaining accurate and reliable information from the departments regarding grants, teaching loads and student enrollments. An idea that was proposed was to coordinate with Thom D. Chesney (Associate Provost for Student Success & Assessment), since this data is collected from all departments for SACS assessment efforts.
## Program Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or Program</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Response to Report (of latest review)</th>
<th>Next Review Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>2002; 4-08</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral and Brain Sciences</td>
<td>2002; 4-08</td>
<td>3-6-09</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiology (Doctorate)</td>
<td>ASHA 2007</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td>ASHA 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Disorders (MS)</td>
<td>2000; ASHA 2007</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td>ASHA 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic, Political and Policy Sciences</td>
<td>1994; 2004; 12-08</td>
<td>2-15-09</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>NASPA 2-17-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASPA 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Comp Science (UG)</td>
<td>1995; 2000; ABET 2006; ABET 11-07 (EE,SE,TE)</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td>ABET Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science Graduate Program</td>
<td>4-07</td>
<td>7-08</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Graduate Program</td>
<td>4-08</td>
<td>4-18-09</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science and Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering (UG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering (MS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>2001; 11-07</td>
<td>4-1-09</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1993; AACS B 2002; 11-07</td>
<td>4-9-09</td>
<td>AACS B Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences and Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology/Molecular &amp; Cell Biology</td>
<td>1994; 11-06</td>
<td>2-07</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1998; 4-07</td>
<td>4-08</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>1999; 4-07</td>
<td>6-07</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>1997; 10-06</td>
<td>1-07</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1996; 3-07</td>
<td>6-07</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Mathematics Education</td>
<td>1999; 11-06</td>
<td>4-07</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviews scheduled for AY 2010-2011 (Fall 2010 - Spring 2011):**

Mathematical Sciences - Spring 2011
August 10, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Academic Council
FROM: Judy L. Barnes, Director of University Events
SUBJECT: Annual Report of the Commencement Committee, 2009-2010

1. Membership

The Commencement Committee is a University-side Standing Committee appointed by the President not reporting to the Academic Senate, The University of Texas at Dallas.

The voting members of the Commencement Committee included two members of the faculty, Kathryn Evans and Fang Qiu; and two student representatives including the President of Student Government, Diana Kao and Undergraduate Student, Haroon Hashimi.

Non-voting members included: Speaker of the Faculty, Murray Leaf; Assistant Vice President for Student Financial Aid and Academic Records and University Registrar, Karen Jarrell; Associate Vice President for Business Affairs, Rick Dempsey; Dean of Undergraduate Education, Michael Coleman; Dean of Graduate Studies, Austin Cunningham; Chief of Police, Larry Zacharias; Director of Health Services, Beverly Ballard; Bookstore Manager, Brian Weiskopf; Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, Donna Rogers; Media Services Representative, Caroline Crossley; Alumni Relations Representative, Erin Dougherty; Director of University Events, Judi Hensley/Judy Barnes; Special Events Coordinator, Danielle Derbes.

2. Meetings

Two meetings of the Commencement Committee were conducted during the 2009-2010 academic year. A meeting held on January 26, 2010 discussed the Fall 2009 ceremonies and was also the final meeting for Committee Chair, Judi Hensley. The new Director of University Events, Judy Barnes, was introduced to the committee. [Meeting agenda and minutes are attached.]

The second meeting of the Committee was held on April 2, 2010 in preparation for the Spring 2010 commencement ceremonies. [Meeting agenda and minutes are attached.]
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT DALLAS
NUMBERED POLICY MEMORANDA

POLICY MEMORANDUM 83-12-44

Issued: September 1, 1983
Revised: January 14, 1985
Revised: May 13, 1985
Revised: September 1, 1987
Revised: September 1, 1988
Revised: May 1, 1990
Revised: September 1, 1990
Revised: April 4, 1995
Editorial Amendments: February 2, 1998
Editorial Amendments: September 1, 2000
Editorial Amendments: November 22, 2002
Editorial Amendments: April 18, 2006
Editorial Amendments: September 19, 2007

COMMENCEMENT COMMITTEE

The Commencement Committee is a University-wide Standing Committee appointed by the President not reporting to the Academic Senate, The University of Texas at Dallas.

The Committee is responsible for the direction and conduct of the University's commencement activities and graduation ceremonies and for recommending to the President modifications to the procedures and practices followed for these activities.

The Committee shall be composed of at least two members of the faculty and two student representatives, including the President of the Student Government. Ex officio, non-voting, members shall be those who hold the following positions: Speaker of the Faculty, Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Undergraduate Education, Chief of Police, Assistant Vice President for Facilities Management, University Registrar and Director of Academic Records, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, Director of University Events, Bookstore Manager, Coordinator of Student Health Services, a representative from Media Services and a representative of the Alumni Association. The Special Events Coordinator also serves as a non-voting ex officio member and provides staff support to the Committee as well as overall coordination for commencement activities. The Executive Vice President and Provost, or designee, serves as the Responsible University Official.

The term of office for committee members shall be three years, effective September 1 to August 31, and members may be reappointed by the President for additional terms. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

The Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee shall be appointed by the President annually.
Commencement Committee Meeting

January 26, 2010

Committee Description: The Commencement Committee is a University-wide Standing Committee appointed by the President and not reporting to the Academic Senate.

Committee Charge: The Committee is responsible for the direction and conduct of the University’s commencement activities and graduation ceremonies and for recommending to the President modifications to the procedures and practices followed for these activities.

Committee Membership:

The voting members of the Committee are at least two members of the faculty and two student representatives including the president and Student Government:

Kathryn Evans - Faculty ✓
Fang Qiu - Faculty ✓
Diana Kao - Student Government President ✓
Haroon Hashmi - Undergraduate ✓

Non-voting members include:

Speaker of the Faculty: Murray Lea ✓
Assistant Vice President for Student Financial Aid and Academic Records and University Registrar: Karen Jarrell ✓
Associate Vice President for Business Affairs: Rick Dempsey ✓
Dean of Undergraduate Education: Michael Coleman ✓
Dean of Graduate Studies: Austin Cunningham ✓
Chief of Police: Larry Zacharias ✓
Director of Health Services: Beverly Ballard ✓
Bookstore Manager: Brian Weiskopf ✓
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students: Donna Rogers ✓
Media Services Representative: Caroline Crossley ✓
Alumni Relations Representative: Erin Dougherty ✓
Director of University Events: Judi Hensley/Judy Barnes
Special Events Coordinator: Danielle Derbes ✓

Meeting Agenda

I. Introduction of Participants including description of Commencement role/duties
II. Debriefing from December Commencement
III. Suggestions for Spring Commencement
IV. Long-term Suggestions
V. Suggestions for Next Meeting
Commencement Committee Meeting
McDermott Suite/Calatrava Room
January 26, 2010

I. Attendance
   Michael Coleman
   Caroline Crossley
   Rick Dempsey
   Erin Dougherty
   Kathryn Evans
   Haroon Hashmi
   Judi Hensley/Judy Barnes
   Karen Jarrell
   Murray Leaf
   Larry Zacharias
   Gayle Poirot
   Feng Qiu
   Kerry Tate
   Wanda Trotta

II. Introduction of Committee Members

III. Debriefing of December 2009 Commencement
   A. Student (Haroon Hashmi)

      1. Larger venue suggested
      2. Input from students re tickets (attached)
      3. Crowded conditions

   B. Undergraduate Education (Michael Coleman)

      1. Chronic problems

         a) Traffic
         b) Places to stand
         c) Weather in December

      2. Parking/traffic flow seemed ok

   C. Media Services

      1. Equipment issues
2. Purchased new equipment for Spring

D. Police

1. Signs needed to direct disabled to handicapped parking

Action item:

Put additional information on Graduation website re handicapped parking and have additional signs made.

E. Facilities

1. Egress issues
   a) Although a good idea the photo backdrop was located in a high traffic area
   b) “Recessional” eases egress issue as would using back door exit
   d) Rent tents for outside

F. Faculty representative – Kathryn Evans

1. Suggested faculty attendance related to grades being due December
2. Final exams late
3. Suggested designated place for students to go to meet parents.
4. Communicate clearer message about where to meet.
5. Encourage school receptions to alleviate traffic in lobby.

G. Alumni Relations – Erin Dougherty

1. Provide a FAQ to help staff
2. Provide cell phone list for staff

H. Graduate Dean’s Office – Wanda Trotta

1. Felt low faculty attendance was due to confusion as to which ceremony to attend (hooding or commencement).
2. Parking issues – open up 1 hour prior to ceremony.
3. Better signs to move graduates to assembly area.
IV. Suggestions for Spring 2010 Commencement

A. Student (Haroon Hashmi)

1. Tickets
   a) Survey indicated some students didn’t know they could get extra tickets.
   b) Suggested putting up more signs to communicate that more tickets are available.
   c) Suggested Facebook as an avenue for ticket exchange among students.
   d) Suggested individual schools/advisors add to their notification re tickets as students will listen to their advisor.

B. President’s Office – Judi Hensley

1. No less than 6 tickets! EVER!
2. More ceremonies

V. Long-term (.....very)

A. Venue

1. Too small
2. Not nice enough
3. New venue on campus
4. Off-campus option
5. Coleman talked about survey done in the past and if venue accommodates large numbers, other things would change, i.e., no walking across the stage, graduating en mass, one student speaker, etc.
6. Erin suggested that graduates could still walk in that type of venue
7. Hensley suggested getting specifics of what students would like. Some venues just wouldn’t work as they would be too costly.
8. Tickets would still be needed and receptions following ceremonies might not be possible off-site.

9. Media issues would occur as use of our crew and equipment would be very limited, if at all.

10. Rick discussed long-range Visitor Center/Bookstore and Events Center (years away due to funding issues)

   B. Haroon suggested doing another survey and secure involvement of Alumni Relations.

   C. Mandate faculty participation one commencement per year

   D. Add pomp

   E. Student Organization participation in commencement

IV. Next meeting – no date set
Student Input about Commencement, collected October 2009:

David McNally: "If they already have the ceremonies split into the different schools and spread over 2 days and there is still not enough to expand how many tickets each student gets, then I would prefer moving to a larger arena. I understand the appeal of having it on campus, but if seeing the campus is really that big of a deal then they could always hold tours after the ceremony, or each student could give there family a tour if they so desired. At my high school graduation I received 8 tickets, borrowed 4 more from a friend, and still had relatives who wanted to come but couldn't, so the more tickets available, the better, especially as UTD continues to expand."

Sevon Geil: "I am looking forward to the graduation ceremony this December and I do think that it is unique having it on campus in a pretty intimate setting. I do think though that the size of the University exceeds holding future ceremonies in an intimate setting - the number of people graduating is more than the total number of people enrolled at what is considered "small" Universities elsewhere. My high school in 2005 had around 2500 total people and a little over 600 were graduating, yet the high school graduation ceremony was held at UT Austin's Frank Erwin Center (where they hold NCAA Division I basketball games - a huge arena). So considering that the University is so much larger and thousands of people are graduating, I think that the graduates are going to want to invite friends, family, and significant others closest to them and have had an impact/influence during their collegiate experience. Right now, apart from my family, I have to "choose" between my closest friends or my boyfriend and most of them have expressed interest in attending. What do I tell them? No? Please watch the webcast instead? It just seems that it might be taken as impersonal. I'm glad that the webcast option is there though because I do think it is considerate to offer it freely for all those that could not attend the actual ceremony whether it be because of the number of tickets or distance/cost to travel or other considerations."

Priscilla Gonzalez wrote
I honestly didn't realize what graduation was going to be like until I read these responses. I think we should be able to graduate somewhere else. It's pretty ridiculous that we graduate in our nasty small gym. Even for my high school we graduated at SHSU. We should be able to find a place more suitable.

Manasa Kesavarapu wrote
I would definitely like to have the ceremony off campus simply for having the option of having more space. No matter where we decide to have the ceremony, the degree is going to be from UTD so I don't see why there is an objection to having a ceremony at a place with larger accommodations.

Sara Kebede wrote
I'd much rather UTD spend millions of dollars to build an arena more conducive to commencement ceremonies than use said funds to construct a reflection pool and plant flowers.

Truc Phung wrote
I agree with ALL the comments below. Either they should invest in building something better or we should have it off campus. I graduated in that gym for my undergrad and it was kind of embarrassing. I worked so hard for my degree and my family (a selected few) had to come to our gym to watch. It almost makes our degree look like a joke. I did like being split up by schools though because I have been to other college graduations like Tech and it too forever. It also helped with traffic and things like that.
Ahou Vazirisepehr wrote
I totally agree with Jessica who wrote below me. My high school class was 1000 people and we had it in a pretty awesome place. If my high school could have a great graduation, why shouldn't my college- considering I AM paying tuition after all! And with the size of this year's freshmen class, if we keep growing the way we have been- there is NO way the gym is going to continue to fit everyone!

Melanie Yabs wrote
Let's have Graduation in a center off campus. I wouldn't mind not physically graduating here at UTD. It doesn't take anything anyway from my degree and it makes for a more comfortable environment. For my high school graduation, we held it at a convention center off campus and no one took offense. It was a much better idea than holding it in our high school gym.

Shane Browning wrote
we need a nicer facility anyways... but no one enjoys graduating in the high school gym looking Activity Center. It is what it is, but it's kind of ugly right now.

Jessica Nassau wrote
definitely off campus. My high school in Orlando, Florida had a graduating class that consisted of 700+ students and we had it in the Amway Arena where the Orlando Magic NBA team plays. if my high school can do that I think UTD should be able to do it somewhere bigger and nicer than the Activity Center.

Vinay Kumar Aerry wrote
since UTD is vying for Tier 1, they will need to create a bigger facility to accommodate more students. In the long term, having a larger indoor gym is more realistic rather than using the AC for commencement ceremonies. But then again, having it in the gym does not have a real feeling of graduating; after all its in a gym. We should build something similar to what Harvard (Harvard square) and other Ivy league schools use to hold commencement ceremonies. Obviously there is a cost, but it can be used in long term for other large meetings as well.

Irene Solis wrote
I would rather us have the ceremony in an off-campus facility. I am from a large family (8 siblings) and they won't be able to attend when I graduate. It's ridiculous! The AC is way too small for a graduation ceremony. Having two ceremonies is costly and time-consuming. Having ceremonies in the summer is also a great idea!

Christie Bubel wrote
I agree with the reasoning behind having a smaller ceremony. However, maybe they could have a ceremony for the summer graduates. This would create more seats per person and actually honor graduates when they get their diplomas.

Matthew Rivera wrote
Off campus in a bigger facility. With only 6 tickets available, I have to already choose either one of my brothers or grandparents to sit out, and that is ridiculous. Plus I have other family that would want to attend as well. They should rent out a larger auditorium, maybe somewhere downtown like The Majestic or something like that, the Activity Center is both small and ugly.
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I. Welcome

II. January 26, 2010 Meeting Minutes

III. Updates:

a. Ceremonies
   - Added 6th ceremony
   - Summer walker number a little less than last year (less than 100)

b. Graduates

c. Student Speakers
   - 21 applicants
   - All schools represented
   - Taping 4/19 and 4/20
   - Selection committee small group and student government representative (Diana Kao)

d. Status
   - All food has been ordered
   - All printing has been requested
   - Student Ambassadors have been requested
   - Musicians/singer are hired
   - All rental vendors have been hired
   - I have contacted Barbara at Ducky Bob's to ask what else we can do to aid the recessional if it's raining (awning, another tent, etc).
   - Trying to get all info to Keith so we're not getting programs delivered the day of
IV. Discussion

a. Recessional
   - Move photo opportunities to under tent and provide more than one “station”
   - Suggestion of having photo opportunities at school receptions instead of tent as they might linger under tent if photo opps are there
   - Recess on both side of stage (will need to station off near Encore Brass)
   - Create 2 lanes in the lobby. One of families leaving and one for families entering

b. Parking Map
   - Give Registrar’s Office parking information to hang out when student pick up their tickets
   - Possible color code lots by ceremony
   - More signage needed; specifically handicap
   - Faculty park in Lot G
   - Decided shuttle bus option too difficult with current campus construction
   - Add no parking tickets to info given to students at ticket pick up
   - Temporary walk way/access through construction site for the weekend
     1. JudyB will talk with Rick Dempsey
   - Police liked map marked with lots and arrows for exit flow

c. Signage
   - Possibly Communications will have the signs up at all 4 corners of campus
   - Banners high so people can see who is where

d. Other
   - Move all vendors under tent if weather permits
   - Attached something (sign/banner) to tend/building wall for photos
   - Faculty/Staff Dining Room discussed as option, but too far to walk
   - Make announcement at end of ceremony that photo opps are available at school receptions or under tent
   - Erin mentioned that there is a rough draft of the survey to student regarding off-campus graduation.
   - Doors will open 30 minutes before start time
   - Close parking for bookstore needed – UTDPD said parking close to the rotunda is ok. Would like to be under tent as well with the rest of the vendors.
   - Walk through the week of 5/5 with key offices
   - Trial run of lift the week before to make sure working properly and repair if needed
August 17, 2010

To: The Academic Senate

From: Homer Montgomery, Chair

Subject: Annual Report of the Distance Learning Committee of 2009-2010

1. Membership

The Distance Learning Committee was composed of: Rhonda Blackburn (OEE), Daniel C. Bochsler (SOM), John P. Fonseka (EE), Donald A. Hicks (EPPS), Marilyn R. Kaplan (SOM), Homer Montgomery (NS&M), and David P. Parry (A&H).

2. Meetings

The Committee met as necessary to complete an agenda we set out at the first meeting. Primarily, we focused on two goals: 1) Design and administer the first survey of student opinion about distance learning at UTD; and 2) redesign and administer a similar survey to the faculty. We hoped to be able to both better understand the opinions of the two groups and to provide a means to compare the two. Additionally, we had two speakers. David Parry presented a “state of the art” instructional session for the committee. Darren Crone spoke to us about how the elaborate distance learning program in SOM works. Finally, Rhonda Blackburn and Dan Bochsler produced the informative “Online Course Development Guidelines” which is available from either of the authors.

3. Surveys

The student survey was announced by President Daniel via email on January 14, 2010. The revised faculty survey was presented via email on April 23, 2010. Both were conducted using snaponline. Surveys were set up and administered by Katrina Adams of OEE.
4. Survey results

The following analyses provide rich detail from both student and faculty perspectives. Rather than reiterate the findings, we would suggest reading sections of the appended documents that interest you. What do your students and colleagues think about online learning at UTD? Find out. Survey results were compiled and organized by Christine Salmon and Rhonda Blackburn of OEE. The categories are: General Comments, Support, Ease of Use, and eLearning Tools. If anyone would like a copy of either survey, please contact Katrina Adams katrina.adams@utdallas.edu.

One can rapidly obtain a sense of the findings by reading the Sample Comments and Summary sections for each survey. (p. 3 and p. 12).

Examples

Faculty comments:
“eLearning should be used by every faculty, to the appropriate degree. It helps to keep things organized, saves time in preparing for subsequent courses, and at minimum is an effective way to drive some individual student learning to "their time" allowing more time for quality teaching planning and preparation."

“Better than nothing...but I'd almost prefer nothing.”

Student comments:
“Compared to modern Web 2.0 sites, eLearning looks like something out of the stone age. It is very clunky and feels haphazard. The functionality is better than the looks, but still not great. Considering the main focus of UTD is technology, the site should look and work much better.”

“Please start offering online courses or I personally will have to transfer to a school that does.”
## FACULTY SURVEY

### UTD Instructional Technology Faculty Survey - Report on Analysis of Comments


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is the way of the future, and the future starts now. It is a highly interactive tool, while allowing time flexibility, and concentration of all relevant material in one place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLearning should be used by every faculty, to the appropriate degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students seem to tolerate eLearning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade submission from eLearning to Orion needs to be restored / established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had all my questions answered and problems resolved very fast and in a professional manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found the eLearning staff very responsive to my requests for help. Technical support was very helpful, but it took a long time to solve the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You never get good technical support: it appears that any person that answers the phone has no idea about how to use E-learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They use elearning and appreciate that I can leave them updates, comments, etc and that they can discuss with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to put materials in elearning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assignment submission and discussion features are nice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

Comments for the Instructional Technology Faculty Survey were asked from the following questions:

- **Q16**: I am satisfied with eLearning.
- **Q18**: My students are satisfied with their experiences in eLearning.
- **Q26**: Do you plan to continue to use eLearning for your courses?
- **Q40**: How satisfied were you with your experience(s) contacting UTD's 24/7 Helpdesk?
- **Q43**: How satisfied were you with your experience(s) contacting UTD's eLearning team ([elearning@utdallas.edu](mailto:elearning@utdallas.edu))?
- **Q44**: Thank you for completing our survey. Please leave any additional comments here.

Comments from all questions were coded into six major categories, several with sub-categories.
The report below describes in more detail these categories, beginning with a brief summary followed by representative comments.
General Comments

Most of the entries coded as “general comments” were attitudinal, including positive (5), negative (6) and neutral comments (7). Neutral comments indicated that eLearning meets faculty needs at a basic level, but negative comments indicated that some faculty feel forced to use eLearning - “It’s required” - or feel eLearning is the only option available to them - “Do we have any other choice?” Other negative comments focused on technical aspects and indicate a “high learning curve” for usability. Positive comments focus on the convenience of eLearning for both faculty and students. Most faculty will continue to use eLearning, but some comments indicate a reluctance to do so.

Positive Comments

“Simply, I find eLearning effective and reasonably efficient.”

“I find it to be an important communication tool and saves a lot of paper and printing resources that I have relied on before.”

“I like elearning, and I think it is important for students to have access to this information.”

eLearning is the way college level courses are going and more hybrid courses should be encouraged at university and school levels instead of just relying on a few faculty members who are ahead of curve; students must expect eLearning in traditional courses and not resist it; likewise, UTD must support student access to eLearning with more user friendly labs because many students can’t afford to have their own computing facilities.”

eLearning should be used by every faculty, to the appropriate degree. It helps to keep things organized, saves time in preparing for subsequent courses, and at minimum is an effective way to drive some individual student learning to “their time” allowing more time for quality teaching planning and preparation.”

Neutral Comments

“It is the integrated system, so I have to use it in order to be sure I can reach all of my students. You have me prisoner.”

“Doesn't hurt and helps some students.”

“I am sure that as I learn it, it will be less annoying. It seems to have useful features, and the students seem to be able to navigate it to their satisfaction.”

“It seems to be working fine. I don't have strong feelings one way or another.”

eLearning seems to be okay for most of my purposes.”

Negative Comments

“Relative to previous methods, too much effort for too little value added.”

“Better than nothing…but I'd almost prefer nothing.”

“It is the only resource available to me on which to post copies of the syllabus, assignments. If another more "user friendly” resource were available, I would use that particular platform.”
“Ultimately, eLearning is too closed, too limited, and too finicky about browsers.”

Student Satisfaction
Comments about student satisfaction were similar to faculty satisfaction, ranging from positive to negative. Neutral comments indicated that some faculty do not know how their students feel about eLearning or have not heard complaints or praise. Comments coded as negative indicate that faculty perceive a lack of enthusiasm by students for eLearning. Positively coded comments were mostly a general acknowledgement that students like eLearning, with a few pointing out the convenience of accessing course materials.

Positive comments
“\textit{I think most students like the fact that everything for my course is in one spot, even if it is a link to another web site. I don't ever hear them complain!}”

“The feedback I have had has been good.”

“They seem generally pleased,”

“Students like it. They just need to get used to using it.”

Neutral comments
“I think the students will use whatever tool is provided and told to use to complete the course.”

“Haven't heard horror stories or anyone rave about it.”

“I don't know how much students are satisfied. I have not heard any complaints. Hence I chose the Neutral option.”

“It seems, the students are OK with the system, they did not complain.”

“Students did not report me either positive or negative response.”

Negative comments
“\textit{Students are no happier than I am with eLearning.”}

“My students have learned to live with it. They know that it helps them in some ways, but they are not too thrilled about it.”

“The students are not enthusiastic about eLearning.”

“They mostly find what they need, but they are not excited about eLearning and it does not invite them to participate.”
Support

Responses to Q43 about the eLearning Team were overwhelmingly positive, indicating responsiveness and competency. Comments about the UTD 24/7 Help Desk were mixed. Some faculty received prompt and effective help while others were unsuccessful. Comments indicated that support staff, whether the eLearning Team or the 24/7 Helpdesk, have good attitudes and treat faculty with respect.

eLearning Team

“They are a wonderful group of people! Very helpful and knowledgeable.”

“… my problems have been solved quickly and efficiently.”

“They have been responsive to requests and making changes to my courses.”

“VERY helpful.”

“Responses have been timely and helpful.”

“I am confident in the help that the eLearning team provides.”

UTD 24/7 Help

“They answered my questions quickly.”

“I ended up solving my own problems every time when I called.”

“I called the 800 number and the guy I reached knew so little about elearning I was really stunned. Luckily as I was teaching him how to log on and do some basic things I answered my own question.”

“My problem was solved quickly and efficiently.”

“Individuals have limited online knowledge and seem to react to scripts and are not particularly interested in being helpful, probably because the supervisory level also doesn’t care.”

“The live chat basically functioned as little more than an answering service, unable to answer my questions and relaying them, by email to the OEE, where it didn’t get answered until the next day (thus defeating the 24/7 availability). (And then those answers were dissatisfactory because of eLearning’s limitations, but that doesn’t influence my assessment of why the 24/7 chat help was pointless.)”
Instructional Issues

Comments coded as instructional issues fell into several sub-topics. Many relayed the instructional uses of eLearning by faculty. Most comments indicated eLearning is used to share course materials as well as means to communicate with students. A few comments indicated a good use of eLearning features for class activities. Some faculty are still confused by the changes in the way sections in eLearning are requested and created. Comments also indicated some displeasure with copying content from semester. Several faculty indicated that not having a direct link from eLearning to Orion, especially for enrollment updates and grade submission, is a concern. One comment relayed a concern with cheating in online quizzes.

Instructional Uses

“I therefore mostly use eLearning to provide course materials and supplements for the course, even though it is capable of much more.”

“Using e-learning helps me reach a large number of students quickly and effectively. I can contact them individually or as a group, and can provide them with their marks confidentially.”

“Being able to communicate with my students through eLearning (i.e. handouts, announcements, etc.) at any time is very valuable.

“I post all course outlines, non-textbook required readings, optional readings, illustrative exercises & questionnaires, videos, and extra credit opportunities on eLearning. I send announcements between classes, I grade using eLearning, and all papers are turned in on eLearning. My course is nearly paperless - I haven't lugged home a big stack of papers in several years.”

“It provides a course specific platform for posting course related materials including weekly power point presentations. It allows exchanging ideas through discussions and email. I consider eLearning user friendly allowing efficient use of time and effective use of web to provide course related material to students conveniently.”

Section Creation and Copying Content

“It is now much harder for me to set up and manage my classes. I have a lot less access and control over my past classes and materials.”

“I am confused every semester about how to get my courses for the next semester and how to copy over my content.”

“...the lack of access to old courses is a problem as is the time it takes to move an old course to a new shell for use in a future semester.”

Link with Orion
“Exporting grades to SIS is no longer available which is VERY burdensome for large classes.”

“…we cannot submit grades via elearning STILL.”

“Please update my eLearning student list in REAL TIME so I know who is actually enrolled and who is not.”

Ease of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Comments</th>
<th>Navigation</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Speed &amp; Stability</th>
<th>Technical Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments coded as ease of use fell into many of the same sub-topics as the Student Survey. Overall comments were mixed ranging from “user friendly” to “clunky” and “prickly”. Like the Student Survey, many comments focused on difficulties users faced. eLearning is not generally perceived as easy to use. Respondents indicated several specific technical issues: javascript errors, browser issues, speed and stability. Several respondents indicated that eLearning has a high “learning curve”.

Navigation for faculty and for students (as reported to faculty) is a concern.

Overall comments

“I have to relearn how to do things every time I plan a new assignment. There is a lot I CAN do, but the learning curve is too high.”

“Students have hard time navigating and understanding the organization - Look at Facebook or Twitter for UI simplifications - this is where the students live. Give them 1990’s design - most of them couldn’t even type on keyboard when eLearning design was launched.”

“I think it is not as user friendly as it could be.”

“Cumbersome for advanced use (not related to training).”

“It is me (faculty) that I [sic] have to go thru lots of hoops just to post materials.”

“Students report that they find eLearning unintuitive and clunky.”

Navigation

“The platform is difficult to navigate. The “Blackboard” platform that we used previously was much more intuitive and easy to navigate.”

“[I]t is confusing why different functions are available in the “teach” and “build” sections [sic].”

“... [the] most frequent complaint is lack of flexibility and terrible -- repeat TERRIBLE -- navigation and interfaces.”

“Students have hard time navigating and understanding the organization.”

“Changes are time-consuming and the flow is not always intuitive.”

Speed and Stability
“I am apprehensive about eLearning mostly for reliability reasons. I cannot afford trouble accessing course material during the course of a semester.”

“The bugs are mostly out of it now; it is reliable and dependable.”

“They seem quite tolerant of the glitches.”

“I have found the course to be accessible to both my students and me 24 hours a day, 7 days per week with rare interruptions to service delivery.”

“My biggest concern with elearning is that it can be quite slow at times.”

“Please try to make the system faster.”

eLearning Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Chat</th>
<th>Gradebook</th>
<th>Quizzes</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Files</th>
<th>Desired tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Respondents commented on the various tools in eLearning (see the box to the left). The tools most mentioned were gradebook, mail, files and discussions. Nine comments specifically referenced difficulty with the gradebook, some positive but most were negative. Again the issue of exporting grades from eLearning to Orion was pointed out. Comments indicate that faculty sometimes have difficulty uploading files and posting materials. Concerns about email focus on the forwarding feature that does not allow replies. Discussion comments were mixed, some faculty use the tool with success and others had difficulties. Several comments suggested other tools, particularly collaborative social media, that could be incorporated into eLearning.

“Some of the tools are not user friendly.”

“…apparently it has social functions they like--being able to communicate with each other and arrange study and work meetings.”

Gradebook

“For example, yesterday we wanted to download some information from gradebook, and found that it was extremely cumbersome to do that.”

“When a student drops the course I don’t want to see their (usually ridiculously low) averages reflected in the statistics in eLearning. To get a real indication of how the students actually still in the class are doing, I again have to export to excel and calculate the average and mean there.”

“I am able to record and average grades very quickly.”

Files

“It’s difficult to post slides.”
“I can upload the changed syllabus to elearning after the changes, but so far I haven't figured out how to get all the links to work.”

“Students find eLearning's lack of ability to distribute multiple file databases frustrating, as I do.”

Email

“When email is forwarded to me from elearning, net id is not included so I cannot reply without going into elearning or use the directory.”

Discussions

“Board discussion icon remains on even when all discussions are read.”

Desired Tools

“For it to work for me, it really should have a wiki component so that students can collaborate.”

“eLearning doesn't work the way students (or I work) and lacks important tools, particularly in terms of collaborative work and social networking.”

“They also resent the fact that they can't get push notifications or RSS feeds to keep them in contact when they don't login on a regular basis.”

“Having a UTD template, departmental and/or school templates, course templates, and the ability to create our own course templates would be fantastic!”
Sample Comments:

I firmly believe the school should invest in a reliable internet system. Consider the one at DCCCD. I took an online course there with no issues but it seems that every online technology at UTD (eLearning, Orion, Galaxy, etc.) malfunctions on a regular basis. For how technologically advanced our school claims to be, I would expect higher quality [sic], reliable and functioning technology.

Please encourage more teachers to use eLearning, as it has proved to be a useful tool for myself, among other students.

eLearning may be bad, but Orion is much much worse.

I love that all of my course information is all online, on one site. I love that I can access it on my iTouch while im in the UTD campus buildings that way I can always check it.

UTD should be ashamed of not keeping up with technological trends, especially given its origins. The fact that only one class in my undergraduate degree plan was available online is a disgrace. Even the DCCC offered many classes online and I found them to be a great alternative for a non-traditional, returning adult student like me. UTD should embrace online education or it will fall behind the universities that do.

I really love UTD online courses. The content is outstanding. The eLearning platform is horrible, though.

Thank you for enhancing my learning experience at UTD!

This software is not really integrated in the academic environment. Most instructors prefer not to use it at its full capability, or not to use it at all.

I have only been able to advanced as far as I have in my education because of on-line classes.

E-learning is a useful tool and helps me succeed in my classes. I like having documents and other tools available at any location.

I have never really had any problems with the elearning program. It helps me to stay in contact with my instructors and the aids in an organized manner because it is seperated [sic] by the classes.

“Please lower tuition for online classes.”

Compared to modern Web 2.0 sites, eLearning looks like something out of the stone age. It is very clunky and feels haphazard. The functionality is better than the looks, but still not great. Considering the main focus of UTD is technology, the site should look and work much better.
Summary

Comments for the Instructional Technology Student Survey were coded into six major categories, several with sub-categories.

Distance Learning
- Need More
- Attitude
- Cost & Fees
- Transfer
- Technology Desired
- Preference

Ease of Use
- General Comments
- Stability
- Navigation
- Speed
- Organization
- Technical Issues

Support
- Confusion
- Attitude of Service
- Knowledgeable
- Timely Response

Instructor Issues
- Use eLearning or not
- Ability to use
- Design of courses

Confusion

eLearning Tools
- Announcements
- Assignments
- Calendar
- Chat
- Discussions
- Email
- Gradebook
- Grading Forms
- Notifications
- Quizzes
- Roster
- Syllabus
- Web Links
- Who's Online

The report below describes in more detail these categories, beginning with a brief summary followed by representative comments.

Distance Learning
Comments about distance learning ranged from high praise to intent to transfer if distance courses were not offered. Comments were coded into six major categories (see box to the left).

**Need More**

**Attitude**  
comments by far outweighed any other category (more than 25 specific mentions). They generally called for UTD to provide more online classes, particularly for more undergraduate classes. The **Need more** comments cited the flexibility offered by online courses that allows students to conduct their studies while working and to reduce their travel distance and travel time.

“**UTD needs to offer online courses!** It would benefit many students by allowing them to reach their goals. Please start offering online courses or I personally will have to transfer to a school that does.”

“**UTD should be ashamed of not keeping up with technological trends, especially given its origins. The fact that only one class in my undergraduate degree plan was available online is a disgrace...** UTD should embrace online education or it will fall behind the universities that do.”

“I have been an UTD staff member for over 10 years. I have only been able to advanced as far as I have in my education because of on-line classes. I am unable to leave work to attend classes on campus. I hope this program expands in the near future.”

“I would love to see more undergraduate courses offered on line. It would really help people who want to learn but don't have the flexibility to attend daytime classes. Too many courses are not offered in the evening.”

“I would like to stress how useful online courses are to students with a tight schedule. Please offer more online courses.”

“I prefer the online classroom. Being able to work at my own pace helps with a busy life. As time is precious, online classes allow me to use my time more efficiently.”

“Making Distance Learning an efficient tool is imperative. If more classes could be taught in a “Virtual Classroom”, the necessity of commuting to campus on a regular basis would decrease, thus reducing the overall cost of attendance.”

**Attitude**  
comments were coded into Positive and Negative comments about distance learning. Most comments were positive, indicating that student like the option of having online classes and desired more. Negative comments tended to focus on cost, on technical problems or on how the course was designed, although several did suggest that certain courses - majors courses or graduate courses - were not suited for online learning.

“**Online Education was very approariate [sic] and rewarding for me.**”

“**Online learning is great & I would definitely recommend it to** I really love UTD online courses. The content is outstanding.”
other prospective students with busy professional &/or personal schedules!”

“I answered no for on line courses. The reason for that is: I learn better face to face. Some courses I will consiter [sic] taking on line, not the courses for my major.”

“E-learning is more time consuming then I believe it is meant to be. By the time I access the discussions, assignments, etc after dealing with checking your browser and changing settings, I could have just attending class that evening and had a formal discussion or retrieved my assignments from the syllabus.”

Cost and Fees
Several respondents commented on the cost of online/distance courses, indicating dissatisfaction with additional fees.

“Perhaps the only unfortunate part of the online course is the added fee.”

“I think elearning should not charge student "distance learning fee". I paid more money for one of my TBA course. I’m not satisfied with that extra charge policy. In many unversities [sic], the on-line course usually cheaper than the traditional course. However, UTD goes the reverse way. At any time if I can choose on-campus course, I will not choose on-line course. Thank you.”

Transfer
Several respondents indicated that they would have to transfer to other institutions because UTD’s online course offerings are insufficient.

“I am considering transferring to SMU because of their distance education program. I will be able to take any graduate class as a distance student, and then I won’t have to worry about needing to miss class because of work, or not finishing my degree in a timely manner due to limited class availability. If this were an option at UTD I would stay either way.”

“Please start offering online courses or I personally will have to transfer to a school that does.”

Desired Technology Use
Respondent comments included requests for specific technologies, including podcasting, webconferencing and wikis.

“...I believe our learning experience can be enhanced by new media (podcasting, wikis, etc.).”

“Please podcast eLearning lectures. Also, it would be huge to make free conference calling available ot [sic] eLearning students for meetings (ala GoToMeeting or Verizon Conferencing).”

“Have you considered providing a taped recording of the inclass [sic] lecture as the distant education content? In class lectures involve detailed explanation of concepts and the distant students can also benefit from the questions asked in the class.”

Preference
Several comments stated specific preference for traditional face-to-face classes, although some did acknowledge the benefit of online components. Interestingly, several comments indicated that graduate classes are better suited to the traditional face-to-face format.

“I prefer classes that deliver the lectures online. The hassle of discussion online quickly becomes redundant and is basically a check box substitution for speaking in class. I like taking the tests online and my convenience.”

“I prefer traditional education, although I would like to have more online course offerings at UTD.”

“I think eLearning and online courses can be very helpful for undergraduates, especially in basic courses. I just don’t see as much of a use for them at the graduate level, at least not in A&H.”

“At the graduate level an important part of what I pay for is to be part of a discussion in a seminar setting. Blackboard software can be very effective in managing a course without going to the extreme of offering the course only online. I realize that with online courses you can have a single professor be responsible for more courses and students thus reducing university costs, but as I stated earlier, part of what I pay for and expect is face to face contact with other graduate students and the faculty in an on-campus environment.”

Instructor Issues

Comments revealed three major instructor issues: whether or not instructors do or should use eLearning, their ability to use it or other technology well, and the design of courses using eLearning. These last two can be construed as a matter of training.

Elearning use

Many of the comments indicate a desire for more instructors to use eLearning, either for distance learning or as support for face-to-face classes. Respondents cited primarily immediate access to class materials. Also indicated was student perspective of a negative faculty attitude toward eLearning. There were comments expressing a preference for web-based tools in place of eLearning.

“I wish all of the professors would go to eLearning, it makes it much easier to have access to the class materials and grades.”

“Minimum duty of a professor”

“...many professors and lecturers choose not to use it, making eLearning only semi-helpful.”

“Not all teachers use it. More consistency.”

“It’s difficult for instructors to use; two of my instructors refuse to use it, instead relying on their personal UTD web space to distribute [sic] notes and assignments.”
“...professors hate it so much they hardly update or use it. It makes it frustrating.”

“I’d like to see it used more uniformly across all classes, though. It helps me to have all material for all classes organized consistently in a single place.”

“I am satisfied with the information it provides, but I do wish more instructors would make use of it.”

“Communication between students and their instructors is an essential key to success, and I believe more utilization of eLearning by teachers and students would be a mutually beneficial experience. eLearning provides additional avenues for communication and is a great way to receive/submit assignments, and an easy place to make materials available, such as the class syllabus and lecture notes.”

"NO" I don’t want instructors to use eLearning, I want them to use the real Internet.”

Instructor ability to use
Comments clearly showed a perception of instructors who either are unable to use eLearning as students believe it should be or instructors who simply do not use the functions students prefer.

“The eLearning is good when the professors use it appropriately. Sometimes, they don’t post everything online, and so if I have to go out of town for work, I have no idea what was covered, or what I need to do if some of the professors don’t post information online. I’ve had to drop a class because of the lack of information received online.”

eLearning is a great tool to have if it is utilized properly. It is apparent that some professors are not taking advantage of the gradebook, calender [sic], and assignments.”

“...many time professors are not prompt at answer questions on discussions and email, if promptness and thoroughness are not going to be observed, then they should not use these tools at all.”

“For Blackboard software to be effective for graduate students, the faculty, or at the very least their TAs, should be trained on and encouraged to use the Blackboard tools.”

“Professors need to learn how to use it properly.”

“Many faculty either avoid using it, or use it only to post assignments and grades. It has lots of potential that is not being realized. Perhaps a mandatory training for all faculty, TA, and students if it is a university goal to adopt it fully.”

“It’s frustrating when it doesn’t work properly and when professors don’t use it correctly but overall I like eLearning.”
“...teachers/TAs do not all seem to know how to use it properly. In one class the TA would post assignments to the discussion forum and only on the day of submission (and sometimes after) would the teacher post the actual assignment to be submitted. Then the TA would post a grade independent of the posted assignment (so the assignment would appear ungraded if examined).”

Design of courses
Calls for more uniform design.

“Instructors aren’t consistent, it would be good if there were a few tools used by each professor...maybe syllabus and announcements at a minimum....”

eLearning seems to be an efficient tool, but the professors are not utilizing all that it offers.”

“Requiring uniform usage of eLearning by faculty would greatly benefit students in that they would know what to expect and be familiar with navigation in eLearning.”

“It appears that distance students are short changed. It is hard to believe that even without all the inclass [sic] discussions, the lecture for 3 credit hour class can be just 25-30mins per week! The lectures do not go in depth into the topic and are only power point deep - no detailed explanations at all....”

“Some instructors throw everything to the front page. If there is a syllabus link, then all the teachers should make an attempt to use it rather than posting in different sections. This makes it harder for students to find things.”

“Many professors lack the proficiency to post their syllabus or their gradebook on eLearning. The syllabus is best to view and download as a PDF file, but many teachers choose to give a MS Word file, which is hard to download.”

“It’s hard to find the information I need sometimes since different instructors post things in different online avenues. Sometimes information is emailed and not on elearning or the information is not on elearning and not emailed. The way the instructors use the program is not very efficient.”

Confusion
Comments indicate that some respondents were confused about eLearning. They were unable to distinguish elearning from WebCT or Blackboard as well as WebCT from Blackboard.

“not sure how to distinguish [sic] that from Blackboard which is already used. I certainly prefer to have all materials in a single CMS/LMS.”

“Please get something that works at least as well as WebCT.”

“It's not that I don't like eLearning, just don't know anything about it. I've used Blackboard for all my classes.”

“I prefer the Blackboard layout to eLearning/WebCT...”
“I am not familiar with 'elearning.' however i can tell you that 'blackboard' leaves a lot to be desired.”

“I have no knowledge of the purpose of eLearning. None of my instructors have used it. I don't understand how this would be beneficial and no duplication of material posted on BlackBoard.”

“WebCt seemed to have worked fine, why did you try to fix something that was not broken?”

Ease of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments coded as “ease of use” ranged from the very negative to positive. We identified six sub-codes as listed in the box. Other than the general comments, which included positive, most of the sub-code comments were negative and focused on difficulties users faced.

eLearning is not generally perceived as easy to use. The word “buggy” or some derivation of it was used several times, as was “not intuitive” and “clunky”. eLearning was compared to other web-based programs, which were seen as simpler, easier to use and more desirable. Stability and speed were clearly issues. Respondents indicated several specific technical issues: difficulty logging in (too many clicks), javascript errors, popup windows, and browser issues. Several comments suggested a single login for all UTD technical services (eLearning, Orion, Galaxy).

General comments

“eLearning is NOT intuitive to use as either a student or instructor.”

“eLearning is easily one of the worst programs I've ever used. It's excessively bloated... and the navigation is completely unintuitive....”

“eLearning is a terrible system and needs drastic renovations to become feasible.”

“It is usable.”

“My experiences with eLearning are split between helpful and frustrating.”

“We thought WebCT 4 was bad. It seems like every “upgrade” since then has added more bloated features that I have never used... Overall, let us see a solid product that does a few things well rather than one that fails at the million things it tries to do.”

“I have used WebCT during my undergraduate studies and I felt comfortable with the eLearning environment. eLearning’s uptime was also fairly good. My studies were never affected as a result of an eLearning outage.”

“I have had little trouble with e-learning. Most of the materials posted are easy to access.”

“It's not bad, but it could be much more user friendly. It's a clunky system that mostly does what it set out to do, but it could be much more seamless.”

“I really love UTD online courses. The content is outstanding.”
“eLearning is a great system and I believe it is better than the previous version of WebCT. I believe it would have been very difficult to learn interactively without eLearning.”

“Elearning has been an effective tool to access course information and materials. I have also found it very useful when tracking my grades and communicating with the teacher’s assistant.”

“eLearning is nothing special. Supplementing eLearning with tools like GoToMeeting (or other online collaboration / conferencing tools) is critical for on-line group projects. Also, Google Docs and Microsoft Office Live are free and offer much better tools for on-line collaboration than eLearning does.”

**Stability**

“eLearning is, at present, dysfunctional and undependable.”

“Last semester the eLearning site was down more than the independent [sic] sites my instructors used. Another factor is compatibility ease of use and speed with my instructors sites vs. the eLearning site that UTD provides.”

“Elearning is very buggy, inefficient, and difficult to use.”

“It crashes often and is not as easy to use as the Pearson Education....”

**Speed**

“I don’t think eLearning is too hard to navigate, but sometimes it’s confusing and/or slow.”

“I find that accessing the eLearning site is cumbersome and difficult, and that the entire system is too slow to navigate.”

“The software is slow and cumbersome.”

“Pages take forever to load, and you’re not permitted to open more than one main browser tab to elearning at once. Combined, these two features create a terrible user experience.”

**Organization**

“The site is inconvenient, poorly designed, clunky (java?), and is generally only useful because there is no other method available for teachers to send files to students.”

“I found that I spent too much time learning new techniques rather than the material. It was very frustrating to need to master one thing before being able to get to the material. While I see an importance in both, I often felt as if I was spending too much time dealing with the structure rather than the content of the class.”

“The software used (WebCT/eLearning/...) is extremely inefficient.”

“The layout and organization could be more user-friendly. The site has an archaic look and feel. Crowded.”

**Navigation**
“It is rarely used in my classes because it is difficult to navigate.”

“Very slow and very unpleasant to navigate.”

**Technical Issues**

“...the additional login hassles and cookie separation are new annoyances.”

“The on-campus computers often have error messages when trying to open eLearning. On my home computer, I inconsistently receive [sic] Java & javascript errors.”

I have to click three screens before I am even able to log in. The system is down sometimes when I have to turn in assignments.

The one thing I would like out of the current system is a single public url for accessing eLearning instead of the current system.... Why five(5) clicks before I can enter my credentials? It makes no sense.... Apart from that, eLearning is alright.

To many Log in’s. You have to log into galaxy to check email, then you have to log into elearning to see the courses and payments are done thru orion. Would like to have you log in for all.

It's not so much a problem with eLearning, but the campus’ internet services are hugely disorganized. Students are forced to log into 3 different web services to manage their school activities. These should be centralized/integrated.

The email system is truly cubmersome [sic] and it needs to be linked directly to the UTD email system...

There are pop ups coming up whenever I open the eLearning site, and that’s very irritating.

The website is annoying when i have to access galaxy, elearning and that that new orion nonsense [sic] simply to check emails, grades, register and course material......someone in the IT department who thought it would be fantastic MUST be insane!!!!! This is rediculous! [sic]

“It is not compatible with the browser I use- Google Chrome.”

**Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confusion</th>
<th>Attitude of Service</th>
<th>Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Timely Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments for the Support question were coded into four sub-categories (see the box to the left). Many comments indicated a confusion of eLearning support and HelpDesk with the UTD IR HelpDesk. In both cases, respondents described a variety of response time and issue solutions, ranging from immediate response but no solution to long response time and no solution. Overall, though, support personnel were seen as polite and trying to help. The

**Confusion**

“They were helpless in aiding me in setting up my email on campus to work with my work computer. I had to utilize my work IT person to get my computer to be useable.”

“The UTD helpdesk was polite but unable to help me with my problem. They referred me to the elearning helpdesk, and they were able to help me.”
“The response was quick and I accomplished what I needed.”

**Attitude of Service**

“The people who answer my questions (I have used the help desk on more than one occasion) were very friendly and seemed competent. Even after I hung up the phone, they were searching for answers to my problems and got back to me in the same day. I was impressed that they found answers so quickly - it made me feel valued as a student at this university.”

“Timely and knowledgeable representative that was able to fulfill my request.”

“Every time I’ve called them, whether it was for a password reset or troubleshooting information, I’ve always been helped quickly and completely.”

“I had no idea how to access my email, and they were super helpful.”

“When I called it was for a very simple question that I could have answered myself if I had taken the time. So when I asked the question whoever was on the other side was very helpful and did not appear frustrated at all at the simplicity of my question. Those are the things that one as a user appreciates.”

“The technician didn’t understand my problem, was not able to resolve it, didn’t have a helpful attitude. (NOTE: this is NOT the response I get from actual UTD IT technicians. It was clear this was a call center located elsewhere.)”

**Knowledgeable**

“They couldn’t help me. My browser crashed in the middle of an online mid-term. They were useless. I had to email the professor and take the exam over. It was a very stressful experience.”

“[T]hey are good but there is only so much you can do with e-learning and the major problems they cannot answer.”

“eLearning helpdesk could not solve my problem or tell me why the system was down. I guess they’re good for "documentation" in case I have an issue while taking an on-line exam.”

“As mentioned, the response in case of difficulties with eLearning has to be addressed promptly and in a serious fashion. The treatment was (1) I do not know when the service will become available again (2) Please try again and Good Luck. There is no accountability for when the service will be come available in case of issues.”

**Timely Response**

“I had a quick response and the problem was resolved within the day.”

“My call and my questions were answered right away.”

“They were able to solve the problem quick and efficiently with high service satisfaction.”

“ Took 2 months to respond to an issue I had.”

“It took too long to reply to my problem and not until I contacted them again. Unfortunately they gave me a wrong answer.”
eLearning Tools

Respondents included many comments on the various tools in eLearning (see the box to the left). The tools most mentioned were mail, quizzes and discussions. The comments were mixed - some liked the discussions and others criticized the tool. Timing out seemed to be the most common complaint for quizzes. Several respondents indicated a desire for email notifications and for those notifications to go to a personal email address.

“I enjoy being able to see my grades online and get averages before they "officially" appear-- this helps me keep track of where I need to be.”

“eLearning has been very easy to use. It is very helpful at times also, especially discussions, when you have problems its very easy to get some help from other classmates. Assessments are also easy to take.”

“eLearning has improved my education by allowing me to easily access course material in a timely and efficient manner. I especially like the web link feature where professors include extra information, and calendars that remind me of upcoming quizzes, exams, and homework assignments.”

“Mail is cumbersome and reliability is an issue.”

“Quizzes online are not user-friendly.”

“The discussion boards is not intuitively laid out and it’s hard to view an entire threat at once and there doesn’t seem to be a way to set that to be the default. The discussion board also causes most computer to hang for a minute when first opened (probably because Java is being loaded.)”

“The discussion threads are often hard to follow. For example, I prefer my discussions to be ‘unthreaded’ however, there isn’t a button I have found to lock in that option - so I have to choose it every time which is annoying.”

“When a professor posts an assignment on eLearning, I do not receive an email that says I have a new assignment. I would like to receive an email to my personal email account (not my UTD account) letting me know that there's a new assignment posted for my ABC 1234 course.”

“…the "Attempt 1" is not clear in that there is more than one attempt allowed for an assignment.”

“As a TA, I would like to see more flexibility in defining rubrics for assignments. The grading rubric tool is designed to work with writing assignments and doesn’t accommodate math or science work very well.”
“i would like the elearning module to be improved in a better way..like i would like to know if anyone has posted anything or replied through a notification to my email..jus[sic] like have we get notifications from facebook..”
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Dean Larry Sall welcomed the committee and gave the Library Director’s report.

In matters of library maintenance and security, Dr. Sall reported that a second floor restroom had been flooded. Maintenance staff have used enzyme treatment on the area and will monitor for any long-term sanitation effects. A male stalker has been reported in the library. He has been videotaped on security cameras and library staff and UTD Police are on the alert.

Regarding campus construction, the Library is looking forward to recovering space in the library basement as other non-library units move to their new spaces. Currently 48% of the McDermott Library Building is used by non-library units.

Commenting on acquisitions and electronic resources in the library, Dr. Sall noted that when quality is equal, electronic materials are preferable. Some vendors require purchase of both print and electronic versions. Paper copies of items also held electronically are sent to the surplus materials unit. When possible, the library will make purchases within the UT System consortium rather than individual UTD campus purchases. Offering a historical perspective, in 1999, the library had 2,000 journals, now 46,000 ejournals.

When books are requested via Inter-Library Loan, the library will attempt to purchase a copy for the UTD collection. The ILL request is still processed so the borrower will have quick access to the item. There was some concern over low quality photocopies being received from other libraries via ILL. Dr. Sall will instruct the ILL staff to request pdf files instead of photocopies whenever possible.

Dr. Sall reminded the committee that when new campus programs are established, the programs should budget funding to help the library purchase holdings for the new programs.

Library liaisons are available to receive purchase requests from faculty and are willing to make library use and resource presentations to classes.

As UTD makes its push toward Tier One status, the library will also need to qualify as a Tier One library. The library is currently on a ten-year plan to reach that level in holdings, but will ultimately require a budget roughly triple the current budget.

The committee asked about the long-term viability of the current library building. Dr. Sall reported that the building is on track for another 40 years of service. Space recovery in basement will allow for compact shelving and other extended storage measures. The library now sees itself as a function, not a place, with more than half its resources available online.

Dr. Sall presented the 2009–10 Library Budget report. In regards to sources for the library budget, $4.6 million come from student fees, while $2.3 million come from the legislature. The library is losing money for the purchase of books/monographs. Overall, the library is dealing with a 10% inflation for resources.

The reported budget is as follows:
LIBRARY BUDGET, 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>FY10 Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,820,654.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>138,839.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td>355,298.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,959,493.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td>228,663.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections (Print &amp; Electronic, Reference, etc.)</td>
<td>425,377.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,909,917.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals (Print and Online, Microforms)</td>
<td>1,080,977.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (processing)</td>
<td></td>
<td>121,747.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC / CURRICULUM SUPPORT BUDGET (print and electronic materials)</td>
<td>202,242.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,780,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ALLOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,968,416.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MISC ACCOUNTS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY PUBLICATIONS/ DISSERTATIONS/REPLACEMENTS</td>
<td>12,225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL COLLECTIONS</td>
<td>13,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC ACCOUNTS TOTAL</td>
<td>25,225.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no old business.

Dr. Sall mentioned the SPARC Initiative for open-source journals. SPARC is part of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). http://www.arl.org/sparc/

One of the elements that might be of interest is the author's rights materials: http://www.arl.org/sparc/author/

The other part of interest would be creating an open access policy for the University: http://www.arl.org/sparc/advocacy/campus/

The need for a Spring Semester Library Committee meeting will be determined and scheduled at a later date.
To: Academic Senate  
From: Lawrence Overzet ECS  
Re: Annual Report of Safety and Security Council  

Dear UTD Senators:  


The committee met 6 times during the two long semesters, 10/08/09, 11/12/09, 12/10/09, 2/4/10, 3/4/10 and 5/6/10. At the outset of the year, it was decided that in addition to the ordinary coordination and reporting activities, the committee would break into subcommittees which would work on three focus areas. These were to be areas where this committee might bring significant benefit to UTD. After discussion, we decided the three areas to be: (i) Research lab safety enhancement, (ii) The assigning of real street names and addresses to campus buildings and (iii) Campus lighting enhancement. The Research lab safety subcommittee made significant progress in determining and scheduling safety training. They were coordinating with the Bio-Safety committee and proposed Bio and Chemical Safety Committee. The street names subcommittee prepared names and coordinated with both local (Richardson) and State entities. No final resolution was obtained, however, as the political aspects adversely impacted the safety and security issue. The campus lighting subcommittee made significant progress in determining the causes for persistent problems and finding solutions while also ensuring that the unusual level of construction on campus did not adversely affect outdoor lighting.  

The 05/06/10 minutes are included at the end of this report as an example.  

Sincerely,  

Professor Lawrence J. Overzet  
University of Texas at Dallas  
Department of Electrical Engineering  
overzet@utdallas.edu  
Phone: (972)883-2154  
Fax: (972)883-5725 (email after faxing)
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<tr>
<td>Sam Eicke</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ricky Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim Winkler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenys Chafin-Garrett</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Donna Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td>James Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Alexis Harper</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Vivian Rutledge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Larry Zacharias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Jamison</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abhimanyu Singh</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mark Pace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bruce Jacobs (Visiting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Administrative
A) Call to Order – Dr. Larry Overzet called the meeting to order at 2:30 PM
B) Adoption of Agenda
C) Minutes from March 4, 2010 meeting were approved
D) Chair’s Report – UTD and System Sustainability Policy as well as Committee
   • Has been approved by Faculty Senate. Final copy will be sent to SSC.
   • There should be a connection between this new committee and SSC, but how?
   • Suggestion: should have separate committee that coordinates with SSC
   • Recycling and water conservation are not in the policy. Should be addressed.

2) Review of Reports and Committees
A) Lighting Survey – Kelly Kinnard/Chief Larry Zacharias
   • Lighting needs change as construction proceeds.
   • FM has been keeping up with changes. It has been reported to the police
     department that the new sidewalk on the east side of University Dr is very dark and
     seems unsafe. This has been reported to FM.
B) Office of Emergency Management (OEM) – Calvin Brown
   • Tied UTD’s outdoor siren warning system to City of Richardson’s so when
     Richardson’s goes off so will UTD’s.
   • Final stages of getting mass communication system on campus. Will give UTD
     ability to communicate with entire campus through T.V.s, cell phones, speakers,
     etc. Hopefully will be available by Fall 2010.
   • Discussion ensued regarding policy on when messages are sent out and by whom.
     Some policy is already in place but doesn’t cover all aspects. Suggested that SSC
     be consulted on policy development and get copy of policies and procedures
     adopted. (An Emergency Notification Plan.)
C) Fire Systems Report – EH&S, Mark Pace
   • Annual inspection of campus apartment fire system has been completed.
   • Four buildings coming online this summer. Systems will be tested.
   • Fire drills will continue on Friday’s, weather permitting.
   • City of Richardson is putting UTD campus maps on their fire trucks to make
     campus access less confusing during a response.
D) Radiation Inventory and Reports – EH&S, Kathy White
   • Waiting for a license amendment from the State to be able to move our Radioactive
     waste to our new hazardous waste building.
E) Biosafety – EH&S, Kathy White
   • Meeting next week. A request has been made to the Provost to change name to
     Biological and Chemical Safety Committee
F) Accident & Emergency Reports – EH&S, No Report
G) Chemical Waste and Inventory – EH&S, Kathy White
   • New waste facility is working well.
H) ADA Issues – Kerry Tate, Kelly Kinnard
   • Some handicap spaces were moved so steam and chiller lines could be repaired near the Conference Center. We have the requisite numbers of spaces still.
I) Walkways, Sidewalks and Parking Lots – Kelly Kinnard
   • Walkway change near Activities Center
   • New parking lot near CN should be open this summer
   • Drive H from lot I to Drive A will be replaced.
J) Policy and Procedure
   • Previously discussed under Chair’s Report. The SSC wants to see some policy development on the new mass communication system use. (Emergency Notification Plan.)

3) New Business –
A) Research Lab Safety Subcommittee– Kathy White
   • Met 3 weeks ago. Training for lab use will be scheduled to accommodate more students/staff/faculty. Working on getting an online training management system that could be used campus wide. Need headcount to determine price.
   • Dr. Leaf suggested having Bio and Chemical Safety Committee modify charge to include safety training and be approved by Senate.
B) Campus Lighting - previously discussed under Lighting Survey
C) Street Names Subcommittee
   • Lt. Dorsey sent list of name changes to City of Richardson for review of duplications, etc
   • List also sent to Board of Regents but they decided to table it for now due to the UT System rewriting policy on naming streets on campuses.

4) This meeting is the last meeting of the school year. It was suggested that the committee only meet over the summer if we need to discuss the Emergency Notification Plan.
A) Meeting Adjourned at 3:45 PM.
I. PURPOSE:
The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to promoting campus safety and the security of personal and University property, consistent with the requirements of law and prudent financial and programmatic practices. As part of this commitment, the university seeks information on the possible criminal history of all individuals under consideration for appointment to full time positions and all positions deemed “security sensitive” under Texas law. This policy defines the acquisition and use of such information by the University.

II. WHEN BACKGROUND CHECKS ARE REQUIRED:
A. For applicants other than current employees who are under final consideration for a full-time staff or faculty position, following normal screening and selection processes;
B. For a current employee, staff or faculty, who is under consideration for a transfer, promotion or reclassification from a non-security sensitive position to a position designated as a security sensitive position; and
C. For a current employee who is under consideration for a transfer, promotion or reclassification from one security sensitive position to another security sensitive position if the University has not previously obtained either criminal history record information or criminal conviction record information.
D. For current employees, students, and volunteers whose assignments involve contact with minors on a regular basis outside the scope of faculty/student instruction. Examples of types of activities involving minors that would require criminal background checks are summer camps, research involving human subjects, or volunteer activities. A minor is a person under the age of 18.

III. USE OF INFORMATION:
A. Such criminal history or criminal conviction information will be used only for the purpose of assuring that employing the individual will not pose a reasonably foreseeable danger of financial loss to the institution or violent behavior toward others.
The information will not be used to discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, disability, age or sexual orientation.

B. Such criminal history or criminal conviction information will be treated as confidential as required by law. Such information will not be made a part of the applicant’s file, or the employee’s personnel file, or communicated to any unauthorized person. The release of such information pertaining to staff must be authorized in writing by the Senior Vice President for Business Affairs. The release of such information pertaining to faculty must be authorized in writing by the Provost. The release of criminal history information to unauthorized persons is a criminal offense under Texas Government Code §411.085.

C. The University will assure that no decision will be made on the basis of information obtained through a criminal background check or criminal history check under this policy without providing that information to the person being considered and giving them an opportunity to respond or offer corrections in accordance with Section VI.

IV. DEFINITIONS:

A. Position: Both full-time and part-time positions, whether the position is filled or to be filled by a regular or a temporary worker, but not including a position filled by a temporary worker provided by a temporary employment agency; the employment agency should be expected to conduct and held responsible for conducting the criminal background check.

B. Select Agent: This term has the meaning assigned in 18 U.S.C. §175b, as that section may be amended from time to time.

C. Security Sensitive Position or area: Security sensitive positions or areas are those UTD positions or areas described in Texas Education Code § 51.215 (c) and Texas Government Code § 411.094 (a) (2), as those sections may be amended from time to time; positions that have responsibility for providing patient care or for providing childcare in a childcare facility, as that term is defined in Texas Human Resources Code §42.002 (3), as it may be amended from time to time; and positions that have direct access to, or responsibility for, pharmaceuticals, select agents, or controlled
substances; or physical areas such as laboratories or facilities on the university campus that have been designated as security sensitive by the administrative officer or faculty member responsible for them.

D. **Hiring Official:** The Dean, in the Division of Academic Affairs, the Department Head, in other Divisions, the faculty member in charge of a laboratory or other facility; or the equivalent administrative official seeking to fill a vacant position

In determining which specific positions to designate as security sensitive, the Executive Vice President and Provost and the Senior Vice President for Business Affairs will consider whether departments or other units perform functions that may pose increased risks at the University, considering factors including but not limited to the following:

1. All senior level administrative positions;
2. Responsibility for the preparation, maintenance or approval of the financial, payroll, personnel or purchasing systems;
3. Direct access to, or responsibility for, cash, checks or University property, disbursement or receipts;
4. Significant inventory control responsibilities, including receipt and release of inventory;
5. Responsibility for execution or approval of financial transactions;
6. Direct responsibility for the care, safety of security of humans or the safety or security of personal University property;
7. Responsibility for operating, in the course of normal job duties, University-owned or leased vehicles, machinery or toxic systems that could cause death, injury, or illness;
8. Direct access to, or responsibility for classified information pertaining to the national defense;
9. Direct access to data protected by Federal or State law or non-disclosure agreements, medical records, personnel records, other personnel data or confidential criminal justice information, or to critical data processing systems.

V. **SOURCES:**

The following sources may be used as appropriate:

A. Applicants who are not current employees or current employees seeking promotion or transfer from a non-security sensitive position to a security sensitive position:
   1. The Texas Department of Public Safety Crime Records Service – Secure Site. (The Secure Site can provide a National Criminal History Record Check.)
   2. A private vendor that offers national criminal background check services.
3. Other state, national, and international sites.

B. Current Employees:
   1. The TX DPS Crime Records Service – Public Site.
   2. Other public state, national, and international sites.

VI. PROCEDURES:

A. The President has designated the Executive Vice President and Provost as the official responsible for designating which faculty positions or areas are security sensitive, and the Senior Vice President for Business Affairs as the official responsible for designating which non-faculty positions or areas are security sensitive. Directors of administrative offices who wish to designate certain positions as security sensitive should notify the Vice President for Business Affairs; faculty responsible for positions that they wish to designate as security sensitive should notify the Provost.

B. Only the Chief of Police is authorized to initiate requests on behalf of the university for criminal history record information or criminal conviction record information from the Texas Department of Public Safety, other law enforcement agencies, or private agencies designated by the University for this purpose.

C. The information sources of the public and secure site of the Texas Department of Public Service Crime Records service does not require a signed release from the applicant for whom the information will sought. No release will be sought from applicants for non-security sensitive positions. Applicants for security sensitive positions will be asked to sign the appropriate university release form. There will be two such forms. One form will be for information from the DPS secure site, the other will be for information from a private donor that offers national criminal background check services. Both forms will clearly specify agency will be used, and what information will be sought.

D. Security sensitive positions will be identified as such in job descriptions and vacancy advertisements. Hiring officials are responsible for requesting that an applicant who is the finalist for a security sensitive position complete the current UTD Criminal Background Check Form. The hiring official will forward the
completed form and a copy of the criminal convictions section of the finalist’s employment application to the University Police Department. An applicant who refuses to complete, sign, and submit the form will be removed from further consideration for the position.

E. Upon receipt of a request for criminal history information, with the accompanying release form if required, the Chief of Police will promptly obtain and review the individual’s criminal history record information or the individual’s criminal conviction record information for the last seven years. The Chief will provide the hiring official or faculty member with the results of the investigation and cause the UTD Police Department section of Criminal Background Check Form to be completed. No other notes are to be made on that form.

F. If the results of an applicant’s criminal history record information investigation suggest that the applicant may pose an undue risk to others or to the university, the hiring official may, at his or her discretion, consult with the Chief of Police, the Director of Human Resources, and/or the appropriate Vice President about the risk. However, it is the responsibility of the hiring official to evaluate the risk and make the final hiring decision. The evaluation should be based on such factors as the duties of the position, the nature and number of offenses, the dates of the offenses, employment and rehabilitation history, accuracy of the information on the employment application, and other job-related factors.

G. The criminal background check for security sensitive positions will consider up to seven prior years of employment and residence for purposes of review.

H. Questions regarding compliance and other issues related to security sensitive positions should be addressed to the Executive Vice President and Provost or to the Senior Vice President for Business Affairs, as appropriate.

VII. NOTIFICATIONS AND OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND:

A. Pre-adverse Action Disclosure. If the University receives a report indicating that a current employee has a criminal record the hiring official will notify the employee that such a report has been received and provide the employee with a copy of his or her report. If the report is a factor in considering adverse
employment action - denying a job application, denying a promotion reassigning or terminating the employee - before any adverse action is taken, the individual will be notified of the right to challenge the accuracy and completeness of the report.

When the university has used a third-party vendor credit reporting agency to conduct the criminal record checks, the resulting report is considered a “consumer report” under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA).\(^1\) If a consumer report is relied on to deny employment, deny a promotion, reassign or terminate an employee, the institution will provide the current employee with a specific pre-adverse action disclosure that includes a copy of the employee's consumer report and a copy of “A Summary of Your Rights Under the Fair Credit Reporting Act” – a document prescribed by the Federal Trade Commission. The credit reporting agency that furnishes the individual’s report is required to give the institution the summary of consumer rights.

**B. Opportunity to Respond for Staff Positions.** Within five business days following the receipt of the report, the employee may submit additional information to the hiring official/supervisor relating to the criminal record and why it should not affect an employment decision. Before the hiring official/supervisor makes a final employment decision he/she will review all information provided to him/her with an official(s) designated by the institution and obtain a recommendation from the designated official(s) about whether to proceed with an offer or adverse employment action. The decision of the hiring official is final and may not be appealed. However, if the individual is a current employee standard employee grievance procedures may be used. Further, if the criminal record leads to termination, the employee discipline and discharge procedures will be used.

---

\(^1\) The institution using a credit reporting agency for this purpose must have a procedure in place in accordance with the U. T. System Office of General Counsel issued model policy for addressing notice of address discrepancies received from a credit reporting agency regarding the subject of a report.
C. Opportunity to Respond for Faculty Positions.
   
i) Outside Applicant. Within five business days following the receipt of the report, the individual may submit additional information to the hiring official relating to the criminal record and why it should not affect an employment decision. Before the hiring official makes a final employment decision, he/she will review all information provided to him/her with an official designated by the institution and obtain a recommendation from the designated official about whether to proceed with an offer. The decision of the hiring official is final and may not be appealed.
DRAFT U T DALLAS POLICY ON FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

PREAMBLE

Rule 31003, Section 1, of the Regents' Rules and Regulations (http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules.htm#A4) establishes U T System policy concerning the Abandonment of Academic Positions or Programs. Section 1 calls for the President of the University to determine institutional procedures for an in-depth review to inform and guide decisions on these matters “with full and meaningful faculty input.” Section 2 concerns elimination for “Academic Reasons.” Section 3 concerns elimination due to institutional financial exigency. This document establishes U. T. Dallas policy and procedures relating to Section 3.

GENERAL POLICY ON INTERPRETATION OF REGENT’S RULES

Regents Rule 31003, abandonment of academic positions or programs must be interpreted in the light of Rule 40101 which gives faculty a “major role” in regard to “general academic policies and welfare” and related matters and in the light of the further provisions that assign these faculty responsibilities to the faculty governance organization and require that the organization and procedures of the governance organization be set out in the university Handbook of Operating Procedures and subject to governance review and approval.

The University of Texas at Dallas recognizes the importance of tenure as a fundamental safeguard for academic freedom, an encouragement for faculty to engage in research at the frontiers of knowledge, and as the basis of a level of personal financial security sufficient to make faculty positions at U T Dallas attractive to creative scholars, researchers, and artists of national and international importance. The aim of this policy is to assure that the University’s response to an institutional financial exigency does everything possible to preserve this commitment to tenure while also providing the strongest possible foundation for rapid recovery and future growth.

The term “faculty committee” as used in Regents Rules section 31003 shall be understood here as meaning the Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas, the regular committees of the Senate, or the Exigency Committee and appeals committees to be established in accordance with this policy.

The term “faculty” as used in Regents Rules 31003 to designate those eligible to be appointed as faculty on the Exigency Committee and appeals panels shall be understood here as meaning individuals holding tenure-track, tenured, and emeritus positions with the titles of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor with primary assignments in teaching, research, and advising. It shall also include individuals holding yearly or longer-term renewable non-tenure track position with the titles of Senior Lecturer and Clinical Professor with primary assignments in teaching, research and advising. It shall not include faculty holding administrative appointments at the level of dean or above. For purposes of this policy the position of Associate Provost shall be regarded as an administrative appointment at the level of dean or above.

INITIAL DECLARATION OF FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

Institutional financial exigency is a demonstrably bona fide financial crisis that adversely affects an institution as a whole and that, after considering other cost-reducing measures, including ways to cut faculty costs, requires consideration of terminating appointments held by tenured faculty. Whenever there is reason to anticipate that the University as a whole is threatened by financial
exigency, the President at the earliest date possible shall inform the Faculty Senate and all potentially affected budgetary units of the problem.

The President shall consult with the Senate and the concerned budgetary units to determine the nature and seriousness of the problem, the most appropriate of the possible courses of action to be taken, and the means of safeguarding faculty rights and interests, including tenure rights. In solving such a problem, the University shall make every reasonable effort to reassign affected faculty members to other suitable work and to aid them in finding other employment.

On the basis of these deliberations, the President shall write an Initial Declaration of Financial Exigency, giving the extent and scope of the emergency and the general approach to be taken to respond to it.

ADVICE OF THE SENATE

The President shall submit the Initial Declaration of Financial Exigency to the Senate for advice. This process may involve amendments and may, but need not, result in a joint Senate-presidential Exigency Plan. The Exigency Plan, whether joint with the Senate or not, shall include a formula for the membership of the committee “composed of faculty and administrative personnel to make recommendations to the president as to which academic positions and/or academic programs should be eliminated as a result of the financial exigency” designated in rule 3.1, as well as the general criteria the committee should apply in making its recommendations. This committee will be called hereafter the Exigency Committee.

The size and composition of the Exigency Committee shall be specified in the Exigency Plan, provided that it has at least seven members. At least one-half of these members shall be faculty as defined above, and at least one-half of the faculty members shall be appointed from nominations submitted by the Senate. The Senate procedure for making the Senate designated appointments on the Exigency Committee shall be that the Senate will nominate at least twice as many faculty members as there are openings consigned to it, and the President shall appoint the members from among them. For faculty appointed to the remaining positions on the Exigency Committee, no Senate nomination is necessary. At least a majority of the total number of faculty will be tenured. All faculty appointees should seek to represent the university as a whole, not just programs initially slated to be reduced or just those not so slated, and at least some of them will have served on the Committee for Qualifications of Academic Personnel.

PROCEDURE FOR ELIMINATING POSITIONS

The Exigency Committee shall develop and implement the Exigency Plan in two stages. First, it will assess current programs and recommend cuts or other actions as described in Rule 31003 Section 3.2. Second, upon receiving approval for this assessment or a modified version thereof, it will proceed to designate specific positions to be eliminated as described in Rule 31003 Section 3.3 to 3.5, provided that:

For section 3.2, assessment of academic programs. The Exigency Committee will provide a written report of its analysis of programs, which shall be submitted to the President, who shall then consult with the Senate before decisions are made for specific positions to be eliminated. As stated in the Rule, “The committee will review and assess the academic
programs of the institution and identify those academic positions that may be eliminated with minimum effect upon the degree programs that should be continued and upon other critical components of the institution’s mission. The review will include, but not be limited to, as relevant: (a) an examination of the course offerings, degree programs, supporting degree programs, teaching specialties, and semester credit hour production; (b) an evaluation of the quality, centrality, and funding of research activities; and/or (c) an assessment of the productivity, community service, and quality of clinical services (in relation to teaching, healthcare delivery, and scholarly activity).” The Committee shall consider and may offer advice on all avenues by which terminations of faculty members can be avoided or minimized, and, as well, by which the negative effects of any necessary terminations can be mitigated. Unless an extension is approved by the President, the Committee shall submit its recommendations in writing within 60 days after the committee receives its charge.

In section 3.3, Review Consideration. After the President approves the recommendations regarding programs to be cut, the Exigency Committee next recommends specific positions to be eliminated. These recommendations should also be contained in a written report. The recommendations should be related to the Exigency Committee’s assessment of programs. If other officers of the university, such as deans or program chairs, are involved in identifying individuals whose appointments are to terminated, those recommendations and the process for obtaining them should be described in the report. The Exigency Committee will have available the personnel records of those being considered including current curriculum vitas, annual reports, promotion committee reports and recommendations, and results of periodic performance reviews. It will have access to full personnel files. Faculty whose positions would be jeopardized by the proposed actions will be provided the opportunity to contribute meaningfully to the Committee's review process.

For section 3.4, Tenure Preference. The Exigency Committee should not apply an unduly narrow interpretation of the idea that two candidates should be “equally qualified” before preference is given to one with tenure over one without. Preference should be given to tenured faculty over non-tenured if they are have approximately the same qualifications and prospects, and those with more years of service over those with fewer years provided that their accomplishments are roughly proportional to their relative academic lifetimes. Salary considerations shall not be part of these decisions. The decisions should be consistent with the general principle that greater contributions will gain greater recognition.

In section 3.5, Recommendation. According to the Rule, “upon completion of its review,” the Exigency Committee “shall promptly recommend in writing to the president those persons who may be terminated, ranked in order of priority, with the reasons for their selection. The president shall, with such consultation with institutional administrative officers as the president may deem appropriate, determine which academic positions are to be terminated because of the financial exigency and shall give the holders of these positions written notice of the decision.” The Exigency Committee’s recommendations to the President shall be made in writing. Unless an extension is approved by the President, the Committee shall complete its work in a period of time no longer than 60 days from the submission of the initial report, specified in section 3.2, identifying the programs to reduce or eliminate.
PROCEDURE FOR NOTICE AND APPEAL

A faculty member whose position has been eliminated is entitled to appeal the decision, subject to the requirements of Regents’ Rules 31003 sections 3.7 and 3.8.

The burden shall be upon the appellant to show by a preponderance of the credible evidence that:

(1) Financial exigency was not in fact the reason for the initial decision to reduce academic positions; or

(2) The decision to terminate the appellant as compared to another individual in the same discipline or teaching specialty was arbitrary and unreasonable based upon the evidence presented.

(3) Whether the criteria established in the Exigency Plan were properly and fairly applied to the individual case and that any failure to properly and fairly apply the criteria clearly disadvantaged the appellant compared to other individuals in the same discipline or teaching specialty who were considered for termination.

The hearing shall be held before a panel consisting of full-time faculty drawn from the list of faculty in the pool approved for service on hearing tribunals in accordance with the UTD Policy on Hearing Tribunal Selection Procedures, provided that such faculty are not in the academic programs affected by the decision. At least half of the membership of such panels shall be from faculty recommended by the Senate. The size of such appeals panels shall be determined as part of the Exigency Plan. The Hearing Panel shall elect its own Chair. The hearing must be held no later than 30 days after a written request is submitted to the President's office.

The employment of a tenured faculty member who is to be terminated under this policy shall end no sooner than the end of the current academic term; faculty will be allowed reasonable time to close down laboratories, complete teaching assignments, and transfer their responsibilities. If an entire program or functionally distinct part of a program is cut, employment of all tenured faculty in that program will terminate when the program or part itself is terminated, and will not extend beyond the termination of the program. During this period of employment and for three additional years, the terminated faculty member shall have the right to first consideration among equally qualified candidates for any faculty position at U. T. Dallas for which a recruitment and hiring process is conducted and for which the faculty member in question formally applies. In addition, the considerations noted in Rule 31003, Section 2, Subsections 2.6 - 2.11 of the Regents’ Rules and Regulations will be extended to the faculty member to be terminated.

NO CONCURRENT REPLACEMENTS

If appointments are terminated, the University will not at the same time make new appointments into the same subject area or specialization except in extraordinary circumstances where a serious distortion in the academic program would otherwise result. That is, a tenured faculty member or a more senior faculty will not be terminated only in order for the University to replace him or her with a new person in the same subject area or specialization at lower pay.
Guide to by-laws

Students should be aware of all the Scholarship Committee by-laws as they will affect the awarding of scholarships. The University Senate must also approve these changes.

1. The Committee will only accept letters of recommendation from UTD faculty and advisors, except in the case of transfer scholarships for which we will accept letters from external faculty.

2. Late applications will not be considered.

3. Students applying for all but the “entrance” scholarships must be degree-seeking and have successfully completed 12 hours at UTD at the undergraduate level, or 9 hours at UTD at the graduate level, except in cases where the conditions of the scholarship require exceptions.

4. The Committee will award as many scholarships as possible before the beginning of the fall semester to help with retention and to reduce financial need. This means that the Scholarship Committee appointed in the fall has to meet during the fall, and most importantly during the spring.

5. The Committee will start awarding scholarship monies for the upcoming fall beginning in March of the same year. This means that the bulk of the work of the Scholarship Committee will be conducted over the spring, and so members of the committee should be selected who are available to serve over this time frame.

6. When there is any mention of financial need as a criterion in the scholarship, the Committee requires that a “FAFSA” form be submitted.

7. The Committee will award scholarship monies as equitably as possible since there are a large number of applicants who apply for all the advertised scholarships. To do this, the Committee will, in general, take into consideration the total amount of awards to students, eliminating some large scholarship recipients from consideration for smaller scholarships, and in some cases combining different scholarships to create an appropriate level of award for a student.

8. Decisions of the scholarship committee are final. They are not subject to appeal. Members of the committee should not discuss decisions with students who want to know why they did not get an award. The Committee will notify students whose applications were not accepted to tell them the reason only when it is appropriate to do so (e.g. their application was received late, they did not have appropriate references, or sufficient references etc.).

9. For prestigious awards, “runners up” will be chosen in case the initial awardees decline or cannot accept the award.

10. To simplify administration and potential auditing concerns, whenever possible the Committee will disburse the total amount of a scholarship in one lump sum in the semester in which it is awarded, rather than hold a portion of the scholarship to be awarded conditionally at a later date.
11. All members of the Scholarship Committee will have computer accounts set up that will enable them to view Scholarship Applications on line. This will involve encryption software, and any other measure to ensure the security of student information (FERPA).

12. When outside parties wish to review particular scholarship applicants and provide the committee with recommendations regarding suitable or preferred candidates for their awards, their representatives will be required to review redacted versions of the applications at a location on campus to ensure confidentiality of student records.

13. The Committee will only consider applications of “Consortium students” who are enrolled for 5 or more credit hours at UTD in the semester in which the award is made.

14. To facilitate students who wish to apply for departmental scholarships, the Committee will name a departmental contact for each department. This contact information is provided to the Financial Aid Office.

15. Scholarship applications require new documentation including letters of recommendation with each application. It is not sufficient to refer to dated material of previous years or materials not submitted with the application that may be on file somewhere in the university.
DRAFT U T DALLAS POLICY ON FINANCIAL EXIGENCE

PREAMBLE

Rule 31003, Section 1, of the Regents' Rules and Regulations (http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules.htm#A4) establishes U T System policy concerning the Abandonment of Academic Positions or Programs. Section 1 calls for the President of the University to determine institutional procedures for an in-depth review to inform and guide decisions on these matters “with full and meaningful faculty input.” Section 2 concerns elimination for “Academic Reasons.” Section 3 concerns elimination due to institutional financial exigency. This document establishes U. T. Dallas policy and procedures relating to Section 3.

GENERAL POLICY ON INTERPRETATION OF REGENT’S RULES

Regents Rule 31003, abandonment of academic positions or programs must be interpreted in the light of Rule 40101 which gives faculty a “major role” in regard to “general academic policies and welfare” and related matters and in the light of the further provisions that assign these faculty responsibilities to the faculty governance organization and require that the organization and procedures of the governance organization be set out in the university Handbook of Operating Procedures and subject to governance review and approval.

The University of Texas at Dallas recognizes the importance of tenure as a fundamental safeguard for academic freedom, an encouragement for faculty to engage in research at the frontiers of knowledge, and as the basis of a level of personal financial security sufficient to make faculty positions at U T Dallas attractive to creative scholars, researchers, and artists of national and international importance. The aim of this policy is to assure that the University's response to an institutional financial exigency does everything possible to preserve this commitment to tenure while also providing the strongest possible foundation for rapid recovery and future growth.

The term “faculty committee” as used in Regents Rules section 31003 shall be understood here as meaning the Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas, the regular committees of the Senate, or the Exigency Committee and appeals committees to be established in accordance with this policy. It does not include committees that the Senate does not constitute or approve.

The term “faculty” as used in Regents Rules 31003 to designate those eligible to be appointed as faculty on the Exigency Committee and appeals panels shall be understood here as meaning individuals holding tenure-track, tenured, and emeritus positions with the titles of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor with primary assignments in teaching, research, and advising. It shall also include individuals holding yearly or longer-term renewable non-tenure track position with the titles of Senior Lecturer and Clinical Professor with primary assignments in teaching, research and advising. It shall not include faculty holding administrative appointments at the level of dean or above. For purposes of this policy the position of Associate Provost shall be regarded as an administrative appointment at the level of dean or above.
INITIAL DECLARATION OF FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

Institutional financial exigency is a demonstrably bona fide financial crisis that adversely affects an institution as a whole and that, after considering other cost-reducing measures, including ways to cut faculty costs, requires consideration of terminating appointments held by tenured faculty. Whenever there is reason to anticipate that the University as a whole is threatened by financial exigency, the President at the earliest date possible shall inform the Faculty Senate and all potentially affected budgetary units of the problem.

The President shall consult with the Senate and the concerned budgetary units to determine the nature and seriousness of the problem, the most appropriate of the possible courses of action to be taken, and the means of safeguarding faculty rights and interests, including tenure rights. In solving such a problem, the University shall make every reasonable effort to reassign affected faculty members to other suitable work and to aid them in finding other employment.

On the basis of these deliberations, the President shall write an Initial Declaration of Financial Exigency, giving the extent and scope of the emergency and the general approach to be taken to respond to it.

ADVICE OF THE SENATE

The President shall submit the Initial Declaration of Financial Exigency to the Senate for advice. This process may involve amendments and may, but need not, result in a joint Senate-presidential Exigency Plan. The Exigency Plan, whether joint with the Senate or not, shall include a formula for the membership of the committee “composed of faculty and administrative personnel to make recommendations to the president as to which academic positions and/or academic programs should be eliminated as a result of the financial exigency” designated in rule 3.1, as well as the general criteria the committee should apply in making its recommendations. This committee will be called hereafter the Exigency Committee.

The size and composition of the Exigency Committee shall be specified in the Exigency Plan, provided that it has at least seven members. At least one-half of these members shall be faculty as defined above, and at least one-half of the faculty members shall be appointed from nominations submitted by the Senate. The Senate procedure for making the Senate designated appointments on the Exigency Committee shall be that the Senate will nominate at least twice as many faculty members as there are openings consigned to it, and the President shall appoint the members from among them. For faculty appointed to the remaining positions on the Exigency Committee, no Senate nomination is necessary. At least a majority of the total number of faculty will be tenured. All faculty appointees should seek to represent the university as a whole, not just programs initially slated to be reduced or just those not so slated, and at least some of them will have served on the Committee for Qualifications of Academic Personnel.

PROCEDURE FOR ELIMINATING POSITIONS
The Exigency Committee shall develop and implement the Exigency Plan in two stages. First, it will assess current programs and recommend cuts or other actions as described in Rule 31003 Section 3.2. Second, upon receiving approval for this assessment or a modified version thereof, it will proceed to designate specific positions to be eliminated as described in Rule 31003 Section 3.3 to 3.5, provided that:

For section 3.2, assessment of academic programs. The Exigency Committee will provide a written report of its analysis of programs, which shall be submitted to the President, who shall then consult with the Senate before decisions are made for specific positions to be eliminated. As stated in the Rule, “The committee will review and assess the academic programs of the institution and identify those academic positions that may be eliminated with minimum effect upon the degree programs that should be continued and upon other critical components of the institution’s mission. The review will include, but not be limited to, as relevant: (a) an examination of the course offerings, degree programs, supporting degree programs, teaching specialties, and semester credit hour production; (b) an evaluation of the quality, centrality, and funding of research activities; and/or (c) an assessment of the productivity, community service, and quality of clinical services (in relation to teaching, healthcare delivery, and scholarly activity).” The Committee shall consider and may offer advice on all avenues by which terminations of faculty members can be avoided or minimized, and, as well, by which the negative effects of any necessary terminations can be mitigated. Unless an extension is approved by the President, the Committee shall submit its recommendations in writing within 60 days after the committee receives its charge.

In section 3.3, Review Consideration. After the President approves the recommendations regarding programs to be cut, the Exigency Committee next recommends specific positions to be eliminated. These recommendations should also be contained in a written report. The recommendations should be related to the Exigency Committee’s assessment of programs. If other officers of the university, such as deans or program chairs, are involved in identifying individuals whose appointments are to terminated, those recommendations and the process for obtaining them should be described in the report. The Exigency Committee will have available the personnel records of those being considered including current curriculum vitas, annual reports, promotion committee reports and recommendations, and results of periodic performance reviews. It will have access to full personnel files. Faculty whose positions would be jeopardized by the proposed actions will be provided the opportunity to contribute meaningfully to the Committee's review process.

For section 3.4, Tenure Preference. The Exigency Committee should not apply an unduly narrow interpretation of the idea that two candidates should be “equally qualified” before preference is given to one with tenure over one without. Preference should be given to tenured faculty over non-tenured if they are have approximately the same qualifications and prospects, provided that their accomplishments are roughly proportional to their relative academic lifetimes. Salary considerations shall not be part of these decisions. The decisions should be consistent with the general principle that greater contributions will gain greater recognition.

In section 3.5, Recommendation. According to the Rule, “upon completion of its review,” the Exigency Committee “shall promptly recommend in writing to the president those persons
who may be terminated, ranked in order of priority, with the reasons for their selection. The president shall, with such consultation with institutional administrative officers as the president may deem appropriate, determine which academic positions are to be terminated because of the financial exigency and shall give the holders of these positions written notice of the decision.” The Exigency Committee’s recommendations to the President shall be made in writing. Unless an extension is approved by the President, the Committee shall complete its work in a period of time no longer than 60 days from the submission of the initial report, specified in section 3.2, identifying the programs to reduce or eliminate.

PROCEDURE FOR NOTICE AND APPEAL

A faculty member whose position has been eliminated is entitled to appeal the decision, subject to the requirements of Regents’ Rules 31003 sections 3.7 and 3.8.

The burden shall be upon the appellant to show by a preponderance of the credible evidence that:

(1) Financial exigency was not in fact the reason for the initial decision to reduce academic positions; or

(2) The decision to terminate the appellant as compared to another individual in the same discipline or teaching specialty was arbitrary and unreasonable based upon the evidence presented.

(3) Whether the criteria established in the Exigency Plan were properly and fairly applied to the individual case and that any failure to properly and fairly apply the criteria clearly disadvantaged the appellant compared to other individuals in the same discipline or teaching specialty who were considered for termination.

The hearing shall be held before a panel consisting of full-time faculty drawn from the list of faculty in the pool approved for service on hearing tribunals in accordance with the UTD Policy on Hearing Tribunal Selection Procedures, provided that such faculty are not in the academic programs affected by the decision. At least half of the membership of such panels shall be from faculty recommended by the Senate. The size of such appeals panels shall be determined as part of the Exigency Plan. The Hearing Panel shall elect its own Chair. The hearing must be held no later than 30 days after a written request is submitted to the President's office.

The employment of a tenured faculty member who is to be terminated under this policy shall end no sooner than the end of the current academic term; faculty will be allowed reasonable time to close down laboratories, complete teaching assignments, and transfer their responsibilities. If an entire program or functionally distinct part of a program is cut, employment of all tenured faculty in that program will terminate when the program or part itself is terminated, and will not extend
beyond the termination of the program. During this period of employment and for three additional years, the terminated faculty member shall have the right to first consideration among equally qualified candidates for any faculty position at U. T. Dallas for which a recruitment and hiring process is conducted and for which the faculty member in question formally applies. In addition, the considerations noted in Rule 31003, Section 2, Subsections 2.6 - 2.11 of the Regents’ Rules and Regulations will be extended to the faculty member to be terminated.

NO CONCURRENT REPLACEMENTS

If appointments are terminated, the University will not at the same time make new appointments into the same subject area or specialization except in extraordinary circumstances where a serious distortion in the academic program would otherwise result. That is, a tenured faculty member or a more senior faculty will not be terminated only in order for the University to replace him or her with a new person in the same subject area or specialization at lower pay.