ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
April 17, 2002


ABSENT: Michael Baron, George Barnes, Metin Cakanyildirim, T. Constantinescu, Franklyn Jenifer, Ram Rao

VISITORS: Poras Balsara, Dinesh Bhatia, Mike Coleman, Austin Cunningham, Douglas Dow, W. J. Dowling, Matthew Goeckner, David Maldonado, Kendra Ray, Tres Thompson, Paul Tran

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Dr. Wildenthal called the meeting to order and made the following announcements. The Callier Center North campus has been delayed a little. Founders renovation has also been delayed. The budget is still being finalized. The McDermott Computer Lab needs renovation or to be moved. Possible location for moving would include the old Cafeteria space or the AHE building. Nothing has been decided at this time.

Regents’ Academic Affairs subcommittee met and approved Doctor of Executive Leadership, Ph.D. in Computer Engineering, Ph.D. in Telecommunications Engineering and the Ph.D. in Software Engineering. These four proposals are on the agenda for the May meeting of the Board. U. T. System has the Ph.D. proposals for Political Science and Economics.

The staff in the office of the Executive Vice President and Provost is now working on the conversion of the Ph.D. in Chemistry and the Ph.D. proposal for GIS and Sociology.

When these are finished, there may be need for additional degrees from A&H and Human Development due to their Program Reviews that have just been completed.
The search committee for the Dean of Engineering and Computer Science has been appointed and they have been meeting. Dean Bert Moore is chairing the search.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of March 20, 2002 as distributed. The motion carried.

3. SPEAKER’S REPORT

Since I was unable to attend the meeting of the Academic Council, Professor Yasbin took my place to introduce the matters pertaining to faculty governance. Most of what follows is from his report on what transpired.

A. Receivership policy. Pursuant to a formal recommendation of the Faculty Advisory Council, the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct has drafted a UTD policy to govern the process of placing an academic unit in what is now coming to be called “academic receivership.” This is a newly standardized term for an old process, in which the administration assumes control of a unit in which collegial cooperation has broken down and where the faculty are unable to agree on their own actions. There is nothing in Regents’ Rules defining or governing such administrative action, although it has been taken in U.T. System components and the Regents and OGC have, apparently, raised no objections. Two current instances concern the Music department at U.T. Austin and the Mathematics department (now split into two mathematics departments) at U.T. San Antonio. It was the latter case that particularly concerned the FAC, in part because in the process of imposing receivership the administration declared the faculty members concerned unable to participate in faculty governance bodies in general. The consequence was that the FAC governance committee composed a draft policy and the FAC as a body recommended that it be adjusted as appropriate and adopted on each campus. This is what the Committee on Faculty Standing has now done. It came to the Council at the last meeting of the Council, and was tabled for review involving me, Dr. Beadle, and Dr. Sutton. My expectation is that it will come back to the Council at the next meeting to be placed on the Senate agenda for the next meeting thereafter.
B. Hiring Administrators: Although I thought this could be finalized without any more meetings, too many issues have come up since the last meeting to make this practicable. We need to meet at least one more time.

C. Calendar. At the last meeting of the Council, there was one further modification of the academic calendar, which was to move the Spring Break one week later. This will make it correspond with the breaks of U.T. Austin as well as RISD and PISD. The Council had no objection, and the Administration will publish the calendar accordingly.

The Council and administration also agreed to reestablish the calendar committee on a permanent basis, as a University Committee, with representation from the Administration, Faculty, Staff, and Students. I will work with the Provost to draft a charge. Since the Council’s action, the Staff Council has also discussed the idea and agreed on the form that its representation will take. The basic idea is to have a committee with relatively long-standing membership composed of people especially interested in this sort of puzzle, who can serve as a focal point for complaints and suggestions and as a locus of institutional memory, and who can meet from time to time as needed to tweak the calendar when the suggestions or complaints seem to require it. John Workowski is to be the Chair, so if you have further suggestions please send them to him.

D. Follow-up on Chemistry Ph.D. approval. Professor Ferraris reported that the Chemistry department has changed the wording in the description of the PhD to incorporate the suggestions made on the Senate floor when the Senate voted approval, which were basically to make it absolutely clear that both tracks to the PhD involve a dissertation.

E. Discussions on Organizations of Schools. Pursuant to the discussions in the Senate of two meetings back, I have now met twice with the Masters to discuss a possible redrafting of their charge. There does, now, seem to be some consensus developing that there needs to be some body in overall charge of, or with overall concern for, the undergraduate program, there does not seem to be any clear consensus among the Masters on what this might involve or how it should be described. At the last meeting, we agreed that further discussions would be necessary, and that it would probably be a good idea to separate the description of the Master (aka Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education) in the several schools from the problem of describing the role and function of the Master’s Council (aka the Council of Associate Deans for Undergraduate Education). The central point of difficulty
appears to be whether to regard the Masters as part of the administration or as part of the faculty governance system or both—and if so, how?

F. Potential Restructuring of the University. The majority and minority reports of the special committee on restructuring the University have now been posted on the Senate web site, and were discussed in Council. Following up on previous discussions in the Council and Senate connected with the organization of the schools concerning the creation of a Graduate Council, the Academic Council agreed to separate out the relevant sections of the report for discussion by the Senate at this meeting.

G. Commencement: The Commencement Committee has met and has asked that we make more of an effort to get faculty to attend. We should do so.

H. All other items discussed by the Council are also on the agenda for today.

4. REPORT ON PRESENT STATUS OF THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION AND SPONSORED PROJECTS

Dr. Wildenthal gave a presentation on behalf of Vice President for Research and Graduate Education Da Hsuan Feng on the status of his office. The old title of Office of Research Administration and Sponsored Projects is now incorporated as part of the Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Education. This office is being structured into different divisions to handle the processing of proposals and awards, the compliance, Institutional Review Board and IUCAC. The Animal Care Facility is also part of the office. There is now an external council as well as a new internal research council that has been established under Dr. Feng. There was some discussion about the number of staff members in this office and Dr. Wildenthal said they are still reviewing the office and are working toward increasing the total numbers.

5. CHARGE: ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

The draft charge for the Advisory Committee on Research was discussed. A motion was made and seconded to appoint a subcommittee to review this draft and report back to the Council. The motion passed. Dr. Wildenthal mentioned that the subcommittee also needs to keep in mind that this committee would also work with the Safety Office, the Animal Care Facility and everything involving research. The faculty members that
volunteered to participate on this committee include Janok Bhattacharya, Cy Cantrell, Lawrence Cauiller, Robert Glosser, Murray Leaf, and Lawrence Overzet.

6. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Dr. Cantrell presented the report as a result of work done by a large number of people over the last year in response to campus wide concerns. Dr. Cantrell made comments about the ease of maintenance of academic integrity on exams, but it is more difficult to maintain integrity on work completed outside of class. After discussion, the supervision of T.A.’s should be given to the Graduate Dean instead of the Dean of Students. Also, the testing center should be centered under the Undergraduate Dean’s office instead of the Dean of Students. After further discussion a motion was made and seconded to approve the following motions. The motions were voted on individually and all were approved as written below:

A. Administrative actions.

The faculty Senate recommends the following administrative actions. The motions are in regular font, explanations or elaborations in italics.

1. Proctors.

The Dean of Graduate Studies should be authorized and provided with necessary funds to train selected Teaching Assistants and lecturers as proctors for examinations. Selection should be made from the disciplines where the proctoring is needed by the Dean of Graduate Studies upon nomination from the School Deans.

Enough proctors should be trained to maintain a ratio of students to faculty members and proctors of 30:1 or lower. Trained proctors should receive extra compensation for their services.

2. Testing Center.

The Dean of Undergraduate Education should be authorized to create and staff a testing center in which examinations can be administered and proctored effectively.

3. Class Rolls.

The Registrar should distribute class rolls to faculty in a form that makes it easy to prepare check-in, checkout and seating lists for examinations.

The Senate will be available to consult with the Registrar on the form.
4. Reporting forms.

Forms for reporting infractions of academic integrity should be made available on the U.T. Dallas Intranet as well as in the office of the Dean of Students.

B. Faculty training and awareness.

1. Periodic discussion and review in faculty meetings.

The new policy on academic dishonesty and the provisions approved in these acts of the Senate and administration should be discussed in faculty meetings in each of the University’s Schools.

2. The Dean of Students with the Speaker of the Senate or his/her designee should make available training sessions on procedures for ensuring academic integrity that will be available once a year to all faculty, and attending it should be mandatory for new faculty.

3. In order to monitor students’ opinions on the level of academic integrity in specific classes, the University should add to the standard evaluation questionnaire an item of the form “I have observed cheating in this class” (with responses ranging from “frequently” to “never”).

4. Evidence of active measures to maintain academic integrity should be included in all reviews of faculty members’ teaching effectiveness.

5. Faculty Manual.

The Subcommittee on Academic Integrity will draft a manual for distribution to faculty. It shall outline the measures to take for assuring academic integrity and the responsibilities they entail for individual faculty. It should provide instructions and guidance for documenting and reporting instances of academic dishonesty and provide suggested practices for designing and conducting examinations and for discouraging and detecting plagiarism. After it is prepared, the manual will be circulated to faculty by the VPAA and Provost and posted on the University web site. Once the manual is written and after the Senate Subcommittee on Academic Integrity is dissolved, the manual shall be reviewed annually by a committee consisting of the Dean of Students, the Speaker of the Faculty, and the President of Student Government. Changes shall be approved by the Academic Senate.
7. GRADUATE COUNCIL

There was discussion about the possibility of establishing a Graduate Council. A motion was made and seconded to establish a subcommittee to draft a charge for this Council and report back to the Academic Council. Dr. Leaf and Dr. Cunningham will work on a proposed charge for a Graduate Council.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The business was concluded and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sandra K. Goertzen
Academic Governance Secretary