1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Dr. Daniel called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone back from the summer break.

Dr. Daniel discussed enrollments. Fall enrollment is what it was last year, which is better than originally thought. Graduate enrollment is still not where it needs to be but with the hire of the new Vice President of Enrollment Services it should get better. Enrollment Services offices are being revamped. There were lots of factors to contribute to the low numbers in graduate students. There were issues with Enrollment Services computer systems and electronic forms were not submitted like they should have been. An electronic form is going to be used for graduate enrollment; the idea is that the applications will be routed directly to the schools/programs for review.

Dr. Daniel is continuing to meet with the Graduate Council to address problems in graduate admissions. Graduate applications had increased and enrollment was up but the amount of graduate students that actually showed up was down considerably. Dr. Pirkul has been asked to assist in trying to determine what really happened.

The strategic plan calls for continuing enrollment growth of about 5% a year.
To accomplish this, the university must continue to add new degree programs.

Recruiting of high school juniors and seniors should be better in FY08. UTD purchased for the first time ever the ACT and PSAT list so that these students can be targeted as potential UTD students. The enrollment growth is around 5%.

Queries for information from Enrollment Services employees are very frustrating to students/faculty/staff. In particular queries to refer people for degree programs. There should be a direct line for faculty to be able to call and get information to help students.

Dr. Ravi Prakash asked how the GRE and GPA scores listed in the catalog for graduate admissions were to be interpreted, noting that one current view is that we were obligated to admit anyone who satisfied the minimum requirement. Speaker Leaf responded that this was a matter of academic policy and the faculty’s view had always been that the general catalog requirements are minimal requirements and that programs were free set additional requirements.

Dr. Spector, the new Vice President for Diversity, will be here on campus in January. Dr. Leaf will invite her to attend a meeting, if possible for September. Dr. Leaf will communicate with her.

Dr. Jamison the new Vice President of Business Affairs started on August 1st. New student facilities/buildings/landscaping projects are his first main focus.

Temporary classroom buildings will soon be removed, the President hopes. He challenges the faculty to do some blue sky thinking for ways of improving the campus.

Street naming is on hold for now until there is a decision on the beautification project.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Amendments and corrections were made the minutes as circulated and accepted by Speaker Leaf. Simeon Ntafos moved to approve the minutes as amended. Seconded by Robert Kieschnick. The motion carried.

3. SPEAKER’S REPORT

A. Dr. Leaf asked if the Senators were satisfied with the email agenda packets. It was agreed to continue with them as for this meeting, meaning that there would attachments for each item rather than a single pdf file, but that all Senators who also wanted hard copy should let Tonja Brown know, and she would provide one.
B. Dr. Leaf asked the President of Student Government, Ben Bower, when SGA would be meeting. The meeting times would continue to be Tuesday afternoon. It was agreed that Dr. Kaplan would be the primary Senate representative and would attend at that time; Dr. Leaf would also attend when possible.

C. As reported in the Dallas Morning News about a week ago, there has been a flap about changes in IRS rules that would, it seems, leave people who elect to take nine-month salaries over twelve months subject to a penalty of up to 20% if they did not fill out the appropriate forms before beginning the salary year. The problem was that few schools had been notified of this in time to do anything by way of providing the necessary forms, and evidently it was not clear what the forms were. This was especially of concern among public school teachers, and their associations—particularly the TEA—were very alarmed. In response to the protests, the IRS has announced that the rule change will not go into effect this year and they will advise schools on what to do. Meanwhile, I have asked our HR office if they are following this, and they (Sandee Goertzen) assured me that they have been. The OGC is involved and we will have the necessary paperwork available as soon as they are sure it meets the IRS requirements. This should be fairly soon.

D. Our PTR policy requires that the Speaker of the Faculty be notified of those who are being subject to review each year. There is no action to take; it is simply to provide transparency to assure the intent of the policy is being followed. Thus far I have received notices from ECS and EPPS. I have not being doing anything with these notices in the past, but it seems to me that unless there is an objection it will be good practice henceforth to note them in the minutes and file the full letter, noting the names of those being reviewed, in the governance office.

E. NS&M is in the process of voting final approval on their school bylaws.

F. The Committee on Committees will meet August 23. We expect to have recommendations for the September Council meeting and hence also for the September Senate meeting.

G. In view of time constraints this month, the Academic Council authorized a mail ballot to approve the candidates for graduate for the summer commencement. There were 34 votes in favor, none opposed. We thus had a quorum, and approved the candidates for graduation. I note that there was some concern that the use of the website called "Survey Monkey" might have not have comported well with the seriousness of the issue, and also that it would have been better to include the text of the motion normally read in the Senate for such approvals—in both cases partly because this would have provided assurances that the request for participation in the vote was not some sort of scam. In the future, when mail ballots are authorized we will definitely include the text of the motion.
We will also look for an alternative survey vehicle (or at least an alternative name).

H. Mark Anderson has indicated in an email that the Committee on Effective Teaching will make some recommendations regarding changing its membership to include more representation from those concerned with teaching evaluation in the respective schools. Depending on the specific content of the recommendation, and when we get it, the Committee on Committees may wait to recommend appointments to that committee.

I. Changes in IP policy are presently being vetted with the Intellectual Property Advisory Committee and concerned stakeholders, and will come forward to the Senate when everyone is satisfied. The Intellectual Property Advisory Committee is unusual in that it does not have a charge in the manner of other Senate or University committees; how it is constituted and what it does is set out in the IP policy itself.

4. UT SYSTEM FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT.

A. The process of developing compensation plans for the health campuses has taken an interesting turn. As previously described, the FAC had recommended guidelines for governance involvement in the process of developing the plans. The reason was that while Vice Chancellor Shine had previously required campuses to involve “faculty” in the process, given the traditions of the UT system this had not been consistently construed as involving the organized governance bodies, and even when it did the involvement was haphazard and non-standardized. Lack of faculty input and agreement was a major cause of the blow-up at UTMB, and a source of serious discontent elsewhere.

Concurrently, the OGC has hired, for the first time, a health lawyer. At the previous FAC meeting, Dr. Shine announced that she was working on the guidelines, and we agreed on a schedule for bringing the two processes together.

The OGC draft has now been circulated. It is not a guideline for governance involvement. It is essentially a model for corporate bylaws, in which the campus as a whole would be the corporation, the President the CEO, the Deans and Programs heads the officers and board of directors. The faculty would essentially take the role of stockholders. This is not an arrangement that we would find tolerable at an academic campus. We will see what the faculties of the health campuses will do.

B. Dr. Leaf has sent a description of the confrontation between the Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions and the Department of Education to the FAC and it has been placed on the agenda for the September meeting of the Executive Committee.
C. An item concerning our amendments to Chapter 49 of the HOP is on the agenda.

5. CAMPUS HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The Campus Housing Advisory Committee representative from the Senate will be Dr. Ravi Prakash. Dr. Leaf with notify Vice President Rachavong. Since this committee does not fall under Senate purview, we will not follow the process for confirming appointments to Senate and University Committees that begins with the Committee on Committees.

6. CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN CITY PLANNING

Dr. Cantrell reported that CEP approved the certificate program in City Planning submitted by EPPS. This is an academic certificate program. The credit hours from these courses will be applicable toward the Masters in Public Affairs if the students choose to go on with it. New courses need to be added.

A motion to approve the certificate program was made by Cy Cantrell and seconded by Timothy Redman. The motion carried.

7. LIBRARY PRESENTATION


8. OMBUDSMAN

The first draft of the job description for this position was distributed for comments by President Daniel. At this time, we are planning on one person serve faculty, staff, and students. In response to the draft, Dr. Leaf and Dr. Nelsen both had similar concerns. The job description is fine; the position is actually highly standardized and the job description calls for the recognized best practices. But there needs to be a policy defining the position to accompany it, particularly in regard to accountability and reporting. There would definitely have to be reports to the President and Senate, tailored so as to take into account the requirements of confidentiality but recognizing that the Ombudsperson would be in a good position to recommend changes in policies. Another possibility to consider was that the Ombudsperson would meet annually or periodically with the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct for an informal conversation. A further issue concerned how the committee would be constituted to review and recommend candidates for the position. The Senate and Dr. Daniel agreed that there should be a policy in place before this position is filled. It was agreed that
Dr. Daniel, Dr. Chandrasekaran, Dr. Leaf, and Dr. Nelsen would work together to draft such a policy.

9. **SB 1231 LIMITS on DROPS & WITHDRAWALS**

Dr. Nelsen reported. This is a new state law; we have no say in its content but must find a way to comply. Since the law regulates drops over the student’s entire undergraduate career at all schools, it imposes new and very difficult problems in coordinating records between institutions that we are all trying to cope with. The Coordinating Board has written rules for this process. Students can drop three transcripted classes with no penalty but anything after that will be an “F”. They will fail that class. The main problem initially, however, is simply to get the word out. Students already enrolled are grandfathered. The requirement will be explained to freshman students in Rhet 1101 classes in Fall 2007.

10. **CHAPTER 49**

The agenda packet contains two letters from OGC giving their views on “Sharing information about Potentially Dangerous Students.” These were forwarded to Dr. Leaf by Donna Rogers, Dean of Students. They pertain to our proposed amendments to Chapter 49 of the handbook, dealing with faculty and staff involvement with students that are disruptive, menacing, or potentially dangerous to themselves or others. Dr. Leaf is of the view that OGC’s view of the requirements of FERPA and related laws are consistent with our own, and that they therefore do not suggest any need to change or reconsider our recent actions. His question was whether the Senate saw any other possible reading. The Senate agreed that there was no evident problem; we should go ahead. Dr Leaf will discuss the amendments with Dean Rogers on Thursday and expects to send the texts forward to the FAC promptly thereafter. The FAC asked to see them at their last meeting, which was immediately after the events at Virginia Tech. Since we seem to be in the lead in recognizing the ways in which present disciplinary practices might fail to sufficiently pro-active in guarding against such behavior, they were interested in our thinking and wanted to consider whether it could serve as a model for other campuses. We, in turn, might recognize further issues and possibilities on the basis of their reactions. The next meeting of the FAC Executive Committee will be September 7.

This information will be posted on the Senate website for reference.

With a view toward the possibility that discussions on campus or in the FAC might lead to suggestions for minor adjustments in wording, Dr. Leaf asked for a motion to allow him to make such adjustments as might be needed. A change that has already been suggested is that the allowance for a delay of one week between notifying the student of the decision of the Dean of Students and notifying the concerned faculty be eliminated. They should be notified at the same time. The amendments had been drafted before the events at Virginia Tech. In retrospect, immediate notification seems more important. The Senate agreed that this should be done.
Dr. Cantrell moved to allow Dr. Leaf to make such adjustments in the wording of the amendments. Dr. Salter seconded the motion. The motion carried.

11. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Cy Cantrell and seconded Marilyn Kaplan. The motion carried.

APPROVED: ______________________________ DATE: _____________
Speaker of the Faculty