September 15, 2009

To: The Academic Senate

From: Catherine C. Eckel, Chair, Committee on Qualifications

Subject: Annual Report of the Committee on Qualifications, 2008-2009

1. Membership

The Committee on Qualifications consisted of Kenneth J. Balkus (NSM), Christine Dollaghan (BBS), Greg Earle (NSM), Catherine Eckel (EPPS and Chair), Richard Golden (BBS), Robert Lowry (EPPS), Adrienne McLean (A&H and Vice Chair), Aria Nosratinia (ECS), Brian Ratchford (SOM), Richard C. Reynolds (A&H), Katherine Stecke (SOM), and Kang Zhang (ECS).

2. Procedure and meetings

Several changes were made from previous years to the procedure used by CQ to evaluate cases for third-year review, tenure, and promotion. These changes were made in order to improve the quality of decisions made by the Committee and provide more detailed reports on the Committee’s deliberations for each case.

First, the meeting schedule was changed to allow for fewer, but longer, meetings. In particular, three meetings were held to review cases, one for each rank. This change was made to facilitate comparisons across cases and to improve consistency in recommendations. The first two were half-day meetings, but a full day was allotted for the tenure meetings. On January 6, the Committee met to discuss all reviews for promotion to the rank of Professor. Third-year review cases were considered on February 6, and sixth-year and tenure cases on February 20. A final meeting on March 6 was held to evaluate the Committee’s work and make recommendations for changes to the promotion and tenure guidelines and procedures. The Committee met with Provost Wildenthal on March 26 to discuss the recommendations.

Second, the structure of the Committee’s deliberations was changed. For each case, one committee member was assigned to be the “primary” reviewer and another to be “secondary.” While all committee members were expected to read and consider all cases, the Committee found it useful to have this structure to help focus the discussion. The two
reviewers were from outside the candidate’s school in order to avoid conflicts of interest, and they did not act as advocates for their assigned cases. Efforts were made to match reviewers to cases that were not too far from their areas of expertise, when possible; for example, committee members from NSM could review ECS cases, etc. The primary reviewer was asked to prepare a document and make a brief presentation summarizing the case, including its strengths and weaknesses. This was followed by a full discussion and vote. The secondary reviewer was responsible for taking notes and writing up the Committee’s discussion. In some cases the Committee found it useful to have a “do not discuss” category for unambiguous cases. The assigned reviewers then forwarded summary documents to the Chair, who then combined the two documents into a letter detailing the Committee’s discussion and recommendation for each case. These letters were reviewed and revised by the committee members, and a final version submitted to Dowla Hogan who prepared it for signatures.

Third, a representative from the Provost’s office was asked to sit in on the meetings, though that person did not of course have a vote or participate in the discussion of candidates. This representative helped clarify questions about procedures and policies, and served as a useful conduit for information as the electronic file process was developed (see 3 below). In addition, such a person can act as a repository of information, helping to provide continuity from year to year in the Committee’s procedures, and facilitating needed changes in the review process as they arise.

3. Electronic files

Another important change was the development of a secure website that could accommodate electronic files for the documents for each case under review. During 2008-2009 a pilot program took the hard copy files and scanned them for posting on the website. For the 2009-2010 review cycle the site has been improved so that each candidate can now upload their own documents. At each subsequent level, reviewers can view these documents as needed and upload relevant materials (external and internal review letters, etc.).

4. Review activity

During its regular meetings, the Committee reviewed 14 third-year review cases, 13 sixth-year reviews, 5 additional cases for tenure, and 7 cases for promotion to Professor. These are detailed in the attached table. In addition, the committee reviewed and approved 5 cases for new hires with tenure.

5. Final meeting and evaluation

Because a number of changes had been made to CQ protocol, a special meeting of the Committee was held on March 6 to evaluate the procedural changes and suggest improvements at all levels. The Committee members evaluated very positively the reduction of the number of meetings to three, the structure of the review procedure, and the inclusion of a representative from the Office of the Provost. Holding one meeting for
all decisions of a particular type made the review process more consistent, and the new structure produced much more detailed records of the Committee’s deliberations. The attendance by Associate Provost Inga Musselman at the meetings was most helpful, and the Committee really appreciated her input. The Committee was extremely pleased by the move to electronic files, which made reviewing the files much more manageable. Members of the Committee made numerous suggestions for clarifications and changes to all phases of the review procedure, which were intended to streamline the process and improve the average quality of the materials. Most of these were implemented this cycle as Dr. Musselman briefed the new Ad Hoc Committee chairs and candidates for review at each level. In addition, committee members had multiple suggestions for improving the electronic file format and access. Overall the changes were very well received. During the meeting with Dr. Wildenthal on March 26, he also commended the changes.

6. Thanks!

The move to electronic files required an enormous amount of investment on the part of the University and the Provost’s office. The transition went extremely well, and I and the other members of the Committee very much appreciate all the time and effort that went into making it successful. The implementation of the Committee’s suggestions for modifications in the website and review procedures is due to the extraordinary efforts of Associate Provost Inga Musselman. In addition, the Committee was very ably assisted, as always, by Dowla Hogan.
Committee on Qualifications
2008-2009
Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Reappointment Decisions

Reappointment at Assistant Professor:

Fourteen faculty members were reviewed for reappointment as assistant professors. All fourteen received positive recommendations from CQ for reappointment, and the Provost and President agreed.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure (or Tenure Only):

Eighteen faculty members were reviewed for tenure. Thirteen of these were sixth-year review cases, four were considered for promotion and tenure with prior service elsewhere, and one case was for tenure only. The committee recommended in favor of tenure at the rank of Associate Professor for fourteen, and against tenure for four. The Provost and President agreed with thirteen of the fourteen positive recommendations and three of the four negative recommendations, overturning one in each category.

Promotion to Professor:

Seven faculty members were reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor. Six were recommended for promotion by the Committee, with one recommendation against promotion. The Provost and President agreed in all seven cases.

Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Reappointment Decisions by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts and Humanities</th>
<th>Economics, Political and Policy Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
<td>2 promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 promoted to Professor</td>
<td>2 promoted to Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior and Brain Sciences</th>
<th>Natural Science and Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering and Computer Science</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
<td>2 promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 tenured at Associate Professor</td>
<td>2 denied Tenure and terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 denied Tenure and terminated</td>
<td>1 promoted to Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 denied promotion to Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Murray Leaf, Speaker of the Faculty
From: Mary Chaffin, Chair Core Curriculum Committee
Date: July 20, 2009
Re: Core Curriculum Committee - Annual Report for 2008-2009

On behalf of the Core Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to report its actions for the past academic year. We met eight times during the year to discuss changes proposed for the core and address requests for exceptions to the core.

Core Curriculum Course Change Requests:
- MECH 1v95 Fundamentals of Mechanical Engineering (030)
  - Concern that core courses do not have "v" numbers.
  - CCC is concerned about the science content of the course.
  - This issue was tabled for later discussion, and then dropped.
- AMS 3384 North American Archaeology (080)
  - Prefix change requested from AMS to ISGS.
  - Approved.
- NATS 2v10 Chaos and Fractals (030)
  - This course will have a non "v" number in the fall 2009 when course numbers are assigned.
  - Designed for CV students.
  - Approved.
- ISNS 3355 The Science of Cars (030)
  - Approved.
- COMM 3300 Reading Media Critically (010)
  - Approved
- Math 1316 Trigonometry (020)
  - Approved.
Core Curriculum Exception Requests:
These are requests made by ADU’s for exceptions to the core for students that had taken the wrong courses thinking they fulfilled core curriculum requirements.

- BIOL 4v90 (010)
  - A biology student took this as advanced writing.
  - **Approved** - added to core for spring 2002 only.

- HUMA 1315 (040)
  - A biology student took the incorrect course at Dallas County Community College.
  - **Denied** – student must take a humanities course that meets the core requirements.

- EE 4488/CE 4488/TE 4488 (010)
  - ECS student took wrong advanced writing course.
  - Was previously added to core for spring 2008 – request is for fall 2007.
  - **Approved** - added one section for the fall 2007. All should be removed from core for spring 2009.
  - All ECS students should take ECS 3390 for advanced writing.

- PHYS 1100 (030)
  - **Approved** – added one section for the fall 2005. This student claimed misadvising.

- BA 4305-502 (010)
  - A biology student was misadvised.
  - **Approved** – added one section for the fall 2008.

- CHEM 4v91 (010)
  - A bio/chemistry student is currently (spring 2009) in the wrong class for advanced writing.
  - **Denied** – Karen will drop/add the student to the correct course.

Assessment of the Core Curriculum:
- We visited with the Office of Student Support and Assessment about concerns of assessment of the core. We agreed that now that our SACs visit is over that we should step back and evaluate our processes to make assessment more efficient and more meaningful.
- OSSA returned to us with a timeline for core assessment. We will operate on a three year cycle with year 1 being a planning phase, year 2 being data collection and year 3 being reporting. This will allow more time to study our results and make adjustments to our curriculum based on our findings.
Other Business:

- The last sentence in the catalog copy for the humanities requirement stated: “Students must complete at least one course that is representative of literature, philosophy, cultural studies, modern language, or classic language.” An ECS student requested that a Japanese language course that she had taken be counted as humanities core. Shelley Lane had denied the request. The CCC supported her decision and agreed that advanced languages might fulfill the core requirement but that first year courses did not as they focused on vocabulary and grammar. Shelley Lane rewrote the catalog description to remove the ambiguity: “Students must complete at least one course that is representative of literature, philosophy, or cultural studies.”

- At the end of the spring semester, the Academic Affairs Committee of the UTD Student Government proposed that we allow foreign language credit to fulfill the humanities credit. This issue is pending for discussion in the fall 2009.
The committee met 3 times over the year, in November, January, and April. Most of our time was taken up with the upgrade of WebCT to Vista. Rhonda Blackburn announced that with WebCT on the new server, it would be a good time to rename the learning management system something that was not tied to a brand name. She also announced that faculty would begin requesting their courses to be populated on the system, rather than having them automatically loaded.

It was decided that we should survey both faculty and students concerning WebCT usage, in order to customize training for the new version. The target date for the survey was early February, which would have allowed enough time to deal with any concerns faculty might have. Additionally, Rhonda Blackburn was to visit the Academic Senate, to present the coming changes.

Regarding training for faculty, it was suggested that OEE reach out and conduct training sessions to small groups of faculty rather than relying on them to attend prescheduled training sessions. To my knowledge this only occurred in SOM the week of 8/10.

The surveys were sent out by OEE in May, between the spring and summer semesters. The committee has not received any survey results yet.

Rhonda Blackburn did not ever attend a senate meeting.

Note that while there was discussion about faculty requesting courses on WebCT, there were never any implementation details shared by OEE. Several of the specifics that have recently come to light are either troublesome or unacceptable:

- Timing
  - Courses cannot be requested earlier than 1 week prior to the start of classes. Even given the ability to make course templates, this is not enough time.
    - Since new faculty, adjuncts and teaching TAs may not be “in the system” it would be helpful if an administrator or a TA could access the system for them
    - It was not clearly understood that this would be an every semester process. In other words, if Dr. A teaches the same course every semester, why must this process, which could easily be automated, be manually run by each instructor, every semester?
  - Courses will be deleted 2 weeks after the end of the grading period
• There is no allowance for incompletes
• There is no easy way to access the course for grade disputes
• Many faculty members use WebCT as a method of archiving assignments, emails, etc. for the 1 year period we are required to retain student course information.

Ultimately, it is the sense of the committee that though we were asked for our opinion, it was ignored. Additionally, the name change from WebCT to eLearning does nothing to improve a system that many faculty members believe is, at the least, inadequate. We do not understand the reasons for these changes, some of which seem arbitrary, particularly when the faculty is being asked to complete tasks which used to be automated.
Committee on Effective Teaching – Report for AY 2008-09

This committee met once during the academic year. It needs to meet more often to play an effective role on campus and I regret that I was not able to provide more leadership during this past year. For this committee to reach its potential, it should develop a regular monthly meeting schedule early in the year. Administrative support for scheduling meetings, etc. would be very valuable.

Part of our meeting focused on teaching awards. In our discussion, it was observed that there is a lot of disparity across schools in terms of the number of teaching awards made by each school. Also, there are very few university-level teaching awards. The committee was in favor of proposing that additional teaching awards be established at the university level and recommended that awards be considered for innovations in teaching and for teaching excellence by junior faculty (less than five years from completing their PhD or less than five years at UTD). Nominations for such awards might come from students, administrators or faculty.

Rhonda Blackburn made presentations about WebCT (now elearning), the Classroom Experience Project and Instructional Technology. We had planned to discuss Teaching Academy Certification but time constraints prevented us from doing this.
Memorandum

To: Murray Leaf, Speaker of the Faculty
Cc: Magaly Spector, RUO
From: Rachel Croson, Chair Faculty Mentoring Committee
Date: September 1, 2009
Re: Faculty Mentoring Committee--Annual Report for 2008-2009

The Faculty Mentoring Committee met twice in Fall 2008 to discuss and implement mentoring activities. The Committee's activities were conducted in parallel with the development and piloting of a new Faculty Mentoring Program at UT Dallas, to which the Committee contributed substantially. Below I describe each of these activities in turn.

Faculty Mentoring Committee

In the past, the activities of this committee have been somewhat sporadic. This year we scheduled two in-person meetings at the beginning of the Fall 2009 semester in order to discuss and assign duties to each committee member.

Each committee member was provided with a list of the untenured faculty in their school. They were instructed to contact each of the faculty on the list, either in person, via phone, or via email. When multiple representatives from each school were on the committee, the list was divided up.

The contact was designed to accomplish a number of goals. First, the committee member was to "check in" with the junior faculty, see if they needed advice or guidance that was not currently being provided. Second, the committee member was to ensure that the junior faculty member knew about and was involved in whatever programs were currently in place at the individual school. The existence and effectiveness of these programs varies widely between schools, and we wanted to be sure not to override the programs which currently existed. Third, the committee member was to introduce the new Faculty Mentoring Program (still in its pilot stage) to the junior faculty members (s)he contacted, and to encourage them to participate.

Committee members followed up with the committee chair to confirm they had indeed been in touch with the junior faculty to whom they were responsible, and to ask questions and make suggestions about the new Faculty Mentoring Program, described in more detail below.
New Faculty Mentoring Program

In parallel with the activities of the Committee, a working group was formed to design and implement the new Faculty Mentoring Program. That group consisted of:

Rachel Croson, Chair, Faculty Mentoring Committee
Magaly Spector: RUO, Faculty Mentoring Committee
Lauren DeCillis, Director of Galerstein Women’s Center
Rhonda Blackburn, Assistant Provost, Office of Educational Enhancement
Shaun Longstreet, Coordinator of Educational Enhancement
Christine Salmon, Coordinator of Educational Enhancement
Emily Tobey, Associate Provost
David Ford, Professor OSIM in School of Management

With input from members of the Faculty Mentoring Committee, this working group designed and implemented a pilot Faculty Mentoring Program. The Faculty Mentoring Committee was instrumental in disseminating information about this program, and encouraging junior faculty to take part.

The program began January, 2009 with 24 junior faculty participants from six schools. A list of participants can be found in an addendum to this report (addendum 1), and details about the program can be found in the attached brochure (addendum 2). Participants have reported exceptionally positive experiences. A summary of responses from our three-month evaluation is also included here (addendum 3).

Future Plans

Our hope is to “roll out” the new Faculty Mentoring Program to all new and existing untenured faculty at UT Dallas in January 2010. Croson presented the program at the New Faculty Orientation and has begun receiving applications from our incoming untenured faculty. We plan to contact our existing junior faculty, and invite them again to participate for the January 2010-January 2011 session.

Funding for this program has been provided by the Provost and President’s office. This funding covers the cost of the workshops (lunches, room setup, ...) and $1000 for each participant to pay to bring their senior external mentor to campus during the year. Funding has been allocated for the next cycle (Jan 2010-Jan 2011).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentee</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department/Area/Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhaskar Banerjee</td>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Boots</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chetan Dave</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gooch</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>Literary Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaohu Guo</td>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umit Gurun</td>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashaunda Henderson</td>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla Holub</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihaela Iovu</td>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Krawczyk</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Li</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu Li</td>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying Liu</td>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy Maguire</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Martin</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christa McIntyre</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candice Mills</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Morris</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cihan Muslu</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkman Muslu</td>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Nickerson</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint Peinhardt</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tianbing Xia</td>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jie Zheng</td>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONNECTION
Access to UT Dallas Resources
Assistance in defining career goals
Promotion
Improved success for tenure and beyond
Networking
Personal development of professional and
Enhancement

WHY MENTORING?

UT AND DALLAS MENTORS

Non-UT Dallas Mentors

Industry or community professionals
Mentee, field of interest or appropriate
with research expertise related to
faculty at other academic institutions

This program has opened up many new
opportunities for me.
My mentors have helped create a culture
about the state of my area and of the field.
It has been reassuring to hear of others
while asking about them to my mentors.
I am able to discuss a variety of ideas with
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September 2, 2009

To:    Dr. David Cordell, Secretary
       Academic Senate

From: Dr. Richard K. Scotch, Chair
       Committee on Faculty Standing & Conduct

Re:    Report on Committee Activities in 2008-2009 Academic Year

Our committee has had modest activity during the 2008-2009 Academic Year.

In September 2008, we reviewed an allegation of misconduct by a student against a faculty member referred to us by then Vice Provost Robert Nelson. It was our consensus that there was insufficient evidence in the file to support the allegation, and that no remedial action was necessary.

At the request of Speaker Murray Leaf and the Compliance Training staff, members of the committee reviewed changes in the Annual Compliance Training in January 2009 and served as beta testers for the training. We found that the changes generally represented an improvement over past training procedures, although individuals had several specific suggestions and comments about the material we reviewed.

Finally, during the summer months, at the request of Speaker Leaf, the committee reviewed alternatives for a proposed UT Dallas Financial Exigency policy. After initial discussion in May, a subcommittee comprised of Dr. Ivor Page and Dr. Richard Scotch continued to review policy drafts with Speaker Leaf over the summer.

There was no further business for the committee in the past year.
FACULTY LIBRARY COMMITTEE MEETING, November 14, 2008

Susan Chizeck, chair

Attendees introduced themselves and identified their school/department.

Attending:
IS: Susan Chizeck (chair)
AH: Michael Farmer (vice chair), Ming Dong Gu, Natalie Ring
BBS: Richard Golden, Jeffrey Martin
ECS: Nasser Kehtarnavaz
EPPS: Michael Tiersdorf
SOM: Jane Salk
NS: Rockford Draper
Library: Larry Sall, Ellen Safley, Jean Vik, Mary Jo Venetis

Not attending:
Titu Andrescu (N), Steve Nielsen (N), Suresh Radhakrishnan (M), Doug Watson (Ep), students Ashley Hooker, Megan Malone

Dean Larry Sall welcomed the committee and presented the Library’s materials budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009. The student Library fee has been increased to $14 per semester hour which will provide approximately $4.5 million in the Library materials budget. The wages and benefits of the Library staff ordering and processing these materials also come out of this budget. Maintenance on the software used for the Library’s day-to-day business is included in this budget.

Dr. Sall distributed a printout of the materials budget for 2008-2009 showing a breakdown in how the money is being allocated. There is not a specific allocation given to each school, but the Library liaisons are reviewing and ordering relevant material as well as placing orders for titles requested by faculty (except for textbooks.) There is a purchase request form (Suggest a Title) on the Faculty Resources section of the Library web page which can be used to submit requests. (http://www.utdallas.edu/library/faculty/index.html)

A major concern of the Library is the dwindling amount of space available for stacks and study areas. In 2012 there will be new buildings coming online and the Dean has been told by University administration that non-Library staff will be moved out of McDemott Library and the Library will occupy the whole building at that time. Meanwhile, the Library is buying electronic material to replace print journal titles
as they become available and weeding the print copies to make more room for study areas and new titles.

The Library is conducting frequent surveys to see how we are doing and what can be improved. As a result of requests from across the University, the leisure reading collection has been restored. This is a program to lease titles rather than purchasing them, and new titles are added each month.

Dr. Mary Jo Venetis, Associate Library Director for Technical Services, gave a report on the Texas Digital Library program which is a statewide program spear headed by the University of Texas and Texas A & M to digitize and make available the intellectual output of participating universities. The McDermott Library repository currently includes the Special Collections History of Aviation digital collection. Each school can have its own repository linked from the main UTD repository page called Treasures @ UT Dallas (http://lib.treasures.utdallas.edu). The Forum on Financial Crisis sponsored by the School of Economic, Political, and Policy Sciences has been added to the repository and includes the podcast of the event. The main page is still under construction, but should be completed soon. The repository can include images, videos, documents, podcasts, and many other formats.

Question: What is the approval process for vetting materials submitted to the repository?
Answer: That needs to be discussed and policies developed.

Question: Is this something that every public university in Texas is doing?
Answer: It is more than public universities. Some private universities are also participating. A list of those members participating in the project can be found at http://www.tdl.org/members/

Question: Will this expand the number of ejournals available to UTD?
Answer: There are plans to develop an ejournal about the Texas Digital Library which would be made available through the repository, but that is the only one so far.

Dr. Sall pointed out that any monograph written by a UTD faculty author will be purchased and added to the Library’s collection. Also, if a faculty member serves on the editorial board of a journal, the Library should be notified so that title can also be added to the collection.

Dr. Ellen Safley, Senior Associate Library Director gave a presentation on copyright and licensing issues. Copies of a special Library newsletter insert entitled “Copyright Guidelines for Electronic & Print Reserves” were distributed. A copy of the Library’s guidelines for print and electronic reserves can be found at http://www.utdallas.edu/library/services/reserves/reservesvc.htm

Question: Why can I not place a digital copy of one play from a collection of plays on reserve?
Answer: A play is a complete work and may be copyrighted individually even though it is a chapter in a collection. Copyright law prohibits making a reproduction of an entire work to be placed on reserve. We would have to look at each book to make a determination.

The licenses the Library signs for our electronic resources have restrictions unique to each vendor. The license usually specifies who can have access to a resource (currently enrolled students and current University employees). It also specifies how access can be achieved (IP authentication, password, etc.),
and how the campus community can use the resource (usually for educational purposes only) “may view, download, or print individual articles, individual chapters, or other individual items for their educational/scholarly use.” The Library cannot profit from the license and allow people to pay for access/document delivery. The information cannot be altered, reformatted, redistributed, etc. The vendor can deny access to UTD if they detect excessive or robotic downloading of articles.

Question: Has this ever happened?
Answer: Yes. Recently two vendors denied UTD access for four days while we investigated what appeared to be robotic downloading of whole issues. We have had other incidents involving both students and faculty.

Question: Why can’t Visiting Scholars have remote access?
Answer: Our licenses state that only “currently enrolled students and current faculty and staff” can be given remote access.

Question: Why are faculty members who will be teaching in an upcoming semester denied access prior to the start of the semester?
Answer: The Library receives a daily file from HR of all who are considered current employees. Once a faculty member is included in that file, their remote access goes into effect.

Other concerns from faculty:

Question: Does the Library keep statistics of online orders requested?
Answer: The liaisons keep a record of all the requests they receive.

A list of liaisons by school is available at [http://www.utdallas.edu/library/askalib/liaison.htm](http://www.utdallas.edu/library/askalib/liaison.htm).

Question: So the liaison system seems to be working to order materials?
Answer: Letters are sent to Deans and faculty requesting lists of titles that their school needs. We are proactive in replacing materials with new formats, such as changing videos to DVD as they become available. Some of the videos that we own are not available on DVD, just as some journals are not available in electronic format.

Question: How do we compare to our peers in Library collections, journal holdings, etc.?
Answer: Dr. Safley is working on a comparison between our Library with the lower third of the Association of Research Libraries. The latest figures available are from 2006. We have some gaps in the collection caused by the addition of new degrees in areas where we have never collected. Dean Sall would like to see a lump sum provided for Library materials as part of the start-up costs for a new degree program.

The LibQual survey conducted the last three years shows that the faculty feels the Library does not have enough books or journals for their field of study. Specific requests should be sent to Dr. Safley (safley@utdallas.edu).
Some concerns were raised about eBook access. For example, a faculty member assigned one as required reading, but the students were unable to get in; they can print only one page at a time; they are limited to reading a certain number of pages during a session. This sounds like an eBook provided through NetLibrary. These books were purchased for the entire UT system by Austin. If we know the title being used, we can add extra copies.

Questions: Are there any plans to restore the approval plan?
Answer: Circulation statistics of titles received on the approval plan show less than 25% of them circulated during the first few years of ownership. The librarians prefer to buy selectively from lists of titles based on our approval profile and from reviews.

Questions: Why are faculty members only allowed to check out books for a semester?
Answer: We have tried to match the circulation policies at other UT system libraries. One week before the last day of finals, semester loans can be renewed online or by calling the circulation desk. If the books go one day past the due date, they must be brought to the Library so they can be checked in before they can be checked out again. Faculty members are not charged overdue fines, but if they have a book that goes 60 days overdue they will be charged the cost of replacing the book plus a $25.00 processing fee for the staff time it takes to search for the book, determine it has not accidentally been placed back on the shelf, order a new copy, catalog it and prepare it for circulation.

The need for a Spring Faculty Committee meeting will be determined and scheduled at a later date.
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate
From: Alain Bensoussan, Chair Research Advisory Committee
Date: September 3, 2009
Re: Research Advisory Committee - Annual Report for 2008-2009

During the 2008-2009 Academic year, the Research Advisory Committee consisted of:

Alain Bensoussan, Bruce Gnade, Juan Gonzalez, Gopal Gupta, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Philip Loizou, Xinchou Lou, Duncan MacFarlane, Rafael Martin, Aage Moller, Bert Moore, Mihai Nadin, Hasan Pirkul, Myron Salamon, Todd Sandler, Mark Spong, Hobson Wildenthal
Philip Loizou was co-Chair.

General Comments

Four meetings have been organized. It seems that in a year it is difficult to have more. Nevertheless it limits the possibilities of issues to be considered. We have focused on discussions on the strategies of various schools (not all), and identification of common problems. We have appreciated the presence of the Provost at all meetings (of course the VP Research attended also all meetings). This has permitted to have an excellent exchange and a fruitful debate. For instance, the discussion on the measures to attract a larger number of PhD has finally conducted to the President decisions concerning PhD students tuition.

The minutes of the meetings are enclosed.

October 17, 2008

Alain Bensoussan proposed that the committee should first gather information (e.g., research success stories) from the Deans and Faculty, and then focus on strategies to improve research productivity.

Bruce Gnade, representing the OSP office, presented slides summarizing UTDs research expenditures and UTD’s research goals. Some of the goals mentioned included a production of 300 PhDs per year and $100M per year in external research within an eight year time frame. In terms of priorities, he mentioned the submission of a competitive NSF Center proposal. Currently, for FY07 we had 132 PhD students, with total expenditures of $46.5M in FY07, and $57.7M in FY08. Total IDC is about $6.8M.
Dean Pirkul suggested that we should count summer faculty salary as additional research expenditures. Rafael Martin said it is an accounting issue, but certainly doable (will present an approach in the next meeting).

Bruce Gnade mentioned that UTD was able to tap into the ETF funds with several start-up and spinoff companies working closely with the University. The total ETF funding reached $15M in the last three years.

After Bruce’s presentation, Dean Spong gave a brief summary of the Emmitt project and its status. Emmitt money is fading down, and the Jonsson School cannot provide any more matching to future projects. He can only support projects requiring matching or large multi-investigator proposals (MURIs). Some issues facing us: (1) drop in number of PhD students after Emmitt (2) faculty need to budget tuition in future grant proposals (RA/TA tuition was taken care by Emmitt money before). Dean Spong made the following proposal to address the tuition issue: After PhD students defend their dissertation proposal, they should be eligible for a tuition waiver (to be taken care of by the Provost’s office). When asked how the School of NSM handles currently the tuition fees, Dean Solomon said that he uses IDC to cover tuition. Bruce Gnade said he will look into how much money would be required by the Provost’s office to take care of tuition fees for post-proposal PhD students.

Following Dean Spong’s discussion of the tuition-fee proposal, Aage Moller mentioned that he tried in the past (as OSP director) to hire a professional grant writer for the OSP office. One minor problem is that this would require that faculty submit their proposals at least 1-2 weeks in advance to the OSP office. Such a writer can also help students win more fellowships (e.g., NSF graduate fellowships). At the very least, perhaps a grant writer can be used to assist in large Center proposals. Rafael Martin supported this position. Rafael Martin suggested the creation of a junior faculty group, in which the faculty would critique each other’s proposals.

Alain asked Dean Spong to present in the next meeting achievements from the Emmitt Project, and perhaps lessons learned. Dean Spong further updated everyone on what’s next for the Jonsson school: A search is on for a Dept Head and faculty in the Mechanical Engineering Department (30 freshmen students enrolled this year), a bioengineering program in progress — proposal in UT System to become a third partner to the UTA-UTSW program. Once approved, a new Bioengineering Dept will be created with a plan of hiring 15-16 faculty (with split appointments with UTSW). The plan is to hire 3-5 faculty/yr for next 5 yrs with the goal of reaching 40 faculty and 300 students within next 3 yrs. Next, the creation of a Systems Engineering and Management Department will follow. First as a certificate program will be presented to the industry to solicit interest. This will be a joint program with the School of Management.
November 25, 2008

Provost Wildenthal distributed detailed budget charts and summarized the research expenditures of all Schools. The total research expenditures across all schools were $24M in Y2008, and the indirect cost return was $7M. Target funding should reach $60M. Provost mentioned that the operation of the OSP office improved over time (now under the leadership of Bruce Gnade), but UTD lacks federal supported Research Centers (e.g. NSF’s ERC).

Dean Spong continued his presentation of the Emerit project status, and mentioned that Emerit funds were used for startup packages, equipment, RA salaries, scholarships and matching funds.

Dean Salamon provided an overview of his school comprising of 6 Departments and 75 faculty members. There are 5 institutes/Centers in the school of NSM: Nanotech, Lithospheric Studies, Space Sciences, Sickle Cell Center and Advanced Imaging Research Center (AIRC). School’s research expenditures last year were $8M in direct costs. Thirty PhD students graduate per year, the majority (64%) of which are on contract/grant support. He mentioned some of the obstacles facing his school which included lack of space in Founder’s building and heavy teaching loads (2+2). RA tuition (about $500K/yr) is currently being paid by IDC returned to the school. Another issue is that the joint research carried out by NSM faculty with UTSW does not get accounted for (approximately $1M/yr through AIRC). It is also difficult to appoint UTD students/postdocs on UTSW funding.

Alain brought up some strategic issues for discussion in next meeting: (a) large scale grants, (b) increase of number of proposals, (c) increase research productivity.

March 12, 2009

Alain started the meeting with notice to the fact a report from the committee would need to be prepared by September and that the committee should meet one or two more times before the report was prepared.

Dean Bert Moore provided an overview of his school which consists of 4 main programs, Cognition and Neuroscience, Psychological Sciences, Communication Sciences and Disorders and Audiology. There are 3 research centers: Callier Center, Center for Brain health and Center for Children and Families, with various research labs. Graphs for BBS Research Expenditures from 2005 thru 2009 and for Grants were provided to the committee, along with a spreadsheet listing Awarded Grants for FY 08 and FY 09 (copies attached). Dean Moore mentioned the following as challenges/issues that he feels the school faces: 1) Predictable screen for start-up packages for new faculty; 2) Need for incentives to reward faculty for their efforts in submitting proposals; 3) teaching loads - need for common university policy regarding “buyouts”; 4) Need for faculty to mentor new/younger faculty regarding proposals/research activity; 5) Need for improved
infrastructure support, i.e., Office of Vice President for Research; 6) Financial support for research faculty; and 7) Indirect cost return.

Alain called on Rafael Martin regarding options and scenarios regarding Ph.D. tuition. Rafael asked that Dean Spong pose the question for the committee. Dean Spong expressed the need for the tuition of Ph.D. students to find its way back to the schools given the fact once a Ph.D. candidate has finished his/her course work, their tuition is still very high. Could a nominal tuition fee be charged to the Ph.D. candidate to enable them to continue their access to the school and the faculty not take a hit? Dean Spong suggested that a new source needs to be found to reduce the tuition when only signing up for thesis hours.

Provost Wildenthal addressed the issues posed by Dean Moore - there is not enough start-up support, knew of no other incentive for faculty to apply for grants other than for their own financial support over the summer, teaching load/buyout does not impact the school’s aggregate income but does indeed need to have a university wide policy for the morale and cultural impact on the academic community. He mentioned that the support infrastructure of the school is weak at this time (regarding space, etc.) because we do not have enough money. He addressed the tuition issue posed by Dean Spong by stating that he and Dr. Gnade will prepare a draft proposal/report which will be sent the committee for their approval/signature.

Rafael Martin reported that the Research Office had been discussing ways to improve its ability to help the faculty with their proposals/applications. The committee recommended that 1) a grant writer be hired by VPR’s office to specifically to write the proposals, 2) encourage mentoring by faculty of new faculty for submitting their proposals, and 3) offer a course in writing grants. The committee agreed to recommend this to the Office of the Vice President.

Priorities of the committee meeting were agreed to be:

1) Ph.D. tuition proposal as soon as possible.
2) Recommendation to the Office of VPR to hire a person to write/help write grants.

Dean Brian Berry will be asked to make presentation on EPPS research at next meeting.

June 8, 2009

Dean Berry provided an overview of the EPPS school comprising of 7 programs including criminology, economics, geography and geospatial sciences, political science, public affairs, public policy and political economy, and sociology. There are 8 Institutes/centers in the school of EPPS that are actively funded by NSF and the Dept. of Education. The School’s total funding reached $8.3M with a total of $1.5M in research expenditures in FY’08. The number of students enrolled in EPPS increased from 150 in Y2003 to 400 in Y2008. Some of the issues facing the school of EPPS include: (1) the challenge in maintaining and supporting the current research infrastructure, and (2) the
need for better computing lab resources to accommodate the increase in computer-intensive research.

Following Dean Perry’s presentation, Provost Wildenthal took the floor and discussed some issues facing the University along with some decisions/directions pursued by the Provost’s office. The provost mentioned that there will be a decrease in start-up funds owing to a 25% decrease in endowment funds from the UT-System. The UT-System will not support the construction of new buildings in the next 1-2 yrs. In terms of space, there are plans to purchase the Raytheon building and invest ($4-5 M) in renovating 95,000 sq. ft. of space. The Information Resources or Dept of Mechanical Engineering might move there. Finally, the Provost talked about the need for an increase in number of PhD students supported by external grants and contracts. The cost for PhD tuition fees can be quite expensive ($12,000/yr) and he offered to pay the tuition fees (effective Fall’09) for all PhD students whose salaries are paid from “non-base-budget” funds. A PhD graduate student is defined as one who has accumulated 30 or more hours of graduate coursework or has an MA/MS degree and has formally advanced to graduate status by the student’s Department/Program.
Scholarship Committee 2008-2009
Final Report

by

Elizabeth Salter, PhD
Chair of the Scholarship Committee

Voting Members of the Committee were Michael Coleman, Austin Cunningham, Douglas Eckel, John Hoffman, Shelley Lane, James Murdoch, Simeon Ntafos, Elizabeth Salter, and Robert Stillman. Also included in correspondence with the committee were non-voting members: Cathy Coursey, Amy Meaders, Sheila Pineres, Tracey Rockett, and Barbara Seale. Tracey Rockett was not a member of the committee but is learning the procedures hoping to be Chairman next year.

Meetings were held over the internet via e-mail containing no identification numbers. Original applications were posted on the scholarship drive which was available to all members of the committee.

The process for awarding scholarships began with the Committee Chair updating the cumulative GPA of applicants to the latest completed semester - spring 2009. Amy Meaders composed a master chart of the applicants for the scholarships, and the chair of the committee used this list to make her own lists, sorted by revised GPA and also sorted by need as determined by Financial Aid. The applicants were also sorted into Graduate and Undergraduate applications as some awards are limited to a specific group. Late applications, applications with letters not on official university/community college letterhead, and incomplete applications were eliminated from consideration.

For each scholarship (except the Northwood and the Women’s Center), the chair of the committee reviewed and prepared a spreadsheet listing the criteria and the steps in deliberation for the proposing of the awards. This was then sent to the Committee for comments and/or a vote to accept or reject the nominations. The comments were then answered by the chair of the committee and the vote was taken. When a majority of the votes supporting the nominations were in, then the chair of the committee notified Amy Meaders that the scholarship committee had approved the scholarship recipients. For the scholarships chosen by other bodies (Northwood and Women’s Center) the best procedure is to send the applicants to the Scholarship Committee for vetting for eligibility, and then sending the vetted applications to the other bodies for final decision making. If the procedure is done in reverse then candidates can be chosen whom the Scholarship Committee considers to be ineligible and substitutions must be found. The latter procedure is more cumbersome.

Merit based scholarships were given to the students with the top GPA. However, most university wide scholarships handled by the Scholarship Committee had a need based component which required a fafsa (an application for financial aid) to be on file. Need was then determined by the Financial Aid Office. After each award requiring financial aid was made, the chair of the committee deducted the amount of the award from unmet need, so need changed
throughout the scholarship awarding process. This is why some people have multiple need based awards, because even with multiple awards, their need was the highest of all student applicants.

**Recipients** of the awards and the amounts are attached in a spreadsheet (Appendix 1).

**Comparison** of Scholarships awarded by the Scholarship Committee over the past 4 years is attached (Appendix 2)

**Comments:**
In appendix 2, the NIL designation means that the Scholarships are no longer available, that there are insufficient funds currently to meet the designated minimum award or that these scholarships are no longer administered by the Scholarship Committee. Last year (2007/2008) the International Education Fund Scholarship - a very complicated scholarship was removed from the purview of the University Scholarship Committee and handled by a committee from the Provost’s Office. The Southwest Airlines Scholarship was a one-time only award in 2007/2008. The Moller Endowed Scholarship this year (2008/2009) did not contain sufficient funds to make the minimum disbursement, so the funds will be kept for next year.

The Scholarship Committee made 87 awards with the details provided in Appendices 1 and 2; the total awarded was $161,450. The individual scholarship awards ranged from $1,000. (with one person getting 2 x $500. awards) to $8,500. The maximum received by any one person was $9,500, and that was to a person who got $8,500 and $1,000 for a need based award. The typical award was for $1,000. with the Scholarship Committee trying to disburse the money as widely as possible.

One area that should be better communicated to faculty/advisors writing letters of recommendation is that all letters submitted on behalf of Scholarship applicants have to be on UTD letterhead.

**Problem:**
An issue arose this year with the Clark Scholarships after the final report was written. (This is being added after the final report was sent to the Scholarship Committee. It will be sent again.) The Clark was designed to attract and keep students who begin as a transfer student and then can be re-activated through the senior year and even into the first year of graduate school. At UT-Dallas. A problem arose this year because none of last year’s recipients applied for the scholarship and so none of them received it. **There needs to be clarification.** We need to state that scholarships are not automatic and need to be applied for each year as the Scholarship Committee has no way of knowing if the former recipient is even planning to attend the next year. Second if a student wishes to apply for the scholarship in subsequent years, is there a minimum CGPA and number of hours that must have been taken to receive the award? Since we have so many very bright students completing for this award, I would like to suggest that to be eligible the continuing student must be either a Senior or first year graduate student in September, with a CGPA of at least 3.75. While these are just suggestions, the Scholarship
Committee of 2009-2010 must decide upon these issues before the posting of the Clark Scholarship for 2010.

**Trends:**
The Bernard Parsons Scholarship will no longer be assigned to the University wide Scholarship Committee. It will in future be handled within EPPS.
The Women’s Center Scholarship reflected new wording which suggested that preference would be given to women in STEM programs. For that reason virtually the only applicants for this award were the women to whom preference was to be given.
The Holocaust Studies Scholarship was not assigned to the University wide scholarship committee this last year (2008/2009).

The removal of even one scholarship from the list decreases the overall pool of money available to the general university community. Some schools within the university are financially better endowed than others, and so the general university wide scholarships are the only avenues available to the students at every school. By putting preferences on awards such as the one from the Women’s Center, it minimizes access to many deserving women who may not be in these STEM areas. While only three scholarships are affected this year, I hope that this is not the beginning of a trend to shift awards to the schools, slowly depleting the general university – wide scholarship coffers. Also it is my hope that more “general scholarships” are sought for the university rather than strictly targeting new scholarship monies for specific programs and schools within the university.

Respectfully submitted

Elizabeth Salter PhD
Chairman of the Scholarship Committee