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ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
February 16, 2011

PRESENT: Hobson Wildenthal, Kurt Beron, Dan Bochsler, John Burr, Cy Cantrell, David Cordell, Gregory Dess, Kelly Durbin, Tobias Hagge, John Hoffman, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Ganesh Janakiraman, Kamran Kiasaleh, Murray Leaf, Dennis Miller, Jessica Murphy, Ramachandran Natarajan, Steven Nielsen, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Tim Redman, Orlando Richard, Liz Salter, Zhenyu Xuan


VISITORS: Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Sheila Amin Gutierrez de Piñeres, Lewis Chang, Rochelle Peña

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS
Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order and announced that President Daniel is in Austin attending a Regent’s meeting. There were no questions or announcements.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
David Cordell asked if Simon Kane’s presentation could be moved higher in the meeting order. Greg Dess moved to approve the agenda. Cy Cantrell seconded the motion. The agenda was approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Cy Cantrell moved to approve the minutes as distributed. Dan Bochsler seconded. The motion carried.

Jessica Murphy raised a point of order indicating that the next scheduled Senate meeting is on March 16, which is during Spring Break. Speaker Leaf suggested that the March meeting be moved to March 23. Greg Dess moved to move the Senate meeting to March 23. Tim Redman seconded the motion. The motion was approved and the date of the next Senate meeting will be March 23, 2011.

4. UPDATE OF WEB-BASED ELECTION PROCEDURE (Item taken out of Order)
David Cordell gave a brief history of the decision to initiate a web-based system for the Senate election and introduced Simon Kane of the Provost’s Office. Simon proceeded to demonstrate some of the changes he has made to the system since he last presented it to the Senate. There was general discussion of the changes and some corrections were noted. Simon assured the Senators that he will be monitoring the process as it goes along to ensure that everything is
working as it should. There was some discussion on the nomination process. Simon explained that there are two “pools” of nominees – one for tenure/tenure track and one for senior lecturers and clinical faculty. One can only nominate from one’s own group.

The methodology for final voting will be a list. Senators will rank those names in terms of favorites.

David Cordell will send out an email to all voting faculty explaining the transition to the new web-based system. Tim Redman asked if a paper notification could be sent to all voting faculty as well and it was agreed that this would be done.

5. **SPEAKER’S REPORT**

Speaker Leaf is still discussing our Criminal Background Check Policy with Priscilla Lozano, in OGC. This raised general issues for all campuses that we also discussed in the Faculty Advisory Council, and with VC Prior and Dr. Martinez at the FAC meeting.

In December, Ms. Lozano sent back a marked up version our approved draft that would have been significantly different from what we wanted. She and I discussed it, and on 26 January she sent back a revised set of comments and modifications. I read it and reacted. This seems mostly to be what we wanted, but there are still a few very minor issues and one fairly large one. The large one is whether a "security sensitive position" can or must be defined by access to a "computer terminal."

Priscilla thinks it should be in the policy, because it is in the law. Speaker Leaf intentionally left it out of the draft because it is referring to an obsolete technology and does not have a stable meaning any more.

The law was written in the late 1970s or early 1980s. A computer terminal at that time would have meant an interface with the university mainframe, and the intent seems clearly to protect financial and administrative records. The other two parallel criteria are that the position involves handling cash and having access to a master key. So when written the law was aimed at a quite restricted subset of university employees, which would not have normally included faculty. Our present UTD policy on criminal background checks, which we wrote about fifteen years ago, is based on this assumption.

If we now construe terminal as meaning an actual computer, office or laptop, then virtually every position is security sensitive. But that was not the intent of the law, and we (UTD) didn't want to do it because we didn't want or the hassle of getting all these checks. But the other UT campuses are going ahead on the interpretation that it means a computer, even though they have not actually developed their policies before doing so.

In principle, each campus is independent and can make its own interpretation of the law, but Priscilla and Speaker Leaf agree that this would be a legal vulnerability, in the sense if one campus is sued a good lawyer can make a good case that their interpretation is arbitrary by showing that another campus in the UT system had a different interpretation. So it would be better if we could agree on a common approach. This was the main point that I made with Dr. Prior at the FAC meeting—this is not something Priscilla and I should decide. The system should decide.

Meanwhile, however, at the FAC meeting we agreed that we could have two templates, one for each interpretation of the law. They wind up doing the same thing, they just use different language. The template based on the interpretation that all positions were security sensitive was
roughed out during the meeting. There was not time to complete the template based on the assumption that only a restricted set of positions would be security sensitive.

Since the meeting Speaker Leaf has emailed the two templates insofar as we have them to VC Prior, and had a further conversation with Priscilla. Since the campuses are already in effect opting for the broader interpretation, Priscilla thinks the Regents also want the broader construction, and this appears to be what is assumed in the new system policy UTS124. Dr. Leaf’s argument was that if it comes to court a good attorney could easily argue the plain language as evidence of legislative intent that the law should have a much narrower scope. Even though a judge may not know anything about terminals versus computers otherwise, the argument is very likely to be persuasive. Speaker Leaf asked if there was case-law to the contrary. Apparently there is not, positive results from criminal background resulting in non-hirings which in turn result in law suits would be very rare events. But Priscilla’s argument in response was that the System or campus would argue that this broader reading has now been around for a long time, and the legislature has had several opportunities to correct it by redrafting or otherwise clarifying the original law and it has not does so. So by default it has recognized the present reading as within its meaning. Priscilla says that there is case law to the effect that judges accept this kind of argument.

Either way, however, Speaker Leaf’s still more general argument was that whatever interpretation we take, the interpretation itself should be in the policy. Only then can the policy provide clear guidance for its implementation. Dr. Leaf thinks Priscilla now agrees. He thinks Priscilla and VC Prior will conclude that we should all go ahead with the option of saying we interpret the law to include access to computers, which makes virtually all positions "security sensitive. So the policy will focus on the levels of clearance. Dr. Leaf will finish rewriting ours accordingly.

Speaker Leaf noted that there are three levels of security sensitive positions. Level one, which is checked on the state public website requires no permission. Level two would be a statewide search of records on the state secure site. Faculty would all be considered level 1 or level 2. Level 2 can also be designated as a national search. National searches are done through a fingerprint search. Level 3 is designated as security sensitive administrative positions. This search would be a national search through the Texas DPS or a private firm.

Speaker Leaf explained that if a name search is done the university will receive a list of names and then must choose who they think is the correct person and pay for that report. Because that information may or may not be accurate, the information received in these searches cannot be released to the applicant. Fingerprint searches are more accurate and those results can be released. If an adverse report comes back the applicant can then ask that a fingerprint search be done to substantiate the information.

Speaker Leaf presented this information to the Academic Council last week. The Council agreed that he should continue to work on the document with OGC and bring it to the Senate when their revisions are received. He offered to share the current draft of the policy with anyone who is interested in reviewing it more closely.

We have sent out the notices appointing the new Vice Chairs of the Student Scholarship and Core Curriculum Committees.
The Commencement Committee has met. We are planning on six commencement ceremonies for this spring and will probably include an evening ceremony for SOM, but the details are not final. Greater use will be made of the new mall to draw people out of the Activities Center between ceremonies.

6. **FAC REPORT**
Speaker Leaf reported that the major item of discussion at their recent meeting was the Criminal Background Check policy. There was also some discussion of UT Austin’s exigency policy. The Provost at UT-Austin has decided that their exigency policy cannot say anything that is not in the System policy.

The discussions regarding the current legislative session were scary but indeterminate. We will not know anything about the budget until April or May.

Speaker Leaf reported that it looks promising to have a faculty regent appointed. The chair of the Faculty Advisory Council has been attending the academic affairs meetings of the Regents and the Regents seem pleased with the faculty involvement.

7. **STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT**
David Cordell reported that the Student Government met last night and approved a $70.00 fee for the Student Union expansion.

They also approved placing newspaper stands around campus and discussed the possibility of having a minor in film.

Lewis Chang reported that Student Government is also very concerned regarding the fact that faculty members are requiring students to turn off cell phones completely during class. He asked faculty to consider allowing students to have them on silent or vibrate. They feel that this presents a safety issue since the new emergency alert system uses text messages as one of the primary means of communication.

There was discussion regarding this and the possibility of students checking email and sending text messages during exams. The faculty understand the student’s concern, but it was the consensus of the Senate that it is critical that students do not use cell phones during class. It was suggested that the professor or other faculty member leave their phone on to receive any alerts. It was also pointed out that the fire alarm system has a loud speaker system through which announcements can be sent.

8. **CEP PROPOSALS**

A. **GRADUATE CATALOG REVISIONS**
Cy Cantrell presented this information. A link to the catalog copy was provided in the agenda packet distributed to the Senate. Dr. Cantrell noted that the first forty pages is simply a summary of what has already been approved in various sessions of the Senate. He called for questions. There were none. Cy Cantrell moved to approve the catalog revisions. Jessica Murphy seconded. The motion carried.

B. **REVISED DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS**
Cy Cantrell asked Dean Piñeres if she would like to address this item. She stated that this revised policy is cleaner than the previous policy. Each semester’s standing is based only on the previous semester’s outcome. Students who are successful while on academic warning can move back to probationary status. Students who are unsuccessful will be suspended. Tim Redman pointed out that the major GPA and general GPA should be consistent. This change
was approved in Academic Council but was not changed in the information distributed to the Senate.

Simeon Ntafos asked for clarification of the following sentence: “If the student meets the Academic Probation Requirements, the student will return to Academic Probation. If the student again fails to meet the Academic Probation Requirements while on Academic Warning, the student will be suspended.” His objection was to the use of the word again. After discussion it was agreed that this word could be removed from the sentence.

Simeon Ntafos once again raised the issue of the discrepancy between the wording in the 2010 catalog (and the 2011 catalog copy currently under consideration) and the way that the policy is being enforced by the Registrar’s Office; specifically, the Registrar’s office has implemented a two-semester limit on warning status which is not present in the approved catalog copy. He asked if the Senate was going to make a statement regarding this issue. Neither Provost Wildenthal nor Speaker Leaf felt that this is something that would benefit from a motion. If someone reads the minutes and raises an issue it can be addressed at that time.

Simeon Ntafos moved to strike the section on changing majors from the Disciplinary Actions section and place it elsewhere in the catalog. There was no second and this motion failed.

Cy Cantrell moved to approve the policy with the amended wording. Tim Redman seconded the motion. The motion carried with one abstention.

9. **HOP COMMITTEE PROPOSALS**

A. **REVISED TRAVEL AND RISK-RELATED ACTIVITIES POLICY**

Abby Kratz presented this revised policy. She stated that what was distributed was not a markup version but version in the new template being used for HOP policies. There were so many changes that she felt it would be easier to have a clean copy. The majority of the changes were relating to business practices that were imbedded in the policy. She pointed out section 3(C) which states “If an incident of a serious nature occurs during travel and involves inappropriate behavior by a student, the faculty or staff member may immediately end the student’s participation in the activity by making a reasonable effort to provide the student access to public transportation for an unaccompanied return to the University at the student’s expense.” The question was asked how one could make sure that the student pays for their return trip in this instance. Dr. Jamison replied that the responsible faculty member needs to make sure that this is understood before taking the trip. After further discussion Dr. Jamison and Dr. Kratz stated that as a last resort the responsible faculty member should pay for the return trip and they would be reimbursed for this expense.

One capitalization error was pointed out on page one.

Liz Salter moved approval of the policy. Orlando Richard seconded. The motion carried.

B. **RESEARCH TITLES**

Dr. Kratz presented this information. She stated that this is primarily just a cleaning up of the current policies. On page two under the Research Scientist designation, Jessica Murphy pointed out that the word “is” prior to the word “able” is redundant and asked that this be changed. Jessica Murphy moved to approve the research titles with this amendment. Dan Bochsler seconded the motion. The motion carried.
10. **REVISION TO THE CHARGE OF THE COMMENCEMENT COMMITTEE**
Speaker Leaf introduced this item and explained that the change is being made at the request of the Commencement Committee. The proposed change eliminates reference to the Special Events Coordinator since that position no longer exists. Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki moved to approve this change. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**
There being no further business, Provost Wildenthal asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Dan Bochsler moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded and the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED:  
Murray J. Leaf  
Speaker of the Academic Senate
February 14, 2011

TO: Academic Senate Members

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

RE: Academic Senate Meeting

The Academic Senate will meet on Wednesday, February 16 at 2:00 p.m. in the T.I. Auditorium, ECS South 2.102.

The revisions to the graduate catalog, Item #7(A) on the agenda, along with the entire agenda packet, can be found on the Senate website, http://www.utdallas.edu/senate/Meetings2.html

Please bring the agenda packet with you to this meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at x6751.

Attachments

xc:

David Daniel
Hobson Wildenthal
Andrew Blanchard
Serenity King

John Wiorowski
Calvin Jamison
Inga Musselman
Larry Redlinger

Darrelene Rachavong
Abby Kratz
Rhonda Blackburn
Rochelle Peña

Chief Larry Zacharias
Deans
Grace Bielawski SG President

2010-2011 Academic Senate

Bardhan, Indranil
Berat, Kurt
Bhatia, Dinesh
Bochsler, Dan
Breen, Gail
Burr, John
Cantrell, Cyrus
Chandrasekaran, R.
Cordell, David**
Dess, Gregory
Dieckmann, Greg
Durbin, Kelly
Fass, Simon
Hagge, Tobias
Hoffman, John
Huynh, D.T.
Ishak-Boushaki, M.
Janakiraman, Ganesh

Keith, Linda
Kiaseh, Kamran
Kisunzu, Phillip
Leaf, Murray*
Menon, Syam
Miller, Dennis
Murphy, Jessica
Murthi, B.P.S.
Natarajan, R.
Nielsen, Steven
Ntafos, Simeon
Prakash, Ravi
Redman, Tim
Richard, Orlando
Salter, Liz
Richard Scotch
Stern, Robert
Thompson, Lucien

Vidyasagar, M.
Xu, Yexiao
Xuan, Zhenyu
Zhang, Harold

*Searker
**Secretary
AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
February 16, 2011

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS
   DR. WILDENTHAL

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   DR. LEAF

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   January 19, 2011 Meeting
   DR. LEAF

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT
   DR. LEAF

5. FAC REPORT
   DR. LEAF

6. STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT
   DR. CORDELL

7. CEP PROPOSALS -
   A. GRADUATE CATALOG REVISIONS
   B. REVISED DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS POLICY (CATALOG)
   DR. CANTRELL

8. HOP COMMITTEE PROPOSALS -
   A. REVISED TRAVEL AND RISK-RELATED ACTIVITIES POLICY
   B. RESEARCH TITLES
   DR. KRATZ

9. REVISION TO THE CHARGE OF THE COMMENCEMENT COMMITTEE
   DR. LEAF

10. UPDATE ON WEB-BASED ELECTION PROCEDURE
    DR. CORDELL

11. ADJOURNMENT
    DR. WILDENTHAL
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ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
January 19, 2011

PRESENT: Hobson Wildenthal, Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Gregory Dess, Gregg Dieckmann, Kelly Durbin, Simon Fass, D.T. Huynh, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Ganesh Janakiraman, Linda Keith, Phillip Kisunzu, Murray Leaf, Dennis Miller, Jessica Murphy, Steven Nielsen, Simeon Ntafos, Tim Redman, Orlando Richard, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Robert Stern, Lucien Thompson, Zhenyu Xuan

ABSENT: Indranil Bardhan, Dan Bochsler, Gail Breen, John Burr, Tobias Hagge, John Hoffman, Kamran Kiasaleh, Syam Menon, B.P.S. Murthi, Ramachandran Natarajan, Ravi Prakash, Mathukumalli Vidyasagar, Yexiao Xu, Harold Zhang

VISITORS: Calvin Jamison, Jim Gary, Simon Kane, Sheila Amin Gutierrez de Piñeres, Claudia Tatum

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order and announced that President Daniel is downtown meeting with Senator John Cornyn and would be unable to attend today’s meeting. He noted that the House Budget Committee released their version of the State budget yesterday but the Senate version has not been released. Since the final state budget will be a combination of both the House and Senate versions, it is premature to draw any firm conclusions from this first House version. One of the principle qualitative aspects of the House budget is a big cut in Texas Grants, the state’s financial aid program and a major retraction or elimination of projects funded out of the ARRA relief money. He feels that the net result will be a somewhat smaller percentage decrement in our state funding than what was originally anticipated but this is still not a trivial amount.

The question was raised if the state budget is cut by 10% what percentage is that of our funding. President Wildenthal replied that if tuition and fees and enrollment growth were static figures, it would be a 5% cut. However, since that is not the case, it is very difficult to assign a fixed percentage. At the moment all that can be said is that we will not have as positive a financial situation as we have had in the past four years.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Speaker Leaf asked to add an additional item to the agenda – revision to the charge of the Commencement Committee. Cy Cantrell moved to add this item to the agenda. Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki seconded the motion. The motion carried. David Cordell asked the Senate’s permission to move Simon Kane’s demonstration of the online voting system up in the order of the agenda following Jim Gary’s presentation. There was no dissention.
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   Cy Cantrell moved to approve the minutes of the November 17, 2010 meeting as distributed. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

4. **SPEAKER’S REPORT**
   On Tuesday, UTD Chief of Police Zacharias asked Speaker Leaf to inform the Senate regarding upcoming key-card renewals for additional buildings. Faculty and others who have given students or employees access to laboratories or other areas they are responsible for will be asked to go over all of these assignments. The new system, for those who do not yet have it, will allow access to areas based on Comet Card swipes. So faculty will need to turn in the Comet Card number of those they want to have access, along with the conditions for that access. Access can be programmed for hours of the day, days and hours of the week, and periods of time such as semesters or years. Apparently not all current lists are up to date, so the Chief wants to take this opportunity to correct them. Speaker Leaf asked members of the Senate to spread the word among their colleagues; if anyone has questions Chief Zacharias welcomes phone calls or emails.

   With the concurrence of the Academic Council, Speaker Leaf has asked the President to appoint Simeon Ntafos Chair of the Committee on Student Scholarships and to appoint Marilyn Kaplan Chair of the Committee on the Core Curriculum. Neither of these required Senate approval since both moved up from Vice Chair positions to fill vacant Chairs. Dr. Ntafos was already Vice Chair of the Scholarships Committee, and the person we had approved as Chair declined to accept. Dr. Kaplan was Vice-Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee, with Dr. Ntafos as Chair. When Dr. Ntafos agreed to serve as chair of the Scholarships Committee, he resigned as Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee and Dr. Kaplan then moved up to fill that vacancy. Of course this was done with their mutual agreement, and in discussion with Sheila Piñeres, as Dean of Undergraduate Education. This leaves their former positions as vice chairs vacant, and there is an item to deal with that on the agenda for today.

   Donna Riha resigned last month as sustainability officer, leaving the newly formed Sustainability Committee without an RUO. Speaker Leaf has asked Dr. Jamison to name someone else. Dr. Jamison stated that Rick Dempsey will continue to serve on this committee and will act as the RUO.

   The Committee on Academic Integrity is working on a policy for more effective adjudication of cases of plagiarism involving Master’s and Ph.D. theses and dissertations, and also on revisions to the rules for dealing with academic misconduct in general. In both cases, decisions will be made by faculty panels. Watch the Committee’s website for developments, and feel free to communicate with them.

   We need to return to the UTD mission statement. Speaker Leaf will ask Dr. Gary to set up a blog or ListServe for it, with a link from the Senate website.

   We have received a response to our Criminal Background Check policy draft from the Office of General Counsel. The response would have involved substantial changes in substance. These changes would also have departed from the agreement that had been arrived at among and between the Regents, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors, and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Advisory Council. I have discussed these with the designated lawyer in OGC,
Priscilla Lozano, and she is revising her suggestions. She also raised an interesting and possibly important issue of law. This is that Texas Education Code 51.215 appears to say that the only way to seek a “criminal records check” from the Texas Department of Public Safety secure site (as opposed to a check only of court records from the public site) is for the position in question to be designated as “security sensitive.”

The same language is use in the Texas Government Code §411.094, Access to Criminal History Record Information: Institutions of Higher Education, Section 2, namely: “(c) Criminal history record information obtained by an institution of higher education under Subsection (b) may be used only for the purpose of evaluating applicants for employment in security-sensitive positions.” The problem this raises is that while the Regents appear to want all new hires to be reviewed in this site, construing all new hires as “security sensitive” appears to go beyond the intent and limits of the law—unless we take the law in a very confusing way. We are working on this.

5. FAC REPORT
Speaker Leaf had no report to give.

6. REPORT ON UPCOMING PEOPLESOFT SOFTWARE TRANSITION
Jim Gary, Chief Information Officer, gave a brief overview of the new human resources and financial system software that the university will switch to on February 21. The new system will include timekeeping functions, payroll and all financial transactions – virtually all business functions of the administration of the university will be included in this software package. We are doing this as part of the UT System shared services initiative. We will be the pilot program for implementing the HR and financial systems. This will be a slightly different model from the new student system that we began using a little over a year ago. The initiative is driven from the Chancellor’s office as a measure of economy. We were selected to be the pilot program in part because our current software is no longer supported and we would have had to make a change at this time anyway. We were originally scheduled to go live on December 1, but all of the training materials were not in place.

On February 11 the current system will be shut down, and there will be a period of two weeks when no transactions of any type can take place. The date for the transition of all the transactions from our current system to the new PeopleSoft system is February 21.

This will be a complete change in the way the university does business from the administrative side. This will affect procurement, timekeeping, contracts and grants management - almost anything that touches the financial system. Dr. Gary stated that this conversion has given us an opportunity to re-examine our current processes to find ways to improve. He acknowledged that there will be some trial and error involved in the transition and estimates that it will be 12-18 months before everything is completely settled.

Dr. Jamison stated that what we are trying to do with the new system is to eliminate some of the antiquated business practices that we are currently using and trying to streamline as much as possible. He stated that payroll is the most sensitive area and stressed that they are taking extra precautions to ensure that payroll is done correctly. However, he acknowledged at the same time that mistakes will be made.
Dr. Gary was asked if the new system would make it easier to track grant funds. He stated that there are tremendous changes in this area and that users would have far greater flexibility to manage accounts. Everything in the system is designed to empower the users.

7. CONSIDERATION OF ONLINE VOTING
At the November Senate meeting Simon Kane presented a rough prototype of a system that could be used for electronic voting for the upcoming Senate election. At that time Simon was asked to proceed with setting up the system and bring it before the Senate at today’s meeting to provide a better understanding of how the system would work. David Cordell explained that the intent is then to have the Senate go through a mock election process of nominating and voting to ensure that the system is working correctly before unveiling it to the university.

Simon Kane introduced the system and explained that this is still not the final version. Simon has taken the feedback he received from the November meeting and tried to incorporate most of that into the latest version of the system. The system uses the UTD net ID and password. Access to the e-Vote system will be available through the Provost’s website as well as an email invitation that will be sent to all faculty members. Simon proceeded to go through a demonstration of the system and showed what each screen would look like in the nomination and voting processes.

Cy Cantrell moved to authorize use of the electronic e-Vote system for this year’s Senate election. Gregg Dieckmann seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion carried.

8. APPOINTMENT OF AD HOC ELECTION COMMITTEE AND APPROVAL OF ELECTION CALENDAR
The next order of business was to appoint an ad hoc election committee. Speaker Leaf noted that the committee usually consists of three people to assist the Secretary of the Senate and suggested R. Chandrasakaran because of his concerns with privacy and John Wiorkowski since he has the tabulation formula that is used in the current system. Simon Kane stated that the tabulation would not be done electronically – that information will continue to be tabulated as it has been in the past. Simon Fass volunteered to serve. There were no further nominees. Gregg Dess moved to accept the nominees by acclamation. Cy Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

9. STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT
David Cordell reported that the students held their first textbook swap. Fifty-eight textbooks and fifteen non-textbooks were swapped. There were 120 books left for the next swap. Dr. Cordell was surprised at the low number of books that were swapped, but feels that the program is viable and will just take a few cycles before more students take advantage.

Student volunteers have been recruited to sit on the E-Learning Committee as well as the Parking and Transportation Committee.

9. CEP PROPOSALS

Revisions to the Undergraduate Catalog
A link to the catalog revisions was sent to members of the Senate prior to today’s meeting. Cy Cantrell asked if anyone wished to raise any questions regarding the information that was presented. Simeon Ntafos noted that in the section on Academic Warning there is a discrepancy with between the wording in the 2010 catalog (and the 2011 catalog copy currently under
consideration) and the way that the policy is being enforced by the Registrar’s Office; specifically, the Registrar’s office has implemented a two-semester limit on warning status which is not present in the approved catalog copy. Dean Pineres stated that what the catalog copy states and what was put into place and what the minutes of the Council for Undergraduate Education meetings revealed and what the flow charts that were produced from the minutes of the CUE meetings say are very different from what is in the catalog. The CUE is currently trying to determine whether the intent was what was in the catalog copy or whether the intent was the actual policy that was passed by the CUE. What the catalog copy states is not actually what has been implemented. However, what has been implemented is what was passed by the CUE and what was after speaking with the Registrar discussed with Dr. Coleman and Kathy Alexander. Dean Pineres has asked for clarification on the catalog copy numerous times. It should be noted that the catalog copy that went into place was incorrect and emergency changes to the catalog were made in the past to coincide with what was really happening. The supplemental section is a massive re-working of the 2010-2012 catalog because for some reason the catalog last year did not happen as it should have. It is not the intent of the CUE to argue with the catalog copy. They will discuss what was passed in their previous meetings and determine if that is the way that the policy should continue. At that time, they will present any necessary modifications to the catalog copy to the Committee on Educational Policy to be presented to the Senate for approval.

Simeon Ntafos maintained that the posted 2010 catalog copy is what CUE, CEP and Senate approved last year and the Senate link has the same policy for the 2011 catalog (already approved by CUE and CEP).

Cy Cantrell moved adoption of the first forty pages of the undergraduate catalog with the understanding that the Discipline section would be removed from the remainder of the catalog until further clarification on the policy can be provided by the CUE. Richard Scotch seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion carried.

Cy Cantrell moved adoption of the course descriptions and individual disciplines section of the undergraduate catalog. Liz Salter seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion carried.

PROPOSED ACADEMIC CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN CRITICAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Cy Cantrell asked Dean Pineres to address this proposal. She stated that this certificate proposal came about as a result of faculty concerns that students did not have adequate oral and written communication skills and from students who have asked for more options to develop their communication skills. The proposed certificate is twelve hours and is completely voluntary. Faculty will submit a request to have courses designated as critical communication skills courses. Students can then choose to take those designated courses in order to complete the requirements for the certificate.

Of the four courses required, one will emphasize oral communication, one will emphasize written communication, one will be a capstone course, which evaluates the accumulation of what the student has presented, and a fourth course, which can be the major-specific writing course. The Office of Undergraduate Education will track the students to ensure they have completed all the appropriate courses and received a grade of a “B” or higher. The Office of Undergraduate Education will also be responsible for issuing the certificates upon completion of all required courses. Dean Pineres stressed that the program is completely voluntary and no
student will be forced to participate. The certificate will not appear on a student’s transcript. Since the program is completely interdisciplinary the Office of Undergraduate Education will be responsible for all assessment.

Cy Cantrell moved adoption of the Academic Certificate Program in Critical Communication Skills. Tim Redman seconded. There was no further discussion. The motion carried with one abstention.

10. APPOINTMENTS TO STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP AND CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEES

As noted earlier in the Speaker’s Report, Speaker Leaf, with the concurrence of the Academic Council, has asked the President to appoint Simeon Ntafos Chair of the Committee on Student Scholarships and to appoint Marilyn Kaplan Chair of the Committee on the Core Curriculum. Both of these moved up from Vice Chair positions to fill the vacant Chair positions. Speaker Leaf is recommending the appointment of Dr. Sara Maxwell as Vice Chair of the Committee on the Core Curriculum, and the appointment of Dr. Doug Eckel as Vice Chair of the Committee on Student Scholarships. Cy Cantrell moved to accept these appointments. Kurt Beron seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the motion carried.

11. SELECTION OF HEARING TRIBUNAL POOL MEMBERS AND PROPOSED REVISION TO HEARING TRIBUNAL SELECTION PROCEDURES POLICY

Speaker Leaf stated that the Senate could change any member who is currently serving in the Tribunal Pool, but specifically a replacement must be named for Duane Buhrmester, who passed away last year. Speaker Leaf asked for suggestions for a replacement; Gregg Dess volunteered to serve. Cy Cantrell moved to approve the list of tribunal pool members with the addition of Gregg Dess. Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki seconded. The motion carried.

Speaker Leaf presented the revision to the Hearing Tribunal Selection Procedures and stated that after discussing this with Dean of Students Gene Fitch he had a modification to the wording that was distributed. We will no longer be using hearing officers, only hearing panels. The revised wording under consideration is: “Members of this tribunal panel will also be regarded as faculty recommended by the Senate to serve on hearing panels to consider allegations of academic misconduct. Appointments to such panels will be made by the Dean of Students. Members of the tribunal panel who agree to serve in these capacities will receive training by the Dean of Students. The Dean of Students will report the number, membership, and activities of such panels to the Committee on Academic Integrity at the end of the fall and spring semesters.”

Cy Cantrell moved to approve the revision. Orlando Richard seconded the motion. Further discussion ensued. Dr. Chandrasekaran raised the concern that the members of the Hearing Tribunal Pool were selected because they have the skills to make a judgment on faculty issues but may not have the required skills to make a decision regarding academic dishonesty. Liz Salter stated that a panel hearing academic dishonesty cases should include Senior Lecturers that work with students on an undergraduate basis.

After further discussion, Speaker Leaf withdrew this item from consideration. He will write a comparable policy for a faculty panel on academic dishonesty review. There was no objection to the withdrawal of this item.

12. APPROVAL OF SENATE ELECTION CALENDAR
Richard Scotch moved to approve the calendar as circulated. Tim Redman seconded. David Cordell stated that he is concerned that Simon Kane would not have time to complete the e-Vote system by February 1. Speaker Leaf stated that the Election Committee could postpone the beginning of the election process to accommodate the completion of the new voting system as long as the election was finalized by the dates stated in the Senate bylaws.

13. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, Provost Wildenthal adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED: ___________________________ DATE: _________________

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate
Disciplinary Actions

Academic Good Standing

Students at UT Dallas are expected to maintain a grade point average (“GPA”) of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale, which equates to a C average. Additionally, students are expected to maintain a GPA of 2.0 in their major-related courses to remain in Academic Good Standing.

Disciplinary Status Overview

UT Dallas maintains an academic disciplinary policy to encourage students to make the necessary academic and life changes to succeed. Students who fail to meet the minimum expectations of Academic Good Standing must meet more stringent standards and regularly consult with academic advisors. The disciplinary policy provides a student with several opportunities to make the necessary adjustments prior to a final dismissal from UT Dallas.

UT Dallas Disciplinary Status:

- **Academic Probation**
- **Academic Warning**
  - **Initial One Long Semester Academic Suspension (One Semester)**
  - **Second One Year (12 months) Academic Suspension (One Year)**
- **Final Dismissal**

Each Disciplinary Status will be indicated on the student’s academic record.

Academic Probation

If a student’s cumulative GPA falls below a 2.0, the student will be placed on Academic Probation. Academic Probation will be indicated on the student’s academic record.

Academic Probation is designed to help students make the required adjustments to achieve success and a degree at UT Dallas. These adjustments will vary based upon the individual circumstances of each student, but should be taken seriously.

If a student is placed on Academic Probation, the student will be required to follow certain protocols and meet higher academic standards. These protocols and standards are designed to bring the student back to Academic Good Standing and allow the student to meet graduation requirements.

A student on Academic Probation is required to meet the following Academic Probation Requirements for the semester:
Academic Probation Requirements:

- Earn a minimum semester GPA of 2.2.
- May not withdraw or request an incomplete from a class.
- Meet with an academic advisor prior to registration.
- Retake all required Major and University Core Courses failed the previous semester.*
- Register for a maximum of 15 semester credit hours.±
- Maintain satisfactory progress towards graduation.

*The Associate Dean of the student’s school reserves the right to alter this requirement on a case by case basis.

± The Associate Dean of the student’s school reserves the right to alter this requirement on a case by case basis. If a student has registered for more than 15 semester credit hours prior to his or her placement on Academic Probation, the student’s schedule must be reduced to a maximum of 15 hours. The student is required to meet with his or her academic advisor to find an appropriate adjustment to the student’s academic schedule.

If a student on Academic Probation meets the Academic Probation Requirements but fails to achieve a cumulative GPA of 2.0, the student will remain on Academic Probation and must continue to comply with all Academic Probation Requirements.

If at any time, a student’s cumulative GPA meets the 2.0 minimum requirement, the student will regain Academic Good Standing. A student’s cumulative GPA is only affected by UT Dallas coursework. Coursework at another institution cannot be used to return a student to Academic Good Standing.

Academic Warning

A student will be placed on Academic Warning for failure to meet the Academic Probation Requirements. A student on Academic Warning is also required to meet the Academic Probation Requirements as listed below:

Academic Probation Requirements:

- Earn a minimum semester GPA of 2.2.
- May not withdraw or request an incomplete from a class.
- Meet with an academic advisor prior to registration.
- Retake all required Major and University Core Courses failed the previous semester.*
- Register for a maximum of 15 semester credit hours.±
- Maintain satisfactory progress towards graduation.

*The Associate Dean of the student’s school reserves the right to alter this requirement on a case by case basis.
The Associate Dean of the student’s school reserves the right to alter this requirement on a case by case basis. If a student has registered for more than 15 semester credit hours prior to his or her placement on Academic Probation, the student’s schedule must be reduced to a maximum of 15 hours. The student is required to meet with his or her academic advisor to find an appropriate adjustment to the student’s academic schedule.

If a student has registered for more than 15 semester credit hours prior to his or her placement on Academic Probation, the student’s schedule must be reduced to a maximum of 15 hours. The student is required to meet with his or her academic advisor to find an appropriate adjustment to the student’s academic schedule.

Academic Warning should be a wake-up call for students who have not been able to make the adjustments required of students on Academic Probation. If a student is placed on Academic Warning, the student should consider a change of major or a dramatic alteration of their academic, social, and extracurricular circumstances. The student should meet with their advisor and professors and or Associate Dean to determine an academic path to success.

If the student meets the Academic Probation Requirements, the student will return to Academic Probation. If the student again fails to meet the Academic Probation Requirements while on Academic Warning, the student will be suspended.

If at any time, a student’s cumulative GPA meets the 2.0 minimum requirement, the student will regain Academic Good Standing. A student’s cumulative GPA is only affected by UT Dallas coursework. Coursework at another institution cannot be used to return a student to Academic Good Standing.

**Temporary Academic Departure**

Students who leave the University on Academic Probation or Academic Warning may be readmitted with the same status, even if they have attended another institution in the interim. *Performance at another institution will be a factor in the readmission decision.*

**Academic Suspension**

Students are automatically placed on Academic Suspension for failure to meet the Academic Probation Requirements while on Academic Warning.

Students on Academic Suspension may not enroll in, audit, or visit a class unless readmitted as described below. Students who have already pre-registered for classes will automatically be dropped from all classes. Notice of Academic Suspension will show on the student's academic record.

**Length of Academic Suspension**

- A student’s initial Academic Suspension will be for a period of one long semester.
- A student’s Second Academic Suspension will be for a period of one year (12 months).
- Circumstances that would lead a student’s to a third Academic Suspension result in Final Dismissal from UT Dallas without a possible readmission.

**Readmission**
A student placed on Initial One Long Semester Academic Suspension must petition to his or her Associate Dean for readmission. If the student has not declared a major or is a non-degree-seeking student, the student must petition the Dean of Undergraduate Education.

The Dean of Undergraduate Education must approve the readmission of all students placed on Second One Year Academic Suspension.

A student that is readmitted may be subject to additional probationary conditions placed upon them by the Associate Dean or Dean of Undergraduate Education. Such additional probationary conditions may be individual to the student and his or her academic circumstances, but will be designed to encourage the student to reach Academic Good Standing and be eligible for Graduation.

A student who reenters the University after Academic Suspension will reenter on Academic Warning.

**Changing Majors**

_A student may find that his or her interests and skills are better suited to a different academic discipline._ A student may find greater success in a different academic discipline. If a student has been placed on Academic Suspension and wishes to select a different academic discipline, the student must first complete the [Change of Major Form](#) prior to petitioning for readmission. If the Change of Major is approved, the student must petition to the new Associate Dean for readmission.
Travel and Risk-Related Activities

Student Travel Policy for University Organized or Sponsored Events

[formerly B2-170.0-B2-170.5]

Policy Statement

It is the policy of The University of Texas at Dallas to promote safe travel by students to and from events and activities covered by this policy.

Rationale

The Texas Education Code requires each institution of higher education to adopt a policy related to student travel.

Scope

This policy applies to the travel of enrolled undergraduate or graduate students to attend activities or events that are:

- organized and/or sponsored by The University of Texas at Dallas; and
- occur more than twenty-five (25) miles from the University campus.

The types of activities and events covered by this policy include course related field trips, individual Study that requires an overnight stay, Recreational Sports club trips, the activities of sponsored student organizations and other university departments, and meetings of academic organizations where a student is officially representing the University.

The policy does not apply to travel undertaken by students to attend out of town athletic events in which they are not participating, or to engage in student-teaching, local internships, practicums, observations or research, unless the research is organized by a member of the faculty.
Whenever a student travels outside the United States or Puerto Rico to study or to attend activities or events, the travel undertaken must conform to the requirements of the Protocol established by the Office of International Education, http://www.utdallas.edu/oie/protocol.html.

Individual schools and departments should be consulted regarding any specific guidelines established by those units for student travel within twenty–five miles of the University.

Definitions

An organized event is one that is initiated, planned and arranged by a member of the University's faculty or staff, or by the members of a sponsored student organization, and is approved by an appropriate administrator.

A sponsored event or activity is one that the University endorses by supporting it financially, or by sending students to participate in it as official representatives of the University.

An enrolled student is one who has been admitted to and is attending classes at the University.

An appropriate administrator is a Dean, Department Chair, or Director of an administrative unit, or their delegate.

Related Statues, Policies, Requirements or Standards

- UT Dallas,

Procedures

Activities sponsored by an academic unit are under the purview of the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Questions regarding the policies, procedures, or forms should be directed to the Office of the Provost at extension 6742.

Activities sponsored by Student Affairs are under the purview of the Office of the Dean of Students. Questions regarding those activities should be directed to the Dean of Students at extension 6391.

Required provisions for student travel:

Travel Authorization

In order to assure that the events or activities that involve student travel are within the course and scope of the University's mission, and that student safety issues have been addressed, travel undertaken pursuant to this policy must be authorized in advance by an appropriate administrator.
1. To request authorization, members of the faculty, staff or sponsored student organizations who organize activities covered by this policy must submit a completed Student Travel Request Authorization form, along with the required documents and information, to the appropriate administrator for approval. Whenever possible, the request should be submitted at least five (5) working days in advance of travel to the activity or event.

2. Additional forms must be completed at the time that the Student Travel Request Authorization form is prepared. The exact forms will vary according to the nature of the travel, but will always include the Release and Indemnification Agreement. This form and additional forms to be completed will be found at the Senior Vice President for Business Affairs website, http://www.utdallas.edu/businessaffairs/risk/travel.php. As appropriate, information collected will include:

   a. A list of participants including their names, local addresses and phone numbers, and the names and phone numbers of persons to contact in case of an emergency.

   b. The name and phone number for the responsible University employee(s) who will be available to the students at all time during the travel and activity.

   c. Copies of valid operators' licenses for any students who will operate vehicles.

   d. Copies of current medical insurance certificates or both sides of a current group insurance membership card, for each person who wishes to participate in an overnight activity or event. The purchase of a reasonably priced, short-term insurance policy can be arranged by academic and administrative units on behalf of students who do not have, or cannot verify, current medical coverage. Information concerning this coverage is available from United Healthcare at 1-800-237-0903, ext. 6287.

   e. Completed and signed Release and Indemnification Agreements for each participant.

   f. Completed and signed Medical Information and Release forms for each participant.

3. a. When leading group trips, faculty or staff should carry emergency contact information, proof of medical insurance coverage, and the authorization for emergency medical treatment for each participant. Guidelines for emergency procedures in the case of an accident or mechanical breakdown are available at http://www.utdallas.edu/businessaffairs/documents/emergency-guidelines.pdf.

   b. The faculty or staff member in direct charge of a planned travel activity should submit a list of the students who will be travelling at least ten days before travel to the Dean of Students who will notify the faculty or staff member if any of the students has previously engaged in violent or abusive behavior. The faculty or staff member in direct charge of the travel activity may for good reason refuse to allow any student to participate in the activity provided it is not required for completion of a course or program of study.

   c. If an incident of a serious nature occurs during travel and involves inappropriate behavior by a student, the faculty or staff member may immediately end the student’s participation in the
activity by making a reasonable effort to provide the student access to public transportation for an unaccompanied return to the University at the student’s expense.

4. Faculty or administrators responsible for student travel activities or courses that involve frequent field trips can collect the following information from students at the beginning of each semester and keep it on file with the appropriate administrator for use throughout a semester:

- proof of current medical insurance;
- completed and signed medical authorization forms;
- completed and signed release and indemnification agreements (a single release and indemnification agreement may be used if a single description fits all the proposed trips); and
- proof of a valid vehicle operator's license for students who will operate vehicles.

5. One-time approval can be provided for multiple trips led by faculty or staff that involve the same locations and same participants.


Travel by Motor Vehicle

1. Compliance with Laws and Policies

   a. Motor vehicles used for travel covered by this policy shall have a current proof of liability insurance card and a state inspection certification.

   b. Travel undertaken by means of fifteen passenger vans must comply with the requirements of UT System Administration Policy UTS157.

2. Vehicle Operator Requirements

   a. All students who will operate vehicles while engaged in travel covered by this policy must have a valid operator’s license and be trained as required by law to drive the vehicle that will be used.

   b. Operators shall comply with all laws, regulations and posted signs or directions regarding speed and traffic control, and seat belts and other safety restraints.

3. Safety Requirements for Both Operators and Passengers

   a. Alcohol and Illegal Substances. Occupants of motor vehicles shall not possess, consume, or transport any alcoholic beverages or illegal substances.
b. Passenger Capacity. The total number of passengers in any vehicle at any time it is in operation shall not exceed the manufacturer's recommended capacity, or the number specified by University policy, or federal or state law or regulations, whichever is lowest.

4. Travel by Rental Vehicle

Rentals of vehicles to use for travel to activities or events covered by this policy are governed by the following guidelines.

a. Vehicle Reservations

The University is a participant in the State Travel Management Program, which has negotiated favorable vehicle rental rates with a number of car rental companies. While use of one of the University's travel agencies is not required, doing so will help assure that: 1) vehicles are rented pursuant to the State Travel Management plan whenever possible; 2) that vehicle rental agreements are valid; and 3) that necessary insurance coverage has been purchased. Information concerning those agencies is available at [http://www.cpa.state.tx.us/procurement/prog/stmp/](http://www.cpa.state.tx.us/procurement/prog/stmp/).

b. Payment of Costs for Rental Vehicles

1) Vehicle rental charges can be a) billed centrally to Procurement Management; or b) billed directly to those Departments or Divisions that have uniquely numbered accounts with state contract car rental companies. If the rental costs are to be centrally billed, it will be necessary for the driver to obtain a voucher from the University's Travel Management Services prior to picking up the rental vehicle.

2) If necessary, personal credit cards may be used to rent vehicles for travel covered by this policy, and cardholders will be reimbursed for appropriate and approved costs. If rentals are from companies that are not under the state contract, the reimbursement amount will be limited to that which would have been incurred for equivalent state contract rentals.

c. Insurance Coverage

1) Rentals from Companies Participating in State Travel Management Program

Loss/Damage Waiver and Primary Liability insurance coverage are automatically included in the rates charged by companies participating in the State Travel Management Program. That protection does not cover injuries to persons or possessions inside a rental vehicle. Therefore, it is suggested that the personal injury insurance protection and the personal effects insurance protection offered by rental companies be purchased for student travel covered by this policy, particularly if there will be numerous passengers in the vehicle.

2) Rentals from Non-State Contract Rental Companies
If no state contract cars are available and it is necessary to rent vehicles from non-contract companies, then both the Loss/Damage Waiver and Primary Liability Coverage must be purchased unless the rental is charged to a University issued credit card. It is suggested that the personal injury insurance protection and the personal effects insurance protection offered by rental companies be purchased for student travel covered by this policy, particularly if there will be numerous passengers in the vehicle.

5. Travel by Means of a Vehicle Owned or Leased Long-Term by the University

In addition to complying with the general rules set out above, travel by means of a vehicle that is owned or leased long-term (for a period of more than one year) by the University must comply with the following requirements:

a. Proof of Insurance, Inspection, and Safety Devices

Vehicle used for travel activity covered by this policy must:

1) have a current proof of liability insurance card;

2) have a valid state inspection sticker;

3) have all devices or equipment required by federal or state law or regulation; and

4) comply with any other applicable federal or state law or regulation.

b. Service and Maintenance

A University-owned or long-term leased vehicle used for student travel under this policy must be subject to scheduled periodic service and maintenance by qualified persons and comply with the requirements applicable to The University of Texas System Business Procedure Memoranda, now part of the UT System Policy Library.

c. Employee Operators

All operators of vehicles described in this section shall be on the payroll of The University of Texas at Dallas. All operators must have a valid license for the operation of a particular vehicle; and have a current BMDRIV rating on file. Environmental Health and Safety can be contacted for information on how employees may obtain a rating.

6. Travel by Privately Owned Vehicles

The use of personal vehicles by students for travel to events covered by this policy is strongly discouraged.

a. When requesting authorization for travel that involves the use of personally owned vehicles, the requestor, in addition to submitting the information described in Item 2 under Travel
Authorization, shall also submit a copy of a current liability insurance certificate for any vehicle to be used for the proposed travel.

b. The persons responsible for the proposed activity and travel shall inform students who will drive their privately owned vehicles that their personal liability insurance policy will be looked to first to cover any liability that may result from the use of the vehicle for the proposed travel.

7. Volunteer Drivers and Passengers

Non-student/non-employee drivers and passengers who accompany students on travel covered by this policy must sign the Release and Indemnification and the Medical Information and Release forms prior to the trip. Forms can be downloaded at the website http://www.utdallas.edu/businessaffairs/risk/travel.php5.
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## GENERAL POLICY

Generally, unclassified research positions should be held to a minimum; however, individuals holding the titles of Research Scientist or Research Associate will be considered as Administrative/Professional. The following provisions to the Regents' Rules and Regulations will further define this policy which is intended to achieve consistency in the use of academic titles and acquisition of tenure at UTD.

Normal appointment procedures should be followed when requesting new Research appointments or extension of existing Research appointments.
RESEARCH SCIENTIST (UNCL.)

A person may be appointed to the position of Research Scientist (Uncl.) only after the approval of the President upon the recommendation of the appropriate administrative head and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. Normally, these approvals will be processed through the routine appointment and budget procedures. A person appointed to this position will be eligible to participate in the Optional Retirement Program provided all other eligibility criteria are met.

The Research Scientist (Uncl.) category is designed to serve two (2) purposes:

1. A person reserved for individuals not seeking or being considered for appointment as a faculty member (though he/she would generally be considered qualified for a faculty appointment) and is able to receive full funding for research activities from outside sources may be appointed as a Research Scientist (Uncl.). Such a person would devote full time to research activities, would not be a member of the faculty, and as such, would not be in the tenure channel. Expectancy of continued employment is based solely upon the continued availability of outside funding.

2. It may be used as a "joint appointment" category for those individuals who are already on the faculty (Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors only) and who can also obtain funding from research grants or contracts for all or part of their salary. For example, a person may have a half-time appointment as an Associate Professor to teach physics and a half-time appointment as a Research Scientist (Uncl.) to conduct research under a federal grant. The individual's time would be evenly split between these two functions. This person, then, is a member of the faculty and, as such, may be in the tenure channel, but he/she is not a faculty member or in the tenure channel by virtue of the Research Scientist position.
RESEARCH ASSOCIATE (UNCL.)

The purpose of this position is to provide a career plan for qualified individuals leading to the possibility of a faculty appointment after post-doctoral work. Appointment to Research Associate (Uncl.) may be granted by the President, or his designee, only upon the recommendation of the appropriate dean or Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

A person receiving this appointment is neither a faculty member nor in the tenure channel during the time the appointment is held.

Two (2) consecutive one (1) year appointments may be received, based upon funds availability and satisfactory performance, but in no case may the span of appointments exceed a total of four (4) years.

PROCEDURE FOR APPOINTMENTS

The procedure for initial appointment as a Research Associate (Uncl.) is as follows:

1. A Search Plan, including the approval of the appropriate dean must be submitted to the appropriate dean and approved by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. (Questions regarding the Search Plan format should be directed to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office.)

2. The vacancy must be advertised in at least one national and one local publication. Diverse vacancies may be publicized in the same advertisement.

3. The Principal Investigator should prepare an academic file on the candidate to include:
   Biographical data (Curriculum Vitae),
   Letters of recommendations, and
   Reprints of the candidate's publications (if available).

4. At the conclusion of the search, and before an offer can be made to the candidate, the Principal Investigator must prepare a summary of the search and submit it, along with all the applicant files attached, and a completed Request For Appointment Form to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs for his approval.

5. If the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs approves the appointment, the Principal Investigator will prepare an offer letter for signature by both the Principal Investigator and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.
PROCEDURE FOR EXTENSION OF APPOINTMENT

To extend the appointment of a Research Associate (Uncl.), the following steps should be observed:

1. Six (6) months prior to the conclusion of the second year of a Research Associate (Uncl.) appointment, the dean should send a request for approval of the extension to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2. If the extension and the concurrences of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Senior Vice President for Business Affairs are received, the file will be presented to the President, or his designee, for approval.

3. The dean will notify the employee, in writing, that the appointment extension has been approved and will provide copies of this notification to the President, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Human Resources Office.

RECLASSIFICATION

If a Research Associate (Uncl.) does not receive a faculty appointment at UTD at the end of an extended appointment, he/she will be reclassified or terminated.
Commencement Committee - 83-I.2-44

Charge

Commencement Committee

Policy Statement

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, Associate 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.
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