ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
February 20, 2002


ABSENT: Alex Argyros, Michael Baron, Duane Buhrmester, Metin Cakanyildirim, Cy Cantrell, Lawrence Caulier, Homer Montgomery, Ram Rao

VISITORS: Priscilla Beadle, Michael Coleman, Karen Jarrell, Jean Stuart, Larry Terry, Paul Tran

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Dr. Jenifer called the meeting to order. Dr. Leaf asked to add an item to the agenda on intercollegiate travel. This item should be added as item #5 and move the item on academic dishonesty to item #7. This change was approved.

UTD is considering increasing fees. There will be a meeting next week with student representatives regarding this increase. There will also be an open meeting for all students to express their opinions about this fee increase in the next several weeks. The students are feeling that if that have to pay more for fees, they want to see smaller class sizes and the faculty/student ratio decreased.

A question was presented to Dr. Jenifer about the Office of Research Administration and Sponsored Projects needing a better financial system. Their system is antiquated and needs to be updated.

Dr. Jenifer explained that we are now in the budget cycle so there may be some tough choices to be made. However, the issue of the financial system will be investigated.

President Jenifer reported that new buildings will bring an additional 350,000 feet of new space in the next two years. The new Engineering and Computer Science building will be opened in June. Final approval was received from the Regents for the new Management Building. We are
still $4M short for the School of Management Building. Ground breaking will take place in early summer.

The new Student Union addition is now open. Final plans are being worked on for Callier II, which will be located on the main campus. The temporary building by Berkner is to be removed in a year and the temporary buildings by Hoblitzelle will be removed in two years.

Dr. Jenifer was asked about the new building for NS&M. He reported that approximately 34 million dollars had been allocated by the State and by System. The exact plans for how this money was to be used had not yet been decided.

Dr. Jenifer reported that the Regents and the Governor have been very supportive of UTD. There is encouraging talk that UTD will be the 3rd University in the top tier. Also, the Task Force on Enrollment is moving quite fast and it is moving as quickly as possible to come up with a plan. The Regents are also talking about establishing a commission to study UTD.

Dr. Jenifer also announced that a search is being started to replace Dean Osborne in the School of Engineering and Computer Science. A consultant has been appointed to work with the Search Committee; hopefully a replacement will be in place by this fall. Dr. Jenifer thanked Dean Osborne for the fine job he has done.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of January 23, 2002 as distributed. The motion was seconded and passed.

3. SPEAKER’S REPORT

A The question of salary compression raised at the previous Council meeting has been referred to the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct. When our committees were formed, in 1978, we considered whether to have a committee on Privilege and Tenure, which many universities have and which would normally consider such an issue. We agreed that we were too small to justify it, and that we would fold what would be the normal function of such a committee into Faculty Standing and Conduct. The chair of that Committee has agreed to consider the question. Dr. Yasbin has referred his material and considerations to them, including the possible relationship between the problem of compression and the problem of minority retention.
B. I have had a request from Janok Bhattacharya for senate action to provide more support for faculty who need visas to come to the US. The request had two parts. One was to provide a way to advise the office of Human Resources on how to word communications with the INS and other concerned agencies in ways that fulfill the details of the requirements of the law, the other was a request to support the applications financially. This was discussed in the Academic Council and the Provost indicated that the University will not undertake financial support for applications as a matter of policy. I will look into the present situation with Human Resources and see if there are some improvements that might be made and, if so, what Senate action this might require.

C. A second question that came to the Academic Council from the faculty concerned the policy on processing applications for research grant applications from Senior Lecturers. Evidently, Senior Lecturers have been told by ORASP that they must have a “sponsor” who is tenured faculty before such applications will be processed. This was discussed in Council and the Provost stated the policy as being that Senior Lecturers have to go through the same application process as everyone else – no more signatures, but no less. This means that if they are in a department, they need the signatures of their department chair, dean, and other usual university officers. Otherwise, they need the signatures of their dean and other usual university officers. The principle is that the grant comes to the university, not the individual, so the designated university officials must make the commitment to it. I conveyed this to the Senior Lecturers. A few days later, however, I was advised of an additional application by a Senior Lecturer who was told the same thing – I believe it was that a tenured faculty member had to be a Sponsor. I called ORASP. Dr. Feng subsequently called me to indicate that everyone was now in agreement on the policy as the Provost had described it in Council.

D. A further issue concerns whether it is or is not the policy, and whether it should be the policy, for Career Services to maintain portfolios for PhD graduates. Professor Nelsen referred this item to the Senate. Council instructed me to talk to the Vice President for Student Affairs about it and report back. I will do so.

E. The Senate Subcommittee on Academic Integrity has finished its discussions of the questions referred to it by the Senate and submitted its report to the Academic Council. Since the recommendations have both legal and financial implications, the Council has referred it to the Provost, who will provide a response for the next Council meeting.

F. The 3+3+3 committee on procedures for hiring administrators has had one meeting and will have at least one more. We should have a document to consider at the next Senate meeting.
G. The Spring meeting of the TCFS will be March 1 and 2. Robert Nelsen and I will attend for UTD. The meeting of the FAC will be March 7 and 8. Robert Nelsen, James Bartlett, and I will attend.

H. March 1 is also the date when applications are due to be a Coordinating Board Fellow. This is basically one-week summer internship with the Board with the possibility of a second week working on a specific project. It provides a chance to learn about their operation and to provide faculty input to them in a series of meetings they hold with administrators from around the state each year at that time. I advised the Academic Council of the date, indicated my intent to apply and asked for advice on whom else to solicit—the Senate or the entire Faculty. The Council agreed that we should notify the entire faculty. Since then, however, I have checked with the CB, and it turns out that the number of fellows will be limited to 20 from the entire state. Since the CB liaison person I spoke to indicated that Priscilla Beadle was her contact on campus, I have spoken to Priscilla about it and we have agreed that if there is another nomination it should come from the administration.

I. The question of honors has been allowed to lapse. Dr. Coleman has recently provided the Senate with information on the effects of the new grading scale on GPA, which is that the current GPA is within the range of GPA’s in previous semesters using the previous scale. This is relevant to the questions that were raised. Professor Leaf will try to see where we are in considering the question and move it forward.

J. Senate elections. As of the close of nominations on Friday we had 21 nominating petitions. Under the rules, we should declare those nominated by Friday to be elected. The election committee, accordingly, has done so. At the same time, since it has been the practice in the past to hold nominations open under such circumstances in order to encourage additional petitions, Professor Yasbin sent an email notification to that effect on Friday. As of today, we have received two additional petitions. If we do not get a total of more than thirty by this coming Friday, the way to handle this situation seems to be to declare the additional nominees elected as well. If we do get more than a total of nine additional nominations, we will be in a situation our present rules do not actually cover. I therefore suggest that we allow some time at the caucus to follow this meeting to decide what our procedure should be.

4. PATENT POLICY

Dr. Larry Overzet presented a report that the committee he chaired submitted which would see 50% of patent proceeds go to the Creator, 25% to the creator’s lab and 25% to UTD. This
proposal is based on U. T. Southwestern Medical School's policy. A motion was made and seconded to approve this proposal. The motion passed unanimously.

5. INTERCOLLEGIATE ACTIVITIES TRAVEL

Dr. Coleman presented the question with Dr. Beron, who is the intercollegiate competition coordinator, the problem that some students have in being penalized by some faculty for missing class when they have to be away from campus on University sponsored events. We currently have 204 students participating in athletics and academic sanctioned events.

A motion was made and seconded that the sense of the faculty is that faculty should make accommodations for students who represent UTD in sanctioned intercollegiate competitions when competing forces them to miss class. They are not asking to be excused, just that faculty try to accommodate their schedule and make other arrangements. The procedure for verifying to faculty a student's official team status by the Office of Undergraduate Education was discussed. This motion passed.

6. ACADEMIC CALENDARS

Jean Stuart presented a revised Academic Calendar. The Committee on Educational Policy has approved this calendar. There was discussion about the classes starting a week earlier in the Fall so that the commencement would be more than a few days before the Christmas holiday. Discussion also evolved around the number of classes on Mondays being different than classes on other days of the week.

A motion was made and seconded to send this calendar back to the CEP. The motion failed.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the calendar as presented. The motion passed by a vote of 12 to 7.

7. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

The Senate considered revised wording for Section 49.06 of the U.T. Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures, tabled from the previous Senate meeting pending incorporation of discussion and suggestions from the floor at that time. A motion was made and seconded that the revised wording be approved. The motion passed.
8. REVISION OF TITLE III – ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, CHAPTER 21
   FACULTY GOVERNANCE – AGENDA COMMITTEE

   The revision changes the makeup of the Agenda Committee to the President and/or his
designee, the Speaker and the Secretary. The original wording made the agenda committee the
President or the Provost. A motion was made and seconded and the motion passed.

9. ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOLS

This had been tabled from the previous meeting, at which the Senate had asked the Speaker to
explain why the proposal was being offered. In response, the Speaker had circulated a discussion
of the difficulties with various governance and other bodies that the proposal was meant to
rectify. The Speaker asked if the Senate were willing to consider it further at this time. There
was discussion of the need for a graduate council and for strengthening the Master’s Council,
but no clear consensus appears to have yet developed.

A motion was made and seconded to table this item indefinitely. The motion failed.

A motion was then made and seconded to refer this item back to the Academic Council. The
motion passed. The Speaker was asked to separate the Graduate and Undergraduate plans in the
next version. In the meantime, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and several Master’s in the
Senate agreed with the Speaker that he would attend the next meeting of the Masters’ Council to
discuss the issues from their perspective.

10. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT LEAVE POLICY

The Speaker introduced the recommended changes in the Faculty Development Leave Policy.
Changes include the reviews being done by the Personnel Review Committee’s in each school to
make recommendations to the Provost.

The Provost expressed the view that the university-level faculty selection committee included in
the recommended changes would only add another layer of bureaucracy and would slow the
procedures. There was also some discussion about the reasoning behind changing the
“assignment” of the original draft to “leave” in the present draft. In the Speaker, this brought out
policy more clearly under the mandate of the Legislature, and is the wording used by most
schools around the state. Several speakers expressed an interest is seeing policies from other
institutions.
A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed faculty development leave policy. The motion failed.

11. CAUCUS OF SENATE TO REPLACE COUNCIL MEMBER

The Academic Senate members met in a caucus to consider how to fill the Academic Council vacancy left by the resignation from the Council of Professor Brandwein. Dr. Richard Scotch was elected to complete the term which will expire in May.

The Senate in Caucus also considered the problem of nominating petitions for the 2002-2003 Senate received after extended final nominating date. The background is that that as of the announced deadline for nominations, only 21 nominating petitions had been received. Following previous practice, the Secretary had, accordingly, emailed the faculty that nominations would be held open for a further week. Under the rules, however, all those nominated by the initial cutoff, if they did not total more than the available seats, were to be declared elected. Hence the question was how to treat the nominating petitions received after the initial deadline. At this point, our rules are silent. It was agreed that if the total received by the end of the extended period were still less than the number of seats to be filled, they would be declared elected. If the number exceeded the number of remaining seats (in this case, nine), an election would held for those seats only.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The business was concluded and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sandra K. Goertzen
Academic Governance Secretary