ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
July 17, 2002


ABSENT: Sheila Amin Gutierrez-Pineros, Poras Balsara, Janok Bhattacharya, Gail Breen, Duane Buhrmeister, Jay Dowling, John Ferguson, Larry Overzet, William Pervin, Srinivasan Raghunathan

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Dr. Wildenthal called the meeting to order in Dr. Jenifer's absence and answered the following questions.

"Will our campus be affected with the ruling of the Attorney General regarding the request for a new fee by U. T. Austin?" Dr. Wildenthal said it would not affect UTD or any of the other campuses.

"Are we on target for the enrollment projections for fall?" Dr. Wildenthal stated that due to some obscure legislative language, some students that were paying non-resident tuition will now be able to pay resident tuition which will decrease our income. The rate we are going, we will be 1 - 2% below our 7% projection. However, it may be that we will have more students enroll due to the job cut-backs in the area and decisions made to use this time to go back to school.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of June 19, 2002 as amended. The motion carried.
3. **SPEAKER’S REPORT**

**A. Graduate Council.** The charge for a Graduate Council has now been drafted. The basic idea is that it will have overall responsibility for coordinating the graduate programs of the university, developing graduate education policy and authorizing deanal action in pursuit of that policy. The basic principle of membership is that it will composed of the heads of the main units of graduate administration on an *ex officio* basis plus a body of faculty representatives of those units elected on a proportional basis. The elected faculty will be in the majority. The Dean of Graduate Studies will convene and chair the meetings. Administration will remain consolidated in the office of the Graduate Dean. The Council will in effect serve as the Graduate Dean’s executive committee.

The next step is to arrange for discussion with the Deans and the Associate Deans for Graduate Study in the several schools. Accordingly, Dean Cunningham suggested we ask that the draft be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of Deans and Directors. I have forwarded it to the Provost with this request. Although the Deans and Directors meeting is not an ideal forum for an extended discussion, this will allow us to introduce the issue and arrange a time for a more extended and focused meeting of the Deans together with the Associate Deans for Graduate instruction soon thereafter.

**B. Policy on the Hiring of Administrators.** This has still not been completed. I had been troubled by the fact that the committee did not seem able to reach a real consensus and each new meeting or email exchange raised new questions for which there seemed to be no principled answer. In trying to understand why this was happening, I have come to believe that basic approach was misconceived. This was to specify in advance for each type of hire how many people would be on the committee, and then to specify how many would be faculty and students and how each would be appointed—basically, by different units on campus: so many from the administration, so many from the senate, so many from student government, and so on. This not the way our committees are now appointed and by and large the present system seems to be more responsive to the requirements of particular searches while also being sensitive to concerns for representation on campus. Accordingly, I am going to take this back to the committee for a more basic consideration of the strategy we should be following, to develop a new approach based on clearer principles that will command firmer and wider assent.
C. Institutional Review Board. In approving the proposed changes to the charge of the Institutional Review Board, the Senate had charged me with ascertaining whether the board itself had seen and approved the draft. It turns out that while some of the changes had reflected suggestions that the Chair had made to the VP for Research and the Provost, the committee had not seen the draft and the draft needed some further changes. The most important point, according to Dr. Nezworski, is that the head of the office of sponsored projects cannot be a voting member of the review board. This had been permitted at the time the charge was originally drafted, but since then the federal guidelines have changed and it is now considered a conflict of interest. There may also be some other issues. The office of Academic Governance has sent the text to the members of the Board and I am awaiting more responses. The charge will have to come back through the Council and go back to the Senate.

D. Academic Dishonesty. Since our new policy is now in place in the Handbook of Operating Procedures, the Dean of Students has issued new forms and adjusted the concerned sections of the university website. As she is doing this, I have asked her also to put together what she thinks should be in the projected faculty manual—some sort of small set of guidelines that we can distribute to faculty along the lines discussed in the Senate and the Senate subcommittee on maintaining academic integrity. When she has it assembled she will forward it to the subcommittee for additions and amendments. Clearly it has to be her office, and not subcommittee, that will have continuing responsibility for producing and distributing the manual, in whatever form it takes, on some sort of regular schedule.

The Academic Council has asked that the Deans be briefed on what is being done in regard to maintaining academic integrity at the next Deans and Directors meeting, and in some regular way thereafter. This will be done.

E. Budget Advisory Involvement. At the last Council meeting we again discussed the possibility of improving communication between the administration and faculty on the budget process, reviewing several models from other universities—some in Texas, others elsewhere. We have agreed to explore it further. We will set up a Senate subcommittee to this end on roughly the same model as that which we set up to deal with maintaining academic integrity. In general, the sense of the Council was that as faculty we do not want to be concerned with all the details of the entire university budget, but rather want to be able to identify those areas which we consider to be particularly important to the academic and research activities on campus and be able to advise the administration in a timely manner
on appropriate priorities in those areas. This would probably include salary policy, but the full list and how it would be handled is what the committee will have to try to work out.

F. Provost's report on evaluation of Deans and Academic Program Review. As agreed in the June Council meeting, the Provost will report the results of the evaluation of deans and the academic program reviews for 2001-2002 in the September Senate meeting.

G. Approval of Candidates for graduation at the end of the Summer term. Since the regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate in August will be after the date of the August Commencement, the Council decided that the list of candidates for graduation will be circulated to the Senate for approval by email.

H. Other items that have been under consideration are reflected in the agenda.

4. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES' RECOMMENDATIONS

Dr. Leaf presented the Committee on Committees' recommendations for the various Senate and University-wide committees for 2002-2003. The Provost has agreed to not review the Committee on Committee's recommendations for the Senate committees prior to the Senate's review of the recommendations. A few typographical corrections were suggested. One change was requested and that was to replace Simon Fass on the University Safety Council with Lloyd Dumas, since Dr. Fass is on SFDA this next year. A motion was made and seconded to approve the recommendations. The motion passed.

5. POLICY MEMORANDUM 79-I.2-27 CHARGE: BIOSAFETY COMMITTEE

Dr. Leaf presented the changes to this charge which is basically expanding the charge to cover all areas related to biosafety and not just recombinant DNA. After discussion, a motion was made and seconded to approve this charge. The motion passed.

6. POLICY MEMORANDUM 75-III.22-3 GENERAL STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES: FACULTY PROMOTION, REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE

Dr. Leaf presented the proposed changes to the charge that were recommended by the Committee on Qualifications, with two types of exceptions. The most important
substantive exception concerns the CQ’s request to include the raw data for teaching evaluations. The amended policy asks only for summaries. The reason is that the raw data are not actually available at UTD, but are kept at the University of Washington. Other exceptions were changes in wording due to changes in State laws. A motion was made and seconded to approve the revised charge. The motion passed.

7. POLICY MEMORANDUM 94-III.21-60 POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

Dr. Leaf presented the changes proposed for this charge. This originated with Dr. Beadle, as a consequence of reviewing the issues raised by the previous item. A motion was made and seconded to modify the following:

Section on Procedures, 3.2, by adding “non-faculty staff or students” instead of “school staff or by teaching assistants” in the third line.

Section on Procedures, 4, to change “designate” to “assure that” in #4, and add “shall be allocated” before “for the administration.”

Item 6 under Procedures. Delete the first sentence and add “by the school dean” in the second sentence after “to be kept.”

The motion was approved.

8. HANDBOOK OF OPERATING PROCEDURES: CHAPTER 21, TITLE III, SECTION V, SCHOOL AND DISCIPLINARY LEGISLATIVE BODIES

Dr. Leaf represented the proposed change to this Handbook item which includes a requirement for bylaws for each school or department. A motion was made and seconded to approve these changes. The motion was approved.

In discussions in Council, the consensus had emerged that these changes will make it advisable to establish a university model that such school and department bylaws can follow. The Senate concurred. A motion was made and seconded to establish a Senate subcommittee made of a member of each school to review the currently available bylaws and make recommendations concerning such a model. The motion was approved.
Recommendations for membership of the subcommittee were solicited and the following were chosen: Engineering - Ivor Page; Natural Sciences and Mathematics – Gail Breen; Social Sciences – Jennifer Holmes; Human Development – Tres Thompson; Management – B.P.S. Murthi; General Studies – Liz Salter; Arts and Humanities – Tim Redman.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

Dr. Salter raised the question of policies for appointment and review of Senior Lecturers. A committee for senior lecturers that was appointed several years ago did not complete their work before the committee was dissolved. The Senate recommended that the Senior Lecturers establish a new committee work to provide their recommendations, which to be referred to the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct and then brought back to the Senate. Dr. Salter agreed to raise this with the Senior Lecturers. A motion was made and seconded to ask the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct to review the Senior Lecturers’ proposal when it is completed. The motion passed.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The business was concluded and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sandra K. Goertzen
Academic Governance Secretary