ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
March 20, 2002

PRESENT: Michael Baron, Kurt Beron, Janok Bhattacharya, Duane Buhrmester, John Burr, Metin Cakanyildirim, Cyrus Cantrell, Lawrence Cauller, T. Constantinescu, Rockford Draper, Cassandra Fesem, Edward Harpham, Robert Kieschnick, Murray Leaf, Homer Montgomery, Simeon Ntafos, Ivor Page, William Pervin, Liz Salter, Hobson Wildenthal, Ron Yasbin

ABSENT: Alex Argyros, George Barnes, John Ferguson, Robert Glosser, Paul Jargowsky, Franklyn Jenifer, Adrienne McLean, Larry Overzet, Ram Rao, Patrick Ryan

VISITORS: Priscilla Beadle, Mike Coleman, Austin Cunningham, John Ferraris, Vijay Mookerjee, Larry Terry, Paul Tran

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Dr. Murray Leaf called the meeting to order in the absence of President Jenifer and Executive Vice President Wildenthal. Upon his arrival, Provost Wildenthal gave the following announcements.

The Management Building has been started. Final plans are not completed because total funding has not been received, so we may have a shell for a portion of the space until it can be completed.

The Senate needs to nominate a faculty member to serve on the Search Committee for the Dean in Engineering and Computer Science.

FY 03 budget is being finalized. The Comptroller has not yet certified that the funds are available for the across the board 3% increase. There will be a legislative budget hearing on the 27th.

A Committee has been appointed by U. T. System to review UTD and former President Bryce Jordan will be chairing that committee. Several other prominent individuals will also be on that committee. Dr. Redlinger will be working with Dr. Jordan on data for UTD. We hope the outcome will show the Regents that UTD has a greater than average
role to play in higher education should receive funding at the same level as U. T. Austin and Texas A&M, that Texas needs at least one more tier one institution, and U. T. Dallas should be that one.

Dr. Yasbin asked the following questions on behalf of the faculty:

i. Can the report of the ad hoc Committee on the potential restructuring of the University be distributed to the faculty? Dr. Wildenthal agreed to have it posted on the web.

ii. What about the revised royalty distribution policy? Dr. Wildenthal stated that this topic had not yet made it to the President’s Cabinet because of the budget process now and earlier because of innovation agreements between the University and other agencies. The Office of General Counsel had rejected a contract between Alcatel and UTD. After further discussion, OGC has finally approved this contract but with displeasure. This has been occupying significant amounts of time by the Administration.

iii. The McDermott Scholars Program has created a lot of confusion and interest. Can a review of the Program be given to members of the Senate and other interested faculty? Dr. Wildenthal suggested that we do that in a future meeting of the Senate.

iv. What is the status of the Summer budget? Dr. Wildenthal reported that last summer $3.4 million was approved. The President has approved $3.7 million. This is a 10% increase over last year’s allocation which is appropriate because of our growth. The actual amount that was submitted by the Deans was approximately $5 million.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of February 20, 2002 as distributed. The motion carried.

3. SPEAKER’S REPORT

A) Texas Council of Faculty Senators Issues. The meeting had three outside speakers, brief internal reports from each campus, and a general business meeting. I will describe them in order.
1) The first speaker was Sam Gwynne, Executive Editor of Texas Monthly and author of “How Good is Your Kid’s School” in the November issue. The article describes the results of a reanalysis of the TAAS results over the past three years by a private consulting firm called Just For The Kids. In this, the schools are broken out by socio-economic ranking of their districts and some effort is made to look at how well students do in each school instead of only how many students get the minimum required score. The article is available at: http://www.texasmonthly.com/mag/issues/2001-11-01/feature.php. The rub of the results is “it is not the kids, it’s the schools.” The ranges of performance between most and least advantaged districts are not the same, but they overlap. The best schools in the poorest districts outperform many schools in the most advantaged districts. Principals and practices are what seem to matter most. Good principals organize the work so as to encourage good teachers and good teaching. The result is an interest at the State level, mainly in the business community, in compiling something like a data base on “best practices” and promoting their spread through some kind of mentoring or training programs.

2) The second speaker was Teri Flack, Deputy Commissioner of the Coordinating Board, speaking on Closing the Gaps. She distributed a brochure and a small card with an extremely small summary of the basic elements of the plan (which is very elementary to begin with), and described what they hoped to accomplish and why. The response was a little bit of grilling and lot of browbeating. The focus of the grilling was the lack in the plan statements of any mention of cost. Ms. Flack’s response was that the cost would be about 23 billion dollars, and when the CB saw this they thought it would be better to get engagement on the goals as a first step rather than present the bill. The browbeating had two main themes. The first was to explain at length all the things money was needed for. The second was to detail the effects that the demand for increased recruitment and retention, particularly of ill-prepared students, was likely to have on educational quality. The CB has stated its position as being that the expansion will come while maintaining quality (at least, one would hope). I am sure this is a sincere commitment; nothing else would make sense. I think they have not given enough thought to how to do this. But nothing that was said to Ms. Flack was calculated to offer any help. The program is going to dominate Texas education for the next several years; the needs it reflects will be prominent well into this century. We need to think about our academic organization and policies in its light.
3) The third speaker was Catherine Parsonault, who coordinates the Coordinate Board Fellows program, which she described. What is most important to note here is that she underlined the same point Teri Flack had tried to emphasize regarding the Board’s changed role and attitude. In plain words, they no longer see themselves as mandated to limit growth, but rather see themselves as seeking ways to promote it. I have been selected as one of the CB fellows from the TCFS for this year, and urge President Jennifer to seek to send an administrator as well.

4) Issues from around the state mainly revolve around governance and administration. Responses to HB 1641 loomed fairly large, although no one has a solution except “holistic” evaluation, which is good in principle but not particularly workable for medical and law schools.

5) The TCFS is about to rewrite its constitution. I have suggested that in view of the increased prominence and effectiveness of the Faculty Advisory Council in the U.T. System, the constitution be specifically worded to establish a relation to it, and that at the same time, the TCFS supplement its present system of regional councils to assure that they also represent the several university systems. I suspect they will do so.

B. Faculty Advisory Council. The Faculty Advisory Council for the U.T. System met in Austin the following week. Again the agenda was partly composed of hearing state-level speakers, partly of reports from the campuses, and partly by considerations of issues by the FAC’s four operating committees: Academic Affairs, Health Affairs, Governance, and Faculty Quality.

I will report on the results in some detail when the minutes are circulated. In the meantime, two items that seem to be particularly worth noting now came out of the Faculty Quality and Academic Affairs Committees. For the former, there is growing concern with the kind of salary compression issues we have recently raised here, and in response there is a growing interest is drawing up explicit campus-wide and possibly even system wide salary policies or review systems. For the latter, the Committee offered a resolution to the effect that efforts at implementing assessment programs in new subject areas be held up until we can see whether the two programs already begun, in Rhetoric and Mathematics, actually yield interpretable results and lead to improvements over and above the other assessment mechanisms already in place. This was passed unanimously by the FAC as a body, and deemed “very reasonable” by Ed Sharpe, the Regental representative.
C. Calendar issues. After the last meeting of the Senate, in which the Senate approved a proposed new academic calendar, senators and others began to have second thoughts as the details began to be understood. These particularly concerned the very short periods between the end of the Spring terms and the beginning of Summer, and the end of Summer terms and the beginnings of Fall, consequent upon moving the beginning of the Fall term into the middle of August. Accordingly, I spoke with President Jennifer and we agreed that I would poll the faculty while the administration would consider delaying implementation for a year pending reconsideration by a committee especially constituted for the purpose. Of the forty-two responses I received from the faculty, those opposed to implementing the calendar as approved outnumbered those in favor of implementation by about two to one. In the meantime, John Wiorkowski and Michael Coleman got together and worked out an alternative calendar that accommodated the student requests for fall commencement a week earlier, so as not to so severely crowd the Christmas holidays, while preserving substantially the same periods before and after the Summer term as in the present calendar, and which also assured that there were the same numbers of Mondays as other days in each term. This was brought to the last Council meeting, and the Council agreed that it was far better and should be used. The Council also agreed that because of the urgency of promptness and also because it was substantially an administrative matter rather than a governance matter, it would not be necessary to bring it back to the Senate. This calendar has now been distributed to the Deans by the Provost, and you should all have received it. The calendar previously approved by the Senate is, therefore, without effect.

Faculty that I have discussed the matter with have been uniformly in favor of re-establishing the calendar committee on a permanent basis. We should discuss with the administration whether this should be done as a Senate or University committee, but the latter seems more logical.

D. Elections. Subsequent to the Caucus after the last Senate meeting and up to the extended deadline, the Governance office received a total of 29 nominating petitions. Since there were thirty positions to be filled, all those nominated were declared elected and it will not be necessary to circulate a ballot. We also have had one nomination after the extended deadline. I have asked the Secretary to accept it and any others, and date them. We have no rules to cover it at this time, but the new Senate will have the power to elect additional members to fill vacancies.

E. Status of policy on hiring administrators. The committee met once. I messsed up in calling a second meeting and we have continued discussions by email, which have
raised some questions about the reasoning behind the U.T. Austin policies that served as the original model, namely what have been the consequences of having students take part in the voting, and why there are no administrators on the committees. I have asked the Chair of the Austin Senate, and he does not know what the reasoning was in either case, but says that there have been no consequences that have been untoward. I expect to have a draft by the next Senate meeting.

F. Status of revisions to Section 49.06 of the Handbook of Operating Procedures. Subsequent to the Senate’s approval of the revisions to this section at the last meeting I have referred this to Dean Rachavong for review, pursuant to some concerns of Dr. Beadle regarding our inclusion of the statement that the actions would be on the student’s “record,” since what is and is not on the student’s official transcript is now heavily shaped by legislation and we did not want to create an appearance of offering an exception to required practices. Dr. Rachavong had the same reaction, and we have agreed to leave out the phrase. It is understood that what the dean does is recorded, and that is sufficient to meet the faculty’s concern. With that deletion, the legislation as approved will now be forward to the President for review by the Office of General Counsel.

4. CHEMISTRY DOCTORATE RENAMING TO PH.D.

Dr. John Ferraris presented the proposal to change the DCHEM degree to a Ph.D. in Chemistry to more accurately reflect what the program is. A motion was made and seconded to approve this proposal (with minor wording changes suggested by Dr. Cantrell). The motion passed.

5. MS IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT

Dr. Mookerjee presented the School of Management’s proposal for this degree which has been a concentration and is now being formalized into a full degree. There is no change in courses required and no policy change. A motion was made and seconded to approve this proposal. The motion passed.
6. UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG

Dr. Michael Coleman presented the change in the Undergraduate Catalog. The first 40 pages, which are now approximately 80 pages, have several substantive changes. The recommended changes are attached to these minutes.

A motion was made and seconded that students be required to request a change in a grade within one long semester. The motion passed.

A motion was made and seconded that students be required to complete an incomplete by eight weeks from the first day of the subsequent long semester. The motion passed.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Undergraduate Catalog as presented. The motion passed.

7. GRADUATE CATALOG

Dr. Austin Cunningham presented the proposed changes to the Graduate Catalog. These recommended changes are attached to these minutes. He also thanked CEP and all the committees who worked hard to make the catalog process a little easier.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Graduate Catalog as presented. The motion passed.

8. RESEARCH INTEGRITY COMMITTEE CHARGE

The charge has been revised to clarify that faculty members do not have to make judgments in specific cases but will only establish the policies by which such bodies will be constituted and operate.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revised charge. The motion passed.
9. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON MAINTAINING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The sub committee report was presented to the Senate at the February meeting and the Provost reported that the President and his cabinet have already considered this issue regarding financial issues in the next year and have agreed to provide the personnel and the costs related to this issue. Dr. Cantrell agreed to circulate the report to the Senate via e-mail. At the next Academic Council meeting there will be further discussion about this.

10. STUDENT PROPOSAL FOR HONOR CODE

Paul Tran presented this proposal for an honor code for the students to remind students not to cheat. This code would read “On my honor, I have neither given nor received any aid on this ...(exam, paper, project, assignment),” and this code could be written by the student on the document being turned in. Student Government is proposing that the resolution be approved by the Senate. Some concern was voiced about what to do if the student would not put the statement on the document. One suggestion is that the faculty should have this requirement on the syllabus for this class. A manual is needed to help the faculty deal with these issues.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the student’s report and refer it to the Subcommittee on Academic Integrity to find appropriate methods for implementation.

The motion passed.

11. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT LEAVE POLICY

Dr. Leaf presented the revised faculty development leave policy for review by the Senate. This clarifies that the school personnel review committee recommendations go to the Provost. A motion was made and seconded to approve these revisions. The motion passed.
12. ADJOURNMENT

The business was concluded and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sandra K. Goertzen
Academic Governance Secretary
Changes to 2002-2004 Undergraduate Catalog

“First Forty”
1. Transfer Admissions—previously approved by Academic Senate
   Clarifies timing and responsibility for evaluation of transfer credit.
2. Credit by Examination
   Change in procedure for awarding credit for AP/IB/CLEP/SATII exams implemented for Fall 2001. Due to timely graduation rebate, students now petition to have credit by examination awarded.
3. TASP—resulting from legislation passed May 2001
   Expanded the exemptions to include military personnel and high school students who have met specific GPA and curricular requirements.
4. Grades
   Allows students one semester to contest grades.
5. Incomplete Grade
   Changes the time limit for completing an incomplete to eight weeks, which brings this policy inline with the policy for graduate courses. The policy now states “An incomplete must be completed eight (8) weeks from the first day of the subsequent long semester.”
6. Course Prefixes, Course Numbers, and Course Descriptions
   The prefixes for BIO, CHM, and A&H will now be BIOL, CHEM, and HUMA. Course numbers for some classes have been changed in order to not conflict with the Texas Common Course Numbering System. Rather than course descriptions appearing within individual program sections, all course descriptions will be at the end of the catalog in alphabetical order.

Arts & Humanities
   New minor in Medical and Scientific Humanities

Engineering and Computer Science
   Proposed changes in hour requirements:
   Computer Science increases from 120 to 121 hours.
   Telecommunications Engineering decreases from 130 to 125 hours.
   Software Engineering decreases from 123 to 120 hours.

General Studies
   Changes were made to Teacher Ed as a result of changes in rules governing educator preparation.
   These changes include:
      New Certification areas and Teaching Fields
      Implementation of guidelines for admission to the teacher certification program
      Introduction of guidelines for approval to enter Student Teaching segment

Human Development
   New minor in Child Development

Management
   New minors in Business Administration and Accounting and Information Management
   Bachelor of Science in Accounting changed to Bachelor of Science in Accounting and Information Management
Natural Science & Mathematics

Added Bachelor of Science in Molecular Biology and Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry
Addition of prerequisite requirements for entry-level mathematics courses based on SATII subject examinations given to entering freshmen
Hour requirements in Chemistry, Biology, and Biochemistry decreased by one hour due to changes in a Major Preparatory Class (CHM 2225 to CHM 2125)

Social Sciences

New Minor in Global Studies

Appendix III

Multiple changes as required by new legislation regarding determination of residence status

*The revised catalog text can be found at http://www.utdallas.edu/lynnltemp/CEPUGCatalog2002/
CHANGES TO 2002-2004 GRADUATE CATALOG

"FIRST FORTY"

Admissions criteria in order to comply with House Bill 1641

COMPUTER SCIENCE

New and approved research track
Color key – red/green/violet – added
Blue – deleted

NEW PREFIXES FOR COURSE NUMBERS

Biology
Chemistry
Arts & Humanities
Management Accounting

MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTING CHANGES

The revised catalog text can be found at http://www.utdallas.edu/student/catalog/grad02/

Two versions are available:

1. clean copy
2. copy showing changes