ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
May 15, 2002


ABSENT: George Barnes, Kurt Beron, Janok Bhattacharya, Duane Buhrmester, Metin Cakanyildirim, Lawrence Cauller, Rockford Draper, Cassandra Fesen, Robert Glosser, Paul Jargowsky, Simeon Ntanos, Larry Overzet, Ivor Page, Ram Rao

VISITORS: Poras Balsara, Priscilla Beadle, Dinesh Bhatia, Gail Breen, Douglas Dow, W. J. Dowling, Da Hsuan Feng, Matthew Goeckner, Ryan Jones, Kendra Ray, Larry Terry, Tres Thompson, John Wiorkowski

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Dr. Jenifer called the meeting to order and answered the following questions:

What is the status of an interim Dean of Engineering and Computer Science? Dr. Jenifer said that they were planning to make an announcement of an interim dean to be effective June 1, 2002.

What is the status of the Chancellor’s search? Dr. Jenifer said that the Regents are holding their selection procedures very secretive and any guess at this time is speculation.

What is the budget outlook for the next biennium? Dr. Jenifer said that it looks bad. The projections for the state is that revenues will be down and most agencies will be doing extremely well if they receive the same funding as they presently are receiving. This places UTD in a very precarious position in our quest to become a Tier I University. The transition to a Tier I University will be expensive. We need to secure the additional appropriate faculty and meet the needs of these new faculty. If we can’t get money from the Legislature, one option will be another fee increase. Some schools have fee increases for the next five years, we only opted to have an increase this coming year. The possibility exists that we will have to raise them again the following year.
President Jenifer also discussed attempts that are underway to examine UTD and its future role in the UT System and in the development of the metroplex. First, Dr. Jordan’s committee, appointed by U. T. System to study U. T. Dallas, will be making their report by this fall. Dr. Jenifer indicated that this committee has been invited to come to UTD to talk to faculty and administrators about where UTD is going. The report from this committee will have a profound influence on the Regents.

There is also another committee working for the Citizens Council of the City of Dallas, along with the Chamber of Commerce, on colleges and universities in the Dallas area.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of April 17, 2002 as amended. The motion carried.

3. SPEAKER’S REPORT

Pursuant to the Senate Caucus as well as the instructions of the Senate in the meeting, the following actions have been taken since the last Senate meeting:

A. Caucus minutes. Since the Senate caucus included a review of what we had done on the priority items for last year and the year before, as well as adding our own new items, we did not wind up with the usual single ordered list of concerns that could be circulated. I have therefore, by way of providing a record we could look back to, tried to indicate the priorities that emerged from the discussion by summarizing what was said about each item and providing some framing comments for review by the Academic Council. The Council has reviewed them and authorized their posting on the Web. They should be up shortly.

B. Facilities in support of teaching and research. The Senate caucus noted an apparent decline in the quality of classroom facilities and support services, and in the discussion in Senate meeting the possibility was raised of referring this problem to the University-wide Campus Facilities Oversight Committee. As it turned out, there were two problems with this: the Chair was Dean Osborne, who is leaving the University, and the charge, reflecting Regents’ Rules, only includes new construction. It does not include the utilization of existing facilities.

Accordingly, I have asked Dean Osborne if he wished to resign from the Chair, and he has said that he does. I have also circulated a draft revision to the charge to
Mr. Lovitt and Dr. Wildenthal. Mr. Lovitt is the RUO. I received a response from
Mr. Lovitt and Dr. Wildenthal responded in the Council meeting. With suggested
modifications, the Council agreed to place a revision of the charge on the agenda
for this meeting. This has been done.

C. Calendar Committee. The Senate also asked Dr. Wildenthal and me to draft a
charge for the Calendar Committee. This was done and discussed in Council, and
is on the agenda today.

D. Advisory Committee on Research. I had circulated a preliminary draft charge for
such a committee early last fall, but it was sidelined in the discussions that led up
to the reorganization of the office reported by Dr. Wildenthal at the last Senate
meeting. At that meeting, the Senate decided to go ahead with the charge and
appointed a subcommittee. That subcommittee has met and revised the draft, and
brought that the Council. The Council discussed it, suggested some modifications,
and agreed to place it on the agenda. Since then, I have circulated it to Dr. Feng
and discussed it in Deans Council. It appears that everyone is in agreement. It is
also on the agenda for this meeting.

E. Inclusion of University Committees in the Senate section of the university
website. In reviewing the Senate website with a view toward improving
communication, particularly with regard to the possible roles of the three
proposed committees on the agenda for today, the lack of a coherent listing of
University Committees alongside the Senate Committees struck me as an
important omission. At present, they are only listed along with major policy
memoranda under the Provost’s section of the University website. I brought this
up in the Council meeting and Dr. Wildenthal, for the administration, agreed to
allow the linking. We will list the University committees alongside or
immediately under the Senate committees, with notes explaining the difference,
with links to their charges, their memberships, and email links to their chairs. The
Council also suggested several other modifications, all along the line of improving
access and promoting more effective and convenient feedback. These are now
being implemented by Professor Yasbin.

F. Along the same lines, this year we will return to the past practice of asking faculty
for their interests in serving on Senate and University committees. I sent out a
memo to this effect this morning. This afternoon, Dr. Yasbin will send an email
form to the faculty to be returned to the Speaker as chair of the Committee on
Committees.
G. Graduate Council. Dean Cunningham and I are working on drafting a charge. Dean Cunningham has provided a general list of the functions that it should perform, and at the moment I am reviewing the approaches taken at other institutions. We have agreed that I will then draft a charge that will have several alternative staffing plans, and then we will meet to see what to do next.

H. Receivership Policy. This has now been discussed by Dr. Sutton, Dr. Beadle, and myself, and appears to be ready to bring back to the Senate. Since, however, Ivor Page, as Chair of the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct, was not able to attend this meeting to describe the Committee’s considerations, we will propose it for the next meeting.

I. Finally, in view of very short time between this Senate meeting and graduation, the Council voted to refer the list of candidates for degrees to the Senate by email ballot. This has been done. The Council further suggested that henceforth it might be a good policy to make this the general practice. As it turned out, we have received just 18 replies from the Senate on the email ballot this time. If it were less than a quorum, one would think that under the rules the candidates would not be considered approved. Accordingly, it seems that before email balloting is made a general practice the matter should be discussed in the Senate. I therefore will ask that this be placed as an additional item on the agenda for today.

4. HEARING TRIBUNAL

Dr. Leaf presented a proposed hearing tribunal that the Academic Council approved. One change needs to be made and that would be to replace Constantine Konstans with a tenured faculty member. A motion was made and seconded to place Suresh Radhakrishnan in that position. The motion passed.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Hearing Tribunal as listed:

Herbe Abdi (H); Poras Balsara (E); Rajiv Banker (M); Lloyd Dumas (S); David Edmunds (A); Euel Elliott (S); Andras Farago (E); Cassandra Fesen (N); Sandy Friel-Patti (H); Donald Gray (N); George McMechan (N); Simeon Ntafos (E); Karen Prager (G); Stephen Rabe (A); Suresh Radhakrishnan (M); Ram Rao (M); Dean Sherry (N); Marianne Stewart (S); Hal Sudborough (E); Emily Tobey (H)

The motion passed.
5. CAMPUS FACILITIES OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

This committee charge has been revised to include the utilization of facilities, not only new construction. The term “facilities” does not mean only buildings. Also included would be long term planning for the entire campus. This revised wording is made to comply with the Regents’ Rules.

A motion was made and seconded to approve this revised charge. The motion passed.

6. CALENDAR COMMITTEE

Dr. Leaf presented the charge for the new Calendar Committee. One item for discussion is the RUO of this committee. A decision about the RUO whether it will be the Senior Vice President for Student Affairs and External Relations or the Executive Vice President and Provost, will be made by Dr. Jenifer.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the charge for this new committee. The motion passed.

7. CHARGE: ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Dr. Leaf presented the draft charge for the new Advisory Committee on Research. Dr. Da Hsuan Feng spoke to the new committee and charge. He agreed that this committee should be established as quickly as possible so that the line of communication is opened. Dr. Feng also indicated that this University is entering a new era, along with the entire U. T. System and this committee will benefit the University.

The motion was made and seconded to approve this new charge. The motion passed.

8. E-MAIL BALLOTS FOR GRADUATES

The e-mail ballot for the candidates for graduation for the Spring 2002 semester was sent out. Only 18 responses were turned in out of a possible 30. The Senators were reminded that approval of the candidates for graduation is one of the few duties that are specified in the Regents’ Rules and they should take it seriously. A recommendation was made for the Speaker to bring the subject up at the Council to come up with a procedure for the