ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
November 19, 2003


ABSENT: Janok Bhattacharya, Tim Bray, R. Chandrasekaran, Jay Dowling, Juan Gonzalez, Gopal Gupta, Karen Hayslett-McCall, D. T. Huynh, Stephen Levene, Matthew Leybourne

VISITORS: Priscilla Beadle, Michael Coleman, Sophie Rutenbar, Larry Terry

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Dr. Jenifer called the meeting to order. There was one change in the agenda. Item #9, peer review for no-tenure track faculty, will be on the agenda in December.

Dr. Jenifer made the announcement that the University of Texas at Arlington has concluded their search for a new President.

The tuition and fee increase is still being discussed and the Regents have been asked for their blessing for UTD's proposal. There is a projected increase of 25% beginning Fall 2004.

The Governor still has the excellence money and it's a possibility that we will get that money.

What will the summer look like now that the tuition issue is resolved? Dr. Wildenthal addressed this issue stating that the funding for summer is actually in the budget this year, so it is budgeted at the same as last summer.
2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of October 15, 2003. The motion carried.

3. SPEAKER’S REPORT

There are two major items to report on: the developments so far on the Presidential search and some developments regarding the effort to support academic integrity.

1. Presidential Search. The day after the last Senate meeting, in which the three representatives were elected (Ramaswamy Chandrasekaran, Murray Leaf and Robert Nelsen) they met with Chancellor Yudoff in his office in Austin, along with Professor James Bartlett. Professors Leaf, Nelsen and Bartlett had already been scheduled to be in Austin for the meeting of the System Faculty Advisory Council, so Professor Nelsen took the occasion to ask the Chancellor for this meeting on the side.

The main purpose of the meeting was to get the Chancellor’s assurance that the Regents would not invoke the clause in the relevant Regents’ Rules that would allow them to select the President for one campus from the candidates of a recently completed search for the President of another campus. In our case, this would have been the search for the President of UT Arlington, which is has just been completed and forwarded its recommendations. The Chancellor assured us that this would not happen. We would get an entirely distinct search.

A second concern was the composition of the search committee. Chancellor Yudoff said that this had not yet been determined. There were state and system requirements for diversity, and in order to be sure that the committee was well balanced in this regard the system had been waiting to see what the composition of the elected membership was before deciding the appointed membership. It was, however, clear that one of the two members from the Board of Regents would be Regent Clements, from Dallas. Regent Estrada, also from Dallas, would not be on the search committee because he had already been appointed to another Presidential search committee in the system. For public members from Dallas, the Regents would seek at least some people who were also on the UT Dallas Development Board. The firmest point the Chancellor made, however, was that although some possible members had been asked for their availability, nothing was really settled because the slates were not yet complete and Regents had not yet acted.
The third concern was with Chancellor Yudoff's own ideas of the person who should be sought. The response stressed three points. It would be a person with substantial scholarly accomplishments, probably in the sciences. It would a person with experience as an administrator in a major research setting, probably a major university. And it would not be a politician—a person most recently from the legislature or from an administrative office based on political appointment.

The elected representatives from the faculty, deans and staff have now met and formed a working group. We will pull together a small and informal consultative group for advice and support. This morning, I sent a letter out to the general faculty explaining what has been happening.

2. Academic Integrity. I have sent out a letter to faculty asking for interest in using the Physical Activities building (perhaps one of the basketball courts) as a temporary facility for large scale, tightly monitored, administration of examinations. The suggestion had been made in the last Senate meeting and seemed worth pursuing as an interim measure until something more permanent or purpose-designed facility might be constructed, perhaps when Founders is renovated. Provost Wildenthal has indicated support for the idea. Dean Rachavong points out that the athletic facility is paid for by student fees and actually brings in money, so preempting it for this purpose will require careful planning and consultation. So far, however, I have only had about three responses, indicating a need for spaces for about two hundred students over the entire period of examinations week. This is less than I had expected but part of the reason seems to be that Ivor Page in ECS is separately organizing something similar within their own facilities. I will ask the faculty again and then see what next step seems appropriate.

The subcommittee on integrity met on Monday. The main items considered were the question of whether to have different penalties for academic dishonesty as between undergraduates and graduate students. There was no clear consensus. The subcommittee also considered organizing some more extensive guidance for faculty dealing with issues concerned with integrity in the specific circumstances of the different schools and programs. A hard-copy manual did not seem practical. They will continue to work on the problem. Finally, the tri-fold pamphlet I developed on dealing with dishonesty that was intended to go to all faculty at least once each year went to Dean Rachavong. Dean Coleman had a problem with the notifications in it regarding his office. Professor Cantrell, for the subcommittee, has agreed to resolve the issue in communication with Dean Rachavong. It should be out soon. The idea is not to say everything important about the subject but rather to provide faculty with something handy to keep in their desks as a first reference point when problems arise.
3. The School of Engineering and Computer Sciences has completed their by-laws. They should be on the agenda for the next Senate meeting.
4. The Vote to approve the list of candidates for graduation was 27 approve, 0 disapprove and 8 non-voting.
5. The fall graduates were voted on via e-mail and the results were: Yes - 27
   No - 0  No responses - 8

Other items that have been underway are on the agenda.

4. COMPACT REPORT

Dr. Wildenthal reported on the compact report process which is a succinct written agreement between the Chancellor and a component institution president that summarizes the institution’s major goals and priorities, strategic directions, and critical issues. It describes action plans necessary to achieve important goals, summarizes the institution’s progress and outcomes and articulates the System Administration’s commitment of resources and time to support particular initiatives. Unlike regulations, the Compact does not impose a single set of written rigid rules on each institution. Within a standard format, it reflects the unique goals and character of each institution. This is a System-wide, institution-level process. Although not expected or required, the component institutions may choose to develop a compact at the college/school/department level as well.

Dr. Sullivan, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at The University of Texas System, stated that this is our chance to say what we really mean and what we really want to do. The Deans will be given instructions on how to proceed with their Compact and the due dates.

The final Compact is due to System February 28th.

5. SCHOOL OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES BYLAWS

Dr. Redman presented the School of Arts and Humanities Bylaws that were approved by the faculty members. A motion was made and seconded to accept these Bylaws. The motion was approved.
6. TEXAS SUCCESS INITIATIVES

Dean Coleman explained that Texas has been under the TASP program which is a minimum computing test prior to going into higher education. In the last legislative session, the TASP program was done away with and they developed the Texas Success Initiatives. It is a carbon copy of the old TASP program in all but two particulars. One, the state quit supporting it financially and turned that responsibility over to the schools and also turned the regulatory program over to the schools. The new test is called THEA. Each institution is now responsible for the students that do not pass the THEA test. The standards are will now be lowered. The minimum was 230. They have now lowered the standards to 201.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the catalog copy for the changes in the Texas Success Initiatives. The motion was approved.

7. CHANGES IN ACADEMIC POLICY REGARDING ADDS, DROPS AND GRADE CHANGES

Dean Coleman presented the change in catalog copy regarding the change to the academic policy regarding adds, drops and grade changes. The Office of the Registrar is asking for a central office to coordinate all the requests for change after census day. The first change will be that students may not add courses after census day without the consent of the instructor and the Dean of Undergraduate Education. The Office of the Undergraduate Dean will act as arbitrator.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the change in catalog copy regarding adding courses after census day. The motion passed.

Dean Coleman then presented the new drop procedure which would allow the students to drop a course with a grade of “W” on the transcript. During the fifth through ninth weeks of the semester students will receive a grade of “WP” (withdrawn passing) or “WF” (withdrawn failing) depending on the student’s performance in class. After the ninth week of class, a student may only drop a class for nonacademic reasons.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the change in catalog copy regarding dropping a course after census day. The motion passed.
Dean Coleman presented the change of grade request which would read that all instructors must complete change of grade requests within eight weeks of the long semester following the semester in which the class was completed. The only exception is when a student files an academic grievance.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the change in catalog copy regarding the change of grade request. The motion passed.

8. CONSOLIDATION OF IR COMMITTEES

Dr. Leaf presented the proposed charge for the combined information resources committees which will now be called the University Information Resources Security, Planning, and Policy Committee. After discussion a motion was made and seconded to approve the new charge. The motion passed.

10. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made to cancel the Academic Senate meeting for December. The motion passed.

The business was concluded and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sandra K. Goertzen
Academic Governance Secretary