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1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

President Daniel called the meeting to order. He had just finished meeting with the Vice President of Budget and Finance. The University started the budget hearing process earlier this year. This will allow the information to feed into the process better than it was last year. Last year two to three faculty representatives sat in on the process. The president was pleased to have their input. President Daniel invited Senate members to attend. The hearings will take place the last two weeks of March.

The board of regents approved an $18 million building expansion immediately adjacent to the Callier Center of Richardson. This expansion is dependent upon the University’s ability to raise five million dollars in private money. The University has a $95 million request for a new engineering building before the state in tuition revenue bonds (TRB). The request ranked sixth in the state out of seventy-seven applications. Currently there is nothing in the State budget for any buildings at universities. However, there seems to be a lot of good will towards the investment.

The Legislature is much calmer than it was in 2011. There is positive money, instead of negative money. On the whole, the legislature is happier. The current budget from the house and senate favors our university. State funding is based upon weighted semester credit hours from the previous two years. The legislature will look at the last two years starting at September 2011. The university’s attendance is up over the last two years. This will raise the universities state funding by approximately $7 million in the base budget.
Speaker Leaf noted that in the past when faculty had a choice, they placed courses likely to get larger enrollments in base budget years and left courses that attracted lower enrollments in off-base years. This practice was a great help. President Daniel responded by noting that formula funding on the whole has become steadily less important in our overall operating budget. The first year UTD accepted freshmen, 1990; the University collected $4.20 of state support to fund the operation of the University for every dollar paid in tuition by the students. This fiscal year the university collected only thirty-seven cents of state support for every dollar paid of tuition by the students. President Daniel is hopeful that the state will continue to fund capital projects. There were no questions.

2. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
Calvin Brown requested a very brief item on emergency preparedness be added to the agenda. Jessica Murphy moved that the presentation by the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness before the presentation from BAIT. Cy Cantrell seconded. Motion carried.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Speaker Leaf presented the previous minutes. Cy Cantrell moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried. The minutes were approved as circulated.

4. **PRESENTATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**
Theresa Towner the chair of the committee on Teaching Effectiveness, presented a recommendation to set up a learning center at the university similar to the other Tier 1 schools. The recommendation had a unanimous approval vote from the teaching effectiveness committee. The committee would like the Senate’s support on this idea.

Pat Michaelson presented a report called “Scholarship reconsidered – Priorities of the Professoriate” by Ernest L. Boyer. It was Boyer’s belief that faculty should treat their teaching with as much scholarly attention as they treat their research. He calls this the scholarship of teaching. What other universities have done to facilitate this climate is to create centers for teaching and learning.

It is the CET’s opinion that our university is behind the times by not having a center for teaching and learning. A handout listing the benchmarked tier one universities with teaching and learning centers was circulated, as well as a copy of the flyer for the UT Austin teaching and learning center. Most of the centers were headed by PhDs that were tasked with staying ahead of the literature on Education and translating it into a way that can implemented by their faculty. At the University level there must be a balance due to the specialized needs of each discipline. The Education people can assist faculty with learning but the faculty will need to develop ways of communicating the specialized needs of individual disciplines.

The flyer from UT Austin illustrates that it has a large center. In their center, they combine a number of items that are in various places across our campus. They have assessment within their center, as well as teaching technology. Their section on instructional development has a staff of ten. The flyer describes what the center does for the university. One of the items they highlight is their consulting services. A faculty member can have a one on one confidential
discussion with a consultant regarding problems they are having in their teaching. An example would be that a faculty member gave a mid-term exam and felt that the students were prepared for it, but all of the students flunked it. The consultant would review their exam, what the faculty member did to prepare the students, and then give recommendations on how to help them with their problem. Their center provides seminars, workshops, and presents speakers. In addition, they have a bi-weekly lunchtime series over a semester on a specific educational topic. The center also provides training for graduate students on how to give instruction as TA’s and later as first time lecturers.

Dr. Michaelson turned the floor over to Karen Huxtable-Jester to describe what BBS had been providing for their school. Dr. Huxtable-Jester circulated a hand-out that listed the ways that BBS is already providing services for their professors, and graduate students. Their group has been ‘filling the gap’ for their faculty and students due to the lack of a center for teaching and learning.

BBS is doing a wraparound approach to this topic. BBS has a very active teaching effectiveness committee that evaluates faculty’s effectiveness any time they are up for tenure or promotion. Last year they created a role, teaching support coordinator, which fills in the gaps that the university does not have from a teaching excellence center. Dr. Huxtable-Jester, as the teaching support coordinator for BBS, is available for one on one consultation to talk about teaching issues, or specific problems. These discussions are not evaluative, so the faculty/ students are not judged in any way. The coordinator has no powers of evaluation, and does not tell anyone the topics of discussion. The BBS group does lunch seminars for its faculty several times a semester. They would like to bring in outside speakers for the seminars, but that has not been possible yet. She opened the floor to questions.

Cy Cantrell questioned how they teach the teaching assistants to teach. Dr. Huxtable-Jester responded that BBS teaching assistants have a teaching orientation. This allows them to know what is expected of them. This includes presentation by different faculty members, and panel discussions with previous graduate students. Last summer Dr. Underwood taught a seminar for Ph.D. students who are about to teach on their own for the first time. It is a course to help them develop their teaching persona; understand classroom dynamics, and other items related to developing their own courses.

Speaker Leaf requested asked what the Senate could do. What kind of operation did the committee recommend? Could the CET create a definite proposal to present to the Senate? Theresa Towner suggested that the Senate recommend that a staffed centralized office be created that is dedicate to creating the Teaching and Learning Center. Their goal is to centralize the resources the university already have at the school level. The CET would like formal endorsement from the university not just symbolically in this endeavor.

The Office of Graduate studies does a two-day orientation with the new teaching assistants that includes what the responsibilities and duties are of a university teacher. This past year they have been going to individual school orientations where they get further instruction. Unfortunately, these very ad hoc arrangements are subject to change. Dr. Tobey added that at new faculty orientation, which is required for new assistant professors who have never taught a
course before, are given three afternoon sessions to orient them. This was done in Fall 2012, and seven of those individuals are teaching their first class this semester. On average, she is spending 4 to 5 hours a week with them because they are unclear on what they are expected to do. This center would facilitate these types of trainings for new faculty and adjunct faculty.

Speaker Leaf noted that in order to proceed further there were two options. The first, the CET submits a proposal to the council. The second option, Senate sets up someone to work with the CET to create the proposal and submit it to the council. Dr. Towner said the CET would prefer option two.

Dr. Michaelson stated that the CET wants an expert on education to head the office. They would want someone who is educated in education, not just a great teacher. Richard Scotch recommended that the committee create a proposal, and a job description detailing the responsibilities of this new position. The proposal could then be presented to the Academic Council on March 6. Dr. Huxtable-Jester agreed to have a proposal from the committee to the Academic Council by the March 6 meeting.

President Daniel asked if the Provost office had been involved in the proposal. Dr. Huxtable-Jester said that only Dr. Tobey had been involved to date. President Daniel is in support of it, and is willing to back this proposal. The Provost office is the appropriate area to put forth a budget request for this program. Dr. Towner noted that the budget process has been started already. Currently there is a discrepancy between the schools regarding how they are addressing this problem. The President feels the program should be at the school level with the dean’s support, and not just at the university level. Jessica Murphy felt the more central the office was the more functionality it would have.

The senate asked the committee to make a specific recommendation for a central office to be brought back to the council on March 6.

5. Presentation by Calvin Brown
On April 2 of 2012 the university had a tornado scare. The Emergency management team created a program to educate the campus on emergency awareness. There were three main points they wanted to highlight. The first is the procedure of what to do when the different alerts are sounded. If an alarm sounds on the outside of buildings, everyone, is to go inside the nearest building immediately until an all clear is given. When an evacuation alarm is given, such as a fire alarm, everyone is to proceed to his or her evacuation area. The third type of alarm is a lock down alarm. All faculty are to lock, barricade the doors of their classrooms, and stay away from all windows and doors until the all clear is given. From the central desk, the emergency management team can broadcast to all buildings and via text messaging or email on phones when an alert occurs, as well as give all clears.

The second point is the responsibilities of faculty during these emergencies. During the April 2 2012 severe weather evacuation, a teacher did not take care of a student with disabilities. When even a student is in a faculty’s classroom, they are the faculty member’s responsibility. If there is not an evacuation information sheet in a classroom, faculty can call the Emergency Services group, and a new one will be posted for them. When the building alarm sounds and says to
evacuate. everyone is to evacuate immediately. If the faculty member cannot move the student with disabilities, they are to be brought to a safe area. The faculty are then to advise first responders where the person is located. The first responders will assist them.

The third point is that if a lock down message is given something bad has happened on campus. A faculty member is to secure themselves, students, and the room they are located in. They are to stay away from the windows and doors. This means that doors are to be locked, if there is no lock, the door is to be blocked with anything available to prevent unwanted entry. Everyone is to stay that way until an all clear is given. On January 8, 2013, a drill for active shooter was performed. Emergency management feel between themselves and the police department, they can take care of the situation. In the meantime, they need everyone to take care of himself or herself until the emergency services can get to you.

This year is the first year that they will be doing severe weather shelter drills in all the buildings. They have trained people in each of the buildings what to do should an emergency arise. They will direct everyone to seven weather shelters. These are interior rooms, typically restrooms, where everyone will be safe from the effects of the storm. Do not be surprised when there is a notice that this drill will be happening. It will only take ten to fifteen minutes before the all clear is sounded.

Speaker Leaf asked if the deans had been alerted to these drills. This would allow them to alert their faculty and could be prepared for the disruption. Mr. Brown had not done that yet, but he would do it shortly. Dr. Izen noted that many classrooms do not have door locks. What are faculty to do in rooms that do not have locks should a lock down order be given? Mr. Brown suggests putting a chair behind it; barricade it with any furniture available. The Emergency management team is working on making it possible that from the central dispatch office they can auto lock all of the exterior doors of all the buildings. Currently not all buildings are set up to allow this, but most are. Dr. Izen asked that all classroom doors have locks, and that faculty have keys. Faculty members are strongly in favor of being in control of locking their classrooms when there is a threat and unlocking it when the all clear is given. Mr. Brown could not address that, but would pass along the recommendation. This may pose a problem as the University is attempting to go keyless. President Daniel asked that the question be taken under advisement. Calvin Brown with follow up with the Campus Police Chief on the question, and will get back with the Senate.

Emily Tobey asked that additional inspections of handicap doors on campus be performed. Many of the doors that she has dealt with recently have not been performing adequately. Mr. Brown responded by saying that they are inspected frequently but if a malfunction with the doors occur it should be reported to his office. They will see to its repair as soon as possible. President Daniel noted that if multiple requests are filed for a health and safety issue, but no action has been taken he would like to be notified. Typically, when he must deal with a problem personally the problem is addressed promptly. He would like the faculty to help him help everyone by alerting him when problems are not being addressed properly.
Ravi Prakash asked they should do if a lock down is in effect and a faculty member finds himself or herself outside of a building. Mr. Brown responded by saying that they should go to a secure location as quickly and safely as possible.

David Cordell asked if there was a posted phone number, like there are in restrooms, if there is an issue someone may call that number and it will be addressed. Mr. Brown responded that currently there is not, but it is a viable solution. It would allow the Health and Safety department to be alerted quicker if there is a malfunction.

A suggestion was made that wherever there is a shelter area, the wireless signal should be stronger. Most people will be getting the all clear via text message or email. Soon as students, staff and faculty are in a sheltered area, they are going to begin using their cell phones to find out what is going on. President Daniel suggested that Andrew Blanchard reviewed the Wi-Fi service strength in the sheltered areas.

6. Presentation From BAIT

While the BAIT set up for their presentation Speaker Leaf summarized what has happened in the past to bring them to the Senate. Over the break, there was a problem with a student who was not dangerous but who clearly did need help. Following this up, Speaker Leaf spoke with Darrelene Rachavong, the Vice President of Student Affairs, about the BAIT operations and visited one of their meetings. Two questions arose from this situation: Is the BAIT concerned with students beyond just those deemed “dangerous”? The answer was that they were. The second question was “How can there be better feedback to faculty?” These are the topics for today.

In the agenda packet is the current charge to the BAIT. The charge shows they have a broad scope. The next question addressed is how can the Senate help the BAIT?

Dr. Rachavong began by giving the Senate an overview. BAIT stands for Behavioral Assessment and Intervention Team. When students’ names are sent to the team, via residential life, police department, other students or faculty/staff themselves, the team gathers all the information they can on the student from a variety of sources. They then make a decision on how they may intervene, and support them here at the university. This involves calling faculty, inviting faculty to BAIT meetings, or possibly getting family involvement. It does not just involve expelling the students if they are a problem. It is providing the help and support the student needs to be successful at the University. The members of the BAIT are James Cannici, Director of the Counseling Center; Gene Fitch, Dean of Students; the Director of Resident Life; the Chief of Police and his Lieutenant; Sheila Amin Gutierrez de Pineres; and the associate Dean of Students, Kimberly Winkler. They have added Cristen Casey, the Director for International Students, as many of their cases involve international students. Kerry Tate, Director of Student Access Ability, is not on the team but she is consulted as needed. They meet every Monday at 8:15 AM for one to two hours. The meetings are typically case management type meetings. If an incident occurs between meetings, they will address it quickly. All of the members are located on the same floor so they are able to talk about cases daily. The types of intervention they do may include bringing in family or sending students to the counseling center for mandated assessment. The assessment may require that a student continue counseling, helping the students get a medical withdrawal, or even hospitalization.
Many times, it may only require parental involvement to provide a support system for them. On the other hand, sometimes there is no way to keep the student active at the university. That only occurs when the behavior is so serious that the university cannot provide the kind of support that the student requires. They will work with the parents to get the student the help they need.

At the Council meeting, the BAIT walked the council through a recent case the BAIT has worked on. The team felt this would be the best way to illustrate what the team does. At this point Darrelene Rachavong turned the floor over to Gene Fitch.

He began by stating that the first priority of the team is the welfare of the university’s students, faculty and staff. If the BAIT is aware of a student that is dangerous or threatening, they are NOT in any of the classrooms. They have been addressed, and removed. They do not know about all of them, but the ones the team is aware of have been/ are being addressed. Dean Fitch then walked the Senate through the same case study described for the council. The details of the case study are omitted to protect the individuals involved.

Over the course of a year, the team will see sixty to seventy students whose cases they discuss at their regular meetings. To date, the team has had forty-five cases from fall until February 20, 2013. Thirty of those are undergraduate students, while roughly ten to fifteen are graduate students. They come from all segments of the student population.

Dr. Rachavong has discovered in the past couple weeks that it is not easy for the staff/ faculty to navigate the web pages to find out where to go if they have a concern. There has never been a BAIT website, but there will be one now. It will have all the numbers and contact information of the committee members on it, as well as alternative numbers to contact someone should a student, faculty, or staff has a concern 24/7. Dean Fitch has added a letter to the process that will go to faculty and staff who have sent a student to the team. A formal letter will be sent to the faculty/ staff who sent the student to them to let them know that the team is acting on their concern. The notification email that the team is required to send out at the beginning of each semester is being updated. They are creating a more involved email that they hope will explain what the team does, and how to contact them should they have a problem student.

Speak Leaf asked what faculty should do outside of working times, and the committee’s meeting time. There were provisions for that before, but they will now be more accessible to staff/ faculty. Dr. Rachavong reiterated that the BAIT is adding more substance to their communications. She also brought up another question that had been addressed to them outside of Senate. What should faculty do if a student needs the counseling center on a weekend? The BAIT team knows that faculty are supposed to call the police department, and they have someone on staff 24/7 to deal with these situations. There has always been support staff available but it has never been properly communicated to the campus population.

Dr. Rachavong noted that faculty are ‘on the front line’ with students. If a faculty member sees a student having difficulties, please advise the BAIT. They can assist getting the help they need. The Dean of Students has the authority to contact the student and bring them into the counseling center. They will not hesitate if they feel a student needs to see the counseling center, in fact they can require it. That is the reason that the team is BEHAVIOR assessment team, and not a THREAT assessment team. The BAIT covers everything.

Tres Thomson asked how long the BAIT follows up with students to make sure they are compliant with their behavior modifications, medications, or counseling guidelines. Dean Fitch
responded that once a student is in the BAIT system they are never completely ‘off their radar’. The student may be at a higher or lower level but the BAIT will continue to follow a student’s case. The student may have completed their treatment plan but that does not mean that the BAIT will not continue to meet with them every week or bi-weekly to make sure they are doing all right.

7. **Presentation by on Salary Compression and Inversion**

Richard Scotch, the chair of the Budget Advisory committee, began by stating that at the caucus of 2011 and 2012 the issue of salary compression came up as a major concern. Since then the Budget committee has been investigating this issue. In 2012 they had discussion with administrators, and with the president’s support the committee was able to get a data base from the strategic planning office of faculty salaries for the current year. Robert Serfling, a member of the Budget Advisory committee, did an extensive statistical analysis on this data. A copy of his report is in the packet. He turned the floor over to Dr. Serfling to give a brief overview on the report, and take questions. The committee also has recommendations.

The base salary across all ranks for beginning faculty is increasing due to market changes. Currently there is not an adjustment internally being made for market changes. According to the report, if there were no compression or inversion, one would be expected to see the salary increase with years at UTD. On average salaries do not increase with years of service. Ideally, an Associate professor should be paid on average higher than the highest paid Assistant Professors. The same can be said about full professors. They should be paid, on average, higher than the highest paid Associate professors. It is true that across the university that Assistant and Associate professors are balanced properly; unfortunately, in the range of the Associate to Full Professor that is not the case. When looking at each school individually there are different levels of compression/inversion in each one. For example, in A&H there is increasing levels of over lapping between ranks, whereas in NS&M they do not overlap very much. These plots demonstrate that there is compression and inversion at UTD. This is most evident in BBS, especially the associate professor rank. One would expect that the assistant professors in the four to nine years bracket would have salaries somewhat above those with one to three years if there were no compression present. The report shows that there was a discrepancy between years of service and salary even with in the same rank across the university.

In summary, the report shows that there is substantial salary compression and inversion at UTD with in each of the schools. This appears as different patterns (i.e. cross ranks, with in ranks, or both). The report does not suggest why this happened, or give solutions to the problem. It simply states that there is a problem, and the committee suggests that the Senate investigate a solution.

Dr. Scotch presented the recommendations of the Budget Advisory Committee. They recommend that a committee be appointed to specifically address the salary compression and inversion. It should consist of members of faculty, and administrators consisting of one or two deans. There was a feeling among the committee that this is a problem that could be addressed by setting up a special fund. The committee is open to discuss this topic with administration and the Senate regarding weather it merits action or not. The committee feels that given Dr. Serfling’s report there is significant evidence that a problem exists. Dr. Scotch drafted a
resolution that was approved by the committee, but during the Academic Council meeting, President Daniel recommended some revisions. President Daniel recommended that gender equity be added to the research, especially in the science and engineering fields. He feels that these types of studies can help identify systemic problems. Dr. Scotch noted that he has already shared with Dr. Tobey due to her work with the Diversity committee that he is already adding further research on that line of thinking. Provost Wildenthal noted that in his thirty years dealing with the problem there is one universal fact. The longer you are at a particular institution, relative to everything else, the lower your salary compared is to those who move. Speaker Leaf suggested that should the resolution pass, the Provost would appoint one or two deans to work with the budget advisory committee. Richard Scotch moved to approve the resolution as amended. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion passed.

8. Speaker’s Report—Murray Leaf

1. The deans have responded to our draft proposal for school guidelines with a memo to Dr. Daniel indicating definite interest in being involved, and noting the proposed hiring process as an area of concern. I have responded to President Daniel, copy to the deans, saying that we certainly will involve them. At its meeting on February 6th, the Academic Council agreed that the best way to involve the deans was by forming a 3+3 committee, with three (or so) deans to work with the Council working group. At that time, however, we did not stop to consider exactly who to appoint. I have therefore asked Dr. Wildenthal to make the appointments at his discretion.

2. President Daniel has been required by the Chancellor to implement a new UT System policy on conflict of interest, conflict of commitment, and outside employment. The most general part of the policy is that these three policies are now to be combined into one. There will be one web-page for making a declaration of possible conflict, there is one template for a campus policy, and there is one system policy. President Daniel received the letter on 16 January 2013. The Chancellor spoke to the FAC Executive Committee about the policy by conference call the next day. The instructions were to have the implementation in our Handbook of Operating Procedures by February 1. The Regents are imposing a sense of urgency. Nevertheless, the deadline is inconsistent with Regents Rule 20201 Section 4.9 (a)(b). This requires presidents to seek formal review from faculty governance on matters affecting faculty within “a reasonable timeframe (60 days or less).” I have asked President Daniel how he wants to proceed and he has said he will respond. An article by Reeve Hamilton in yesterday’s Texas Tribune points out that the disclosure requirements are a good deal more detailed than what the Regents are subject to, or the legislature. The policy and form are not inherently problematic, but they could be if they are not applied reasonably. We need discussion.

9. FAC Report—Murray Leaf

The FAC met January 24 and 25. The meeting was very busy and seems to have been regarded as quite constructive. The highlights were:

1. Regent Stillwell was the first speaker. He gave a very frank and constructive assessment of the general orientation of the Board at present and over the next few years. He emphasized two things. First, there is always a diversity of views and they manage to work
out the differences. Second, the process of appointment, and also much of what the board
decides to do, is "political." He did not paraphrase what he meant by this, but my
understanding was that this does not mean that the regents work from fixed political
agendas or ideologies, but rather that they decide with a view toward what is being
discussed in the political arenas of the state and with a view toward political consequences.
Regent Stillwell expressed high regard for the faculty, emphasized the importance of
deferring to faculty judgment in professional/academic matters, and generally conveyed the
sense that in the end the Regents would continue to act accordingly.
In connection with the idea of university concerns being also "political" several members of
the FAC brought up (once again) the prohibition on lobbying. Regent Stillwell noted that
legislators want to be informed and that they appreciate information and expressions of
concern from the faculty. Faculty also have rights as citizens.
2. Chancellor Cigarroa spoke in considerable detail about legislative issues. A priority will
be to emphasize the importance of formula funding.
He also spent considerable time on the Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment Policy
and the political logic of the merger of UT Pan-American and UT Brownsville.
3. Pedro Reyes and Dan Sharpnorn discussed a number of issues as well. Main points
were:
Outcomes based funding is likely to pass in the legislature, but would not be more than
10% of the formula appropriation. Guns on campus also seems likely to pass.
The UT System has initiated organizational analyses of the campuses in the system. Four
have been chosen to start. UTD was or is one of them. This is connected to the general
concern with lack of clarity and transparency by basic level administrative units—
departments on most campuses, school for us.
There was more discussion of Conflict of Interest/Commitment. Dr. Reyes and Mr.
Sharpnorn recognized that the Feb 1 deadline for finalizing policies was not likely to be
workable. FAC members should advise their campuses to do what they can. FAC also
discussed several issues. One was the meaning of "permission." Mr. Sharpnorn indicated
that from the system point of view, "approval" meant the same thing.
4. The next speaker was Senator Kel Seliger, the new chair of the Senate Higher Education
Committee. He is from Odessa-Midland. The FAC felt that Senator Seliger would continue
with the supportive and knowledgeable leadership that had been exercised recently by
Senator Zafririni and would continue to work with Senator Zafririni on matters she has been
focusing on, including more support for research universities. Senator Seliger emphasized
the importance of formula funding.
5. James Cox, the OGC attorney on copyright, spoke to the FAC on Friday. Mr. Cox did not
disagree with my analysis of faculty rights under copyright law, but argued that there were
other kinds of "ownership" beside copyright. When the regents claimed to own our
research data, it is in one of these latter senses. The discussion was contentious but
interesting. The ideas clearly need further development.
6. Stephanie Huie spoke as the person who is replacing Sandra Woodley for system data on productivity. She mainly talked about Academic Analytics. This is available in Beta version but not to the public. We agreed to make it available for faculty to test—looking up themselves and seeing how complete the results are. It does include books; it does not include works or art or performances. There were resolutions on benefits for domestic partners, contingent faculty in governance, language for the campus Conflict of Interest policies, and measures to increase pay rates for work-study students in order to enhance retention. Other resolutions were deemed to need more work.
I think it fair to say that the overall sense of meeting was that all who participated as guests shared the FAC members’ sense of what higher education required, why it was necessary, and what it promised.

10. **Election Committee Report**
David Cordell announced that Tenure/ Tenure system has thirty-two nominees for forty-six positions. Thirteen people have one petition. Even if the one petition people got a second petition, we would still not reach the allowed forty-nine. He encourages that if any one wished to be a member of the Senate in 2013 to submit your petitions. For the Senior Lecturer group there are five positions, and four nominations. There are five with one petition. That will most likely fill up without a problem. He is concerned that the tenure slots will be filled.

There are 489 voting faculty. The bylaws allow as many as 10% of the tenure-system faculty to serve on the Senate. The maximum number of tenure-system faculty to on the Senate is 51 members plus five non-tenure system faculty. It is a milestone that the Senate has reached its maximum capacity, and membership is now capped.

11. **Student Government Liaison Report**
Raj Dwivedi had to leave early due to an exam at 4 pm. Emily Tobey read his report. Student Government convinced the Pub to remain open on Saturdays, and until 1 AM on weekends. Student Government is planning a Health fair/ 5 k event called ‘I heart UT Dallas’. The Student Fee Committee convened on Friday February 15, and will do so for the following three Fridays. He will continue to keep the Senate posted. If there were any questions members may contact him.

There being no further business, Provost Wildenthal adjourned the meeting.

**APPROVED:**

Murray J. Leaf  
Speaker of the Academic Senate

**DATE:** 3 Apr 2013