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ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
September 17, 2008

PRESENT: Sheila Amin Gutierrez de Piñeres, Mark Anderson, James Bartlett, Cy Cantrell, Gregg Dieckmann, Jay Dowling, Kelly Durbin, John Hoffman, Jennifer Holmes, Shayla Holub, Joseph Izen, Surya Janakiraman, Marilyn Kaplan, Robert Kieschnick, Murray Leaf, Paul Mac Alevey, Dennis Miller, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Michael Rebello, Young Ryu, Elizabeth Salter, Richard Scotch, Lucien Thompson,

ABSENT: Gail Breen, John Burr, Santosh D’Mello, Juan Gonzalez, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Kamran Kiasaleh, Adrienne McLean, B.P.S. Murthi, Timothy Redman, Robert Stern, S. Venkatesan

VISITORS: Calvin Jamison, Remsen Jennings, Hobson Wildenthal

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Dr. Daniel called the meeting to order and had a couple of announcements. UT Dallas has topped 15,000 students enrolled. These are regularly funded students. We have met our mark of 500+ growth and if we can do that each year Dr. Daniel will be happy.

Dr. Daniel has received several compliments regarding UT Dallas faculty.

The Provost office seems to have survived the loss of Dr. Nelsen. There was an endorsement of Dr. Daniel’s proposal regarding more top tier universities in the Austin and Waco newspapers (the Austin paper ran a full page article).

The official announcement regarding the replacements for Dr. Nelsen has not been made but Dr. Wildenthal unofficially announced Andrew Blanchard, Vice Provost, Sheila Pinieres, Inga Musselman, James Marquart, Emily Tobey, Richard Huckaba and Edward Harpham, Associate Provosts.

Dr. Daniel also announced that UT Dallas turns 40 next year and that he was searching for ideas to celebrate this event such as special programs, speakers, etc. Dr. Redman volunteered to be on a planning committee for this committee.

2. APPROVAL OF THE SENATE AGENDA

Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the agenda as amended and Dr. Redman seconded the motion. The motion carried.
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Scotch moved to approve the minutes for the August 20th meeting as circulated and Dr. Kieschnick seconded the motion. The motion carried.

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT

1. At the last Senate meeting we had no appointments for one position representing NS&M on the CQ, replacing Viswanath Ramakrishna. The Senate left this to Juan Gonzalez and Murray Leaf to find someone to serve. Dr. Gonzalez and Dr. Leaf have agreed on Dr. Kenneth Balkus. Dr. Leaf has asked Tonja Brown to arrange the letter of appointment.

2. Letters of appointment to Senate and University committees have gone out. Preliminary letters have been sent out by email, and we have received numerous replies. There have been some declines, but not many. Tonja Brown will tabulate them and we should be able to make whatever adjustments are needed by the next Senate meeting.

3. I have discussed with Dean Rogers the case of plagiarism in a Master’s paper in ECS that was detected only after the degree was awarded. This is taking a very long time to resolve. One of our concerns was whether this showed that we needed to adjust our recently passed policy on faculty as expert witnesses in adjudicating such cases. Dean Rogers thinks that our policies as they stand have been adequate; the slowness in dealing with the problem was mainly because of the slowness in initially identifying it. The plagiarism involved copying from another student, and it only came to light the latter student discovered and reported it.

In discussion, Dr. Cantrell reported that there have been a few cases of plagiarism reported. One student was allowed to submit five different copies of the same paper. Dr. Leaf agreed that this should be referred to the Academic Integrity committee. Dr. Leaf will attend this meeting.

The wording of the policy on consultation with faculty has now been incorporated in Chapter 49 of the Handbook of Operating Procedures, which is on the agenda for today.

The faculty needs to be more actively aware of its obligation to assure that work that it approves has been done honestly.

5. FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT

1. The Executive Committee has met and set the agenda for the October meeting and priorities for the year. Since we think Regent’s Rules are now in good shape, the priority will be to urge the regents to support a strategy to yield more research universities in Texas, and to assure that such the UT system is in a good competitive position to develop them. This activity will have two prongs. First, within the system, the FAC will consider endorsing the policies proposed for the state as a whole by President Daniel, which Dr. Shine has already indicated that he agrees with. Mainly, this is to provide incentives and remove disincentives for research all across the state, in such as way that those universities interested in going in
this direct will be able to compete constructively for support. Second, to endorse the approach of approach of Senator Morrison, which is to break the state into regions and try to get one serious top-tier (research) university in each. As start in this direction, I have been asked by the FAC to ask Dr. Daniel if we can have copies of his proposal to circulate to the FAC for the members to consider.

2. The FAC is identifying legislators to carry our faculty regent proposal. There are several who might do it. This should go forward in the legislative session just beginning.

3. The agenda for the next meeting will include seeking a report from Dr. Shine on the search for a new chancellor.

6. COMMITTEE REPORTS (see Appendixes A, B and C)

Scholarship Committee Report: Dr. Salter reported that the Fall was fairly calm and Spring deadline was April 15th there have been several new scholarships added this year and that there was $228,830 awarded in scholarships in FY08. Some changes need to be made the committee bylaws. The Provost office is currently working on some scholarship issues that came up.

Dr. Redman moved to approve the committee report and Dr. Pineres seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Distance Learning Committee Report: Dr. Kaplan reported that the committee spent most of the year working on WebCT issues and that Dr. Blackburn would like to more populate the use of WebCT.

Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the committee report and Dr. Holmes seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Committee on Qualification Report: In addition the report of last year’s actions, Dr. Leaf noted that Eckel, the proposed incoming chair, has met with Dr. Wildenthal and Dr. Daniel regarding some changes that she would like to see in made in the reporting of the committee and the Provost recommended that she present them to the Senate.

Dr. Kieschnick moved to approve the committee report and Dr. Scotch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

7. OGC CHANGES – CHAPTER 49 (see Appendix D)
Dr. Leaf reported that the OGC chapter 49 as submitted with a few changes Dr. Leaf regarded non-substantive.

Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the wording submitted by the OGC and Dr. Scotch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Discussion item Dr. Daniel feels that grade appeals should be routed through the Provost office and not through the President’s office. Currently state law mandates the grade appeals process.
8. POLICY ON POLICIES (see Appendix E)

Dr. Leaf reported that this the OGC response to recent changes in Regents Rules aimed at improving administrative responsiveness to faculty, staff and students. The aim of this policy is to assure that the stakeholders each group will review and be able to respond to what goes in the handbook. There is a problem with the present version, however. As it stands the review committee, not the faculty, decides what matters come under the faculty's areas of responsibility. Since there is only one faculty member, the Speaker, on this committee, it is possible that the committee may deem something to be not falling within the faculty purview that the Faculty Senate thinks does fall within their purview, and the Senate would have no recourse.

Dr. Redman moved to amend the proposed policy by inserting in page two section 5.1 “with the concurrence of the Senate”, so that the section shall read:

5.1. Designations and Responsibilities.

The Policy Coordinator will chair the HOP Committee. The HOP Committee will review all HOP sections and for each section is responsible for designating a Responsible Executive; determining a period review schedule; designating, with the concurrence of the Academic Senate, whether it pertains to the areas of faculty responsibility in educational policy formulation; and developing a Stakeholder Review Plan.

Dr. Redman moved to approve the Policy on Policies as amended. Dr. Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

9. DRAFT FOR LMS (Learning Management Systems) (see Appendix F)

Dr. Leaf reported that this committee has been meeting and working for a year without a charge and the Council has suggested that it be made a Senate committee therefore this policy was needed. He noted that in the last sentence of the first paragraph, “implement” should be “implementing.” This was accepted as an editorial amendment.

Dr. Cantrell moved to approve the charge as corrected. Dr. Holmes seconded the motion. The motion carried.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Daniel asked for motion to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Cantrell moved to adjourn and Dr. Kieschnick seconded the motion. The motion carried.

APPROVED: Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Faculty

DATE: Nems 2009