1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS

Speaker Murray Leaf called the meeting to order in President Daniel's absence.

Dr. Leaf began his report while the Senate waited for the Dr. Daniel to arrive. Dr. Leaf urged the Senate members to become involved in one of the state-wide organizations whose purposes are to represent the interests and concerns of University and College Professors in Texas. The main organizations are the Texas Association of College Teachers, American Association of University Professors, or Texas Faculty Association.

Provost Wildenthal announced that a campus-wide Enhancement Committee is being formed to gather ideas and recommendations to present to the new landscape architect, Peter Walker & Associates. The committee will be composed of the faculty, staff, students and some non-UTD people to provide a greater variety of comments and suggestions. There will be a kick-off meeting on Friday, September 22, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. in Davidson Auditorium in the School of Management. All faculty, staff and students are welcome. The new committee will meet afterwards. When asked about the work that has started on a section of land on campus near the School of Management, Dr. Wildenthal replied that a Frisbee golf course is being built for the students.

Dr. Daniel arrived and Dr. Wildenthal told him about the discussion thus far. Dr. Daniel added that Alumni Association gave the money for the golf course, and this project is not part of the Beautification Enhancement Project. Dr. Leaf stated that the Campus Facilities Committee and the University Safety and Security Council should also be involved.

The President said this Enhancement project is the start of a new era at UTD. The Peter Walker & Associates Landscape Architects will be involved with landscape design of the University for years to come, so the grounds will mix well with new buildings and changes. One of the main ideas is a place that can be used as a background for graduation pictures and such, as well a focal point that people will associate with UTD. He has decided to postpone parking lot construction to give the new landscape architect time to make suggestions about the best use of the land and the best locations for parking lots.

Commenting on a concern that was made by a Senator on living spaces for international graduate students, Dr. Daniel said he agreed that it was an important issue to him. He went on to say that the university is having a big housing shortage problem, and the Waterview apartments have a waiting list. Since the Board of Regents have made graduation rates a top priority, the need for housing, for freshmen especially, is of great urgency. He would like to have more places for students, both undergraduate and graduate, to live, and is looking at the possibility of building dedicated housing. Jody Nelsen, Dr. Wildenthal, Dr. Rachavong and he are looking into the issue
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of housing and how to best provide for undergraduate and graduate students since the priorities of each group differ.

Dr. Cantrell commented that involving transfer students in campus life more than they have been should also be a high priority. UTD has a great number of transfer students, and getting them more involved would benefit the university and the alumni associations. Dr. Daniel agreed and added that the Vice President for Student Affairs, Dr. Rachavong, is considering new ideas and programs to help bring more transfer students into campus life. He suggested the Senate may want to invite Dr. Rachavong to speak to the Senate and answer questions. The Senate agreed that they would do so. We will also invite Dr. Sheila Piñeres.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Daniel called for a motion to approve the minutes of July 19, 2006. One error was noted. On page 2, in item 4, the month discussed for not meeting should be August, not September. Another error appears on page 3, in the Policy for Senior Lecturers, the title "Clinical Lecturers" is non-existent and should be "Lecturers." In the same paragraph, the second sentence should read "It adds definitions of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers."

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as amended. The motion carried and the minutes were approved.

3. SPEAKER'S REPORT

1. Policy Matters

The need for non-substantive revisions to our policy documents is more or less constant, to be consistent with changes in wording of laws, Regents' Rules, and our own administrative structure. As a rule, the Senate does not want to be involved when such changes have no significance for academic policy. A few years ago, we agreed to a general procedure for deciding whether revisions to policies and charges were non-substantive in this sense. The procedure is that they are reviewed by the Academic Council Agenda Committee, which is the President, Speaker, and Secretary. In practice, Dr. Beadle makes the changes and if the matters are clearly non-substantive the Speaker does not invoke the full committee.

2. There have been editorial revisions to the charges of two university committees.

(1) The charge of the Safety Council has been revised, at the request of the committee, to change the name to Safety and Security Council, in keeping with new Federal mandates. Also, the composition of the committee has been expanded to include ex-officio representation from the new university office of Environmental Health and Safety.

(2) There have been changes in the charge of the Distance Learning Committee reflecting changes in the titles of offices concerned with Distance Learning.
A number of other changes have gone forward to System involving changes in the titles of our former College Masters to Associate Deans of Undergraduate Education, a change that the Senate recognized several years ago.

3. SACS related actions that require no Senate action, but that the Senate should be aware of:

The SACS office is trying to assure that online (distance learning) courses have the same syllabi as classroom courses or syllabi with comparable content.

Up to now, our course evaluation process has not included distance learning courses. The process of filling the forms in and turning them in was not appropriate. The University of Washington will provide online course evaluations for these courses. The cost is nominal: $175 to initiate and then $25.00 per course. The administration is going ahead with the arrangements.

Robert Nelsen advises us that we will probably need to put in place a more explicit type of quality control on dissertations—assigning some specific responsibility. Implicitly, our policy and practice has been that this is the responsibility of the dissertation committee. The examining committee at the time of the Oral should provide a check to be sure they have carried it out, and the Graduate Dean, finally, should be sure that this has all been done properly. The most obvious place to say this is in the bylaws of the Graduate Council. We could ask them to make the changes and submit them to the Senate for review.

4. Cooperative Education, Internships, and Curricular Practices Training/Industrial Practices Program (CPT/IPP). A problem in equity has been identified by Michael Doty, Director of the Career Center. This concerns the number of credit hours that ECS and SOM allow to provide a student with what they consider “full time” status. Full time status, in turn has implications for students’ coverage on health insurance plans and probably other such arrangements. According to a memo from Mr. Doty, ECS allows enrollment for one hour of IPP (but not other types of independent study) to confer full time status. SOM, by contrast, requires 3 semester hours. Mr. Doty’s question is “Why can a domestic [student] from ECS register for a one-hour class and be considered full-time while any other domestic student in another program is not permitted?” He continues that “It is the Career Center’s desire to have this interpretation inclusive of all students in the other schools.” In a memorandum dated July 20, 2006, the Provost has asked the Deans to report on the practices in their respective schools. They have presumably reported. This may require consideration by the Senate to formulate a general policy.

5. Provost Wildenthal has asked for three faculty representatives for the Campus Enhancement Project Committee. We had no procedure and the names were needed before September 22. The Speaker consulted with the Committee on Committees and then asked the Senate for volunteers or recommendations. This yielded seven names, all
6. of whom would have been able representatives. He has recommend Dr. Jack Rushing, Dr. Sheila Amin Piñeres, and Dr. Marilyn Kaplan. In the even that Dr. Piñeres was place on the Committee on the basis of her administrative capacity, Speaker Leaf recommend Dr. Ravi Prakash in her stead.

4. U. T. SYSTEM FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Professor Leaf noted that there was a tenure crisis at University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston. Apparently the President overspent the budget. There are tenured faculty in positions that the university has proposed cutting, and there are tenured faculty who have been told their salaries will be cut substantially. President Daniel added that the problem has been developing for several years. The Texas Faculty Association has been involved. The FAC has only recently become involved, but is now concerned and will be watching developments carefully.

Changes sometimes pop up unexpectedly in Regents' Rules, and it is not always clear where they might lead. Recently, a change in wording makes it part of the President's duties to convene meetings of the academic governance body. Since we do this, it is not a problem. But it is not a standard practice in the UT campuses, and it is not possible to know what the reaction of other campuses may be and whether they will then affect us. Another change in Regents' Rules is that the section that had described the process for searches for higher level administrators has been dropped. This was partly in response to our own last presidential search, which we felt was overly prescribed in some respects, and the recommendations of the search committee that grew out of it. But, again, it is not clear where the present lack of guidance will lead.

There had also been a section in Regents' Rules that made it a presidential responsibility to assure that sections of the Handbook of Operating Procedures pertaining to matters under faculty purview were reviewed by the faculty governance body before being submitted to the Regents for final approval. The FAC had suggested wording to clarify and strengthen this section. The section now seems to have disappeared. We will see if the requirement is stated somewhere else.

The next meeting of the FAC is October 12 and 13.

5. RESEARCH FACULTY POLICY

Speaker Leaf called for a motion to approve the proposed policy on Research Faculty (Non-Tenure-Track). The policy was drafted by Professor Nelsen. It concerns a new set of titles that we have started to use. This represents a departure from a policy decision we made when we just became a university, transitioning from the post graduate institute, which was to eliminate soft money positions and have as many faculty as possible on secure, tenure track, appointments. This was never put in writing as such, but is reflected indirectly in many of our other policies. On the other hand, unlike the earlier state of affairs, this draws a clear line between soft money positions and titles and tenure/tenure-track positions and titles, and is very clear that in the former case the university has no financial or employment obligation if the person is not self-supporting or grant-supported.
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Professor Cantrell moved acceptance as circulated in the agenda packet. The motion was seconded. In discussion an amendment was suggested replacing the phrase “research Professor” with “research faculty.” The maker and author accepted the amendment.

The motion as amended carried on voice vote.

6. DRAFT SENATE MISSION STATEMENT FOR SACS

Speaker Leaf called for a motion to approve the draft U. T. Dallas Academic Governance Mission statement, with some editorial changes to the text as circulated in the agenda packet. The requirement for the mission statement comes from SACS. The content of the statement is adapted from our Senate website. A further change was suggested from the floor and accepted. With the amendments, the text is:

MISSION STATEMENT: ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE, U T DALLAS

The Regents’ Rules of the Board of Regents, The University of Texas System, recognize the traditional areas of faculty concern and provide a sound basis for an effective system of faculty governance, in which the faculty has primary responsibility for curricular and academic policies and procedures and the administration has primary responsibility for the institution’s financial integrity and compliance to general law. The Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System (hereafter referred to as the Regents’ Rules), Series 40101, defines the Faculty Role in Educational Policy Formulation as follows:

Sec. 3 General Authority. Subject to the authority of the Board of Regents and subject further to the authority that the Board has vested in the various administrative officers and subdivisions of the System, the faculties of the institutions regularly offering instruction shall have a major role in the governance of their respective institutions in the following areas:

3.1 General academic policies and welfare.  
3.2 Student life and activities.  
3.3 Requirements of admission and graduation.  
3.4 Honors and scholastic performance.  
3.5 Approval of candidates for degrees.  
3.6 Faculty rules of procedure.

The governance system at The University of Texas at Dallas is designed to carry out this responsibility. The central idea of the UTD governance system is that the Academic Senate is the principal policy making body, subject to review by the General Faculty. The Committees of the Academic Senate are executive committees. They are not simply advisory. Each committee has an assigned Responsible University Official (RVO). The RVO is an administrator whose area of responsibility is most closely aligned with the area of responsibility of the Committee. The RVO is subject to a general charge that they are to regard the advice of the Committee as the advice of the Senate, while the Committees are subject to the general charge that their advice and
recommendations shall be consistent with the general policies of the Senate. If there is dispute regarding whether this advice is consistent with Senate policy, the Committee is further charged to bring this to the attention of the Senate, while the RUOs are further charged to bring this to the attention of their administrative superiors, for resolution in the Senate.

Robert Kieschnick made the motion. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried by voice vote.

7. CREDENTIALING OF FACULTY

This is also in response to a SACS requirement. The requirement is that we be able to document that all faculty are credentialed to teach the courses they teach. U. T. El Paso was considered to lack a policy on this and was threatened with non-renewal of accreditation. They responded with an extremely elaborate and detailed policy, in which transcripts had to be required of all hires and specific administrators were assigned detailed responsibilities for checking them. This met with SACS approval. In our view, this type of rigid and elaborate detail, and the underlying assumption that the only way one becomes qualified to teach a topic is by taking a course in it, is inconsistent with the nature of a research university and would be an embarrassment. We want faculty who create knowledge that did not even exist when they were students. Our present policy is that it is the responsibility of the ad hoc committee, primarily, to assure that candidates have the qualifications they claim and that they are, in fact, competent to teach what they are being hired to teach. We have, therefore, developed a set of forms that make this explicit, while leaving to the committee to say how they have made that determination and on what evidence. The proposed amendment is to make the use of this form part of our formal policy. Accordingly, Speaker Leaf called for a motion to amend the policy, General Standards and Procedures: Initial Appointments To The Ranks Of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, by adding the following sentence at the end of the second paragraph in the section titled “Search Committees” shown in the agenda packet:

Ad hoc committees should certify credentials of candidates using the University’s Certification of Credentials and Qualifications forms for faculty positions.

The motion was made by Professor Cantrell and seconded by Marilyn Kaplan. The motion carried by voice vote.

8. CONSULTATION IN THE SELECTION OF CERTAIN KEY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS

This policy had originally been approved by the Senate in 2003 but not sent forward to system. It was reapproved by the Senate last Spring and sent to the Office of General Counsel. They objected to the wording on two main grounds: that it did not make clear enough that the President was not bound by the recommendations of the committee, and that there should be more consistency of wording throughout the several sections for the different officers. Speaker Leaf
called for a motion to approve the policy as circulated with the agenda packet, striking the last sentence in the first paragraph, beginning “The President is responsible. . .” He commented this had been removed in Council but the deletion was not carried forward.

The motion was made and seconded. The motion carried by voice vote.

9. PART-TIME FACULTY HIRING AND EVALUATION PROCEDURE

This is partly in response to SACS, and partly in response to what we have also recognized as a need for some time, as a logical next step after extending peer review to Senior Lecturers. The main thrust is that it dovetails the solution with established practice. Our present policies and bylaws require that each school have a teaching evaluation committee. This policy simply adds oversight of part-time faculty to their responsibilities, which in most schools they have already. Speaker Leaf called for a motion to approve the policy.

Robert Kieschnick made the motion. Jennifer Holmes seconded the motion.

In discussion Professor Cantrell suggested adding the following wording to the end of the second paragraph:

The Dean or Department Head shall certify the credentials of part-time faculty hires using the U. T. Dallas form, Certification of Credentials and Qualifications for a Non-Tenure System Faculty Appointment.

The maker and second accepted the amendment.

The motion carried on voice vote.

10. APPROVAL OF APPOINTEES TO AUXILIARY SERVICES ADVISORY & PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEES

10. A. AUXILIARY SERVICES:

This is a newly renamed committee, formerly the Food Services Committee. As such it was somewhat dead over the last few years. The administration would now like to bring it back to life with an expanded charge. The Committee on Committees had not been aware of the need to make recommendations for this committee when it met in July. After asking the faculty for expressions of interest, and receiving several, the Committee on Committee nominated Sheila Piñeres and Linda Keith. The Council recommends approval. Speaker Leaf called for a motion to approve the recommendations.

In discussion it was agreed to refer the problem of getting faculty syllabi to Off Campus Books and the Campus Book Store to this committee.

The motion was made and seconded. The motion carried.
10.B. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEES

In this case, the Committee on Committees did not have correct information on the composition of the committee when it met in July. This has now been corrected, and the recommendations are as in the agenda packet.

The motion was made by Robert Kieschnick. The motion was seconded. The motion carried by voice vote.

11. APPROVAL OF LABORATORY CLOSE-OUT POLICY

This policy has been developed by the University Safety and Security Council. This will not go into the Faculty Handbook but will become part of our Handbook of Operating Procedures through the Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual and our safety manual. It is being brought to the Senate to affirm faculty support and help spread awareness.

The motion was made and seconded. The motion carried by voice vote.

12. FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN THE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS.

Professor Nelsen explained that this policy had been originally developed and approved by the Senate in 1996, and has been acted on. Recently, however, the Regent’s Rules has incorporated a requirement that all U. T. components should have such a policy, and required that the involvement include staff and students as well as faculty. Accordingly, our policy has now been revised to incorporate these requirements. It also revises some of the questions to make them more appropriate for the respective positions and more appropriate for online administration.

Tim Redman moved. Marilyn Kaplan seconded. The motion carried on voice vote.

13. Speaker Leaf introduced Chris Dickson, newly elected Chair of the Staff Council, who will be attending the Senate meetings in that capacity.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Noting that there was no further business, President Daniel called for a motion to adjourn. Professor Pervin moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded. The motion carried by voice vote.
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