

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
April 18, 2007

PRESENT: Mark Anderson, James Bartlett, Gail Breen, Duane Buhrmester, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, Juan Gonzalez, John Gooch, Warren Goux, Jennifer Holmes, D.T. Huynh, Marilyn Kaplan, Robert Kieschnick, Murray Leaf, Dennis Miller, Homer Montgomery, Shun Chen Niu, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Beatrice Rasmussen, Tim Redman, Young Ryu, Liz Salter, Mary Urquhart

ABSENT: Poras Balsara, Dinesh Bhatia, Tom Brikowski, John Burr, Jeff DeJong, Gregg Dieckmann, Santosh D'Mello, Gopal Gupta, Sumit Majumdar, Ramachandran Natarajan, William Pervin, Brian Ratchford, S. Venkatesan,

VISITORS: Michael Coleman, Chris Dickson, Richard Huckaba

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Associate Provost Robert Nelsen called the meeting to order in President Daniel's absence.

Announcements included:

- 1.) Workshops will be set up through the Business Affairs office on how to handle a crisis at UTD like the tragedy that happened at Virginia Tech. The workshops will probably begin in May.
- 2.) All ad hoc review committees have completed their work before the deadline. The Provost will have the results for the next Senate meeting.
- 3.) Program assessments for SACS are due May 30 for this semester.
- 4.) There was a problem with mid-term grades not getting submitted from many students using WEB Ct. The submit button was not hit and the grades did not make it to SIS. They can see their grades in WEB Ct, but not in SIS. The problem is being corrected.
- 5.) Faculty who have not completed their compliance training will be approached by their Deans to get it finished.
- 6.) The Deans will also be discussing program objectives with their respective faculty. SACS requires those documents be posted on the Web. There is concern about how some of the objectives appear to students when they check the program descriptions on the Web.
- 7.) Summer enrollment is down 4.4%; semester credit hours are down 3.7%. Freshmen applications for fall '07 are down 9.62%, but admissions are up 3.34%, which is positive. The average SAT score is up for students who are admitted, compared to previous years. Master's applications are up significantly, and PhD applications are also up somewhat.
- 8.) The calendar is not yet set for Spring 2008, but should be ready soon, partly due to the time needed to certify Latin Honors graduates.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Professor Cantrell Moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Dr. Kieschnick Seconded. The motion carried.

3. SPEAKER'S REPORT

1. Results of Caucus election of Speaker, Secretary, and Council. Professor Leaf was elected Speaker of the Faculty. Dr. Kaplan was elected Academic Senate Secretary. It was agreed in Caucus that six would be elected and the new Speaker Leaf would appoint three additional members to assure balanced representation. Those elected were Professors Chandrasekaran, Izen, Holmes, Keishnick, Gonzalez, Redman, Cantrell, and Buhrmester.

In addition, pending a check of the rules, he appointed Dr. Elizabeth Salter to fill one of the vacancies in the Senate and also to the Council, to provide Council representation for General Studies.

The priorities that the Caucus has decided on for the year will be written up and posted on the Senate website. Dr. Leaf briefly reviewed three of the new items, however: ombudsman (discussed below), planning, and emergency response planning.

2. Campus Housing Committee. Speaker Leaf spoke with Vice-President Rachavong about the Senate's desire to have a Senate representative on the Campus Housing Committee. Speaker Leaf also suggested that the Senate representative be a voting member. She is entirely agreeable to having a Senate representative, and says that all we need to do is appoint someone. She will make the necessary changes to the charge. But she also points out that it is a student committee and only students are voting members. Speaker Leaf has indicated that we have no objection to this. Accordingly, the obvious next step is for us to put the appointment of a Senate representative on the agenda. If this works out, we can make it a regular practice.

3. Campus Ombudsman. The Staff Council and Student Government have expressed an interest in having a campus ombudsman. There has also been a persistent interest in this at the level of the UT System Faculty Advisory Council. Speaker Leaf has generally not supported it in the latter context because UTD has a fairly effective tradition of having the Speaker act in this capacity to intervene informally in disputes involving faculty. This has also been the practice at UT San Antonio and Arlington. But this does not do anything for staff or students. If there does seem to be a substantial need for such an office from the point of view of the staff or students, it would be logically almost impossible to exclude faculty. Moreover, if we were to have an ombudsman whose authority would include faculty, it might actually provide a solution to the emergent problem of what to do about deans and/or other school officers who do not abide by

Academic Senate Meeting

April 18, 2007

school bylaws. Accordingly, Speaker Leaf asked Sandee Goertzen and Chris Dickson, for Staff Council for their input. Sandee has responded by reminding us that there was a committee to consider this as part of the strategic planning activity in 2005. Their recommendation was favorable. Speaker Leaf has placed their recommendation on the agenda for next Council meeting, and we will decide what further consideration it might need, if any, before coming to the Senate.

4. Jay Dowling and Shayla Holub have been appointed to the IRB (Committee on Human Subjects) and have accepted the appointments. This is an instance of action under the policy described in item 6 on today's agenda. Since the IRB is a university committee, the Senate only gets involved when asked. We were asked by the IRB chair, and adopted the procedure of seeking a recommendation from the Committee on Committees and seeking approval from the Academic Council, leaving off the further step of sending it to the full Senate, with the delay that that would involve.

5. Calendar issues referred to CEP. This is largely obviated by the recent administrative actions reported by Professor Nelsen, but at the February meeting, the Senate asked the CEP to consider two recommendations of the ad hoc Academic Calendar Policy Committee. These were that we provide early grades for graduating undergraduates—meaning grades that would be submitted before exam week, and that with the exception of grades for graduating seniors final grades would be due four days after the schedule final. The CEP was also asked to consider the alternative possibility of awarding honors provisionally, as we now do for graduation itself, recognizing that this might obviate the need for either or both of the other two measures.

In the meanwhile, in the absence of advice of the Senate, the Administration was holding off issuing a calendar beginning Spring 2008. As it has it has happens, however, several groups on campus need to have this settled so they can plan major events. After a second request for a decision from the chair of our calendar committee and a note of complaint from the Dean of Arts and Humanities, it seemed to me important to state what seems to be the current Senate position. This is that the ruling policy is the statement according to which we approve the awarding of degrees and honors each semester. We approve subject to the provision that the student's current work be completed at the required levels. There is no stated timeline. Thus from the Senate point of view, it seems to me, the present position is there is no requirement that all work be completed and grades be in before the Honors ceremony. Speaker Leaf has circulated this opinion to the chair of CEP, the Chair of the Calendar Committee, and the Provost. So far as Speaker Leaf is aware, we are now all in agreement.

This still leaves the CEP to consider the recommendations for early grades, however. The committee has been discussing this by email.

Speaker Leaf asked Dr. Cantrell to report on the discussion. Dr. Cantrell reported that he had polled the CEP and their view was strongly opposed to separate early examinations for graduating seniors, but there was no objection to provisional honors.

Speaker Leaf summarized the discussion as agreeing that that so as far as the Senate is concerned, the arrangement that has now been arrived at is fine, and the matter should be considered closed.

4. FAC REPORT

No report—the meeting will be next month.

5. SUPPLEMENTAL UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG

Speaker Leaf called on Professor Cantrell to report on behalf of the CEP. Dr. Cantrell indicated that CEP had reviewed the copy and approved it. Professor Redman noted a correction that he had made in the CEP meeting but that was not reflected in the current copy. Dr. Kieschnick ask what the chain of submission had been, and recounted an exchange between the School of Management and the School of Economics Politics and Policy Sciences regarding the finance major that appeared not to be reflected in the copy presented.

Dr. Cantrell noted that the CEP would have a subsequent meeting that could further discuss the copy, and moved that the Senate approve the submission pending verification of the accuracy of the document. Dr. Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

The Catalog Copy is Appendix A.

6. AMENDMENT TO HOP DEFINING ROLE OF SENATE AND PRESIDENT ON APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

Speaker Leaf noted that this is not a new policy. The policy was approved by the Senate three years ago, and is part of the bylaws of the Committee on Committees. The present action is only to put the gist of that policy in the Handbook of Operating Procedures, Title III, Chapter IV, Section B.1., as Section B.2. There is also a further revision to Section C of the same Chapter, which erroneously says that the Committee on Committees is appointed by the Senate. It is in actuality appointed by the Council. The text will then read:

2. Appointments.

For Concurrent Senate Committees, the approval of the Senate is definitive; the President will not appoint anyone to a faculty position on any committee without Senate approval. If appointments are declined, the Senate will arrange to fill the vacancy in the same manner as used for the initial appointment unless specified otherwise in the charge of the concerned committee. For Concurrent University Committees, Senate approval is considered advisory to the President. The President may appoint faculty not recommended by the Senate. If appointments to Concurrent University Committees are declined,

the Senate will not seek a replacement unless asked to do so by the Committee's RUO (the Provost).

3. Replacing Committee Members

If a member of a concurrent Committee misses two consecutive committee meetings, the member will be contacted by the Chair of the committee to ascertain whether he or she still wishes to serve. If the chair determines a replacement is needed he/she will notify the Chair of the Committee on Committees.

C. Committee on Committees

1. As soon as possible after June 1, the Speaker of the Faculty shall convene the Academic Council to appoint the Committee on Committees.
2. The Committee on Committees should develop expeditiously the nomination lists for each of the Concurrent Committees, including nominations for Chair and Vice Chair, and should transmit them to the Academic Senate prior to September 1.

Dr. Nancy Van Ness moved to approve the amendments. Dr. Kieschnick seconded. The motion passed.

7. RESPONSE TO STUDENT SURVEY ON +/- GRADES FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

Speaker Leaf recapitulated that he had offered to write the letter in response to concerns expressed in the graduate survey of reactions to the change of the graduate grading scale to include plus and minus grades. The text had now been discussed in CEP and Council, and it was before the Senate for further review. There were no revisions.

Speaker Leaf asked for a sense of the senate resolution that this was an appropriate action for the Speaker to take. Dr. Redman made the motion. Dr. Kaplan seconded. The motion carried.

9. CERTIFYING CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATE DEGREES IN SPRING '07
(Appendix B is the list of PhD candidates)

Dr. Leaf made the following request for a motion to approve:

These students have applied for graduate degrees and have been reviewed by the Graduate Dean. The Graduate Dean certifies that all of these students will be eligible for the degrees indicated upon satisfactory completion of the current semester's work. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to receive the degrees as indicated upon receipt of final grades and notification of completion of other

requirements, provided that the grades received are consistent with the standards for credit prescribed by this University.

Dr. Urquhart made the motion. Dr. Salter seconded. The motion carried.

8. CERTIFYING CANDIDATES FOR UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES IN SPRING '07 (Appendix C is the list of undergraduate and Masters candidates)

Dr. Leaf made the following request for a motion to approve:

These students have applied for graduation and have been reviewed by the Office of Records. The Office of Records declared that all of these students will be eligible for graduation upon the completion of the current semester's work at the necessary levels. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to graduate upon receipt of final grades, and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades are consistent with the standards for graduation prescribed by this University. I also request that the Academic Senate certify those students designated as eligible to graduate with honors upon completion of coursework and requirements consistent with the standards for honors at the levels offered by this University.

Dr. Holmes moved to approve the candidates. Dr. Van Ness seconded. The motion carried.

10. LANGUAGE TO RESOLVE AMBIGUITIES REGARDING WHO IS A SENIOR LECTURER

This is a discussion item. Dr. Nelsen reported on the discussions that the administration has been engaged to create a clear terminological distinction between faculty who fall under the definition of "senior lecturer" in our policy on peer review for senior lecturer, which is that they should be full-time faculty, as opposed to part time faculty. The distinction is relevant in many areas apart from peer review and contracting relationships, such as who should vote for Senior Lecturer representatives on the Senate, travel policy, and the SACS review. They are agreeing on a distinction between "tenure system faculty" and "non-tenure-system faculty." This was discussed and the senate had no objection to the terminology.

On that basis, Dr. Nelsen said that he would go ahead and make the changes in our documents as editorial changes.

Dr. Leaf noted that editorial changes will come to the agenda committee of the Academic Council for review. If the agenda committee concurs that they are non-substantive, they go into effect. If the agenda committees think they may be substantive, they will place them on the Council agenda so the Council can consider whether to place them on the Senate agenda.

11. AMENDMENT TO HOP DEFINING ROLE OF FACULTY AND STAFF IN
RELATION TO STUDENT MISCONDUCT.

This calls for amendments to Chapter 49 of the Handbook of Operating Procedure: Student Discipline and Conduct. The amendments do the following:

Insert two new sections, 49.07 Faculty Role in Removal for Misconduct and 49.08 Staff Role in Removal for Misconduct.

Adds section 49.10.e calling for notification of the results of disciplinary action to be convey to the faculty and the relevant associate dean for graduate or undergraduate studies of any interim action, and an additional paragraph to section 49.11 calling for the same notification regarding final action.

Inserts language in section 49.37.(c) listing the kinds of behaviors that are regarded as disruptive.

The full amended Chapter is Appendix D.

In addition to setting a clear procedure for faculty and staff to refer a case to the Dean of Students for disciplinary action for misconduct and providing the clear list of instances of misconduct, this also provides that the faculty member or staff person may as ask that the student be barred from campus between the time of the complaint and the time the case is formally heard and decided.

Dr. Leaf explained that he had sent the text for comment to CEP and the Dean of Students the previous week, with the intention of withdrawing it if he had not heard back by the time of this meeting. He has not had a response, but in view of the events the previous day at Virginia Tech, it seemed much better to go ahead with the discussion. The more information comes out regarding the perpetrator and his interactions with the campus authorities, the more it appears to reflect precisely the failure of the disciplinary (and counseling) personnel to communicate with faculty and with each other, and to be responsive to faculty perceptions and judgment, that this legislation is intended to remedy. Of course this was not drafted with the events at Virginia Tech in mind; they had not yet happened. But it was drafted on the basis of previous similar events at the University of Arizona and San Diego State, and of course also events here at UTDallas that he and others have been concerned with, and these appeared to reflect the same sort of failure to keep faculty in the loop on matters of student discipline and disciplinary problems.

An important observation in discussion was that feedback on such matters could be taken into account in allocating financial aid (and assigning graduate students to responsibilities over undergraduates). It should not be the case that a student shows up as a dishonest, disruptive, or dangerous individual for one set of faculty (or others) and is awarded financial support by another set simply because the second set has been administratively prevented from learning of the experience of the first set. A question concerned feedback to faculty other than the original complainant. Dr. Leaf indicated that this was intended to be provided for in the requirement for notification to the Associate Dean for Graduate or Undergraduate Education. It is assumed that they will decide who to inform in turn. In

Academic Senate Meeting

April 18, 2007

Dr. Leaf's view, there is nothing in FERPA to prevent one faculty member speaking to another, or the dean informing faculty, of such matters. It is part of the information needed to carry out their normal responsibilities. After responding to questions and determining that the legislation had general support, Dr. Leaf called for a motion to approve the amendments with the subject to the provision that it will next go to the Staff Council for a review of the portions pertaining to staff.

Dr. Kaplan made the motion. Dr. Van Ness seconded. The motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED: _____
Speaker of the Faculty

DATE: _____