

## APPROVED MINUTES

### ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING January 24, 2007

PRESENT: Mark Anderson, James Bartlett, Duane Buhrmester, John Burr, John Gooch, Jennifer Holmes, Marilyn Kaplan, Robert Kieschnick, Murray Leaf, Sumit Majumdar, Dennis Miller, Homer Montgomery, Shun Chen Niu, Simeon Ntafos, William Pervin, Beatrice Rasmussen, Brian Ratchford, Liz Salter, Mary Urquhart,

ABSENT: Poras Balsara, Dinesh Bhatia, Gail Breen, Tom Brikowski, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, Jeff DeJong, Gregg Dieckmann, Santosh D'Mello, Juan Gonzalez, Warren Goux, Gopal Gupta, D.T. Huynh, Ramachandran Natarajan, Ravi Prakash,, Tim Redman, Young Ryu, S. Venkatesan,

VISITORS: Charlie Barnett, Basheer Benhalim, Chris Dickson, Sheila Pineres

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order in President Daniel's absence.

Dr. Wildenthal began with an update on the Campus Enhancement project. Peter Walker and Partners (PWP) Architects were back on campus January 18. The ideas they presented are on the UTD website now. They continue to express interest in comments and suggestions from the UTD and area communities. The tentative designs PWP brought to the meeting include possible locations of several new buildings that have been approved, or are in the process of being approved, by the Board of Regents. These include the new Student Services Building, the Math and Science Classroom Building, a Student Housing facility that can accommodate roughly 400 students, and, separately, a central dining facility.

The new housing facility will most likely be built on the land which the golf driving range currently occupies. The dining facility may be incorporated into the Student Services building.

The UT System Chancellor's Council will be visiting the campus the weekend of January 26 and dedicating the new Center for Brain Health on Mockingbird Lane in Dallas.

The NSERL building will be dedicated as soon as unpacking of furniture and lab supplies can be completed and the interior polished up.

The new tuition plans have been publicized, and have garnered some less than enthusiastic responses. It is hoped that the realization that tuition will remain the same for four years after students begin their freshman year will bring more positive responses.

U.T. System is in the process of announcing a plan that will allow students whose families earn under \$25,000 annual income to attend UT Dallas or UT Arlington at no charge, if they meet certain criteria.

Spring enrollment head count is down about 1.5% from last spring, and credit hours are down about .5%. Many of the other higher education institutions in Texas are lower in enrollment numbers than UTD. Dr. Pineres and her recruiting staff are working hard to reverse this problem. Dr. Wildenthal said a plan has been developed to extend the guaranteed tuition plan to the community college students who sign on to attend UTD after two years.

## 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2007

There were no corrections of the minutes. Dr. Robert Kieschnick moved to approve them as circulated. Dr. Elizabeth Salter seconded. The motion carried.

## 3. SPEAKER'S REPORT

The Ad Hoc Academic Calendar Policy Committee has drawn up their recommendations and has circulated them. They are proposing some changes, with their basic recommendation shortening the winter break and starting the fall semester a week later. A question will be whether these changes should be made in Fall 2007. There are many important deadline dates that would be affected besides just the start of classes. The committee is hoping to have a final report to the Senate at the next meeting.

The Senate website has been mostly completed. Dr. Leaf has added links to resources and legislators that he believes will be helpful to all faculty members. He encouraged everyone to use these links. The legislators need to know how the faculty feels, and what we need to do our jobs, to be able to pass legislation that would help us. The state is expecting a surplus budget this year, so higher education could be in a position to receive extra funds.

There is also a link to the Research Project Database (AKA the "dating service").

Dr. Leaf said that he and Dr. Daniel, among others, have received a complaint about the process followed making appointments in the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences. He checked with the Chair of that Ad Hoc committee and was satisfied that the rules that were in place were followed, but considers that taking the Committee on the Qualifications of Academic Personnel (CQ) out of the initial hiring process has caused a lack of specificity in the rules, particularly with regard to faculty votes.

Dr. Marilyn Kaplan talked about the Senate newsletter which will be sent out to faculty via email, and will also have a link on the Senate website.

Dr. Kaplan has been attending the Student Government Association (SGA) meetings. They are hanging a banner in protest of Barnes & Noble's refusal to help provide ISBN numbers to students or other book stores. The SGA is getting involved in the U.T. Serve project by helping on the "Destination Imagination" project. And, they are upset about the rate hikes that are happening in the Waterview Apartments on campus.

#### 4. FAC REPORT

The Faculty Advisory Council met on December 7 & 8. The last two meetings of the FAC have focused on the salary problem at the U.T. Medical Branch at Galveston. At medical campuses generally, faculty are expected to get a large part of their salary from grants, but there has been no clear or uniform system for specifying what the various portions of salary were, and what the contingencies were concerning them. Recently, U T System Vice Chancellor Shine has pressed the campuses to develop clear and consistent "compensation plans," but Faculty Governance was not made an integral part of the process through which this was done. Faculty "consultation" was required, but not formal review in the governance bodies. There was no governance involvement at UTMB. The consequence was that when the compensation plan was announced at UTMB, there was massive faculty dissatisfaction and protest, up to and including a "town meeting." One source of the anger was that tenured faculty who had been getting research funds found their salaries cut substantially while some clinical faculty, who had not been producing their own income as required, found their salaries left intact. The FAC decided at their October meeting that it would try to develop guidelines for their faculty governance involvement in this process on the health campuses. At the last meeting, the FAC did in fact develop such guidelines. They are now being circulated around the medical campuses.

Additionally, the FAC will be interested in oversight in Distance Learning.

Finally, a member of the Texas legislature, formerly the mayor of Austin, addressed the group and expressed great interest in supporting higher education. In pursuing this, he has been visiting various campuses, but generally has not been making a point of visiting with the faculty as such. Dr. Leaf has asked him to notify Faculty Governance at those campuses when he is there, and he has agreed to do so.

#### 5. POLICY MEMORANDUM ON CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS

A motion was made by Dr. Kaplan and seconded by Dr. Holmes to approve the proposed policy on graduate and undergraduate certificate programs. It was agreed in discussion to change the name to "ACADEMIC CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS" and that every occurrence of the words "certificate program" in the policy would be changed to "academic certificate program." The policy then reads:

## ACADEMIC CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS

An academic certificate program, for the purposes of this policy document, is a prescribed set of graded, organized courses, the satisfactory completion of which entitles a student to a certificate of completion, but not a degree.

Before an academic certificate program that meets this definition can be advertised or students enrolled, the program must be approved by the Academic Senate, following review by the Committee on Educational Policy and either the Graduate Council or the Council on Undergraduate Education, as appropriate. In addition, all graduate academic certificate programs that require more than 15 semester credit hours of graded, organized courses, and all undergraduate academic certificate programs that require more than 20 hours of graded, organized courses, are subject to review and final approval by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

An assessment plan must accompany every proposal for an academic certificate program.

At the end of every semester, for each academic certificate program, the cognizant School or Department must report the number of students enrolled in the program and the number of students completing the program to the Office of Strategic Planning and Assessment.

The courses taken for an academic certificate program may be used in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree, to the extent that is permitted by the requirements of the cognizant degree program. Admission to an academic certificate program does not constitute admission to a degree program.

The motion passed.

### 6. DISTANCE LEARNING COMMITTEE '05-'06 ANNUAL REPORT

Speaker Leaf was not sure that this was meant to be the final report for this committee. He said he would check with the committee's chair. He then asked for a motion to accept the report as it is. Dr. Robert Kieschnick made the motion, Dr. Marilyn Kaplan seconded it. The motion carried.

The report is Appendix B.

Dr. Nelsen added that Distance Learning Courses are now being evaluated and posted online. This had not been done previously.

The Senate noted that the report poses a number of questions. Since the Distance Learning Committee itself was the body best qualified to answer them, the Senate agreed that Speaker Leaf should refer the questions back to the committee for their views.

## 7. FACULTY MENTORING COMMITTEE '05-'06 ANNUAL REPORT

Speaker Leaf asked for a vote on accepting this report as submitted. The report was accepted.

## 8. POLICY ON PUBLISHING LISTS OF REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS

Students have tried a number of ways to get the UTD Bookstore to release the ISBN numbers on books that are required for a course. The Bookstore has not been cooperative. Basheer Benhalim, the Student Government President, said that some students have started buying and selling their books online. Dr. Wildenthal suggested creating a small form online in a central location, as is now done for syllabi. Each professor or instructor could then log on and fill it in, and the information can then be made available to the Bookstore, other vendors, and students. The Senate and Student Government representatives agreed that we should try it. Dr. Nelsen undertook to design and mount the site, although they would not be to do it until after June.

## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR "HONORS IN THE MAJOR"

Dr. Ntafos moved to approve the catalog copy for "Honors in the Major." Dr. Bartlett seconded.

Speaker Leaf noted that the present title had not been in the original text submitted to the Academic Council. It had been adopted in the discussions in Council, but the wording had not been fully carried through in text as circulated in the agenda packet. Accordingly he proposed two further changes of the term "School Honors" to "Honors in the Major." One is in the last line of the first paragraph on page two, and the second change in the very last sentence on page two. This was accepted by the makers.

The motion passed. The approved text is Appendix C.

In addition to approving the catalog copy, the Senate considered whether it should be a UTD-wide policy that all students should have access to a such a program (that is, to a thesis (or project) honors program)?

And, further, whether there should be a general policy in regard any or all of the following:

- A. Requirements in terms of faculty supervision and oversight?
  - B. The credit given for faculty supervision in terms of faculty teaching load?
  - C. What will the requirements be in terms of oversight of the faculty supervision?
  - D. Publicizing the results in some place, or by some means. Can there be a general policy for this, and, if so, what would it be?
  - E. Costs, where costs may be incurred?
- discussed a number of policy issues that it raised.

Academic Senate meeting  
January 24, 2007

It was agreed that the entire list should be referred to CEP and CUE for their recommendations.:

#### 10. AD HOC ELECTION COMMITTEE & CALENDAR

Speaker Leaf asked for a motion to appoint John Wiorkowski as the Chair of the Election Committee. Dr. Kieschnick made a motion, Marilyn Kaplan seconded it. The motion carried.

This has the effect of beginning the Senate election cycle.

#### 11. REPORT ON UT-ARLINGTON'S NEW FACULTY/STAFF CLUB

Dr. Kaplan gave a report on the Faculty/Staff Club at U.T. Arlington. She visited the campus recently and ate at the club. The artwork was designed and donated by faculty from Arts & Humanities. The food was upscale, not fast-food fare. It is for faculty and staff only. It is open for lunch and serves wine and beer from 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm. It is now self-sustaining. The idea for the club was started by the new U.T. Arlington President, James D. Spaniolo, who felt that the university should have a place for faculty and staff to eat and visit.

The Senate agreed, without a formal motion, that we should pursue the possibility of a similar arrangement.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Being there was no more business to discuss, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
Speaker of the Faculty

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT DALLAS**  
**NUMBERED POLICY MEMORANDA**

---

POLICY MEMORANDUM 07-III.21-xx

Draft: January 10, 2007

**CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS**

A certificate program, for the purposes of this policy document, is a prescribed set of graded, organized courses, offered for academic credit, the satisfactory completion of which entitles a student to a certificate of completion, but not a degree.

Before a certificate program that meets this definition can be advertised or students enrolled, the program must be approved by the Academic Senate, following review by the Committee on Educational Policy and either the Graduate Council or the Council on Undergraduate Education, as appropriate. An assessment plan must accompany every proposal request for a certificate program. In addition, all graduate certificate programs that require more than 15 semester credit hours of graded, organized courses, and all undergraduate certificate programs that require more than 20 hours of graded, organized courses, are subject to review and prior approval by the U. T. System and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

At the end of every semester, for each certificate program, the cognizant School or Department/Program must report the number of students enrolled in the program and the number of students completing the program to the Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis.

The courses taken for a certificate program may be used in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree, to the extent that is permitted by the requirements of the cognizant degree program. Admission to a certificate program does not constitute admission to a degree program.

## MEMORANDUM

Distance Learning Committee  
2005-2006 Year-end Report

Submitted by: D. A. Hicks, Chair  
November 17, 2006

### Committee Membership

#### Faculty

Barnes, George E (VC)	MANAGEMENT	SM2.232	SM27	gbarnes@utdallas.edu	972-883-2783
Hicks, Donald A (C)	SOCIAL SCIENCES	GR3.804	GR31	dahicks@utdallas.edu	972-883-2733
Kitagawa, Midori	ARTS & HUMANITIES	JO4.810	JO31	midori@utdallas.edu	972-883-2806
Ledbetter, Cynthia E	SCIENCE EDUCATION	FN3.308	FN33	ledbeter@utdallas.edu	972-883-2496
Lewin, Peter	MANAGEMENT	SM3.223	SM31	plewin@utdallas.edu	972-883-2729
Torlak, Murat	ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING	EC3.518	EC33	torlak@utdallas.edu	972-883-4624

#### RUO

Kratz, Abby R	ACADEMIC AFFAIRS & PROVOST	MP2.103	AD23	ark024000@utdallas.edu	972-883-6742
---------------	----------------------------	---------	------	------------------------	--------------

#### Ex-Officio (with vote)

Hargrove, William W	EX. DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION RESOURCES	AD2.403	AD28	hargrove@utdallas.edu	972-883-6883
Cunningham, Austin J	DEAN OF GRADUATE STUDIES	FN3.218	FN31	Austin.Cunningham@utdallas.edu	972-883-2234
Helms, Robert	DEAN OF ENGINEERING & COMPUTER SCIENCE	EC3.728	EC32	rxh033000@utdallas.edu	972-883-2974
Rachavong, Narris D	VP FOR STUDENT	AD2.412	AD31	dar@utdallas.edu	972-883-



	AFFAIRS				6863
Pirkul, Hasan	DEAN OF SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT	SM4.608	SM40	hpirkul@utdallas.edu	972- 883- 6813

**Committee Charge:**

*The Committee on Distance Learning is a Concurrent Committee of the Academic Senate charged to analyze, support, and provide planning advice and recommendations regarding distance learning as this activity involves faculty time and effort, and demands upon staff and financial resources. The Committee will advise the President through the Academic Senate on **strategy and policy regarding distance learning**, and will advise the Executive Vice President and Provost, through the Coordinator of the Center for Online Learning and Technology, on **academic and faculty issues that pertain to distance learning**. [Emphasis added]*

**Summary 2005-2006 Committee Activities**

The Committee met three (3) times during the academic year:  
(September 30, 2005; December 12, 2005, April 24, 2006)

**A. Organizing Issues: What Are the Recurring Issues Over the Recent Past?**

A review of the work of previous Distance Learning (DL) Committees revealed that year after year several questions have dominated discussion:

1. Will the expanded “reach” of online instruction complement or undercut efforts to maintain the highest possible quality in on-site instruction?
2. Are scarce university resources best delivered through a centralized or decentralized (school-specific) distance learning support infrastructure?
3. What is the best way to incent faculty to augment their existing courses with online features (*hybrid model*) and/or to develop more online courses (*pure model*). This includes an acknowledgement of the heavy front-end investments required to develop online instructional materials, as well as the relatively heavier time commitment for online instruction in either a pure or a hybrid model.
4. What is the best way to evaluate the quality of the learning experience associated with the use of new distance learning technologies?

**B. Contemporary Usage Patterns and Experiences**

The 2005-06 Committee sought to pursue these questions through

- a) An initial assessment of school-specific experiences on the UT-D campus
- and

b) A survey of individual school adoption/usage patterns

### **1. University-Wide Perspective**

To some extent, the rapid enrollment growth on our campus in the past several years may have blunted some of the momentum of previous years to accelerate the use telecommunication technologies to expand access to higher education beyond the physical campus. However, as this growth has put pressure on existing physical plant – classroom space in particular – and as the college-age population and effective demand for high education across Texas have grown, it is likely that attention will turn once again to distance learning opportunities.

One development that appears to have emerged in recent years is the separate diffusion of online instruction and the use of course management tools such as Blackboard and Web CT for both online and onsite courses. As regards the latter, the recent announcement of the merger of Blackboard and Web CT may well reduce the reticence of nonadopters to consider the use of such tools, as they no longer are faced with questions about which tool is the better one. Moreover, new rules promulgated in April [2005] by the Coordinating Board (CB) and the subsequent gradual trickling in of reporting instructions from CB staff for measuring distance-learning activities across campuses could well alter this landscape. The following patterns have emerged from “school scans” focused on usage of DL technologies on campus:

1. Not surprisingly, there is evidence that individual schools have adopted varieties of DL technologies in diverse ways that best meet their individual needs. This may argue against a more centralized model with which to promote the use of these tools.
2. For the first time we have spotty time-series evidence of the expanded use of DL activities at the program level (see below). SOM appears to have successfully integrated DL tools and program curricula and generally adapted to the mobility of their target markets.
3. NS&M reports that one of the continuing obstacles to the adoption of DL technologies and their integration into faculty research and teaching is general unfamiliarity with what is available and how it can be used. This may argue for making introductory workshops more or less mandatory at the school level, not unlike the mandatory training exercises we are required annually to complete online. In addition, NS&M appears to have concluded that the best way forward is to adopt a division of labor whereby faculty focus on curriculum content alone and an instructional designer/developer be made available to produce the online course packages (see below).

In order to explore what have become recurring issues/questions, the Committee attempted to conduct “school scans” through the use of a brief survey. Assuming that a “centralized” or “top-down” approach to driving greater adoption of DL technologies was not likely to be productive, these school scans sought to identify patterns of adaptation of DL practices by instructors to the special opportunities/ circumstances in individual schools and courses. The following categories were used:

1. **Inventory of DL usage** [this might include a) [*Hybrid*] evidence of the use of course management software (Blackboard, WebCT) and b) [*Pure*] courses offered to off-site students.
2. **Evidence of "best practices"** - Brief description of DL implementation that appears to work successfully.
3. **School-level support systems** provided to facilitate DL (brief description)
4. **Business model** details: Does a course or a program impose a surcharge on students to support DL-specific activities. Can you estimate how much has been raised (per course, per semester, or for the school in aggregate?)
5. **Strategic significance of DL to school mission?** Evidence of new markets served?
6. **Persistent barriers?** [List obstacles that the university might focus on and remove].
7. **Other-** whatever "nuggets" you think might be usefully passed along.

While the results of these school scans were relatively sparse, those associated with the School of Management (SOM) yielded information worth noting broadly by the university. Accordingly, we bring these forward for consideration.

## 2. A School-Specific Perspective: The SOM Experience<sup>1</sup>

The SOM recognized in the mid-1990s a need to provide graduate level degree courses to customers disenfranchised by geography and time. The students that were served by the development of distance education (now, online) deliverables were those who were actually at a geographic distance, or whose employer's travel commitments prevented them from attending a typical once-a-week 7pm class on campus, or who had a conflict between two courses in their degree program offered at the same time, or who had personal/family constraints, or who were transferred to another city/country prior to completing the UTD degree.

Each of the degree programs that has emerged have different combinations of these students and have different blends of online and face-to-face contact. From the outset, the extension of degree programs into the online environment has been guided by the same rigor and quality control as on-campus courses, including the involvement of the same faculty, and the requirement for interactive contact between faculty and students. A new

---

<sup>1</sup> Commentary provided primarily by Profs. Peter Lewin and George Barnes (SOM). The discussion draws primarily on the experiences in the following programs: a) Global MBA Online program, b) Accounting and Information Management (MS AIM); c) Global Leadership Executive MBA (GLEMBA); and d) Project Management

Web-conferencing (VOIP) tool, *Elluminate*, replaced an older phone-based system in Fall, 2005.

1. The availability of the Internet, and the instructional software platforms that have been developed for it, have created opportunities and challenges for university instruction. Our university has responded somewhat inconsistently.
  - a. On the one hand, as evidenced by the existence of this committee and the programs in some of our schools (most notably the SOM), the response has been positive, even enthusiastic.
  - b. On the other hand, there is the common fear that online-teaching may be a dangerous gimmick that will help us to dilute the quality of our courses and allow standards to deteriorate.
2. Online instruction is not simply on-campus instruction migrated online. There are important mutual complementarities (synergies) between the two. This partially addresses the fear of standards dilution. The development of the internet, along with evolving student computer skills, means that instructors will have to adapt to their students' need for seamless online supplements. As our instructors become more comfortable with online tools in their everyday teaching, the likelihood that they will become interested in creating or participating in online courses, tends to be enhanced. (New pervasive technologies imply the development of new "cultures" and this takes time and is not without pain).
3. This raises the issue of university strategy. To the extent that UTD as an institution would like to be a player in the online instruction environment, and would like to see its faculty taking initiative, it will need to consider how to make resources available to that end.
  - a. Should this be as a response to that initiative or should it precede it?
  - b. What should be the source of these funds? Is there a mechanism for facilitating "fee for service" at the local level? A fee for the student?
  - c. There are obvious problems with "unfunded mandates," articulating a mission, or desired initiative without somehow making the funds available.
4. A basic principle of planning for online instruction development and delivery would appear to be *a separation of content from mechanism*. The latter should be based on state-of-the art general purpose (online instructional) technology which is provided as a service to the instructor who is in control of the content. This involves commitment to the employment and use of personnel with special skills in computer-based educational design.
  - a. Should this be university wide – a service organization to the whole university? The benefits are economies of scale – spreading the cost over a wider number of users. Potential costs and dangers are conflicts over usage, ambiguities of authority and accountability, the creation of an underused bureaucracy, etc.

- b. An alternative is a set of decentralized service organizations – call them distance-instruction-service-centers (DISCs) (one for each school?) accountable to the school or department they serve. The benefits are greater ease of communication and oversight, a tailoring of size and effort to the needs of the school or department, fruitful competition and interaction between the different DISCs which leads to mutual cross fertilization of ideas, etc. Potential dangers are wasteful duplication of effort – multiple bureaucratic islands.
- 5. The unresolved debates in online education apparently suggest:
  - a. Quality interaction is key in determining education quality. It occurs in all courses (online and other) at three levels - between student and instructor, between student and student, and between student and content.
  - b. The actual medium of interaction is much less important than the quality of the interaction.