MEMORANDUM
August 29, 2017

TO: Academic Council*

COPY TO: Richard C. Benson  
Hobson Wildenthal  
Inga Musselman  
Calvin Jamison  
Abby Kratz  
John Wiorkowski  
Marion Underwood

FROM: Office of Academic Governance  
Christina McGowan, Academic Governance Secretary

SUBJECT: Academic Council Meeting

The Academic Council will meet on WEDNESDAY, September 6, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in ATEC 1.201. Please bring the agenda packet with you to the meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at cgm130130@utdallas.edu or x4791.

Attachments

2017-2018 ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Andrew Blanchard  
David Cordell**  
Lisa Bell  
Bill Hefley  
Jennifer Holmes  
Joe Izen  
Murray Leaf***  
Tim Redman *  
Chris Ryan  
Richard Scotch ***  
Tres Thompson  
Tonja Wissinger  

JW Van Der Schans - Student Government Pres.

*Speaker  
**Secretary  
*** Vice-Speaker
AGENDA
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
September 6, 2017
ATEC 1.201

1. Call To Order, Announcements & Questions  
   Dr. Benson

2. Approval of the Agenda  
   Dr. Leaf

3. Approval of Minutes – August 2, 2017 Meeting  
   Dr. Leaf

4. Speakers Report  
   Dr. Leaf

5. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates  
   Serenity King

6. TXCFS/FAC REPORT  
   Drs. Leaf & Cordell

7. Student Government Report  
   JW Van Der Schans

8. CEP Recommendation  
   Clint Peinhardt
   A. Undergraduates taking Graduate Courses
   B. Revisions to UTDPP1001 - Academic Certificates
   C. Spring FY18 Pilot Program for Tuberculosis Testing for International Students

9. Consideration of Resignation of Tim Redman as Speaker  
   Murray Leaf

10. Presentation: Campus Emergency Protocols  
    Murray Leaf

11. Presentation on How Classrooms are Assigned  
    Jennifer McDowell

12. Discussion: The Process for Changing Grades  
    Richard Scotch

13. Interim report from the Steering Committee for the Strategic Plan  
    Richard Scotch

14. Regents’ Rule 31006: Academic Workload Requirements  
    Dr. Leaf

15. FY 17 Annual Committee Reports  
    David Cordell

16. Replacements for Committee on Committees Recommendations  
    Dr. Redman

17. Adjournment  
    Dr. Benson
Item 3:
Previous Meeting Minutes
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Council. They have not been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are not the official minutes.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
AUGUST 2, 2017

PRESENT: Richard Benson, Inga Musselman, HolsonWildenthal, Andrew Blanchard, Lisa Bell, David Cordell, William Hefley, Jennifer Holmes, Joe Izen, Murray Leaf, Tim Redman, Chris Ryan, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Tonja Wissinger

ABSENT: None

VISITORS: Colleen Dutton, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Jennifer McDowell, Terry Pankratz, Marion Underwood, JW Van Der Schans

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions
   President Benson called the meeting to order at 1:01 PM. President Benson gave the Council an update on the search for top administrators, including the new Dean of Undergraduate Education. There are two finalists, and an announcement should be made by the end of the month.

   Enrollment is problematic. There is a national declining trend on graduate level applications. Our Masters level enrollment will decline significantly, which is most unusual for the university. Fewer foreign born graduate students are choosing to study in the United States for graduate education. There have been down ticks before, e.g. after September 11, 2001, but the university has recovered.

   The yield numbers have dropped significantly. It is odd for the yield percentage to move more than a couple percentage points. Typically one can predict with good accuracy what it will be. That is not the case for fall 2017. The freshman class will be roughly the same size as fall 2016. It is very unusual for the university not to show growth in freshman class enrollment. The problem is that the university had planned for growth. When reduced tuition revenue is coupled with the shortage in state funding, it presents a real problem for the university. One issue that will be explored is why fewer freshman are accepting the university’s offer of admission. The enrollment statistics will be closely scrutinized in the following months. President Benson opened the floor to questions. There were none.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   Speaker Redman requested that Collen Dutton’s presentation be moved to the end of the Speaker’s Report. Murray Leaf requested that a discussion on Intellectual Property be added to the agenda right after the Reaffirmation update. Joe Izen moved to approve amended Academic Council agenda. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
   Andrew Blanchard moved to approve the June 7, 2017 minutes. Bill Hefley seconded. The motion carried.

4. Speaker’s Report
1. Speaker Redman thanked Chris McGowan for moving forward the Committee on Committees’ recommendations and the appointment process. He had concerns with the recommendations for the Committee on Qualification of Academic Personnel. Those concerns will be addressed in item 9.

2. Speaker Redman requested that a report on the recent state legislation be presented at the August Academic Senate meeting. Murray Leaf moved to place a presentation on recent state legislation to the Academic Senate agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

3. All additional items were on the agenda.

5. **SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates – Serenity King**
The SACSCOC report is due in 41 days. The university is in good shape, but Ms. King is updating items that have changed in the last few months. The Academic Freedom narrative has been revised. The changes will be resubmitted to the Faculty Reaffirmation Committee for approval.

Previously, changes to the principles would not have impacted our reaffirmation, but SACSCOC has changed its review procedure. The new principles won’t affect what the university must address for the report that is due in September 2017, but new instructions will be given to the reaffirmation group in January 2018 on the new principles. A new report will be written and it will go to the site visiting team a couple weeks before they arrive. This means that the visiting team will be reviewing principles that were not reviewed by the offsite committee. The new principles relate primarily to financials, including student debt. They also require a self-evaluation of the Board of Regents. The reaffirmation team is in contact with UT system to make sure the self-evaluation process moves forward.

The new Core Curriculum Assessment Process that was approved by the May 2017 Academic Senate will be launch fall 2017. It is called “Comets to the Core.” It was officially launched on August 2, 2017. There were hiccups, which were expected, but all is going well.

Orbit, the new Quality Enhancement Program (QEP), has a logo and the marketing campaign will launch soon. The Council was advised it should begin seeing the logo in email signatures. The team has a challenge to communicate to the existing students about Orbit so they can address any questions posed to them during the site visit, however Orbit will not pertain to them as it is directed toward first year students starting in fall 2018.

Ms. King reminded the Council that the Assessment Committee will make a presentation at the August Academic Senate meeting, as it was placed on the agenda at the June Academic Council Meeting.

6. **Revisions to the Leave Policy- Colleen Dutton**
The current policy was revised to align current practices with the actual policy. The revisions allowed HR to incorporate the updated 2015 legislation. Richard Scotch moved to place on the Academic Senate agenda. Lisa Bell seconded. The motion carried.

7. **Informational: Long Term Care Insurance - Colleen Dutton**
Speaker Redman noted that the LTC Insurance premiums had doubled in price for the FY18 academic year. He requested that Colleen Dutton explain what this had occurred. Chris Ryan moved to place an informational item on the Academic Senate agenda. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.
8. **Intellectual Property - Murray Leaf**
   A patent question was raised on a recent patent application by a faculty member. There is not a policy that has a time line of when the patent ownership is returned to the faculty member. Dr. Leaf highly recommended that a policy be created that acknowledges the current practices. The item was deferred to the Committee on Intellectual Property. The Committee will investigate the situation, and if necessary create a policy to address the issues.

9. **TXCFS/ FAC Report - Murray Leaf**
   There have been no TXCFS or FAC meetings since the last Senate meeting.

10. **Student Government Report – John William Van Der Schans**
    Student Government (SG) President John William Van Der Schans spoke with Dr. Jamison concerning communication with students with regard to changes to buildings and construction of new buildings. There was confusion when the Art Barn was torn down, and SG wishes to make sure there is better communication with students regarding such activities. SG will be live streaming their meetings on social media. SG resold donated furniture for student to use in their apartments.

11. **Revisions to UTS 189- Institutional Conflict of Interest – Tim Redman**
    No action will be taken on this item.

12. **Re-evaluation of Committee on Qualification of Academic Personnel recommendations by the Committee on Committees– Tim Redman**
    In FY 2017 there were 14 members on the committee, and the only female on the committee was Marilynn Waligore. Richard Scotch moved to refer the committee recommendations back to the Committee on Committees for further discussion and to place the Committee on Committee membership recommendations on the August Academic Senate agenda. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried. The Committee on Committees will reconvened on August 9, 2017 to discuss reappointments.

13. **Senate Agenda for August 16, 2017:**
    1. Call to Order, Announcements, and Questions
    2. Approval of the Agenda
    3. Approval of the Minutes
    4. Speaker’s Report
    5. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates
    6. TXCFS/ FAC Report
    7. Student Government Report
    8. Report from the University Assessment Committee.
    9. Report on the recent state legislation
    10. Revisions to the Leave Policy
    11. Informational: Long Term Care Insurance
    12. Updates to the Committee on Committees Recommendations

14. Adjournment
There being no further business President Benson adjourned the meeting at 2:08 PM.

APPROVED: ______________________________ DATE: ______________________________

Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty
Item 8:
Committee on Educational Policy
September 2017
Updates
Graduate Courses

Upper-division undergraduates, who are classified as seniors and core complete, may petition the Undergraduate Associate Dean and Graduate Advisor to take graduate courses by completing the appropriate form available in the student's academic advising office. Schools may have additional requirements for undergraduates to register for graduate courses. If approved, these graduate courses can be applied toward satisfying undergraduate degree requirements or can be designated for future application toward a graduate degree requirement at UT Dallas. The student must declare at the time of registration for the course, on a form provided by the Undergraduate Associate Dean, how each approved course is to be applied. Once applied, the options cannot be changed.

An undergraduate student cannot take more than 15 graduate semester credit hours total. For example, if an undergraduate student chooses to take 9 graduate semester credit hours reserved for application toward graduate degree, the undergraduate student can take only 6 graduate semester credit hours toward the undergraduate degree (this includes graduate hours chosen towards the fast track option).

Fast Track Option

The Fast Track option enables qualified senior undergraduate students to include master's level courses in their undergraduate degree plans as they work towards a master's degree at UT Dallas. Admission into a Fast Track program is open to senior undergraduate students, 90 or more earned hours and core complete. Each Fast Track program may have additional admission requirements and deadlines; therefore, seniors interested in a Fast Track program should consult their academic advisor or Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies and graduate advisor in their intended master's program. For more information on the programs, please review Fast Track Programs.

Program Requirements

1. Maintain a cumulative gpa of at least 3.000.
2. Satisfy all program requirements while maintaining good academic standing.
3. Do not repeat a single master's level course more than one time. Only three master's level courses are allowed to repeat once. Withdrawals included.
4. No more than 15 semester credit hours taken at the master's level. An undergraduate student can only take only 15 graduate semester credit hours total. For example, if an undergraduate student chooses to take 9 graduate semester credit hours reserved for application toward graduate degree, the undergraduate student can only take only 6 semester credit hours at the master's level in the Fast Track option.
Academic Certificate Programs - UTDPP1001

Policy Statement

An academic 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.

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 cognate degree program. Admission to an academic certificate program does not constitute admission to a degree program.

Approvals

Before an academic certificate program that meets this definition can be advertised or students enrolled, the program must be approved by the school's curriculum committee as outlined in the school's bylaws, the Office of the Chief Academic Officer, the Graduate Council or Council on Undergraduate Education, as appropriate, the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Academic Senate. An assessment plan must accompany every proposal request for an academic certificate program. 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 prior approval by The University of Texas System and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Certificate programs, regardless of semester credit hour length, may only be offered in areas and at levels authorized by an institution's table of programs.

Templates for academic certificates and for assessment plans can be found online on the Provost's Office Academic Forms and Templates website at: http://provost.utdallas.edu/home/academic-program-proposals.

Recognition of Certificate Completion on Student Transcripts

Undergraduate certificates: The student's transcript will reflect that the student has completed the undergraduate level academic certificate program, if the student (a) has a grade point average of at least 2.0 in the organized courses that constitute the undergraduate academic certificate program, (b) meets all academic standards as required by the school and stated in the catalog, (c) the certificate program and the courses constituting such program are listed in the catalog, and (d) the student declares to the RUO of the Program his/her intent to complete the certificate.

Graduate certificates: The student's transcript will reflect that the student has completed the graduate level academic certificate program, if the student (a) has a grade point average of at least 3.0 in the organized courses that constitute the graduate academic certificate program, (b) meets all academic standards as required by the school and stated in the catalog, (c) the certificate program and the courses constituting such program are listed in the catalog, and (d) the student declares to the RUO of the Program his/her intent to complete the certificate.

Closing a Certificate Program
In accordance with university procedures to be in compliance with the SACS Commission on Colleges Substantive Change Policy, a certificate program may not be closed until UT Dallas has received prior SACSCOC approval of a teach-out plan. The dean of the school must submit to the Provost's Office a memo that includes a teach-out plan. The Provost's Office will submit the request to the SACS Commission on Colleges.

**Declaring Admission into a Certificate Program and Reporting**

In order to automate certificate program completion audits, students will be required to declare admission into a certificate program in order to be tracked within the university’s student data system as a certificate program student. The Office of the Registrar will certify that all undergraduate certificate program requirements have been met and will award the student’s certificate. The Office of Graduate Studies will certify that all graduate certificate program requirements have been met and will award the student’s graduate certificate. At the end of every semester, for each academic 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 Academic Records.

**Policy History**

- Issued: 2007-02-14
- Revised: 2009-02-02
- Revised: 2014-11-12

**Policy Links**

- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1001
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1001
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1001
Item 9: Consideration of Resignation of Tim Redman as Speaker
Bylaws of the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas - UTDPP1007

Policy Statement

I. Preamble

The Academic Senate is a representative body, formed from the General Faculty of The University of Texas at Dallas, in which faculty develop their concerns and proposals in exercising their major roles in faculty governance. The Academic Senate is aided in its work by the Academic Council, a smaller body formed from the Academic Senate which meets regularly with the President and Chief Academic Officer and by the Faculty Committees. As the regular primary faculty governance body, the Academic Senate is expected to coordinate faculty exercise of faculty governance responsibilities in the interests of academic excellence at The University of Texas at Dallas.

II. Authority

These Bylaws supplement UTDPP1088 - Faculty Governance of the Handbook of Operating Procedures of The University of Texas at Dallas. Nothing in these Bylaws shall be construed to conflict with the Handbook of Operating Procedures, the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System, or state law.

III. Organization

A. Membership in the Academic Senate

1. Only members of the Voting Faculty are eligible for membership in the Academic Senate. Members of the Voting faculty are limited to the following, as defined in UTDPP1088, Section I.B.1.a:
   a. Faculty appointed half-time or more to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Regental Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor.
   b. Faculty appointed half-time or more to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Instructor.
   c. Faculty appointed full-time to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, or Senior Lecturer 1, 2, or 3

2. As specified in UTDPP1088, Sec. II.B.1, "The elected members of the Academic Senate shall consist of no fewer than twenty-three and no more than fifty-one voting members of the General Faculty, with intermediate numbers computed so as to be as close to 10% of the voting membership of the General Faculty as possible."

3. Each School in the University shall be represented in the Senate.

4. A minimum of 50% of Senate positions shall be held by tenure-system faculty and a minimum of 10% of Senate positions shall be held by non-tenure-system faculty.

5. All members elected or appointed to the Academic Senate according to these Bylaws, and only those members, shall be voting members of the Academic Senate.

6. Non-voting participants
   a. The President and Vice President of the Student Government Association, or their assignees, shall be invited to attend meetings of the Academic Senate as non-voting participants, except when the Academic Senate is in executive session.
b. The Chair of the Staff Council shall be invited to attend the Academic Senate meetings as a non-voting participant, except when the Academic Senate is in executive session.

B. Elections for Academic Senate

1. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be in charge of the election, although he or she may designate other faculty and staff members to assist.

2. The nomination and election procedures, including a calendar, shall be distributed no later than February 1. Nomination and election procedures may be online or may utilize paper petitions and ballots. The election procedures, beginning with the nomination process and ending with election of a Speaker of the Faculty-Elect and Secretary of the Faculty-Elect, shall begin no later than March 15 and end no later than April 14. At least two weeks shall be allowed for submission of Academic Senate nominating petitions, and one week for ballots in the Academic Senate election.

3. Nominating petitions are collected by the Office of Academic Governance. For an individual to be placed on the election ballot, two nominating petitions must be submitted on his or her behalf. Any member of the Voting Faculty may submit a nominating petition for any other member of the Voting Faculty, or for himself or herself. No one may submit more than two nominating petitions, and no one may submit more than one nominating petition for any one individual.

4. The Secretary of the Faculty shall ascertain the willingness of each nominee to serve if elected. The names of those who do not wish to serve will not be placed on the ballot.

5. If the number of nominees is below 23 (the minimum number of Senate positions as specified in UTDPP1088, Sec. II.B.1), the nominating period shall be extended, and the Secretary of the Faculty shall make additional efforts to encourage nominations.

6. If the number of nominees exceeds the minimum of 23, but does not exceed the maximum of 51, all nominees shall be deemed elected, and there shall be no formal election.

7. The Secretary of the Faculty shall make ballots available by the date designated in the election calendar.

8. Ballots shall be secret and must be submitted in accordance with the election procedures to be valid.

9. Each member of the Voting Faculty may vote for as many five nominees and will indicate his or her first choice, second choice, and so on to a maximum of five. All such votes shall be counted, and the order of choice will only be used for tie-breaking.

10. As explained in III.A.2 above, based on the current size of the General Faculty and projected growth, the number of Senators will be 51. To ensure that 1) all schools are represented (III.A.3 above), 2) at least 50% of Senate positions are allocated to tenure-system faculty (III.A.4 above), and 3) at least 10% of Senate positions are allocated to non-tenure system faculty (III.A.4 above), the following procedures shall be used to determine the results of the election.

   a. The number of Senate positions will be multiplied by 50%, rounded upward if necessary. That number of positions will be allocated to the top tenure-system vote recipients. Thus, based on 51 Senate positions, the top 26 tenure system vote recipients will be deemed elected. Ties will be broken by counting the number of “first choices” received. If there is still a tie, the number of “second choices” will be counted, and so on.

   b. The number of Senate positions will be multiplied by 10%, rounded upward if necessary. That number of positions will be allocated to the top non-tenure-system vote recipients. Based on 51 Senate positions, the top 6 non-tenure system vote recipients will be deemed elected. Ties will be broken by counting the number of “first choices” received. If there is still a tie, the number of “second choices” will be counted, and so on.

   c. If any School within the University is not represented in 1 and 2 above, the top vote recipient from that school will be deemed elected.

   d. To fill the remaining positions, all remaining nominees, whether tenure-system or non-tenure system, will be pooled and ranked by number of votes
received. Ties will be broken by counting the number of "first choices" received. If there is still a tie, the number of "second choices" will be counted, and so on.

e. If there are fewer nominees in either of the two faculty categories (tenure system and non-tenure system) than the number of Senate positions calculated by the 50% or 10% factor, respectively, all nominees in that category will be deemed elected and the minimum percentage will not apply.

11. The Secretary of the Faculty shall notify successful candidates of their election and of the date of the Senate-Elect Caucus, and shall notify the General Faculty of the election results.

C. Vacancies and Appointments

1. If a member of the Academic Senate resigns his or her seat or leaves The University of Texas at Dallas for a period expected to exceed four months, that seat shall be filled by the unelected candidate who received the most votes in the prior election, bearing in mind the minimum number of required tenure-system, non-tenure-system, and school faculty for Academic Senate.

2. If enough seats are vacated such that the original nomination list is exhausted, the Academic Senate shall fill vacancies by majority vote of all members of the Academic Senate.

3. In the event a sitting member of the Academic Senate is appointed to the position of Dean, that individual is no longer eligible for Academic Senate membership. That seat will be vacated, and the Academic Senate shall fill the vacancy in accordance with III.C.1 and III.C.2 above.

4. If a member of the Academic Senate misses two consecutive Senate meetings, the Senator will be contacted by the Secretary of the Faculty to ascertain whether he or she still wishes to serve. If not, the Senator will be immediately replaced by the procedures of Sections III.C.1 and III.C.2 above.

5. If a member of the Academic Senate misses three meetings during September-May, the Academic Senate may, by a majority vote of those present, declare the seat vacant. The seat will then be filled by the procedures of Section III.C.1 and III.C.2 above.

D. Officers

1. Roster and Duties

   a. Speaker of the Faculty: The Speaker of the Faculty is the principal elected officer of the General Faculty, of the Academic Senate, and the Academic Council. The Speaker shall:

      i. preside as described in the Handbook of Operating Procedures, UTDPP1088;

      ii. chair the Executive Committee, if any, of the Academic Senate in its coordination of the work of the General Faculty, Academic Senate, Academic Council, and Concurrent Committees in order to improve the academic welfare and standing of The University of Texas at Dallas;

      iii. assist in formulating faculty views as motions to be placed before the Academic Council or Senate for discussion and resolution; and

      iv. together with the Secretary of the Faculty, review drafts of the minutes and authorize their circulation for formal approval.

      v. Sign the official copy of the approved minutes of the Academic Council and the Academic Senate.

   b. Secretary of the Faculty: The Secretary of the Faculty shall:

      i. serve as Secretary for meetings of the General Faculty, the Academic Senate, and the Academic Council;

      ii. see that minutes are kept, made available to any faculty member, and filed in the Office of the President and, through that office, with the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of The University of Texas System, and with the Library of The University of Texas at
iii. together with the Speaker of the Faculty, review drafts of the minutes and authorize their circulation for formal approval;

iv. provide a report on Academic Senate and Academic Council activities to the General Faculty at least once a year;

v. in case of the absence of the Speaker from a meeting of Academic Council or Academic Senate, sign the official copy of the approved minutes of the Academic Council and Academic Senate for transmittal to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of The University of Texas System; and

vi. maintain a list of all recommendations that the Academic Senate and/or Academic Council has made to the administration so that the President may be requested to comment on these items at the beginning of each meeting.

c. Vice Speaker: The Speaker may appoint one or two members of the Senate to serve as Vice Speaker(s) and assist in carrying out the Speaker's official and unofficial duties. Vice Speaker(s) will serve for a term of one year, and will become ex officio voting members of the Academic Council if not already elected to the Council by the Senate.

d. Other Offices: The Academic Senate may, through its Resolution of Operating Procedures, create, provide for election or appointment, and provide duties for other offices of the Academic Senate and the Academic Council.

2. Election of Officers

a. The Academic Senate-Elect shall, in a caucus announced to and open to the voting members of the General Faculty and presided over by the Speaker of the Faculty, and under Robert's Rules of Order (current edition) elect its Speaker by a majority vote. The individual elected shall be known as the Speaker-Elect of the Faculty until June 1. The term of the Speaker of the Faculty shall be for two years.

b. The Academic Senate-Elect shall, in a caucus announced to and open to the voting members of the General Faculty and presided over by the Speaker-Elect of the Faculty, and under Robert's Rules of Order (current edition) elect its Secretary of the Faculty, who shall be known as the Secretary-Elect of the Faculty until June 1.

c. Until the election of the Secretary-Elect of the Faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty shall perform the routine functions of Secretary for the Academic Senate-Elect.

E. Academic Council

1. Relation to Academic Senate: The Academic Senate should, through its Resolution of Operating Procedures, specify at least the following:
   a. the powers delegated to the Academic Council;
   b. the extent to which the Academic Council is to function as an executive committee for the Academic Senate;
   c. the extent to which the Academic Council is to function as an agenda committee for the Academic Senate; and
   d. the communications required between the Academic Council and the Academic Senate, and between the Academic Council, Academic Senate and the Voting Faculty, including the appropriate form for the Minutes of the Academic Council and the Academic Senate.

2. Election, Removal, and Vacancies

   a. After the election of the Speaker-Elect and Secretary-Elect of the Faculty, the Academic Senate-Elect shall, in a caucus announced to and open to the voting members of the General Faculty and presided over by the Speaker-Elect of the Faculty, and under Robert's Rules of Order (current edition), elect the remaining members of the Academic Council. Members in
addition to six may be appointed by the Speaker with approval of the 
Council. Election shall be by simple plurality vote, with each member of the 
Senate voting for a number of candidates up to the number of positions to 
be filled.

b. These members, along with the Speaker-Elect of the Faculty and the 
Secretary-Elect of the Faculty, shall be known as the Academic Council-Elect 
until June 1.

c. The Academic Senate, in a caucus session, may accept resignations of 
members of the Academic Council, remove any members of the Academic 
Council except the Speaker of the Faculty or the Secretary of the Faculty, and 
vote on replacements to the Academic Council.

d. When a member of the Academic Council must be absent from a meeting, 
the member may designate, through the Secretary of the Faculty, a Senator 
to represent him or her at that meeting as a member of the Academic 
Council.

e. The President of the Student Government Association or designee shall be a 
non-voting participant in the Academic Council during the Council's 
non-executive sessions.

f. If appointed by the Speaker to serve as Vice Speaker, Senators will serve as 
ex officio voting members of the Academic Council for the duration of their 
term.

IV. Procedures

A. The Academic Senate shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order (current edition) unless 
procedures described in the Handbook of Operating Procedures, UTDPP1088 - Faculty 
Governance or these Bylaws make exception to Robert's Rules of Order.

B. Actions of the Academic Senate

1. Actions During the Spring and Summer
   a. At the first meeting of the Academic Council, which shall be called by the 
      Speaker-Elect of the Faculty to take place as soon after May 31 as practical, 
      the Council shall prepare a calendar of regular meetings for the Academic 
      Council and for the Academic Senate and shall set the date of the annual 
      General Faculty meeting. The calendar shall be published as early in the 
      academic year as possible.

   b. As soon as possible after the new Academic Council is elected, it shall 
      appoint the Committee on Committees so that it may begin composing 
      slates of nominees for the University, Concurrent, and Academic Senate 
      committees for which it is charged. The membership of the Committee on 
      Committees shall be approved by a majority vote.

2. Submissions of Items for Debate
   a. The Agenda Packet for the Academic Senate normally will be sent to the 
      Senate one week prior to a meeting of the Academic Senate.

   b. The Agenda Committee for the Academic Senate, consisting of the President, 
      the Secretary, and the Speaker normally will confer five days prior to the 
      submission of the Agenda Packet to the Academic Senate.

   c. Items for debate that are not on the Academic Senate Agenda normally will 
      be deferred to a later Academic Senate meeting.

   d. The Agenda Committee for the Academic Senate will attempt to bring all 
      items submitted to it to the Academic Senate, although it may recommend 
      that particular items be sent to committee and/or to the Academic Council 
      prior to Academic Senate debate. Any memorandum submitted by any 
      General Faculty member of the University to the Academic Senate or to the 
      Speaker of the Faculty that requests action by the Academic Senate or 
      Academic Council must be reported to the Academic Senate by the Agenda 
      Committee of the Academic Senate.
3. Debate and Passage
   a. If the President and Provost are not available to chair meetings of the Senate at which legislation is enacted, the Speaker shall chair. In the absence of the Speaker, a Vice Speaker shall chair. In the absence of a Vice Speaker, the Secretary shall chair. In the absence of the Secretary, the meeting may be chaired by any member of the Senate designated by the Speaker.

   b. The chair of a meeting of the Academic Senate may participate in the debate but shall exercise particular care to preside in a manner which is fair to all points of view in the debate.

   c. The President and/or the Speaker of the Faculty may invite to meetings of the Academic Senate those persons believed to be necessary to assist the Academic Senate in the conduct of its business.

   d. Except when the Academic Senate is in executive session, meetings of the Academic Senate are open to the General Faculty, who may request the privilege of participation in the debate.

   e. A simple majority of the voting membership of the Senate constitutes a quorum. If a quorum is not present, business that would otherwise have been conducted may be discussed, but votes shall not be taken.

   f. Members of the Academic Senate who anticipate making lengthy or complicated amendments to legislation should bring sufficient written copies to distribute to the entire Academic Senate.

   g. Passage of legislation or resolutions shall require a simple majority of those voting members present. Votes shall be recorded by hand count: ayes, nays, abstain. Role call votes shall be taken if three or more members request.

   h. The Secretary of the Faculty is responsible for sending copies of motions passed to the parties addressed.

C. Actions of the Academic Council
   1. Submission of Items for Debate and Passage

      If the President and Provost are not available to chair meetings of the Council at which Senate agenda items are discussed, the Speaker shall chair. In the absence of the Speaker, a Vice Speaker shall chair.

      a. The Agenda Committee for the Academic Council, consisting of the President, the Secretary, and the Speaker, normally will confer by email at least five days before each Academic Council meeting. Items to be included on an agenda must be submitted prior to that time.

      b. Items for the Agenda of the Academic Council will normally originate with the President and with the Academic Senate, its Executive Committee, or the Speaker of the Faculty.

   2. Transmissions from Academic Council to Academic Senate The Academic Council shall formulate its recommendations to the Academic Senate and transmit them to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Senate. It shall generally transmit all items submitted to it to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Senate.

D. Records and Communications
   1. Actions required by motions of the Academic Senate or Academic Council, as described in the minutes, will be conveyed to those concerned, or will be taken by the Academic Governance Secretary only after approval of the minutes for circulation, but without waiting for the formal approval of the minutes at the subsequent meeting of the Academic Senate or Academic Council.

   2. The general policy on composition and contents of records including minutes is the same for both the Academic Council and Academic Senate, and is as follows:

      a. Consistent with Robert's Rules of Order, the approved minutes constitute the only official record of the actions of the Academic Council and Academic Senate;

      b. The minutes are intended to allow members of the General Faculty to follow the debates and actions within their representative bodies, the Academic
Senate, and within the Academic Council;

c. The Secretary of the Faculty or the Academic Governance Secretary may make recordings of the Academic Council and Academic Senate meetings. Tapes of meetings shall not, however, be considered official documents, and will be kept only until the minutes of the meeting recorded are officially approved, after which the recordings may be destroyed in accordance with the University’s Records Management Retention Policy and records retention schedule;

d. Unapproved minutes of Academic Council and Academic Senate meetings shall be distributed to the Academic Senate expeditiously, if possible within two weeks after the meeting;

e. Minutes are numbered serially each year, including special meetings;

f. Attendance for minutes includes both those present and absent of the voting membership, ex officio members, and student observers. Invited guests are also listed;

g. Minutes of the Academic Council and Academic Senate are distributed to all members of the Academic Senate, and made available at the authorized locations for Regents’ Rules and Regulations, and are also sent to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of The University of Texas System; and

h. The minutes of the last meetings of the Academic Senate and Academic Council will be approved by the incoming Academic Senate or Academic Council, respectively.

3. The Academic Senate shall establish procedures, in its Resolution of Operating Procedures, to disseminate information about its debates and actions to the General Faculty effectively and expeditiously.

E. Resolution of Operating Procedures: The Academic Senate may, by adoption or revision of its Resolution of Operating Procedures, modify the following portions of its procedures without having to amend these Bylaws:

1. delegation of duties and powers to the Academic Council;

2. designation and powers of the Agenda Committee;

3. designation and powers of the Executive Committee, if any; and

4. instructions to the Secretary of the Faculty regarding the character of action or discussion minutes to be taken.

F. Amendment of Bylaws

1. These Bylaws may be amended by a majority vote of the Senate members, provided that the proposed amendment passes, at two consecutive meetings of the Academic Senate separated by at least two weeks.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty shall transmit a copy of the amended Bylaws to the President for review. All amendments must be approved by the President and by the institution's chief legal officer or the Vice Chancellor and General Counsel for inclusion in the UT Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures pursuant to Rule 20201, section 4.9.

3. The amended Bylaws shall become effective immediately.

Policy History

- Issued: 1979-09-10
- Revised: 1980-02-28
- Revised: 1982-12-14
- Revised: 1983-04-21
- Revised: 1992-02-01
- Revised: 1996-05-30
Policy Links

- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1007
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1007
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1007
Item 15:
FY17 Annual Committee Reports
May 22, 2017

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Edward J. Harpham, Chair, Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Annual Report of Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee 2016-17

I. Membership
The membership of the [Committee Name] consists of:
Edward J. Harpham (chair),
Elizabeth Boyd,
Young Ryu
Bart Ryprna
Carl Sechen
Michael Tiefelsdorf
Mark Spong
Toni Stephens
Kim Laird
Sanaz Okhovat
Dennis Guten
Raviteja Lingineni
Kevin Parag Desai
Nate Howe, ex officio with vote
Frank Feagans, RUO

In addition, the following individuals have regularly attended and participated in the meetings of the committee as reflected in the minutes:

II. Meetings
November 11, 2016
December 2, 2016
February 24, 2017
March 24, 2017
May 22, 2017
Actions Taken
Until last year, this committee has been largely inactive for a number of years. There are a number of reasons for this inactivity. Harpham was appointed chair in January 2016 to fill a position that had been empty for some time. The Senate mandate for the committee was outdated, not reflecting the separating out of the offices for information security and information resources. Leadership in the office of OIT also was undergoing transition for a 15 month period.

Last spring the committee began regular meeting again, sorting out its roles, duties and responsibilities. Chair Harpham went to the Senate securing a new policy charge for the committee reflecting the new institutional structure affecting Information Technology at the university.

This year the committee focused attention upon establishing lines of communication with the Office of Information Technology that would provide input into the development and implementation of policies regarding information technology development at the university. Regular reports from leadership in OIT (including the newly appointed OIT vice president Frank Feagans) have put the committee in a position to assist and advise OIT in planning and policy matters. Information regarding information technology problems and bottlenecks was gathered from members of the committee and passed along to appropriate OIT.

III. Recommendations for Following Year
1) Expand and formalize activities as a conduit between the faculty, professional staff, and OIT regarding IT matters present and future at the university as demanded by the committee’s new charge. The committee sees itself playing a central role in informing OIT as to pressing concerns and problems relating to OIT throughout the university.
2) Schedule 3 meetings for each semester next year.
3) Provide advice to OIT for long-term planning purposes, particularly in light of new strategic planning being formulated by the president.
4) The Committee believes that OIT should formally report to the Academic Senate regarding the present problems facing the development of information technology at UT Dallas in light of the new strategic plan being developed by the president.

IV. Supporting Documents: attached are the minutes from the committee’s meetings.
Addendum: Additional Committee Suggestions for Annual Report 2016-17

- Integration of dining options around campus in a dedicated smartphone app that gave info like menus, hours, specials, locations (apart from the website)
- Adding parking space sensors to surface lots
- Improved wifi coverage in campus outdoor gathering spaces
- Develop training facilities, perhaps within the individual schools, and the soft- and hardware infrastructure to design professional blended and full-online courses (JSMO is leading here, but they do it only within their school).
- Provide sufficient training and information opportunities to the UTD community to keep up with technological developments on campus and its related policy revisions.
- Fully document the legal ramifications and protections of using UTD’s email accounts for university business and private correspondence. E.g., FERPA, open records request, requests by law enforcement and border security to view email accounts etc.
- Explore the possibility of developing a campus-wide parking spaces management system for vehicles entering the campus (the garages already provide some information, however, it is not on the level that is available, for instance, at DFW airport).
- Increase use of Duo 2-factor protection to include high-risk PeopleSoft pages and Outlook Web Access email portal.
- Facilitate the installation of system and application patch updates, which often directly reduce vulnerabilities
- Take over operations and development for Shibboleth federated identity management.
- Replace legacy identity management software supported by Oracle with replacement system; Microsoft Identity Manager has been selected as the replacement system.
- Ensure that backups occur and are verified to work.
- Greater network segmentation to isolate valuable systems to only necessary connections.
- Produce and maintain current network diagram(s).
- Implement Virtual Desktop Infrastructure model to replace traditional desktop workstations.
- Develop a mobile app which all people on campus will want to use for various benefits.
- On-campus Help Desk presence.
- Allow faculty, in consultation with their department's tech support staff, to quickly and efficiently order the precise laptop and desktop configurations that their research demands. Faculty need access to the full catalog of options, including (ideally) from more than one vendor.
- Computing inventory must be revamped. Upon purchasing receiving a computing item, the purchaser must be permanently recorded as the inventory holder in a database. The purchaser can later request that items be removed from the database if they are sold (with the new owner so recorded), rendered obsolete, and so forth.
Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes

November 11, 2016

Present: Edward Harpham (H & Dean), Elizabeth Boyd (ATEC), Young Ryu (JSOM), Bart Rypma (BBS), Carl Sechen (ECS), Michael Tiefelsdorf (EP), Mark Spong (EC & Dean), Toni Stephens (Audit), Kim Laird (Administration), Sanaz Okhovat (Research and Compliance), Jay Silver (Staff Council), Raviteja Lingineni (Student), Kevin Desai (Student), Gabe Cava basis (Office of Research)

Next meeting: December 2, 2016, 1:30 pm to 2:30 pm, Cecil and Id a Green Center Conference Room 2.216D

1. Announcements

Dr. Harpham discussed what this meeting is for and what the focus is. He discussed the name of the committee and the decision has been made to remove the “Security” from the title of the committee hence forward the name is now the Information Technology and Planning and Policy Committee. He discussed that the purpose of the committee is gather representatives from every area of the university to collaborate and network about topics, problems, and ideas that can be further communicated to upper level management that will align with their strategic plans as they make Information Technology decisions. He expects the reps to be open and express their concerns and issues so that he may push the topic up to the provost office for them to know what is going on in the community.

2. Discussion

Brian Dourty, Interim Information Technology Officer discussed four main issue areas regarding information technology planning; Organization, FY17 Budget, Projects, and Challenges. Below you will find a brief summary of the categories.

• Organization

First round of interviews for a new CIO went well, and they are targeting to make an offer no later than winter break. Also AVP Scott Willet has submitted his resignation; he has accepted a position at UT SIS. Shannon Cepica was named interim AVP. The search for a new AVP will begin after appointing a new CIO for UTD. Also there were 4 Associate directors added to OIT roster. 2 in EAS for PeopleSoft related activity, and 2 under system and operations. The 2 for system will be used for network infrastructure and admin teams and the other will be used for adding more responsibility for Information Security as they progress with the position. Part of the OIT team was moved to the Admin building to assist in departmental requests concerning desktop issues as they occur throughout the university.

OIT has 7 positions open, plus the 140 employees currently working and 60 student workers. As the university grows they will be needing their positions filled and as one position vacates they will reevaluate that position to make sure that they are utilizing it to the best of its abilities to help suite the operations of OIT. Decentralizing the position to create two or more positions to help with the volume of the work load is one of his examples for position
before an offer is made. OIT headcount has diminished because they have lost a lot of people to UT SIS. Resource planning will be important in this area.

The OIT operations and Capital budget is searching for sustainability.

Workloads has created a backlog and they are trying to prioritize the backlog and get back up to speed with some areas. Finishing upgrades has created a difficulty. They are thinking what they can do to finish upgrades. Should they hire temps?

Howe has also discussed university wide communication has been a challenge but they are moving forward because they are now allowed to send out communication emails for outages and problems that have emerged.

3. General Discussion

Overall across the room, the committee has discussed how important this meeting was because they were unaware of some of the challenges OIT has been facing. Dr. Harpham has urged OIT to create a wish list and prioritize it based on its importance so they can formulate their findings to discuss with new CIO and President as they plan to make decisions. Dr. Harpham has offered a new meeting time for December 2nd 2017 at 1:00 – 2:30 pm. He has told the committee to put together their concerns, projects, and wish lists so that they can create a strategy to align it with President’s and CIO’s mission.
Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes
December 2, 2016

Present: Edward Harpham (Dean of Honors College), Elizabeth Boyd (ATEC), Young Ryu (JSOM), Bart Rympa (BBS), Carl Sechen (ECS), Michael Tiefelsdorf (EPPS), Toni Stephens (Audit), Kim Laird (Administration), Sanaz Okhovat (Research and Compliance), Jay Silver (Staff Council), Raviteja Lingineni (Student), Kevin Desai (Student), Gabe Cavazos (Director Office of Research Information Systems), Nate Howe (Director of Information Security), Stephenie Edwards (Awareness and Outreach Manager), Josiah Summerville (Accountant of Honors College)

Next meeting: TBD, Cecil and Ida Green Center Conference Room 2.216D

1. Announcements

Previous minutes were given to the committee to make adjustments if needed. Dr. Harpham would like the meetings to be a “proposal idea circle” that will aggregate the University’s short-term and long-term objectives and align it with the CIO’s and President’s objectives.

2. Discussion

- Nate Howe, Director of Information Security
  - Howe has requested to create a centralized Help Desk for Faculty and Staff by creating a help desk window staffed with knowledge-based customer service agents who can help resolve university-wide desktop issues. Once created, he wants to have the help desk’s location announced campus wide so employees are informed.
  - His concern is how to take everyone’s requests, combine them, and create a letter of proposed priorities that the university has agreed upon that will address problem areas in order to support students, faculty and staff.
  - In response to Nate’s concerns, Brian Dourty wants to ensure that the proposal aligns with the President’s plans to ensure the process runs smoothly.

- Brian Dourty, Interim VP and Chief Information Officer, discussed two initiatives his office is working on.
  - OIT is in the middle of implementing Zabbix, enterprise-level software designed for server status monitoring. This software will be used to stay up to date on server status and create a dashboard for any area that is operating slowly or having trouble. Zabbix will create operational reports such as network incident statuses, overall internet usage, and building-to-building internet usage.
  - Second initiative is to implement a software called Pager Duty. This software will be used as a notification system that will monitor infrastructure health and incident response. It will enable OIT to resolve outages for optimal service performance. Pager Duty will also discover any patterns or anomalies that can disrupt the server. The two initiatives are a safety net to notify employees quickly of server errors and to quickly eliminate server attacks if any occur in the future.
bus routes for students to reference. He has requested the app to include dining menus and any announcements that will pertain to the student body.

- Desai has identified multiple orphan domains of the University’s websites that may be out of date. Orphan domains can create a vulnerability in the system if the website is not secure enough. Dourty will reach out to web development to resolve the issue.

3. General Discussion

- Dr. Harpham discussed the agenda for the next meeting. Departments should discuss and request immediate needs for their area. The needs discussed in areas will be accumulated to make a formal request to the senate to push political pressure to the president. Direct suggestions were made to the speakers of the committee in order to move forward in resolving their issues. The suggestions are listed below:
  - Nate Howe should define the functions of the requested centralized “Help Desk”. What will make the help desk expand and upgrade its qualities?
  - Cavazos will need to summarize his department’s issues and requests, and then email it to Summerville for him to incorporate these into the meeting minutes.
  - The committee will need to find the procurement policy that narrows the selections of devices to purchase, and submit a letter to the senate emphasizing how it is restricting the faculty’s functions and capabilities. High-end devices are important for Computer Science and Electrical Engineering.
  - Dourty should contact web development to discuss the inconsistencies in the orphan websites. The websites can have stale content and security vulnerability.
  - Last Dr. Harpham has stated that he wants all departments to form an immediate wish list. The wish list will be collaborated into one agreed letter that will be sent to the University’s Senate.
Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes

February 24, 2017

Present: Edward Harpham (Dean of Hobson Wildenthal Honors College), Peggy Attari (OIT Associate Director), Shivani Narain (OIT Technical Team Lead), Gabe Cavazos (Office of Research Information Systems Director), Brian Dourty (OIT Interim CIO), Steven Edwards (Awareness and Outreach Manager of Information Security), Nate Howe (Director of Information Security), Brian McElroy (Security Engineering Manager of Information Security), Jean Vik (Associate Library Director for Systems), Michael Tiefelsdorff (EPPS Faculty), Chris Milazzo (Library Systems Analyst), Dennis Guten (BBS Systems Analyst), Ali Subhani (IT Audit Manager of Audit), Elizabeth Boyd (Lecturer ATEC), John McConnell (Systems Specialist ECS), Carl Sechen (ECS Faculty)

Next meeting: March 24, 2017, 3 p.m.–4 p.m., Cecil and Ida Green Center Conference Room 2.216D

1. Announcements

- Committee received previous meeting minutes to review, adjust, and approve. Committee has approved minutes. Dr. Harpham referenced how important it is to have the most relevant representatives available at the committee and/or council meetings. He would like to continue to have departmental issues discussed in meeting and flowing up to the Senate as much as possible.

- Updates concerning new Chief Information Officer is coming soon. The potential candidates were able to have a public forum for university to engage and ask questions.

2. Discussion

- Gabe Cavazos, Director of Office of Research Information Systems, updated the committee on his department’s progress.
  - Office of Research has created data management plans, and they are in the process of creating quotes with third parties to resolve server infrastructure and data storage issues.
  - Mobile Device Management is making progress on iPad Mobile Device plans. Their goal is to secure all mobile devices across departments and divisions.

- Nate Howe, Director of Information Security, had an update on the help desk topic.
  - On behalf of the users, Howe wants to have a point of contact that the university can reach out to resolve desktop issues. He wants the new CIO to make the decision on who the point of contact will be.

- Carl Sechen (ECS) and John McConnell (ECSS) elaborated on their issues with procurement and Dell.
  - John McConnell (ECSS)
allow the user to reset their passwords without calling help desk. In addition, supervisors will not have to complete Sponsor Renewals every year. If we terminate the employee, the system will disable the employee’s access, and if the employee is new, the system will add the employee.

- This new update will reduce software support costs, administrative burden, and passwords resets. Verification process will be quicker, and it will interface with new employees’ applications.
  - IT will explore the option to use cell phones as a way to reset passwords in the system also.
  - When resetting the password the system will forward a verification code to your cell phone that will authenticate their identity.

- One of Dr. Harpham’s biggest worries is will the university be able to adapt to the upcoming changes? Will the process affect the privacy rights of the university employees’ email address? What will happen if the employees have only one email address?
  - OIT will be notifying every one of the massive change and will advise the university to add a personal email address to their comet account.
  - The help desk will continue to be open at normal business hours to resolve any password resets if there are people who have trouble with the new update.
  - If employees are using their UTD email to forward emails to their personal account, then it can be a FERPA issue, and if they are forwarding emails from their personal account to their UTD account, then it can a privacy issue for the employee. UTD expects its employees to keep their personal and business emails separate from each other.
  - OIT’s target date to implement the new change is March 15, during spring break. There will be a temporary system outage; it will give OIT enough time to implement the new changes, and go live.

3. General Discussion

- Peggy Attari (OIT Associate Director) expressed the idea of considering a Lean University Initiative.
  - A Lean University Initiative helps identify issues, develops plans to resolve issue, and implements resolution to improve efficiency and the needs of the university. UTD used this technique to resolve paper form checkouts. This resolution reduced time and labor for checkout approval and saved costs from using paper. Now checkout is electronic.

- Nate Howe notified the committee of the latest phishing attempt and reminded the committee to continue to be on the lookout for any phishing attempts.
  - He described a phishing email as having a non-official email address that employees cannot recognize. He said this phishing attempt was seasonal since it referenced W-2 during mid tax season.
Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes

March 24, 2017

Present: Edward Harpham (Dean, Hobson Wildenthal Honors College), Gabe Cavazos (Director, Office of Research Information System), Brian Dourty (CTO, Office of Information Technology), Stephenie Edwards (Awareness and Outreach Manager, Information Security), Jean Vik (Associate Director, Library), Michael Tiefelsdorf (Faculty, EPPS), Chris Milazzo (Systems Analyst, Library), Dennis Guten (Web Developer BBS), Elizabeth Boyd (Senior Lecturer, ATEC), John McConnell (Systems Specialist, ECS), Carl Sechen (Faculty, ECS), Frank Feagans (CIO, Office of Information Technology), Sandy Farrar (Director, ATEC), Bart Rypma (Faculty, BBS), Raviteja Lingineni (Student, CS)

Next meeting: April 28, 2017, 3 p.m.– 4 p.m., Cecil and Ida Green Center Conference Room 2.216D

Announcements

- Committee received previous meeting minutes to review, adjust, and approve. Minutes approved. Harpham referenced the importance of communicating across campus as the committee continues to move further into its initiative and agenda. He encouraged the representatives to spread the word if this committee applies to other offices.

- Harpham introduced the new CIO of Office of Information Technology, Frank Feagans, and transferred the attention to Feagans to introduce himself and share OIT’s priorities.

Discussion

- Frank Feagans, CIO for Office of Information Technology:
  - Feagans received his Bachelor’s Degree in Computer Engineering and Master’s Degree in Computer Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Before UTD, he worked at The University of Arizona as Director for Central IT Services. Before applying to the CIO position, Feagans was the AVP for Enterprise Applications.
  - Feagans saw the problems UTD was experiencing with the Oracle PeopleSoft System; he found it suitable and interesting to apply to the vacant CIO position.
  - Feagans priority is to stay aligned with UTD’s vision of having strong communication and contact with the university’s departments.
  - He expressed his five priorities to be Research Support, Digital Enterprise, Student Experience, Third-Party Licensing, and strong Core Services.
  - OIT will have the last budget meeting. Feagans has read over the committee’s previous meeting minutes and it looks like everyone is facing the same problems budgetary wise. It is very important to create a budget model that enables the significant areas as the university continues to grow.
feedback from the forums, and Dourty wants to know if there is any other areas of interest for OIT to explore. The Forums do not have to be very technical every session and the forums should be an all-inclusive experience for the audience.

- The Net-ID Management System update was partially successful. Feagans and Dourty discussed that there were some hurdles during the implementation and they had ran out of time while overcoming them. They did implement a new PeopleSoft bundle upgrade, but their main problem is having a testing environment that is not identical to their production environment. OIT will plan accordingly and communicate the new date to retry the implementation.

- Jean Vik (Associate Library Director of Systems) had concerns on the Net-ID system implementation.
  - Vik wanted to know if any changes would happen with Alumni Net-IDs. Will alumni accounts be a part of the migration?
  - Dourty has assured Vik that there will be no changes to Alumni and they are a part of the migration.
  - Harpham emphasized how important it is to allow alumni relevant access to the system. Alumni play an important part in gifts for the university, and we will need ways to contact them.

- John McConnell briefly announced that the rollout of Last Pass was successful but their challenge is teaching the end-user how to use it for their benefit.
  - Dourty included his recent experience at an OIT event with a staff member who had trouble logging into the system because they did not know how to use DUO, an identity authentication software for Faculty and Staff.
  - Dourty and Feagans took note of adding a technological education training for Faulty. Feagans sparked the idea of using a mobile-front end on Web-Ex that will simplify the identity verification process for end-users.

Conclusion

- Harpham has issued a homework assignment for everyone to create a brief paragraph of his or her own department’s grievances. Harpham will summarize the minutes and grievances into a letter for the senate.
  - Since the committee does not make decisions or policies, we have to communicate to the senate in order for them to understand what we need
  - Feagans advised the committee to quantify how a tweak to the system will save time and/or money. For example, the experience with Dell is unpleasant and in order to bring true attention to the problem, we have to quantify the issues that occur after working with the vendor. If we do not quantify how Dell costs us money, the Senate will view the grievances as “whining”.
May 12, 2017  
To:  The Academic Senate  
From: Susan Chizeck  
Chair, Library committee  


Membership:

In attendance: Susan P. Chizeck - IS (Chair), Ellen Safley (Dean of Libraries), Robert Ackerman - BBS, Jonas Bunte - EPPS, Lawrence Chung - ECS, Richard Golden - BBS, Pia Jakobsson - AH, Suriya Janakiraman - JSOM, Lindsay King - NSM, Jessica Murphy - AH, Josef Nguyen - ATEC, Dmitry Rachinsky - NSM, Maximilian Schich - ATEC (co-chair), Amy Walker - ECS, Ben Wright - AH

Absent: Nina Baranchuck - JSOM, Idean Salehyan - EPPS, Tyler Ortega (JSOM student).

Meeting: February 3, 2017

Actions and Discussions

Clarify mission of the library committee: The mission of the library committee is to be a conduit of information between the library and the faculty and other constituencies. We bring issues up to the administration and advise on policy. We also bring information back to the departments, explain policies and bring back feedback.

Director’s Report, Dr. Ellen Safley, Dean of Libraries - Highlights

New chat service staffed by librarians open all library hours.

Students can check out laptops, calculators, and digital cameras, as well as books. Also equipment for the sight-impaired is available.

There is in-house use of textbooks for core undergraduate courses.

Interlibrary loan can generally deliver articles in less than 11 hours.

Dissertations are now only in digital format, from 2017 onward.

Collection Statistics
Usage of print resources holds steady and online sources expanding. Electronic format is more expensive and may not be permanent. Subscribe to over 70,000 electronic journals. New can be added, first put on wish list to see demand. Moving to streaming media, and few requests for DVDs. Libraries cannot get Netflix or Hulu. Can make requests online or through library liaison.
Renovation Activities:

Library is extremely noisy, so a quiet study room has been added. People use library as social space.

Have an advisory group of students, the McDermott Student Advisory Group.

Space Concerns

Study space has high demand, especially for electrical plugs. Students often sit on floor to be near a plug. Rewiring old building difficult.

Desperately need to expand shelving space, as 6000 print volumes added each year.
Inadequate storage and space for collections.
Mechanical Engineering has taken over large space on third floor, for several years.
Possibility of relocating some special collections and archives to SPN.
Current group study rooms booked 100% of the time (11 a.m. to 11 p.m) by students.

Staffing Concerns

Library has several open positions. Hiring library professionals is difficult due to our salary scale. Current professionals spread thinly to cover high demand for services.

Library Instruction Activities

In addition to teaching library research techniques for many course assignments, this department now teaches 3 online courses (undergraduate library research skills, graduate library research skills, and Health Informatics) through the School of Interdisciplinary Studies.

Students know much less about information resources than they think. Courses requiring library research should schedule information sessions. Loreen Henry is the liaison. [Note: my students were quite unfamiliar with resources in the physical library as well as online.]

Impact of Expanded Hours

A year ago, the library added 24/5 and weekend hours, resulting in 51,000 people exiting the building between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m., a very high usage. A valid Comet Card is needed to enter the building after 11 p.m.

Faculty Author Reception

Held each year to celebrate new book publications, so contact the library to be included. Reception this year is April 13 at 4 p.m. in the McDermott Suite.

Other Discussion topics

Very important: Concept of the moving wall: People do not understand that electronic access to journals and other materials is time-limited and even though we have paid for a given year, it disappears in a few years and can only be accessed if archives are repurchased. What is
available to users for free depends on large UTD and UT System payments. Academic material is not easily "available on a cellphone."

**Recommendations for Following Year**

Put in bookdrops near NSERL area to facilitate return of library books.

To support a Tier One university, library needs more space, particularly controlled climate storage space. - possibility of archive space for rare books in SPN area

Educate users about library holdings, which change due to digital holdings

Educate users as to the payment structure for holdings, which are ephemeral unless on paper

Requests for books, journals and databases can be made to Dean Safley or departmental library liaison

Access: active students, faculty and staff have both on site and remote access

Alumni and community users can come to the library to use materials
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Academic Council

FROM: Judy L. Barnes, Director of University Events


1. Membership

The Commencement Committee is a University-wide Standing Committee appointed by the President not reporting to the Academic Senate, The University of Texas at Dallas.

The voting members of the Commencement Committee included two members of the faculty, Kathryn Evans (School of Arts and Humanities) and Francesca Filbey (School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences); and two student representatives including the President of Student Government Akshitha Padigela, and Undergraduate Student, Nancy Fairbank (UG-EPPS).

Non-voting members included: Director of University Events, Judy Barnes (Chair); Speaker of the Faculty, Tim Redman (Vice Chair); University Registrar and Director of Academic Records, Jennifer McDowell; Associate Vice President for Business Affairs, Rick Dempsey; Dean of Undergraduate Education, Andy Blanchard; Dean of Graduate Studies, Marion Underwood; Chief of Police, Larry Zacharias; Bookstore Manager, Rawn Johnson; Dean of Students, Amanda Smith; Media Services Representative, Darren Crone; Alumni Relations Representative, Melinda Mendoza, Office of Communications, John Walls (replaced Kamrhan Farwell) and Rena Piper, Event Manager from the University Events. [Attendance report attached.]

2. Meetings

Two meetings of the Commencement Committee were conducted during the 2016-2017 academic year. A meeting held on September 23, 2016 where we discussed the Spring, 2016 ceremonies results and upcoming Fall, 2016 ceremonies. [Meeting agenda and minutes are attached.]

The second meeting of the Committee was held on January 26, 2017 to discuss Fall, 2016 results and in preparation for the Spring, 2017 commencement ceremonies. [Meeting agenda and minutes are attached.]
AGENDA

I. Welcome
   a. New Committee Members

II. Review of Spring 2016 Commencement
   a. 7 Ceremonies
      b. New: entry way, orator, gonfalons on top stage, registrar hand diploma cover

III. Fall 2016 Commencement
   a. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers
   b. 7 Ceremonies – 4 Friday and 3 Saturday
   c. Dates—December 16-17
   d. Countdown to Commencement—September 27

IV. Discussion
   a. Keepsake regalia—bachelor and masters
   b. Staging—ramp to side
   c. Student Speakers—Deadline October 31 (automated...eLearning)
   d. Challenges—parking, construction
   e. One Commencement and school-based ceremonies
   f. Miscellaneous
Commencement Committee
September 23, 2016

MINUTES

I. In attendance: Judy Barnes, Darren Crone, Kamrhan Farwell, Melinda Mendoza, Rena Piper, Kathryn Evans, Akshitha Padigela, and Nancy Fairbank

II. Welcome
   a. New Committee Members

III. Review of Spring 2016 Commencement
   a. 7 Ceremonies
   b. New: entry way, orator, gonfalons on top stage, registrar hand diploma cover

IV. Fall 2016 Commencement
   a. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers
   b. 7 Ceremonies – 4 Friday and 3 Saturday
      - With Hooding taking place Thursday evening.
      - Due to timing, schedule has been set and approved. All agreed with set schedule.
        c. Dates—December 16-17
      - All agreed on dates for ceremonies.
        d. Countdown to Commencement—September 27

V. Discussion
   a. Keepsake regalia—bachelor and masters
- New regalia will be phased in for the fall semester and moving to spring being the only approved regalia.
  
  b. Staging—ramp to side
  
  c. Student Speakers—Deadline October 31 (automated...eLearning)
  
  d. Challenges—parking, construction
  
  e. One Commencement and school-based ceremonies

- SG students still voice interest in having several commencements vs. one

  f. Miscellaneous

- SG students requesting tossing of caps at the end of each commencement ceremony. Barnes will run idea by President for input/approval.
Commencement Committee
January 26, 2017

AGENDA

I. Welcome

II. Review of Fall 2016 Commencement
   a. 7 Ceremonies—statistics
   b. New: President, regalia, record faculty participation (A/H, ATEC, BBS), new carpet, military surprise.

III. Spring Commencement
   a. Dates—May 10-13
   b. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers
   c. 8 Ceremonies -- four recommendations
      • Hooding day/time—Wednesday at 1 pm
      • Honors day/time—
      • Ceremony days/times
   d. Propose to President and Provost
   e. Countdown to Commencement—February 14, 2017

IV. Discussion
   a. Student proposal—toss hats
   b. Regalia enforced
   c. Student Speakers—Deadline: March 24, 2017
   d. Miscellaneous
MINUTES

I. In attendance: Judy Barnes, Andy Blanchard, Darren Crone, Rick Dempsey, John Walls, Rawn Johnson, Jennifer McDowell, Amanda Smith, Marion Underwood, Larry Zacharias, Kathryn Evans, Francesca Filbey, Akshitha Padigela and guests Sai Saripella and Mareze Crone

II. Welcome

III. Review of Fall 2016 Commencement
   a. 7 Ceremonies--statistics

   Regalia sales went really well and the new regalia was well received. Dr. Blanchard inquired what the maximum on the stage is and Judy stated that 45 was pushing it, but 50 would be the absolute Max. Jennifer stated that it does not leave a lot room for people to move back that way.

   Wireless access did not work but Darren's team will work on it.

   Web trends. Visits (going to the website) and views (actually viewing the video) was up 30%.

   Do we still want to do CD's? Ron stated that they are not part of HighEd but they do get a lot of calls regarding the CD's. Darren's team will look at what they can do.

IV. Spring Commencement
   a. Dates—May 10-13

   Initial Application and RSVP Numbers
c. 8 Ceremonies -- four recommendations
   • Hooding day/time—Wednesday at 1 pm
   • Honors day/time—
   • Ceremony days/times

- Dr. Underwood Inquired if we can do graduate and undergraduate ceremonies for ENCS. Judy will ask Dr. Spong and look at previous year’s statistics.
- Dr. Underwood prefers option 1. It is more family friendly.
- Dr. Blanchard likes that honors and hooding is on a separate day, it makes it more special.
- Student government inquired if it would be more rushed. Judy and Dr. Underwood ensured that it is never rushed and would be the same as usual.
- Student government inquired if we can check public school’s calendars. Judy noted that her observation is that attendance numbers are low for children. Dr. Underwood stated that she would recommend that people pull out their kids for such a special occasion. Amanda stated that she worked in a public school and they encouraged children to attend graduations.
- Dr. Underwood stated that if honors is at 10am then it would be okay for hooding to be at 1pm, however, if honors move to 11am then hooding would need to be moved to 2pm.
- Judy stated that no Saturday would benefit RO. Jennifer stated that either way, we will be there.
- Dr. Blanchard stated that instead of convenience, we should look at tradition. With honors and hooding being isolated on one day, that makes it more special. He also like to look at the long term.
- Kathryn stated that if the goal is to get more students to attend then looking at the statistics it seems as if attendance drops on Saturdays and the last one on Fridays. Earlier is better.

d. Propose to President and Provost

- Judy want to propose two options. Agreed that the first two options without ceremonies on Saturdays will be presented.

e. Countdown to Commencement—February 14, 2017
V. Discussion

a. Student proposal—toss hats

- Dr. Benson asked for time to think about it. Judy went through the dangers.

b. Regalia enforced

- We need to put language out there. Ron stated companies are targeting students and they are buying regalia they can’t use. He also stated that there will be a drawing to give away 2 sets of regalia.

c. Student Speakers—Deadline: March 24, 2017

d. Miscellaneous
### Spring 2017 Commencement Ceremony Options

**Honors, Hooding +8 Ceremonies**

(NOTE President selected highlighted option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am Honors</td>
<td>9am #1</td>
<td>9am #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30am #2</td>
<td>11:30am #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm Hooding</td>
<td>2pm #3</td>
<td>2pm #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30pm #4</td>
<td>4:30pm #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am Honors</td>
<td>9am #2</td>
<td>9am #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30am #3</td>
<td>11:30am #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm Hooding</td>
<td>2pm #4</td>
<td>2pm #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30pm #1</td>
<td>4:30pm #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am Honors</td>
<td>9am #1</td>
<td>9am #4</td>
<td>9am #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30am #2</td>
<td>11:30am #5</td>
<td>11:30am #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm Hooding</td>
<td>2pm #3</td>
<td>2pm #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am Honors</td>
<td>9am #3</td>
<td>9am #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30am #4</td>
<td>11:30am #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm Hooding</td>
<td>2pm #1</td>
<td>2pm #5</td>
<td>2pm #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30pm #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Director of University Events (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>Dean of Undergraduate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>Media Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Dempsey</td>
<td>Associate VP for Facilities Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Kamrhan</td>
<td>Farwell</td>
<td>Office of Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Office of Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Rawn</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Bookstore Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>University Registrar and Director of Academic Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Mendoza</td>
<td>Alumni Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Rena</td>
<td>Piper</td>
<td>Event Manager - University Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Redman</td>
<td>Speaker of the Faculty (Vice Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Interim Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Underwood</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Zacharias</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Faculty Appointment (A&amp;H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Francesca</td>
<td>Filbey</td>
<td>Faculty Appointment (BBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Ashitha</td>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>Student Representative (Sr. NSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Akshitha</td>
<td>Padigela</td>
<td>Student Government President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Fairbank</td>
<td>in lieu of Ashitha Mathew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest</td>
<td>Sai</td>
<td>Saripella</td>
<td>in lieu of Nancy Fairbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest</td>
<td>Mareze</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>Office of the Registrar (in lieu of Rena Piper)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 20, 2017

TO:       The Academic Senate
FROM:    Rashaunda Henderson
         Chair, Committee on the Support of Diversity and Equity


I. Membership
The membership of the Committee on the Support of Diversity and Equity consists of: [Rashaunda Henderson-Chair, Meghna Sabharwal-V. Chair, Kim Knight, Toyah Miller, Lloyd Dumas, Kimberly Hill, Orlando Richard, Rym Zalila-Wenkstern, S. Starnaman, Mandy Maguire, Jilian Round, Erin Smith, Abby Kratz, Sherry Marek, Eloise Square, Melissa Palmer, Carrilaine Schneckner, Daniel Hernandez, Letitia Andrews, Jane Shipman, Yue (Selina) Gu, Jazzmyn Wilson, Annette Rogers].

The following people would like to be removed from the committee. Some have recommended replacements.

Kim Knight - Josef Nguyen
Sherry Marek – no suggestion
Kimberly Hill – Manual Martinez
Eloise Square – no suggestion

II. Meetings
2016 – August 26, September 30, October 21, November 18, December 20 (meeting with President Benson)
2017 - March 24, April 21, April 28 (Town Hall), May 26

III. Highlighted Actions Taken

1. During the 2016-2017 calendar year we met with President Benson (December 2016) to introduce the committee and discuss the results of the 2015 Survey. 5 members of the committee involved in the analysis of the quantitative (Likert scales, etc.) and qualitative (open-ended questions) presented a summary of findings about the survey. We made President Benson aware of our intent to collect additional information by having a separate Town Hall meeting.

2. The website has been updated with the survey link (on Qualtrics) and presentation that was given to President Benson. Website: https://www.utdallas.edu/diversity/partners/SupportCommittee.html

3. We held a Town Hall meeting on April 28 during lunch-time and presented
results from the survey to interested attendees from faculty and staff. We had approximately 50 attendees and used an online tool (slido) to capture real-time questions and responses to two specific survey questions. We polled the audience on participation in a Fall Focused Session event and the top 5 priorities that the University should be facing as it relates to Diversity and Equity.

IV. Recommendations for Following Year

Our first meeting in Fall 2017 is scheduled for Friday 9/8/17.

We plan to have a focus group session on September 22, 2017.

We plan present results from the survey (Spring 2015), Town hall meeting (April 2017) and upcoming focused group meeting (September 2017) in October 2017 (either 10/2 or 10/16) to the President’s council/cabinet. Dean Fair (RUO) will advise us on this effort.

V. Supporting Documentation

Meeting agendas.
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
September 30, 2016, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
Arts & Technology Building – Conference Room (ATC) Bldg., Room 1.201

1. Opening remarks by Rashaunda Henderson

2. Introductions

3. Climate Survey Discussion
   a. Suggestions for current draft
   b. Timeline for survey report (Originally proposed dates to meet with President Benson – 10/21 or 10/28) - November 11th or 18th
   c. Recommend to shift dates after Inauguration

4. New Business
   a. Report to President Benson
   b. Future plans for committee
   c. Next meeting
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
October 21, 2016, 11:30 a.m-1:00 p.m.
Arts & Technology Building – Conference Room (ATC) Bldg., Room 1.201

1. Opening remarks by Dean Fair & Rashaunda Henderson

2. Introductions

3. Climate Survey
   a. Draft 5 discussion – Finalize by December 2/9
   b. Finalize date to meet President Benson
   c. Committee Report – RM Henderson

4. New Business
   a. Future plans for committee
   b. New Business
      i. Kim Knight - LEAP Committee has been working on a handout for LGBTQIA Diversity in the Classroom, [Set up Webex at each meeting]
      ii. Diversity in the Classroom Workshops – follow-up to Dr Stanley's talk
   c. Next Meeting November 18

Actions

• Erin (update to Actions)
• Meghna (update appendices to include gender and race)
• Rashaunda (draft of committee report)
• Dean Fair (to contact President Benson’s office for a meeting on 12/2 or 12/9)
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
November 18, 2016, 11:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
Arts & Technology Building – Conference Room (ATC) Bldg., Room 1.201

Actions

• Erin (update to Actions)
• Meghna (update appendices to include gender and race)
• Rashaunda (draft of committee report)
• Dean Fair (to contact President Benson’s office for a meeting on 12/2 or 12/9
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
March 24, 2017, 11:00 a.m-12:30 p.m.
Synergy Park North Building (SPN) - Conference Room 1.111

1. Opening remarks by Dean Fair & Dr. Meghna Sabharwal

2. Approve minutes

3. Introductions

4. Old Business - Climate Survey
      i. 12/20/16 slides, Printed notes
   b. Plans for Survey Town Hall – We need help and subcommittee volunteers
      i. Logistics: Location for ~100 people, facilitator, order refreshments, proposed
dates: 4/28 (12-1:30pm).
      ii. Advertisements and invites: See attached invitation draft (similar to CTL or
event brite), send electronic invitation by 4/7
      InterCom - [Items must be submitted to the Intercom editor a week before the
Intercom distribution date, generally the second and fourth Wednesdays of
each month.]
      UT Dallas News Center - [If you have an idea for News Center coverage, contact
the Media Relations department.]
      iii. Content: Present 3 Big challenges from survey, Current Recommendations,
Progress towards survey comments (ERGs, Accessibility, etc.)
      iv. Sign-up sheets for future focus group
   c. Update survey website with content – We need help and volunteers to update webpage
with useful links from other universities, etc.
      i. Post presentation given to Dr. Benson as pdf by 3/30

5. New Business
   i. President Benson’s strategic plan – ST4: Diversity and Inclusion
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
April 21, 2017, 11:00 a.m-12:30 p.m.
Synergy Park North Building (SPN) - Conference Room 1.111

1. Opening remarks by Dean Fair & Dr. Rashaunda Henderson

2. Approve minutes

3. Introductions

4. Old Business - Climate Survey
   a. Plans for Survey Town Hall – We need help and subcommittee volunteers
      i. Logistics: Location for ~100 people, facilitator, order refreshments, proposed dates: 4/28 (12-1:30pm – Founders North, Kusch Auditorium, Room 2.102 FN).
      ii. Advertisements and invites: Emails went out, Selina mentioned at Staff Council; Do we estimate a number for food/drinks, details, etc? Do we add flyers around campus?
      iii. Content: Present 3 Big challenges from survey, Current Recommendations, Progress towards survey comments (ERGs, Accessibility, etc.)
      iv. Polling – Letitia, Rym and Daniel; Sample questions
      v. Sign-up sheets for future focus group
   b. Update survey website with content ✔ – James Dockery and ODCE completed. Continue updating webpage with useful links from other universities, etc.

5. New Business
   i. Recent issues on campus - Do you know which office/committee receives reports of such incidents on our campus and maintains these records?
   ii. President Benson’s strategic plan – ST4: Diversity and Inclusion
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
May 26, 2017, 11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Synergy Park North Building (SPN) - Conference Room 1.111

1. Opening remarks by Dean Fair

2. Approve minutes

3. Introductions

4. Old Business – Town Hall Discusson
   a. Update survey website with content
   b. Make plans for group focus session early fall

5. New Business
May 26, 2017

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Karen Huxtable
Chair, Committee on Effective Teaching


I. Membership

The membership of the Committee on Effective Teaching consists of:

Karen Huxtable Chair (BBS)
Vince Ng Vice-Chair (ECS)
Shelby Hibbs Committee Appointee (A&H)
Sean McComber Committee Appointee (ATEC)
Gregg Dieckmann Committee Appointee (NSM)
Galia Cohen Committee Appointee (EPPS)
Angela McNulty Committee Appointee (IS)
Rebecca Files Committee Appointee (JSOM)
Jonathan Schueler Student Appointee
Pramukh Sai Atluri Student Appointee
Simon Kane Technical Expert
Darren Crone Technical Expert

RUO
Paul Diehl Associate Provost

Ex-Officio members:
Andrew Blanchard Dean of Undergraduate Education (UG ED)
Marion Underwood Dean of Graduate Education
Natalie Ring Associate Dean UG ED (A&H)
Eric Farrar Associate Dean UG ED (ATEC)
Melanie Spence Associate Dean UG ED (BBS)
Simeon Ntafos Associate Dean UG ED (ECS)
Sarah Maxwell Associate Dean UG ED (EPPS)
Tonja Wissinger Associate Dean UG ED (IS)
Marilyn Kaplan Associate Dean UG ED (JSOM)
Dennis Miller Associate Dean UG ED (NSM)

II. Meetings

The committee met 6 times, on October 6, November 15, January 27, February 24, March 24, and April 28. The subcommittees for the Regents’ Outstanding Teaching Awards and the President’s Teaching Awards met separately in January and March.
III. Actions Taken

1. The competitions for all University level teaching awards will be managed by the Committee. It will forward its recommendations for award winners to the President.
   a. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) now manages the process of creating award categories (for President and Provost approval), soliciting award nominations, creating awards selection committees, identifying evidence of teaching effectiveness, and running committee meetings. CET was consulted for approval on these guidelines and procedures. CET members are encouraged to promote development of new teaching awards in their schools.
   b. A subcommittee of four members of CET served on the committees that solicited nominations and selected candidates who were put forward for the ROTA and five President’s Faculty and TA Awards.

2. At our first planning meeting, committee members expressed concern about students’ general levels of preparedness for achieving course goals even in entry-level courses. Students come to campus unprepared for note-taking or identifying the main ideas in a passage of text, lacking life skills and ability to solve their own problems, and generally lacking a common culture. Addressing these deficits in the first year already seems too late.
   a. CET suggested that CTL develop a workshop to address these issues. In February, Dr. Cirulli Lanham presented a workshop for faculty and TAs called *They Get Younger Every Year! The challenges of teaching and reaching Millennials.*
   b. Jonathan Schueler suggested that CET develop a plan to promote informal faculty-student relationships/mentorships to help students feel connected. Various plans for matching volunteer faculty members with groups or lists of students were considered. Members of Student Government have agreed to take on this idea next year and will work with CET to develop a plan.

3. The Committee will receive annual reports from each individual School Committee on Effective Teaching and will facilitate and evaluate the work of the School committees. The Committee will forward the individual School reports and its summary evaluation report annually to the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost).
   a. CET worked with the Provost’s Technology Group to send reminders about best practices for end of semester student evaluations of teaching (SET) to all faculty. A number of faculty members responded with concerns about the validity and usefulness of SET. To address these concerns, CTL has received approval from the Provost for a Task Force on SETs for next year.
   b. We will follow the same procedure for requesting information from the deans as we did last year.

The questions we asked were as follows:
1. Does your school have a standing Teaching Effectiveness Committee? If yes,
   a. Who appoints the members?
   b. How often does it meet?
   c. What is the charge of the committee?
2. Which instructors are evaluated by your school’s Teaching Effectiveness Committee?
3. When are the evaluations conducted?
   a. How often are instructors evaluated if they have priority?
   b. Are instructors evaluated if they do not have priority (e.g., tenured faculty)? If so, what is the schedule for that?
   c. How is the evaluation included in or connected to the annual review, third year, and tenure evaluation process?
4. By what methods are instructors evaluated (i.e., which tools, measures, or methods of observation are used)?
   a. What course materials are examined (e.g., syllabus, exams, assignments, student artifacts)? Please specify.
5. Who conducts the evaluations? How are members of the evaluation committee selected?
6. How are evaluation results communicated to the instructor (i.e., what is the feedback process)? Please indicate timing of feedback and whether it is formative or summative.

Responses from the Deans or their designees are attached, as received throughout the spring semester (Appendix A). Replies were received from BBS, IS, JSOM, ATEC, EPPS, and NSM.

4. The Committee will create and refine procedures for the training of and monitoring of the teaching effectiveness of graduate teaching assistants.
   a. CET members agreed to suggest more intensive and targeted orientation sessions for graduate TAs in August within their schools. CTL will work closely with ATEC, AH, and NSM to develop their TA orientations and follow-up programming.

5. The Committee will receive complaints about and requests for improvements in the teaching environments on campus and pass on recommendations for improvements to the University administration.
   a. A complaint was made by Dr. Angela McNulty about Classroom Buildings 1 and 2. Ongoing problems with dead rodents and larger animals and the resulting smell has caused a sometimes overwhelming bad smell. This concern was immediately forwarded to the Academic Council and Senate.

6. The Committee will encourage and review the funding of projects in the use of new technology and new teaching methods, both on campus and by transmission to
remote sites. It will also advise the University administration and Academic Senate on ways to ease the transition to "the high tech classroom."

a. We have forwarded the existing rubric used for peer evaluation of online teaching to Dr. Darren Crone. His team will review the form and make recommendations, if needed, for modification or for how it may be used most effectively.

7. As part of the general requirement to improve awareness of new ideas and new technologies, the Committee will occasionally invite renowned speakers to give seminars on campus.

a. CET suggested that CTL invite cognitive psychologist Dr. Stephen Chew to offer faculty and TA workshops in February. These were very well received. Next year’s speakers will include Robert Duke, Linda Hodges, Jay Howard, and Therese Huston.

8. Committee members expressed concern about providing greater support for Lecturers. Committee members suggested that UT Rio Grande Valley and Richland Community College both offer good models that we can examine for ideas. Similarly, we can look into providing greater support for faculty of all ranks who are new to UTD, and consider providing regular opportunities for interaction among faculty across schools.

a. A Lecturer Needs Survey will be created and distributed by CTL to identify what supportive programming lecturers would welcome as well as when and how it should be offered. An essential aspect of distributing this survey will be identifying and continually updating the names and schools of all part-time and full-time Lecturers. CET members agreed that this also will be handled by CTL.

IV. Recommendations for Following Year
1. Student participation in this committee is valued, but students appointed by SGA do not always attend CET meetings. Next year and in the future, CET will request replacement representatives if students’ schedules interfere with their ability to participate.

2. Other CET members have expressed a desire to participate in all meetings, but scheduling sometimes interferes with classes and other obligations. This is the case for committee appointees and for associate deans. Now that CTL has meeting space in the library, CET will meet on the first Friday of every month from 12-1pm. Lunch will be provided by CTL.

V. Appendices
Responses from BBS, IS, JSOM, ATEC, NSM, and EPPS are appear below. Responses were not received from ECS nor AH.
BBS

1. Does your school have a standing Teaching Effectiveness Committee? Yes
   a. Who appoints the members? As specified in the BBS Bylaws (approved 9/5/14) the Dean appoints the Chair of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee, and the Dean appoints the other members of the TEC in consultation with the Chair. Members appointed each year by the Dean, and members of the committee will be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Chair for one year terms, renewable.
   b. How often does it meet? Face-to-face meetings are scheduled as needed; in recent years the committee has agreed to conduct most of its meetings via email, to reduce the travel burden for members housed primarily in locations other than on the main campus in Richardson.
   c. What is the charge of the committee? The TEC is charged with conducting systematic evaluations of teaching to be communicated to the faculty member and relevant administrators. The TEC prioritizes evaluations to ensure that evaluations of T and TT faculty are available in the early fall of the year of their promotion review.

2. Which instructors are evaluated by your school’s Teaching Effectiveness Committee? Instructors at all levels can be and have been evaluated by the TEC, but evaluations of T and TT instructors have priority, as described below.

3. When are the evaluations conducted? The TEC schedules evaluations of T and TT faculty according to those who will be reviewed for promotion the following year to ensure that at least two teaching evaluations are available for inclusion in the candidate’s portfolio at the time of the promotion review.
   a. How often are instructors evaluated if they have priority? At least twice in the year prior to their review.
   b. Are instructors evaluated if they do not have priority (e.g., tenured faculty)? If so, what is the schedule for that? Review of tenured faculty is not conducted on a set schedule, but rather is contingent on the need for such reviews and the number of other priority reviews being conducted in a given year.
   c. How is the evaluation included in or connected to the annual review, third year, and tenure evaluation process? Evaluation reports (co-signed by the TEC member and the faculty member, who may add comments prior to signing the report) are disseminated to BBS associate deans and to the head of the faculty member’s BBS area; reports also
are included in the portfolios of T and TT candidates for review and/or promotion for consideration by the ad hoc promotion review committee.

4. By what methods are instructors evaluated (i.e., which tools, measures, or methods of observation are used)? In October of 2014, the TEC voted in favor of a proposal by its Chair at that time, Professor and Associate Dean Marion Underwood, to conduct classroom observations using one of two forms required by the UT System Regents; I’ve attached these (Example A: “Peer Observation for Formative Assessment of Teaching” and Example B: “Classroom Observation Form”). After completing the observation form the observer and instructor meet within a few weeks to discuss and co-sign the form (with additional comments from the instructor if requested).

a. What course materials are examined (e.g., syllabus, exams, assignments, student artifacts)? Please specify. Observers review syllabi posted on Coursebook and also request materials such as exams, assignments, and slides presented during class sessions.

5. Who conducts the evaluations? How are members of the evaluation committee selected? The Chair and members of the TEC consult to distribute an equal number of evaluation assignments to each member of the TEC, based on factors including availability, interest, and avoiding having more than one report by a single observer.

6. How are evaluation results communicated to the instructor (i.e., what is the feedback process)? Please indicate timing of feedback and whether it is formative or summative. Feedback is formative and is provided in a face-to-face meeting between the instructor and the evaluator. At this meeting they review the printed copy of the evaluation report and discuss or clarify the evaluator’s comments. The instructor then has the opportunity to add comments to the report, after which the instructor and the evaluator sign and date the report.
Submitted by Erin Smith, Chair

The School of Interdisciplinary Studies (IS) has a standing Teaching Effectiveness Committee. It was convened in the fall of 2013 as the Peer Teaching Evaluation Committee to establish a system for annual peer observations / assessments of teaching. The 5 members (from IS and the Teacher Development Center) volunteered for service on the committee at a School faculty meeting. The committee was charged with researching systems of peer evaluation at other institutions, creating a program for peer observation/assessment, producing a training/orientation presentation about the assessment process, and piloting the program in the spring of 2014. The committee met four times in the fall of 2014, twice in the spring of 2014, and roughly once a year since then to maintain / assess the program. The program of annual observations continues, with changes to accommodate feedback from participants.

Evaluations involve every participating instructor being observed by a peer once a year and also serving as a peer observer for a colleague once a year. Most observations occur during the spring semester. This system spreads the work and time commitment necessary to do good assessment widely, rather than concentrating it in the hands of a few committee members. In addition, it gives all participating instructors a sense of ownership and investment in the process. Most observers report that they learn as much from the process as the instructor being observed. They also find that the time commitment to do one observation each year is reasonable.

Participation in the peer evaluation program is voluntary for everyone—tenured, tenure-track, and full-time non-tenure track. We put all instructors (that is, T and NTT) in the same pool because of the small number of faculty in IS. Assignments of peer observers are based on schedules, content areas, and disciplines (the approaches and methodologies of Interdisciplinary Studies instructors range widely). These assignments change each year. The committee chair informally accommodates instructors’ concerns about awkward collegial relationships (based on rank or friendships, for example). We cast these annual peer observations/assessments as one part of a larger teaching portfolio that might include student evaluations, self-evaluations, voluntary additional peer observations, videotaped classes, statements of teaching philosophy, etc.

The observations/assessments involve: (1) a brief pre-observation meeting the week before the mutually agreed-upon class to observe; (2) the classroom observation; and (3) a post-observation meeting to discuss the written report of the classroom observation. By mutual agreement, the pre- and post-observation meetings can be by phone or skype. Observers are required to use one of two University-approved forms (Form A or Form B), although many chose to add additional materials (most commonly a narrative of what they observed in the class).

At the pre-observation meeting, the instructor provides the syllabus, course readings and materials for that day of class, and discusses any pedagogic challenges or concerns. Observers do not assess student artifacts or exams, although they do have copies of all assignments and course materials for the class period observed.

Post-observation meetings involve a brief discussion of the written report of the class observation, which the instructor receives at least 24 hours before the meeting. These meetings occur in the week following the observation. Both instructor and observer sign
the report, and it is submitted to the Dean’s office. Instructors who wish to append a
response or additional materials are encouraged to do so. These reports and discussion
are largely formative—that is, feedback to guide improvement in teaching. However,
instructors can include these reports in their portfolios for promotion, where they serve a
more summative purpose as evidence of teaching excellence.
Peer observations/assessments were required in the spring of 2014 (12 IS instructors
participated), and participation was voluntary in subsequent years. 6 instructors
participated in 2016-17. Although participation is voluntary, lecturers who wish to apply
for promotion are required to submit peer observations from the prior two years as part of
their portfolios. Tenure-track and tenured faculty evaluations as part of third-year,
tenure, and promotion reviews are separate from this peer observation system, and are
undertaken by two members of the review/promotion committee (mostly tenured faculty
from Schools outside IS). Observation/assessment reports are reviewed by the Dean as
part of the annual review process.
At the urging of the Center for Teaching and Learning, Interdisciplinary Studies is setting
up an award for teaching excellence, to be awarded for the first time in the 2017-18
school year. A 4-person committee of volunteers was formed at a February faculty
meeting to establish the application process and criteria for the award. That committee
had its first meeting in April of 2017 and is circulating a proposal to the larger faculty
this spring.
JSOM

1. Does your school have a standing Teaching Effectiveness Committee? Yes
   
a. Who appoints the members?
   
The Dean
   
b. How often does it meet?
   
Once or twice in fall and once in spring.
   
c. What is the charge of the committee?
   
This is a SOM standing faculty committee which reviews the quality of teaching in the School’s programs and makes recommendations for improvement. It is also responsible for the selection of the School’s annual Teaching Excellence Award recipients.

2. Which instructors are evaluated by your school’s Teaching Effectiveness Committee?
   
Faculty that are being evaluated for promotion and faculty that are nominated for teaching awards. Those nominated for teaching awards are recommended by the Area Coordinator and students.

3. When are the evaluations conducted?
   
a. How often are instructors evaluated if they have priority?
   
Candidates for promotion have classroom evaluations done twice by two different above rank faculty. All others are evaluated by the Area Coordinator and Dean during annual evaluations. Primary information used is student evaluations, class size and type of course taught.
   
b. Are instructors evaluated if they do not have priority (e.g., tenured faculty)?
   
If so, what is the schedule for that?
   
Classroom evaluations are conducted as they are needed, i.e, if we identify issues with a particular instructor/course that require further attention. Evaluations are done annually using student evaluations, class size and type of course taught.
   
c. How is the evaluation included in or connected to the annual review, third year, and tenure evaluation process?
   
Classroom evaluations are considered in the evaluation of teaching in the third year, tenure and full professor promotion cases.

4. By what methods are instructors evaluated (i.e., which tools, measures, or methods of observation are used)?
   
a. What course materials are examined (e.g., syllabus, exams, assignments, student artifacts)? Please specify.
   
The committee evaluates teaching based on student evaluations and comments, course syllabi, diversity of courses taught and periodic classroom evaluations.

5. Who conducts the evaluations? How are members of the evaluation committee selected?
Above rank faculty conducts classroom observations and evaluations. Members of evaluation committee are selected by the chair of the committee in consultation with the area coordinator.

6. How are evaluation results communicated to the instructor (i.e., what is the feedback process)? Please indicate timing of feedback and whether it is formative or summative.

Classroom evaluations are communicated back to the instructor via the forms provided by the Provost’s office for documenting classroom evaluation. Annual evaluations of teaching are communicated back to the faculty again using the forms for annual evaluations.
ATEC

Hello Karen,

I’m trying to find answers to the questions. As you now, ATEC is a new school, and many policies and procedures are not yet in place or well established. I’ve asked on of the ATEC Associate Deans to fill in what ever information we have. I’m hoping by next year we will be able to borrow and implement some of the best practices that your committee identifies.

Anne Balsamo

NSM

Dear Karen,

I had thought I had already answered this email. Unfortunately, as it stands currently, we do not have a committee on teaching effectiveness. This will be rectified in the near future.

bruce
Bruce M. Novak, PhD
Dean, School of Natural Sciences & Math
The University of Texas at Dallas
Richardson, TX 75080--3021
bruce.novak@utdallas.edu
972-883-2416
1. At the moment we have no TEC. At the current time there is nothing in our bylaws that requires one, but we plan to change the bylaws to require such a committee. We did have a functioning TEC at one time from the late 1990s to about 2010, however as the faculty in EPPS expanded it became impossible for the members of the TEC to keep pace with evaluations. For that reason, the work of the committee was delegated to the program heads (see below). As we recognize the need to reestablish a TEC for EPPS, we will examine what we consider to be best practices of those Schools currently operating with a TEC and consult with them as necessary. However, in order to avoid similar problems as experienced in the past, we expect the program heads will continue to play a lead role.

2. NA

3. NA

4. Even though we do not have a TEC, we do conduct regular evaluations of faculty. These evaluations are done through the regular third year and promotion and tenure process whereby members of the third year and p and t committees evaluate the in-class performance of instructors through classroom visits, and assessment of teaching performance using subjective observational assessment. Similar assessments are performed by the individual program heads for selected instructors, including a mix of senior lecturer, tenure-track and tenured faculty done on a yearly basis as part of the annual performance review. The evaluations are conducted by at or above rank faculty of colleagues, with those conducting the evaluations selected by the program head in consultation with the associate program head and faculty. All results are communicated in writing and in person to the instructor or faculty member being reviewed.

5. See Number 4 above

6. See Number 4 above

Denis J. Dean, Ph.D.
Dean of the School of Economic, Political and Policy Science
Professor of Geography and Geospatial Information Science
TO: The Academic Senate
From: Michele Hanlon
Chair, Campus Facilities Committee
Subject: Annual Report of Campus Facility Committee, 2016 – 2017

I. Membership
The membership of the Campus Facilities Committee consists of: Michele Hanlon, Chair, Christopher Camacho, Ernest Hanning, Lucien Thompson, Dean Dennis Kratz, Dean Mark Sprong, James Harrington, John Cruz (student), Matt Grief (ex-officio), Patrice Holt (ex-officio), Ellen Safley (ex-officio)
Other ex-officio: Executive Vice President, Provost, Senior Director of Research Compliance, Assistant Vice President of Environmental Health and Safety, Director of Media Services, Assistant Vice President of Auxiliary Services, Associate Vice President for Business Affairs.
RUO – Vice President for Administration

II. Meetings
May 5, 2017: Orientation and introduction of new members. We discussed updates for the past year with regard to university growth, building facilities, sustainability, and security.

July 2017 (TBD): Upcoming – discussion and planning for SEC event.

III. Actions Taken
The Committee agreed to take part in a Service Excellence Campaign (SEC), designed to inform and educate the university community regarding the work done by facilities related services. The Committee will partner with the Office of Administration and Student Life services during welcome week. Planning for this event will be finalized during the Campus Facilities July 2017 meeting.

IV. Recommendations for Following Year
Engage the committee membership in the work done by facilities by educational contact with various facilities component directors.

Develop outreach to students, staff, and faculty regarding campus improvement needs.

Develop outreach to students, staff, and faculty via information and education re facilities operations at UTD.

V. Notes, Commentary, Supporting Documentation
Agenda for meeting on May 5, 2017:

Campus Facilities Committee Meeting Agenda: “One Campus. Our Campus”
Friday, May 5, 2017 – Happy Cinco de Mayo!
3:00 – 4:00pm

I. Introductions
II. Campus Updates – Dr. Calvin Jamison
III. Sustainability – Thea Hunt
IV. Service Excellence Campaign – Michele Hanlon
V. Subsequent Meeting Dates
VI. Open Discussion
VII. Adjourn
Report from the Committee on Educational Policy – Academic Year 2016-2017

Clint Peinhardt, Chair

May 24, 2017

----

CEP is charged with approving all new courses and programs, as well as all changes to courses and programs. Additionally, we examine changes in language in the catalog and other academic policy issues that are referred by the Academic Council and/or Senate. I would like to note for the record how our work depends in large part on the work of the Registrar’s office and of the Provost’s office. Their professionalism this last couple of years has been outstanding, and they have made CEP’s work much easier, so I just want to make sure they get some credit!

During this academic year, we created a set of official bylaws. The bylaws clarify the mission of the committee, the responsibilities of the Chair and Vice-Chair, and various procedures, including advanced receipt of agenda items. CEP approved the new bylaws in our December meeting, and they have served to refocus our monthly agendas around substantive categories of our mission. I’ll use those same categories in my listing below.

While the full details are available in our minutes and those of the Senate, here is a summary of the agenda items we addressed this year.

(1) New Programs
   a. M.S. in Financial Engineering and Risk Management (Aug)
   b. M.S. in Social Science Data Analytics and Research (Sept)
   c. B.A. in Philosophy (Oct)
   d. M.A. in Art History (Dec)
   e. B.S. in Human Resources Management (Dec)
   f. Minor in Film Studies (Feb)
   g. Certificate in Research Accounting (Mar)
   h. Concentration on Business Analytics (Mar)
   i. M.S. in Leadership and Organizations Development (May)

(2) Changes to Existing Programs
   a. Name change: MS in Healthcare Management to MS in Healthcare Leadership and Management (Aug)
   b. ATEC undergraduate and graduate program consolidations (Feb)
   c. M.S. in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology – new concentration
   d. Approved numerous undergraduate degree changes (Mar and May)
   e. Approved numerous graduate degree changes (Mar and May)
   f. Name change: BA in Art & Performance to BA in Visual & Performing Arts (Apr)
   g. New CORE assessment plan (May)
(3) New or Changed Courses
   a. Approved 1 of 1 new graduate classes (Aug)
   b. Approved 1 new graduate and 2 new undergraduate courses for Spring catalog (Oct)
   c. Approved 223 of 223 graduate course additions, removals, and changes (Oct)
   d. Approved 235 of 239 undergraduate course additions, removals, and changes (Oct)
   e. Approved 6 of 6 graduate course additions in mechanical engineering (Dec)
   f. Approved 132 of 132 undergraduate course additions, removals, and changes (Feb)
   g. Approved 236 of 236 graduate course additions, removals, and changes (Mar)
   h. Added courses that qualify for the CORE curriculum (Mar)
   i. Approved 250 of 250 undergraduate course additions, removals, and changes (Mar)
   j. Approved 205 of 205 graduate course additions, removals, and changes (Mar)
   k. Approved 18 of 18 undergraduate course additions, removals, and changes (May)

(4) Policy changes
   a. UTDPP1075: New category of graduate assistants (Aug)
   b. Added campus carry language to syllabus template (Aug)
   c. English language proficiency requirements (Sept)
   d. Admission requirements for 3-year degrees from international institutions (Sept)
   e. UTDPP 1052- Section 4.5.2: Requiring 3 Voting Members from the Academic Program on Dissertation (Dec)
   f. UTDPP 1052- Section 7.1: One vs 3 Semester Credit Hours in the final examination semester (Dec)
   g. Requiring change of Majors Approval (Dec)
   h. In Absentia and Change of Catalogue Year Policies (Feb)
   i. Fast Track language in the catalog (Feb)
   j. 1st year admission changes (Feb)
   k. Transfer admission changes (Feb)
   l. New Catalog Language on no transfer credit for WCEM Courses (Mar)
   m. Changes to the undergraduate and graduate “first 40” policies (Apr)
   n. UTDPP 1052: changes to transfer credit (May)

Additionally, the committee regularly received updates regarding the SACSCOC Assessment process and relevant proceedings in the state legislature, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and the Board of Regents for the UT-System.
Committee on Qualifications Annual Report to the Senate, 2016-2017 Academic Year

Members of the Committee:
Abdi, Herve (BBS)       Ali, Ashiq (SOM)       Channell, David (A&H)
Dufour, Frank (ATEC)    Haas, Zygmunt (ECS)     Hart, John (BBS)
Hooshyar, Ali (NSM), Chair Li, Dong (EPPS)     Lowry, Robert (EPPS)
Malina, Roger (ATEC/NSM) Makris, Georgios (ECS)     Rebello, Mike (SOM)
Waligore, Marilyn (A&H), Vice-chair Zhang, Chuanwei (NSM)

Review Activity for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of review</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>2016-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third-year, mid-probationary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure review &amp; Promotion to Assoc Prof</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc to Full Prof</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside hires with tenure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall workload increased by about 9%, mainly due to the increase in number of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor reviews.

Meeting schedule, operating procedures, and workload:

Mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion reviews. Prior to CQ’s evaluation, a candidate for promotion, is reviewed by an ad hoc committee, a faculty vote with recorded minutes, and a Dean’s report. The components analyzed were research/creative activity, teaching effectiveness, and service. UTD policy requires excellence in either teaching or research/creative activity and if teaching is excellent, then the candidate should have performed well in research/creative activity.

CQ met as a committee on seven Fridays mornings: January 6, 13, and 20, and February 3, 10, 17, and 24. The expectation was that all CQ members read all the cases. Each CQ member was assigned one case to summarize per session, and one case to take notes on the CQ discussion. It takes several days to prepare for each weekly meeting. The chair merged the summary and discussion for a final report, which were usually one to two pages long. CQ considered the following factors for cases with tenure: (1) sufficient documentation to support the
recommendation for or against promotion; (2) independent letters from at least five external evaluators (independence was defined as not having a self-interested association with the candidate for promotion); (3) clear articulation of the strengths and weaknesses of each case; (4) school-specific guidelines; and (5) consistency within individual schools. Out of CQ’s 54 recommendations, the President and the Interim Provost concurred with 52 of the recommendations. On March 31 the Interim Provost met with CQ to discuss the recommendations for the other two reviewed cases.

**External hires with tenure.** CQ evaluates all external hires with tenure. These evaluations are conducted mostly via email because they are often time-sensitive. The CQ has imposed a 48-hour turnover to complete evaluations for urgent cases. For external hires whose need for deliberation is less urgent (as determined by the Provost), CQ has imposed a 96-hour turnover. For hires at the same rank (e.g., an Associate Professor from another institution hired as an Associate Professor at UTD), our operating procedures allow the CQ Chair to determine how many CQ member responses are sufficient; after expiration of the turnover time. This process accommodates unusual times for the hires (e.g., summer). For hires that involve a promotion (e.g., an Associate Professor hire as a Full Professor), eight affirmative votes (a majority) are required. However, thanks to our dedicated CQ members and availability of Internet, almost all cases have been reviewed with 92%-100% of CQ members participating. The types of external hires are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous rank</th>
<th>Proposed rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof w/o tenure</td>
<td>Associate Prof with tenure</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof with tenure</td>
<td>Associate Prof with tenure</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof with tenure</td>
<td>Full Prof with tenure</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof with tenure</td>
<td>Full Prof with tenure</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations and suggestions for improvements:**

It is estimated that each case requires about one hour. Up to 12 cases per week may be considered, which can require at least two full days per week. The chair probably spends double the time. As the university expands, so will the number of cases reviewed. In the not distant future, assigning academic workload credit to CQ members may need to be taken into consideration.

Thanks to the continued efforts of Dr. Inga Musselman (Interim Provost) who holds annual meetings with the candidates for promotion and ad hoc committee chairs to discuss the review process and procedures, the usual issues that are of concerns in the review process: publication authorship (listing of all authors, determining contribution of candidate for evaluation), number
of PhD students supervised, indication of UTD student authorship, independent research done at UTD (as opposed to research done as a PhD or post-doctoral associate), including the mid-probationary report during tenure review, teaching evaluations, seem to have been effectively dealt with. The reports provided by the ad hoc committees were generally of high quality, reasons for their recommendations in general were well justified with supportive documents and details of their reasoning.

The most frequent concern raised for several cases involved the outside hires with tenure. In general for such cases, the external letters were not always independent/arms-length (e.g., PhD mentors or co-PIs on grants). The written policy for outside letters is stated in UTDPP1057:

> For tenured appointments, the Search Committee should solicit at least five independent judgments of the candidate's qualifications (these may include, but must not be limited to, individuals recommended by the candidate).

Even so, the rules were not always met. CQ is mandated to not seek additional information beyond what is provided. We have the option of not voting, but standing on such a principle has not been considered productive, especially since many of these hires were time-sensitive. This lack of deference to the arms-length rule seems to have started to propagate to some ad hoc committees too. In one case we even had a Dean note that the candidate’s file did not contain sufficient number of arms-length external review letters. However the Dean still had submitted the case to the Provost Office and CQ for review. The CQ had to return the file to the ad hoc committee for its completion. Such unnecessary delays are not fair to CQ and the candidates, since it may cause considerable delays in their tenure/promotions.

The followings are the issues that CQ finds are in need of improvement and CQ members recommend their implementation:

1. A check list page be included in any tenure/promotion file for indicating presence of all the needed documents, including at least five arms-length external letters. This should assist the respective Dean to quickly check a file for completion before it is sent to the Provost Office and CQ for further processing, or to return it to the ad hoc/search committee to obtain and include the needed documents before the announced deadlines.

2. The Provost Faculty review website contains the statistical summary of teaching for candidates under review. In addition to reporting student evaluations for courses taught by the candidate, another column needs to be added to this teaching summary that reports average GPA for the listed courses. It is true that this information is available in another part of the review website, but inclusion of it in the statistical summary of teaching will be more informative and will make it easier not only for CQ but also the ad hoc committees to better evaluate teaching effectiveness of a candidate.
3. CQ members believe it is very beneficial to have more information about what tier one schools consider as “excellence” in teaching when evaluating a faculty for tenure, and what measures do they use to arrive at such a designation. It is suggested that the “center of teaching excellence,” collect and provide CQ with such information.

4. CQ recommends its membership’s demographic mirror that of UTD’s Full Professor population in terms of gender and race/ethnicity.

A final comment concerns the participation of Dr. Joseph Pancrazio, who represents the Provost’s office at CQ meetings. He is not a voting member of the committee, and he does not participate in discussions, except to clarify matters of policy. Nonetheless, he has had an excellent impact on the quality of reviews within UTD. Also, Dr. Inga Musselman (Interim Provost) has continued to provide instructions to ad hoc committee chairs and candidates for promotion, with the result of higher quality information from both. She is very knowledgeable about CQ deliberations and historical reasons for existing procedures. It is felt that the conscientious efforts of Dr. Inga Musselman over the years have improved the review process by acting as an intermediary between the candidates for promotion, the ad hoc committees, and CQ. As a result CQ members continues to benefit from her vast experience and knowledge on CQ matters.
May 8, 2017

TO:    David M. Cordell, PhD
       Secretary, The Academic Senate

FROM:  Christine Dollaghan, PhD
       Chair, Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct

SUBJECT: Annual Report of Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct, 2016–2017

I.  Membership
    The membership of the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct consisted of
    Roderick Heelis (Vice-Chair), Thomas Brunell, Si Zheng, and Ram Rao.

II.  Meetings
     As no faculty grievances or faculty conduct issues were referred to the Committee
     during the 2016-2017 academic year, no meetings were held.

III.  Actions Taken
      None.

IV.   Recommendations for Following Year
      None.

V.    Special comments/Notes/Supporting Documentation
      None.
TO: The Academic Senate  
FROM: Rafael Martin  
Chair, University Research Integrity Committee  

SUBJECT: Annual Report of University Research Integrity Committee, 2016 – 2017  

I. Membership  
Vice President for Research (Chair, ex-officio), Paul Fishwick (Vice-Chair), Marion Underwood (ex-officio), Stuart Cogan, Christine Dollaghan, Vijay Mookerjee, Thomas Riccio, Todd Sandler, Allan Sherry, Jason Slinker. Joseph Pancrazio represents the Executive Vice President and Provost (RUO).  

II. Meetings  
December 7, 2016: general meeting to discuss policies and procedures  
March 30, 2017: special meeting to discuss a specific conflict of interest  
June 20, 2017: quarterly meeting to discuss policies and procedures, review progress from March 30 special meeting  

III. Actions Taken  
The committee’s primary action is the review and approval of conflict of interest management plans. These reviews are conducted through panels consisting of two URIC representatives, and the appropriate school dean. 8 management plans have been approved in the current fiscal year.  

The panel also serves as a corrective body should a researcher violate their management plan. The primary purpose of the March and June 2017 meetings was to review the corrective actions recommended by a review panel for a particular conflict of interest situation.  

The committee also advises the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) on procedures, forms, and other items used in the implementation of UTD’s conflict of interest policies. The committee advised ORC on new policy trainings and conflict management documents at the December 2016 and June 2017 meetings. The policy trainings are now implemented campus-wide, and ORC has implemented the conflict management documents based on committee recommendations.  

IV. Recommendations for Following Year  
The committee and ORC will focus on COI education targeted at graduate students. ORC is developing educational materials and training, and will work with Graduate Studies to implement this program.  

V. Supporting Documents  
1. Meeting Agenda, December 7, 2016  
2. Meeting Agenda, March 30, 2017  
3. Meeting Agenda, June, 2017
I. Introduction
   Rafael Martin

II. Update on UTD Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policies
    Rafael Martin

     a. Research Conflict of Interest (UTDPP1029)
     b. Outside Activity Policy (UTDPP1102)
     c. Revisions to COIC Policies

III. Management Plan Updates
     Conor Wakeman

     a. FY17 Q1 COI Compliance Report

IV. Policy Trainings
    Conor Wakeman

     a. COIC Policy Training for Faculty and Researchers
     b. COI Policy Training for Reviewers

V. Conflict Review Documents
    Conor Wakeman

     a. Checklist for Conflict Management Plan Review
     b. Review for Related Research

VI. Action Items
University Research Integrity Committee  
The University of Texas at Dallas  
9:00-10:00 AM  
March 30, 2017  
Student Union Room 2.504

Members
Rafael Martin (Chair)  Interim Vice President of Research  
Paul Fishwick, Ph.D. (Vice Chair)  Arts and Technology  
Stuart Cogan, Ph.D.  Engineering and Computer Science  
Christine Dollaghan, Ph.D.  Behavioral and Brain Sciences  
Vijay Mookerjee, Ph.D.  Management  
Joseph Pancrazio, Ph.D.  Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost  
Thomas Riccio, Ph.D.  Arts and Humanities  
Todd Sandler, Ph.D.  Economic, Political and Policy Sciences  
A. Dean Sherry, Ph.D.  Natural Sciences and Mathematics  
Jason Slinker, Ph.D.  Natural Sciences and Mathematics  
Marion Underwood, Ph.D.  Dean of Graduate Studies

Guests
Inga Musselman  Interim Provost  Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost  
John Hansen  Associate Dean  Engineering and Computer Science  
Sanaz Okhovat  Assistant Vice President  Office of Research Compliance  
Conor Wakeman  Conflict of Interest Manager  Office of Research Compliance

Time Meeting Convened: 9:02  
Time Meeting Adjourned: 9:58

I. Introduction  Rafael Martin

II. Conflict of Interest Determination – Walter Voit  Rafael Martin
   a. Notice of Conflict of Interest Determination
   b. Revised Management Plan
   c. Supporting Documentation

III. Conflict Investigation and Enforcement  Conor Wakeman

IV. Management Plan Updates  Conor Wakeman
   a. FY17 Q2 COI Compliance Report

V. Quarterly Meetings

VI. Action Items
I. Introduction

II. Conflict of Interest Determination – Walter Voit
   a. Notice of Conflict of Interest Determination
   b. Revised Management Plan – ORC comments May 9 2017

III. Proposed Amendment to UT Systemwide Policy 175
    a. UTS175 – Proposed Public Reporting Revisions

IV. Revisions to Research Personnel Disclosure Form
    a. Research Personnel Disclosure

V. Management Plan Updates
    a. FY17 Q3 Compliance Report for Conflict of Interest Management

VI. Interim Annual Report
    a. Interim RIC Annual Report FY17

VII. Quarterly Meetings

VIII. Action Items
June 12, 2017

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Lloyd L. Lumata
      Chair, Institutional Biosafety and Chemical Safety Committee

SUBJECT: Annual Report of Institutional Biosafety and Chemical Safety Committee (IBCC), 2016–2017

I. Membership
The membership of the IBCC consists of: Lloyd Lumata (chair), Manuel Quevedo-Lopez (vice-chair), John Burr, Sheena D’Arcy, Jonathan Ploski, Heng Du, Roy Dimon (community member), and Bill Alsup (community member).

II. Meetings
The regularly scheduled monthly meetings of the IBCS Committee are the first Wednesdays of each month at 2pm, primarily at the 1st or 2nd floor conference room of the BSB building. In the present cycle, we have met 9 times, and our next meeting is scheduled for July 5, 2017.

III. Actions Taken
Our main task as a committee is to review and decide approval or rejection/revision of research protocols done by principal investigators (PIs) on campus that have potential biosafety and/or chemical safety concerns. The IBCC role is distinct from the roles of Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Animal Institutional Care and Use Committee (AICUC). Our panel is consisted of faculty members from biology, chemistry, physics, neuroscience, engineering, a medical doctor, a city health officer, and 3 staff members of UTD Office of Research Compliance. In addition, we have also formulated a handbook on bio- and chemical safety guidelines that will be distributed to research labs on campus.

From Sept 2016-June 2017 the committee has reviewed:
• 11 New Protocol Registrations;
• 9 Protocol Amendments;
• 4 Protocol Renewals;
• and addressed 10 Policy Issues

These protocols were submitted by research professors on campus mainly from NSM, BSB, and ECS.

IV. Recommendations for Following Year
The frequency of IBCC meetings (once per month) has so far been sufficient to accommodate the pace of research protocol submissions at UTD that have
potential bio- and chemical safety concerns. As UTD is growing in the number of researchers, the committee is prepared to meet twice per month if necessary if there is a substantial increase in protocol submissions. Our IBCC coordinator James Pharr manages these meetings very well.

V. [Any Special comments/Notes/Supporting Documentation]
The protocols that we have approved were rigorously evaluated by the various experts in our panel and it is our highest priority to examine every detail of research methodologies submitted to keep UTD with zero incident of bio- and chemical safety violation.
TO: The Academic Senate  
FROM: Rafael Martin  
       Chair, University Research Integrity Committee  
SUBJECT: Interim Annual Report of University Research Integrity Committee, 2016 –2017

I. Membership
Vice President for Research (Chair, ex-officio), Paul Fishwick (Vice-Chair), Marion Underwood (ex-officio), Stuart Cogan, Christine Dollaghan, Vijay Mookerjee, Thomas Riccio, Todd Sandler, Allan Sherry, Jason Slinker. Joseph Pancrazio represents the Executive Vice President and Provost (RUO).

II. Meetings
December 7, 2016: general meeting to discuss policies and procedures  
March 30, 2017: special meeting to discuss a specific conflict of interest  
June 2017: planned special meeting to discuss a specific conflict of interest

III. Actions Taken

The committee’s primary action is the review and approval of conflict of interest management plans. These reviews are conducted through panels consisting of two URIC representatives, and the appropriate school dean. 6 management plans have been approved in the current fiscal year.

The panel also serves as a corrective body should a researcher violate their management plan. The purpose of the March 2017 meeting was to review the corrective actions recommended by a review panel for a particular conflict of interest situation.

The committee also advises the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) on procedures, forms, and other items used in the implementation of UTD’s conflict of interest policies. The committee advised ORC on new policy trainings and conflict management documents at the December 2016 meeting. The policy trainings are now implemented campus-wide, and ORC has implemented the conflict management documents based on committee recommendations.

*Note: The committee will submit a final report in August after completing upcoming actions. These actions include a June special meeting and completion of pending conflict management plan review panels.*

IV. Recommendations for Following Year

The committee and ORC will focus on COI education targeted at graduate students. ORC is developing educational materials and training, and will work with Graduate Studies to implement this program.

V. Supporting Documents
1. Meeting Agenda, December 7, 2016  
2. Meeting Agenda, March 30, 2017  
3. Meeting Agenda, June 2017 [forthcoming]
I. Introduction
   Rafael Martin

II. Update on UTD Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policies
    Rafael Martin
    a. Research Conflict of Interest (UTDPP1029)
    b. Outside Activity Policy (UTDPP1102)
    c. Revisions to COIC Policies

III. Management Plan Updates
     Conor Wakeman
     a. FY17 Q1 COI Compliance Report

IV. Policy Trainings
    Conor Wakeman
    a. COIC Policy Training for Faculty and Researchers
    b. COI Policy Training for Reviewers

V. Conflict Review Documents
   Conor Wakeman
   a. Checklist for Conflict Management Plan Review
   b. Review for Related Research

VI. Action Items
### Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rafael Martin (Chair)</td>
<td>Interim Vice President of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fishwick, Ph.D. (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Arts and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Cogan, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Engineering and Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Dollaghan, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Behavioral and Brain Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijay Mookerjee, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Pancrazio, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Riccio, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Sandler, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Economic, Political and Policy Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Dean Sherry, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Natural Sciences and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Slinker, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Natural Sciences and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Underwood, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inga Musselman</td>
<td>Interim Provost</td>
<td>Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hansen</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>Engineering and Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanaz Okhovat</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President</td>
<td>Office of Research Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conor Wakeman</td>
<td>Conflict of Interest Manager</td>
<td>Office of Research Compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time Meeting Convened:** 9:02  
**Time Meeting Adjourned:** 9:58

I. Introduction  
II. Conflict of Interest Determination – Walter Voit  
   a. Notice of Conflict of Interest Determination  
   b. Revised Management Plan  
   c. Supporting Documentation  

III. Conflict Investigation and Enforcement  

IV. Management Plan Updates  
   a. FY17 Q2 COI Compliance Report  

V. Quarterly Meetings  

VI. Action Items
1. Meetings
   a. As a committee, we met monthly in December, January, February, March, April and May. As a new committee, we sought to define our role and discuss assessment processes.

2. Our charge and how we addressed this so far this semester:
   a. To encourage the creation and maintenance of an assessment climate that promotes the meaningful use of assessment data
      i. In response to the conversations, CTL and Office of Assessment are creating new workshops to address needs.
   b. To review and disseminate information to faculty on best practices for student learning outcomes assessment
      i. Resources shared include:
   c. To serve as a vehicle for communication and facilitate information sharing across units
      i. Shared how ECS uses eye charts and curriculum mapping
      ii. Circulated examples of logic maps and curriculum maps from Public Affairs
      iii. There was discussion about student evaluations and how to encourage more meaningful feedback. Suggestions include having mid-term evaluations/feedback.
      iv. Pre and post-tests in bioengineering were discussed. Bioengineering also has great faculty accountability and buy in.
   d. To promote the improvement of processes and celebrate successes of assessment across campus
      i. Presentations made from academic, non-academic, core, and Student Affairs assessment leaders on assessment processes
ii. Currently, UT Dallas uses an online database—Hyoka to collect assessment reports. The vision for this software is to share what students are learning/how programs are doing between departments. Anyone with a faculty/staff login can see this information. https://provost.utdallas.edu/hyoka/

3. Committee action plan:
   a. CTL will have a discussion in the fall about student evaluations and is creating a task force (May 2017: approved by the Provost).
   b. Office of Assessment will continue to work on providing supplementary data for reports (especially after all the surveys given to students are centralized)
   c. Will continue to meet over the summer with those with 12 month appointments, focusing conversations on non-academic assessment
   d. Fall:
      i. How to create action items from assessment reports?
      ii. How to help others see assessment as useful?
      iii. Who are our stakeholders and how to communicate with them? (public engagement)

4. Recommendations for Senate:
   a. In the original charge for our committee, we suggest adding “and constituents” to the third duty, reading: To serve as a vehicle for communication and facilitate information sharing across units and constituents.
   b. We would like to recommend that the President and Provost of UT Dallas take a public stand and endorse assessment at convocation and other fall activities showing our commitment to assessment as a University.
   c. We suggest that our student liaison make a presentation to Student Government annually about what they have learned from being on our committee.
      i. Student reflection: “Before attending the University Assessment Committee meetings, I had never heard about university assessments. During the first meeting, I recall being confused as to what everyone was discussing. However, after just a few meetings, I now have a better understanding of the purpose of university assessments and the committee. I believe that by allowing students like myself to participate is valuable because it gives us a better understanding about what is going on at our school. One of the things that I learned from attending the meetings, which is important to a student, is why we are tested and assessed in such manners and how the assessments help the entire university and the public understand how and what students are learning. University assessment is something that I believe is important for the entire university to understand and work on together to improve the way students are evaluated. I hope that in the future, more students will be allowed to take part in the committee.”
Item 16:
Committee Appointment Replacement
### Replace Sean Cotter from A&H on the Student Fee Advisory Committee as Member.

Recommended replacement would be ______________________.

**Current Faculty members are:**
- Kathryn Evans (AH) (8/31/2018)

Excerpt from UTDPP1037 –
“The Committee membership consists of 9 voting members and shall include 5 student members, 2 faculty and 2 staff members appointed by the President or his designee.” ...
“Faculty members shall be appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in Title III, Chapter 21, Section I.B.1. of The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures: [http://www.utdallas.edu/Faculty/Handbook/appendices.html](http://www.utdallas.edu/Faculty/Handbook/appendices.html)).”

### Replace Jessica Murphy from A&H on the Committee on Faculty Mentoring as a Member.

Recommended replacement would be ______________________.

**Current Faculty Members are:**
- Walter Voit (ECS) (8/31/2018) Chair
- Lowell Kiel (EPPS) (8/31/2018) Vice Chair
- Nadine Connell (EPPS) (8/31/2019)
- Vladimir Dragovic (NSM) (8/31/2019)
- Todd Fechter (ATEC) (8/31/2019)
- Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki (NSM) (8/31/2018)
- Elena Katok (SOM) (8/31/2018)
- Jackie Nelson (BBS) (8/31/2019)
- Aria Nosratinia (ECS) (8/31/2018)
- Karen Prager (I) (8/31/2019)
- Kathryn Stecke (SOM) (8/31/2018)

Excerpt from UTDPP1037 –
“The Committee shall consist initially of twelve faculty members and two representatives of the Office of the Provost. Faculty members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees in consultation with the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity....”

### Replace Robert Wallace from A&H on the Program Review Committee as Member.

Recommended replacement would be ______________________.

### Replace Robert Wallace from A&H on the Program Review Committee as Vice-Chair.

Recommended replacement would be ______________________.
Current Faculty members are:
Jay Dowling (B) (8/31/2018) Chair
Lynn Winstead (IS) (8/31/2018)
Dohyeong Kim (EPPS) (8/31/2018)
James Szot (JSOM) (8/31/2018)
Mark Lee (NSM) (8/31/2018)

Excerpt from UTDPP1013 –
“The membership of the Program Review Committee is comprised of six faculty members and four deans who are appointed by the President to two-year renewable terms. Members from the faculty are recommended by the Academic Senate after consultation with the Committee on Committees; deans are recommended by the Provost. Faculty should be drawn from the schools in which reviews will be conducted during the year of their service, or from the library if the library is to be reviewed.”

Replace Lee Bulla from NSM on the Institutional Biosafety & Chemical Safety Committee as Member.
Recommended replacement would be ______________________.

Current Faculty members are:
Lloyd Lumata (NSM) (8/31/2018) Chair
Manuel Quevedo-Lopez (ECS) (8/31/2019) Vice Chair
Robert Rennaker (NSM) (8/31/2020)
Sheena Darcy (NSM) (8/31/2018)
Jon Ploski (BBS) (8/31/2018)
Heng Du (NSM) (8/31/2018)

Excerpt from UTDPP1016-
“Members of the Biosafety Committee must be sufficiently qualified through their experience, expertise, and diversity to ensure respect for its advice and counsel. Members must have expertise in recombinant DNA technology and the capacity to assess the safety of recombinant DNA research experiments and any potential risk to public health or the environment. Members must also have knowledge of chemical agents and any potential risk to public health or the environment.”

Replace Josef Nguyen from ATEC on the Library Committee as Chair.
Recommended replacement would be ______________________.

Current Faculty members are:
Pia Jakobsson (AH) (8/31/2018) Vice-Chair
Susan Chizeck (I) (8/31/2019)
Josef Nguyen (ATEC) (8/31/2018)
Robert Ackerman (BBS) (8/31/2018)
Nina Baranchuk (SOM) (8/31/2018)
Jonas Bunte (EPPS) (8/31/2019)
Excerpt from UTDPP1076-
“Eight members, one representing each School, shall be appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in UTDPP1088). Eight members, one representing each School's library acquisition committee, will be nominated by the respective School Dean.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Brewer</td>
<td>A &amp; H</td>
<td>8/31/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Replace Kenneth Brewer from A & H on the Academic Calendar Committee as a Member.

Recommended replacement would be **Richard Scotch**.

Current Faculty members are:
Jennifer Holmes (EPPS) (8/31/2018) Chair
Ravi Prakash (ECS) (8/31/2018)

Excerpt from UTDPP1011-
“Three members are representatives of the faculty, nominated by the Speaker of the Senate.”