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TO: Academic Senate Members

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

RE: Academic Senate Meeting
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---
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AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
September 18, 2013

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions  
   Dr. Daniel

2. Introduction of Randall Rikel, University Controller  
   Dr. Leaf

3. Approval of the Agenda  
   Dr. Leaf

4. Approval of Minutes  
   August 21, 2013 Meeting  
   Dr. Leaf

5. Speaker’s Report  
   Dr. Leaf

6. FAC Report  
   Dr. Leaf

7. Student Government Liaison Report

8. School By Laws  
   Dr. Leaf

9. Faculty Personnel Review Committee  
   Dr. Leaf

10. Committee on Committees recommendations  
    (S06) CEP Vice Chair Selection  
    (S11) Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel  
    (S14) Academic Program Review  
    (U07) Information Resources Security Planning, and Policy Change  
    Dr. Leaf

11. Resolution on the installation of invasive software on University Computers  
    Dr. Leaf

12. Annual Reports of Committees  
    Dr. Leaf
    - Academic Program Review
    - Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
    - Senate Advisory Committee on the University Budget

13. Adjournment  
    Dr. Daniel

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
August 21, 2013

UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
August 21, 2013


Visitors: Andrew Blanchard, Gene Fitch, Serenity King Abby Kratz, John McCaskill, Chris Parr

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
   Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order. As of August 21 there are approximately 1000 international graduate students still waiting to register. The university is expecting a 10% enrollment increase but without those students it will only be 4%. Most of them are currently waiting on TB vaccinations and other such items.

   Jennifer Holmes requested an update on when the finals schedule would be posted. Currently professors are waiting to add the dates to their syllabus, but have not gotten a firm time and date. Andrew Blanchard responded that they are currently working on it and are aware of the situation. The dates and times will be determined by upper University management.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   Speaker Leaf presented three changes to the agenda. The discussion on the resolution on invasive software was tabled until President Daniel will be in attendance. The committee on committees’ recommendations for the Institutional Animal Care and Use committee will be withdrawn pending further review. Gene Fitch’s presentation on Chapter 49 will be moved from item 11 to item 8. Jennifer Holmes moved to accept the amended agenda. Peter Assman seconded. Motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
   Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes. Liz Salter seconded. Motion carried.
4. Speaker’s Report – Murray Leaf

1. New guidelines for bylaws for schools. The committee has nearly concluded. I think we have reached a consensus but the committee has not yet agreed to it explicitly. One more round of emails should do it. I expect to have the draft for the Council meeting in September. The most important change from the current guidelines is that each school will have an executive committee from the faculty or an academic advisory committee that will work with the dean and more processes will be spelled out in such a way as to assure administrative transparency and appropriate consultation.

2. Encryption policy continues to be a problem. President Daniel has authorized our ISO, Leah Teusch, to appoint her own consulting committee, which she has done. This appears to indicate intent not to work with the Senate Information Security Advisory Committee. Nevertheless, our committee is continuing to try to work with her and in any case to develop its own policy recommendations. This includes item 13 on the agenda. UT System policy is that when policies are formed, before they get system approval they should have been reviewed by all stakeholders. Regents Rules, in addition, are clear that when the stakeholders are “faculty,” this means faculty organized through the governance system. The HOP committee has been established to assure that this happens before policies are sent forward for approval. Our HOP committee has acted accordingly and will doubtless continue to do so.

3. Everything else that has been under discussion is reflected in the agenda.

5. FAC Report

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Advisory Council met on Friday, August 9. The main purpose was to set the agenda for the full FAC meeting at the end of September, but to do so we also met with VC Reyes and Dan Sharphorn, Director of the Office of General Council.

The main concern was the proposed policy on conflict of commitment and interest, as described in UTSP 180. As originally drafted, in accordance with demands of the Regents, this would have required all faculty and certain staff to describe all their outside activities, compensated and uncompensated, regardless of whether they occurred during their periods of employment during the academic year and on work days. They would be required to get approval from their supervisors before such activities could be undertaken and all reported activities were to be disclosed on a public, searchable, database. Financial interests of others in their households would also have to be disclosed. Failure to disclose could result in termination of employment.

In response, last Winter the FAC passed several resolutions. Essentially, they reasserted long standing and long recognized rights that faculty members have as human beings, citizens, and scholars. The conclusion was that it should be up the concerned faculty and staff themselves to make a prima facia judgment of whether there was the reasonable appearance of a conflict, and if so they should disclose it. Religious, political, and other non-work related associations were their own concern. Activities we normally engage in as scholars in our respective discipline, and report in our annual reports, did not need to be reported again and we did not need to get permission to engage in them.
Evidently, the presidents and others all reacted along the same lines. At the Spring meeting of the FAC, Chancellor Cigarroa promised to establish a committee to consider revising the policy further. He also promised that once the revision was completed, the draft would come back to the FAC for further comment. The purpose of the meeting with Dr. Reyes and Mr. Sharphorn was to describe the revisions and hand the draft policy back to the FAC accordingly. It will be on the agenda for the September FAC meeting. But I can convey the most important point now. The draft is intended to conform to the FAC resolutions. In my opinion it does so. Normal scholarly activity does not need to be disclosed; it can be considered preapproved. The only information that will be on the database is prima facia conflicts, along with the plans for managing them. We are still discussing who will be able to access, but along with the draft of the new SP 180 Dr. Reyes circulated a report from the National Academy of Public Administration on a similar proposal to disclose financial interests of members of Congress. Even though such information is already otherwise available, they unequivocally recommended against putting it on a public, searchable, database—for all kinds of reasons both of personal security and national security.

The encryption policy has also been modified. The only information that the university now will consider itself obligation to protect by encryption is that which is required by law, either HIPAA, FERPA, or specific contractual requirements.

The possible policy on departments is moving slowly, but were assured that nothing will be decided finally without faculty involvement.

6. Approval of April 17th Caucus Minutes
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes of the Caucus with minor edits. Kurt Beron seconded.

7. Presentations by Serenity King
   A. SACS Fifth-Year Report

   In 2007 the University was reaffirmed. In March 2014 the University is required to submit a fifth year interim report to SACS. SACS is now requiring the university to include certificate program graduates as part of the institutional summary section. Previously the university had been required to report the list of certificate programs but not the number of graduates from each certificate program. SACS is also requiring to provide reports professional accreditation on Self Studies to ensure the institution consistently presents itself to all accrediting bodies. The university must demonstrate Provide an additional 10 page Quality Enhancement Plan Impact Report, which evaluates the extent to which the institution achieved the goals and objectives of GEMS: Gateways to Excellence in Math and Science.

   The largest part of the fifth-year interim report is the Part III, the ‘mini compliance report’. It consists of how we respond to 20 of the principles. In the cohorts that submit reports each year, as few as 12% of institutions are passing their 5th year review. Our goal is to not make the same mistakes that others are making. Serenity distributed a list of what is needed for the reports to all of the senators. (Appendix A). The University must respond at the program level, not institution. SACS needs a faculty roster of all members.
of faculty. This is to prove that the university is not run on adjunct professors. Full time faculty determined by our workload policy.

When the assessment team request assessment reports, those reports need to include a narrative on how the results will be used to improve the program. The reports need to detail what has changed since the review to meet the student learning outcomes. From the purposes of SACS each major at the university is considered a program, this includes general education.

B. Higher Education Legislative Summary

Of the 6000 bills submitted to the legislature, 2000 of them were tracked by UT System. Of those 2000 the UTD group followed 400 bills. Serenity was tasked with following 100 of those bills. She distributed a document detailing some of the bills she followed. (Appendix B).

The first bill highlighted limited the powers of the coordinating board. They are now required to do negotiated rulemaking. In addition, institutions cannot decline transfer credit SOLEY on the accreditation status of the sending institution. There is now a time limit on how long program approvals and review can take. The coordinating board now has only 5 days to respond to request additional information to supplement a program proposal. If no response in one year, the program is auto approved. The coordinating board can no longer consolidate or eliminate degree programs. They are allowed to make recommendation, but they are to go to the board of regents only.

SB40 requires institutions to require an additional course for any program leading to a teaching certificate on how to deal with mental and emotional disorders. SB11459 requires military personnel be allowed reinstatement into their graduate programs. SB1531 requires universities to tell students how much it will cost them to stay in school greater than 4 years, and how much income will be lost from doing so. There were significant changes made to do HB5 it due to the number of items added to it. The bill contained changes to high school curriculums. The changes to the curriculum will change how the university will admit students for auto admissions.

David Cordell asked if it was possible for a student who gets a 1500 out of 2400 on SAT to apply. Asst. Provost King responded that they could apply. A student cannot be stopped from applying with that score. HB1296 requires the TEA to make public accountability available. It requires the coordinating board to do a work force study and then send to institutions to tailor new programs to those projections.

Under the heading of governance issues there were several bills. SB146 was regarding criminal background check on students who wish to live on campus. SB1907 allows handguns to be transported on campus in cars, but NOT on person. This was the only hand gun bill that was passed by the legislature. SB15 was on Regents responsibilities. It was passed by the house and senate but was vetoed by the Governor. Asst. Provost King included a link in her document to a speech by Kel Seliger’s to the coordinating board on July 13 2013. Speaker Leaf encouraged faculty to express their opinion on SB15 to their state senators.
8. Updates to Chapter 49- Student Code of Conduct

The code was not meeting the university’s needs, and is now being brought up to date. Gene Fitch presented revisions to specifically 49.07 A, 49.07B and 49.16 C. These areas state the responsibilities of the Dean of Students office in responding to faculty members or referral sources when an academic or disciplinary case is sent to them. They wish to roll them into one generic statement so that should there be future changes they only have to update one area instead of three.

Confidentiality of Disciplinary Process. In accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), 20 USC 1232g, a student’s disciplinary files are considered “educational records.” These records are confidential and may only be accessed by the student and as otherwise provided by law. In cases involving academic dishonesty, the dean will promptly notify the appropriate faculty member regarding the outcome of any disciplinary process so that the outcome may be properly recorded. The dean will also notify other appropriate university officials, including the student’s advisor or associate dean, upon request by the university official and a showing of a legitimate educational interest.

Dean Fitch’s office will alert the reporter of the infraction if the student was found guilty of the infraction, but has removed the requirement that the associate deans of the schools be advised as well. It will now be the exception instead of the norm. It was thought that it might be a FERPA violation by releasing it all the time. The Academic example given by Dean Fitch was that a faculty member is out of the country for the summer. The faculty member reported an R for a student, and it will be up to the associate dean to fix. That is an example of when the information would be shared with an Associate Dean when they were not directly involved.

Richard Scotch expressed the faculty’s concern that when a faculty member is a student’s advisor, and is never notified when a graduate student has “disappeared” due to suspension or expulsion. Dean Fitch assured him that in that type of case the advisor would be notified. Speaker Leaf recommended that a policy or memorandum be written so the need to know is clear. Dean Fitch agreed that once the amendments were approved by Austin one would be developed.

An example of information that would not be shared was that a student had not appeared in class for two weeks. The professor tried to contact them but had no success. It was reported and a welfare check was made. The check found that the student had been raped. The office will not share the “back story” but will let the faculty member know that they are dealing with it. The office will keep communication with the faculty member to monitor the student’s welfare in class.

Another example is that a student is disruptive or has poor hygiene. It isn’t a threat but is a concern. The student is brought in to the office and is upset that a faculty member has reported them. The student makes the comment “wait until I see them again.” In this case the office will call the faculty member and let them be aware that the student made that statement before they left the office. The student will be removed from the class. If it is something basic, they won’t
give the faculty member the “back story” but if it would directly impact the professor or the students in their class, the office will alert them immediately.

Tim Redman moved to approve the text submitted with the amendment of the ‘Confidentiality of Disciplinary Process’ moved per discussions with Abby Kratz to section 49.04. Richard Scotch seconded. Motion carried.

9. **Student Government Liaison Report**
   No representatives present. No report.

10. **Framework for Excellence in Doctoral Education**
    UT System posted this and wished faculty response. Jennifer Holmes was concerned about the wording of the document (Appendix C), specifically point K onwards. She felt the framework more detailed than necessary for some programs. Matthew Brown was also concerned that the university would be required to use MyEDU software. Speaker Leaf responded that these were guidelines, not requirements. Richard Scotch moved to approve the framework in principle. Tim Redman seconded. 15 votes in favor, 2 Nay votes. Motion carried.

11. **UTDPP 1052-Policy on Procedures for Completing a Graduate Degree**
    Dr. Leaf explained that the wording changes on the document were made to conform to the Framework for Excellence. Jennifer Holmes moved to approve the changes. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

12. **Committee on Committees recommendations.**
    Richard Scotch moved to accept the recommendations from the Committees on Committees, and allow Council to fill any outstand appointments. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

13. **Resolution on the passing of Cy Cantrell**
    Matthew Brown moved to approve the memorial statement (Appendix D) on Cy Cantrell as amended. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

14. **Annual Reports from Committees**
    Richard Scotch moved to accept the Library Committee, the Committee on Student Scholarships and the Distance Learning Committees’ Annual Reports. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion passed.

    There being no further business, Provost Wildenthal adjourned the meeting.

**APPROVED:** ___________________________  **DATE:** _____________
Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate
SACS Fifth-Year Interim Report Overview
Due Date: March 25, 2014

Five Components:
Part 1: Signatures Attesting to Integrity

**Part 2: Institutional Summary Form Prepared for Commission Reviews**

**Part 3: Fifth-Year Compliance Certification**

Part 4: Fifth-Year Follow Up Report (not applicable to UT Dallas)

**Part 5: Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)**

Part 2 Institutional Summary:
1. History and Characteristics: (mission, service area, composition of student population, admission policies, identify peer institutions)
2. List of Degrees: (majors and certificates. Must include the number of graduates in the calendar year previous to submitting this report (January to December) for majors and certificates
   **Action:** provide number of spring 2013 certificate graduates
3. Off-Site and Distance or Correspondence Education
   a. Off-site Locations: (for each site, list majors offered and for each major offered, list percentage offered at that site)
   b. Distance/Correspondence Education: (list of credit-bearing program in which 50% or more are delivered through distance education modes. For each, indicate whether the program is delivered through synchronous or asynchronous technology or both)
4. Accreditation: (list federally recognized agencies that currently accredit the institution, provide the date of the most recent review and indicate if negative action was taken, provide copies of statements used to describe itself for each accrediting bodies, indicate any agency that has terminated accreditation and the date and reasons for termination, and indicate the date and reason for an institution voluntarily withdrawing accreditation with any agency.
   **Action:** provide copies of latest self-studies
5. Relationship to the U.S. Department of Education (list any limitations, suspensions, or terminations by DOE)

---

Part 5: QEP Impact Report:
Limited to 10 pages to address the following:
1. a succinct list of the initial goals and intended outcomes of the QEP
2. a discussion of changes made to the QEP and the reasons for making those changes
3. a description of the QEP’s impact on student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning, as appropriate to the design of the QEP. Include the achievement of identified goals and outcomes, and any unanticipated outcomes of the QEP.
4. a reflection on what the institution has learned as a result of the QEP experience
Part 3 Fifth-Year Compliance Certification: Demonstrate compliance with the following Principles of Accreditation: (88% of institutions ‘failing’ first attempt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Keys to Compliance</th>
<th>Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Number of Full-time Faculty (49% of institutions received citation)</td>
<td>Institution’s full-time faculty data must be disaggregated to the program/discipline level. Rationale for how institution determines a particular number of full-time faculty is adequate per program. Evidence of how faculty load policy is applied.</td>
<td>Provide faculty roster indicating full-time/part-time status per program, including certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.8</td>
<td>Qualified Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.1</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness—Student Learning Outcomes (57% of institutions received citation)</td>
<td>Assessment process described; evidence it is followed; evidence student learning outcomes assessed using mature data; document how data is used to make program improvements; provide rationale for sampling; include data on off-site/distance programs and consider comparability</td>
<td>Program assessment: Fall 12/Spring 13 reports due Oct 15; Fall 13/Spring 14 plans due Oct 15 Core course assessment via AT6: Spring 13 reports due Sept 30; Fall 13 plans due Sept 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3</td>
<td>Admission Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.11</td>
<td>Qualified Academic Coordinators (36% of institutions receive citation)</td>
<td>Rationale needed for why individuals are qualified to coordinate and oversee development and review of curriculum; include certificate and distance learning programs</td>
<td>Provide accurate and current program head list, including certificate programs. Transcripts/CVs may be needed if not already on file. Dean to provide rationale if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11.3</td>
<td>Physical Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13.1A</td>
<td>Accrediting Decisions Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13.1B</td>
<td>Complaint Procedures Against Commission or Institution</td>
<td>Maintain a record of complaints that can be made available to SACS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13.1C</td>
<td>Reaffirmation—Distance Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Achievement</strong></td>
<td>Include general and program specific graduate rates, job placement rates, course completion rate, licensure exam pass rate. Explain how data is used to evaluate appropriate student achievement.</td>
<td>OSPA can provide some data, but programs supply student/alum success stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Program Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Publications of Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Program Length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Complaints</strong></td>
<td>Provide evidence of implementation of policies; provide examples that demonstrate resolution; address distance education students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Recruitment Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7/3.10.2</td>
<td>Title IV/Financial Aid Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.1</td>
<td>Distance Learning: Student Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.2</td>
<td>Distance Learning: Student Privacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.3</td>
<td>Distance Learning: Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Credit Hour Policy</strong></td>
<td>Institution must have an official credit hour policy whose definition complies with federal definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contacts:
Serenity King, serenity.king@utdallas.edu, x6749
Andy Blanchard, ablanch@utdallas.edu, x6716

Websites:
UT Dallas SACS: [http://sacs.utdallas.edu/](http://sacs.utdallas.edu/) (fifth-year review section forthcoming)
UT Dallas Assessment: [http://provost.utdallas.edu/assessment](http://provost.utdallas.edu/assessment)
SACS Commission on Colleges: [http://www.sacscoc.org/FifthYear.asp](http://www.sacscoc.org/FifthYear.asp)
83rd Legislative Session


Process: Nearly 5,900 bills filed. UT System tracked 2,302 of them, 20% of which passed. UT Dallas’ analysis team, 7-8 individuals led by Vice President for Public Affairs Amanda Rockow, analyzed approximately 350 bills specific to academic institutions. Of the 107 assigned to me, 34 passed but 1 was vetoed. Overall, the Governor vetoed 26 bills.

Budget: See pages 2-5. The overall biennial funding increase to UT Dallas was 14% or $21M. Various research appropriations, including the Texas Competitive Knowledge Fund (previously Research University Development Fund) and the Research Development Fund, increased. The Legislature earmarked $70M for the Texas Research Incentive Program (TRIP), which rewards private donations at the emerging research universities. UT Dallas should receive nearly $16M of these funds. The Legislature also awarded $15M in special item funding for a joint request by UT Dallas and UT Southwestern for the Texas Institute for Brain Injury and Repair. Tuition Revenue Bonds: The Legislature included $175M in the budget package for principal and interest payments for $2.7B in construction projects at state universities; however, the legislation to authorize these projects did not pass the regular session and the Governor did not add TRBs to the three subsequent special sessions.

Academic
SB 215, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Sunset Bill, redefines THECB’s powers and duties (see pages 29-31). Highlight five specific areas:
(1) Negotiated Rulemaking: requires THECB to engage in negotiated rulemaking with the university systems and institutions to identify unnecessary requests for information and ways to eliminate or streamline them. Also requires negotiated rulemaking with affected institutions when adopting a policy, procedure, or rule relating to admissions policies, allocation or distribution of funds, certain data requests, its new compliance monitoring function, and standards to guide the board’s review of new construction or the repair/rehabilitation of existing facilities. Also must engage stakeholders in development of long-range master plan, adopting policies for advisory committees, and policies for public comment at board meetings.
(2) Admissions: Board of Regents must certify that its institutions do not prohibit transfer credit based solely on the accreditation status of the sending institution
(3) Program Approvals and Reviews: A new degree proposal is considered approved if the THECB staff have not denied or approved the request within one year of receiving the proposal. THECB staff have five days from receiving a proposal to determine if an institution has submitted a completed request. If the THECB staff require additional information, it does not lengthen the one-year review period. Institutions must continue to demonstrate a new program meets student and job market demand and does not unnecessarily duplicate an existing program. The THECB may review the number of degrees awarded every four years or more frequently. The THECB must review each degree and certificate program at least every 10 years.
Preliminary planning is no longer required but institutions must notify the THECB. The undergraduate graduation and persistence rates are no longer included among criteria for approval of doctoral programs. (New THECB rules: If the THECB staff determine within 5 days that an institution needs to provide additional information, the institution must do so within 10 working days or it will be returned to the institution. Institutions must notify all public institutions within a 50-mile radius that we intend to offer a new program 30 days prior to submitting the request to the Coordinating Board).

(4) Low Producing Programs: The THECB may no longer order the consolidation or elimination of any degree or certificate program but may recommend such action to the institution’s governing board. If the institution’s governing board does not accept the THECB’s recommendations to consolidate or eliminate, the university system must identify the programs recommended for consolidation or elimination on the next legislative appropriations request. (New THECB rule: the 10-year period before reinstatement of a closed or consolidated program has been deleted. The temporary exemption and appeals process has been deleted. No System rules yet).

(5) Off-campus courses for credit or distance learning courses: Institutions may offer only with specific prior approval of the board. An institution must certify to the Board that a course offered for credit outside the state meets Board criteria.

Other: construction approval, Texas B-On-Time, TEXAS Grant, Texas Competitive Knowledge Fund

SB 460: Requires instruction in the detection of students with mental or emotional disorders as part of the training for any education certificate that required a person to possess a bachelor’s degree. Once the panel of experts develops the course, institutions must add this to its curriculum.

SB 1159: Requires graduate and professional programs to grant re-admission or re-enrollment to any veteran who was initially offered admission but could not enroll or had to withdraw due to deployment. The program must grant credit for previous coursework and accept standardized test scores regardless of the time since the person was initially offered admission.

SB 1531: Requires institutions beginning with fall 2014 to provide first-time undergraduates a comparison of the average costs paid to graduate in four, five, and six years. Institutions must also provide students an estimate of average lost earnings if graduating in five or six years instead of four. The statement must include actions the student can take to graduate in a timely manner, including contact information for available support services the institution offers.

HB 5: This 111-page bill covers a multitude of public school curriculum requirements and assessment measures. Effective 2013-2014, eliminates end-of-course exams except for Algebra I, Biology, US History, and combined reading/writing tests for English I and II. Prohibits end-of-course assessments from determining class-rank to be used for purposes such as entitlement to automatic college admission or as a sole criterion in the determination of whether to admit a student to a general academic teaching institution. Effective 2014-2015, eliminates the Minimum, Recommended, and Distinguished Achievement high school program and creates the High School Foundation program (see page 34 for curriculum). In the ninth grade students must indicate which endorsement--STEM, business and industry, public service, arts and humanities,
and multidisciplinary studies—he or she intends to earn. Automatic Admissions: each general academic institution must grant admission to an applicant if the applicant graduated in the top 10 percent of his or her graduating class in one of the two school years preceding the academic year and if the student completed the curriculum requirements for distinguished level of achievement under the foundation program. A student who does not qualify for automatic admission may apply to any general academic teaching institution if the student successfully completed the curriculum requirements under the foundation program and the ACT’s College Readiness Benchmarks on the ACT or earned a score of at least 1500 out of 2400 on the SAT. (THECB is negotiating rules with institutions on this now).

**HB 1296:** Requires TEA to compare each institution of higher education among one another regarding relative costs of tuition, retention rates, graduation rates, average student debt, loan repayment, and employment of students. Institutions must include a link to this information not more than three links below the main webpage. Also requires THECB to identify types and levels of education, training, and skills needed to meet the next five-years workforce needs. Institutions should use this information when planning for new degree program or course offerings.

**Governance and Administrative Issues:**

**SB 146:** Allows institutions to access the non-public criminal history database maintained by DPS to screen applicants for student campus housing. Only the Chief of Police or housing office can access the records, and the records must be destroyed. If the background check results in adverse action, the student must be notified.

**SB 1907:** Institutions may not enforce policies that prohibit or place restrictions on the lawful storage, or transportation in private motor vehicles, of firearms or ammunition by Concealed Handgun License holders on the streets, driveways, parking lots, parking garages, or other parking areas located on the institution’s campus.

Legislation authorizing individuals with concealed handguns licenses to carry a handgun on campus did not pass.

SB 15, Regents’ Responsibilities, passed both houses but was vetoed by the Governor. "I am very disappointed by Governor Perry's decision to veto SB 15, a bill that not only puts into statute best practices, but also adds much needed transparency to higher education governance. The continued lack of transparency and persistent conflicts, this legislation clearly was necessary, due in no small part to some of Governor Perry's appointees. The decision to veto SB 15 ensures that the conflicts, controversies, and lack of transparency will continue. It harms the reputation of Texas' world class public universities and hinders their ability to attract the best students, faculty, and administrators to this great state." –Senator Seliger’s press release

**July Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Meeting:**

Senator Kel Seliger, Chairman of the Senate Higher Education Committee, addresses Board

http://youtu.be/6BQ1Q5sBBhg?t=11m38s

0:11:38 through 0:44:03
The University of Texas at Dallas  
Framework for Excellence in Doctoral Education

1. Reviews of Ph.D. Programs: UT Dallas has scheduled external reviews of Ph.D. programs consistent with the schedules and criteria promulgated by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The thirty (current count) UT Dallas doctoral degree programs each have specific semesters set for their reviews, continuing on through FY 2019. The reviews scheduled for FY 13 have been completed and the reports to UT System and the THECB are being prepared. The final reports resulting from each Program Review will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs of The University of Texas System concurrently with their submission to the Coordinating Board.

2. The basic criteria to be addressed in all reviews of Ph.D. programs are described in the following outline.

a) The strength of program faculty should be evaluated by attributes including:
   - Publications
   - Citations
   - Professional honors
   - External funding
   - Dissertation supervision

b) The organization of the program should be evaluated by review of the annual calendar of program activities and the assignments of responsibilities for these various activities to program administration, faculty, and staff. Activities include such elements as:
   - Recruitment of students
   - Degree plans for students
   - Advising for course selection
   - Course availability for satisfactory progress
   - Contracts for mutual responsibility of students and program
   - Milestone examinations or alternative evaluations
   - Financial rewards for milestone completions
   - Annual audits of progress
   - Career advising

c) The metrics by which the success of the program is to be evaluated include data on:
   - Quality of entering students
   - Retention/Attrition rates of entering students
   - Times to graduation
   - Successful employment of graduates
   - Active alumni organization for graduates
Active Advisory Council for students and graduates

3. The consequences of an external review that documents unsatisfactory performance of a Ph.D. program would entail first intensive internal discussions by the provost, dean, and department leader of the deficiencies identified in the review, followed by comprehensive discussions that involve the program faculty along with program and school administration, with these discussions directed toward identifying successful remediation actions.

Within two years of an unsatisfactory review, a second, more intensive external program review will be conducted to assess progress made in remediating the deficiencies noted in the initial review. If this second program review again finds the program performing unsatisfactorily, new consultations between the university’s central administration, the dean, program leader, program faculty, and faculty governance will consider the options of continuing remediation efforts, or exploring mergers with related programs within UT Dallas or with another university, or termination of the degree program.

4. Following are narrative comments on the above outline.

a) Successful Ph.D. programs must be staffed with adequate numbers of faculty who manifest the scholarly excellence that qualifies them to advise and mentor Ph.D. candidates.

b) Successful Ph.D. programs must attract student applicants who demonstrate the academic capacities appropriate for successful graduation from the program and for competitive success on the national job markets after graduation.

c) Successful Ph.D. programs must have faculty and administration that provide the necessary attention and energy necessary for maintenance of a sound and constructive curricular structure and an advising program that ensures recruitment of competitive new students and timely progress of these students to graduation.

d) Successful Ph.D. programs will demonstrate good retention rates and timely progress of students to graduation. The time elapsed between the initiation of and graduation from Ph.D. studies is a matter of great importance to the individuals concerned, to the institutions, and to the state. A general target for full-time Ph.D. students is graduation within five years from admission into a program as a Ph.D. student.

e) Students should be admitted as aspirant Ph.D. students only after rigorous scrutiny of their academic records designed to assess carefully their qualifications for successful pursuit of the doctorate. Upon admission, students
should receive comprehensive, itemized, statements of expectations for the entire educational sequence leading to graduation, along with similarly detailed responsibilities of the program administration, presented upon entry, co-signed and updated annually. UT Dallas played an important role in the cooperative formulation of the Milestones Agreement that will guide and monitor the progress of future doctoral students. This process is being implemented for newly appointed doctoral students. The Milestones Agreements will provide the mechanism for monitoring the effectiveness of the improvements we are initiating in the advisement of Ph.D. students.

f) Each of the UT Dallas Ph.D. programs has developed its own specific Milestones Agreement. The Agreements all require that progress be assessed and reported annually following entry into a program and continuing until graduation or termination from the program. They specify the roles and responsibilities of specifically assigned staff and faculty in these assessments and reports on each student. All milestones on a successful progress through graduation are spelled out – core and elective courses, entry and pre-dissertation exams or other evaluations, formation of a committee and chair, and progress toward completing the dissertation. And, consequences for failure to meet expectations in a timely fashion are also detailed.

g) Before and during the first semester of enrollment as Ph.D. candidates, students will participate in an orientation program that provides them with detailed overviews of faculty research interests and advisement regarding satisfying curricular requirements and preparation for taking the required comprehensive examinations. They will be required to participate in workshops that address writing, communication, and instructional skills. In following semesters students will attend regular seminars as further preparation for determining a dissertation topic. Students will be guided towards choice of a dissertation topic during their third year of study, with the aim of commencing work on the dissertation as soon as the second comprehensive evaluation has been completed.

h) Students enrolled as aspirant Ph.D. students should be advanced to formal Ph.D. status only after satisfying either the requirements for a masters degree in a field relevant to the specific Ph.D. program or of 30 semester credit hours of appropriate graduate work in the field of study AND only after the students have passed a first comprehensive evaluation, designed to validate their readiness to commence Ph.D.-level studies.

i) The scheduling of these "qualifying" evaluations should allow for timely progress toward initiation of Ph.D. studies.

j) Students progressing from aspirant into formal Ph.D. status should be rewarded, if employed by the university, by an appreciable increment in compensation.
k) By no later than approximately two calendar years after being advanced to formal Ph.D. degree-seeking status, Ph.D. students should pass a second comprehensive evaluation designed to validate their mastery of the core graduate-level academic knowledge appropriate to their field of study and their readiness to commence independent work on a dissertation.

l) Upon passing the second comprehensive evaluation, if not earlier, students will select/be assigned a dissertation supervisor and committee and commence working on the dissertation.

m) Upon being authorized to form a dissertation committee and satisfactorily commencing work on the dissertation, students will be rewarded, if employed by the university, with a significant increment in compensation.

n) Members of external advisory boards will make regular presentations to student groups informing them of employment and other trends in the profession.

o) Successful programs should encourage formation of social networks of alumni and current students to create a dynamic and supportive alumni organization.

p) Students should receive regular distributions of national and regional employment data and opinion articles on state of the profession.

q) Successful Ph.D. programs should demonstrate that graduates move from their student status at UT Dallas to productive and appropriate employment situations after graduation. Appropriate employment of our Ph.D. graduates is, again, of crucial importance to the individuals, to the institution, and to the state. We will implement the related technology imbedded in the MyEDU software as soon as it is deployed. In the intervening time, and continuing, the Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis and the Office of the Provost will collect, codify and post national data on salaries and employment rates, and the UT Dallas Career will be directed to provide individual counseling and advice to these students to supplement the input they receive from their supporting faculty members.
In Memorium: Cyrus Duncan Cantrell III, Professor of Electrical Engineering and Physics

On June 20, 2013, Professor Cyrus Cantrell died after a brief and unexpected illness. By this resolution, the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas wishes to commemorate his exceptional record of service.

Professor Cantrell came to UTD in 1980. He had been on the Senate almost continuously since 1982. He served as Speaker of the Faculty four consecutive terms, from 1985-86 to 1988-89.

This was also the time of the birth of the Eric Jonsson School, in which Professor Cantrell had played a key creative role. Subsequently, he served for many years as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the School while also serving on numerous Senate bodies. His last administrative position in the School was as a Senior Associate Dean.

Professor Cantrell had served on the Academic Council for most years since 1989.

From 2003 he served for three years as the first chair of the Advisory Committee on Research. He also served as a committee member.

In 2003 he chaired an ad hoc committee of the Senate on academic integrity. The committee recommended that the Senate establish a standing Committee on Academic Integrity. We did so beginning in 2005. Professor Cantrell was its first Chair, initially for three years and then returning for two more. The aim was to affirm an important policy. Integrity could not simply be something we expected; it also had to be actively taught and incorporated into the culture of the University.

Professor Cantrell served as Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy from 2006 until he was not able to continue. This is a crucial committee with an especially heavy workload. It was always difficult to find faculty members who could chair it effectively and build continuity. Through a series of initiatives in cooperation with the administration, the committee's activities have now been more firmly institutionalized in a way that should last well into the future.

In 2008, after several previous years of complaints in the Senate about the
University’s provisions for graduate admissions, the Senate established an *ad hoc* committee to work with the then new Vice President for Enrollment Management, Curt Eley, to rebuild both the University admissions website and the graduate enrollment process behind it. Professor Cantrell served as the chair and principal liaison. The work was completed successfully in 2011.

We also note that Professor Cantrell established the Sarah Montgomery Marple-Cantrell Memorial Scholarship for Women in Engineering in honor of his younger daughter, who passed away in 2003.

The Senate appreciates Professor Cantrell’s judgment, integrity, devotion, and leadership. We mourn his passing.
PREFACE

This document contains guidelines to assist individual Schools within UTD to draft or modify their respective bylaws. The purpose of such bylaws is to assure clear, transparent, and appropriate faculty and administrative processes for carrying out the major recurrent activities in each of the several schools of the university.

This is a template, not a rigid prescription. Uniformity is desirable because it can assure that the same general principles are being applied in the same way, but it should not come at the cost of recognizing real differences in the situations to which our several schools must respond.

Bylaws should be clear, concise, and constructive. They should be process-oriented rather than legalistic, representing a joint effort on the part of administration and faculty to arrive at mutually satisfactory ways to discuss and resolve common problems.

Academic tradition and Regents' rules recognize a number of areas of policy that are primarily the responsibility of faculty. Rule 40101, section 3, articulates them this way:

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

3.1 General academic policies and welfare.
3.2 Student life and activities.
3.3 Requirements of admission and graduation.
3.4 Honors and scholastic performance generally.
3.5 Approval of candidates for degrees.
3.6 Faculty rules of procedure. (Series: 40101)

The Board of Regents itself is responsible for other areas where the faculty has little voice, such as financial and fiscal security for the university as a whole, provision of physical facilities, and compliance with general law. The administration is in between, being delegated powers by the Regents but also responsible for carrying out academic policies established by the faculty. At the campus level, the division of responsibility between administration and faculty is represented by the rules and policies establishing the distinction between the faculty governance organization and the administration. Bylaws should establish how this division is implemented in schools and departments.

At the University of Texas at Dallas, the primary administrative unit is the school. The chief academic officer in a school is the dean. Deans are appointed by the President and report to the Provost; all the deans together make up the Council of Deans.

In Texas generally, by Coordinating Board convention, the degree-granting unit of the university is the program. Faculty must therefore be assigned to programs to carry out their teaching obligations. Every program must be assigned to at least one school for administrative purposes. Most programs are assigned to only one school. However, programs may utilize courses offered by other programs and other schools. UT Dallas has always sought to encourage interdisciplinary cooperation in program design, content, and implementation.

All of the faculty members assigned to the programs of a school make up the faculty of the school. The faculty of the school is responsible for academic policy in the school as a whole, and for exercising oversight over the individual programs. University policy requires schools to establish faculty committees for some of these purposes. Schools may develop additional committees or bodies on their own as long as they do not conflict with established university policy. The school bylaws are the primary document for describing what bodies will be responsible for such oversight and how it is to be carried out.

If a school has departments, the school bylaws should say what these departments are, and what their powers and responsibilities are compared to the powers and responsibilities of the faculty of the school as whole.

School bylaws must be drafted by a committee of faculty of the school, elected by the faculty of the school by secret ballot. Before adoption they must be available for consideration by all the faculty of the school. To be adopted, they must be approved by at least a majority of the faculty of the school in an open meeting with full prior written notice and debate.
School bylaws may allow for departmental bylaws. Departmental bylaws should be consistent with school bylaws, which in turn should be consistent with UT rules and policies. If there are departmental bylaws, the departmental bylaws and the school bylaws together should be clear about which decisions are to be made at each level. At UT Dallas, meetings are conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order. Quorum requirements must be specified.

According to the Handbook of Operating Procedures, after the bylaws are approved by the school, they are to be approved by the Senate, Provost and the President. In reporting bylaw amendments to the Senate for approval, schools should describe the vote they received in the school.

Wherever these guidelines use the word “chair” for the head of a department or program, they should be understood as meaning “chair or head.”

Where provisions in these guideline do not apply to the School of Interdisciplinary studies because of its small number of faculty, both non-tenure system and tenure-system, the school should make appropriate adjustments.

The general elements that school bylaws should contain or should address are:

**PREAMBLE**

School bylaws should begin with a Preamble. The Preamble should name the school, the programs, the centers, and any other such features of the school organization that will be described in the bylaws. If there is an overall strategy that the school has agreed on in arriving at its policies and providing oversight to its operations, this could be usefully mentioned or described. For example, will the school rely heavily on meetings of the entire faculty, or will it delegate major functions to groupings of programs? If the latter, the groupings should be named here and included in the body of the description. For schools with departments, the departments should be named and the programs for which each is responsible. The preamble should also indicate whether there are features or aims in the school mission statement that should be referred to in its internal procedures.

The Preamble should also state that all faculty meetings will be conducted according to Robert’s Rules of Order.

**FACULTY**

**FACULTY**

UT Dallas policy distinguishes Voting Faculty from the General Faculty. The voting faculty consists only of tenured or tenure-track faculty. General faculty also includes non-tenure-track faculty, usually titled Senior Lecturer or Clinical Professor. The voting faculty of the university are described in The Handbook of Operating Procedures, Chapter 21, Section I B as follows:
Voting members of the General Faculty shall consist of the following:

1. 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.
2. Faculty appointed to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Instructor and who hold appointments of half-time or more.

The title “instructor” at UT Dallas has been used only for faculty newly hired to serve as Assistant Professors, but who failed to have their dissertations completed as promised. As such, the title is now substantially obsolete. Non-tenure-track faculty are not titled “instructor.”

The members of the voting faculty in the school may accord voting rights to members of the general faculty in the school on matters other than personnel actions for tenure-track faculty.

Since in principle all faculty meetings except those involving personnel decisions are open meetings, non-voting members of the general faculty must be able to attend meetings. Bylaws may say whether they have privilege of the floor. In the absence of a specification it should be assumed that they do have the privilege, since they would have it in a meeting of the Academic Senate.

The method of assigning faculty to programs should be described. This need not be overly formal. Self-selection and consensus are possible, as is assignment by the Dean. Catalogs list faculty associated with programs; this should describe how those associations are created. There is no numerical limit on the number of programs a faculty member can be assigned to for academic purposes, although for administrative purposes a school may assign one program or department as an administrative “home.”

If there are groupings of programs that faculty are assigned to apart from their associations with programs, this should be described.

If faculty are assigned to or associated with centers or institutes that are funded as part of the school activities, the method of making this assignment should be described.

A method for resolving disputes regarding the assignment of faculty to programs, program groupings, or centers, should be described.

**MEETINGS AND VOTING OF THE SCHOOL FACULTY.**

Bylaws should provide for two kinds of meetings: regular meetings and caucus meetings.
Regular meetings:

The bylaws should require at least two regular meetings per year on a fixed schedule. One meeting should be early in the fall term, the second near the end of the spring term.

If only two regular meetings are scheduled, provision must be made for calling additional meetings if faculty request them.

Regular meetings should be chaired by the Dean or the Dean’s Designee.

The quorum must be specified. In the absence of a different specification, a quorum is a majority of the voting faculty who are in residence that term.

Bylaws should specify the actions for which a vote of a quorum of the full faculty is required.

Bylaws should specify how minutes will be kept and how they will be made available.

Bylaws should specify minimum notice for a meeting and for agenda items. They may also specify a requirement for accepting agenda items proposed during the meeting that were not on published agenda, such as by majority vote or two-thirds.

It should also be easy for faculty to call a regularly scheduled meeting, such as one of the annual meetings, if the dean fails to do so. The faculty might, for example, empower the chair of one of the faculty committees to call such a meeting.

Major decisions should be confined to meetings held in a period that corresponds to the nine-month terms for which most faculty are appointed.

Caucus Meetings.

Bylaws should provide for caucus meetings of the faculty without the dean being present. Rules for the caucus may also exclude associate deans. Caucus meetings cannot make policies for the school that require assent of the dean.

Caucus meetings can formulate positions to be considered with the dean at regular meetings. There should be a simple procedure for a small number of faculty to call a caucus meeting of the faculty. Requirements for notice and for an agenda need not be the same as for a meeting called by the dean.

A caucus meeting may also be provided as a regular occurrence, as it is for the newly elected Senate.
CONDUCT OF BUSINESS.
There should be a statement that the school follows Robert’s Rules of Order. However, an exception could be made in the bylaws. Examples of exceptions could include a procedure for the use of email ballots or alternative requirements for a quorum.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

DEAN. The duties and responsibilities of the Dean with regard to academic policy should be indicated. In general, the Dean is responsible for the finances and physical resources of the school, representing the school to the Provost and President. The faculty, not the dean, has primary responsibility and the primary voice in setting academic policy in a strict sense, meaning setting intellectual standards and goals, setting the curriculum and standards for student evaluation, and setting standards for and participating in peer review.

The section on the Dean should address, explicitly or implicitly, the way the balance between these two sets of responsibilities is maintained, respecting the integrity of each. The general duties of the Dean with regard to financial and other administrative policies should be indicated. The common practice at UTD has been that the deans appoint the members of the school faculty committees in consultation with the Executive Committee or the Academic Advisory Committee. These appointive powers and the procedures for appointment should be indicated—who is appointed and by what process.

Schools may also have elected committees with elected chairs in addition to committees that must be elected under UT Dallas policies.

The role of the Dean in hiring should be described, distinguishing the positions that should be filled with faculty consultation and involvement from positions that the Dean can fill at his/her discretion.

ASSOCIATE DEANS FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. The Associate Deans have clearly defined roles in university policy as members of the Council on Undergraduate Education, in preparing catalog copy, and usually in communicating with the scheduling office on course scheduling. These responsibilities should be delineated. In addition, the bylaws should specify how they are appointed (for example by the Dean or by the Dean with approval or confirmation of the faculty) and their qualifications, powers and duties. For example, must they be tenured? A persistent weak spot in the administration of our undergraduate programs has been supervision of contingent faculty, meaning faculty hired on a course-by-course or term-by-term basis. Is this part of their responsibilities? (If not, someone else should be responsible for them).

ASSOCIATE OR ASSISTANT DEAN FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION. This is an ex-officio member of the Graduate Council. They have established roles in coordinating the graduate programs, preparing catalog copy, and communicating with the scheduling office on course scheduling. Where these functions have devolved onto programs, as in NS&M, the
relation of the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies for graduate studies to whoever does it in the programs should be indicated. Does the Associate Dean for Graduate Education have no responsibility at all (does copy go right from programs to the Dean?) or is there some limited responsibility?

The bylaws should specify how the Associate Dean for Graduate Education is appointed (for example by the Dean or by the Dean with approval or confirmation of the faculty), their qualifications (tenured only?), powers and duties. Is the Associate Dean for Graduate Education responsible for assigning TAs? Is the Associate Dean for Graduate Education responsible for hiring and supervising lecturers? (If not, the bylaws should say who is.) What is the role of the Associate Dean for Graduate Education in setting up ad hoc committees for dissertations?

PROGRAM HEAD.

Program heads are appointed by the school dean in consultation with the faculty.

DEPARTMENT AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRS OR HEADS. At present, only the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics and the School of Engineering and Computer Science have departments. The chief administrative officer of a department is a “head” or “chair.” Departments are usually responsible for one or more academic programs. Department heads or chairs are appointed by the dean in consultation with the faculty.

The Chair position may also be a program head position for one or more programs, or the program head or heads may be separate.

Departments normally have an annual budget that includes faculty salaries. Chairs may have responsibilities in hiring. Chairs may also have responsibility for preparing annual review assessments and for preparing evaluations of faculty in the Period Performance Evaluations. They may also have responsibilities in setting course schedules, room assignments, and the like. A department should have an Executive Committee unless there are so few faculty that it is more efficient to have the entire faculty meet regularly with the Chair.

In schools with departments, bylaws should specify the term of appointment of the chair and whether it shall be renewable.

Each school should also specify the process by which the department chairs are appointed. Chairs appointed through an external search will be subject to the usual review process for faculty appointments and appointed by the President on recommendation of the Provost and Dean in the usual manner.

Departmental bylaws are probably better kept separate from school bylaws, but if schools have departments the school bylaws should indicate in general what part of school functions are delegated to departments and whether the departments should have further bylaws of their own.
OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN THE SCHOOL. Some schools have groupings of programs that are not departments in the sense that they do not have budgetary autonomy and the main fiscal responsibilities of the school dean are not delegated to the faculty member who represents or heads these units. We have no established term for this kind of organization. Henceforth, bylaws should use either the term “program group” or “program area.” The faculty member designated to represent or coordinate them should be designated “program group coordinator” or “area coordinator.” The choice between the two terms should be based on which provides the more accurate description. If they are in fact a grouping of programs, brought together because their courses or other activities are related or in order to share common resources, such as a secretary, they should be described as a program group. If they are rather a set of faculty brought together around a common interest that cross-cuts several programs, the idea of a “program area” and “area coordinator” is more appropriate. If they are significant in the teaching program of the school, the bylaws should describe such groups and the responsibility delegated to them.

CENTERS AND INSTITUTES. Our present Policy on University Research Units and Organized Research Units - UTDPP1010 assumes that centers or institutes are groupings of faculty concerned with common or interrelated research problems and are in principle independent of schools. Originally, they were conceived of as self-funding. As we have evolved, we have developed important centers with other kinds of functions and other kinds of funding. If a school has centers as an integral part of its functioning, and if faculty positions in the center are part of normal faculty assignments over which Deans, Associate Deans, or Department Heads have authority, their governance arrangements should also be included in the school bylaws. This should, again, indicate the arrangements for shared governance—are there faculty bodies to work with the directors and how are they constituted?

EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS. Bylaws should note that Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and Program Heads are subject to upward evaluation under the UTD policy on Evaluation of Academic Administrators - UTDPP1047.

STANDING COMMITTEES

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OR ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE. The previous Senate guidelines did not require school executive committees. School bylaws should now specify either an Executive Committee or an Academic Advisory Committee.

An Executive Committee is elected by the voting faculty of the school. The minimum size of such an Executive Committee should be seven, with exception of Interdisciplinary Studies. The bylaws may also provide for student representation on the Executive Committee. The election will be conducted with an open nominating procedure and a secret ballot. The method should be specified in the bylaws. Schools may decide not to elect members at large; they could also be elected from specified subdivisions of the school faculty.

Faculty eligible for election to the Executive Committee shall not include the Dean, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, or department Chairs or Heads.
Schools may choose to have an Academic Advisory Committee in place of Executive Committee. An Academic Advisory Committee will consist of the department heads or chairs of other such units together with at least three faculty who do not hold such appointments and who are elected by secret ballot from the school as whole. For an Academic Advisory Committee, it is important that the procedures for appointing chairs or program heads involves sufficient faculty consultation that the chairs or program heads can properly be considered to represent faculty views and interests.

The Executive Committee or Academic Advisory Committee should meet with the dean regularly. Their scope of concern shall include academic policy and personnel matters that affect academic performance and faculty working conditions.

School bylaws may specify whether there should be formal faculty approval to authorize searches for new hires, and if so whether this approval should be by the school faculty, department faculty, program faculty, Executive Committee, or Academic Advisory Committee. Non-tenure system faculty, if permitted to vote for other matters under the school bylaws, shall not vote on personnel matters involving tenure-system faculty. Student members shall not vote on personnel matters involving faculty.

While members of the Executive Committee may properly expect details of their views on delicate matters to be held confidential within the committee, the votes of the committee recorded in minutes should be readily available to the faculty as a whole.

**FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEW COMMITTEE.** This is a standing committee in each school mandated by three UT Dallas policies: the policy on annual reviews of faculty, on periodic performance evaluations, and on promotion and tenure. The Committee has a university charge that describes the general method of election. Bylaws may add further specifications. For example, in a school like ECS it might be advisable to specify representation by discipline. Since only equal or above-rank faculty can participate in these reviews, it is recommended that this committee should consist of tenured full professors.

**COMMITTEE ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING.** A school Committee on Effective Teaching is mandated by POLICY MEMORANDUM 96-III.21-70, which requires in part:

A. A teaching evaluation procedure developed and administered by an independent faculty committee.

B. Written objective standards for evaluating teaching performance. These standards must include student course evaluations, teaching load contributions, diversity of courses covered, course development and administration, and thesis and dissertation supervision.

C. Procedures for periodic collection of reliable and verifiable information related to teaching performance including periodic classroom visits by
designated faculty to gather direct observational information that supplements information taken from sources such as course syllabi and student course evaluations.

D. Some mechanism for faculty to comment on their evaluations and provide information they feel is pertinent to the teaching evaluation process.

E. The bylaws should specify how the membership is constituted, the terms for which they serve, how they report their results and to whom, and how their procedures are established, whether by the committee, the school, or both in some combined process.

COMMITTEE FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES. In general, the bylaws should indicate who is responsible for planning, preparation of catalog copy, and scheduling courses in the undergraduate program. If this is done by an undergraduate program committee, then the bylaws should specify who the members are and how they are appointed or selected. If there is no school committee, then the bylaws should indicate who is responsible instead.

COMMITTEE FOR GRADUATE STUDIES. In general, the bylaws should indicate the process by which the graduate program is developed and implemented, specifically describing who is responsible for planning, preparation of catalog copy, and scheduling courses. If this is done by a graduate program committee, then the bylaws should describe it. If this is done by departments or programs, the bylaws should say how the information is aggregated and coordinated at the school level.

PROGRAM COMMITTEES. The bylaws may provide either for program committees associated with the various degree programs in the schools or combinations thereof, or they may provide a general pattern for all program committees. In either case, however, there should be clear provisions for who is to be on such committees, how disputes about who is to be on them are to be resolved, who chairs them, and what their relation is to the school committees. In schools with departments, program committees may be unnecessary; the decision should be up to the school or department.

OTHER COMMITTEES. Each school should specify their standing committees and when necessary should create temporary committees to meet their administrative and academic needs.

The bylaws should provide a way to form them, establish their operating rules, and dissolve them.

KEY ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES.
STATE OF THE SCHOOL REPORT AND CONSULTATION. The dean should present a “state of the school” report to the faculty at the beginning of each year at a meeting of the school faculty. This should include plans for searches and other program initiatives. The meeting should provide opportunity for discussion. Resolutions from the faculty in relation to the plan should be in order.

At the end of each spring term, the dean should report what was actually done and the faculty should again have the opportunity to offer advice and resolutions.

APPOINTMENTS OF TENURE-SYSTEM FACULTY.

All appointments of tenure-system faculty in the University of Texas at Dallas shall be made in accordance with the General Standards and Procedures: Initial Appointments to the Ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor - UTDPP1057. Appointments to named chairs and appointments under the U T STAR$ program are not exceptions. A chaired professor is still a professor. Appointments must go through the same approval process within the school as any other tenured appointment (assuming that it would be a tenured appointment).

University policy requires votes on all tenure and promotion reviews by “the faculty of the school or department in which the person under review has teaching and/or administrative responsibilities.” School bylaws should specify whether this vote is to be by department, school, or both. Bylaws must also specify the quorum requirements. The university policy specifies the procedure.

Ordinary searches. School bylaws may provide for faculty involvement in making up appropriate ad hoc committees for approved hires. The composition of such committees should require approval by either the Executive Committee or the full school faculty. If approval is to be by the full school faculty, bylaws should specify how the necessary meeting is to be called.

Opportunity Searches. The bylaws may provide for faculty involvement in making up appropriate ad hoc committees. The default rule is that composition of ad hoc committees requires approval by the Executive Committee or Academic Advisory Committee. School bylaws may require approval by the full school faculty instead.

APPOINTMENTS OF NON-TENURE-SYSTEM FACULTY.

Bylaws should specify the approval process for hiring and reappointing non-tenure track faculty. This should include consultation with, or a recommendation from, the program faculty or program head.

Responsibility should be assigned for hiring part-time faculty, adjunct or associate faculty, and for making non-tenure-track special appointments. There should also be provisions for
the evaluation and reappointment of part-time faculty, since these are not covered in the general University policies on promotion and tenure.

Criteria for promotion and tenure. University policy requires that faculty of the several schools develop their own supplementary guidelines to implement the general university criteria for promotion and tenure. The policy does not say what body represents “the faculty” for this purpose but it assumes that policies for the school will be made by the faculty of the school. This means that they should be approved by the faculty of the school as a whole, in assembly. School bylaws may delegate this to departments or other subordinate units.

CREATING NEW DEGREE PROGRAMS. School faculty should vote to approve new degree programs in the school. Bylaws should provide the procedure.

If there are departments, department faculty should vote to approve new degree programs in the department.

If the program involves faculty or disciplines from several departments, school bylaws should provide for votes in all the concerned departments.

Results of the votes should be reported to the Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate in requests for Senate approval of the new programs.

CLOSING EXISTING DEGREE PROGRAMS. Combining or eliminating degree programs and transferring their faculty to other programs in the school should require votes by the program faculty and school faculty. Voting procedures should be specified. Votes in programs should be taken before votes in departments (if any) or schools. Votes in programs should be made available to department faculty (if any) before they vote; results of the vote in programs and departments should be made available to school faculty before they vote.

Elimination of programs that would result in termination of tenured faculty requires conformance to Regents Rule 31003, Section 2, Elimination of Academic Positions of Programs: Elimination for Academic Reasons as implemented in the UTD Academic Program Abandonment Policy - UTDPP1000.

AUTHORITY

No provisions in the various bylaws may override or contravene established university or Regents’ policies.

PROVISIONS FOR AMENDING THE BYLAWS

All bylaws should include a provision for amending the bylaws. Requirements now vary. Amendment should require at least a majority of the faculty present.
Proposed policy

Faculty Personnel Review Committee

Each School in the University of Texas at Dallas with more than four tenure-track faculty shall establish a Faculty Personnel Review Committee. The Committee has a general responsibility, on behalf of the faculty in the school, to assure that the university and school personnel review policies are applied fairly and equitably. The Committee has specific duties in relation to annual reviews, the promotion and tenure process, and periodic performance evaluations.

Membership

Faculty Personnel Review Committees are chaired by the dean of the school and must include at least five tenured faculty members from the School elected by the school faculty. Election will be by secret ballot, with plurality voting. The bylaws of the school may allow one additional member to be appointed by the Dean to assure balance. Service on the Personnel Review Committee should rotate among the tenured faculty on a staggered annual cycle with no member's term to exceed two years. Only tenured faculty may serve on this committee, and recommendations regarding tenured Associate Professors and Professors may be made only by tenured Professors. A majority of the members should be of the rank of full professor.

Responsibilities

University review define three main processes for faculty review: 1. Annual reviews for all faculty, including non-tenure track faculty, 2. Peer review processes for tenure-track faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure, and 3. Periodic Performance Evaluation for tenured faculty. The specific responsibilities of the committee and the relevant policies in each case are:

1. Annual reviews.

The Committee does not conduct annual reviews of faculty and has no required duties in the process, but it since it must use the annual reviews in its two other required tasks, it should concern itself with the quality and evident fairness of the reports. If it finds problems, these should be reported to the school Dean and faculty. Faculty who consider their annual reviews to be inconsistent with university and school policy may address a request for corrections to the Personnel Review Committee. The Committee response should be provided to the Dean with a copy to the faculty member.
2. Retention, tenure, and promotion.

Each year in the fall term, the committee shall recommend to the Dean of the School those faculty members for whom ad hoc committees should be appointed for consideration for retention, tenure, and promotion. In order to formulate this advice, the Committee may review the faculty of the entire school by itself, or it may call for recommendations from departments or other subordinate units. School bylaws should describe the process. For this purpose, the Committee and any subordinate units involved in the process will have access to the faculty annual reviews for the current year and previous years. They may also request additional information. This annual review process will lead to one of three recommendations:

1. In the case of faculty in their first or second year of service, to not reappoint the faculty member.

2. To recommend that an ad hoc committee be composed for renewal of a non-tenured appointment (normally in the third year of service as an Assistant Professor) or for consideration for tenure or promotion as required under the General Standards and Procedures: Faculty Promotion, Reappointment, and Tenure (UTDPP1077).

3. To make no recommendation, thereby retaining the faculty member at their current rank.

These recommendations will be communicated by the Dean to the Provost according to the schedule.

A faculty member may request an ad hoc committee review for retention, tenure, or promotion even if the School's initial decision is not to initiate such a review. Such requests will be submitted to the Dean of the School. The Dean will seek the advice of the Faculty Personnel Review Committee.


The committee also serves as the School Peer Review Committee as required by the Procedures Governing Periodic Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (UTDPP1064), and the General Standards and Procedures for Review of Nontenure-System Faculty - UTDPP1062. Generally, the Committee is to review the preliminary evaluation prepared by the dean and provide its own written recommendation in response, which the dean is to take into account in preparing his final evaluation. Both the dean’s recommendation and that of the Committee will be forwarded to the Provost.
Recommendations regarding tenured Associate Professors may be made only by tenured Professors.

**Additional Responsibilities**

A Faculty Personnel Review Committee may be charged with additional responsibilities under other university policies or by school bylaws. The Dean may seek the Committee’s advice on additional personnel actions, including new hires.

**NOTE:** If this approved, the current section on the Faculty Personnel Review Committee in General Standards and Procedures: Faculty Promotion, Reappointment, and Tenure should be replaced by the following:

Recommendations for establishing *ad hoc* committees to consider faculty for retention, promotion, or tenure, will normally originate with dean of the school and the Faculty Personnel Review Committee, as described in the policy establishing Faculty Personnel Review Committees and as implemented in school bylaws.
Academic Program Review - UTDPP1013

Policy Charge

Academic Program Review PRC

Policy Statement

Academic units and programs are reviewed regularly to evaluate their quality and their effectiveness in supporting the university's mission. As described by this policy, the Program Review Committee, a standing committee composed of members of The University of Texas at Dallas faculty and academic administration, oversees the review process. The Committee functions in cooperation with the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost), under whose auspices Academic Program Reviews are conducted.

Program Review Committee (PRC)

This university committee maintains general oversight of the review process to assure its efficacy and uniformity. During each program review, one member of the Program Review Committee, designated the Program Review Committee Monitor, participates directly in the process. The entire Program Review Committee evaluates the operation of the review process on a continuing basis and makes an annual report to the Provost and Academic Senate. In this report, it recommends any modifications of policies or procedures regarding reviews it considers advisable. In addition, it consults with and advises the Provost on other aspects of reviews as requested.

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.

The Responsible University Official is the Executive Vice President and Provost.

The term "Academic Program" or "unit" as used in this document may refer either to a degree-granting program, department, School, or to any academically coherent, distinctively functioning subdivision thereof.

Frequency of Review and Criteria for Selection
In accord with Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.52, Academic Programs ("units") shall be reviewed in intervals not to exceed seven years. Reviews may occur more frequently if the Provost, in consultation with the appropriate dean, finds that the circumstances of a particular program warrant an earlier date. However, a program may not need to be reviewed under the procedures of this policy if mandated external accreditation reviews occur regularly and substantially meet the criteria outlined under The Review Procedure below. According to Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.52 (c)(11) and (d)(11), institutions may submit reviews performed for programmatic licensure or accreditation in satisfaction of the state’s review and reporting requirements.

Master's programs classified with the same 6-digit Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) as doctoral programs are reviewed simultaneously with their related doctoral programs. UT Dallas reviews bachelors programs in the same discipline as masters and doctoral programs simultaneously with those programs.

Selection of units to be reviewed in a given year will be made by the Provost after consultation with the Program Review Committee and the appropriate dean(s). The review schedule will be submitted to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) staff. The factors (not in priority order) to be considered when creating the review schedule include:

1. Planned program changes;
2. Elapsed time since last major review of budget, staff and academic programs;
3. University or program accreditation cycles;
4. Significant changes in student demand; and
5. Overlap or shared responsibilities with other programs being reviewed.

The Review Team

The Program Review Committee oversees the evaluation conducted by a Review Team that is appointed and charged by the Provost. The Provost consults with the unit undergoing review and/or the Program Review Committee, as appropriate, regarding selection of Review Team members. The Review Team's composition may vary from program to program, but will incorporate both internal and external members. Typically, it will include:

1. At least two members from the UT Dallas faculty and academic administration who are not affiliated with the program to be reviewed, appointed by the Provost after soliciting recommendations from consultation with the Program Review Committee.
2. One member of the Program Review Committee, appointed by the Provost after consultation with the Program Review Committee, to act as the Program Review Committee Monitor. In addition to responsibilities as a regular member of the Review Team, the Program Review Committee Monitor will have the duty of conferring with and reporting to the Program Review Committee and, on the basis of knowledge acquired as a member of the Program Review Committee, of helping each Review Team ensure
consistency of its individual review within the overall review process. This individual will not be affiliated with the program under review.

3. For doctoral programs, at least two external reviewers with subject-matter expertise who are employed by institutions outside of Texas will be appointed by the Provost after consultation with the unit under review and brought to campus for an on-site review. The reviewers must affirm that they have no conflict of interest and must be part of programs that are nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline.

4. For masters programs, at least one external reviewer with subject-matter expertise who is employed by an institution outside of Texas will be appointed by the Provost after consultation with the unit under review and will be provided the self-study materials. UT Dallas can invite the reviewer(s) to campus or request that they conduct a remote desk review. Each reviewer must affirm that he or she has no conflict of interest and must be part of a program that is nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline.

The Provost may add additional members as appropriate. One member of the Review Team, usually a member not affiliated with UT Dallas, will be designated Chair of the Review Team by the Provost at the time the Team is constituted. The Review Team will evaluate the unit as requested by a written charge prepared by the Provost after consultation with the Program Review Committee.

The Review Procedure

Reviews will be conducted as follows:

The unit undergoing review will consult with the Provost regarding suitable dates for the Review Team's campus visit, and the detailed schedule of events during the visit. It will prepare a comprehensive self-study document (an internal planning document, not intended for general distribution) in accordance with guidelines and instructions issued by the Provost. These guidelines include criteria outlined in Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.52, Review of Existing Degree Programs. The Review Team also will collaborate with the Provost in ensuring that the Review Team's on-campus needs are met. The Provost will designate a Review Coordinator (the Dean, Head, Director, or suitable substitute) from the unit under review to ensure that the duties assigned to the unit in connection with the Review Team are carried out.

The Provost will provide the Review Team a detailed charge, along with the unit's self-study document. The Office of the Provost will issue the visit schedule, oversee the visit arrangements for the Review Team (transportation, housing, meals, reimbursement, etc.) and serve as liaison between the Review Team and the unit being reviewed.

Before the campus visit, the Review Team will familiarize itself with the unit's self-study, and with the Provost's charge. During the visit, it will consult with members of the unit's faculty, students, and staff and inspect facilities. It may request additional information beyond that provided in the self-study. Adequate time will be allowed in the latter part of the visit for the Review Team to deliberate in private and reach its conclusions.
At the beginning of the visit, the Review Team will have an introductory interview with the Provost. Before leaving the campus, the Review Team will hold two exit interviews. In the first, held with the Program Review Committee and the unit's faculty and administration, the Review Team will provide its preliminary assessment of the goals, plans, staffing, resources, existing and potential strengths, etc., of the unit, and those areas needing improvement. In the second, held with the Provost, the President and other appropriate senior administrators, the Review Team will summarize its immediate impressions and provide a forecast of its eventual written report. Then, within one month of the campus visit, the Chair of the Review Team will provide a complete written report on the Review Team's conclusions to the Provost.

Along with addressing any unique aspects of its charge, the Review Team's report will assess the unit's overall performance and its specific strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for any changes the Review Team thinks are advisable. The evaluation should refer to the program's self-study and note items of agreement and disagreement between the Review Team's assessments and those of the self-study. The Review Team will share its final report with the faculty and administration of the unit. The unit's chief administrative office, in cooperation with faculty and staff, will provide a written response to the report to the Provost, giving specific actions planned in the light of the Review Team's recommendations. Where the unit disagrees with findings and/or recommendations of the Review Team, it will state its reasons for such disagreements. The unit's faculty will have access to this document as well as to the Review Team's report. The Provost will discuss the Review Team's report and unit's response with the unit's administration and faculty. Finally, the Provost will prepare recommendations to the President. The university administration will submit a report of the outcomes of each review, including the evaluation of the Review Team and actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program, to the THECB no later than 90 days after the Review Team has submitted its findings to the institution.

In the years between reviews of the unit, this record of the Program Review will be pertinent to decisions on budget, staffing, curricular and degree changes, and allocation of special resources.
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Information Resources Security Planning and Policy Committee - UTDPP1003

Policy Charge

IR Security Planning and Policy Committee

Policy Statement

The Information Resources Planning, and Policy Committee is a University-wide Standing Committee. The Committee will advise and assist the Vice President, Chief Information Officer in long range planning for development and use of the university's information resources in such a way as to strike the best possible balance between outreach for education, support of research, and the maintenance of information security. With respect to long range planning, the Committee will deal with all aspects of information resources including existing and emerging requirements, current and anticipated technologies and preferred policies and practices. The committee is expected to maintain liaisons with the Committee on Distance Learning, the Committee on Effective Teaching, and all other university and administrative committees whose work bears on issues of information resources. With respect to security, the committee will have a permanent subcommittee on security compliance to oversee the University's compliance with U. T. System system-wide policy UTS165, U. T. System Information Security Action Plan, and Texas Administrative Code 202. Responsibilities of the full committee include but are not limited to:

1. Participation in the creation and implementation of long-range plans for Information Resources development and utilization. Within that process, the committee will assist in the identification and prioritization of goals, objectives and action items. Completed planning efforts will be documented by the Office of the Vice President, Chief Information Officer and submitted to the Academic Senate before being submitted to the President's Cabinet or concerned State of Texas agencies.

2. Review of The University of Texas at Dallas Information Resources Use and Security Policy A5-110.0 to insure compliance with U. T. System and Texas Administrative Code requirements.

3. Monitoring of the implementation of the UTD policies.

The Committee shall be composed of at least thirteen voting members. Seven shall be tenure-track faculty, including at least two holding administrative positions of Dean or above, 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). In addition, there shall be one representative each from Audit and Compliance, Academic Affairs, the University Staff Council, the Office of the Vice President for Research, and the Office of the Vice President for Administration. The University Chief Information Security Officer shall be a member ex officio, with vote. The Vice President, Chief Information Officer (under the terms of U. T. System system-wide policy UTS165) is the Responsible University Official (RUO).
The security compliance subcommittee shall consist of the Chief Information Security Officer and at least one committee member from Audit and Compliance, one from Academic Affairs, one from the Office of the Vice President for Research, one from the General Faculty, and one each of the University staff and Information Resources staff. Membership of the subcommittee shall be determined by majority vote of the full committee.

In consultation with the full committee, pursuant to system-wide policy UTS165, the task of the subcommittee on security compliance shall be to advise the Vice President, Chief Information Officer on ways to carry out the tasks assigned in system-wide policy UTS165, namely to:

1. Analyze information to determine whether it is confidential, sensitive, both or neither.
2. Prepare a security plan to protect information identified as confidential, sensitive or both.
3. Assign management responsibility for implementing the security plan.
4. Train personnel to treat information resources properly.
5. Monitor the treatment of information resources to ensure compliance with the security plan.
6. Submit planning documents and reports to state agencies as required.

The term of service of the Committee members shall be for two years, effective September 1 to August 31, staggered in time to make approximately equal numbers of appointments expire each academic year. Members may be reappointed by the President for additional terms. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

The Committee will meet annually in October to organize subcommittees or other working units for fulfilling its responsibilities and to determine a schedule of meetings that includes at least one per quarter at a time and place designated by the Chair. Additional meetings will be called by the Chair or RUO as may be necessary. The Chair and Vice Chair are appointed annually by the President.
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University Owned Desktop Encryption Requirements

1. High risk desktop computers are to be encrypted by May 31, 2014.
   a. Deans, Chairs, and/or Department Heads, in concert with the institution’s Chief
      Information Security Officer are responsible for identifying the desktops in their areas
      that are high risk, based on guidelines included in the next section.
   b. All other desktop computers may remain unencrypted until they are replaced
      following the respective institution’s guidelines for hardware refresh and replacement,
      at which time they would be properly disposed.

2. All new desktop computers purchased on or after September 1, 2013, are to be encrypted
   before deployment.
   a. Self-Encrypting Drives may be used (just as with laptops) but must be managed via a
      third party tool or otherwise have password security enabled such that the user is
      required to authenticate before the data is decrypted.

Identifying "High Risk" Desktops

What is a “high risk” desktop computer?
In general, there are three circumstances that indicate that a desktop computer is high risk. These
are as follows:

- Based on Location: Desktops in public/high-traffic areas that are used by staff with access to
  confidential/protected data are considered high risk. Small form factor desktops pose an additional
  risk.
- Based on Business Function: Desktops may be high risk based on the activities of the business unit
  in which they are located. For example, desktops in clinical, hospital, or HR settings are likely high
  risk because of the type of work performed in these functional areas. The business unit function/area
  centric approach is the easier to implement because it does not require risk-scoring every desktop in
  the environment.
- Based on Role of User: Computers belonging to Executive Officers and their support staff should, by
  default, be considered high risk as the loss of these computers will likely have an adverse impact on
  the reputation of the individuals as well as the institution as a whole.

The criteria outlined above are not all inclusive. Any desktop computer on which data is stored that if
accessed by an unauthorized party or that holds data that if subject to unauthorized change or
deletion would have highly adverse impact on the University is high risk.
Who makes the final determination as to whether a desktop computer is to be considered high risk?

The decision is made by management of the functional area where the device is located in consultation with the UT Dallas Chief Information Security Officer, the UT Dallas Information Security Advisory Committee and based on criteria identified in the answer to question above. If a dispute arises, the Information Owner of the data placed at potential risk will determine the classification of the device. Any resulting information security exception request must be documented and reported through the exception request process. Policy exceptions may include systems like the following:

- Desktops that have software controls such as DeepFreeze that are configured not to retain data.
- Kiosk computers that are designed not to store any data locally (including browser caches).
- Computers designed with no local storage.
- Virtual desktops for which the hypervisor is a secure “cloud service” and does not permit transfer of the virtual image. **NOTE:** If the hypervisor is a desktop computer, then the desktop itself should be encrypted.

Approved Encryption Methods for UT Dallas Portable Devices

There are several methods of complying with policy for encrypting sensitive data on portable devices. The following features are important in an encryption product:

1. Industry-standard, well-tested encryption algorithms.
2. Encryption key escrow/recovery in case the keys are lost, forgotten, or otherwise unavailable to a department.
3. Support for multiple platforms, especially Windows and Mac (both of which currently make up the majority of portable devices on campus).
4. The ability to demonstrate the device was encrypted in the event it is lost or stolen, in order to better comply with the Texas Identity Theft Protection and Enforcement Act and other related laws.
In the 2012-2013 academic year, participating members of the Academic Program Review Committee were Dean Bert Moore and Drs. Mark Lee, Xinchou Lou, Margaret Owen (chair), and Ross Roesser. Members of the committee served on internal review teams for three academic program reviews held this past year. Additional members serving on the internal review teams were Dean Denis Dean and Drs. Carlos Aiken, Alexander Braun, John Ferraris, Elena Katok, Robert Lowry, Alice O'Toole, Marion Underwood, and Anvar Zakhidov. Outside review committee members and additional details on each of the reviews conducted are shown in the attached Table.

The programs reviewed in 2012-13 are listed below.

### Geosciences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy and Political Economy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Political Economy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geospatial Information Systems</td>
<td>PhD &amp; Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Materials Science & Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>PhD &amp; Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Arts & Humanities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History Desk Review</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Studies</td>
<td>PhD &amp; Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Ideas</td>
<td>PhD &amp; Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Literature</td>
<td>PhD &amp; Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>PhD &amp; Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports for each Program Review were submitted to the Provost and final meetings with the Provost were held. Copies of each Program Review Report were forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs of the University of Texas System and to the Coordinating Board.
Date: August 26, 2013

To: The Academic Senate

From: Peter K. J. Park, out-going Chair
       Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity

Re: Annual Report of the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity, 2012-2013

I. Membership:

The members of the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity were: the Chair Peter Park (AH), the Vice Chair Yang Liu (ECS), Cindy De Frias (BBS), Sherry Li (EPPS), Mandy Maguire (BBS), Alex Piquero (EPPS), Karen Prager (IS), Monica Rankin (AH), Orlando Richard (JSOM), Li Zhang (NSM), Abby Kratz (admin), Sherry Marek (admin), Eloise Square (admin), Yolande Evans (staff), Lisabeth Lassiter (staff), Danny Cordova (staff)

II. The Report:

There was a near crippling problem for this Committee at the beginning of school year. We did not know the names of the three or so members from staff who were supposed to be appointed to this Committee until far into the semester. I was not able to convene the first meeting of this committee until about 8 weeks into the fall semester. It was discovered that the problem was a failure of the normal means of communication. No one was able to reach the president of Staff Council via email because her email program had gone bezirk. I would advise that, toward the beginning of the next academic year, somebody (either the administrative assistant, the Senate speaker, or the new chair of the Diversity and Equity Committee) telephone Rochelle Pena or seek her out in person, to get the names of the staff appointees. We did not have many meetings during 2012-2013; we met on Nov. 8, Jan. 24, and March 1. Not all members were able to attend all meetings because of schedule conflicts, but this is as usual.

Regarding the Faculty Diversity Council Liaisons, recall that it was created a year ago with input from the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity. This Council has been conducting its business in coordination with the Associate Provost for Faculty Development, Emily Tobey, and has had two meetings during 2012-2013. It operates independently of the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity. The latter received reports from Emily Tobey on her work in the area of faculty development, including her work with the Faculty Diversity Council.

There were no specially urgent issues that this Committee took up. In the Chair’s view, it was the usual. Many of the university’s concerns and priorities for staff and faculty development have been taken up by whole departments and officials created in recent years to support or professionally develop our staff and faculty. There was a lively discussion earlier in the year of the on-going effort to create an on-site child-care facility. The results of this discussion were disseminated to the officials who have been all along working on this project, including President Daniel. In the next year, the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity should ask for an update from the Subcommittee on Childcare.
Abby Kratz (former Chair) and I would like to pose this question: Is it possible to add student members (maybe two) to the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity?
August 31, 2013

To: Murray Leaf, Speaker
    David Cordell, Secretary
    UT Dallas Academic Senate

From: Richard K. Scotch, Chair
    Senate Budget Advisory Committee

Re: Report on Committee Activities in 2012-2013 Academic Year

The membership of the Senate Budget Advisory Committee for 2012-2013 remained the same as for the previous academic year: Richard Scotch (chair), Robert Kieschnick (Vice-Chair), Jay Dowling, Rebecca Files, Dung T. Huynh, Ramachandran Natarajan, Tim Redman, Robert Serfling, and Rym Zalila-Wenkstern. Speaker Murray Leaf also routinely attended our meetings.

The committee had several meetings during the 2012-2013 academic year. In the Fall 2012 semester, the committee requested data on UTD faculty salaries from the Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis, which were analyzed by Robert Serfling. Dr. Serfling prepared a report on his analysis that was distributed to the Committee and discussed in January. The primary conclusion of the report was that salary compression and inversion were found at most ranks and within most schools of the university. The report was subsequently presented to the Senate, accompanied by a draft resolution from the committee which proposed that a body be formed of faculty representatives from the Committee and administrators (including deans) to consider how to respond to the salary patterns noted in the report. The resolution was passed by the Senate; appointment of the committee was pending as of submission of this annual report.

The Committee also met during the Spring semester with the new UT Dallas Vice President for Budget and Finance, Terry Pankratz, shortly after his appointment.

Representatives of the Committee were invited by President Daniel to participate in his budget hearings to discuss budget allocations for the 2013-2014 academic year with deans, directors, and vice-presidents in March and April. Most hearings were attended by Committee Chair Scotch, Vice-Chair Kieschnick, or both, with some participation by other committee members. Drs. Scotch and Kieschnick also represented the committee at subsequent meetings of the President’s cabinet to review material from the hearings.