APPROVED AND CORRECTED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Senate. They have been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are the official minutes.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
April 20, 2016

Present: Hobson Wildenthal, Inga Musselman, Robert Ackerman, Naotul Al-Dhair, Frank Anderson, Karen Bayham, Elizabeth Bell, Dinesh Bhatia, Gail Breen, Matthew Brown, John Buri, R. Chandrasekaran, Nadine Connell, David Cordell, Mieczyslaw Dabkowski, Gregory Dess, Gregg Dieckmann, Vladimir Dragovic, Monica Evans, Eric Farrar, Nicholas Gans, Lev Gelb, Jennifer Holmes, Dorihee Honhon, M. Ali Hooshyar, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Joe Izen, Carie Lambert, Murray Leaf, Syam Menon, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Michael Rebello, Tim Redman, Christopher Ryan, Betsy Schlobohm, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Michael Tiefelsdorf, Tonja Wissinger,

Absent: Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Patrick Brandt, Bernard Ganglmair, D.T. Huynh, Michele Lockhart, BPS Murthi, Ramachandran Natarajan, Simeon Ntafos, Sabrina Starnaman, Murat Toplak, Alejandro Zentner

Visitors: Andrew Blanchard, Cristen Casey, Chris Davis, Naomi Emmett, Julie Haworth, Bill Hefley, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Jennifer McDowell, Jessica Murphy, Terry Pankratz, Elisabeth Samuel, Debbie Reynolds Marion Underwood

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
   Interim President Wildenthal called the meeting to order at 2:02 PM. The university made an application to the Governor’s University Research Initiative, Governor Abbott’s program to encourage research in the state. They had dedicated $40 million toward to change the face of Texas research. UT Dallas was encouraged to submit a proposal for a grant, the maximum value of which was limited to $5 million. On April 18, 2016 the university was notified it had been granted $4 million. The only drawback was that the university is required to complete staffing within 30 days. Receiving the grant is a great success for the research for the university.

   The hearings for the University Budget occurred on April 19, 2016. Our incoming President Benson was in attendance. The discussions were fruitful. One topic discussed was what the university needed to do to continue to be great. It was noted that the special accomplishments of the university need attention, and the words of praise need to be backed up with action. He opened the floor to questions. There were none.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   Richard Scotch moved to move the presentation by Colleen Dutton to item 5, and approve the amended agenda. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of the March 23, 2016 Minutes
Mary Jo Venetis emailed a correction to the March meeting minutes. Dr. Venetis requested the following paragraph be updated to reflect that “she” was actually “Dr. Belle Wheelan.”

She encouraged the Senate members to submit their suggestions. Our university had the privilege to host the president of SACSCOC, Beth Wheelan. She met with a wide variety of stakeholders on campus. It was Serenity’s opinion that it was a mutually beneficial visit. She got a sense of who our campus was, as she had never been to our campus. She reminded the university how much she advocates for institution on our behalf, in fact she left our campus and went to visit with the Chancellor, and on to meet with the Commission at the coordinating board. She remarked that our university should use her as a resource in the legislative session more that we have in the past. In particular, she would have liked to have been called about campus carry legislation. She does testify before legislatures quite often.

The corrected paragraph follows:

Serenity King encouraged the Senate members to submit their suggestions. Our university had the privilege to host the president of SACSCOC, Belle Wheelan. Dr. Wheelan met with a wide variety of stakeholders on campus. It was Serenity’s opinion that it was a mutually beneficial visit. Dr. Wheelan got a sense of who our campus was, as Dr. Wheelan had never been to our campus. Dr. Wheelan reminded the university how much she advocates for institution on our behalf, in fact Dr. Wheelan left our campus and went to visit with the Chancellor, and on to meet with the Commissioner at the coordinating board. Dr. Wheelan remarked that our university should use her as a resource in the legislative session more that we have in the past. In particular, Dr. Wheelan would have liked to have been called about campus carry legislation. Dr. Wheelan does testify before legislatures quite often.

Richard Scotch moved to approve the amended minutes. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

4. **Speaker’s Report – Tim Redman**

1. Speaker Redman had recently read about the recipients of the Success in Mentoring honor. He was concerned that the qualifications for the award were not addressed. It was Dr. Redman’s hope that the arts would not be excluded from these honors.

2. Speaker Redman presented an information item. Staff Council was informed that Kent Mecklenburg had left the University. Staff Council appointed Melissa Whiter to replace him in his staff committee appointment. A formal appointment letter will be sent to Melissa Whiter following the meeting.

3. All other items are on the agenda.

5. **Presentation: Time and Labor- Colleen Dutton**

Colleen Dutton gave a presentation to the Academic Senate on the Time and Labor position. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is in Appendix A. In January 2016, UTD implemented a new process for faculty to record the use of sick time that uses the time and labor and absence management modules of PeopleSoft. Faculty are required to record the use of sick time under Texas Labor Code Section 661.203 which reads as follows:

>A faculty member at an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, must submit prescribed leave forms for all sick leave the faculty member takes if the absence occurs during the normal workday for regular employees, even if no classes are missed.
UT Dallas had been inconsistent with this practice, thus the electronic format was implemented to make it easier for faculty to record and report absences. The same process had already been rolled out for all staff.

In addition to reporting use of sick time, UT Dallas is required to track hours worked so we may remain in compliance with the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Instead of requiring faculty to record the hours they worked each day, if they do not take any time off (i.e., sick time, bereavement, jury duty, etc.), then they only need to enter NTR (Nothing To Report) for the month, confirming that they worked their regular hours. ACA requires us to monitor and track hours worked to determine benefits eligibility under ACA. Using the absence management module, which is aligned with the FTE percentages listed in PeopleSoft, is the best way to meet all of our compliance regulations.

The most common concern expressed by the senate members was that the directions initially distributed to the faculty members on how to properly use the system were confusing, and not user friendly. Speaker Redman suggested that Human Resources review the handout that were distributed and using the feedback given, update the documents accordingly. After a lengthy discussion Speaker Redman suggested that senate members email their further concerns directly to Colleen Dutton.

6. **Presentation: One Card- Terry Pankratz and Debbie Reynolds**

Terry Pankratz, Vice President for Budget and Finance, noted that he had been invited to address the concerns that the faculty had regarding the new process and procedures for the One Card system. He opened the floor to questions and concerns. The initial concern was that the relevant website for users is not intuitive, and does not allow for incremental changes to be made after submission. Users found that if they made a change, they were locked out from making any more changes. Debbie Reynolds noted that Procurement is aware of the situation, but that the site is under a UT System contract and the university is not allowed to have its own version. There are two possible reasons for a lockout. First, an approver has approved the information before the user has completed their changes. Second, Procurement has pulled down the data. The data is pulled down on the 10th of every month.

Clarification was requested on the situation in which a user becomes busy and doesn’t complete their report before the deadline on the 10th day of the month. This means that the cost center is wrong, and the only way to fix that is to do an internal departmental transfer (IDT). This causes even more work for the departmental administrative assistants. Many faculty expressed their belief that the new system caused more paperwork, not less. Although the receipts are entered electronically, the user must print the report and get it approved on a paper copy, and the paper receipts must be retained for audit purposes. The user should be able simply to upload the receipts and be finished with the process.

Terry Pankratz assured the Senate members that he would look into the data being locked. He noted that there is a limited window in which one can make changes and that if the deadline is missed procurement must post that transaction as currently entered. The transaction cannot be corrected by that system any longer and requires an IDT. His team will try to assist and will remind everyone that the window is available to make changes. If a user has changes, he/she must make them during that timeframe, otherwise an IDT is required after the transaction is posted to the ledger. He further noted that each of the purchasing cards are hard coded to a default account, and expenditure
code. Both are acceptable, they may not be the correct grant, but they are acceptable account to pay on. If the deadline is missed, Budget will post the transaction to that default account.

Subsequent Senate discussion included comments that the system is not user friendly, that the directions distributed by procurement were not helpful, that the process was even more cumbersome than the previous system, and that it is not respectful of faculty time.

The process is set up so that there are two people reviewing each expense report (cardholder, reviewer, etc.) In order to maintain the integrity of the system, two people must verify expenses. Especially since there has been fraud on some of the cards, someone who has knowledge of the charges must review it, after which a ‘reviewer’ serves as a second pair of eyes to make sure the charges are correct. Jennifer Holmes noted that her concern is that she had to approve the charges 1) in the system, 2) on a paper copy, and 3) at reconciliation. Terry Pankratz noted that because the ‘approver’ approved it in the system, it doesn’t need a signed paper copy. Unfortunately the distributed directions said that approvers must both sign a paper copy as well as digitally approve in the system. Terry Pankratz took note and would be updating the directions to reflect the correct procedure.

Given all the difficulties that faculty has had with the system, Murray Leaf suggested that going forward that new systems, such as this one, be vetted by the Information Resources Planning Committee before being rolled out to the whole university. Terry Pankratz agreed that this would be a good suggestion going forward. Terry Pankratz noted that during the program development there had not been any actual user involvement, although administrative assistants were aware of changes. His team may have overlooked the fact that faculty must interact with the system as well. They did not spend enough time taking faculty’s interaction with the system.

A question was raised concerning why the university chose to move from the paper based system that was used previously to the more digital procedure used now. Terry Pankratz explained that under the old system transactions were downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet, and an employee would parcel those charges out by department and by cost center. This was a manual process done by one employee who had to parcel thousands of records each month. It took roughly a week, and the data were sent via campus mail or email to the card users. The card users reviewed the information. There were errors that had to be corrected and/or updated. The corrections were hand written on the document, which came back to procurement and then someone had to enter those corrections manually. The potential for errors was very high. Budget would get the MasterCard bill on the 4th of the month, and it would be posted to the general ledger on the 10th of the following month, i.e. 40 days later. Fiscal Officers would call budget saying they were trying to close contracts and asking why transactions were not posted. The response was that the bureaucratic process in place did not allow for them to be posted sooner. This new method reduces a 40 day process to 10 days. It much faster, and it is more accurate because fewer people touch it. The only people that touch it are the people who own it. When someone looks at it, and is approved, it is complete. Procurement doesn’t interface with it at all. This has streamlined the process on a macro level for the university.

It was noted by Jennifer Holmes that many faculty have chosen not to use OneCards, as they have found that the cards not to be helpful. Terry Pankratz noted that the card does not work for everyone, and that faculty are not obligated to use it. Debbie Reynolds offered to provide one-on-one help to those faculty who continued to have difficulties with the system. The Senators'
response was that the difficulties were not isolated, and that one-on-one training would be neither beneficial nor practical given the numbers. The process that Debbie Reynolds uses with her procurement staff is the following: 1) the user confirms that it is a good and valid expense, 2) a ‘reviewer’ who works for Debbie reviews it in the system, 3) when it is ready for Debbie to approve it, they take hard copy documents to her, 4) Debbie gives her formal approval. The reason she approves hard copies is that policies and procedures still require it, and internal audit expects to see her handwritten OK on the report itself. They intend to improve that workflow. However, they needed to improve the former process since grants have close-out dates. They have to get the information into the ledger more quickly to have accurate financial reports. They are continuing to work to make it an easier process, but because the university is tied to Master Card with the state contract, they have limited options.

Due to time constraints the discussion was brought to a close with the final comment by Tres Thompson that it was his belief that Budget was offloading accounting duties to the Administrative Assistants (AAs) in each school. He requested that Budget rethink their procedures and processes as AAs and the faculty themselves are not trained accountants, and it is possible errors would occur because of this situation.

7. UT Dallas’ SACSCOC Reaffirmation Project – Serenity King And Jessica Murphy
Serenity King informed the senate that three people had declined Reaffirmation Committee appointments. The Academic Council suggested the following replacements for the SACSCOC faculty committee. Randall Lehmann was replaced by Jill Duquaine-Watson. David Channell was replaced by Ali Hooshyar, and Erin Smith was replaced by Shiloh Warren. At this point, Serenity King turned the floor over to Jessica Murphy for the QEP update.

A document was circulated during the meeting. A copy can be found in Appendix B. The QEP committee received over 200 suggestions. The committee narrowed those suggestions into five different categories: First Year Experience, Communication Counts, Wellness, Curricular Globalization, and Digital Learning. Innovation and Integration. The QEP webpage now has a guide to help people prepare to submit proposals: http://qep.utdallas.edu/. If one clicks the “Submit your QEP Proposal” button, it will take them to the guide and a sample submission.

8. FAC/ TXCFS Report- Murray Leaf
The University of Texas System Faculty Advisory Council met at Ashbel Smith Hall on April 7-8, 2016. The UTD representatives were Murray J. Leaf and David Cordell.

Background: Before the meeting, Chancellor McRaven had expressed strong interest in supporting faculty governance. In response to that interest, the FAC had done two things. First, in 2015/2016, it surveyed the faculty governance leaders on the several campuses on the state of faculty governance of shared governments on their campus. In the survey, six of the campuses reported serious problems or little-to-no shared governance. Four institutions reported “moderately effective” or mixed results in their shared governance procedures. Only four of the fourteen reported having “very effective” shared governance structures and cultures of communication. Second, a sub-committee of the FAC has been working on a “white paper” on shared governance for the chancellor, to be accompanied by a very brief executive summary. Tony Cucolo, the chancellor’s liaison to the FAC, has been working closely with the group.
1. The first guest was Ernest Aliseda, newly appointed regent and chair of the Academic Affairs committee. He mainly asked questions and the FAC members tried to respond. His first question was how to measure success. The FAC response was to reject the use of four-year graduation rate and argue for a diverse range of indicators. He seemed responsive. The conversation shifted to what the regents could do to enhance faculty governance. Despite some initial disagreement within the FAC, consensus settled on the view that the Regents Rules are adequate in defining the areas of responsibility where faculty traditionally have the major voice in making policy. The basic list is in Regents Rules 40101. The Rules are also clear in saying that the responsibilities assigned to faculty should be understood as carried out by faculty governance organizations. This is most explicit in Regents Rules 20201:4.9.(b), which requires each campus president to ensure that all policies that come under Rule 40101 are reviewed by the elected governance body of the campus before they are submitted to the Regents for final approval for inclusion in the campus Handbook of Operating Procedures. The problem is that on most campuses, particularly health campuses, these provisions are not implemented. I also noted our objections to the Regents Rule on intellectual property. The FAC members responded in agreement but we did not go into it.

Dual credit was also discussed. It is a major concern for some member institutions.

2. The next guest was Chancellor McRaven. He reiterated his view of the importance of shared governance. There was some discussion about his “Quantum Leap” initiatives. We also wen: over the main points of the executive summary of the white paper although he had not yet seen it. As with Regent Aliseda, discussion emphasized that while the current Regents Rules are adequate, most campus administrations are not acting in accord with them. He had also asked for one or two points that he should focus on with each campus president. We agreed that these points would not be provided by the FAC as a whole but rather the FAC would solicit them from each campus faculty governance organization. We emphasized that the chancellor should meet with the leadership of the faculty governance organization on the several campuses. Just talking to the presidents is not enough.

3. The next conversation was with David Daniel, Deputy Chancellor, and Raymond Greenberg, Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs. It paralleled the discussions with the chancellor.

4. Next was Dr. Rebecca Karoff, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. She is new to the UT system and this was her first meeting with the FAC. Her major area of concern will be the Quantum Leaps. We also discussed dual credit.

5. The rest of the first day was devoted to committee meetings. David Cordell is co-Chair of Faculty Quality. I attended the meeting of the Governance Committee. The Governance Committee was charged with recommending final version of the Executive Summary mentioned in the background paragraph above. In response to confusion in the morning’s discussions, I added language noting Regents Rule 20201:4.9(b), and relating it to 40101. It was approved.

I also introduced UTD’s Sense of the Senate resolution on Title IX. It turned out that everyone present had been given the same interpretation on their respective campuses and had the same objections to it. So we agreed to circulate it to the full FAC for wider discussion. Andrea Gore, Chair of the UT Austin Faculty Council, was particularly adamant and supportive.
6. The next morning was devoted to more committee meetings followed by committee reports. Several resolutions were passed. These were:
- To approve the Executive Summary on Governance for the Chancellor.
- To circulate the draft white paper to constituent campuses for common comment before making the final revision.
- To include non-tenured clinical faculty on promotion and tenure review committees on health campuses. (This may have been withdrawn.)
- To circulate to the campuses the results of the UT Health Science Center, Houston faculty governance survey of faculty regarding the office of technology transfer and development of intellectual property.
- To seek advice and consent of FAC on executive actions not covered in Guidelines (bylaws):
  
  Be it resolved that any time that the Executive Committee establishes a practice not in the guidelines, or interprets the guidelines in a new way, they should advise the full Faculty Advisory Council and seek their consent by at least a majority vote.

7. The next period was for “urgent campus issues.” We discussed Title IX. Although I had circulated the UTD document the night before, apparently no one had read it carefully. So I briefly explained the situation. Andrea Gore elaborated for UT Austin. I called for a show of hands to indicate what other campuses were being given the same interpretation. Although three of the health campuses’ representatives did not seem to know what we were talking about, all of the academic campuses and one health campus (UTMB) said that they were being given the same interpretation as UT Dallas. It therefore seems evident that the source is the UT system legal office. The FAC therefore agreed to place it on the agenda for the next meeting and to ask Dan Sharp horn, head of the Office of General Counsel, to come to discuss it.

8. The final meeting was with Dr. Steve Leslie Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. He began by commending on the very successful search for a replacement for President Daniel at UTD. Dr. Benson seems well chosen to continue the progress. The overall focus was, again, support for shared governance paralleling the discussion with the Regent Aliseda, Chancellor McRaven, Dr. Daniel, and Dr. Greenberg.

9. The last item of business was election of new Chair-elect. Jonathan Chen, of UT Southwestern, was elected by acclamation.

9. Student Government Report – Caitlynn Fortner
Ms. Fortner noted that this would be the final meeting of her as the FY 16 Student Government President. On April 19, 2016 Student Government (SG) approved an allocation of funds to have the Comet Creed installed in specific buildings across campus. Student Government had a kickball tournament that went over well with students. At the last SG meeting Jessica Murphy presented the QEP update to the students. Caitlynn Fortner and Grant Branam will be presenting reports from their representative UT System Student Advisory Council committees to the Board of Regents. SG
passed a green initiative, however they are looking for recommendations. The deadline for recommendations is May 15, 2016. On April 23, 2016 SG will volunteer for Earth Day Texas. Before introducing her successor, Akshitha Padigela, Caitlynn expressed her thanks to Senate members for their support in the past year.

10. CEP Proposals- Clint Peinhardt

The Committee representative presented the following committee report.

A. Questions on New Course Form
CEP had been charged by the FY 16 Faculty Senate to help prevent course duplication. The suggested questions were designed to assist the Committee on Undergraduate Education/Graduate Council, Committee on Educational Policy, and the Faculty Senate on making decisions to prevent course duplication. The questions were the first response by CEP, but they can be fine-tuned in the future. The suggested questions are as follows:

1. How does this course fit in the curriculum? Major/Core/Elective (can select more than one)
2. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum? If so, which?
3. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course identification numbers below.

4. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in question 3 (target audience, content, learning outcomes etc.)?
5. Faculty contact person

Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the questions. The motion carried.

B. Revision Concerning Bachelor Degree Equivalencies for Graduate School Admission
The revisions lift the requirements that bachelor degree requirement must be a four year degree. The university has been admitting international students who have less than four years. Previously the international students were required to take an additional 24 credit hours. The university realizes that not all international degrees are equivalent and that some students will still need to complete preparatory work here, but faculty want the flexibility to determine which high-quality students should be admitted without the leveling work. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve. The motion carried.

C. First 40 for Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs
The major changes are to the admission requirements, application deadlines, and financial aid. The application deadlines were aligned to earlier timelines to be more competitive. Administrative updates were made to the tuition and financial aid portion. The student affairs section was updated to reflect the name change to 'judicial affairs'. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the amendments. The motion carried.
D. New Graduate Audiology Course
AUD7360 had been a special topics course during the summer for several years. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the course. The motion carried.

E. Non-Academic Withdrawal Process
Some students have abused the system by selectively withdrawing from some courses, but not all, based solely on their likely grades. The system is being amended so that when Non-Academic Withdrawal is requested the deans themselves will be included in the discussions. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the amendments. The motion carried.

F. Second Baccalaureate Degree
This change is recommended due to students who are going for a second bachelor’s degree that is actually a double major. The amendments now spell out the requirements for a second Baccalaureate. This is a clarification in the policy rather than a change in policy. It was noted that later the Graduate Council will address the issue of multiple master’s degrees. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the amendments. The motion carried.

11. Approval of Spring 2016 Graduates- David Cordell
David Cordell moved that:

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

David Cordell moved that:

These students have applied for graduate degrees and have been reviewed by the Graduate Dean. The Graduate Dean certifies that all of these students will be eligible for the degrees indicated upon satisfactory completion of the current semester’s work. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to receive the degrees as indicated upon receipt of final grades and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades received are consistent with the standards for credit prescribed by this University. Robert Ackerman seconded. The motion carried.
12. Amendments to UTDPP1003- Information Technology Resources Security Planning and Policy Committee
Previously the committee handled information security concerns, but that responsibility has been taken on by the Information Security Advisory Committee. Since Dr. Harpham took over the committee he has worked with the various stakeholders to make sure that it is mutually beneficial for all concerned. The committee charge referred to policies that no longer exists, and the amendments remove those references and update the membership. It was noted that the students were not represented on the committee. Murray Leaf moved to approve the amended committee charge with the amendment to add an undergraduate and a graduate student representative to the committee. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

13. Amendments to UTDPP1017- Campus Wellness Committee
The proposed amendments came directly from the committee itself. The committee has been working all year to consider updates to the charge. The committee’s aim is now focused on Faculty and Staff versus students, who have their own committee. The money the committee uses for their programs comes from the tobacco fine that faculty/staff pay to smoke. The committee wanted to 1) clarify what it does, 2) remove student membership, 3) tailor the charge to comport with they are doing now, and 4) describe what they want to do in the future. The Campus Wellness Committee moved to approve the amendments to the committee charge. The motion carried.

14. Amendments to UTDPP1088- Faculty Governance
UTDPP1088 currently states the following: “The President of the University convenes the university community, faculty, and staff, for a ‘State of the University Report’ each year in October.” The recommendation is to change the wording to the following: “The President of the University convenes the university community, faculty, and staff, for a ‘State of the University Report’ each year, usually in October.” Speaker Redman suggested that the FY17 State of the University Address take place on the 5th Wednesday of the month of November. Murray Leaf moved to approve the amendments. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

Murray Leaf proposed the following additional amendments.

- Section III.B.2:
  - Current: “The Speaker of the Faculty, and the Secretary of the Faculty are ex officio voting members of the Academic Council.”
  - Proposed: “The Speaker of the Faculty, Vice-Speaker(s) and the Secretary of the Faculty are ex officio voting members of the Academic Council.”

- Section IV.B.4.1:
  - Current: “As soon as possible after June 1, the Speaker of the Faculty shall convene the Academic Council to appoint the Committee on Committees.”
  - Proposed: “As soon as possible starting on or after June 1, the Speaker of the Faculty shall convene the Academic Council to appoint the Committee on Committees.”

Joe Izen moved to approve the additional amendments made on the floor. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

Speaker Redman raised a question on a possible amendment to Section V. The current policy states the following:
Faculties of the schools and departments shall determine their own voting memberships but may not exclude any voting member of the General Faculty administratively assigned to that school or department and teaching courses, for which it is responsible.

There is one school that has a non-tenure system faculty member who has a 100% administrative role. According to Speaker Redman's reading of the policy, "... and teaching courses" means that that person is precluded from being a member of the voting faculty. A further question was raised about someone who is teaching but also has an administrative load. Reading "courses" as a plural, he inferred that that would be 50% teaching load / 50% administrative load. That would then make the person eligible for the school's voting faculty. Murray Leaf noted that the intention of the senate was always to defer to the schools in matters based on local judgment. Vice Speaker Leaf noted that he did not think that the Senate should specify that level of detail. He felt that a decision regarding someone with 100% administrative load should be left up to the school. Speaker Redman responded that it was against policy. Vice Speaker Leaf noted in the 50/50 situation that it should be up to the schools to handle the ambiguity. Vice Speaker Leaf stated that no amendment was required at this time.

15. New Business

Joe Izen raised a question concerning students who are taking an honors class, but need to move to a non-honors section. These course changes sometimes occur after withdrawal/drop deadline, and sometimes there is a difference between them in the number of credits. A new policy needs to be established so that so that the faculty is not required to go to the registrar every time it occurs. CEP Chair Clint Peinhardt noted his question, and would follow up with him on the concern. Any other concerns Dr. Izen indicated that he had other concerns that he would direct to the Academic Council for its next meeting.

16. Adjournment

There being no further business, David Cordell moved to adjourn. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 3:37 PM.

APPROVED: Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty
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Timesheet Entry Overview
Faculty Senate – April 20, 2016

Presented by Kosima Ketcham
Benefits Analyst, Office of Human Resources
972-883-5343
kosima.ketcham@utdallas.edu

Accessing Timesheets
Timesheets are accessed from the Galaxy Home page – My Menu – Time and Absence – Timesheet
**Entering NTR (Nothing To Report)**

On the timesheet, select “Calendar Period” in the View By dropdown box. Make sure the Date is the month you are reporting your time for. If not, use the "Previous Period or Next Period links to navigate to the correct month. Scroll to the last day of the month and enter 0.00 hours. Select NTR from the Time Reporting Code dropdown menu. At the bottom of the page, click “Submit.”

**Reporting a Full Day Absence**

On the timesheet, there is an absence event section. To add an absence, click the “Add Absence Event” button. Enter the start and end dates, the type of absence, in this case Sick. Click the Submit button at the bottom of the timesheet.
Reporting a Full Day Absence

Once you click "submit at the bottom of the Page, the event will show as "Needs Approval".

If you do not hit the "Submit" button, the timesheet will show "Saved" and the absence will not be processed until submitted and approved.

---

Reporting a Partial Day Absence

On the timesheet, there is an absence event section. To add an absence, click the "Add Absence Event" button. Enter the dates, the type of absence. If less than a full day, click the "Details" button to take you to the next screen.
Reporting a Partial Day Absence

On this screen, in the Partial Days indicator, select from the dropdown box, enter the "All Days Hours" for the duration of the absence, and click OK. This will return you to the main timesheet page.

Reporting a Partial Day Absence

Once you click "submit at the bottom of the Page, the event will show as "Needs Approval". If you do not hit the "Submit" button, the timesheet will show "Saved" and the absence will not be processed until submitted and approved.
On the timesheet, select "Calendar Period" in the View By dropdown box. Make sure the Date is the month your reporting your time for. If not, use the "Previous Period" or "Next Period" links to navigate to the correct month. Enter the number of hours on the corresponding day. Select the proper Time Reporting Code from the dropdown menu.

At the bottom of the page, click "Submit."

Q & A

Thank You
Now Accepting Detailed QEP Ideas at qep.utdallas.edu

Form for QEP Idea Submission

Interested in improving student learning or the environment that supports student learning at UT Dallas? Please submit your detailed idea using the form below.

**Information collection** [name, role, email address]

**Topic:** [Choose One] *First-Year Experience* (Proposals under this topic may include programs to improve retention and success during and after students’ first year at UT Dallas.), *Communication Counts* (Proposals under this topic should address ways to improve students’ interpersonal skills and written and oral communication.), *Wellness* (Proposals under this topic may include programs to support the health of students’ minds, bodies, and social contributions with the goal of improving academic performance and overall lifelong health.), *Curricular Globalization* (Proposals for this topic should consider ways to enhance cross-cultural exchange and learning opportunities.), *Digital Learning: Innovation and Integration* (Proposals for this topic may include ideas for improving student learning through digital learning programs and initiatives.), and *Other.*

**UT Dallas Mission Statement**

The University of Texas at Dallas provides the State of Texas and the nation with excellent, innovative education and research. The University is committed to graduating well-rounded citizens whose education has prepared them for rewarding lives and productive careers in a constantly changing world; to continually improving educational and research programs in the arts and sciences, engineering, and management; and to assisting the commercialization of intellectual capital generated by students, staff, and faculty.¹

**SACSCOC Principles Associated with the Quality Enhancement Plan**

**Core Requirement 2.12**

“The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. (Quality Enhancement Plan)”²


Comprehensive Standard 3.3.2

"The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. (Quality Enhancement Plan)\(^3\)

Summary of Your QEP Idea (no more than 1,000 characters) Please give a clear and concise description of a significant issue directly related to student learning or the environment that supports student learning and clear and concise suggested solution as a starting point for discussions about a Quality Enhancement Plan.

[Open text box here with a 1000 character limit]

References: In support of your idea, please include a list of references. (Refer to the UT Dallas Library’s excellent collection of databases if you have not already: http://www.utdallas.edu/library/index.html.)

Please answer as many of the following questions as possible (your answers can range from a paragraph to a couple of pages for each question):

- What classes, programs, etc., would UT Dallas need to put in place for this QEP? What resources (personnel, financial, physical, academic, etc.) might be necessary for the successful implementation of the QEP? [open text box]
- What are the intended benefits of the QEP to the institution and to its students? [open text box]
- How does the QEP support the mission of the institution? (see Mission Statement above) [open text box]
- What would be the timeline for implementation of the QEP? A QEP should be designed to make an intervention over the course of five years. Please note some of the key milestones over the course of the five-year plan. [open text box]
- An ideal QEP will become part of the campus culture. Does your idea include some sense of a transition strategy for continued success? [open text box]
- What goals would be associated with this QEP and how might the institution go about assessing those goals? [open text box]
- How might we evaluate the success of the QEP? (please be as specific as possible) [open text box]