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
October 17, 2018


Absent: Mohammad Akbar, Judd Bradbury, Monica Brussolo, Jonas Bunte, Pankaj Choudhary, Nadine Connell, Andrea Fumagalli, Lev Gelb, Paul Lester, Meenakshi Maitra, BPS Murthy, Mehrdad Nourani, Nicole Piquero, Shalini Prasad,

Visitors: Melinda Colby, Naomi Emmet, Frank Fagan, Gene Fitch, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Michelle Lockhart, Jennifer McDowell, Jessica Murphy, Terry Penkratz, Clint Peinhadi, Alex Piquero, Scott Simpson, Amanda Smith, J D Thomas, Connor Wakeman,

1. Call to Order for the Academic Senate Meeting and Announcements- President Benson
President Benson called the meeting to order at 1:01 PM. President Benson had few announcements as the State of the University Address is on October 22, 2018. The University is working on doing a one-time bonus for staff and faculty. Going forward, President Benson wants to include the actions of 2018 and 2019 taken into account when the next merit increase period. The floor was opened to questions.
An update was requested on the Dean searches. It was noted that Provost Musselman was working on them. Currently there are four good BBS candidates. The ECS search was re-launched. The Dean of Graduate studies position has been narrowed down to two candidates. An answer on that position should occur soon.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Richard Scotch moved to move item 8 to item 4, and thus making the FAC report item 5, and to approve the agenda as amended. Murray Leif seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. Approval of the Minutes
Murray Leif moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Richard Scotch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

4. Speaker’s Report – Ravi Prakash
- Traditionally the Academic Senate has had a Student Government report during their meetings. Student Government is often aligned with undergraduate interests, and not graduate student
issues. Former Graduate Dean Underwood created a Graduate Student Association (GSA). SG president Eric Chen has agreed to help Allison Stiller, the President of GSA, in the early stages of the Association's growth. The GSA was invited to address the Senate in November.

- Now that the new Chancellor is in place the issue of Methane Gas on UT System lands should move forward.
- The search for the new Chief Compliance Officer is currently ongoing. Speaker Prakash, Secretary Bill Hefley, and Vice Speaker Murray Leaf are participating in the search. The first candidate will be on campus October 30th, 2018.
- All other items are on the agenda.

5. **CEP Recommendations – Clint Peinhardt**
   A. **Undergraduate Course Inventory**
      Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the updated undergraduate courses. The motion carried.
   B. **Graduate Course Inventory**
      Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the updated Graduate Courses. The motion carried.
   C. **NSM DDPA Proposals in Biology and Chemistry**
      Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the DDPA in Biology. The motion carried. Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the DDPA in Chemistry. The motion carried.
   D. **MS in Leadership and Org. Development**
      Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve updated catalog language. The motion carried.
   E. **Exec Ed Organizational Behavior and Coaching**
      Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the updated catalog language. The motion carried.
   F. **ECS Undergraduate Certificates**
      Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the updated catalog language. The motion carried.
   G. **Fast Track Policy Change**
      Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the updated Fast Track Policy. The motion carried.

6. **Faculty Workload Policy - Inga Musselman**
   Provost Musselman advised the Senate of the development of a new Faculty Workload policy for UT Dallas. In spring 2016, UT System established a Faculty Workload Taskforce, and invited members of the academic campuses to be involved in a discussion on the current Regents Rule at that time, 31069. From UT Dallas Provost Musselman and Professor Stephen Spiro were our representatives. The taskforce worked for over a period of a year and half looking very carefully over the Regent’s Rule, which had been affect for 40 years. It was developed out of the Texas Education Code regulations for higher education. At the time it was created, UT System Regents interpreted the Texas Education Code as the UT System Regents were the responsible for creating the Faculty Workload Policy. The policy was very detailed and restrictive. It was a one-size-fits-all policy that was required to be implemented on each campus no matter what the institution's mission was.
The Faculty Workload Taskforce evaluated the policy and the Texas Education code and determined that it has been over interpreted at the time the original Faculty Workload policy was created. The taskforce made a recommendation to the Board of Regents to revise the Regent’s Rule on Faculty Workload so that it was delegated to the individual campuses themselves.

The new Regent’s Rule, which was included in the agenda packet, was approved in November of 2017. In the rule there were key aspects of the rule that will inform what will be done on our campus. “Institutions of Higher Education supported by public funds have the responsibility to fully utilize their faculty resources in ways that achieve its greatest possible educational benefit.” The new Regent’s Rule states, “Through shared governance each academic institution shall establish a Faculty Workload Policy”, furthermore in 3.2, “That policy shall set forth equitable and fair guidelines that permit each department head under the supervision of the dean to best employ departmental faculty to 1) Foster student success  2) to advance the department’s mission.”

The university has been asked to create our own Faculty Workload policy. This policy is to be implemented by fall 2019. In spring 2018, a UTD 3+3+3+3 committee was created to draft our local Faculty Workload policy. There were three deans, three academic administrators who were not deans, three tenured or tenure-track faculty, and three non-tenure system faculty. Of the members, three were Academic Senate members. The committee in August and September of 2018 on five of the six Fridays to develop a Faculty Workload framework that will inform the creation of school level workload policies. The schools are to have a preliminary draft to the office of the Provost by the first week of December. Once the school policies are created, the school would be free to create program/ departmental policies. Provost Musselman opened the floor to questions. After a lengthy discussion, the policy was brought forward from the UTD Faculty Workload 3+3+3+3 Committee for a vote of approval. Further discussion proceeded on the motion, in order to clarify exactly what Senate approval meant. The approval sought applied specifically to the document titled “The University of Texas at Dallas Draft framework in response to changes to Regents’ Rule 31006 Faculty Workload and Reporting Requirements.” This is what will go to the HOP committee for approval for transmittal to the Regents. The other documents are guidelines for the schools to follow on campus, subject to the understanding that the process should be “bottom up” from the faculty and not “top down” dictated by the administration. The motion was approved.

7. SACSCOC/ The Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) Updates – Serenity King

Ms. King introduced the new ORBIT/ QEP director, Dr. JD Thomas. A handout was distributed to the senators. The handout is in appendix A. The THECB posted their agenda on October 17, 2018 for their October 25 meeting. There were two reports that Ms. King advised the senators to review carefully as they relate to issues the university is having with Field of Study (FoS). The studies have lists of recommendations, including to have institutions report their FOS use, and to create rules for collective actions against institutions who do not follow FOS. These recommendations will drive the discussions during the legislative session. Typically best practice reports are sent to institutions for public comment, but the THECB did not do that and placed them into the agenda without comments. Ms. King has been on the phone with UT System, and UT Austin faculty to decide if they want to create a team to do a public testimony at the board meeting. They wish to include testimony from a transfer student who will be seriously affected by the missing lower division courses, such as a pre-med transfer student who completes the Biology FOS.

UT Dallas objected to the Psychology FoS, but our objection was not discussed. The university has since objected to the Biology, Economics, Mathematics and Computer Science FoS. Our CS
representative went to the meeting, and agreed with 27 of the 31 hours that they are proposing. They were unable to include linear algebra in the FoS. There is also a computer language course that is also objectionable.

The response from the THECB to SACSCOC was due back on October 15, 2018. Ms. King has reached out to the THECB to ask them to share that response. They have not responded as of the time of the meeting. It would be helpful to know how the THECB responded to SACSCOC before considering public testimony. UT Austin has passed their resolution from their Academic Governance on Field of Study. It has been submitted to SACSCOC. Ms. King recommended that the Senate also submit our resolution to SACSCOC.

8. FAC Report – Murray Leaf
The UT System Faculty Advisory Council met in Austin October 4 and 5, 2018. UT Dallas was represented by Murray Leaf and Ravi Prakash.

As usual, the program extended over two days. The first day began with new member orientation led by Dan Cavanaugh, the current chair. He described the general procedure and organization of the FAC and stressed that while in the past the relationship between the FAC and the administration has been adversarial, it is now cooperative.

The first speaker was General Murray of the Army Futures Command. The Command occupies part of the UT system administration building and represents a partnership between the Army and universities in general. The focus, as Gen. Murray described it, is mainly on recognizing and developing technologies and materials relevant to winning future wars. This can be a source of research funding.

The next speaker was Trey Atchley, III, Chief Inquiry Officer, UT System. The stated topic was protection of intellectual property. His focus was a directive from somewhere in the federal government, possibly the recent NIH “Dear Colleagues” letter, expressing concern about researchers transferring valuable ideas to foreign organizations including possibly hostile governments. His general conclusion was that universities should become more alert to policing this possibility.

This was followed by Jonathan Cheng, reviewing what the FAC has been doing to address the problem of burnout among physicians on the health campuses.

Steve Leslie, executive Vice Chancellor for academic affairs, joined the group for lunch and affirmed the importance of faculty and the Faculty Advisory Council.

The rest of the day was taken up by campus reports and committee meetings. Campuses generally reported budgetary restrictions and lack of raises for faculty. Otherwise, problems seemed fairly campus-specific.

Speaker Prakash and Vice Speaker Leaf attended the governance committee meeting. Following instructions given by Prof. Cavanaugh, the committee focused on developing a statement on parental leave. In the course of discussion they realized that they had done the same thing last year.
The next day began with more campus reports. This was followed by a discussion by Helen Mohrmann, Chief Information Security officer, on the nominal topic of protection of research data and two factor identification. Everything she recommended is what we are doing at UTD. Perhaps other campuses are not.

Tony Cucolo, Associate Vice Chancellor for Leadership Development and Veterans Affairs, described programs he could give on campuses for leadership development. These would mostly be of interest on the health campuses. They also mostly concerned administrative leadership rather than faculty or scholarly leadership. But he did have a thoughtful slide listing about twenty contrasting points of difference between professional and bureaucratic ways of doing things.

Finally, Kevin Lemoine, Associate Vice Chancellor for academic affairs, joined the discussion by telephone to review what has been done by UT system and cooperating campuses on responding to the Coordinating Board effort to impose the other study curricula uniformly statewide. Everybody on the UT side seems to be in firm mutual agreement.

The FAC approved no resolutions while in session, although it will consider the statement on fields of study by email and have an email ballot.

9. Student Government Report-
No Student Government Representative in attendance.

10. Staff Council Report- Naomi Emmet
The UT System Employee Advisory Council (EAC) will be meeting October 28-30th, 2018. Ms. Emmet and Paula Stone will attend as UT Dallas representatives. A report from the meeting will occur at the November Senate meeting. Ms. Emmet will be speaking as part of State of the University Address as the staff representative. She encouraged staff to attend. The Regents Outstanding Employee Award was given in 2017, but it is currently on hold due to financial reasons. The Staff Council website will be updated to reflect that no nominations will be taken at this time. Coffee with the President will be October 25, 2018. There was a waiting list for this staff even:. The deadline for nominations for Care Awards is October 31st. Ms. Emmet will also be sitting on the search committee for the Chief compliance officer. Other staff representatives will be included once she consults with the Staff Council. The artwork issue that came up at Staff Council in September has been resolved. The roll call vote, and the proposal was not accepted. Any artwork that comes into the institution at a certain level it goes to the Dean, and it is at their discretion to be displayed in their school. Therefore if the artwork is offensive to the staff JSOM, will be staying in JSOM. The Staff Council did not wish to be censor of artwork on campus. What is seen as artwork by one group could be different to another; therefore it is not their role as Staff Council.

11. New Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee and Policy – Connor Wakeman
UT System board of Regents implemented a policy that requires that each campus have an institutional conflict of interest policy and committee to review issues. Murray Leaf moved to approve the new policy and committee charge. Bill Hefley seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

12. FY 18 Annual Committee Reports – Bill Hefley
Bill Hefley moved to approve the reports. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried unanimously.
13. Resolution on Field of Study—Murray Leaf

Murray Leaf moved to endorse the resolution:

"The fields of study requirements promulgated by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) threatens the authority and responsibility of higher education faculty to design curriculum.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges are, respectively, the leading associations of higher education faculty, higher education upper administrators, and higher education governing boards. Their joint statement on governance lays out the basic and necessary division of responsibilities and authority among and between their respective constituencies: faculty, administrations, and governing boards. The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved. (AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, Section 5)

This authority flows from the fact that the faculty teach their institution's courses. Courses should represent the state of knowledge in their respective disciplines, and they vary according to the type of institution, place of the specific course in the curriculum, student preparation, the program, and the faculty.

The Coordinating Board action jeopardizes the accreditation of public higher education institutions in Texas by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). There are good reasons for SACS to question THECB on fields of study. THECB is not a faculty body. Nor is it an educational institution. It is not authorized by an accrediting agency to offer a curriculum and it lacks the competence to be so authorized. Having institutions of higher education to send faculty to sit on committees to approve the fields of study does not provide them this competence. State control of curriculum is fundamentally inconsistent with American ideals of intellectual freedom and higher education law.

Accredited degrees are subject to review. Accreditation is evidence that scholars from comparable institutions recognize degrees as meeting national standards. The accreditation process, organized through regional accrediting commissions, is recognized by federal law as a requirement for all federal funding and by Texas law as a requirement for certain state funding.

We support coordination of requirements between Texas four-year institutions and community colleges; we support coordination of requirements among four-year schools as well. But such coordination must be done by local agreements between institutions offering four-year programs and the community colleges. It cannot be done in a way that erodes the ability and authority of faculty in four-year institutions to design the curriculum that best benefits their students. Educational excellence is best advanced by providing many pathways from many starting points, without reducing standards for the sake of uniformity."

Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

14. Resolution by UT System Faculty Advisory Council on Freedom of Speech—Murray Leaf

Murray Leaf moved to endorse the resolution included in Appendix B. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

15. Committee Replacements from Committee on Committees—Ravi Prakash

The Committee on Committees moved to approve the recommendations. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried unanimously.
16. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Richard Scotch moved to adjourn. Bill Hefley seconded. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 2:47 PM.

APPROVED: [Signature]

Ravi Prakash  
Speaker of the Faculty

DATE: 1/15/2019
THECB Updates 10/17/2018

THECB agenda and accompanying reports and presentations for Oct 25 meeting:

Two Items of Particular Interest

1. Agenda item X-L “Texas General Academic institutions: Increasing Successful Community College Transfer”
   http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/reports/PDF/11628.PDF?CFID=87119492&CFTOKEN=54987741

   Recommendations

   Priority
   • [Texas public General Academic Institutions] GAI resources should continue to increase their presence on community college campuses. Community colleges need to provide space, and academic counselors need to insist that students seek out information from university representatives on their campus.

   • Community colleges should move students toward an early connection with universities.

   • GAIIs need to be heavily involved in student academic and financial advising at the community colleges. Degree guides must be easily available on institutional websites to students as they plan their own academic and financial path toward transfer.

   • GAIIs should increase targeted financial aid to community college transfer students to ease the financial fears and restraints for students transitioning to a university.

   Efficiency
   • Texas public universities must be more diligent in aligning their courses with those in the Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual (ACGM) and in using the Texas Common Course Numbering System (TCCNS) because they provide the universal language to communicate lower-division program requirements and course information. This information should be easily available on institutional websites.

   • GAI faculty and administrators need to actively use the Texas Core Curriculum (TCC), the ACGM Learning Outcomes Project, and Field of Study Curriculum (FOSC) to improve transfer. When a new FOSC is approved by the THECB, the information should be published on institutional websites.

   • The development of multiple articulation agreements that often compete or conflict with these statewide initiatives should be discouraged.

   • Public universities and community colleges must work with software vendors to expedite solutions to transcripting and degree-auditing issues to ensure correct application of the TCC and FOSC courses toward degree requirements.
Leadership

- GAI faculty and administrators need to be proactive instead of reactive to the statewide initiative of FOSC. Universities should provide the leadership in the efforts to align curricula for specific degree programs or groups of similar programs. Without this leadership, the void may be filled by community college faculty with less vested interest in the quality of the bachelor's degree programs and a greater interest in expanding the number of courses taught at the lower division. FOSC discussion should clarify the distinction between lower-division and upper-division courses and provide an appropriate and balanced alignment.

- Professional development must be used to increase faculty and administrator awareness of the significance of statewide initiatives, such as the TCC, the ACGM Learning Outcomes Project, and FOSC, to align courses and curriculum.

THECB Recommendations to the 86th Texas Legislature

- Restructure the core curriculum to help ensure students take courses that count toward their degrees. The more standardized the core is across institutions the easier it is to ensure the courses will apply to majors.

- Require institutions of higher education to embed information about FOSC courses in degree programs posted on their websites and verify use of FOSC.

- Support an interactive online degree site that allows students to input their majors and receive a list of the required courses needed to complete a specific degree in four years.

- Require institutions to provide program course requirements to THECB, including indicators of which courses satisfy the core curriculum and field of study curriculum.

- Study the feasibility of a transfer admissions guarantee and make recommendations to the Legislature about student and institutional criteria for such a system.

- Require all types of dual credit students to file a degree plan at 30 semester credit hours. All other students are already required to file a degree plan. Require institutions document compliance.

2. Agenda item X-M “Study on Best Practices in Credit Transfer”


Recommendations

Dual Credit

Applicants to community colleges, including dual credit students who plan to transfer or attend a four-year institution as a first-time-in-college student for a bachelor's degree, should indicate that intent on ApplyTexas (statewide online application to college) and designate their destination institution for a bachelor's degree. Notification of intent should be sent to the four-
year institution to initiate contact with the interested student at the earliest opportunity to provide advising.

Data suggests that the more dual credit semester credit hours students accumulate, the more excess hours the student will accumulate. Therefore, high school students should not be allowed to enroll in Core Curriculum courses for which they have already received Core credit, even if the course will satisfy other high school requirements. For example, if the student has already received credit for a core curriculum course by completing a literature course, then a second literature course is unlikely to apply to a degree unless the student plans to major in English.

THECB Recommendation to the 86th Texas Legislature:
• Require all types of dual credit students to file a degree plan at 30 semester credit hours. All other students are already required to file a degree plan. Require institutions document compliance.

Core Curriculum and Field of Study

The Texas Core Curriculum was originally conceived as a transfer mechanism. While Core courses transfer and apply to the Core at any public institution of higher education (IHE) in Texas, Core courses do not always apply to satisfy specific degree program requirements. The Core has been, and still is, conceived of as the "basics," i.e., skills and knowledge that every student should know upon completion of a degree at a public IHE in Texas. It should be made explicit in statute that the Core should reflect that premise. Further, it should be made clear in statute that the phrase "consistent with a common course numbering system" means the courses are either in the THECB's Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual (ACGM) (academic inventory of courses funded at two-year institutions) and active in the Texas Common Course Numbering System (TCCNS), or there is an equivalent to that course in the ACGM/TCCNS at the institution.

A Field of Study (FOS) Curriculum encompasses all lower-division courses that are necessary for a student to be successful at the upper-division level in the applicable discipline. If a student is not academically prepared to take the minimum requirements of the FOS, it should be understood that the student may need courses outside of the FOS to prepare. For example, if calculus is the minimum requirement for the degree major, students who come to higher education underprepared for the degree program may need to take the prerequisite courses of college algebra, trigonometry, and/or pre-calculus; however, college algebra, trigonometry, and pre-calculus are not part of the FOS, and institutions are not required to apply these preparatory courses to the degree.

Texas public higher education institutions should adjust their own curricula to align to the FOS. With the increasing importance and expansion of community colleges, the traditional view of uniqueness and exclusivity of bachelor's degree programs is counterproductive to promoting student and credit transfer. This includes the alignment of and clarification of the distinction between lower division and upper division courses resulting in the absence of course taught at one level by some institutions and at another level by others.

THECB Recommendation to the 86th Texas Legislature:
Restructure the Core Curriculum to help ensure students take courses that count toward their degrees. The more standardized the core is across institutions, the easier it is to ensure the courses will apply to majors.

Compliance to Core Curriculum and Field of Study

The THECB should be given authority and resources to audit compliance with the statutes pertaining to the Texas Core Curriculum and FOS Curricula, including the development and adoption of rules for corrective action.

The THECB should be given the resources and authority to require and provide professional development to administrators, faculty, and advisors at institutions to increase their awareness of the significance of statewide initiatives to align courses and curriculum and their responsibility in compliance.

Institutions offering a bachelor’s degree program in a FOS curriculum discipline should designate their course equivalents to the FOS courses and post this information online in the catalog and on departmental pages of their websites.

Institutions offering a bachelor’s degree program should be required to inform transfer students about the application of core curriculum and FOS courses to the degree program prior to initial student enrollment.

THECB Recommendations to the 86th Texas Legislature:
- Require institutions of higher education to embed information about FOS courses in degree programs posted on their websites and verify use of FOS curriculum.
- Require institutions to provide program course requirements to the THECB, including indicators of which courses satisfy the Core Curriculum and Field of Study curriculum.

Articulation Agreements

Articulation agreements should be standardized and used to clarify the alignment of courses for FOS and to designate core curriculum courses needed as prerequisites, major support, or major courses for the FOS. University and community college faculty and administrators should conscientiously articulate courses based on content and semester credit hour values to align curricula and ensure that students do not accumulate excess credit hours.

Articulation agreements should be assessed by institutions for their effectiveness by tracking students after transfer into the articulated degree programs. Transfer student success in subsequent upper-division courses should be monitored to identify learning gaps in student preparation between the two-year and four-year institutions. Learning gaps should be addressed through collaboration between partner institutions’ faculty.

Articulation agreements that include nonstandard, unique-need courses should be discouraged since such courses have limited applicability to degree programs statewide.
The THECB will work with institutions to develop statewide guidelines and templates for articulation agreements. Articulation agreements that promote and encourage successful student transfer put the student first and include the following essential components:

- Course by course equivalency in specific degree programs
- Common syllabi for specific courses required by the degree programs
- Designation of program specific core curriculum courses
- Provisions to track transfer students progress in degree program after transfer
- Alignment with ACGM and TCCNS
- Consistent with Field of Study (FOS) curriculum for programs where an FOS exists

THECB Recommendation to the 86th Texas Legislature:
- Support an interactive online degree site that allows students to input their majors and receive a list of the required courses needed to complete a specific degree in four years.
On Freedom of Speech

Freedom of Thought and Expression as Essential to any Institution of Higher Learning

Faculty Advisory Council
The University of Texas System
May 29, 2018

From UT System Regents’ Rule 40501: Speech and Assembly

The freedoms of speech and assembly are basic and essential to intellectual development. However, these activities are subject to the well-established right of colleges and universities to regulate time, place, and manner so that the activities do not intrude upon or interfere with the academic programs and administrative processes of The University of Texas System or any of the institutions. Each institution may designate one or more appropriate areas on the campus where students, faculty, and staff may engage in rallies, group demonstrations, or public oratory without prior administrative approval. All rallies, group demonstrations, and public oratory must be conducted in accordance with the provisions of this Rule and the reasonable and nondiscriminatory rules and regulations of the institution.

The primary two purposes of colleges and universities are 1) to pursue the truth, and in service of such pursuit to produce, interpret, understand, defend, and disseminate knowledge; and 2) to instruct our students, the future generations of Texans, Americans, and world citizens, in that knowledge and to train them in how to produce, interpret, understand, defend, and disseminate knowledge. These two purposes can be fulfilled only if colleges and universities commit to a robust defense of the freedom of speech.

Accordingly, the Faculty Advisory Council, as the elected representative body for the 20,000+ faculty of UT System, here emphasizes our commitment to free speech as stated in Regents’ Rule 40501. We support the ideals of discovery, dissent, and debate (the “3D’s”), as elaborated by Chancellor McRaven, to guide our campuses and their communities in considering issues of free speech:

- Discovery – Discovery encompasses the two primary purposes of our institutions, 1) the pursuit of knowledge and truth, and 2) the education of our students in such pursuits: The System and its institutions should place no content restrictions on discovery, and therefore faculty and students should be free to pursue whatever questions and issues they find worthy.

- Dissent - Challenge and skepticism are necessary trials through which knowledge and truth are tested and refined: The System and its institutions should allow for and encourage dissenting viewpoints.
Civil and respectful discourse is considered to be an ideal mode of dissent, and foundational to academic life. However, we acknowledge that past events have warranted the use of emphatic and boisterous voices in the expression of dissent, and that these more active forms of dissent may be justifiable again in the future. We further acknowledge that freedom of speech must be made equally available to all members of our campuses, and that expression of dissent by one must not infringe upon the right of free speech of others.

- **Debate** - The System and its institutions should allow for and encourage robust and open debate between dissenting viewpoints on whatever issues UT System faculty and students choose to pursue. Investment of time and resources to serve students and faculty in cultivating reasoned conversations will yield returns on our campuses in the development of knowledge and the education of students, as such debate inherently requires participants to both listen to and understand the views of others, as well as articulate and defend their own views based on logic and evidence.

Our commitment to the two primary purposes of universities, to seek truth and educate students, also entails that the UT System and its institutions should foster discourse and reflection on positions regarding controversial societal issues. We should encourage students to reflect on their positions, and thereafter either to demonstrate support for or to perform amendment of those positions based on logic and evidence. When objective supporting evidence is unavailable, students and faculty should be encouraged to seek it and, in its absence, to exercise humility, tolerance, and understanding of divergent views.

In proposing these basic tenets, we reaffirm our support for freedom in the academic pursuits of faculty and for education of students in conscientious, responsible citizenship.

Precisely because of this commitment to the principles of free speech, however, the UT System and its institutions should reserve the right to restrict certain forms of expression based on established policy, statute, legal precedent, and the U.S. Constitution, including speech which: violates the law, defames an individual, amounts to a genuine threat to safety, constitutes harassment, substantially violates privacy or confidentiality, or proves incompatible with the function of the System and its institutions. We support Regents' Rule 40501, which states that the System and its institutions may regulate time, place, and manner of expression so that it does not "intrude upon or interfere with... academic programs and administrative processes," and should permit expression on our campuses by outside groups only if they have been invited and appropriate approval has been granted. These restrictions are narrow and should be interpreted and implemented in a way that is consistent with the general commitments to free speech delineated in this document. Such restrictions should also be employed and enforced fairly.
The Faculty Advisory Council hereby proposes an intellectual framework, based on the 3D’s of Discovery, Dissent, and Debate, for deliberations regarding free speech on UT System campuses. We assert that free speech is essential to the goals and purposes of our institutions of higher learning and serves humanity as a critical component in the attainment of knowledge and truth and in the preparation of students to be contributing members of society. On behalf of all UT System faculty, we reaffirm our commitment to free speech for the good of our System, its institutions, all of its members—especially our students, and for the good of our state and nation.