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AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
August 15, 2018

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  Richard Benson
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  Ravi Prakash
3. SPEAKER’S REPORT  Ravi Prakash
4. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates  Serenity King
5. TXCFS/FAC REPORT  Murray Leaf and Bill Hefley
6. Student Government Report  Eric Chen
7. Staff Council Report  Naomi Emmet
8. Presentation: Improvements to the Course Material Adoption Process  Carrie Chutes
9. Presentation: Consensual Relationships Training  Colleen Dutton
10. Approval of April 2018 Senate Caucus Minutes  Ravi Prakash
11. Results of Summer Voting  Ravi Prakash
   A. May 2018 Senate Minutes
   B. Graduate Degree Program Pages to be Updated in 2018-2019 Approval Vote
   C. Summer 2018 Graduates
   D. Approval of Committee on Committee Recommendations
12. Final Charge on Academic Records Retention Committee  Ravi Prakash
13. Informational: Revised Committee on Qualification of Academic Personnel Bylaws  Ravi Prakash
14. Approval of Schedule of Senate Meetings, Academic Year 2018-2019  Ravi Prakash
15. Adjournment  Richard Benson
The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to maintaining learning and work environments as free as possible from conflicts of interest and favoritism. The University recognizes that two consenting adults should be free to conduct a personal relationship if they so wish when the relationship does not interfere with the goals and policies of the University; some romantic, dating and/or sexual relationships, although consensual, do create conflicts of interests.

This policy addresses those consensual relationships.

- [http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3103](http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3103)
**Persons Affected**

- This policy applies to all University administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

- This policy is applicable regardless of the gender of the University employee with supervisory teaching, evaluation or advisory authority and/or the gender of the employee, student or student employee who is directly or indirectly supervised, taught, evaluated, or advised by the supervisory employee.

---

**Prohibited Consensual Relationships.** The following consensual relationships, even if a single event, are prohibited:

(a) A consensual relationship between a supervisor (as defined below and is defined as including faculty members) and supervisee regardless of whether the supervisory relationship is direct or indirect, unless the supervisor discloses the relationship in advance and a management plan is in effect;

(b) A consensual relationship between a coach or athletic staff and any student athlete or student assigned to or associated with the athletics department, such as interns and student employees, including any coach or student associated with an intellectual competition team, unless waived by the President or his or her designee for good cause. This prohibition does not apply to a student assistant coach who serves on a voluntary basis unless the student assistant coach has direct or indirect authority, including the appearance of such authority, over a student or student athlete assigned to or associated with the athletics department.

*If the prohibition is waived, a management plan must be completed.*
**Reporting Requirements**

(a) The supervisor must report a consensual relationship as described in 3.1. to the Dean/Vice President/Executive-level administrator and the Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO). The supervisor must make the report prior to entering into the relationship or if the relationship exists, with as much advance notice as possible prior to the supervisor accepting supervisory authority.

(b) The individuals receiving the report must immediately collaborate to attempt to manage the conflict of interest. If management of the conflict is not possible, the relationship is prohibited.

---

**A management plan will:**

1. provide an alternative means for the supervision, teaching, advising, evaluation of the supervisee or otherwise mitigate the conflict;

2. give priority to the interest of the subordinate individual;

3. be written;

4. be acknowledged and signed by the parties to the relationship; and

5. be maintained by the Office of Human Resources and reviewed by the CHRO on an annual or as needed basis.
Reporting Alleged Violations:

(a) Violations of this policy should be reported to:

Colleen Dutton, Chief Human Resources Officer:
phone: 972-883-2130
email: colleen.dutton@utdallas.edu

(b) An individual in a supervisory role over a supervisor who is notified of or becomes aware of an alleged violation of this policy must immediately report the information to the CHRO.

Investigation and Discipline

a) The matter will be investigated and if a policy violation occurred, the University may take disciplinary action, which may include termination. If there is a complaint of sexual harassment about a relationship covered by Sec. 3.1, above, and the relationship has not been disclosed and a management plan implemented, the burden shall be on the supervisor to explain the failure to comply with this policy and such failure will be a factor in determining whether the relationship was consensual and free of sexual harassment. Allegations of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct (and any associated retaliation) may also be subject to investigation in accordance with applicable University policy.

b) Disciplinary action will be handled under the University’s policies for discipline and dismissal of faculty or employees depending on the supervisor’s status.
Retaliation is Prohibited!

Retaliation of any kind against anyone for reporting a consensual relationship or for participating in any proceeding pursuant to this Policy is prohibited.

Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance https://www.utdallas.edu/oiec/equity/

Counseling Resources for Employees and Students

Employees: Confidential counseling services are available to employees through the Employee Assistance Program provided by UT Southwestern and may be reached by calling 800-386-9156 or 214-648-5330 or by email at eap@utsouthwestern.edu.

Students: Counseling services are available to students through the Student Counseling Center located in the Student Services Building, suite 4.600. The 24 hour phone line is 972-883-2575 and the website is http://www.utdallas.edu/counseling/.

Galerstein Gender Center located in the Student Services Building, suite 4.300. The phone line is 972-883-6555 and the website is http://www.utdallas.edu/gendercenter/.
Additional Resources and Policies:

- University of Texas System Systemwide Policy, UTS 184 Consensual Relationships
- University of Texas System Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 30105
- UTDBP3103 – Consensual Relationships [http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3103](http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3103)
- UTDBP 3090 - Nondiscrimination Policy [http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3090](http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3090)
- UTDBP3102 - Prohibited Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Sexual Harassment Policy [http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3102](http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3102)

For questions or additional information contact:

Colleen Dutton, SPHR, SHRM-SCP
Chief Human Resources Officer
AD 2.208
[colleen.dutton@utdallas.edu](mailto:colleen.dutton@utdallas.edu)
972-883-2130
Questions?

Thank You!
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 CAUCUS MEETING
April 18, 2018

Present: Mohammad Akbar, Lisa Bell, Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia, Andre Blanchard, Denise Boots, Patrick Brandt, Mathew Brown, Monica Brussolo, Jonas Bunte, Adam Chandler, R. Chandrasekaran, Nadine Connell, Vladimir, Dragovic, Andrea Fumagalli, Gopal Gupta, Michele Hanlon, Bill Hefley, Jennifer Holmes, Ali Hooshyar, Dung T. Huynhm, Joe Izen, Midori Kitagawa, Murray Leaf, Meenakshi Maitra, John Mccracken, Syam Menon, Mehrdad Nourani, Simeon Ntafos, Catherine Parsonenault, Nicole Piquero, Ravi Prakash, Suress Radhakrishnan, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Michael Rebello, Richard Scotch, Stephen Spiro,

Absent: Robert Ackerman, William Anderson, Gary Bolton, Judd Bradbury, Thomas Brikowski, Pankaj Choudhary, Galia Cohen, David Cordell, Chris Davis, Greg Dess, Eric Farrar, Todd Fechter, Lev Gelb, Julie Haworth, DoHyeeong Kim, Paul Lester, B.P.S. Murthi, Alexis Piquero, Christopher Ryan, Tres Thompson, Murat Torlak, Andrea Warner-Czyz, Tonja Wissinger, Alejandro Zentner

Visitors: Elizabeth Boyd

1. Call to Order, Introduction of Senate Members
Speaker Leaf called the meeting to order at 12:03 PM. The Senators-elect introduced themselves. Speaker Leaf noted that David Cordell is the Elected Secretary of the Senate and Christina McGowan is the Staff Secretary for the Senate.

2. Description of Agenda: Election and Setting Priorities
Speaker Leaf described the purpose of the meeting. It is to elect the Speaker, the Secretary, and the Academic Council, and to set the priorities for the 2018-2019 year.

3. Description of Officers duties, and Academic Council
Speaker Leaf gave a summary of Former Speaker Murray Leaf’s report from the April 2017 Caucus.

There are two dominant types of Faculty Senate models in the United States. The first is that the faculty is advisory. The Senate is advisory to the administration; the senate committees are advisory to the Senate and so forth. The other is the Shared Governance model. In the shared governance model, faculty and administration share responsibility for policy development. The Faculty Senate handles the academic side, while administration handles the administrative side—although each in consultation with the other. The UTD Senate is based on the idea of shared governance. The Senate itself is the policy making body for the faculty, subject to being overruled by the entire faculty if they hold a meeting. The committees of the Senate are executive committees. The Senate makes the policy, the committees interpret the policies of the senate for their respective concerned administrators. The administrators carry out the policies. We seem quite clearly to be widely recognized as the best example of shared governance in Texas, although at UT Austin there is also very substantial faculty autonomy and responsibility at the departmental level.

The ‘Speaker’ is not the chair of the Senate. The actual chair of the senate is the President of the University. In the absence of the president and provost, the speaker will chair the meeting, but otherwise, what you will generally see is that
the President chairs but the speaker or other faculty lead discussion on specific items. The Speaker is also the ex officio chair of the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees is appointed each year by the Academic Council. The Speaker is also an ex officio member on five other committees. The Speaker and Secretary are members of the UT system Faculty Advisory Council. The Speaker, Secretary, or designate are representatives of UTD in the Texas Council of Faculty Senates. The Senate has a Faculty Liaison with Student Government. The Speaker is responsible for the liaison. The Speaker serves on the Safety and Security Council and the Handbook of Operating Procedures Committee. Members of this committee cannot out-vote the Speaker on matters of academic policy. The Senate bylaws have been amended to add two new positions to the Senate, two Vice-Speakers to assist the Speaker in his duties. The Vice Speakers are appointed by the Speaker.

The Secretary is responsible for communication within the Senate organization. This includes responsibility for the minutes. The Secretary is the chair of the Senate Election committee. The Secretary supervises the corresponding staff secretary. Like the Speaker, the Secretary acts as the Faculty’s representative at the Faculty Advisory Council and the Texas Council of Faculty Senates.

The Academic Council is the Agenda Committee for the Senate; it is NOT an executive committee. The Council does not make decisions in place of the Senate. The Senate is the policy making body. The Council is representative of the Senate members. The members serve as back up for the Speakers and/or Secretary if needed at UT System Faculty Advisory Council or on some committees. They appoint the Committee on Committees. They will vote on some replacements for Committee appointments when Senate approval is not required.

4. Votes on Officers:
According to the Senate Bylaws, the Speaker and Secretary are elected separately from the Council members. Speaker Leaf called for nominations for Speaker of Faculty Senate. Ravi Prakash was nominated and accepted. Richard Scotch was nominated but declined. There were no other nominations. Nominations were closed. Richard moved to elect Ravi Prakash by acclamation. Ravi Prakash was elected by acclamation. Speaker Elect Prakash reappointed Murray Leaf and Richard Scotch as Vice Speakers.

Speaker Leaf called for nomination for Secretary of Faculty Senate. Bill Hefley was nominated, and accepted. Speaker Leaf requested further nominations. There were no other nominations. Nominations were closed. Richard Scotch moved to elect Bill Hefley by acclamation. Bill Hefley was elected by acclamation.

Speaker Leaf opened the floor to nominations for Academic Council. Tres Thompson was nominated as the BBS representative. Joe Izen was nominated as the representative for NSM. Jennifer Holmes was nominated as the representative for EPPS. Viswanath Ramakrishna was nominated as the representative for NSM. Dinesh Bhatia was nominated as the ECS representative. Syam Menon was nominated as the JSOM representative. Elizabeth Boyd was nominated as the ATEC representative. Andrew Blanchard was nominated as the representative for ECS. Lisa Bell was nominated as the ATEC representative. Matt Brown was nominated as the AH representative. Tonja Wissinger was nominated as the representative for JSOM.

Speaker Leaf requested further nominations. There were no other nominations. Nominations were closed. The caucus was instructed to vote for six members.

5. Priorities for 2018-19:
The agenda packet included a review of priorities that were set by Caucus in 2017. After discussion within the Caucus, additional items for 2018-19 include the following:
• Address student food insecurity on campus
• Continue the study of the child care/family issues on campus
• Increase the number of teaching assistance on campus via online application of graduate students
• Address concerns of overzealous auditing of compliance for research accounts. The issue was referred to research committee but nothing has done.
• Continue Addressing space and scheduling issues on campus
• Address fellowships, stipends, and salaries for teaching assistants.
• Continued study of Non-Tenure Track Faculty Salary Compression and Inversion
• Review placement of service contracts by researchers and departments.

6. Summer meeting Schedule:
The new Academic Council members were invited to the May 2, 2018 Council meeting. The new Council will begin at the June 6, 2018 at 1 PM meeting. Richard Scotch moved that there will not be a June or July Senate meeting, nor a July Council meeting. Nicki Piquero seconded. The regular meeting schedule will resume on August 1, 2018 at 1 PM.

7. Announcement of New Academic Council:
Andrew Blanchard (ECS), Tres Thompson (BBS), Joe Izen (NSM), Tonya Wissinger (ID), Dinesh Bhatia (ECS), Lisa Bell (ATEC), Matt Brown (AH), Jennifer Holmes (EPPS), and Syam Menon (JSOM) were elected to the 2018-2019 Academic Council. The order of the other votes will be kept in case a replacement is needed.

There being no further business, Speaker Leaf adjourned the meeting at 12:54 pm.

APPROVED: ___________________________ DATE: _____________
Murray Leaf
Speaker of the Faculty
Voting Results

May 2018 Academic Senate Minutes
• 25 yes
• 2 abstain
• 1 no

CEP Item- Graduate Degree Program Pages to be updated in 2018-2019 catalog
• 26 yes
• 1 abstain
• 1 no

Summer 2018 Graduates
• 30 yes
• 0 abstain
• 0 no

Committee on Committee recommendations
• 29 yes
• 0 no
• 0 abstain
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
May 16, 2018


Absent: William Anderson, Elizabeth Bell, Dinesh Bhatia, Vladimir Dragovic, Eric Farrar, Todd Fechter, Andrea Fumagalli, Julie Haworth, William Hefley, D.T. Huynh, Joe Izen, Dohyeong Kim, Blair Miller, BPS Murthi, Won Namgoong, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Murat Torlak, Alejandro Zentner

Visitors: Eric Chen, Naomi Emmet, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, John McCracken Jennifer McDowell, Terry Pankratz, Clint Peinhardt, Bill Pervin, Elizabeth Rugg, Beth Tolan, Marion Underwood,

1. Call to Order for the Academic Senate Meeting
   President Benson called the meeting to order at 1:01 PM. The University had 10 commencement ceremonies this spring. He noted that there were almost as many Masters Degrees as Undergraduate Degrees. The university is currently on track for a record amount of incoming freshmen for fall 2018; however, the master’s application pool is again down substantially. It is believed that this is due to fewer students from India and China applying due to the current political climate.

   President Benson commented on the passing of Margaret McDermott, a long time benefactor to the university. She was 106 years old. President Benson opened the floor to questions. There were none.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   Richard Scotch moved add a presentation on the recent cyber-attacks on campus to the agenda, and to approve the agenda with that amendment. Kurt Beron seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. Approval of the Minutes
   Richard Scotch moved to approve the circulated minutes. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried.
4. **Presentation- Update on Cyber-attacks on campus – Nate Howe**

   During spring 2018 there were some serious breach attempts. There has been a significant increase in phishing emails, some using compromised internal email addresses. One of the breach attempts was a student attempting to change their grade. That incident has since been turned over to the Dean of Students. The most significant attempted breach was on May 8, 2018 to the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM). An attack came from outside of the university where the attacker somehow got access to the credentials of a computer administrator in NSM. On May 8th 150 computers were compromised and outgoing traffic was blocked. The compromised computers used Linux OS. This incident required the activation of the University’s third-party forensics partner. The investigation is continuing. As of May 16th, there are 280 compromised computers. Until the investigation is completed business operations in NSM will be seriously affected. To make sure that the breach cannot spread any further, computers must be completely erased and programs must be reinstalled. This has caused issues as many of the computers had class grades that must be turned for the end of the semester. Mr. Howe has asked that the faculty be patient with his team as they try to recover from the incident. The Office of Information Security is working with an outside firm to create a rapid recovery team for the incident.

   Mr. Howe advised the faculty that going forward the university will be considering two-factor logins for web mail and PeopleSoft when accessed off campus. They will also be investigating segmenting more systems. Mr. Howe asked to give a follow up presentation at the August Academic Senate meeting. When asked what the faculty can do to help the situation, Mr. Howe again noted that patience with his team would be very helpful. They are working on the situation, but it cannot be fixed in one week.

5. **Speaker's Report – Murray Leaf**

   Nothing to report. All items are on the agenda.

6. **SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates – Serenity King**

   1. **Key Aspects of Orbit to Address Based on On-Site Reviewers’ Recommendations:**
      a. Focus and content of Orbit programming (institutional capacity)
      b. Orbit leadership and initiative management (institutional capacity)
      c. Professional development for Orbit affiliated faculty and staff (institutional capacity)
      d. Assessment of student belonging, engagement, and persistence (assessment)

   2. **Strategies to Address Key Aspects:**
      a. Examine student belonging, engagement, and persistence at UT Dallas
      b. Define belonging and engagement for UT Dallas
      c. Revisit target student populations
      d. Hire Orbit director
      e. Develop program-level strategies aimed at increasing belonging and engagement
      f. Establish teams that work on program content, professional development, and assessment

   3. **Conclusions:**
      a. Maintain “Orbit: Keeping New Comets on Course” as first-year student success initiative for all first-year students in each of the four populations (first-time in college, transfer, graduate, international)
      b. For QEP five-year impact report due to SACSCOC in conjunction with the university’s Fifth-Year Interim Report, focus only on one population, specifically undergraduate transfer students
      c. Maintain New Student Engagement Board (NSEB)
d. Hire Orbit Director*, reporting to the Provost, who will work cooperatively with existing faculty and staff in academic affairs and student affairs to coordinate with NSEB on initiatives targeting all four populations, with an emphasis on transfer students.

4. Next Steps:
   a. Bi-weekly meetings (Provost Musselman, VP Fitch, Dean Murphy, Dean Smith, SACSCOC Liaison King, members of Assessment staff, additional personnel as discussion unfolds) to address strategies in 2 above
   b. Response Report due to SACSCOC by August 8, 2018

7. FAC Report – Murray Leaf
   The meeting began at 10 am, Thursday, April 19, 2018. The first two hours were taken up with several presentations by Stephanie Huie, Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives, and David Troutman, Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives. They mainly talked about a large study of dual credit they have undertaken at FAC initiative. It has now turned into a cooperative effort with several state agencies. My general sense is that dual credit is here to stay and can be useful. A consistent statistical result is that students who have taken it do better in college, although it is not clear what causal relationships this might reflect. There are still many issues in defining it, saying who should teach such courses, and how they should be related to advanced placement.

   Next item on the agenda was a lunch discussion with Dan Sharphorn, Director of the Office of General Counsel. Mr. Sharphorn mainly talked about the difference between Texas and Michigan, where he was previously, in the amount of time that has to be spent dealing with state initiatives. Michigan has a constitutional firewall preserving University autonomy. Texas does not.

   The rest of the afternoon was spent on campus reports and committee meetings. Dr. Cordell is co-chair of Academic Affairs and Faculty Quality. Murray Leaf attended Governance. Governance spent most of time on the maternity leave policy that the Faculty Advisory Council is trying to help campuses develop. This included about an hour discussion with an attorney from the Office of General Counsel on the relationship between the federal family maternity leave policy and anything we might try to do. He emphasized that the federal policy does not require the time allowed off be taken as a block. It can be intermittent. So, for example, a woman who has graduate students can arrange her leave to include time for supervising them. This was news to me, although when I returned to UTD I found it was not news to our Human Resources office.

   Academic Affairs and Faculty Quality presented a policy on NTS faculty, which the FAC endorsed.

   The meeting continued on Friday with more committee meetings and campus reports. Rebecca Karoff reported on the Student Success Summit III that the system arranged. Apparently, people were happy with it.

   The FAC spent most of the afternoon first discussing a recommendation for changing the Regents Rule dealing with upward evaluation of administrators. The amendments were coming from the health campuses primarily. They are unhappy with their administrations and want to be able to express this early and often. One change would be to have the evaluation every two years. Others concerned the presentation of results. Generally, I think we would find the changes unnecessarily repetitious, but in discussion I was assured that the wording was intended to allow enough faculty governance discretion for us to continue as we are now doing.
The next and last major item was discussion of a draft statement on freedom of speech. This resulted in a fairly acrimonious discussion that was inconclusive. It is continuing by email.

8. Student Government Report- Eric Chen
SG is continuing to work with the UTD Tech Store to have a tech vending machine installed across campus during the summer. During finals week, Starbucks and Papa John’s remained open until 2 AM for late night studying students. They are currently reviewing the data to decide if this is a program they wish to continue in the future. Student Government had its final FY 18 meeting on May 10, 2018. At the meeting the formal ceremony of transference to the new membership occurred. The new membership’s goal for the next year to make several internal improvements.

9. CEP Recommendations– Clint Peinhardt
   A. Policy on transfer credit from non-degree granting institutions
   This policy was created in response to the SACSCOC external visit. They asked the university to create a policy that will put into place our willingness to accept credit from institutions that are not institutions of higher education. Dr. Peinhardt displayed on the overhead screen a copy of the policy that was approved by the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) at their May 2018 meeting. He noted that it differed slightly from what was passed by the Graduate Council and the Committee on Undergraduate Education. The difference in the CEP version was that it added an extra layer of approvals to the core documents of the required cooperative agreement. Those agreements will have to be approved by the Provost’s Office, the University Attorney, and the University Registrar regardless, but for the next couple of years Academic Governance will need to give their approval as well. Dr. Peinhardt noted that CEP will be revisiting this policy many times over the next couple years. Dr. Peinhardt opened the floor to discussion.

   In the documents provided it is noted that CEP’s version would be approved for executive education, but Graduate Council’s did not. Dr. Peinhardt responded that the committee wished to include all versions of the policy for the Senate to review before a final version was approved. A request was made to explain why “for executive education only” was added to the CEP version of the Graduate Catalog language. Marion Underwood responded that because our university is young we cannot afford further difficulties were our integrity is questioned; therefore, for now we must reserve the transferring of credit from non-degree granting institutions to executive education. Jennifer Holmes expressed her concerns over the policy because EPPS has a program in which they are applying for a Coverdell Fellowship to support returning Peace Corp volunteers. The idea was that the university would give them course credit for their Peace Corp service as an alternative to a Dallas-based internship they would be qualified for. The proposed policy could prevent EPPS from pursuing this program.

   Dr. Peinhardt noted that the proposed policy would not prevent the EPPS program forever, although it is not allowed in the policy. He noted that it is something the university could consider in the future. Serenity King’s office did an extensive survey of our peer institutions and found that where credit like this was allowed, it was almost entirely for undergraduates. Marion Underwood noted that from the information that Serenity’s team gathered, there wasn’t a single school that accepted credit from a non-degree granting institution.
Matt Brown stated that there would not be any such transfer credit granted from non-degree issuing institutions unless it is part of executive education. Dr. Peinhardt confirmed his statement, and further noted that for the undergraduate component there are several exceptions built in due to federal regulations. An example is that the university can accept up to 12 hours of academic credit for military service, which is already in the undergraduate catalog. This requires the schools to ascertain what activities that they can allow for academic credit from previous work experience and non-academic institutional affiliations. It is because of situations like this that Dr. Peinhardt feel that the policy will need to be revisited several times over the coming years. Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the following:

**Graduate:** The University of Texas at Dallas awards academic credit for non-credit coursework, not originating from the institution only in instances in which a signed cooperative agreement exists between the entity offering the non-credit work and the institution. The cooperative agreement must be reviewed and approved by the program faculty, the school administration, Graduate Council, the Committee on Educational Policy, Academic Senate, the Provost’s Office, the University Registrar, and the University Attorney. Terms of the agreement must specify the responsibilities of the outside entity, including their obligation to send instructor credentialing information, course syllabi with articulated outcomes and participant deliverables, and verification of participants’ completion, to the institution. Academically qualified UT Dallas faculty provide annual oversight of the outside entity’s content to ensure that non-credit work is comparable in both content and rigor for the awarding of an equivalent UT Dallas graduate credit experience in the respective degree program. Such transfer credit is awarded for purposes of executive education only.

**Undergraduate:** The University of Texas at Dallas does not award undergraduate academic credit for non-credit coursework not originating from the institution except as required by legislation regarding exam credit and military service, by terms agreed upon through a collaborative agreement with an outside entity, or by individual petition to the program head of the student’s declared major. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education provides final approval of individual cases. Some schools or programs may opt not to allow individual petitions as specified on their departmental webpages.

The cooperative agreement must be reviewed and approved by the program faculty, the school administration, Council for Undergraduate Education, the Committee on Educational Policy, Academic Senate, the Provost’s Office, the University Registrar, and the University Attorney. Terms of the agreement must specify the responsibilities of the outside entity, including their obligation to send instructor credentialing information, course syllabi with articulated outcomes and participant deliverables, and verification of participants’ completion, to the institution. Academically qualified UT Dallas faculty provide annual oversight of the outside entity’s content to ensure that non-credit work is comparable in both content and rigor for the awarding of an equivalent UT Dallas credit experience in the respective degree program.

27 yea votes, 1 nay, and four abstained. The motion carried.

**B. New Program- BS in Data Science**

Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the new degree program, BS in Data Science. The motion carried.
C. **New Certificates in JSOM**
   a. Transformational Leadership - Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the new Certificate in Transformational Leadership. The motion carried unanimously.
   b. Negotiation and Mediation - Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the new Certificate in Negotiation and Mediation. The motion carried unanimously.
   c. Organizational Consulting - Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the new Certificate in Negotiation and Mediation. The motion carried unanimously.
   d. Strategic Human Resources - Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the new Certificate in Strategic Human Resources. The motion carried unanimously.

D. **Undergraduate Course Inventory**
   Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the Undergraduate Course Inventory. The motion carried unanimously.

E. **Graduate Course Inventory**
   Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the Graduate Course Inventory. The motion carried unanimously.

F. **First 40 pages - Undergraduate**
   Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the revisions to the First 40 pages of the Undergraduate Catalog. The motion carried unanimously.

G. **First 40 pages - Graduate**
   Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the revisions to the First 40 pages of the Graduate Catalog. The motion carried unanimously.

H. **Undergraduate Degree Plan Updates**
   Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the undergraduate degree plans. The motion carried unanimously.

I. **Graduate Degree Plan Updates**
   Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the Graduate Degree plans. The motion carried unanimously.

10. **Discussion: Possible move to NCAA Division 2 Athletics – President Benson**
    Currently our university is a NCAA Division 3 university in the American Southwest Conference (ASC). We are unusual as a Division 3 school and in our conference. We are the second largest Division 3 School in the country. The only one larger is New York University. The other schools in the ASC are a factor of ten smaller than our university, i.e. we have 28,000 students they have 2,800. Most of the schools are church related, but three are public schools: Sul Ross State University, University of Texas at Tyler (UT-Tyler), and ourselves. UT-Tyler is leaving the conference and Division 3 starting FY19 moving to Division 2 and the Lone Star Conference. There is no other Division 3 conference that is available to our university except for ASC. The Division 2 – Lone Star Conference is very much interested in our university and would give us a warm welcome. President Benson asked the standing committee on athletics to begin an investigation into the feasibility of
having our university move to Division 2. President Benson reiterated that nothing has been
decided, and it is strictly for information purposes at this point. Before the university could begin to
make a decision of yea or nay on a move, there are various bits of data that is needed. How would
this change affect our reputation? What would it mean for our ability to compete? How much
money would the university have to spend? What teams would need to be created? Would we need
to have new athletic venues? To pull all the data it could take quite some time, and therefore to assist
with data collection an outside consultant has been hired. They have assisted other universities with
their moves, but their job is to guide our university in making a well-informed choice.

Our university’s athletic fee ($45) is close to the lowest in the conference, and by a factor of 10
lower than what it is at Division 2 schools. Our fee has not changed in 20-years, and UT System is
not keen to have that number go up anytime soon. Even if the university made the decision to move
to Division 2, the university would need student support for an increase in the fee. Early vetting has
shown a good amount of student support. If the university was to petition the NCAA for the
change to Division 2, it would not be until 2020. And even then it could be a couple more years
until the move was made. It is possible that after all of the research and data it may be found that
Division 3 may be the best place for our university.

There are currently carrot and stick reasons for making the move to Division 2. We are not the same
school we were when our university began competing at Division 3. It could be a good thing to be
among other schools with similar enrollment, and not the second biggest Division 3 school. The
stick reasons are that the other schools in Division 3 would like not to compete with our university,
and we could be forced to become independent. Going independent would not be good for our
student athletes.

One of the stipulations with going Division 2 would require the funding of a small number of
athletic scholarships. Division 3 does not require athletic scholarships to be offered. Greg Dess
raised a question as to how many athletic scholarships would be required if we went Division 2.
Kurt Beron responded that the university competes in 13 sports. For Division 2 we would need only
one more sport, but it would be ideal to have 16 sports. Dr. Beron reminded the Senate members
that many of their alma maters had high profile athletics, but that is not what our university plans to
do. All of the scholarships would be partial. An example was given that the basketball team might
have thirteen players, but there would be 8-9 whole scholarships divided up among them. Most
these would be scholarships to pay for books. The average scholarship pool at Division 2 schools is
$2 million, but any student getting a scholarship would have to meet our universities academic
requirements. Greg Dess raised the question of if it was possible to have a hybrid model where
only certain sports were Division 2, while the rest were Division 3. Kurt Beron responded that it
was not possible. There were only 5 schools who had mixed divisions and those are Division 1/
Division 3 schools. Murray Leaf requested confirmation on a statement made by Gene Fitch at the
Academic Council meeting that the school would have to provide 108 full time equivalent
scholarships. Dr. Leaf wanted to know how that would be handled. Dr. Beron responded that those
108 full time equivalent scholarships would be split to assist 300-400 individual students as their
coaches saw fit. Dr. Leaf asked if offering athletic scholarships was required. Dr. Beron responded
that the university must have a minimum amount of roughly $800k of athletic scholarships to be
part of Division 2. A question was raised if one of the new sports that would need to be added for
Division 2 would be football. Unequivocally football would NOT be one of the sports added
should the university transition to Division 2. One sport that is being considered would be track and
field. A concern was raised that the athletic scholarships would come at the expense of academic
scholarships. President Benson responded that would not be the case, our students are academics who enjoy playing athletics.

All present understand that these discussions are strictly for informational purposes, and any decision is months, if not years, away. Nothing is being authorized or not authorized. The transition, should it occur, is years away. That being said, Speaker Leaf stated that when a decision on the transition was eminent, the academic Senate will vote on it. Incoming Speaker of the Faculty Senate, Ravi Prakash concurred.

Further, Dr. Prakash requested clarification on the statement made by Gene Fitch in the April 2018 UTD Mercury article “UTD considering DII move”: “Ultimately, my goal would be Division 1, because that’s what we most closely match up with, but the NCAA requires you to go through Division II first.” President Benson assured the Academic Senate that moving to Division 1 was not on the table at all. However, should the university choose to go down that path decades from now, the only way to do that would be to transition to Division 2 at some point. President Benson cautioned the faculty against an assumption of a negative correlation between athletics and academics. Our university has amazing academics who are also amazing athletics. A school’s academics are not lowered due to the amount of athletics a school has.

11. Authorize an Email Vote to approve Summer Graduates- Murray Leaf
R. Chandrasekaran moved to authorize an email vote to approve Summer Graduates. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

12. Authorize an Email Vote to Approve Faculty Appointments to Committees - Dr. Leaf
R. Chandrasekaran moved to authorize an email vote to approve faculty appointments recommended by the Committee on Committees. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

13. Hearing Tribunal Appointments - Dr. Leaf
Dr. Leaf reported that all tribunal pool members are eligible to be reappointed. Andrew Blanchard moved to reappoint the tribunal members. Alex Piquero seconded. The motion carried.

14. Acknowledgement of Murray Leaf and David Cordell’s hard work for Academic Governance – Richard Scotch
Richard Scotch stood and acknowledged the hard work of Murray Leaf and David Cordell in the past year and beyond to Academic Governance. This was their final meeting as Speaker of the Faculty and Secretary of the Faculty. The members in attendance applauded in appreciation.

15. Adjournment
There being no further business, President Benson adjourned the meeting at 2:32 PM.

APPROVED: ___________________________ DATE: _____________

Murray Leaf,
Speaker of the Faculty
Draft charge for ad hoc committee to propose a policy on record retention for academic records for UT Dallas.

The name of the committee shall be: Ad Hoc University Committee on Academic Record Retention Policy.

This is an *ad hoc* University committee established by the Academic Senate and the academic administration to draft a coherent policy that specifies which types of records should be regarded as academic records maintained by the University and recommends their retention or destruction.

The committee should assume that the core academic record is the student transcript, which should be maintained permanently. The committee is asked to identify: (a) additional academic records that should be maintained permanently; (b) records that may be considered relevant to the transcript, but not require permanent retention; and (c) records that should be included in the academic retention policy to meet requirements such as those pertaining to accreditation and licensing of university’s programs.

The following records are not academic records maintained by the university and will not be subject to this policy: (a) records maintained by faculty members for their personal use in instruction and in organizing their courses; and (b) personal communications among faculty and teaching assistants regarding students, or between faculty, teaching assistants, and students.

The chair of the committee shall be the University Registrar. Members of the committee shall be:

- Undergraduate Dean representative
- Graduate Dean representative
- Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination (Serenity King)
- Chair of the HOP Committee (Abby Kratz)
- Committee on Educational Policy representative
- Records Management Officer (Courtney Spooner)
- Financial Aid Office representative
- University attorney (ex officio)
- Chief Compliance Officer

The term of appointment is indefinite and will end when a policy is approved by the Academic Senate and the Provost. An initial recommendation is expected by October 1, 2018.
Procedures of the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel

With respect to the appointment, retention, and promotion of academic personnel, the charge of the CQ is comprehensive:

“The Committee is charged with reviewing all recommendations from faculty ad hoc committees and School deans regarding the initial hiring, promotion, and promotion to tenure of members of the faculty, assuring that high academic standards are maintained, that appropriate and uniform procedures were followed in the review process, and that the evidence supports the recommendations. The Committee is further charged with reviewing and assessing the standards of excellence for the various academic ranks and for tenure, making due allowance for the different traditions and requirements of the different disciplines.”

These bylaws do not modify or abrogate this responsibility or the standards to which the charge refers. Rather, they address the way the charge is carried out.

General operating rules:

CQ deliberations are confidential. CQ meetings are not open, and members are not to describe them to others outside the meetings.

Members of CQ should not normally chair ad hoc committees. CQ members who are on ad hoc committees or who otherwise have been involved in preparing the cases that come before the CQ do not normally recuse themselves from the proceedings. More usually, they describe their involvement and position and try to provide what information they can with that involvement in view. They may, however, refrain from voting.

If there are significant deficiencies in the preparation of the case, the CQ will return the file to the dean, ad hoc committee, or search committee with appropriate queries. (Reviews of files are expedited if references who were chosen by the committee are clearly identified and if outside letters of reference are accompanied by biographical sketches that specify rank or title.) The CQ will not let such deficiencies work to the detriment of the person under review, but will judge the case solely on substance. If deficiencies or lapses in the file are due to the action or inaction of the faculty member under consideration rather than due to the ad hoc committee or dean, the CQ expects this to be clearly documented.

Although all the members are expected to familiarize themselves with all cases, one member is usually charged with introducing the case and summarizing the issues to start the discussion. This is normally not a member from the school of the person under consideration. The members from the school then commonly respond, and the discussion proceeds from there. CQ members do not act as advocates for their schools and indeed do not act as advocates or opponents generally, but try to weigh all sides of all cases as best they can.

Each case is given as much time as is necessary to reach a sense that no major issue has been left unexplored. Although the committee takes and records formal votes, the votes are not generally taken as decisive until those in the minority are satisfied that their position has been fully presented, discussed, and understood, and by and large the weight in the vote is recognized as fairly reflecting the balance of pro and con positions or issues in the discussion.

The record of the vote is sent forward to the Provost in a memo signed by all members of the CQ who voted. The memo should contain a succinct but informative statement of the rationale for CQ’s conclusion, with the considerations reflected in the votes both for and against the final recommendation.
In the case of third year internal reviews, the CQ attempts to judge whether the candidate's career trajectory appears to provide a good prospect of tenure or, if it does not, to summarize why. The aim of CQ deliberations is to put past accomplishments and evidence of present potential together to provide a sense of the overall likely career trajectory of the person under review and to compare this with what is normal and desirable, given the general state of the field as well as the situation in other fields that may be relevant.

The CQ does not view cases in isolation. Since it is charged with being concerned with maintaining general university standards as well as with assuring fairness in the process for individual cases, it must try within reasonable limits to view them in the context of the entire university and across time.

All internal reviews and all appointments of new faculty that are not entry level appointments will be discussed and voted on at a regular meeting of the CQ.

If files for new hires are received that are incomplete and not prepared according to the search procedures in the Faculty Handbook UTIDPP1057, it is expected that information in the file will justify the exception(s). If the information is insufficient for CQ to judge the suitability of the appointment, the file will be returned to the Provost for the deficiencies to be remedied, without prejudice as to the qualifications of the candidate. The Provost and CQ will meet in late April to review decisions made during the faculty internal review cycle.

A quorum is two-thirds (3 members) of the members of the CQ, rounded to the nearest integer. Beginning in the Fall of 2008, the CQ will transition to digital files in order to allow members to be able to access the material remotely, through a secure website. Candidates for promotion and tenure as well as ad hoc committees for new hires should be advised of this as early as possible. Members of the committee who have difficulty accessing the files should promptly notify the Provost’s office.

These bylaws may be changed at any time by a two-thirds vote of the full CQ.

**Expedited procedures for initial entry-level appointments/new hires with tenure.**

In order to expedite consideration of candidates for entry level, non-tenured appointments, after the file has been distributed to CQ members, an email vote will be taken, unless one or more members raise an issue of concern. In this latter case, the file will be discussed at a meeting prior to taking the vote. Files will be reviewed as to:

1) Completeness with all necessary elements (ie: letters from referees, evidence of research, evidence of teaching).

2) Constitution of the search committee, whose members should not have a conflict of interest in the selection of the candidate.

3) Due diligence of the search committee, consistent with maintaining standards of fairness across the university.

4) Minimal requirements of the candidate needed to assume the position offered, normally a PhD or equivalent, with a dissertation in the relevant area. (It is helpful if the CQ knows how the search was described in an advertisement, and where the advertisement appeared.)
In order to facilitate consideration of new hires at the rank of Associate or Full Professor with tenure, the file will be distributed to all CQ members by email. Members should circulate comments to the entire committee using the “reply all” function or its equivalent. After members have had an opportunity to circulate comments, votes will be cast in the same manner. Normally, 96 hours will be allowed for this process. Should the Provost and the Chair of CQ agree that time is of the essence (for example, in the case of competing offers), the time allowed may be shortened to 48 hours.

The general rules to be followed for new hires with tenure are as follows:

1. If the candidate has tenure in a comparable university and is being hired at the same rank, then approval is usually routine provided that: (i) The file contains at least five letters from arms-length references; (ii) research, publications, grants, teaching, etc. are commensurate with the requested rank.

2. Same as (1) BUT it is also a promotion. Then more review of the record (research, teaching and service) is usually warranted and more attention is paid to reference letters making sure that we have at least 5 arms-length letters which are very supportive of the candidate.

3. If the candidate is being promoted AND tenured, the review process is similar to our own faculty being reviewed for tenure and promotion (UTD policy statements: UTDPP1057, UTDPP1077).

The CQ membership, with emails, will be posted in the Senate section of the university web site, along with the charge, the description of the general policies covering hiring and promotion, and these bylaws.
Proposed Schedule of Senate Meetings, Academic Year 2018-2019

All meetings at 1 pm in the TI Auditorium, ECS South
Meetings are normally the third Wednesday of the month

NOTE: There are three proposed exceptions listed below.

- August 15
- September 19
- October 17
- November 28 - Rescheduled from November 21 (Fall Break)
- December 19 - Cancelled
- January 16
- February 20
- March 27 - Rescheduled from March 20 (Spring Break)
- April 17
- May 15