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
February 18, 2015

Present: Hobson Wildenthal, Naofal Al-Dhair, Frank Anderson, Zalman Balanov, Poras Balsa, Karen Baynham, Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Gail Breen, Matthew Brown, John Burr, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, George Decourcy, Gregg Dieckmann, Vladimir Dragovic, Andrea Fumagalli, Yulia Gel, Jennifer Holmes, Wieslaw Krawcwich, Murray Leaf, Vance Lewis, Michele Lockhart, Jason McAfee, Dennis Miller, Jinkyong Na, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Tim Redman, Scott Rippe, Christopher Ryan, Mark Salamasick, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Michael Tiefeldorf, Tonia Wissinger,

Absent: David Daniel, Eugene Deluke, John Ferguson, Nicholas Gans, Lev Gelb, M. Ali Hooshyar, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Joe Izen, Carie Lambert, Emir Muslu, Jared Pickens, Matthew Polze, Betsy Schlobohm, Tres Thompson, Murat Torlak, Alejandro Zentner

Visitors: Andrew Blanchard, Nancy Fairbank, Karen Huxtable, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Inga Musselman, Suresh Radhankrishnan, Mary-Jo Venetis,

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
   Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM. The outcome from the legislature is uncertain. The legislature will be funding weighted student credit hours at the same level as the past biennium. This means that the legislature will promote growth. The university looks to increase the instruction operations budget by 9%; however they will not be funding inflation. That is a point that President Daniel, and other system presidents are making to the committees. At the very least tuition funding, tuition fees, and state appropriations should keep up with inflation. Currently the university operating budget that is derived from designated tuition and fees that are allocable is approximately $180 million. While that amount that come from statutory tuition, and state appropriation is approximately $100 million. Of that $100 million, much of it is statutory tuition. The university is only getting from the taxpayer approximately $40 million a year out of $300 million+ that the university operates upon.

   Much will depend on what the legislature does about funding for research which was instituted a few sessions ago. This could allow the university to receive between $10-12 million based on the university’s research productivity. It will also depend on if the legislature re-funds The Texas Research Incentive Program (TRIP), which could give the university $20+ million. If the university qualifies for the National Research University fund, i.e. the aspiring Tier 1 schools, the university would receive an additional $9 million a year. UTD currently is holding
at just under 200 PhD’s per year, and right below a $400 million endowment. The university must achieve those goals two Septembers in a row in order to qualify.

Provost Wildenthal opened the floor to questions. A request for an update on the current construction was made. They are currently planting trees, but the plan is to have the project done by the end of March. The next phase is the east/west corridor.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   Murray Leaf moved to approve the agenda. Jason McAfee seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
   Murray Leaf moved to approve the minutes. Viswanath Ramakrishna seconded. The motion carried.

4. Speaker’s Report – Tim Redman
   1. A suggestion from the manager of the University Book store expressed a concern that there is not a Book Store committee on campus. The universities he had worked at previously had one, and was curious why ours did not. He wished to get more opinions from students. It was discovered that the Auxiliary Services Committee has student members, and the manager of the book store is a member.
   2. The Senate Election calendar was distributed and elections will take place soon.
   3. Everything else was on the agenda.

5. Presentation by the Committee on Effective Teaching – Karen Huxtable
   Karen Huxtable gave a presentation to the Academic Senate on what the Committee on Effective Teaching has been doing. In order to promote teaching effectiveness across campus the committee has created an E-Learning resource for the faculty. The committee wanted to provide material about teaching to all faculty, not just new faculty. E-learning has discussion boards for faculty to ask questions, especially those who don’t want to ask anyone else face to face. Posts can be made anonymously, and anyone in the faculty campus community can weigh in on the topic. It was noted that only faculty have access to this discussion board, as faculty must sign in to view the board. No students are able to view or give comment on discussions. The committee is open to suggestions and input for the site.

6. FAC/ TXCFS Report
   The UT System Faculty Advisory Council met in Austin 22-23 Jan 2015. Murray Leaf and David Cordel attended for UTD. Elizabeth Heise chaired the meeting.

Dr. Heise noted that the FAC had a response to its request to attend meetings of the Board of Regents Committee on Academic Affairs. The response was that we would get an advance copy of the agenda and if there was an item on which we wanted to address the committee we would be able to do so. This was not what the FAC had asked for. We want to be present with privilege of the floor. A major purpose is to be able to follow the conversation and respond where it appears to be directed by assumptions about what faculty do that are factually incorrect, before such assumptions get built into Board decisions and policies.
The FAC agreed on the issues to be taken up by committees.

Dr. Ray Greenberg, V.C. for Health Affairs, discussed issues on the health campuses. The overriding theme was he recognized and wanted to support efforts to strengthen faculty involvement in governance on the health campuses.

Kimberly Coleman, Chair of the Employees Advisory Council introduced herself and described the Council’s concerns. We agreed to seek areas of overlapping interest and to have close communication. She stayed with the FAC for the entire meeting.

The next guest was Dan Sharphorn, Dir. of the Office of General Counsel. The main topics were the report of the task force on commercialization of intellectual property and related concerns about Regents Rules on IP. FAC members also asked about the current status of UTSP175 and again urged that it be withdrawn.

Stephanie Huie, Vice Chancellor for strategic initiatives, discussed seekUT. This is a website that the system has established to provide information concerning the economic costs and benefits of a UT education. It includes readily accessible information on costs, the amount of student debt and its distribution among students, and economic returns by school, level of degree, and discipline. The members thought that this was good information.

At the end of the hour, members asked about the status of information on the web about faculty performance, most notably SciVal and AcademicKeys. This has been made available and is being used. Apparently, however, faculty has not been able to check it. We agreed to ask her back to discuss this at the next meeting.

Barry McBee reviewed the situation in the legislature. The top priority will be tuition revenue bonds for new construction. The need on several campuses is intense. The FAC generally agreed with the System priorities described by Mr. McBee.

The afternoon was devoted to committee meetings.

On Friday, January 23, the first guest was Coordinating Board Commissioner Raymond Paredes. Mr. Paredes stressed that the funding crisis was not going to end and higher education had to respond by innovation that produced greater efficiency. Among other things, he argued that the emerging research university initiative was spreading too few resources over too many campuses. He also urged the members to make greater efforts to explain the value of what they do to the public, including the legislature.

The discussion with Dr. Paredes was followed by committee reports. The resolutions are included at the end.

Vice Chancellor Reyes and Mr. Sharphorn join the FAC for lunch. The FAC expressed interest in the new chancellor and were generally happy with what was reported. Discussion returned to the recommendations of the task force on intellectual property and the related issue of the Regents’ Rules concerned with intellectual property. There was general agreement that faculty governance involvement is necessary for developing any new policy and in making changes to
the Regents' Rules. The FAC urged that the Rules be changed to clarify and strengthen the faculty's rights to what they create, rather than to obscure them with counterclaims.

The final guest was Regent R Stephen Hicks. Vice Chancellor Reyes remained to join the conversation. Regent Hicks expressed first of all his strong conviction that the purpose of the Board of Regents was to support the University. This meant also to support the faculty. He stressed that he recognized the importance of faculty research, and that he would seek more faculty communication with the Board. We discussed the possibility that a FAC member from the health campuses and a member from the academic campuses would attend meetings of the Committee on Academic Affairs. Mr. Hicks assured the Council that he would support it.

FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS:

RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE

To: UT System Campus Presidents, Provosts, and Chairs of campus governance organizations

Through: Pedro Reyes, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
         Raymond Greenberg, Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs

UT System campus governance organizations should be aware of their powers and responsibilities as assigned by tradition and recognized in accrediting standards and UT system rules. The provisions are as follows:

1. First, the traditional and necessary authority of the faculty is recognized in The University of Texas's Regents' Rule 40101, "Faculty Role in Educational Policy Formation." This states that "the faculties of the institutions regularly offering instruction shall have a major role in the governance of their respective institutions in the following areas:
   • General academic policies and welfare.
   • Student life and activities.
   • Requirements of admission and graduation.
   • Honors and scholastic performance.
   • Approval of candidates for degrees.
   • Faculty rules of procedure.

Second, the Rules recognize that "the faculty" is represented by the elected bodies of the faculty governance organization. Institutional policies should be in the institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures. It follows that the faculty governance organization should have a major role in designing all policies in the Handbook of Operating Procedures under the headings of Regents Rule 40101. In Regents’ Rule 20201, responsibility to assure that such policies are reviewed by the governance body are assigned to the President of the university. As follows:

The University of Texas's Regents’ Rule 20201, Section 4.9:

“(a) Input from the faculty, staff, and student governance bodies for the institution will be sought for all significant changes to an institution’s Handbook of Operating Procedures. The institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures will include a policy for obtaining this input that is in accordance with a model policy developed by the Office of General Counsel.
(b) Sections of the Handbook of Operating Procedures that pertain to the areas of faculty responsibility as defined in Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 40101 titled Faculty Role in Educational Policy Formulation will be explicitly designated in the Handbook of Operating Procedures. The president, with the faculty governance body of the campus, shall develop procedures to assure formal review by the faculty governance body before such sections are submitted for approval. The formal review should be done within a reasonable timeframe (60 days or less).”

In addition, the accreditation standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and Liaison Committee on Medical Education place great emphasis on the importance of faculty governance involvement in establishing academic policies. For UT campuses, this necessarily would mean involvement of the faculty governance organization:

2. SACS/COC standards related to faculty governance:

“3.2.6 There is a clear and appropriate distinction, in writing and practice, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy. (Board/administration distinction)

3.2.7 The institution has a clearly defined and published organizational structure that delineates responsibility for the administration of policies. (Organizational structure)”

“3.4.1 The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. (Academic program approval)”

“3.4.10 The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty. (Responsibility for curriculum)”

3. LCME standards related to faculty governance: (The resolution then quoted Standards 1.3 Mechanisms for Faculty Participation; 2.6 Functional Integration of the Faculty; 4.6 Faculty/Dean: Responsibility for Educational Program Policies; 6: Competencies, Curricular Objectives, and Curricular Design; and 7.3 Scientific Method/Clinical/Translational Research)

RESOLUTION ON NON-TENURE SYSTEM FACULTY IN FACULTY GOVERNANCE:

To: UT System Campus Presidents, Provosts, and Chairs of faculty governance organizations

Through: Pédro Reyes, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
          Raymond Greenberg, Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs

The University of Texas’s Regents’ Rule 40101, “Faculty Role in Educational Policy Formation,” states that “the faculties of the institutions regularly offering instruction shall have a major role in the governance of their respective institutions in the following areas:

• General academic policies and welfare.
• Student life and activities.
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- Requirements of admission and graduation.
- Honors and scholastic performance.
- Approval of candidates for degrees.
- Faculty rules of procedure."

The UT System Faculty Advisory Council recommends that each UT System campus establish guidelines and policies that clearly define the categories of non-tenure-track faculty who have instructional responsibilities comparable to those of tenure track faculty and provide for including them in the faculty governance system, providing the ability to vote, serve on representative bodies, and be appointed to appropriate committees. Policies should be adopted to ensure fair representation to maintain the integrity of the academic community.

RESOLUTION ON UNDUE INFLUENCE IN ADMISSIONS

Note: This responds to the draft policy sent in fall 2014 to the campus administrators who oversee admissions. It does not, therefore, take into account any changes that may have taken place in the intervening months.

The Faculty Advisory Council embraces the principle of prohibiting outside and improper influence in admissions. In order to ensure integrity in admissions policy the FAC would like to make the following observations:

- We advocate a considerable expansion of the faculty capacity to act to advocate for or otherwise have a voice in admissions. Because of the role of faculty in every element of student education, from drafting admissions standards to approving candidates for graduation and all of the instruction that goes on in between, faculty can never be considered an "improper third party." The faculty represents the most interested party in the System outside of the students themselves.
- Faculty members are especially central in the process of the recruitment and application prospects of graduate students. Even given official graduate and professional school admissions policies, applicants often need faculty support for both program admission and funding. The policy as written could, if read narrowly, be construed as limiting the faculty's rightful role in graduate education, which includes recruitment, admissions, and funding.
- Additionally the drafted policy does not into account the realities of student recruitment for athletics and activities such as art, music, drama, debate, and others.
  o Athletics coaches are in regular contact with admissions officials regarding their recruits. Readings of some aspects of this document would indicate coaches' contact with admissions to be inappropriate behavior. We believe this to be an inappropriate hindering of coaches' ability to recruit student-athletes.
  o As read the current policy clearly prohibits contact between outside third parties and admissions officers. But the clear intent of the policy is to prohibit improper external pressure being applied to anyone on campus who might then try to influence admissions policy. It would clearly violate the spirit, and possibly the letter, of the proposed policy for a legislator or other powerful person to try to influence a faculty member or member of staff (whether in admissions or not) to advocate for or against an applicant. Yet the lifeblood or athletic recruiting is contact with high school coaches.
  o Music or theater instructors (who may but may not also teach one of their high school musicians) may play a similar role for talented music students. There are other examples, but
these represent two of the most visible ones. This creates a potential conflict. Without these contacts athletic recruiting would be nearly impossible. Yet carving out an exception for coaches and yet denying similar rights for other citizens to act to advocate for students who are not athletes would be equally problematic.

- One possible solution is that anyone can provide support for an applicant but that support must be clearly documented.
- Two sections of the proposed policy seem to be in conflict with one another: II.B (With regard to graduate school and program admissions, third-party communications are also prohibited; however, third parties may participate by composing formal letters of recommendation, if such letters are permitted or required, and if the third party is an expert in a relevant academic or professional field and has personal knowledge of particular candidates) III.B.2 (Any graduate school or professional program may engage in customary solicited or unsolicited conversations with experts in the relevant academic or professional field and with personal knowledge of particular candidates to that graduate or professional school to determine the likelihood of success of those candidates to a particular course of study).

7. Student Government Liaison Report- Nancy Fairbank

Student Government (SG) has a proposal to increase the alcohol limit in the Pub that has been submitted to Dean Fitch. Following that it will be submitted to Dr. Daniel. The BYOB tailgate proposal is following suit. On February 19th is a ‘Dine with the Dean’ event with Dean Blanchard and Fitch. Dr. Holmes is creating an Advisory Council for Political Science. SG wants to encourage other schools and programs to create Advisory Councils if they have not already done so. SG is having a ‘Meet your senators’ event to encourage student to come to SG meetings. A new flyer kiosk has arrived for student use however the company sent the wrong one. When the new one arrives, the kiosk will be available for student use. SG is distributing a recycling survey to ascertain student awareness on the single stream recycling on campus. SG is also doing a survey on student opinion concerning guns on campus. There are students outside of SG that are petitioning about this issue. SG wants to get a campus wide option. SG believes the campus will be against guns on campus; however they want to get a cemented opinion from the survey. The University of Texas System Student Advisory Council passed a resolution against guns on campus. SG senate voted on the proposed drug and alcohol policy changes. FERPA allows for schools to call the parents of students who are under 21 for their 2nd and subsequent alcohol violation, and first and subsequent drug violations. As this is allowed by FERPA, SG voted that they do not think this policy is good to implement on the campus for a number of reasons. This was a very close vote, and a highly visited meeting by students.

8. CEP Proposals

The Chair of the Committee, Suresh Radhakrishnan, presented the following committee report:

A. Course Inventory:

A summary of the 2015-206 courses inventory for Undergraduate and Graduate courses was presented. 1774 courses were revised. This was approximately half of the courses inventory. 202 new courses were added, and 147 courses were removed. The
balance of 1425 courses was merely updated. The primary task for the changes was to enter the rationale for repeatable courses. Of the 1774 courses, 932 were repeatable courses. At Chair Radhakrishnan’s request, the repeatable courses were broken up into three categories, general, topics, and exempt to facilitate discussion. General was for all courses that didn’t fall into the two categories. The exempt group included independent study, research courses, thesis, and dissertation courses. The topics group are both topic and special topic courses. There was one amendment made to the repeatable rationale for PHIN courses. The rationale was amended from “student to achieve an acceptable or a desirable level” to “the student will achieve his/her desired goal.” Four math core courses were tabled until they are approved by CUE.

At the undergraduate level a new courses prefix was added, ITSS, Information Technology and Systems for JSOM. The new prefix will replace the existing prefix MIS. At the graduate level BUAN was created for Business Analytics in JSOM. The question was raised as to why new prefixes are added. The response was to assist externally when a course was tied to a specific program. Also course numbers can run out, and a new prefix is added. Both the undergraduate and graduate courses were approved by Council of Undergraduate Education, Core Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, and CEP. CEP moved to accept all changes made by CEP be approved by the Senate with the understanding that it is living document and there could be changes. Jason McAfee seconded. The motion carried.

9. Space Utilization Resolution
A report by Dr. Larry Redlinger was distributed to the Senate before the meeting. It is included in appendix A. The choke point for space are science labs. For the sake of discussion, Judd Bradburry moved to consider having classes on campus on Sundays. Kurt Beron seconded.

Ravi Prakash expressed his displeasure on the concept of Sunday classes. Gregg Dieckmann, the Associate Dean in Chemistry took the floor. He gave the Senate the rational of why this topic was being discussed. Fall 2014 the university had two general Chemistry classrooms for labs. The labs ran 7 am to 10 pm Monday through Friday, and then Saturday 8 am – 6 pm. This maxed the time available for the courses to be offered. It was at that time that options for the future began to be considered. As the freshman class continues to increase the need more options becomes more critical.

One option suggested was to extend course time from 10 PM to 1AM. This was not a popular option for faculty. The next option was to have chemistry labs on Sundays. If additional space was not allotted, additional time slots must be added. A third lab was identified for use as a general chemistry lab. With the addition of the room it gave a 30% increase in space, but it will not be enough for the growth anticipated for fall 2015. All time slots and spaces will be full with no more room for growth for the following year. There was one suggestion made to cap the number of freshman in the courses; however the course is a “gateway” course which is needed for many degree programs. This may force students to be off a semester or to take summer courses. The problem was given to the faculty senate as a whole to help find acceptable short term and long term solutions.
Dennis Miller suggested that Sunday lab courses could be done temporarily until growth levels off, or classroom construction is completed. Matt Brown reminded the Senate that the growth was predicted but the space was not granted. Dr. Brown suggests that nothing be done and allow for students to influence administration to push for the additional space.

Nancy Fairbank included the students’ perspective. The lack of space has the potential to harm students. Sundays are a religious day for many students. Transportation is a concern on Sundays because public transportation schedules are limited. She requested that before Sunday, and late night labs are considered that a hard line be given and the push for Tuition Revenue Bills be much stronger. By allowing the Sunday classes it creates a weaker line on the need for these labs. Reports show that the university is scoring 100% efficiency on room utilization. A standard should not be created where the university allows Sunday classes or very late night classes. Whatever the decision, the students must be taken into account.

The Provost stated that the problem has been solved for the immediate future, i.e. two to three years. The university does not expect a 30% growth over the next two years. There is a diversity of opinions but for now the university will not be force to require the late night or Sunday courses. With additional two years, it will allow administration and faculty to put forth a plan for additional space so that Sunday and late night courses will not be required. The issue was declared resolved for now. Judd Bradbury moved to table the motion. Liz Salter seconded. The motion to table carried.

10. Amendments to UTDPP1007 – Faculty Senate By Laws
In spring 2014 there were difficulties tabulating the votes during the Faculty Senate elections. The policy has been updated to correct those difficulties, how to break ties, and to correct the formatting. Richard Scotch moved to approve the changes for the second time. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried.

11. Guns on Campus Resolution
The resolution was originally approved on March 20, 2013 by the Faculty Senate.

"The University of Texas at Dallas Faculty Senate believes that the carrying of firearms on campus by anyone other than law enforcement officers is detrimental to the safety and security of all on campus."

Murray Leaf moved to approve. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried.

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

APPROVED: ____________________________
Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty

DATE: 6.21