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
November 19, 2014

Present: David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Robert Ackerman, Frank Anderson, Zalman Balanov, Karen Baynham, Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Gail Breen, Matthew Brown, John Burr, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, George Decourcy, Eugene Deluke, Vladimir Dragovic, John Ferguson, Nicholas Gans, Yulia Gel, Jennifer Holmes, Joe Izen, Wieslaw Krawcewicz, Carie Lambert, Murray Leaf, Vance Lewis, Jason McAfee, Dennis Miller, Jessica Murphy, Jinkyong Na, Matthew Polze, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Tim Redman, Christopher Ryan, Mark Salamasick, Liz Salter, Betsy Schlabe, Richard Scotch, Tonia Wissinger,

Absent: Ponas Balsara, Naofal Al-Dhair, Adam Brackin, Gregg Dieckmann, Andrea Fumagalli, Lev Gelb, M. Ali Hooshyar, Mustapha Ishaak-Boussaha, Michele Lockhart, Emire Muslu, Jared Pickens, Ravi Prakash, Scott Rippel, Michael Tiefeldorf, Tres Thompson, Murat Tordak, Alejandro Zentner

Visitors: Nancy Fairbank, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Inga Musselman, Suresh Radhankrishnan, Mary Jo Venetis

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions

President Daniel called the meeting to order at 2:01. The university’s request to create an Honors College was approved by the Board of Regents. There is a serious space crunch on the campus. The university needs at minimum two more buildings the same size as the bioengineering building currently being built. President Daniel was able to get Permanent University Fund (PUF) money to purchase more modular buildings for the university. It is his hope that four more modular buildings will be built by August. The two buildings that are at the top of the list to be built are an engineering building, which was before the legislature in 2013 but was not approved by both houses. The second building would be a science building.

The board also approved the design development which is the last board approval level for the expansion to the students’ services building. It will go immediately next to the current Student Services building, but it will be at the loss of parking lot K. With the loss of so many parking lots recently a new parking garage will be created soon, therefore it is expected that parking fees will go up.

President Daniel opened a conversation to discuss the Arts and Technology Program (ATEC). The ATEC program is growing. In the past ten years the school has gone from 10 students to over 1000. In the past year administration has addressed a series of questions raised about how the ATEC program should be organized. The ATEC/ EMAC degrees are
out of the Arts and Humanities school, even though it is actually an interdisciplinary degree program split between computer science and the arts. In the last year they have changed the reporting line of the Director from the Dean of A&H to the Provost. This was to make sure the university got the full impact of Arts and Technology. The Provost has been working with the faculty involved in the program and has come to the conclusion that reorganization would be advisable. President Daniel has met with Deans to discuss the prospect, and the Provost has been in discussion with the ATEC faculty and staff to get their feedback. The President opened the floor to discussion following a brief presentation by the Provost. Provost Wildenthal explained the series of events and discussion that have brought him to his conclusion. One point that had not been decided was what the concept would be called. It would be too small for a “school”; therefore the title put forth was “institute.” The faculty of the “institute” would be responsible for their bylaws, standards, promotions, and tenure. The funding is still there for those who have a job and they will continue to have a job; therefore it is simply a matter of reporting lines.

Murray Leaf raised a list of concerns regarding the use of the term “institute.” He noted that degrees are issued by programs, which are only found in schools. Per UTDDP1010- Research Units and Organized Research Units, an “institute” is considered a research unit.

“Research units are centers, institutes, or laboratories which may identify primarily with one discipline or may be multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary.”

Calling the new concept an “institute” could generate difficulties as the current policies have an administrative chain that lists program head to Dean to Provost. It was Vice Speaker Leaf’s opinion that when the university was created, that it was not the intent to have “institutes.”

Joe Izen raised the question of why the ATEC program could not be moved to engineering and computer science. The Provost responded that from his discussions with the faculty, the program currently is doing research that would not fit with any of the current schools. It is a new kind of teaching and scholarship. The research agendas created by the program are a new “species” of research. It is no longer simply an engineering program or any of the current programs. Given the growth potential for the program it could easily become its own school, especially with the advancement of Emerging Media and Communication.

Jessica Murphy raised the concern that ATEC teaches its own students and could make the school very insular. If it were to become a school would this create even more isolation? Also she raised the concern of what would become of the tenure-system and non-tenure-system faculty when this program becomes a school. Will they still have the same protections as the faculty in the other schools? Provost Wildenthal responded that those that already have tenure will keep their tenure where they currently have it, and that tenure-line faculty who are not yet tenured would be the same. Non-tenure-track faculty would still have the same protections as those in the other schools. After much discussion it was decided that once a formal plan had been created the topic will be added to the agenda for another discussion.
Freshman applications for Fall 2015 are up 40% from 2014. The average SAT score of the applied freshman was 1300 in Fall 2014, but for Fall 2015 it is 1308. 50% of the applications are coming from the DFW metro area, and UTD draws from all the metropoleses within Texas.

2. Approval of the Agenda
David Cordell moved to add a discussion on adding the student honor code to the syllabi templates. R. Chandrasekaran moved to add questions regarding the e-learning evaluations. Matt Brown moved to approve the amended agenda. Jason McAfee seconded. The motion carried.

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

4. Presentation by Calvin Jamison- Office of Administration
Calvin Jamison gave a presentation to the Academic Senate detailing the recent updates to campus, and what will be happening in the near future on campus. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation is in Appendix A.

5. Speaker's Report – Tim Redman
1. Tim Redman attended a Staff Council meeting of November, and was impressed. Recently the Student Success Center did a presentation to the Staff Council. He requested that the center do a similar presentation for the Senate. It will be placed on the December Council agenda for considerations.
2. Speaker Redman called for appreciation for Calvin Jamison on his informative presentation.
3. There is a possible conflict with spring break (March 16-20, 2015) and the March 18th Faculty Senate meeting. He requested that the senators look at their calendars to find out if it is feasible to have a meeting on March 11th or March 25th.
4. Speaker Redman raised his concerns that there were still vacancies in committees into the month of November. He wanted to acknowledge that CEP and CET have been working diligently this school year.
5. Everything else is on the agenda.

6. TXCFS Report
The following report was submitted by Murray Leaf.

The meeting was attended by Murray Leaf and David Cordell.

The group customarily has a meeting of the executive committee the night before the main meeting. Murray Leaf attended as vice president for the northeastern region.

1. The meeting began with a welcome by the TCFS and Texas AAUP presidents at 1 PM. This was followed promptly by a talk by Julie Schmid, executive director of the AAUP. Schmid's background is more higher education labor than academics. The main theme was that the AAUP is now 100 years old. The question was whether this called for a
reassessment or any changes? She framed her talk with an update of recent AAUP interpretations of federal employment data to the effect that 70% of "our colleagues" in higher education employment are now contingent faculty. She was concerned with what this portended for loss of tenure and the general deterioration of employment conditions in the profession, reflecting recent AAUP papers, and she indicated that the AAUP would be focusing on trying to improve security of employment for contingent faculty. This included the idea that there is now a breakdown in the social contract between higher education and America, which Hunter Rawlings, as president of the AAU, was the first to voice a few years ago.

I was a bit interruptive, after a while, because this percentage implies a definition of higher education that makes no sense. The greatest increase in post high school enrollment since World War II has been in community colleges and in Masters Programs of vocational character, such as real estate and art programs. A large part of the enrollment in community colleges is not in academic subjects at all. This is where the vast bulk of the contingent faculty are and it is silly to think of this type of faculty employment in these institutions as an erosion of tenure or as requiring the protection of tenure. Non-tenure track or non-tenure system teaching is an increasing part of what we have to deal with in mainstream higher education, particularly in undergraduate instruction in research institutions. We do have to find a way to increase their security of employment, particularly in states that make it difficult to unionize. But this is a problem with a much more manageable, principled, and incremental solution than trying to give security of employment to people teaching real estate or cheese making and community colleges.

2. This was followed by a panel on faculty intellectual property rights and concerns. I had organized the panel and moderated it. Other panelists were Michael Farmer, incoming Senate President at Texas Tech, Susan Weill professor of journalism at Texas State University San Marcos, and Tim Letzring, Dean of the College of Education and Human Services at Texas A&M Commerce.

I think the presentations were useful and constructive. I gave a short background on the major case law. Prof. Farmer described recent negotiations with their Board of Regents and administration which among other things pinned down the meaning of the phrase "significant contribution" of the University in developing faculty intellectual property. This appears in many university rules as the ground for the regents or university claiming an ownership right. The Tech faculty asserted that a significant contribution had to be much more than $5000. The administration agreed. We need to do this in the UT system.

Somewhat along the same lines, professor Weill described contract templates that they had developed in the Texas State system for being very clear about the rights of faculty who create online material. Essentially, if you don't have a contract and you create it, its yours. If you have a contract the contract will specify a quid pro quo. The contracts all are very clear in using the phrase "work made for hire" to describe the work if it is intended to be treated legally as a work made for hire. Again, an extraordinarily straightforward approach that seems to work.

Dean Letzring is a lawyer and focused on the recent court cases pertaining to free speech rights of faculty as government employees. This doesn't directly bear on intellectual property
issues but it does indirectly, in the sense that our free-speech rights as citizens support our rights to own what we say as creators under copyright. If the University can limit what we can say it can limit what we create. It is an important caution. We need to keep it in mind.

My general conclusion was that faculty in other public systems in Texas are not having the difficulties dealing with their attorneys that UT system faculty are--at this moment.

3. The next speaker was James Goeman, from the Texas higher education coordinating Board. The general consensus was that the conversation was much more relaxed than the last time we heard from him. He recognized that the board has now been assigned a less regulatory and more coordinating role, and that seemed fine. The delegates did not bring up any notable problems. The coordinating board is still keeping track of what they call low producing programs, but essentially they just pass their information on to our respective governing boards.

4. The rest of the afternoon was mainly taken up with campus reports. We try to extract issues from these of general concern. One such concern was policies on and tenure promotion, and specifically whether they should include a requirement for "collegiality." Also whether this was part of service or related to service. We agreed more or less immediately to have a panel for the next meeting on promotion and tenure policies.

5. The discussion of issues of common concern carried over to the next morning and we revisited the collegiality issue in a slightly different way. One aspect of collegiality is having senior faculty act responsibly in constructively evaluating and advising junior faculty. But another aspect is bullying. Several campuses seem to have fairly severe problems with exploiting junior faculty, such as demanding co-authorship of articles, being included on grants or taking senior authorship when the junior faculty member is actually the senior author. If the junior faculty complain or do not go along, they may be denied promotion on grounds of lack of collegiality. It is obviously a perversion, but it will be interesting to dig into it and see how it gets started. This will probably also be the subject for some kind of forum in the spring meeting, either discussion panel, or speaker.

6. There were also four resolutions. One was to reaffirm the previous TCFS opposition to any change in Texas law banning guns on campus. The second was to urge the legislature to increase the funding for Texas Education Opportunity Grant program. Another was to fund the Texas Hazelwood act. The fourth was to increase the legislative appropriation for higher education 25%, to bring per capita student funding back almost to 2001-2002 levels.

7. **Student Government Liaison Report- Nancy Fairbank**

   Student Government President and Vice Present were at the University of Texas System Students Advisory Council meeting in Austin the week of November 17th. The Council is against the Honest Transcript bill which would list the median grade of the class on the student's transcript. They supported a fee that could be levied by universities that would go toward grant projects on their campus. They expressed a list of concerns to the regents, including distance learning fees and as to why they were different between universities, and what those fees were paying for. They raised their concerns on how academic honesty would be handled in online courses to make sure the quality of the education would be upheld. Lastly they discussed guns on campus, which had been a heated discussion in previous
sessions. They voted to say they agreed with the previous conclusion that it should be a per
campus student body decision. They suggested that a central advising record be added to
campuses which is something that some schools have that our university would benefit
from.

Due to UT-SAC, they missed the Student Government tailgate, which was very successful,
and very safe. Students who were of age consumed three kegs of alcoholic beverages at the
tailgate without incident. Students, who were of age, showed interest in having future
tailgates; where alcohol would be available, and would support an update to the alcohol
policy.

SG wished to express their gratitude for the new stoplight at the corner of Rutford and
Synergy. It has been a student safety concern. SG also met with Dr. Blanchard, and the
Core Committee to discuss IB/AP credits. Dr. Blanchard responded that the schools would
look into it and see if they can do more continual updates regarding IB/AP credits.

8. CEP Proposals
The Chair of the Committee, Suresh Radhakrishnan, presented the following committee
report.

A. Supplemental Courses for Spring 2015
These are new courses that will be offered in Spring 2015. There are 20 new
undergraduate courses, 11 of which are from the school of management, 4 from
EPPS, and 3 from gender studies. There are 18 graduate courses, 6 of which are
from BBS. Two of the undergraduate courses are repeatable. CEP used these
courses to create guidelines on justifications for a repeatable course. There must be
two parts to the justification. The first part is the rational for why the course is
repeatable. The second is why there is a maximum. Richard Scotch moved to
approve the courses. Jessica Murphy seconded. The motion carried.

B. Revised Toulouse Cotutell Agreement
At the October senate meeting the senate approved a Cotutell agreement; however
the previous applicant can no longer fulfill the agreement. As the agreement is
between the school and the specific applicant, and new proposal was created. There
are no changes to the agreement other than the applicant’s name. Richard Scotch
moved to approve the proposal. Jason McAfee seconded. The motion carried.

C. Informational: Fast Track Programs- Serenity King
Earlier in the semester a new interpretation of a SACS principal was brought to the
Associate Deans that had significant impact on Fast-Track or Dual-Masters
programs. That is still a possibility. However after persistent questioning, SACS has
taken the interpretation back to their board of trustees and will re-evaluate if they are
going to continue to enforce this. A final answer will be given at the December
Annual SAC meeting. There will be seven representatives from our university
attending. The interpretation currently states that a combined undergraduate and
graduate program must have a minimum of 150 credit hours. Some fast-track
programs were designed so that students could graduate with potentially 141 credit
hours. Combined masters must have a minimum of 60 hours. Currently the lowest credit hour combined program is 63.

9. Information Security Policy- Nate Howe
Nate Howe brought to the senate an updated copy of the Information Security Policy. The updates were per feedback he received since his presentation at the October senate meeting. Murray Leaf moved to approve the policy. Jessica Murphy seconded. Speaker Redman opened the floor to discussion. Two concerns were voiced. It was felt that “UTD business” needed its own definition, and with specific criteria. It was found that the definition of “community data” was not consistent with the “university data” definition. The motion carried.

10. Recommendations for Committee Replacements
Richard Scotch moved to approve the recommendation of Duncan Macfarlane to the Committee on Academic Integrity, Vladimir Dragovic to the Committee on Faculty Mentoring, Rebecca Files to the Committee on Effective Teaching, and Robert Ackerman and Ryan McMahan to the Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects. Kurt Beren seconded. The motion carried.

11. Approval of Candidates for Graduation – David Cordell
David Cordell moved that:

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

David Cordell moved that:

These students have applied for graduate degrees and have been reviewed by the Graduate Dean. The Graduate Dean certifies that all of these students will be eligible for the degrees indicated upon satisfactory completion of the current semester’s work. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to receive the degrees as indicated upon receipt of final grades and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades received are consistent with the standards for credit prescribed by this University. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

12. Student Course Evaluation Procedures- Karen Huxtable-Jester
The Effective teaching committee wishes to promote the way in which faculty can encourage student to take the evaluations. The committee suggested students use their own devices and do them in class. The problem is the link is not sent to students in time for the last class session. The Committee requested that the email with the link be sent to students
no later than fall December 1/ spring April 20. Murray Leaf moved to approve the recommendation. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried.

13. Substantive Changes and School Bylaws
Murray Leaf moved to add the following sentence at the end of the section on "Regular Meetings" in the Senate-approved guidelines for bylaws for schools, and notify the schools accordingly:

"Faculty of the school shall vote on all substantive changes in school programs as defined in the UT Dallas Substantive Change Policy."

Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

14. 3+3+3 Committee on Non-Tenure-Track faculty
Murray Leaf move to appoint the following to the Non-Tenure Track Faculty 3+3 committee: Jennifer Holmes, Richard Scotch, and Ravi Prakash as the tenure track faculty members. Liz Salter, David Cordell, Betsy Schlobohm as the Non-Tenure Track members. Dennis Krazt, Bruce Novak, Hasan Pirkul as the Deans members. Viswanath Ramakrishna seconded. The motion carried. Tim Redman stated that Richard Scotch would chair.

15. Adding the Student honor code to syllabi
Robert Ackerman moved to add the student honor code, "As a Comet, I pledge honesty, integrity, and service in all that I do" to the syllabi templates. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

16. Questions regarding the e-learning evaluations
Vice Speaker Murray Leaf read aloud an email from Ravi Prakash.

"I am concerned about the email from the registrar including the below about new restrictions to be imposed on how instructors manages their courses in e-learning. The email refers to an internal audit of e-learning use. I am not sure if the senate was ever informed of such an audit. More over the outcome of the audit has not been shared with the faculty yet it is being used in theory how instructors teach courses. Last I checked the Senate is charged with faculty governance not the VP of Business Affairs. I hope the Auditors realize that 1) E-learning is not a software product that is admired for its quality, availability and ease of use. 2) Multiple free and open source course management alternatives exist and are superior to e-learning and are used by instructors at several universities including UTD. They can replace e-learning or almost all tasks except maintaining student grades. 3) E-learning student grade management module has a terrible spreadsheet support and provides very limited support for designing complex grade assessment formulas. In light of these shortcomings in e-learning one would hope rather than reflect placing obstacles in the path the university be trying to make it easier for faculty to use it in ways they decide that are best for their course. Of course there does exist the possibility that the university is trying to get rid of e-learning and saw itself some money once it has convinced all instructors to abandon it."

Speaker Tim Redman read aloud another portion of the same email for the record.

"The Course evaluation window is too long; opening more than a month before the last day of class. That early in the semester, especially in courses where different ideas and algorithms have yet to be integrated into a comprehensive solution do the students have enough information to conduct a fair evaluation."

Matt Brown moved to refer the listed concerns to the Learning Management Committee, and his comments on Course evaluation to the Effective Teaching Committee. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.
17. Adjournment

There being no further business, President Daniel adjourned the meeting at 3:37 pm.

APPROVED: Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty

DATE: 6/2/15