APPROVED AND CORRECTED MINUTES

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
October 15, 2014

Present: David Daniel, Robert Ackerman, Frank Anderson, Zalman Balanov, Porra Balara, Karen Baynham, Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Gail Breen, Matthew Brown, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, George Decourcy, Eugene Deluke, Vladimir Dragovic, John Ferguson, Andrea Fumagalli, Nicholas Gans, Yulia Gel, Lev Gelb, Jennifer Holmes, M. Ali Hooshyar, Wieslaw Krawcewicz, Carie Lambert, Michele Lockhart, Murray Leaf, Jason McAfee, Jessica Murphy, Emire Muslu, Jinkyong Na, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Christopher Ryan, Mark Salamasick, Liz Salter, Betsy Schlobohm, Tim Redman, Scott Rippel, Richard Scottich, Michael Tiefelstorf, Tres Thompson, Murat Torlak, Tonia Wissinger, Alejandro Zentner

Absent: Hobson Wildenthal, Naofal Al-Dhair, Adam Brackin, John Burr, Gregg Dieckmann, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Joe Izen, Vance Lewis, Dennis Miller, Jared Pickens, Matthew Polze,


1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
   President Daniel called the meeting to order at 2:01. Ebola rumors are circulating, but there has been no impact on the campus. Distressed parents have been calling, and the president has spoken to many of them. The health center is well versed in procedures. There has not been any connection between the university and the exposure victims.

   The President is working with legislators to make sure that they understand the needs of the university. One particular issue that he is working on is academic space. The university is in serious need of more lab space. Ideally the university needs 3 more buildings the size of the current bio-engineering building under construction. The university is attempting to get more modular buildings, and if necessary they will fast track certain items with the assumption that the university will eventually have the funding for the buildings. Sadly the funding is not keeping up with the necessary universities current needs.

   Founders’ day will be October 29th 2014. It will be the 50th anniversary of the dedication of the first building on campus. This will become a campus wide celebrated event. There will be a celebration of winding down the fund raising campaign the same day. With no more announcements, the president opened the floor to questions. There were none.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Richard Scotch moved to approve the agenda with the addition of the Regent Request Discussion as item 9. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes with minor spelling errors corrected. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried.

4. Presentation by Nate Howe- Information Security Office
Chief Information Officer Nate Howe gave a presentation to the Academic Senate detailing the recent accomplishments of his office. He informed the Senate that his office is working with various committees across campus to update outdated information security policies. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation is in Appendix A.

The previous Senate concern of “what is ‘university data’” was raised during the question and answer session. A motion was made to postpone further discussion on the topic until the November Senate meeting. In the meantime a definition of what ‘university data’ means will be developed by Murray Leaf, Ravi Prakash, Tim Shaw, and Nate Howe. R. Chandrasekaran seconded. The motion was approved.

5. Speaker’s Report – Tim Redman
1. Tim Redman returned on October 1, 2014. He formally thanked David Cordell, Murray Leaf, Richard Scotch and Christina McGowan for filling in during his absence.
2. Speaker Redman responded to Judd Bradbury’s request for an annual report to be created for the Faculty Senate. Tim Redman stated that the annual report is the minutes which are approved by the Senate and posted on the Senate website. A summary has no status as there is no reference to this in Roberts Rules of Order. It was suggested that the ‘annual report’ be a summary presented to the Caucus meeting each year by the Speaker. This procedure was agreeable to everyone.
3. There will be an Academic Council and Faculty Senate meeting in November. There will be an Academic Council meeting in December but not a Senate meeting. There will not be an Academic Council meeting in January, but there will be a Senate meeting. The December Council meeting will set the agenda for the January Senate meeting.
4. Everything else is on the agenda.

6. FAC Report
The meeting was attended by Murray Leaf and David Cordell. Murray Leaf’s report is as follows.

1. The faculty advisory Council met on September 25th and 26th Thursday and Friday.
2. At the beginning of the meeting, I recounted what Pres. Daniel had reported to us from OGC: namely that all universities in the system had approved UTSP 175 but UT Dallas. I said I had checked with Austin and they had not approved it. The representatives from Austin at the meeting confirmed that they had not approved it. We then asked if any of the other universities had approved it. The show of hands indicated that no one had.
3. The first major guest was Paul Foster the new chair of the Board of Regents. The FAC was very impressed. He made a point of expressing regard and respect for faculty and what faculty do. He reaffirmed the traditional but recently abandoned position of the regents that they will not engage in micromanagement. He also, very importantly, indicated interest in more communication between the faculty and the board. We agreed that we would make a recommendation. At the end of the meeting, the FAC recommended that the Council have a representative from the health campuses and also a representative from the academic campuses invited to meetings of the academic affairs committee with privilege of the floor.

Chairman Foster also made the point that he thinks the board should act as a corporate body and not as individuals. That is, individual members should not be making the kind of personal inquiries and demands that the Texas Public Policy Foundation (TPPF) members of the board have been making recently.

4. We also had our legislative report from Barry McBee, Vice Chancellor and chief governmental relations officer. The prospect is mixed. It looks like the legislature will definitely have more money to spend but will be more "conservative" and therefore perhaps less inclined to spend it on education.

5. Susan Franzen, Director, Shared Services Initiatives, discussed time and attention management.

6. Rep. Donna Howard, from the Austin area, discussed the issues in the upcoming legislative session. She agreed with McBee's assessment of the upcoming political balance. She also, however, showed a solid awareness of the issues in higher education in Texas and the need to support it more vigorously. She is on the house higher education committee and may be considered for chair although she is a Democrat and thinks it unlikely that she will be appointed.

7. Patricia Hurst spoke to the Council about the report from the Regents' task group on intellectual property. She stressed that it is still very far from becoming a recommendation to the Regents and that system is now seeking advice and reactions from the Faculty Advisory Council. Recommendations may include revising the basic regents' rules 90101, 90102 90103. The discussion was frank and constructive. I asked if she had received the FAC resolutions on intellectual property. She said that she had. While she repeated many times the principle that the creation belongs to the creator, it was not clear that she sees how the current regions rules are inconsistent with that principle. The Faculty Advisory Council will keep working on it.

8. Randy Wallace, associate vice chancellor and chief business officer, gave a very clear presentation of the universities' total budget.
9. We also met with VC Pedro Reyes and Dan Sharphorn, Director of OGC. We ask Mr. Sharphorn or if there was any possibility consideration of changing or revising UTSP 175. His response indicated that there was not.

Dr. Reyes listed several matters of concern that he would like faculty views on. One is guns on campus. They are expecting a new bill to come forward in the legislature and they’re expecting the legislature to be more inclined to pass it this year than last. The second is grade inflation. The TPPF has decided that this is another scandal in higher education that they have to deal with and has proposed a bill in the legislature that would require all transcripts to show the average grade in the course along with the grade for the student. The TPPF paper that is circulated to the legislature is the usual sweeping overstatement. The third is in-state tuition for undocumented students. I don’t remember the fourth. Perhaps it was the idea from one of the regents that online course evaluations should also include student comments. This idea has subsequently been circulated by Vice Chancellor Reyes to the presidents for comment.

There was also considerable discussion, or speculation, regarding the new Chancellor McRaven. He will take office beginning in January. The general attitude is wait-and-see. Those on the Council with military background or military experience are generally more optimistic than some who lack such experience.

10. The FAC discussed a bundle of issues connected to upward evaluation of administrators. Apparently on many campuses this is not very satisfactory. Several members brought this up in the discussion with Vice Chancellor Reyes. Initially, there were many recommendations to elaborate the relevant Regents’ Rule to include more specification of how the review was to be conducted and increase the frequency. On discussion, the Council decided that the better approach was to make recommendations to senate organizations to be more involved on their own campuses in making local rules.

11. The Council passed several resolutions. One was to renew our previous resolution in opposition to guns on campus. Another was a recommendation to the member institutions, as noted, that the faculty governance organizations be more involved in designing local policies to implement the Regents’ Rule for upward evaluation of administrators. Another was a recommendation to the Board of Regents by way of Vice Chancellor Reyes that a member of the faculty advisory Council from a health campus and a member from an academic campus be invited to attend meetings of the academic affairs committee of the regents with privilege of the floor.

7. Student Government Liaison Report- Nancy Fairbank
The week of November 15th will be Homecoming week. There will be parked cars for a tailgate, and the cars can enter at 9:30 AM. The actual tailgate will run from 10:30 AM-1:00
PM. The basketball teams will be making an appearance. Student Government (SG) is hopeful that the faculty will come out and support the event. SG is working on proposals for an alcohol policy, specifically alcohol in the Pub and a BYOB policy on campus. They are currently conducting a Wi-Fi survey of the campus. They feel that the Wi-Fi strength is not strong enough around the plinth. SG is working on a student toll tag program similar to UT Austin. This will give students a discounted rate, and have the school logo on the tag. They will be meeting with Dr. Blanchard the week of October 20th to discuss IP credits being comparable to AP credits. IP is not used in Texas much but is comparable to AP, but the transfer of credit hours is not the same. SG addressed the students’ comments being available at their Oct 14 meeting. An informal vote was taken, and concerns were raised at the meeting. Overall the student and SG were in favor of the idea. They will be submitting a more detailed email to Dr. Daniel within the next 7 days.

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

A. Cotutelle dual degree program agreement.

The Provost office notified all schools that all international agreements for degrees must go through the Provost office and go through the Faculty Governance process. This is the first agreement the Provost office has received since the notification.

The agreement is for one student only. The student will fulfill all the requirements to receive a PhD from UT Dallas, then using a portion of the research from UTD, the student would return to their home university to complete a second PhD for the home university. One member of the home university will be on the UTD PhD committee, and one member of UTD will be on the home university PhD committee. All French higher learning institutions participate in these types of agreements. There are a number of prestigious U.S. universities such as MIT, Yale and Columbia who have such agreements. This type of collaboration has been done for decades in the sciences. This type of agreement allows UTD to have access to a greater variety of research options. The purpose is to build research partnerships throughout the world between partnered universities.

For UTD as well such agreements will help enhance the visibility and carve out fruitful research partnerships. The home university covers all tuition and fees for the student. Currently UTD has one such agreement in place. This student will be graduating in May 2015.

A concern was raised by many CEP members that this could be considered “double dipping” as the student would be receiving 2 PhD’s for similar research work. In response it was noted that the student’s dissertation will clearly note that the PhD was done under a Cotutelle agreement. CEP moved to approve the agreement. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

B. MS in Energy Management

The proposal is to create a management level degree targeted towards management positions in energy companies. The intent of the program is to graduate from the
program skilled decision makers in the field. All courses but two already exist. The two that will need to be created are a capstone project, and one specialty course on law and regulation. An advisory board made up of local energy companies’ executives will assist guiding the program and the needs of the companies in the market. There are universities in Texas that offer Energy Management as an MBA concentration, but nothing as focused as this program. Typically, programs at Texas schools such as Rice, A&M and UT Austin are part of MBA program and are not specially focused on energy management. This degree will focus people who are not currently in the industry, or are in the industry but do not have a master’s degree. CEP moved to approve the proposal. Betsy Schlobohm seconded. The motion carried.

C. Informational: Repeatable Courses
Tim Shaw reviewed the policy, and clarified the language. Specifically he removed the term “penalty fee”, and replaced this with the phrase “undergrads will be charged the non-resident fee for those repeated courses.”

9. Regent Request: Student Evaluation of Faculty
A hand out was distributed to the Senate. Regents would like to publish student comments. In order for students to give permission for their comments to be used a check box would be included on the form. This will allow them to waive their FERPA rights on the document. President Daniel requested feedback from the Senate on the topic. A concern was raised that if a liable comment came from a student, does the university publish the comment; if so who makes the call on what is and is not published. Another concern raised was that a document would not be formally signed so that it can be part of an official record. Having a student sign the document could be problematic as there are students who are under the age of 18 and cannot sign for themselves on a legal document. There are websites already on the web that allow students to give comments on their professors. In those comments the language is not always appropriate, and would require sanitization. If similar comments were made who would sanitize the comments. Another concern raised was that if, for example, there were fewer than 10 comments, the sample size would be small, which could result in an inaccurate rating. The final concern raised was that faculty felt that the students may be misled on how this information could benefit them. It appears to be presented in how to aid students in picking their courses. From experience, the comments rarely give information to aid students in selecting their courses. Are the students aware that they are liable for the comments that they make. There is a case regarding Yelp in which comments made by someone were grounds for suit. It is plausible that a comment made by the students could be brought up 5 years later, and action could be taken against them, as well as the university. The major concern was who was sponsoring the information. By publishing this data the University is endorsing the information instead of the informal information from RateMyProfessor.com. The data the university provides will be official data. The Senate is not in favor of this proposal.

10. Committee on Committee Recommendations
Robert Glosser declined chair and appointment to the Academic Integrity Committee and Judd Bradbury declined appointment to the committee. The Committee on Committees recommended Dongsheng Brian Ma as chair and Vance Lewis as members. Matt Brown declined his appointment to the Learning Management System Committee. The Committee on Committees recommended John McCaskill. Ivan Sudbourough declined his appointment
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to CQ. The Committee on Committees recommended Jason Jue. Pankaj Choudhary declined the appointment to the Library Committee. The Committee on Committees recommended Mieczyslaw Dabkowski. Peter Park declined his appointment as member and chair of the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity. The Committee on Committees recommended Rashaunda Henderson to replace him as member. Following a discussion it was decided that Rashaunda would also replace him as chair of the committee. Christa McIntyre Rodriguez declined the appointment to the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. The Committee on Committees recommended Theodore Price. At the previous Senate meeting John Poliski was recommended to be on the Biosafety and Chemical Safety Committee; however it was found he was already on the committee. To fill that position the Committee on Committees recommended Michael Biewer. John Hansen declined his position on the Research involving Human Subjects Committee. The Committee on Committees recommended Michael Rugg. Betsy Schlobohm moved to approve the amended recommendations. Jessica Murphy seconded. The motion carried.

11. New Business:
   There was none.

12. Adjournment
   There being no further business, President Daniel adjourned the meeting at 3:33 pm.

APPROVED: ____________________
Tim Redman
Speaker of the Academic Senate

DATE: 6.25.15
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Nate Howe
Chief Information Security Officer
nate.howe@utdallas.edu

GOALS TODAY

- Recent accomplishments
- Approach to Information Security Policy draft
- Obtain feedback and support
RECENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Promoted 3rd party patching with Secunia
- Redesigned website with FAQs
- Awareness training brochures
- Streamlined vendor survey
- Monthly ISC meetings
- Open house for Computer Science students
- Drafted Information Security Policy

WHY ESTABLISH INFORMATION SECURITY POLICY?

- Establishes expectations and objectives
- Explains roles, responsibilities, and authority
- Builds awareness and accountability among users

CAN EVERYTHING IN THE POLICY BE ACHIEVED?

- Probably not; benefits must be balanced with cost and disruption
- Information Security wants to create transparent conversations where risks are considered and accepted at the right level (ie. Principal Investigator)
PAST POLICY MISTAKES

- Treating verbal statements by the CISO as policy
- Posting documents on the Information Security website and treating them as policy
- Failing to get feedback and use HOP to make policy official

NEW POLICY WRITING PROCESS

- Started with UT System standard wording they expect at all campuses
- Added specific UT Dallas wording; will replace outdated documents with this single container
- Circulate draft to stakeholders, such as:
  - Communications, Faculty Senate, Human Resources, Information Resources, Internal Audit, Legal, Police...
- Submit to HOP for review, feedback, and/or approval
- Procedures, standards, FAQs, and training materials under development
Sources of Content

**UT System**
- Definitions
- General
- Confidentiality & Security of Data
- Email
- Incidental Use of Information Resources
- Additional Requirements for Portable and Remote Computing
- Password Management
- User Acknowledgement

(Mostly pages 1-4)

**UT Dallas**
- Overview
- Authority
- Roles & Responsibilities
- Data Classification
- Access Control
- Backup & Recovery
- Data Destruction
- Application Management
- Computer Systems Management
- Physical Security
- Business Continuity Planning
- Third-Party Vendors
- Disciplinary Actions

(Mostly pages 5-8)

Examples of Feedback Received

- Push back on UT System "no expectation of privacy regarding any University Data" wording to highlight this authority would be used in the course of a specific investigation only; no general scanning of user's personal machines is intended or feasible

- Section breaks clarify which content originates from UT System

- Add section explaining all policy elements subject to Exception

- Add additional detail to Roles & Responsibilities, such as Information Resources

- Focus on "the process of improving Information Security on campus" rather than Information Security Office
NEXT STEPS

• Is the Senate comfortable with the approach we are taking?

• Is there substantive feedback that should be incorporated into the Information Security Policy draft?

• Does the Senate support submission of Information Security Policy draft to the HOP?

Questions & Discussion

Nate Howe
Chief Information Security Officer
nate.howe@utdallas.edu