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 21, 2015

Present: Hobson Wildenthal, Robert Ackerman, Karen Baynham, Elizabeth Bell, Dinesh Bhatia, Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Patrick Brandt, Gail Breen, Matthew Brown, R. Chandrasekaran, Nadine Connell, David Cordell, Mieczyslaw Dabkowski, Vladimir Dragovic, Eric Farrar, Bernard Ganglmair, Nicholas Gans, Jennifer Holmes, Dorothee Horhon, D.T. Huynh, Mustapha Ishak-Bouchaki, Carie Lambert, Murray Leaf, Syam Menon, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Michael Rebello, Tim Redman, Christopher Ryan, Betsy Schlobohm, Richard Scotch, Sabrina Starnaman, Murat Torlak, Tonja Wissinger, Alejandro Zentner

Absent: Inga Musselman, Naofal Al-Dhair, Frank Anderson, John Burr, Gregory Dess, Gregg Dieckmann, Monica Evans, Lev Gelb, M. Ali Hooshyar, Michele Lockhart, BPS Murth, Ramachandran Natarajan, Simeon Ntanos, Jared Pickens, Ravi Prakash, Tres Thompson, Michael Tiefelsdorf,

Visitors: Denise Boots, Caitlynn Fortner, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Nicole Piquero, Marion Underwood

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
Interim President Wildenthal called the meeting to order at 2:01 PM. Chancellor McRaven calls every other Wednesday at 3 pm teleconference between the presidents of the universities. Therefore he must leave at 2:45 PM. President Wildenthal met with Student Government on October 20th, 2015 to begin discussions regarding a tuition and fee increase. This will be a campus-wide campaign to educate faculty, staff and students as to why the university needs to increase tuition and fees for Fall 2016 and future years. There has not been an increase in three years which poses a problem with the four-year fixed tuition program for students. The university hopes to present a 5% increase for incoming undergraduates and a 10% increase for incoming graduate students. He opened the floor to questions. There were none.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Richard Scotch made the motion to approve the amended agenda. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of the August 19, 2015 Minutes
Betsy Schlobohm, Viswanath Ramakrishna, and Ali Hooshyar were incorrectly noted as being absent. Richard Scotch moved to approve the amended minutes. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried.

4. Speaker’s Report – Tim Redman
1. Various individuals have requested updates on the status of the working group that is developing a proposal for concealed carry policies and procedures. Speaker Redman is on the workgroup and stated that the group was making good progress. It is the workgroup’s hope that a System-wide template will arrive from System shortly. After receiving the workgroup’s recommendations, President Wildenthal will present his recommendations to the System in December 2015.

2. There was a productive discussion on the Presidential search on 09/30/15. It was very informative for those who attended. Speaker Redman reminded the Senate members that if they have any thoughts they should contact the faculty representatives on the committee.

3. Speaker Redman made the recommendation to name two roads after former UT Dallas presidents—Dr. Franklyn G. Jenifer, and Dr. Henry Bryce Jordan. Jennifer Holmes moved for a resolution that two roads on campus should be named after Dr. Franklyn G. Jenifer, and Dr. Henry Bryce Jordan. Viswanath Ramakrishna seconded. The motion carried.

4. Everything else was on the agenda.

5. **Information Security Presentation- Nate Howe**
   Chief Information Security Officer Nate Howe gave a presentation to the Academic Senate updating them on what his office has accomplished in the past year, and what changes will be coming from his office in the coming months. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation is in Appendix A.

6. **Campus Update Report- Calvin Jamison and Denise Boots**
   Vice President of Administration Calvin Jamison gave a presentation to the Academic Senate updating them on what updates have been made to campus in the past year, and what changes will be coming from his office in the coming months. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation is in Appendix B.

7. **FAC Report- Murray Leaf**
   Report of the TEXAS COUNCIL OF FACULTY SENATES FALL MEETING
   October 16-17, 2015
   Embassy Suites Austin – Central

   The meeting began at 11 AM a.m. with an orientation for new members. Richard Scotch and I represented UT Dallas.

   The TCFS meets jointly with the Texas chapter of the AAUP and the Texas Association of College Teachers (TACT). Dana Cooper, TCFS President, introduced their representatives to speak for them. Peter Hugill (Texas A & M; currently VP of Membership) described TACT. James Klein (Chapter President) described the AAUP.

   While Dr. Klein was speaking we received word that the next person on the program was ill and would not appear. This was Dr. Bob Harkins, Associate Vice President for Campus Safety and Security at University of Texas at Austin. Among other things, he had been expected to talk about the University of Texas response to the concealed handgun bill, SB 11. With the agreement of the group, Dr. Klein continued at the podium to lead a discussion on this topic, with Dr. Cooper also moderating. It appeared from the discussion that only the UT system was approaching the problem as a system. Everyone else spoke as though their campus had to decide how to respond to the requirements of the bill on its own. The faculty continues to be deeply offended and upset by this imposition.
The next item was “Roundup reports.” Each campus submits a written report which should indicate major changes and concerns that may be of interest to other institutions. Each representative has two minutes to describe their report verbally. While they are speaking, someone (in this case, me) notes the major themes. We then discuss the themes to identify topics for events at subsequent meetings.

My summary of the roundup themes immediately after the presentation was brief because we had to move onto the next event. I elaborated these remarks in an email to the membership that evening. The email was:

Summarizing topics from the roundup reports

The concealed carry law is obviously the greatest single item of concern. So other concern occurred in a majority of the reports.

Probably the next most prominent topic mentioned was merit increases or pay increases, but more as a fact than problem.

After guns, several topics were mentioned about equally frequently and are somewhat intertwined.

The first of these in terms of the order mentioned was promotion and tenure policy. Five reports. Several campuses are writing it or revisiting it. Others seem to be trying to change it. And in two or perhaps three cases administrations had proposed new policies or changes in policy that the faculty senate was not consulted on and objected to. One campus was explicitly concerned with the problem of increasing emphasis on research. I think it was three who are concerned with whether to require outside letters of evaluation/recommendation for tenure reviews.

The second most common topic was probably shared governance. It came up in two ways. Four reports said that they were concerned with it and working on it by name, apparently with their administrations. And it was also an implied concern in the discussions of promotion and tenure policies in which the administration surprised the faculty and the governance body administration subsequently negotiated.

Five reports also noted that they were writing policies to give non-tenure-track faculty more security of employment by having longer and rotating contracts.

I think one or two reports also mentioned a problem of something like equity in pay for non-tenure-track faculty.

Three campuses indicated concern with evaluation of administrators.

About five reports also mentioned consideration of the structure of the Senate as an elected body one raising the question of whether it would be better to have membership elected at large,And therefore representing the university as a whole, or retaining their present system of representation by units in proportion to the numbers of faculty. The latter seems to be by far the most common pattern. This could probably bear discussion.

Both the policy discussions and the shared governance discussions conveyed the sense that on most campuses academic policies are not normally originated by the governance organization. This in itself
may be a good topic for a panel, namely: how can senates originate policy for policy changes in matters of concern to faculty, and what matters of this type would be of the greatest importance. The converse of this question is "what prevents senates from originating academic policies now?"

An underlying implication of several of the events described concerns the composition of faculty committees. Who appoints them, and what are the criteria? Also, of course, who writes their charges? There is a great deal of difference between a faculty committee whose charge is written by the Government organization and whose membership is appointed by the governance organization compared to a "faculty committee" whose charge is written by the provost or president and whose members are appointed by the provost or president.

The next event was a panel discussion that had emerged from the same process at the Spring meeting last year. At that time the Roundup reports, rather surprisingly, had indicated that several of the campuses had new presidents or provosts who showed a serious and constructive interest in shared governance. We decided that it would be interesting to make up a panel of such administrators in order to understand their motivation. The title of the panel was: A View from the Top: Leading Higher Ed in Tough Times. The panelists were: Dr. Ed Hudetz, Provost, University of Houston—Downtown; Dr. Carine Feyten Chancellor and President, Texas Woman’s University; and Dr. Dana Gibson Hoyt, President, Sam Houston State University. As the title may suggest, the original motivation for the panel was not fully conveyed to the panelists in the process of putting it together. Nevertheless, it worked. At the end of the discussion I re-described the origin and asked if they had any final observations from that perspective. Interestingly, they did. The consensus was that they were all people who did not mind argument. Indeed, in quite different ways they all agreed that argument, some form of open and constructive tension between faculty and administration, was absolutely necessary in the life of any university.

The banquet speaker that evening was Diana Natalicio, President of UT El Paso. She and the faculty of UT El Paso appear to have arrived at the same fundamental conclusion as the faculty of UT Dallas in our own beginning. They could not become a major national or international research university by ignoring or trying to work around their local community. They could only do it by serving that community and developing with it. She described how they did so, including cooperative relationships with local schools, including both community colleges and high schools. For example, they keep track of the high school origins of each of their students in their calculus and pre-calculus classes and send a report back to each high school each term saying how their former students have performed. They have also tried to keep their costs down and work hard among themselves to minimize the impact. She also argued very convincingly and clearly for an alternative to the current use of the graduation rate as a way to evaluate institutional effectiveness. The graduation rate is the proportion of incoming freshmen who graduate from the same school. It ignores students who transfer in and graduate, and students who transfer out and graduate elsewhere. Faculty throughout the UT system have objected to this measure consistently since it first became popular. Instead, she said they use the “completion rate.” It is the proportion of their students who get a degree, regardless of where they began their studies. It was a very impressive talk.

Saturday morning we continued the review of the Roundup reports. Topics for the next meeting will be: 1. A committee would form to consider governance organizations. The Committee will report for the meeting. 2. We (M. Leaf and others) will prepare a resolution on the scope of authority of governance organizations. 3. There will be an NTS faculty panel. It will consider promotion, contract length, criteria for evaluation, and workload.
This was followed by discussion of the 60x30 TX strategic plan of the coordinating board. It turned out that more than half of three representatives had never heard of it. Noting this, and that faculty governance had evidently not been involved in any of the discussions, the TCFS passed a resolution urging the Coordinating Board not to proceed further without formally involving faculty governance organizations.

The membership agreed that the Roundup reports should not be posted on the TCFS website. They would be compiled and sent to the membership as an email attachment.

8. **CEP Proposals- Clint Peinhardt**

The Committee representative presented the following committee report.

**A. Distance Learning Syllabi**
The Distance Learning group combined the old and new templates to make a more comprehensive syllabus. It was recommended that all of the different URL’s be spelled out to aid in locating them.

**B. BS in Public Policy**
The Public Policy and Political Economy Program in EPPS proposes a new undergraduate major in Public Policy. The initiative is seen by EPPS as the foundation for more interdisciplinary programs with ECS and other schools. The new major orients students toward more technical fields and has a more applied focus than the political science degree. It allows 2- credits of electives.

**C. Official Academic Transcript Policy**
The document defines how “concentrations/specializations/tracks” can be listed in order to allow them to be documented on the transcript. One of the strong supporters was the ATEC School. A summation is that in order for a “concentrations/specializations/track” to be allowed on a transcript it must be noted in the catalog copy. Copies of the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog copy were also submitted.

**D. Supplemental Undergraduate and Graduate Courses for Spring 2016**
Seven supplemental Undergraduate courses were approved by CEP.

CEP made a motion for the Senate to approve the Distance Learning Syllabi, BS in Public Policy, Official Transcript Policy as well as the Catalog copy for the Undergraduate and Graduate catalog copy, and the seven supplemental undergraduate courses as circulated. The motion carried.

9. **Student Government Report- Caitlynn Fortner**
Student Government has been working on a bullet pointed ‘Stop Sexual Assault’ campus wide campaign. SG is currently planning the homecoming tailgate. It is set for November 14, 2015 in conjunction with basketball games. SG is working with the bookstore to make a student’s textbook experience better. SG is also working on way to protect pedestrians across campus.
10. Annual Committee Reports – David Cordell
Twenty Three of Thirty Three reports were submitted. Richard Scotch moved to accept the reports that had been submitted to date. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried. The reports will be posted on the Committee website.

11. Consensual Relationship Policy – Colleen Dutton
Richard Scotch moved to approve the policy as circulated. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried. A copy of the policy will be included in appendix C.

12. 3+3+3 Committee on Non-Tenure Faculty Report – Richard Scotch
One year ago the 3+3+3 committee was formed to review the non tenure track faculty policy. The committee proposed amendments to UTDPP 1062. David Cordell gave a list of suggested amendments. The changes would be incorporated into the policy and resubmitted to the Senate for approval.

13. Adjournment
Secretary Cordell stated a point of order that the meeting had lost quorum, and therefore no more issues could be discussed or voted upon. All further items on the agenda required discussion, or vote. Kurt Beron made a motion to table until the next meeting Legislative Summary, Assessment Committee Charge, Approval of Committee Replacements, Amendments to Committee Charges, Regents Rules 31008- Termination of a Faculty Member Pool and to adjourn the meeting and to meet again on November 18, 2015 at 2:00 PM in Texas Instruments Auditorium, ECS 2.102. Zetsy Schlbohm seconded the motion. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 3:47 PM.

APPROVED: Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty

DATE: 11/15/15