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
April 16, 2014

Present: Hobson Wildenthal, Naofal Al-Dhair Shawn Alborz, Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Gail Breen, Gerald Burnham, John Burr, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Gregg Dieckmann, Vladimir Dragovic, Jennifer Holmes, D. T. Huynh, Murray Leaf, Dennis Miller, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Tim Redman, Fabiano Rodrigues, Mark Salamasick, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Si Zheng


Visitors: Frank Anderson, Andrew Blanchard, George DeCourey, Gene DeLute, Andrea Fumagalli, Nate Howe, Calvin Jamison, Abby Kratz, Jinkunug Na, Mary Jo Venetis

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order at 2:08 PM. He had no major announcements. The President was to make a budget proposal in Austin on April 17. Administration is still waiting on the response from the subcommittee on the tuition increase.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Tim Redman made the motion to approve the agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
Richard Scotch moved to approve the amended minutes. Judd Bradbury seconded. The motion carried.

4. Introduction of the New Information Security Officer
The new Information Security Officer (ISO), Nate Howe was introduced to the Senate, and he gave a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is included in Appendix A. Information Security is currently working on two main projects, 1) a safe and compliant cloud base drive alternative for the University, and 2) the encryption of desktop computers on campus. In the past there has been a blanket 'No' on any cloud based drives with no rationale given and no
alternatives offered. With no alternatives people have continued to use cloud-based drives, which is a serious security risk. Information Security is developing a substitute service that will be safe and compliant.

Desktop encryption had been a topic in the Senate before but the question of “why” was never answered. The concern is that if someone could physically steal the hard drive of a computer, could they have access to that hard drive’s data. Encryption prevents a thief from gaining access to that data, protecting everything so that users do not have to be concerned. There is a minor performance impact but with newer machines it is less likely to be noticeable. Each desktop considered for encryption is evaluated on risk-versus-reward. Is the desktop in a public place where it could be easily stolen? What is the machine used for? Is the person using it likely to work with high risk data (i.e., FERPA, HIPPA, HR information)? When was it purchased? If the desktop is considered high risk, then it will be encrypted. An exception may be made if the machine is so old that the software cannot run on it, or the performance is so disrupted that it makes the machine unusable. ISO Howe would be able to approve exceptions, offer a compromise, or if necessary, recommend replacing the machine. He is willing to work with faculty toward the university’s best interest. UT system has a completion deadline for desktop encryption by the end of May.

ISO Howe opened the floor to questions. Shawn Alborz requested an update on the ‘single log in approach’. Howe noted that project had been on hold but work is now proceeding. This process would allow a user to log into a system, and the log in would follow them from one application to the next. The main concern has been whether it is possible to audit the information. Judd Bradbury brought up the feasibility of two-factor authentication for some systems, i.e., a password and a key generated for the user to access a system. This type of security is used in high security areas. Currently the university’s legal department is working with the tool vendor.

Tres Thompson proposed a hypothetical situation to get clarification on how the desktop encryption would work: a locked lab with limited access and with computers that contain no FERPA, or HIPAA information. ISO Howe noted that this type of room would most likely receive an exemption, but a request would have to be made listing all the reasons why it would be safe.

5. Speaker’s Report – Murray Leaf
1. We have received a response to our policy on revoking graduate degrees from Priscilla Lozano at OGC. Her proposed alternative is on the agenda.

2. We have also received a response from Priscilla to our charge for the Faculty Personnel Review Committee back from OGC. Her reactions were mostly questions. We have responded with answers.

3. OGC is also reviewing our changes to the Campus Facilities Oversight Committee.

4. The Council has reviewed the policy on upward evaluation of administrators, and among other things agreed with the provost that it would advisable to put the administrative reviews on a six year cycle like the periodic performance evaluation. In that connection I have also reviewed the policy on Periodic Performance evaluation. It would not need any
changes. If the council concurs, we should be able to bring back all the necessary recommendations at the next Senate meeting.

5. Everything else is on the agenda.

6. FAC Report
   The FAC will meet tomorrow and Friday (April 17-18).

   I have sent an expanded version of our objections to UTSP 175. The FAC will discuss it. We will also discuss the claims the Regents Rules make to own all the "research data" we create or obtain "in the course and scope" of our employment.

   The agenda includes a discussion with Raymund Parede, Commissioner of the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Doubtless we will discuss the core program issues, and the CB's role in it. Evidently we could not get the legislators or new regents we wanted to invite.

7. Senate Election Report
   There was an error on the vote counting. David Cordell recommended waving the cap on the senate membership, and approving the 54 instead of the 51. By unanimous consent, Tim Redman moved to temporarily raise the cap to 54 Senate members. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

8. Student Government Liaison Report
   No report was given.

9. CEP Proposals- MS in Business Analytics
   The catalog copy for the MS in Business Analytics program was presented. It had previously been approved by CEP and Senate. The Graduate catalog was approved by the CEP committee in March but the finalized document for the MS program did not get approved by Graduate council until April. The format was corrected by JSOM and was approved by CEP. Judd Bradbury moved to approve the catalog copy of the MS in Business Analytics. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

10. Update the School bylaws guidelines to reflect the new Voting Faculty
    The template for the school by laws was updated to reflect the changes in UTDPP1088 and 1077. Kurt Beron moved to approve the amendments. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried.

11. Review policy on upward evaluation of Administrators
    There is a difference between the review of Administrators and the Periodic Performance Evaluation policy. Administrators are being reviewed every 5 years, while the PPE requires every 6 years. The amendments made to UTDPP 1047 change the review of administrators to every 6 years, from 5 years. The current document does not specify that the Provost should give a report on the evaluation of deans to the Senate. The university has been doing this but it has not been required. This will be included in the policy.

    The Academic Council made the following amendments. In section 2.2.6:
"To the extent allowed by law, supervisors will preserve the identity of the source of all written and verbal comments received from faculty in connection with the review of an academic administrator. No anonymous material other than the official surveys that correspond with this policy will be considered as part of the review."

The statement was changed to:

"To the extent allowed by law, supervisors will not reveal the identity of the sources of all written comments received from faculty in connection with the review of an academic administrator. No anonymous material other than the official surveys that correspond with this policy will be considered as part of the review."

In order to have the document reflect the current titles of school administrators the following amendments were proposed in Section 2.2.8:

"Following the immediate supervisor’s meeting with the academic administrator being reviewed, the supervisor will convene a meeting to communicate his/her response to the review to the faculty members in the relevant academic unit. In the case of a review of the Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Undergraduate Education, Dean of Libraries, Director of Research Administration, and Vice President for Research, the Provost’s response will be communicated to the Academic Senate."

The statement was changed to:

"Following the immediate supervisor’s meeting with the academic administrator being reviewed, the supervisor will convene a meeting to communicate his/her response to the review to the faculty members in the relevant academic unit. In the case of a review of the Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Undergraduate Education, the deans of the schools, and the Dean of Libraries, the Provost’s response will be communicated to the Academic Senate. The review of the Vice President for Research and the Provost will be reported to the Senate by the President of the University."

Tim Redman moved to approve the amendments. Liz Salter seconded. The motion was approved.

12. Revocation of Graduate Degrees back from UT System Office of the General Counsel (OGC)

The only major change made to the document was that OGC felt that, since this was a student disciplinary matter, it should be addressed by the Dean of Students’ Office. The Dean will appoint a committee of faculty experts to review. Gene Fitch, Andrew Blanchard, and Austin Cunningham all approved of the changes. Tres Thompson moved to accept the recommendations offered by the Office of General Counsel. Judd Bradbury seconded. The motion carried.

13. UTD Policy Implementing UTSP 180: OGC suggested revision

Tim Shaw made a couple of editorial changes on top of the changes that the Office of General Council made to the document. The general change was to make UTSP 180 apply to all University employees. All references to UTS175 were removed from the document so that UTSP180 can now be free standing. Judd Bradbury moved to accept the recommendation offered by the Office of General Council. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

14. Approval of Candidates for Graduation
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. Tim Redman 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. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

15. Adjournment

There being no further business, Judd Bradbury moved to adjourn. Tres Thompson seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 3:03 pm.
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- Introduction

- What is your definition of Security?
## Program Scope - Summarized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Confidentiality</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Delivery Channels

- People
- Process
- Technology
- Facilities
APPRAOCH

- Risk management, not risk elimination.
- Rather than say NO, we help discuss HOW to do things in a safe and responsible way.
- Need to be clear about WHY is are recommending changes.
- Represent UT Dallas first and the UT System second.
- Security is cheaper when built-in early, rather than added later.
EXAMPLE OF A CURRENT PROJECT

- Previous directive was to not use any cloud storage provider, i.e. dropbox.com.

- Despite directive, various services are used around campus because they are convenient.

- Working with IR and System to provide box.com solution, similar to what UT Austin already offers.

DESKTOP ENCRYPTION PROJECT

- If physical access to an unencrypted hard drive is achieved, operating system passwords irrelevant and files can be accessed.

- Whole disk encryption utilities protect all contents of hard drive without ongoing need for user intervention.

- Performance impact considered versus benefit.

- Desktop risk assessment based on location, purpose, user, and purchase date.

- High-risk desktops subject to encryption, exemption, or replacement.
Questions
&
Discussion
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