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
August 21, 2013


Visitors: Andrew Blanchard, Gene Fitch, Serenity King Abby Kratz, John McCaskill, Chris Parr

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order. As of August 21 there are approximately 1000 international graduate students still waiting to register. The university is expecting a 10% enrollment increase but without those students it will only be 4%. Most of them are currently waiting on TB vaccinations and other such items.

Jennifer Holmes requested an update on when the finals schedule would be posted. Currently professors are waiting to add the dates to their syllabus, but have not gotten a firm time and date. Andrew Blanchard responded that they are currently working on it and are aware of the situation. The dates and times will be determined by upper University management.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Speaker Leaf presented three changes to the agenda. The discussion on the resolution on invasive software was tabled until President Daniel will be in attendance. The committee on committees’ recommendations for the Institutional Animal Care and Use committee will be withdrawn pending further review. Gene Fitch’s presentation on Chapter 49 will be moved from item 11 to item 8. Jennifer Holmes moved to accept the amended agenda. Peter Assman seconded. Motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes. Liz Salter seconded. Motion carried.
4. Speaker's Report – Murray Leaf

1. New guidelines for bylaws for schools. The committee has nearly concluded. I think we have reached a consensus but the committee has not yet agreed to it explicitly. One more round of emails should do it. I expect to have the draft for the Council meeting in September. The most important change from the current guidelines is that each school will have an executive committee from the faculty or an academic advisory committee that will work with the dean and more processes will be spelled out in such a way as to assure administrative transparency and appropriate consultation.

2. Encryption policy continues to be a problem. President Daniel has authorized our ISO, Leah Teusch, to appoint her own consulting committee, which she has done. This appears to indicate intent not to work with the Senate Information Security Advisory Committee. Nevertheless, our committee is continuing to try to work with her and in any case to develop its own policy recommendations. This includes item 13 on the agenda. UT System policy is that when policies are formed, before they get system approval they should have been reviewed by all stakeholders. Regents Rules, in addition, are clear that when the stakeholders are “faculty,” this means faculty organized through the governance system. The HOP committee has been established to assure that this happens before policies are sent forward for approval. Our HOP committee has acted accordingly and will doubtless continue to do so.

3. Everything else that has been under discussion is reflected in the agenda.

5. FAC Report

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Advisory Council met on Friday, August 9. The main purpose was to set the agenda for the full FAC meeting at the end of September, but to do so we also met with VC Reyes and Dan Sharphorn, Director of the Office of General Council.

The main concern was the proposed policy on conflict of commitment and interest, as described in UTSP 180. As originally drafted, in accordance with demands of the Regents, this would have required all faculty and certain staff to describe all their outside activities, compensated and uncompensated, regardless of whether they occurred during their periods of employment during the academic year and on work days. They would be required to get approval from their supervisors before such activities could be undertaken and all reported activities were to be disclosed on a public, searchable, database. Financial interests of others in their households would also have to be disclosed. Failure to disclose could result in termination of employment.

In response, last Winter the FAC passed several resolutions. Essentially, they reasserted long standing and long recognized rights that faculty members have as human beings, citizens, and scholars. The conclusion was that it should be up the concerned faculty and staff themselves to make a prima facia judgment of whether there was the reasonable appearance of a conflict, and if so they should disclose it. Religious, political, and other non-work related associations were their own concern. Activities we normally engage in as scholars in our respective discipline, and report in our annual reports, did not need to be reported again and we did not need to get permission to engage in them.
Evidently, the presidents and others all reacted along the same lines. At the Spring meeting of the FAC, Chancellor Cigarroa promised to establish a committee to consider revising the policy further. He also promised that once the revision was completed, the draft would come back to the FAC for further comment. The purpose of the meeting with Dr. Reyes and Mr. Sharphorn was to describe the revisions and hand the draft policy back to the FAC accordingly. It will be on the agenda for the September FAC meeting. But I can convey the most important point now. The draft is intended to conform to the FAC resolutions. In my opinion it does so. Normal scholarly activity does not need to be disclosed; it can be considered preapproved. The only information that will be on the database is *prima facia* conflicts, along with the plans for managing them. We are still discussing who will be able to access, but along with the draft of the new SP 180 Dr. Reyes circulated a report from the National Academy of Public Administration on a similar proposal to disclose financial interests of members of Congress. Even though such information is already otherwise available, they unequivocally recommended against putting it on a public, searchable, database—for all kinds of reasons both of personal security and national security.

The encryption policy has also been modified. The only information that the university now will consider itself obligation to protect by encryption is that which is required by law, either HIPAA, FERPA, or specific contractual requirements.

The possible policy on departments is moving slowly, but were assured that nothing will be decided finally without faculty involvement.

6. **Approval of April 17th Caucus Minutes**
   Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes of the Caucus with minor edits. Kurt Beron seconded.

7. **Presentations by Serenity King**
   A. SACS Fifth-Year Report

   In 2007 the University was reaffirmed. In March 2014 the University is required to submit a fifth year interim report to SACS. SACS is now requiring the university to include certificate program graduates as part of the institutional summary section. Previously the university had been required to report the list of certificate programs but not the number of graduates from each certificate program. SACS is also requiring to provide reports professional accreditation on Self Studies to ensure the institution consistently presents itself to all accrediting bodies. The university must demonstrate Provide an additional 10 page Quality Enhancement Plan Impact Report, which evaluates the extent to which the institution achieved the goals and objectives of GEMS: Gateways to Excellence in Math and Science.

   The largest part of the fifth-year interim report is the Part III, the ‘mini compliance report’. It consists of how we respond to 20 of the principles. In the cohorts that submit reports each year, as few as 12% of institutions are passing their 5th year review. Our goal is to not make the same mistakes that others are making. Serenity distributed a list of what is needed for the reports to all of the senators. (Appendix A). The University must respond at the program level, not institution. SACS needs a faculty roster of all members.
of faculty. This is to prove that the university is not run on adjunct professors. Full time faculty determined by our workload policy.

When the assessment team request assessment reports, those reports need to include a narrative on the how the results will be used to improve the program. The reports need to detail what has changed since the review to meet the student learning outcomes. From the purposes of SACS each major at the university is considered a program, this includes general education.

B. Higher Education Legislative Summary

Of the 6000 bills submitted to the legislature, 2000 of them were tracked by UT System. Of those 2000 the UTD group followed 400 bills. Serenity was tasked with following 100 of those bills. She distributed a document detailing some of the bills she followed. (Appendix B).

The first bill highlighted limited the powers of the coordinating board. They are now required to do negotiated rulemaking. In addition, institutions cannot decline transfer credit SOLEY on the accreditation status of the sending institution. There is now a time limit on how long program approvals and review can take. The coordinating board now has only 5 days to respond to request additional information to supplement a program proposal. If no response in one year, the program is auto approved. The coordinating board can no longer consolidate or eliminate degree programs. They are allowed to make recommendation, but they are to go to the board of regents only.

SB40 requires institutions to require an additional course for any program leading to a teaching certificate on how to deal with mental and emotional disorders. SB11459 requires military personnel be allowed reinstatement into their graduate programs. SB1531 requires universities to tell students how much it will cost them to stay in school greater than 4 years, and how much income will be lost from doing so. There were significant changes made to do HB5 it due to the number of items added to it. The bill contained changes to high school curriculums. The changes to the curriculum will change how the university will admit students for auto admissions.

David Cordell asked if it was possible for a student who gets a 1500 out of 2400 on SAT to apply. Asst. Provost King responded that they could apply. A student cannot be stopped from applying with that score. HB1296 requires the TEA to make public accountability available. It requires the coordinating board to do a work force study and then send to institutions to tailor new programs to those projections.

Under the heading of governance issues there were several bills. SB146 was regarding criminal background check on students who wish to live on campus. SB1907 allows handguns to be transported on campus in cars, but NOT on person. This was the only hand gun bill that was passed by the legislator. SB15 was on Regents responsibilities. It was passed by the house and senate but was vetoed by the Governor. Asst. Provost King included a link in her document to a speech by Kel Seliger’s to the coordinating board on July 13 2013. Speaker Leaf encouraged faculty to express their opinion on SB15 to their state senators.

Page 4 of 6
8. Updates to Chapter 49- Student Code of Conduct

The code was not meeting the university's needs, and is now being brought up to date. Gene Fitch presented revisions to specifically 49.07 A, 49.07B and 49.16 C. These areas state the responsibilities of the Dean of Students office in responding to faculty members or referral sources when an academic or disciplinary case is sent to them. They wish to roll them into one generic statement so that should there be future changes they only have to update one area instead of three.

Confidentiality of Disciplinary Process. In accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), 20 USC 1232g, a student's disciplinary files are considered "educational records." These records are confidential and may only be accessed by the student and as otherwise provided by law. In cases involving academic dishonesty, the dean will promptly notify the appropriate faculty member regarding the outcome of any disciplinary process so that the outcome may be properly recorded. The dean will also notify other appropriate university officials, including the student's advisor or associate dean, upon request by the university official and a showing of a legitimate educational interest.

Dean Fitch’s office will alert the reporter of the infraction if the student was found guilty of the infraction, but has removed the requirement that the associate deans of the schools be advised as well. It will now be the exception instead of the norm. It was thought that it might be a FERPA violation by releasing it all the time. The Academic example given by Dean Fitch was that a faculty member is out of the country for the summer. The faculty member reported an R for a student, and it will be up to the associate dean to fix. That is an example of when the information would be shared with an Associate Dean when they were not directly involved.

Richard Scotch expressed the faculty’s concern that when a faculty member is a student’s advisor, and is never notified when a graduate student has “disappeared” due to suspension or expulsion. Dean Fitch assured him that in that type of case the advisor would be notified. Speaker Leaf recommended that a policy or memorandum be written so the need to know is clear. Dean Fitch agreed that once the amendments were approved by Austin one would be developed.

An example of information that would not be shared was that a student had not appeared in class for two weeks. The professor tried to contact them but had no success. It was reported and a welfare check was made. The check found that the student had been raped. The office will not share the “back story” but will let the faculty member know that they are dealing with it. The office will keep communication with the faculty member to monitor the student’s welfare in class.

Another example is that a student is disruptive or has poor hygiene. It isn’t a threat but is a concern. The student is brought in to the office and is upset that a faculty member has reported them. The student makes the comment “wait until I see them again.” In this case the office will call the faculty member and let them be aware that the student made that statement before they left the office. The student will be removed from the class. If it is something basic, they won’t
give the faculty member the “back story” but if it would directly impact the professor or the students in their class, the office will alert them immediately.

Tim Redman moved to approve the text submitted with the amendment of the “Confidentiality of Disciplinary Process” moved per discussions with Abby Kratz to section 49.04. Richard Scotch seconded. Motion carried.

9. Student Government Liaison Report
No representatives present. No report.

10. Framework for Excellence in Doctoral Education
UT System posted this and wished faculty response. Jennifer Holmes was concerned about the wording of the document (Appendix C), specifically point K onwards. She felt the framework more detailed than necessary for some programs. Matthew Brown was also concerned that the university would be required to use MyEDU software. Speaker Leaf responded that these were guidelines, not requirements. Richard Scotch moved to approve the framework in principle. Tim Redman seconded. 15 votes in favor, 2 Nay votes. Motion carried.

11. UTDPP 1052-Policy on Procedures for Completing a Graduate Degree
Dr. Leaf explained that the wording changes on the document were made to conform to the Framework for Excellence. Jennifer Holmes moved to approve the changes. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

12. Committee on Committees recommendations.
Richard Scotch moved to accept the recommendations from the Committees on Committees, and allow Council to fill any outstanding appointments. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

13. Resolution on the passing of Cy Cantrell
Matthew Brown moved to approve the memorial statement (Appendix D) on Cy Cantrell as amended. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

14. Annual Reports from Committees
Richard Scotch moved to accept the Library Committee, the Committee on Student Scholarships and the Distance Learning Committees’ Annual Reports. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion passed.

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

APPROVED: [Signature]
Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate

DATE: 25 SEP 2013
SACS Fifth-Year Interim Report Overview
Due Date: March 25, 2014

Five Components:
Part 1: Signatures Attesting to Integrity
Part 2: Institutional Summary Form Prepared for Commission Reviews
Part 3: Fifth-Year Compliance Certification
Part 4: Fifth-Year Follow Up Report (not applicable to UT Dallas)
Part 5: Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

Part 2 Institutional Summary:
1. History and Characteristics: (mission, service area, composition of student population, admission policies, identify peer institutions)
2. List of Degrees: (majors and certificates. Must include the number of graduates in the calendar year previous to submitting this report (January to December) for majors and certificates
Action: provide number of spring 2013 certificate graduates
3. Off-Site and Distance or Correspondence Education
   a. Off-site Locations: (for each site, list majors offered and for each major offered, list percentage offered at that site)
   b. Distance/Correspondence Education: (list of credit-bearing program in which 50% or more are delivered through distance education modes. For each, indicate whether the program is delivered through synchronous or asynchronous technology or both)
4. Accreditation: (list federally recognized agencies that currently accredit the institution, provide the date of the most recent review and indicate if negative action was taken, provide copies of statements used to describe itself for each accrediting bodies, indicate any agency that has terminated accreditation and the date and reasons for termination, and indicate the date and reason for an institution voluntarily withdrawing accreditation with any agency.
Action: provide copies of latest self-studies
5. Relationship to the U.S. Department of Education (list any limitations, suspensions, or terminations by DOE)

Part 5: QEP Impact Report:
Limited to 10 pages to address the following:
1. a succinct list of the initial goals and intended outcomes of the QEP
2. a discussion of changes made to the QEP and the reasons for making those changes
3. a description of the QEP’s impact on student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning, as appropriate to the design of the QEP. Include the achievement of identified goals and outcomes, and any unanticipated outcomes of the QEP.
4. a reflection on what the institution has learned as a result of the QEP experience
Part 3 Fifth-Year Compliance Certification: Demonstrate compliance with the following Principles of Accreditation: (88% of institutions ‘failing’ first attempt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Keys to Compliance</th>
<th>Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Number of Full-time Faculty (49% of institutions received citation)</td>
<td>Institution’s full-time faculty data must be disaggregated to the program/discipline level. Rationale for how institution determines a particular number of full-time faculty is adequate per program. Evidence of how faculty load policy is applied.</td>
<td>Provide faculty roster indicating full-time/part-time status per program, including certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.8</td>
<td>Qualified Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.1</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness—Student Learning Outcomes (57% of institutions received citation)</td>
<td>Assessment process described; evidence it is followed; evidence student learning outcomes assessed using mature data; document how data is used to make program improvements; provide rationale for sampling; include data on off-site/distance programs and consider comparability</td>
<td>Program assessment: Fall 12/Spring 13 reports due Oct 15; Fall 13/Spring 14 plans due Oct 15 Core course assessment via AT6; Spring 13 reports due Sept 30; Fall 13 plans due Sept 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3</td>
<td>Admission Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.11</td>
<td>Qualified Academic Coordinators (36% of institutions receive citation)</td>
<td>Rationale needed for why individuals are qualified to coordinate and oversee development and review of curriculum; include certificate and distance learning programs</td>
<td>Provide accurate and current program head list, including certificate programs. Transcripts/CVs may be needed if not already on file. Dean to provide rationale if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11.3</td>
<td>Physical Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13.1A</td>
<td>Accrediting Decisions Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13.1B</td>
<td>Complaint Procedures Against Commission or Institution</td>
<td>Maintain a record of complaints that can be made available to SACS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
83rd Legislative Session

Summary Source: UT System’s Office of General Counsel and Office of Governmental Relations’ Summaries of Legislation Impacting Higher Education in the Regular Session and First, Second, and Third Called Sessions:

Process: Nearly 5,900 bills filed. UT System tracked 2,302 of them, 20% of which passed. UT Dallas’ analysis team, 7-8 individuals led by Vice President for Public Affairs Amanda Rockow, analyzed approximately 350 bills specific to academic institutions. Of the 107 assigned to me, 34 passed but I was vetoed. Overall, the Governor vetoed 26 bills.

Budget: See pages 2-5. The overall biennial funding increase to UT Dallas was 14% or $21M. Various research appropriations, including the Texas Competitive Knowledge Fund (previously Research University Development Fund) and the Research Development Fund, increased. The Legislature earmarked $70M for the Texas Research Incentive Program (TRIP), which rewards private donations at the emerging research universities. UT Dallas should receive nearly $16M of these funds. The Legislature also awarded $15M in special item funding for a joint request by UT Dallas and UT Southwestern for the Texas Institute for Brain Injury and Repair. Tuition Revenue Bonds: The Legislature included $175M in the budget package for principal and interest payments for $2.7B in construction projects at state universities; however, the legislation to authorize these projects did not pass the regular session and the Governor did not add TRBs to the three subsequent special sessions.

Academic
SB 215, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Sunset Bill, redefines THECB’s powers and duties (see pages 29-31). Highlight five specific areas:
(1) Negotiated Rulemaking: requires THECB to engage in negotiated rulemaking with the university systems and institutions to identify unnecessary requests for information and ways to eliminate or streamline them. Also requires negotiated rulemaking with affected institutions when adopting a policy, procedure, or rule relating to admissions policies, allocation or distribution of funds, certain data requests, its new compliance monitoring function, and standards to guide the board’s review of new construction or the repair/repair/rehabilitation of existing facilities. Also must engage stakeholders in development of long-range master plan, adopting policies for advisory committees, and policies for public comment at board meetings.
(2) Admissions: Board of Regents must certify that its institutions do not prohibit transfer credit based solely on the accreditation status of the sending institution
(3) Program Approvals and Reviews: A new degree proposal is considered approved if the THECB staff have not denied or approved the request within one year of receiving the proposal. THECB staff have five days from receiving a proposal to determine if an institution has submitted a completed request. If the THECB staff require additional information, it does not lengthen the one-year review period. Institutions must continue to demonstrate a new program meets student and job market demand and does not unnecessarily duplicate an existing program. The THECB may review the number of degrees awarded every four years or more frequently. The THECB must review each degree and certificate program at least every 10 years.
Preliminary planning is no longer required but institutions must notify the THECB. The undergraduate graduation and persistence rates are no longer included among criteria for approval of doctoral programs. (New THECB rules: If the THECB staff determine within 5 days that an institution needs to provide additional information, the institution must do so within 10 working days or it will be returned to the institution. Institutions must notify all public institutions within a 50-mile radius that we intend to offer a new program 30 days prior to submitting the request to the Coordinating Board).

(4) Low Producing Programs: The THECB may no longer order the consolidation or elimination of any degree or certificate program but may recommend such action to the institution’s governing board. If the institution’s governing board does not accept the THECB’s recommendations to consolidate or eliminate, the university system must identify the programs recommended for consolidation or elimination on the next legislative appropriations request. (New THECB rule: the 10-year period before reinstatement of a closed or consolidated program has been deleted. The temporary exemption and appeals process has been deleted. No System rules yet).

(5) Off-campus courses for credit or distance learning courses: Institutions may offer only with specific prior approval of the board. An institution must certify to the Board that a course offered for credit outside the state meets Board criteria.

Other: construction approval, Texas B-On-Time, TEXAS Grant, Texas Competitive Knowledge Fund

SB 460: Requires instruction in the detection of students with mental or emotional disorders as part of the training for any education certificate that required a person to possess a bachelor’s degree. Once the panel of experts develops the course, institutions must add this to its curriculum.

SB 1159: Requires graduate and professional programs to grant re-admission or re-enrollment to any veteran who was initially offered admission but could not enroll or had to withdraw due to deployment. The program must grant credit for previous coursework and accept standardized test scores regardless of the time since the person was initially offered admission.

SB 1531: Requires institutions beginning with fall 2014 to provide first-time undergraduates a comparison of the average costs paid to graduate in four, five, and six years. Institutions must also provide students an estimate of average lost earnings if graduating in five or six years instead of four. The statement must include actions the student can take to graduate in a timely manner, including contact information for available support services the institution offers.

HB 5: This 111-page bill covers a multitude of public school curriculum requirements and assessment measures. Effective 2013-2014, eliminates end-of-course exams except for Algebra I, Biology, US History, and combined reading/writing tests for English I and II. Prohibits end-of-course assessments from determining class-rank to be used for purposes such as entitlement to automatic college admission or as a sole criterion in the determination of whether to admit a student to a general academic teaching institution. Effective 2014-2015, eliminates the Minimum, Recommended, and Distinguished Achievement high school program and creates the High School Foundation program (see page 34 for curriculum). In the ninth grade students must indicate which endorsement--STEM, business and industry, public service, arts and humanities,
and multidisciplinary studies—he or she intends to earn. Automatic Admissions: each general academic institution must grant admission to an applicant if the applicant graduated in the top 10 percent of his or her graduating class in one of the two school years preceding the academic year and if the student completed the curriculum requirements for distinguished level of achievement under the foundation program. A student who does not qualify for automatic admission may apply to any general academic teaching institution if the student successfully completed the curriculum requirements under the foundation program and the ACT’s College Readiness Benchmarks on the ACT or earned a score of at least 1500 out of 2400 on the SAT. (THECB is negotiating rules with institutions on this now).

**HB 1296:** Requires TEA to compare each institutions of higher education among one another regarding relative costs of tuition, retention rates, graduation rates, average student debt, loan repayment, and employment of students. Institutions must include a link to this information no more than three links below the main webpage. Also requires THECB to identify types and levels of education, training, and skills needed to meet the next five-years workforce needs. Institutions should use this information when planning for new degree program or course offerings.

**Governance and Administrative Issues:**

**SB 146:** Allows institutions to access the non-public criminal history database maintained by DPS to screen applicants for student campus housing. Only the Chief of Police or housing office can access the records, and the records must be destroyed. If the background check results in adverse action, the student must be notified.

**SB 1907:** Institutions may not enforce policies that prohibit or place restrictions on the lawful storage, or transportation in private motor vehicles, of firearms or ammunition by Concealed Handgun License holders on the streets, driveways, parking lots, parking garages, or other parking areas located on the institution’s campus.

Legislation authorizing individuals with concealed handguns licenses to carry a handgun on campus did not pass.

SB 15, Regents’ Responsibilities, passed both houses but was vetoed by the Governor. "I am very disappointed by Governor Perry's decision to veto SB 15, a bill that not only puts into statute best practices, but also adds much needed transparency to higher education governance. Given the continued lack of transparency and persistent conflicts, this legislation clearly was necessary, due in no small part to some of Governor Perry's appointees. The decision to veto SB 15 ensures that the conflicts, controversies, and lack of transparency will continue. It harms the reputation of Texas' world class public universities and hinders their ability to attract the best students, faculty, and administrators to this great state." —Senator Seliger’s press release

**July Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Meeting:**

Senator Kel Seliger, Chairman of the Senate Higher Education Committee, addresses Board

[Link to video](http://youtu.be/6RQ105sBBhg?time=11m38s)

0:11:38 through 0:44:03
The University of Texas at Dallas
Framework for Excellence in Doctoral Education

1. Reviews of Ph.D. Programs: UT Dallas has scheduled external reviews of Ph.D. programs consistent with the schedules and criteria promulgated by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The thirty (current count) UT Dallas doctoral degree programs each have specific semesters set for their reviews, continuing on through FY 2019. The reviews scheduled for FY 13 have been completed and the reports to UT System and the THECB are being prepared. The final reports resulting from each Program Review will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs of The University of Texas System concurrently with their submission to the Coordinating Board.

2. The basic criteria to be addressed in all reviews of Ph.D. programs are described in the following outline.

a) The strength of program faculty should be evaluated by attributes including:
   - Publications
   - Citations
   - Professional honors
   - External funding
   - Dissertation supervision

b) The organization of the program should be evaluated by review of the annual calendar of program activities and the assignments of responsibilities for these various activities to program administration, faculty, and staff. Activities include such elements as:

   - Recruitment of students
   - Degree plans for students
   - Advising for course selection
   - Course availability for satisfactory progress
   - Contracts for mutual responsibility of students and program
   - Milestone examinations or alternative evaluations
   - Financial rewards for milestone completions
   - Annual audits of progress
   - Career advising

c) The metrics by which the success of the program is to be evaluated include data on:

   - Quality of entering students
   - Retention/Attrition rates of entering students
   - Times to graduation
   - Successful employment of graduates
   - Active alumni organization for graduates
Active Advisory Council for students and graduates

3. The consequences of an external review that documents unsatisfactory performance of a Ph.D. program would entail first intensive internal discussions by the provost, dean, and department leader of the deficiencies identified in the review, followed by comprehensive discussions that involve the program faculty along with program and school administration, with these discussions directed toward identifying successful remediation actions.

Within two years of an unsatisfactory review, a second, more intensive external program review will be conducted to assess progress made in remediating the deficiencies noted in the initial review. If this second program review again finds the program performing unsatisfactorily, new consultations between the university’s central administration, the dean, program leader, program faculty, and faculty governance will consider the options of continuing remediation efforts, or exploring mergers with related programs within UT Dallas or with another university, or termination of the degree program.

4. Following are narrative comments on the above outline.

a) Successful Ph.D. programs must be staffed with adequate numbers of faculty who manifest the scholarly excellence that qualifies them to advise and mentor Ph.D. candidates.

b) Successful Ph.D. programs must attract student applicants who demonstrate the academic capacities appropriate for successful graduation from the program and for competitive success on the national job markets after graduation.

c) Successful Ph.D. programs must have faculty and administration that provide the necessary attention and energy necessary for maintenance of a sound and constructive curricular structure and an advising program that ensures recruitment of competitive new students and timely progress of these students to graduation.

d) Successful Ph.D. programs will demonstrate good retention rates and timely progress of students to graduation. The time elapsed between the initiation of and graduation from Ph.D. studies is a matter of great importance to the individuals concerned, to the institutions, and to the state. A general target for full-time Ph.D. students is graduation within five years from admission into a program as a Ph.D. student.

e) Students should be admitted as aspirant Ph.D. students only after rigorous scrutiny of their academic records designed to assess carefully their qualifications for successful pursuit of the doctorate. Upon admission, students
should receive comprehensive, itemized, statements of expectations for the entire educational sequence leading to graduation, along with similarly detailed responsibilities of the program administration, presented upon entry, co-signed and updated annually. UT Dallas played an important role in the cooperative formulation of the Milestones Agreement that will guide and monitor the progress of future doctoral students. This process is being implemented for newly appointed doctoral students. The Milestones Agreements will provide the mechanism for monitoring the effectiveness of the improvements we are initiating in the advisement of Ph.D. students.

f) Each of the UT Dallas Ph.D. programs has developed its own specific Milestones Agreement. The Agreements all require that progress be assessed and reported annually following entry into a program and continuing until graduation or termination from the program. They specify the roles and responsibilities of specifically assigned staff and faculty in these assessments and reports on each student. All milestones on a successful progress through graduation are spelled out – core and elective courses, entry and pre-dissertation exams or other evaluations, formation of a committee and chair, and progress toward completing the dissertation. And, consequences for failure to meet expectations in a timely fashion are also detailed.

g) Before and during the first semester of enrollment as Ph.D. candidates, students will participate in an orientation program that provides them with detailed overviews of faculty research interests and advisement regarding satisfying curricular requirements and preparation for taking the required comprehensive examinations. They will be required to participate in workshops that address writing, communication, and instructional skills. In following semesters students will attend regular seminars as further preparation for determining a dissertation topic. Students will be guided towards choice of a dissertation topic during their third year of study, with the aim of commencing work on the dissertation as soon as the second comprehensive evaluation has been completed.

h) Students enrolled as aspirant Ph.D. students should be advanced to formal Ph.D. status only after satisfying either the requirements for a masters degree in a field relevant to the specific Ph.D. program or of 30 semester credit hours of appropriate graduate work in the field of study AND only after the students have passed a first comprehensive evaluation, designed to validate their readiness to commence Ph.D.-level studies.

i) The scheduling of these "qualifying" evaluations should allow for timely progress toward initiation of Ph.D. studies.

j) Students progressing from aspirant into formal Ph.D. status should be rewarded, if employed by the university, by an appreciable increment in compensation.
k) By no later than approximately two calendar years after being advanced to formal Ph.D. degree-seeking status, Ph.D. students should pass a second comprehensive evaluation designed to validate their mastery of the core graduate-level academic knowledge appropriate to their field of study and their readiness to commence independent work on a dissertation.

l) Upon passing the second comprehensive evaluation, if not earlier, students will select/be assigned a dissertation supervisor and committee and commence working on the dissertation.

m) Upon being authorized to form a dissertation committee and satisfactorily commencing work on the dissertation, students will be rewarded, if employed by the university, with a significant increment in compensation.

n) Members of external advisory boards will make regular presentations to student groups informing them of employment and other trends in the profession.

o) Successful programs should encourage formation of social networks of alumni and current students to create a dynamic and supportive alumni organization.

p) Students should receive regular distributions of national and regional employment data and opinion articles on state of the profession.

q) Successful Ph.D. programs should demonstrate that graduates move from their student status at UT Dallas to productive and appropriate employment situations after graduation. Appropriate employment of our Ph.D. graduates is, again, of crucial importance to the individuals, to the institution, and to the state. We will implement the related technology imbedded in the MyEDU software as soon as it is deployed. In the intervening time, and continuing, the Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis and the Office of the Provost will collect, codify and post national data on salaries and employment rates, and the UT Dallas Career will be directed to provide individual counseling and advice to these students to supplement the input they receive from their supporting faculty members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.13.1C</th>
<th>Reaffirmation—Distance Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Program Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Publications of Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Program Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Student Complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Recruitment Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7/3.10.2</td>
<td>Title IV/Financial Aid Audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.1</td>
<td>Distance Learning: Student Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.2</td>
<td>Distance Learning: Student Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.3</td>
<td>Distance Learning: Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Credit Hour Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contacts:
Serenity King, serenity.king@utdallas.edu, x6749
Andy Blanchard, ablanch@utdallas.edu, x6716

Websites:
UT Dallas SACS: [http://sacs.utdallas.edu](http://sacs.utdallas.edu) (fifth-year review section forthcoming)
UT Dallas Assessment: [http://provost.utdallas.edu/assessment](http://provost.utdallas.edu/assessment)
SACS Commission on Colleges: [http://www.sacscoc.org/FifthYear.asp](http://www.sacscoc.org/FifthYear.asp)
In Memorium: Cyrus Duncan Cantrell III, Professor of Electrical Engineering and Physics

On June 20, 2013, Professor Cyrus Cantrell died after a brief and unexpected illness. By this resolution, the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas wishes to commemorate his exceptional record of service.

Professor Cantrell came to UTD in 1980. He had been on the Senate almost continuously since 1982. He served as Speaker of the Faculty four consecutive terms, from 1985-86 to 1988-89.

This was also the time of the birth of the Eric Jonsson School, in which Professor Cantrell had played a key creative role. Subsequently, he served for many years as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the School while also serving on numerous Senate bodies. His last administrative position in the School was as a Senior Associate Dean.

Professor Cantrell had served on the Academic Council for most years since 1989.

From 2003 he served for three years as the first chair of the Advisory Committee on Research. He also served as a committee member.

In 2003 he chaired an ad hoc committee of the Senate on academic integrity. The committee recommended that the Senate establish a standing Committee on Academic Integrity. We did so beginning in 2005. Professor Cantrell was its first Chair, initially for three years and then returning for two more. The aim was to affirm an important policy. Integrity could not simply be something we expected; it also had to be actively taught and incorporated into the culture of the University.

Professor Cantrell served as Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy from 2006 until he was not able to continue. This is a crucial committee with an especially heavy workload. It was always difficult to find faculty members who could chair it effectively and build continuity. Through a series of initiatives in cooperation with the administration, the committee's activities have now been more firmly institutionalized in a way that should last well into the future.

In 2008, after several previous years of complaints in the Senate about the
University’s provisions for graduate admissions, the Senate established an *ad hoc* committee to work with the then new Vice President for Enrollment Management, Curt Eley, to rebuild both the University admissions website and the graduate enrollment process behind it. Professor Cantrell served as the chair and principal liaison. The work was completed successfully in 2011.

We also note that Professor Cantrell established the Sarah Montgomery Marple-Cantrell Memorial Scholarship for Women in Engineering in honor of his younger daughter, who passed away in 2003.

The Senate appreciates Professor Cantrell’s judgment, integrity, devotion, and leadership. We mourn his passing.