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
May 21, 2014

Present: David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Robert Ackerman, Nofal Al-Dhair, Shawn Alborz, Peter Assmann, Poras Balsara, Judd Bradbury, Gail Breen, Gerald Burnham, John Burr, David Cordell, Simon Fass, Nicholas Gans, Lev Gelb, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Kamran Kiasaleh, Murray Leaf, Chris Linstedt, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Michael Rebello, Tim Redman, Mark Salamasick, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson,


Visitors: Frank Anderson, Karen Baynham, Calvin Jamison, Abby Kratz, Jared Pickens, Matt Polze, Scott Rippel, Michael Tiefelsdorf, Mary Jo Venetis, Tonja Wissinger

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions

President Daniel called the meeting to order and recognized Speaker Leaf's final meeting as Speaker of the Faculty Senate.

'Dr. Murray J. Leaf began his career at UT Dallas in 1975 as an associate professor of anthropology and political economy. From the very beginning, he exhibited great interest in not only being an outstanding teacher and colleague, but an active participant in service to the University.

Dr. Leaf's fundamental research interest is in the relationship between human thought and human social organization—including decision making as an aspect of organization and vice versa. One could reason that his academic expertise led to his willingness to participate and lead in several capacities both at UT Dallas and the UT System.

Prior to his arrival here, Dr. Leaf served as an assistant professor of anthropology at Pomona College in Claremont, California, and at UCLA. He earned his B.A. in philosophy from Reed College in 1961, his M.A. in anthropology from the University of Chicago in 1963, and his Ph.D. in social anthropology from the University of Chicago in 1966.
Almost immediately after his arrival here on campus, he served as executive director for the UT Dallas Accreditation Self Study. By 1977, he served as Secretary for the Academic Senate/Council and a member of the President’s Committee on Goals.

His long-standing service as a member of the UT Dallas Academic Senate also includes his leadership role as speaker from 2001 to 2004 and 2006 to 2014. Dr. Leaf has also provided his unique set of skills, leadership and talent to the UT System’s Faculty Advisory Council and as a member on numerous faculty search committees here at the University.

Colleagues and friends have described him as being dedicated and courageous while never losing sight of the critical role faculty play in maintaining and improving both the quality and perception of the University.

He literally wrote the book on faculty governance, and his integrity is beyond question.

We present this certificate in appreciation of his leadership, his perspective and most of all, the time and effort he has devoted to improving the rich academic experience here at UT Dallas.”

President Daniel then presented Speaker Leaf with a framed certificate in recognition of all his work at the University.

The President then gave a series of announcements. The Board of regents approved non-Texas resident tuition increase by 3.13%. There had been a 2.13% tuition increase Texas resident undergraduate students, but the board did not approved it due to not wanting the increase of tuition on Texas residents. System financial officers were directed to locate funds equivalent to the amount to increase. System understands that cost of living is going up and so are operating costs for a growing university. The current plan for the additional funds will go toward academic affairs.

President then opened the floor to questions. Speaker Leaf requested an update on the University’s goal of Tier 1 status. The university currently has $370 million in endowments, but will need $400 million. The goal is to graduate 200 PhD students per year; currently the university is graduating approximately 180 per year, and expects to continue that for two years. The university expects to reach that goal in 1-5 years. Over all, the Tier 1 goal is expected to be reached within 2-4 years. When the goal is reached it could mean an additional $8 million per year.

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

3. Approval of Minutes
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

4. **Nondiscrimination Proposal- Colleen Dutton**
The amendments made to the documents where two fold. 1) The terms gender identity, and gender expression were added. 2) The 60 day limitation for reporting will be removed. By removing the limitation this will encourage people to come to them as soon as it happens, but it will allow them to keep the investigation in-house. This will also show that the university is an employer who cares. Tim Redman commended the Women’s Center for their detailed research. The question was raised that if the limitation was removed what would prevent accusations years later. Colleen Dutton noted that the time since an alleged incident would factor into the investigation. She stressed that no one would be turned away at the door if they come with a concern. Richard Scotch move to approve the amendments. Ravi Prakash seconded. The motion passed.

5. **Speaker's Report – Murray Leaf**

1. I have corresponded with Dean Fitch about the Discipline Committee from which faculty are drawn to serve on disciplinary panels that his office supervises. Current policy sets the size of the pool at 15. In fact he now has 22. We made calls for volunteers last year and the year before, and responses were good. In addition, several people due to go off the committee expressed an interest in continuing to serve. Since 15 is not an absolute cap, there was no reason to decline their offer. Accordingly, this year we have not asked the Senate to add more new members. Dean Fitch will send a list of the current members to the Senate Secretary.

2. Speaker-elect Redman has met with me, Richard Scotch, and David Cordell about the disposition of our responsibilities for the coming year. Dr. Scotch and I will be vice speakers and will represent UT Dallas at the Texas Council of Faculty Senates meetings. Dr. Cordell and I will represent UT Dallas at the UT SysFac meetings. I will continue to be involved in legislative drafting for the Senate. We will all back each other up in case of absences. Since I am an officer of the TCFS, I think we can also have one additional representative, if anyone might be interested.

3. The Academic Council tabled the appointment of the members of the Committee on Committees until a June meeting, in order to allow more time for consideration. So there will be a June meeting.

6. **FAC Report**
The FAC met on April 17 and 18 in Austin.

We had invited one of the new regents as well as a legislator. They had agreed to come, but then were unable to.
We met with Chancellor Cigarroa, VC Reyes, VC Greenberg (the new VC for health affairs), and Raymund Paredes, Commissioner of the Coordinating Board. All the conversations were informative and constructive.

Resolutions:

**Resolution Regarding Intellectual Property**

The UT System Faculty Advisory Council recommends that the Intellectual property policies of the University should more closely correspond to those of major research universities in the United States, and in the English speaking world in general, by clearly and straightforwardly embodying the principle and policy that the creation belongs to the creator, and that the teaching materials, written products, and inventions of faculty are creations in this sense.

We recommend that the Regents Rules adopt the constructive and forward looking tone of such other institutions of higher learning as the University of California and the University of Illinois.

Regent’s Rules should not claim ownership of scholarly creations on the sweeping, novel, and unsupported ground that they are created “in the course and scope of employment.”

Provisions may be properly made for assigning patent rights to the Regents on the basis of a written and signed contract, providing that the university agrees to an appropriate quid pro quo in which the university provides support for the invention or seeking the patent.

The University (Regents) does not have and should not claim the right or authority to prohibit a faculty member from pursuing a line of research on the ground that it may involve or lead to a patent in which the university might have an interest.

**Resolution Regarding UTS 175**

UTS 175 has significant overlap with UTS 180 and actually contradicts the latter policy in many places. The evident intent and manifest consequence of the Regental requirement is to discourage research and greatly encumber the university's efforts to support it. This requirement is impractical, burdensome, and intrusive for the following reasons.

1. The application of PHS/HHS rules to non-PHS/HHS funded research.

The regulations of different agencies are designed for different contexts. HHS requirements must guard against their funds being used to support consciously distorted research by
researchers with ties to large and wealthy international corporations, including tobacco
companies, pharmaceutical companies, and producers of medical technology. There are
fewer or no such interests to guard against in fields supported by other agencies, public and
private.

2. The application of PHS/HHS rules to unfunded research.

The definition of "research" in the second paragraph of the introduction is "any systematic
investigation, study, or experiment designed to develop or contribute to generalizable
knowledge. The term includes both basic and applied research and product development."
This makes research largely coextensive with scholarly thinking and writing. Faculty
members do this most of their waking hours, wherever they are. Further, Section 3.03 says
"Neither the institution nor a covered individual may expend research funds prior to review
and determination." This prohibition is manifestly intended to extend even to an individual
scholar's own funds on their own unfunded research.
There are two main objections. The first is that this is impossible. The second is that it
violates the First Amendment guarantee against prior censorship. It also violates
fundamental conceptions of academic freedom, which have very similar conceptual
foundations.

3. The application of the policy to students.

Literally, the policy would apply to every student writing a research paper or doing a class
exercise. All the objections to requiring faculty to disclose what their "research" will apply
here even more strongly.

4. Disclosure of compensation...

This information would then be subject to leaking as well as to freedom of information
requests. This also violates the individual's right to privacy.

5. Assignment to the "conflict of interest official" of the authority to "ensure objectivity of
the research" (Sec. 4.01(b) (2) and 4.01 (c)(2).

Ensuring objectivity is a primary responsibility of the researcher. Judging how well this has
been done is a professional judgment. It is not a judgment that can be assigned to a person
simply because they are an administrative superior.
Universities do over half the basic research of the United States. They are an essential
institution for our national survival, international leadership, and ultimately for the survival
of our species. Attacking the capacity of universities to do this research is inconsistent with
the clear mission of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas. This policy embodies such an attack.

The UT System Faculty Advisory Council therefore recommends the following revision to UTS 175.

**UTS 175 Disclosure of Significant Financial Interests and Management and Reporting of Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research**

1. **Purpose:** It is in the interest of the UT-System to avoid conflicts of financial interests, management, and reporting of such conflicts in regard to those projects which involve external funding. Each system component should adopt a policy regarding such conflicts as they apply to their campuses.

2. **Applicability.** This policy applies to all University of Texas System institutions. It is intended to promote objectivity in research by requiring those institutions to establish standards that provide a reasonable expectation that the design, conduct, and reporting of research is free from bias resulting from researcher financial conflicts of interest.

3. **Institutional Requirements.** Each institution must:
   3.1 include the policy in its Handbook of Operating Procedures
   3.2 amend the policy as necessary to comply with federal regulations
   3.3 post the up to date policy on a publicly accessible website;
   3.4 develop a management plan regarding the conflict of interest.

4. **Administration and Enforcement.** Each institution must administer and enforce the policy.

At this time the Senate agreed to have the Academic Council draft a UTD175 proposal.

**Resolution on Best Practices: Policies and Procedures for Assessment of Teaching**

Excellence in teaching is an essential part of the mission of the University of Texas System. Assessment of teaching is central to procedures for faculty retention, tenure and promotion, post-tenure review, merit raise processes, awards, and honors. The Faculty Advisory Council recommends that component campuses develop a policy for assessing teaching that incorporates the following best practices in the annual review processes.

**Materials for Evaluating Teaching**

**Portfolio:** All Faculty will submit a portfolio for annual review for Merit, and for Tenure and Promotion, and Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation. That portfolio may consist of the following, subject to the faculty member's discretion.
**Student Evaluations:** Student evaluations of faculty teaching are widely recognized to be a problematic but still useful tool in assessing faculty instruction. But they are far from the most important or best tool and should never be the sole or main criteria and should account for less than half of the overall teaching evaluation.

**Teaching Materials:** These should include copies of all syllabi and may include copies of assignments, exams, study aids, and any other materials at the faculty member’s discretion.

**Peer observation documents:** Any peer observation process should serve to improve teaching, therefore faculty members shall include documentation both attesting to the fact that they underwent a peer observation process and a response to how they plan to address the comments from observers.

**Workshops/Faculty Development Program Participation:** If the faculty member participated in workshops or other development programs designed to enhance teaching this should be noted in their portfolio and/or annual report. If this participation resulted in a teaching product or other materials, these may be included.

**Published or Ongoing Scholarship on Teaching:** Faculty who publish on pedagogical or other teaching-related matters may include copies of the articles and any other supplemental materials as the faculty member deems appropriate.

**Self-Assessment Narrative:** Faculty may choose to write a narrative reflecting on their teaching and explaining the materials contained in their portfolio. This can be a particularly beneficial process to allow faculty to tout their accomplishments or address any shortcomings, real or perceived.

**Contributions to Curriculum:** This may include university, college, departmental or discipline-level effort connected to curriculum, participation in mentorship programs, serving as a peer observer, and any other work connected to teaching.

**Mentoring:** In recognition of the important role of instructional activities that go beyond the formal classroom setting, the faculty member should provide a description of their mentoring activities.

**Other Materials:** Faculty may include any other materials in their portfolio at their discretion.

**Number of Students Taught:** The number of students taught may be considered as a factor in teaching evaluation, but only to the extent that large numbers fulfill a teaching need required by some disciplines.

**Assessment**

All campuses must have transparent and consistent assessment processes and measurements. The process should be based on narrative assessments, not crudely reductionist numerical measurements (i.e. a 1-5 scale).

All faculty should receive copies of all materials connected to the assessment process at the end of the year, including copies of assessments and related comments from all
administrators who have a voice in the process (usually chair/coordinator, Dean, Provost/Vice Provost/VP for Academic Affairs)

**Chancellor Cigarroa**
The FAC also voted a very heartfelt resolution of thanks to Chancellor Cigarroa for his service.

7. **Student Government Liaison Report**
No report was given.

8. **CEP Proposals- UNIV3010**
CEP approved an additional course for the catalog. It is a non-credit course designed to help transfer students succeed at the university. CEP moved to approve. The motion carried.

9. **Office of General Council comments on PPPE policy plus consideration of changing five years to six years as the review cycle**
The Senate agreed with the recommended changes by Office of General Council (OGC). Further amendments were made to reflect the change in UTD1047- Evaluation of Academic Administrators. The evaluation period will change from 5 years to 6 years. The amendments were made in “Procedures for all Faculty”, item 4; “Procedures for Concurrent and Administrative Faculty”, items 1 and 2. In addition, and the phrase “...except that a Concurrent Faculty member for whom the School Faculty finding is that their work meets or exceeds expectations shall not be subjected to the PPPE process until the normal 6 year review cycle if they do not continue with their administrative responsibilities” was deleted since it is no longer necessary. Judd Bradbury moved to approve the changes by OGC and the amendments. Peter Assmann seconded. The motion carried.

10. **Email vote to Approve Summer Graduates**
Tim Redman moved to approve the use of an email vote to certify Summer Candidates for Graduation. Poras Balsara seconded. The motion was approved.

11. **Resolution on Intellectual Property**
Professor Scotch moved the following resolution:
The Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas Senate supports the recommendations on intellectual property policies approved by the University of Texas System Faculty Advisory Council at its meeting of April 18, 2014.

The resolution is:

"The UT System Faculty Advisory Council recommends that the Intellectual property policies of the University should more closely correspond to those of major research universities in the United States, and in the English speaking world in general, by clearly and straightforwardly embodying the principle and policy that the creation belongs to the creator, and that the teaching materials, written products, and inventions of faculty are creations in this sense.

We recommend that the Regents Rules adopt the constructive and forward-looking tone of such other institutions of higher learning as the University of California and the University of Illinois."
Regent's Rules should not claim ownership of scholarly creations on the sweeping, novel, and unsupported ground that they are created "in the course and scope of employment."

Provisions may be properly made for assigning patent rights to the Regents on the basis of a written and signed contract, providing that the university agrees to an appropriate quid pro quo in which the university provides support for the invention or seeking the patent.

The University (Regents) does not have and should not claim the right or authority to prohibit a faculty member from pursuing a line of research on the ground that it may involve or lead to a patent in which the university might have an interest."

Judd Bradbury seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

12. Adjournment
   There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 pm.

APPROVED: [Signature]
Tim Redman
Speaker of the Academic Senate

DATE: 15.8.14
The FAC met on April 17 and 18 in Austin.

We had invited one of the new regents as well as a legislator. They had agreed to come, but then were unable to.

We met with Chancellor Cigarroa, VC Reyes, VC Greenberg (the new VC for health affairs), and Raymund Paredes, Commissioner of the Coordinating Board. All the conversations were informative and constructive.

Resolutions:

Resolution Regarding Intellectual Property

The UT System Faculty Advisory Council recommends that the Intellectual property policies of the University should more closely correspond to those of major research universities in the United States, and in the English speaking world in general, by clearly and straightforwardly embodying the principle and policy that the creation belongs to the creator, and that the teaching materials, written products, and inventions of faculty are creations in this sense.

We recommend that the Regents Rules adopt the constructive and forward looking tone of such other institutions of higher learning as the University of California and the University of Illinois.

Regent’s Rules should not claim ownership of scholarly creations on the sweeping, novel, and unsupported ground that they are created “in the course and scope of employment.”

Provisions may be properly made for assigning patent rights to the Regents on the basis of a written and signed contract, providing that the university agrees to an appropriate quid pro quo in which the university provides support for the invention or seeking the patent.

The University (Regents) does not have and should not claim the right or authority to prohibit a faculty member from pursuing a line of research on the ground that it may involve or lead to a patent in which the university might have an interest.

Resolution Regarding UTS 175

UTS 175 has significant overlap with UTS 180 and actually contradicts the latter policy in many places. The evident intent and manifest consequence of the Regental requirement is to discourage research and greatly encumber the university's efforts to support it. This requirement is impractical, burdensome, and intrusive for the following reasons.
1. The application of PHS/HHS rules to non-PHS/HHS funded research.

The regulations of different agencies are designed for different contexts. HHS requirements must guard against their funds being used to support consciously distorted research by researchers with ties to large and wealthy international corporations, including tobacco companies, pharmaceutical companies, and producers of medical technology. There are fewer or no such interests to guard against in fields supported by other agencies, public and private.

2. The application of PHS/HHS rules to unfunded research.

The definition of "research" in the second paragraph of the introduction is "any systematic investigation, study, or experiment designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. The term includes both basic and applied research and product development." This makes research largely coextensive with scholarly thinking and writing. Faculty members do this most of their waking hours, wherever they are. Further, Section 3.03 says "Neither the institution nor a covered individual may expend research funds prior to review and determination." This prohibition is manifestly intended to extend even to an individual scholar's own funds on their own unfunded research.

There are two main objections. The first is that this is impossible. The second is that it violates the First Amendment guarantee against prior censorship. It also violates fundamental conceptions of academic freedom, which have very similar conceptual foundations.

2. The application of the policy to students.

Literally, the policy would apply to every student writing a research paper or doing a class exercise. All the objections to requiring faculty to disclose what their "research" will be apply here even more strongly.


This information would then be subject to leaking as well as to freedom of information requests. This also violates the individual's right to privacy.

4. Assignment to the "conflict of interest official" of the authority to "ensure objectivity of the research" (Sec. 4.01(b) (2) and 4.01 (c)(2).

Ensuring objectivity is a primary responsibility of the researcher. Judging how well this has been done is a professional judgment. It is not a judgment that can be assigned to a person simply because they are an administrative superior.

Universities do over half the basic research of the United States. They are an essential institution for our national survival, international leadership, and ultimately for the survival of our species. Attacking the capacity of universities to do this research is inconsistent with the clear mission of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas. This policy embodies such an attack.
The UT System Faculty Advisory Council therefore recommends the following revision to UTS 175.

UTS 175 Disclosure of Significant Financial Interests and Management and Reporting of Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research

1. Purpose: It is in the interest of the UT-System to avoid conflicts of financial interests, management, and reporting of such conflicts in regard to those projects which involve external funding. Each system component should adopt a policy regarding such conflicts as they apply to their campuses.

2. Applicability. This policy applies to all University of Texas System institutions. It is intended to promote objectivity in research by requiring those institutions to establish standards that provide a reasonable expectation that the design, conduct, and reporting of research is free from bias resulting from researcher financial conflicts of interest.

3. Institutional Requirements. Each institution must:
   - 3.1 Include the policy in its Handbook of Operating Procedures
   - 3.2 Amend the policy as necessary to comply with federal regulations
   - 3.3 Post the up to date policy on a publicly accessible website;
   - 3.4 Develop a management plan regarding the conflict of interest.

4. Administration and Enforcement. Each institution must administer and enforce the policy

Resolution on Best Practices: Policies and Procedures for Assessment of Teaching

Excellence in teaching is an essential part of the mission of the University of Texas System. Assessment of teaching is central to procedures for faculty retention, tenure and promotion, post-tenure review, merit raise processes, awards, and honors. The Faculty Advisory Council recommends that component campuses develop a policy for assessing teaching that incorporates the following best practices in the annual review processes.

Materials for Evaluating Teaching

**Portfolio:** All Faculty will submit a portfolio for annual review for Merit, and for Tenure and Promotion, and Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation. That portfolio may consist of the following, subject to the faculty member’s discretion.

**Student Evaluations:** Student evaluations of faculty teaching are widely recognized to be a problematic but still useful tool in assessing faculty instruction. But they are far from the most important or best tool and should never be the sole or main criteria and should account for less than half of the overall teaching evaluation.

**Teaching Materials:** These should include copies of all syllabi and may include copies of assignments, exams, study aids, and any other materials at the faculty member’s discretion.

**Peer observation documents:** Any peer observation process should serve to improve teaching, therefore faculty members shall include documentation both attesting to the fact that they underwent a peer observation process and a response to how they plan to address the comments from observers.
Workshops/Faculty Development Program Participation: If the faculty member participated in workshops or other development programs designed to enhance teaching this should be noted in their portfolio and/or annual report. If this participation resulted in a teaching product or other materials, these may be included.

Published or Ongoing Scholarship on Teaching: Faculty who publish on pedagogical or other teaching-related matters may include copies of the articles and any other supplemental materials as the faculty member deems appropriate.

Self-Assessment Narrative: Faculty may choose to write a narrative reflecting on their teaching and explaining the materials contained in their portfolio. This can be a particularly beneficial process to allow faculty to tout their accomplishments or address any shortcomings, real or perceived.

Contributions to Curriculum: This may include university, college, departmental or discipline-level effort connected to curriculum, participation in mentorship programs, serving as a peer observer; and any other work connected to teaching.

Mentoring: In recognition of the important role of instructional activities that go beyond the formal classroom setting, the faculty member should provide a description of their mentoring activities.

Other Materials: Faculty may include any other materials in their portfolio at their discretion.

Number of Students Taught: The number of students taught may be considered as a factor in teaching evaluation, but only to the extent that large numbers fulfill a teaching need required by some disciplines.

Assessment
All campuses must have transparent and consistent assessment processes and measurements. The process should be based on narrative assessments, not crudely reductionist numerical measurements (i.e. a 1-5 scale).

All faculty should receive copies of all materials connected to the assessment process at the end of the year, including copies of assessments and related comments from all administrators who have a voice in the process (usually chair/coordinator, Dean, Provost/Vice Provost/VP for Academic Affairs)

Chancellor Cigarroa

The FAC also voted a very heartfelt resolution of thanks to Chancellor Cigarroa for his service.