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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 15, 2013

Present: David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Robert Ackerman, Peter Assmann, Shawn Alborz, Poras Balsara, Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia, John Burr, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Gregg Dieckmann, John Ferguson, Lev Gelb, Tobias Hagge, Jennifer Holmes, D. T. Huynh, Joe Izen, Murray Leaf, Syam Menon, Jessica Murphy, Simeon Ntanos, Ravi Prakash, Monica Rankin, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson,

Absent: John Barden, Gail Breen, Gregory Dess, John Geissman, Warren Goux, Umit Gurun, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Kamran Kiasaleh, Nicole Leeper Piquero, Dennis Miller, B.P.S. Murthi, Ramachandran Natarajan, Michael Rebello, Tim Redman, Robert Taylor, Zhenyu Xuan, Kang Zhang

Visitors: Abby Kratz, Calvin Jamison, John McCaskill, James Marquart, Sheila Pineres, Serenity King

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
President Daniel called the meeting to order. The President met with the Board of Regents on May 8. The Board approved the building of a second parking garage that will be with the NSERL 2 project. The location will be just south of the current NSERL building. The Board also approved the request to name the new ATEC building the Edith O’Donnell Arts and Technology Building. The O’Donnell family has been very supportive throughout the years. The dedication ceremony will be November 7. The plan is to start moving everything to the new building this summer. The President opened the floor for questions.

Cy Cantrell asked for an update on how the university’s Tuition Revenue Bill is progressing through the house. President Daniel assured the Senate that it is progressing but there is not much time left in the session. The TRB that the university is most hoping for is the $95 million Mechanical Engineering building.

Joe Izen requested an update on when the SLC building was going to get its new wing. Also, he asked what would be the next planned building after the engineering building. Dr. Izen is aware there are other requests on campus for more visual and performing arts space on campus.

President Daniel commented that as soon as the TRB is passed the next level of needs will be addressed. Currently the biggest limitation for the University is the amount of money the university is allowed to borrow for equipment, renovations, and new buildings. There are guidelines set by UT system that the university must follow. Because the university’s income is so low there is a lot of borrowed money so there is little ability to borrow money due to those
rules. UT Austin has a $2 billion operating budget while our university has a $460 million budget.

The president wanted to formally acknowledge the faculty’s hard work. He recognizes how hard they have worked. It is because of the performance of the professors/faculty that the student performance is so high. He again expressed thanks to everyone for a job well done.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Cy Cantrell moved to remove item 12 (Current Student Academic Dishonesty Policy) from the agenda and add approval of the minutes of the annual caucus to the agenda. Joe Izen seconded. Motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
Cy Cantrell moved to approve the agenda. Joe Izen seconded. Motion carried.

4. Speaker's Report – Murray Leaf
1. The 3+3 meeting on school bylaws has met for the second time. I had circulated a new draft incorporating the changes from the first meeting, but I did so only the night before and most members did not have time to read it carefully. So we will meet at least one more time. Meanwhile, I have set up a Dropbox and members can use it to offer changes interactively. Despite the problems with timing, however, it seemed from the discussion that major disagreements in approach and aim have been resolved and we should be able to agree on wording. The most important change is that the guideline will not call for budget review but rather presentation of a “state of the school” report at a faculty meeting at the start of each year, and a follow up at the end. Each will be a business meeting of the faculty, and the faculty will be able to offer and vote on resolutions.

2. The effort to expand the Budget Committee or more fully engage it in the budget process seems to have stalled. We need to move ahead.

3. Lynn Melton has suggested an amendment to our procedures for promotion and tenure. Wording should be added to make explicit that the duties of the ad hoc committee include assuring factual accuracy the descriptions candidates provide of their accomplishments. If the Senate does not object, I will suggest that the CQ consider how to do this.

4. Several members of the Council plus Joe Izen and Kevin Hamblen met with Chancellor Cigarroa and VC Reyes on April 22. The Chancellor described the emerging new criteria for what kinds of information the System will consider to require encryption. The discussion then focused on the way even these criteria could still adversely affect research. We argued for assigning responsibility for granting waivers to campus committees of faculty plus IS and perhaps industry representatives. The Chancellor felt the discussion was substantive and informative, raising issues that had apparently not been recognized at the System level.
We also expressed concern about the haste with which the Regents are demanding implementation of their other initiatives, and possibly also with setting a policy department chairs. The Chancellor and Dr. Reyes assured us that there would be time for full consideration.

5. Everything else is on the agenda.

5. FAC Report -- Murray Leaf
The meaning began with a general discussion of priorities. We agreed to seven issues to focus on and discussed how to approach them.

2. Discussion with Stephanie Huie, Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives, ad interim. About half of the hour was focused on what they are doing for the disclosure form required by System Policy 180. There will be provisions not to disclose publicly family membership or other personal information. It seems that all compensated activity will be disclosed. Uncompensated activity, such as memberships on religious and political boards, was not quite clear. Huie understands the faculty concerns, but at this point has to implement 180 as written. They seem to imagine that relatively few outside associations will be disclosed; they are planning to provide space for up to five.

The second major topic was Academic Analytics and by extension SciVal, which the health campuses are already using. At this point, they are making it available only to campus institutional research offices. There is no provision for faculty access to allow faculty to check the information on them. To do this, it would be necessary to ask the institutional research office for access.

The FAC does not have confidence that the information will be accurate. The FAC is also concerned that it will be used for evaluation of faculty by administrators without the safeguards of peer review.

3. Discussion with Dan Sharphorn, Vice Chancellor and General Council, ad interim. Mr. Sharphorn first reviewed the legal issues he usually discusses with new department chairs or deans. Compared to Michigan, where he was previously, Texas has a relatively enormous system of state laws and rules that administrators have to be concerned with. This led into a discussion of current legal concerns, which included the Regent’s charge to a task force to develop a “zero tolerance” policy for “inappropriate” sexual relations between faculty and (adult) students. The stimulus for the concern, and hence the policy, was not the possibility of academic bias but rather allegations of sexual harassment under the Equal Employment Opportunity Act. It looks like the recommendations will be closely related to the requirements of the Act, focusing on avoiding relationships that may exploit differences in authority. They will not be concerned with relationships that produce a suspicion or color of bias in academic evaluation.

There were also some discussions of encryption issues and the issues raised by the Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment efforts but Mr. Sharphorn noted that he would stay with the FAC during the next hour, when Chancellor Cigarroa would come, so we agreed to defer discussion until then.
4. Discussion with Chancellor Cigarroa. Chancellor Cigarroa provided background on the change of date for implementation of UTSP 180 and the plan for reconsidering how to do it between now and September 1. He will convene a working group of Presidents, Provosts, and compliance officers. Before anything is final, however, the FAC will also be involved. He noted that there had been uniform and strong opposition, not only from the FAC but also from all of the presidents. This opposition enabled him to go back to the Regents and ask for the time to make adjustments.

The next topic was encryption. The System plan now is to restrict the type of information that requires encryption to what we are clearly under obligation in law or by contract to keep confidential, including HIPAA and FERPA. But the discussion still assumes that the encryption requirement will extend to personal computers. The FAC generally viewed this as much more constructive, and realistic, that claiming that everything we did that was “mission related” was university information, and had to be encrypted, but there are still important ambiguities relating both to FERPA and to the idea of “research data.” The issues were too complex to reach agreement on in the discussion, but the FAC will try to clarify what it considers reasonable.

The last major topic was the FAC’s suggestion that its name be changed to the UT System Faculty Senate. The Chancellor was disinclined to do so, on the ground that he valued the input he gets from the Staff Council and Student Council, and wanted to preserve the sense of the parallelism in the present nomenclature. Dan Sharphorn also thought that there was some legal objection to the name “Senate,” perhaps in Regents’ Rules. He will check with Francie Fredericks. My response was that the name change would more clearly mark the parallelism with University of California faculty governance system, which is generally recognized as the most effective in the nation, which at least among some faculty might signal a change that would make us more attractive as a place (or places) to work. We now appear to have easily the most effective system of faculty governance, and shared governance, in the state at the system level, and we ought to declare it.

5. Discussion with Kenneth Shine, Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs, could only meet with us for a half-hour. He has resigned, and the search for his replacement is well underway. This will be his last meeting with us. We asked him especially to give us his views on what he thought the future would hold for us. He briefly reviewed the current plans and developments, focusing on the South Texas initiative and the proposed new Austin health campus. Generally, needs were great and for this reason the prospects for growth and for innovative research and teaching were also exciting.

I asked if thought had been given to the physical proximity between the new health campus and their counterpart academic campuses. The answer is that it has. They think it is advantageous to have the campuses nearby or physically integrated. They view the two new campuses as experiments in this and are carefully and systematically considering various ways it might be done.
6. Barry McBee, Vice Chancellor and Chief Governmental Relations Officer, described the activities in the legislature. On the whole, the situation seems far better than in the previous legislative session.

In addition to the basic appropriation bill, four others are of particular importance to higher education and of particular interest to faculty. These are:

SB 436 to require College Learning Assessment tests for all students in all public universities. The idea of the test is to measure increase in “critical thinking” as opposed to knowledge. The bill was filed by Brian Birdwell and is supported by the Texas Public Policy Foundation. Faculty generally regard the examination as unhelpful for a number of different reasons, including the many reasons to doubt that there is such a thing as generic critical thinking.

SB 215 on the Coordinating Board (Sunset Bill), sponsored by Birdwell and Nichols. The CB has drifted into rule-making or regulating rather than coordinating. This would get it back to coordinating, leaving it up to institutions or systems whether they wished to take the CB’s suggestions. Also requires the board to eliminate unnecessary data requests. This should spare institutions a lot trouble.

SB 15 “relating to the governance of public institutions of higher education in Texas.” This clarifies the proper and intended role and responsibilities of boards of regents as lay boards, recognizing the principle that their authority should not logically extend beyond their competence. It requires individual appointees to learn the legal requirements of their positions before they can vote on “on a budgetary or personnel matter related to system administration or institutions of higher education,” and it removes the power of the boards to remove presidents of institutions without the concurrence of Chancellors. This is an excellent bill, and will greatly reduce the ability of Boards of Regents in Texas to exceed their authority by using their (erstwhile) ability to fire administrators without check, oversight, or due process. The sponsor is Kel Seliger.

SB 1741 “Relating to training for and complaints regarding members of the governing board of a public institution of higher education.” Is sponsored by Zafirini and complements SB 15.

SB 1882 “Relating to information for legislative purposes requested under the Public Information Act.” This has ten sponsors including Zafirini as primary sponsor. The bill says that information requested by the legislature shall be produced “promptly” and says what promptly means.

7. Pedro Reyes, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs also talked about the conflict of interest/commitment process, and again stressed how useful faculty input has been. In this connection, Dr. Reyes cited the FAC resolution of the January meeting that “UTHSCT be required to expand their current governance organization to include representation from the clinical faculty that is equivalent to the representation from the academic faculty.” He has discussed this with the UTHSCT president, and the President has agreed to do so.

We discussed the System initiative on department chairs. By this time in the meeting, the FAC had formulated a number of basic principles for such a policy, which Dr. Reyes was aware of. He had been copied on the emails. We asked if, in addition, we should work directly with the wording for the draft that had been circulated. He agreed that we should.
We also discussed the System idea for using peer review (meaning faculty visits to classrooms) to improve teaching. This followed on another system taskforce. David Cordell was a member. The recommendation of the task force was to use this only in relation to teaching improvement. System directives based on this report, however, persistent bring in the idea of evaluating teaching in a sense related to consideration for raises, retention, and the like. We agreed in discussion that the FAC would take up the problem of trying to develop two distinct protocols for these two distinct uses of peer evaluation, one for improvement of teaching, the other for evaluations. The Committee on Faculty Quality and Academic Affairs agreed to take it up. Derek Catsam and David Cordell are co-chairs.

8. Elections of Officers. Ed Jackson, who has been Chair-elect, announced his resignation to accept a faculty position at the U of Wisconsin, Madison. Donald Molony was elected Chair-elect in his place, to become Chair at the end of this meeting. Elizabeth Heise, UT Brownsville, was elected Chair-elect. Tom Ingram, UT Arlington, was elected Secretary.


The FAC unanimously approved amended wording to the “guidelines” which serve as its bylaws. The wording was intended to make it clear that the FAC expects each campus to have an elected governance body, and that its representatives to the FAC would be selected by this body. The amended section is:

The University of Texas System Faculty Advisory Council (UTSFAC) assumes that each component institution has an elected faculty governance body. The elected faculty governance body of each U.T. System component institution shall designate two representatives and one or more alternates to the UTSFAC. Normally, these will be the elected chair or president and one other member of the governance body. These individuals become regular members of the UTSFAC for the length of their terms of service in their respective governing bodies. Each alternate, if asked to represent his/her institution in the absence of a regular member, will enjoy the full rights and responsibilities of regular members. Terms of service are determined by the component institution. In selecting their designated representatives, component institutions should strive to maintain continuity of membership and ensure broad faculty input. The names of faculty-designated representatives to UTSFAC are certified by the respective component president as meeting the institution's criteria for UTSFAC representation and forwarded to the Chancellor. Normally, new members begin service at the first UTSFAC meeting of the academic year.

The FAC also unanimously approved each of the following resolutions:

A. Resolution on Computer encryption

The UT System Faculty Advisory Council advocates a common sense approach to computer encryption. Data that would be encrypted would be restricted to that which is protected under state and federal regulation such as FERPA and HIPAA, identification data, the collection of which is authorized by the Institutional Review Board, and information that is protected by contractual agreement.
The UT System Faculty Advisory Council further asserts that certain kinds of faculty records related to students are not FERPA protected and therefore are not subject to encryption. Those kinds of records would include faculty maintained grade records and the like that are not maintained by the institution. Also included is communication about students by faculty to anyone in the institution who has a legitimate educational interest in the information.

B. Resolution on the Core Curriculum:

The Faculty Advisory Council of the University of Texas System supports the principles of academic freedom and local control with regard to the implementation and approval processes for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's Core Curriculum. All course approval processes should happen with the teaching faculty of each campus having the maximum control over their courses and syllabi.

Send to: Cigarroa/Reyes; Legislature; THECB

C. Resolution on Department Chairs:

The Faculty Advisory Council of the University of Texas System supports the following guidelines for The Regents Rules For Department Chairs:

All UT System campuses, including the Health Science campuses, require local policies for implementation, which will be in the HOP (and hence will require review by the formal governance organizations), and should cover department chairs, vice-chairs, and directors of large divisions (more than 10 fulltime faculty) within departments.

Local policies should provide for the following:

1. Substantial faculty involvement from the specific departmental faculty in chair hiring processes such as specifying the size and composition of the search committee, the desired qualifications of candidates, and the number to be interviewed, brought to campus, and sent forward for final consideration.

2. The Chair’s role in the annual review process.

3. The Chair’s role in Periodic Performance Evaluations.

4. Regular meetings with the faculty of the department.

5. The establishment of the role of the chair within the structures of departmental governance. For the Health Science Centers, chair responsibilities shall include management/oversight/organization of the clinical activities for which that department/division is responsible.

6. The length of the term of office and the extent to which it is renewable.
7. The appointment of interim or acting chairs shall be made with significant departmental faculty input and reappointment of interim chairs should not occur save for exceptional circumstances.

8. The procedure for annual evaluation of chairs, which shall include significant faculty input. A summary of the results of the evaluation and the intended actions resulting from this evaluation must be made available in a timely fashion to the departmental faculty after review by the Dean, Provost or their equivalent, and President.

The policy should not be a roundabout way to obtain FAC endorsement for weakening existing UT System campus policies if the local faculty do not want to make such changes.

Send To: Cigarroa/Reyes

D. Resolution on Peer Observation for Improvement of Teaching:

The goal of peer observation of teaching should be the enhancement of teaching, therefore any system-wide peer observation policy should have the purpose of improving teaching rather than providing evaluation. This should not preclude individual institutions from additional policies for a separate process of peer observation for the purpose of evaluation, but any such policy should be developed at the local level.

Send To: Cigarroa/Reyes

E. Resolution in Response to Declining NIH Funding:
Whereas: the threshold for funding individual Federal grants or contracts including but not limited to National Science Foundation (NSF)/ National Institutes of Health (NIH) research proposals (RO1 applications), Department of Defense, Environmental Protection Agency, has reached a historically high level resulting in successful competition for federal extramural funding only for those proposals scored in the top 6th to 5th percentile.
Whereas: this funding threshold is expected to become even more prohibitive with the anticipated across the board spending cuts currently mandated by Congress thus restricting further funding realistically to only a limited number of experienced investigators with established funding track records.
Whereas: in this unfavorable environment, researchers in the biomedical, pure and applied basic sciences, and social sciences (PhD and MD) competing for federal extramural funding in both the academic and health science University of Texas component institutions are still evaluated for professional and academic success and importantly for promotion on the basis of attaining independent NIH / other equivalent federal funding.
Whereas: persistence of this standard of evaluation is unrealistic and potentially unfair and quite detrimental to the University of Texas system and the state.
Whereas: in particular, young or midlevel faculty will inevitably either become frustrated with the process or will be let go after failing to garner the required funding in the expected period of time, thus leading to an increasing risk that the University of Texas will lose a generation of young scientists / investigators.
Whereas: the tangible consequences of losing a large number of young and mid-level researchers both from the perspective of lost scientific contributions and from the perspective of wasted resources utilized for prematurely terminated career development are incalculable. Be it resolved that the University of Texas System should establish a fund to allow for start-up or "bridge" funding for young and established researchers who are academically and scientifically productive and show promise for future contributions but who are not able to procure federal funding in the first few years of their careers or who have temporarily lost funding supporting ongoing meritorious investigations, that this funding should complement any funding currently available for such support on some of this University of Texas campuses, such that this funding will allow young and established faculty to continue successful or promising research and for young investigators in particular, to amass the necessary experience, publications and data to build a portfolio to support successful NIH/NSF funding applications, and not coincidentally, to also remain competitive for promotion within their respective institutions.

Furthermore, be it resolved that such funds should be established to support mid and senior level investigators who have been successful but who have lost current NIH/NSF or other equivalent federal funding to supplement the limited funding that is currently available on some but not all UT institutions.

Furthermore, be it resolved that the University of Texas System start-up and bridge funds will be allocated to the individual UT Universities on a formula basis. Each individual campus / University shall establish a faculty led research funding review committee. This committee shall establish criteria for application and awarding of the start-up and bridging funding for the individual campuses. The review committee shall receive and review applications for start-up and bridge funding and award funding on a merit basis according to the established criteria and level of funding.

Lastly, with no improvement in NIH/NSF / federal funding in sight, be it resolved that the University of Texas System consider a re-evaluation across the system by the constitutive institutions of use of extramural federal funding as a leading metric by which academic success in the biomedical and basic pure and applied sciences is measured and as a sole or principal metric for determining faculty retention and promotion.

F. Resolution on Importance of Teaching and Peer Review in Faculty Evaluation:
Whereas, teaching is the core mission of the University of Texas Health Science Universities, and whereas, the perception amongst faculty of the various HSC component Universities is that teaching is significantly undervalued and in danger of further erosion due to the competing demands on faculty time, in particular, pressures on clinical teaching faculty to maximize billable clinical activity and on research faculty to maximize research productivity; we resolve that, the University of Texas System and its component Universities should include in any future metric developed and ultimately used to evaluate faculty for their meeting of performance expectations, for productivity, for promotion and /or for tenure, a meaningful, reproducible measure of teaching activities and time commitment, teaching quality, and teaching innovation, that this matrix should importantly include formal, structured, and equitable peer review and that this peer evaluation serve as the most important aspect of the evaluation of teaching. Furthermore, we resolve that the University of Texas System should develop a model template in consultation with faculty to accurately capture data on teaching to complement the data likely to be captured on research productivity in SciVal, and that this template should recognize the fundamental differences in scope and type of teaching required.
for training of the various classes of students within the HSC, in particular, the specific
differences in the teaching requirements for PhD candidates and for post graduate students in
healthcare.

G. Resolution of Appreciation to Executive Vice Chancellor Kenneth Shine.

To Executive Vice Chancellor of Health Affairs:
Be it resolved that the Faculty Advisory Council wishes to thank most sincerely Kenneth Shine,
MD, Executive Vice Chancellor for his work on behalf of the Faculty of the University of
Texas, his commitment to a shared vision of achieving excellence in teaching, research, and
clinical care, and his unwavering support for the faculty in their efforts of achieve the core
missions of the University of Texas.

6. CEP Proposals
CEP presented two new policies to the Senate. The first was the Semester Credit Hour policy.
This policy was created due to a possible audit from SACS. The policy is attached as
Appendix A. Cy Cantrell moved to adopt the policy as submitted. Jessica Murphy seconded.
The motion passed. The Provost requested one minor change in wording. [Include the change,
and that it was accepted.]

The second proposed policy is the Revoking of Graduate Degrees policy. Previously this
procedure has taken place under the Dean of Students. This policy specifically targets students
who have received their degree but have left the university. The process would start with a
Faculty review. This will ascertain the severity of the plagiarism. For example is it one
sentence or is 70% of the document plagiarized. The Dean of Graduate studies is the one in
charge of this policy and procedure. The process is both fact finding and allows for appeals.
Cy Cantrell moved to adopt the policy Richard Scotch seconded. The motion passed. The
Policy as amended and approved is attached as Appendix B.

The president requested a wording adjustment. In paragraph three he would like it changed to
read “credible allegations of plagiarisms”, and in Section 2.1 doesn’t say if the author has been
informed. When is the author informed they are being investigated? The wording was changed
so it read "The Dean of Graduate Studies will inform the student an allegation has been
made..." The President also requested that the Graduate Student be removed from the panel, as
it is not their burden to sit on this type of panel. There will be three faculties only from the area
of the thesis/ dissertation on the panel.

The President reminded the faculty that it is important to have this policy in place. It will
protect the institution should there be a necessity to revocation of degrees occur again. Dinesh
Bhatia also reminded the faculty member that ten years ago a situation like this warranted a
slap on the wrist, however now attorneys are becoming involved. He was also concerned that
the faculty members serving on the panel might be in jeopardy of being sued. Speaker Leaf
noted that should something liked that happen that UT system and Attorney General would be
able to defend them. As long as a faculty member is doing something as part of their duties for
the university they will be protected.
7. **Student Government Liaison Report**
The new 2013-2014 Student Government President, Liza Liberman, introduced herself to the Senate.

8. **Amending the State of the University Address**
In the past the state of the university address was given in front of the yearly General Faculty Meeting, now the address is given in front of the entire community. The amendments to UTDPP1088 allow for the address to continue in this manner. The proposed new wording is:

   *Section I. C. Meetings*
   1. *The President of the University convenes the university community, faculty and staff, for a “state of the University Report” each year in October. The meeting of the Senate following the State of the University Report shall begin with a meeting of the General Faculty, at which the General Faculty may consider and vote on Resolutions of the General Faculty.*
   2. *If there is no State of the University Address, the Senate meeting for October of each year shall also be a meeting of the General Faculty.*
   2. *Special meetings of the General Faculty shall be held at the call of the President or the Speaker of the Faculty or at the request of at least twenty percent of the voting members of the General Faculty, as listed on the most recent faculty roster certified by the Secretary of the Faculty, to the Speaker of the Faculty. A minimum notice of one week is required.*

Richard Scotch moved to approve the change in policy. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried.

9. **Conflict of Interest Policy Discussion**
In the members’ packet was a copy of the template from system, including the changes made by council and the president. The initial deadline for approval was February 1, but it has been moved back to May 1 and finally to September 1. The Regents constructed a committee to review this policy and they have met. Speaker Leaf requested approval of the document on the grounds that this was the direction the faculty would like to head on this matter. No vote was taken but there was a general approval that this is the direction the faculty would like to pursue.

10. **Amendment of Charge to Review Encryption Exemption Requests**
The Information Security Advisory Committee has proposed an amendment to its charge. It is amending the charge to reflect that the approval/ non approval to waiver the encryption requirement be made at the local level and NOT at the system level. The committee met and the UT System Information Security officer joined them. Per Speaker Leaf, he was agreeable to this change, as was the chancellor. Speaker Leaf turned the floor over to the chair of the Information Security Advisory Committee, Ravi Prakash.

Currently, every request for a waiver on encryption must be submitted to the Chief Information Security Officer, Leah Teutsch. The process was to take a month. The committee has found this is not the case. CISO Teutsch does not make the final decision. The request is then submitted to
the Chief Information Security Officer for UT System, Lewis Watkins, for final approval. The committee feels that this is non-scaleable solution. It is the committee’s opinion that one person cannot handle the number of requests coming from all the UT campuses. Each campus has unique needs, and unless this was their full time job, the requests cannot be processed in a timely manner. The changes made to the ISAC charge would allow for the thirteen member committee made up of seven tenure track faculty members, with three with expertise in computer security, representatives from Academic Affairs, office of Registrar, Office of Sponsored Projects, Staff Council, a member of Student Government, and two outside of the university security experts to recommend approval or denial of requests for exemption from full disk encryption or any other security mandate. The recommendations from the committee will be passed on to the system level.

President Daniel was concerned on the number of committee members. The committee already has eleven members, and by adding two outside experts it is now thirteen. It is his experience that this type of committee works best with seven members, and not thirteen. Ravi Prakash responded that the ISAC committee was modeled on other university committees that review radiation and bio-hazards. Those committees have two outside experts, and to stay consistent with those types of committees, they were added to the ISAC committee.

President Daniel noted that exemptions are granted very rarely and he does not see that changing in the foreseeable future. Ravi Prakash expressed his concern that as the faculty were not officially consulted on the encryption policy and that they must be in involved now. R. Chandrasekaran stated his concern that the advisory committee would be overruled without justification. Speaker Leaf responded that if it does its job correctly there should not be a need to be overruled. Joe Izen shared his concern that decisions regarding data are being made by people he feels do not have the knowledge base necessary to make an informed decision. Kurt Beron requested, going forward, a report be given by the committee and administration on what was recommended versus what was actually implemented.

The President responded that he has trust in CISO Teutsch and the faculty both. There will be disagreements but hopefully there will not be many. Dr. Prakash moved to approve the committee charge. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion passed. The amended charge is attached as Appendix C.

11. Summer Email Vote for List of Graduates
Cy Cantrell moved to allow for a summer email vote on the approval of Summer Graduates. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion passed.

12. Discussion on FAC Resolutions
Speaker Leaf noted that the listing of the FAC resolution was for information only and did not require a vote.

13. Annual Reports of Committees
Cy Cantrel moved to accept the Annual report from the Committee on Qualifications. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion passed.
14. Approval of Annual Caucus Minutes
Cy Cantrel moved to table until the August meeting. Jessica Murphy seconded. The motion passed.

There being no further business, President Daniel adjourned the meeting.

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

DATE: 18 May 2013
**Semester Credit Hour Value**

Each course has a specific semester credit hours value, in accordance with Coordinating Board Rules (Title 19 Texas Administrative Code 4.6). One semester credit hour indicates an hour of instruction and at least two hours of study time per credit per week in a session or semester. For example, a typical lecture course in a 15 week semester is assigned a value of three semester credit hours. The three semester credit hours represent receiving instruction three hours a week resulting in 45 contact hours and 6 additional hours a week of student preparation including homework.

Factors in determination of the semester credit hour values such as the type of course (for example, laboratory, internship, studio, seminar, etc.) may require proportional adjustment. Courses offered in shortened sessions or semesters are expected to maintain the same number of contact hours.

Semester credit hours for each course are indicated in the academic catalogs or in the schedule of classes for a given term. In the catalog, the hours are shown in parentheses immediately after the course title in each course listing. The number of semester credit hours will be granted upon successful completion.

**Type of Instruction and Semester Credit Hour Value**

These guidelines attempt to guide faculty when determining credit hours. If a course is to be delivered in a format not listed or non-traditional, the course will be required to be reviewed by the catalog approval process. All courses are scheduled to meet the Texas Administrative Code requirements in accordance with the academic calendar.

1. **Lecture, seminar**  
   One semester credit hour equals approximately fifteen, 50-minute periods of classroom instruction (including exam) and at least two hours of outside study per credit per week.

2. **Laboratory, studio ensemble, clinical**  
   Where the Section (1) definition does not fit, for activity supervised as a group, a semester credit hour is awarded for activity in approximately fifteen periods where each activity is at least 100 minutes with possible outside study.

   One semester credit hour is equivalent to approximately fifteen, 50-minute periods of student academic activity. Faculty gives initial guidance, criticism, review, and final evaluation of the student’s performance.
   One semester credit hour may be awarded for an equivalent of at least eighty hours of effort.

5. Fully Distance Education Course: A course which may have mandatory face-to-face sessions totaling no more than 15 percent of the instructional time. Examples of face-to-face sessions include orientation, laboratory, exam review, or an in-person test.
   One semester credit hour equals approximately fifteen, 50-minute periods of synchronous or asynchronous contact. Additionally, at least fifteen, two-hour periods of outside study will be completed by the student.

6. Hybrid/Blended Course: A course in which a majority (more than 50 percent but less than 85 percent), of the planned instruction occurs when the students and instructor(s) are not in the same place.
   One semester credit hour equals approximately fifteen, 50-minute periods of classroom instruction, and asynchronous or synchronous contact. At least fifteen, two-hour periods of outside study will be completed by the student.
Policy on Revocation of Graduate Degrees

1. The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to assuring that theses and dissertations that were submitted as part of the requirements for already-awarded degrees shall meet the highest standards of academic integrity. The standard of scholarly integrity expected on master’s theses and doctoral dissertations is the same as what would be expected in submissions to a publisher or an academic journal. If a Master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation is found to be based on plagiarized or falsified material after the degree has been awarded, then the degree will be subject to revocation.

This policy applies to individuals who have been awarded a master’s or doctoral degree and are no longer enrolled as students. Master’s theses and doctoral dissertations submitted by enrolled students are covered by UTDSP5003, Chapter 49, Subchapter C. Disciplinary Proceedings and Disposition.

In cases in which the University becomes aware of credible allegations of plagiarism or possible falsification of data or other research source material in master’s theses or doctoral dissertations after a degree has been awarded and the individual is no longer enrolled as a student, the Dean of Graduate Studies will direct the investigation and disposition of the case.

2. After a master’s or doctoral degree has been awarded and made available to the public, allegations of plagiarism or falsification of research material may arise from many sources. However such allegations may arise, and however they may come to the attention of UT Dallas employees, the allegations should be referred promptly to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

2.1. The Dean of Graduate Studies will inform the former students that an allegation has been made and appoint a committee of not fewer than three faculty members in the area of the thesis or dissertation to render professional judgments as to whether academic integrity has been compromised and, if so, the extent of plagiarism or falsification. The report of the investigative committee must conclude with a recommendation as to whether the degree shall be revoked or allowed to stand.

2.2. If the faculty investigative committee determines that there is a prima facie case that allegations of plagiarism or falsification of research material are true and recommends that the degree be revoked, the Dean of Graduate Studies will review the material uncovered during the investigation and either approve the findings or ask for further investigation. If the Dean accepts the findings and recommendation of the investigative panel, then a reasonable attempt will be made to contact the former student and inform him or her of the findings and recommendations of the panel.

If the former student disputes neither the panel’s findings nor the sanction of revoking the degree, or does not respond within a period of 30 days from the date of the first contact attempt, then the Dean of Graduate Studies may order the thesis or dissertation to be rejected and recommend to the President that the degree be revoked.
2.3. If the former student disputes either the findings of fact or the proposed sanction, the Dean of Graduate Studies will appoint a hearing panel of three faculty members in the area of the thesis or dissertation. This panel will act as the “hearing officer” within the intent of the Regents’ Rule that applies to enrolled students, Rule 50101, Section 5. Three faculty members will constitute a quorum of the hearing panel.

The University of Texas System Office of General Counsel and the UT Dallas University Attorney will provide guidance to the members of the hearing panel regarding requirements for due process.

The hearing panel will consider all available documentary evidence and may consult with the original supervising committee and the individual(s) who made allegations that academic integrity was compromised. If the former student can be located and seeks to attend the hearing, he or she is entitled to bring an advisor or retain legal counsel. In such a case, the former student must notify the Dean of Graduate Studies immediately to give time for the hearing panel to ask for UT Dallas or UT System legal counsel to be present. Legal counsel and an advisor, if any, shall only provide advice, and shall not act as an advocate in the hearing. Counsel and the advisor will neither question witnesses nor argue.

2.4. The hearing panel will reach its decision by majority vote. The panel’s report must include a numerical tally of the vote. The panel will either recommend that the degree awarded shall stand, or recommend to the President that the thesis or dissertation be rejected and the degree be revoked.

3. In accordance with the intent of the Regents’ Rule that applies to enrolled students, Rule 50101, Section 7, the former student and the Dean of Graduate Studies are entitled to appeal the hearing panel’s decision to the President. The appeal shall be based exclusively on the record of the hearing.

4. After a degree has been revoked, a permanent notification will be placed in the former student’s academic transcript, and the thesis or dissertation will be removed from the University of Texas at Dallas Libraries. If the thesis or dissertation has been placed in a public or commercial repository, that repository shall be notified of the University’s action.
The University Information Security Advisory Committee is a concurrent committee of the Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas.

The Committee will advise the University of Texas at Dallas Information Security Officer in planning and testing measures to provide security for the University for development and use of the university’s information resources in such a way as to comply with UT System security requirements for university information. University obligations are established by the UT System system-wide policy UTS165, U. T. System Information Security Action Plan, and Texas Administrative Code 202, and related interpretive statements such as The University of Texas System Laptop Computer Encryption Implementation—Frequently Asked Questions. The committee’s areas of concern include but shall not be limited to:

- Recommend policies or guidelines to develop and align information security strategies with applicable laws and regulations.
- Monitor policies and procedures to ensure compliance while not asserting undue claims to own or access information owned by faculty or for which faculty are under obligation to other organizations.
- Recommend procedures for IT systems and practice to lower risk of exposure of information and IT resources. Procedures and practice may include appropriate technical infrastructure and security controls in the IT environment.
- Assist in identifying and classifying information.
- Assess and evaluate security incident management and make recommendations for improvements.
- Recommend procedures that increase the security of business continuity and recovery plans.
- Monitor implementation of the UTD policies by the Information Security office.
- Assist in developing plans and methods for education and outreach in the UTD community to explain the need for security measures and assure effective faculty participation.

Recommend approval or denial of requests for exemption from full-disk encryption or any other security mandate. The committee will strive to make its recommendations within a month of submission of request.

The Committee shall be composed of at least thirteen voting members. Seven shall be tenure-track faculty, appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in Title III, Chapter 21, Section I.B.1 of The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures). At least three faculty members shall have expertise in areas of computer security. All shall be selected to represent as much of the range of university as well as non-university information that faculty create and use in the course of their professional activities as is practicable. In addition, there shall be one representative each from Academic Affairs, the Office of the Registrar, and the Office of Sponsored Projects, a staff representative selected by the Staff Council, and a student selected by Student Government, and at least two security experts from outside the
university. One of the faculty members shall be Chair. The Chair and Vice Chair shall be appointed annually by the President upon approval by the Academic Senate.

The University Attorney shall be a member ex officio. The University Information Security Officer shall be the Responsible University Official.

The term of service of the Committee members shall be for two years, effective September 1 to August 31. Appointments shall be staggered in time to make approximately equal numbers of appointments expire each academic year. Members may be reappointed for additional terms. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term upon nomination by the Academic Council.

The Committee shall meet at least bimonthly during the fall and spring semesters. No plan or policy shall be implemented by the Information Security Officer without first being reviewed by the Committee. The Committee shall indicate its approval or disapproval by majority vote. If the Committee disapproves, the Chair shall convey the vote and the reasons to the Vice-Provost and Chief Information Officer. Additional meetings will be called by the Chair or RUO as necessary.