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
November 20, 2013


Visitors: Andrew Blanchard, Marilyn Kaplan, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Mary Jo Venetis, Paula Austell

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
The meeting was called to order at 2:03 PM by President Daniel. There were no announcements. The floor was opened to questions. Tim Redman asked if bicycle riding was allowed on the sidewalks. President Daniel responded that he spoke with the landscaper on how to best address the situation. The new landscaping will begin on December 19, 2013. The new landscape design will have a few places where there will be separate paths for bicycles and pedestrians. At that time, the final landscape designs had not been seen by the President.
Calvin Jamison also responded that once the new landscaping is designed to be more conducive to pedestrian traffic. The university is aware of the number of skateboards used on campus. The new campus core will require that skateboards be walked. Guard rails have been put up across campus to prevent skateboard tricks being performed.
Dr. Jamison continued, stating that the safety of the students, faculty and staff is a high priority for the university. The item at the top of the safety list is the Synergy parkway and Rutherford Intersection. A special cross walk was been put in place there as senior design studios, Alumni and Development, and Audit and Compliance have moved across the street. This has increased pedestrian traffic in that area. Currently the university is working with the city of Richardson to have a stop light installed at that location.
2. Approval of the Agenda
   Richard Scotch moved to accept the agenda as circulated. 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. Introduction of Sue Taylor to Senate
   Sue Taylor, the interim Information Security Officer, introduced herself to the senate. She stated that she works on a transparent level. She is open to listening to people’s opinion. As there would not be time to discuss all problems, she informed the senate that her door was always open to them to discuss any of their concerns. Her goal was to have an open and honest discussion with the faculty. At that time she opened the floor to questions.
   Speaker Leaf commented that she has already spoken with the Information Security Advisory Committee. Dr. Taylor is willing to be a partner with faculty on how to handle their data properly. She reminded the faculty there are government guidelines she has to follow but wants to work with those who would be affected by those guidelines. Her philosophy is to think why a policy is coming down from UT system, and then speak with those who it will affect. Dr. Taylor does understand there can be an exception but there needs to be a reason why, and provisions to make sure that the university as a whole is not hurt. Her goal is to look at the big picture. She does not want to compromise the university or the president but will do what is right for everyone.
   Ravi Prakash reiterated that there must be trust between the faculty and the ISO. In the past this was not the case. The faculty approves of the openness and opinions expressed by Dr. Taylor. In the past there were commination problems between the Information Security Group and faculty when they reacted to an immediate concern. Dr. Taylor is attempting to change the culture and previous behaviors that have been built at the university. She reminded the faculty that it will take time but they will do their best.
   Speaker Leaf asked for clarification on how communication between information security and faculty would work. Dr. Taylor responded that she would be meeting regularly with the Information Security Advisory Committee. Faculty were advised to use the information security advisory committee as a go between for concerns, but if an immediate answer is necessary, faculty may contact her directly.

5. UTSP 180- Conflicts of Interest, Conflicts of Commitment and Outside Activities
   Tim Shaw presented the document to the Senate. It is based on a UT system template that Speaker Leaf, Rafael Martin, President Daniel and others have adjusted to make it specific to the university’s needs. The document conforms to the principles articulated by the UT System Faculty Advisory Council. It is embodies the principle that faculty should not have to ask approval for things that they do as part of their job.
   Tim Redman requested clarification on section 8- Faculty and staff time. He was unclear if ‘maximum time’ was 18 days or 1 day a week. The template originally was written for a set number of hours, but that was removed. President Daniel noted that faculty will often go a month between commitments, and then be gone for several days. He recommended that that the
number of days be averaged per long semester. President Daniel noted his preference of 18 days a semester.
Speaker Leaf suggested one other amendment in section 9B. He requested that the phrase, “when disclosed, and approved” be removed. He noted that section A is a list of items that are approved. President Daniel recommended that the phrase remain in the document, as there needs to be some level of approval. Speaker Leaf commented that there was a provision of approval in advance, without saying what that would be. Speaker Leaf’s example was that a faculty member might know in advance that he would asked to take part in court cases during the coming year, but could not know exactly what those cases would be. In general, a faculty member would not engage in activities that would be damaging to the university. However, if a faculty member is engaging in an activity that they think could reasonably be seen as damaging, then they should consult with the university beforehand. It was agreed to leave the wording unchanged.

Matthew Brown asked if something clearly contributes to the university, would a person need to get approval. Tim Shaw responded that it would depend on who you are, as this policy would affect staff and lectures as well. Speaker Leaf noted that as faculty it would be routed to their supervisor, then perhaps an integrity committee, and then a decision would be made. If you still did not agree with the decision, there is an appeals process in section 11. Matthew Brown moved to strike the wording in 9 b “when disclosed and approved”. There was no second. The motion died.

President Daniel reminded the Senate that the document must be to system by December 2, 2013. Tim Redman moved approve the document with the amendment that the “1 day per week” portion of section 8 be removed. Peter Assmann seconded. Motion carried.

6. Speaker’s Report – Murray Leaf
   1. We still have some declined committee appointments, but none are crucial.
   2. Dr. Wildenthal and I will send out the new guidelines for school bylaws jointly.
   3. Everything is on the agenda.

7. FAC Report
   There is no activity to report.

8. Texas Council of Faculty Senates
   The TCFS met in Austin Oct 25 and 26. David Cordell and I attended for UTD.

   1. There was a panel on "The Future of Tenure." The panelists were James Hallmark, VC for Academic Affairs in the A & M System, Dan Jones, President of A&M Commerce, Lyn Tatum, former president of the Texas AAUP, and me. The main consensus was that tenure will remain, and probably is more secure now in Texas than a few decades ago, but that it still requires ongoing explanation and justification with the general public and the legislature. The other consensus, of a sort, was that there is a serious and growing problem with security of employment for non-tenure track faculty. Their growing numbers may not be a threat to tenure (opinion on the panel was divided; Lyn felt they were); but they deserved job security and it was to everyone's advantage to assure that they were integrated into faculty as a whole.
2. James Goeman, Assistant Director of the Coordinating Board, reviewed the CB's adjustment to the recent sunset legislation. They are rewriting their rules where they see explicit directives in the legislation, but it is not clear that they have understood or absorbed the broader message that their job should be to coordinate rather than to regulate. They are still interested in establishing the common core and they still want to define low producing programs, even though they realize that it is now not up to them to close them down. Discussions will have to continue.

3. There is a session in which representative of each campus presents a "roundup report" that includes describing matters of concern. We pulled topics out of this for a following general discussion. One of these topics was encryption, privacy, and intellectual property. I agreed to circulate the comments I prepared here last spring, and we will have a panel and discussion at the spring meeting. Another topic was regental overreaching. This turns out to be a widespread problem. Among other things, it turned out that Texas Tech had the same demands for a revised Conflict of Commitment policy that UT had, so it is not just coming from the UT regents. Presumably, the source is the Governor's office, or beyond. This, too, will be on the spring program.

9. CEP Proposals- Suresh Radhakrishnan
   1. JSOM Business Analytics MS Program
      The program was developed over the past 12 months from industry development groups. There is a large demand in the industry and by students. There are four specialization tracks, health care, financial, information technology, and marketing. The specialization will be done though the selection of electives. CEP considered the document and moved to approve. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

   2. Catalog change for non-degree seeking students- update/ clarification
      This item was sent back to the CEP at the October Faculty Senate meeting for further clarification of intent. The intent is twofold; to guide students into masters programs, and to define what courses non-degree seeking students may enroll in. Previously the two were intermingled, and how they are clearly defined in separate paragraphs. CEP considered the document and moved to approve. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

   3. Core Curriculum- update/ clarification
      The university must submit to UT System by November 30 2013 the Core assessment plan. Marilyn Kaplan presented a power point illustrating the proposed assessment plan. (See Appendix A).
      The plan submitted to the coordinating board is flexible such that the university can make revisions when implementing the plan. It is strictly a plan, nothing more. Results from the plan will be turned in to the coordinating board in 5 years. The collected data will be kept in a data base which will allow the university to compare freshman versus transfer students, notice trends with faculty, and observe any problems that appear. It will allow the university to follow up on why students did or did not improve.
      Ravi Prakash expressed his concern that the university would once again fall into the trap of adopting evaluations imposed by outside authorities that were actually meaningless. If the evaluation results were not useful, or if the process were not cost effective, would we
continue to use it? More importantly, does reliance on such measures mean we are giving up our own control of the academic agenda.

Dr. Kaplan reminded Dr. Prakash that this is a plan that must be submitted, but that we can change if it does not fit the needs of the university.

Andrew Blanchard responded that the Core Curriculum committee has been working on this process for two years. The system coordinating board has instituted requirements that the university must accommodate, or system will force the university if it does not comply. If the university meets those criteria, we can still move on to what we want to do as a university. This is what the undergraduate deans and core curriculum committee did in this instance. One of the problems the committee is concerned with is that students are admitted to the university at a certain level of capability. Can the university reliably assess whether we have or have not contributed to those capabilities. It is worthwhile to look for an instrument. Here, one is proposed. We have tried on a limited scale. The plan now is to try it on a larger scale. The assessment that must be made is, ‘Is this instrument appropriate for the measurements that need to be made?’ If it is found that the instrument is not, a new instrument will be found. This can be done very cleanly without outside input from the system coordinating board. What we want to measure is the ability of a student to assimilate facts as they come in and assemble them to do complex reasoning. This is what the proponents of CLA+ says it does. If we find that it does not, we can look for something else.

Since the October Senate meeting the language courses that were part of the undergraduate core curriculum and were previously approved would not be included in the core because of the learning objectives requirements for core courses placed by the recommendations from UT Systems would not be met. Therefore the language courses were removed by the Core Curriculum committee. The document was then reapproved by the Core Curriculum committee. The core curriculum needs to be approved by the faculty committees. It has taken 3 years to revamp the core curriculum to meet the UT System objectives. An e-form was created to allow associate dean to recertify their core classes. They worked with the faculty to determine what classes needed to stay in core. The courses are reevaluated once a year, but they could be done at semester if there is a new class. Any new core classes that are created must meet the new standards. CEP considered the list of core courses and moved to approve, no seconded was required. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Blanchard expressed his thanks to the Core Curriculum Committee, and also the staff who provided very significant support for the process. Serenity King, Michael Carriaga, John McCaskill, and Mary Jo Venetis put tools into the hands of the undergraduate deans as well as guidance in what was expected in reporting. Dr. Blanchard requested a vote of appreciation in recognition of the support team as well as the core committee for undergraduate education. Simeon Nafos moved the vote of appreciation. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

4. New Program Check list- Undergraduate & Graduate

In the October Faculty Senate meeting an item came up that had not been seen by concerned faculty. The checklist was created so concerned faculty are notified. CEP
approved of the document and moved to approve, no second was required. The motion carried.

5. CSSS Certificate Program
The document is the same from the October Faculty Senate meeting. Since the meeting it has been reviewed by the ECS faculty CEP considered the document and moved to approve. Ravi Prakash seconded. The motion carried.

10. Student Government Liaison Report
No report was given.

11. Amendment to UTDPP1025- Campus Facilities Committee Charge
The focus of the Campus Facilities Committee has changed and the charge has been updated to reflect this. The Campus Facilities Committee moved to approve. No second was made. The motion carried.

12. Updating UTDPP1007-Faculty Senate Bylaws
The recommended amendments to the Senate rules and bylaws are in the agenda packet. Drs. Redman and Scotch began the discussion. They noted first that there has been ongoing concern with the problem of succession. If the speaker was to step down, who would be the person to succeed him or her? One part of the recommended solution was the creation of the “Vice-Speaker” position. This would also allow the Speaker to delegate tasks to the vice speaker to alleviate their work load. The other part of the solution is to extend the Speaker’s term to two years. We are doing this with chairmanships as well. The reason is that the learning curve of the position requires more than one year.
A different significant change was drafted by Liz Salter and David Cordell. The propose amended the document to reflect the Senior Lecturer status in the Senate. In recent years there has been an oversupply of Senior Lecturers but under supply of Faculty, relative to the number of seats allotted to each. The proposal is to increase the allocation of seats available to senior lectures by changing the system of tabulating votes so that 50% of the seats would allocated to the tenure track faculty receiving the greatest number of votes among the tenure track faculty, but the remaining seats, up to 50%, would be assigned strictly according to plurality votes for the remaining tenure-track faculty pooled with the non-tenure-track faculty. Richard Scotch moved to accept the changes. Judd Bradbury seconded. The motion carried. Per the bylaws any changes must be approved twice by the Senate.

Responding to continuing discussion, Ravi Prakash offered a further wording change. The proposed text read:

A minimum of 50% of Senate positions will be held by tenure-system faculty, implemented as follows. The number of Senate positions will be multiplied by 50%, rounded upward if necessary. That number of positions will be allocated to the top tenure-system vote recipients as described in III.A.17. All remaining nominees, both tenure-system and non-tenure system, will then be pooled and ranked to fill the remaining positions.
David Cordell moved that:

These students have applied for graduate degrees and have been reviewed by the Graduate Dean. The Graduate Dean certifies that all of these students will be eligible for the degrees indicated upon satisfactory completion of the current semester’s work. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to receive the degrees as indicated upon receipt of final grades and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades received are consistent with the standards for credit prescribed by this University. Matthew Brown seconded. The motion carried.

16. December/ January Senate Schedule
Matt Brown moved to canceled the December 18 Senate meeting due to finals and Winter break, and cancel the January 1 2014 Academic Council meeting due to New Years; the December 4 Academic Council meeting will set the agenda for the January 15 Faculty Senate meeting. Richard Scotch 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: 15 Jan 2014
He recommended that it be changed to:

A minimum of 50% of Senate positions shall be held by tenure-system faculty and a minimum of 10% of Senate positions shall be held by nontenure-system faculty, implemented as follows. The number of Senate positions will be multiplied by 50%, rounded upward if necessary. That number of positions will be allocated to the top tenure-system vote recipients as described in III.A.17. The number of Senate positions will be multiplied by 10%, rounded upward if necessary. That number of positions will be allocated to the top nontenure-system vote recipients as described in III.A.17. All remaining nominees, both tenure-system and non-tenure system, will then be pooled and ranked as described in III.A.17 to fill the remaining positions. If there are fewer nominees in one of the respective faculty categories than the number calculated by the 50% or 10% factor, respectively, all nominees in that category will be deemed elected and the minimum percentages will not apply.

Ravi Prakash moved to approve the amendment. Peter Assmann seconded. The motion carried.

13. Updating UTDPP1088- Faculty Governance
Changes were made to reflect the amendments made to UTDPP1007. Richard Scotch moved to accept changes. Judd Bradbury second. The motion carried.

14. Recommendations to Fill Committee Vacancies
The Committee on Committees recommended Fan Qiu to replace Christine Dollaghan on the Information Security Advisory Committee; Meghna Sabharwal to replace Yang Liu on the Diversity Committee, and David Ford for chair of the Diversity Committee. Dr. Ford declined the chair position. Raul Rojas agreed to vice chair the Diversity Committee. Speaker Leaf recommended that the committee meet and recommend one of them to be chair. The committee recommended Larry Overzet or his designee to the Security and Safety Council. The committee could not find a replacement member for the Intellectual Property Committee. Speaker Leaf opened the floor to recommendations from the Senate. Marilyn Kaplan suggests someone from entrepreneurship in JSOM as they have all owned their own businesses. Speaker Leaf will continue to look for someone. Kurt Beron moved to accept the recommendations. Matthew Brown seconded. The motion carried.

15. Approval for Candidates for Graduation
David Cordell moved that:

These students have applied for graduation and have been reviewed by the Office of Records. The Office of Records has declared that all of these students will be eligible for graduation upon the completion of the current semester’s work at the necessary levels. I request, therefore, that the Faculty Senate certify these students to graduate upon receipt of final grades, and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades are consistent with the standards for graduation prescribed by this University. I also request that the Faculty Senate certify those students designated as eligible to graduate with honors upon completion of coursework and requirements consistent with the standards for honors at the levels offered by this University. Ravi Prakash seconded. The motion carried.
Core Curriculum Assessment Plan
» Assessment Methods
» Criteria/targets
» Results reporting
» Analysis
» Action plan

Assessment Plan
» Started in 2005 for SACs
» Assessment completed at course section level
» Heavy burden on faculty
» No feedback loop
» No consistency across courses

Current Assessment Process
» Logical Plan
» Longitudinal Plan
» Consistency in assessment measures
» Results in a format that:
  > Allows for benchmarking
  > Divorce it from individual sections
  > Allows for drilling down to detail when necessary
» Only measure students who complete their core at UT Dallas

Plan Goals
» CLA+
  > Critical Thinking
  > Quantitative Reasoning
  > Communications Skills

» NSSE
  > Social Responsibility
  > Personal Responsibility

» Group video project
  > Oral/visual communications
  > Social Responsibility
  > Personal Responsibility
  > Teamwork

Proposed Tools
Proposed Plan Part 1

» Pre-testing:
  UNIV 1010 for all incoming freshmen
  Orientation days for transfer students who are not core complete
  CLA+ and NSSE
  Group video project 1

» Post-testing:
  CLA+ and NSSE
  UNIV 2020 (new course) for:
  Students who have just completed the core
  Identified by the registrar
  CLA+ and NSSE
  Group video project 2
  Suggested schedule – 4 Saturday sessions
» Group video project assessment
  > Faculty team of assessors
  > Similar to current RHET 1302 assessment

» CLA+ and NSSE
  > Scored by third party
  > Provides national benchmarks

Proposed Plan Part II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Pre-core Criteria</th>
<th>Post-core Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLA+</td>
<td>60% at or above national average</td>
<td>90% at or above initial score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>50% at or above national average</td>
<td>90% at or above initial score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Video Project</td>
<td>80% at or above AAC&amp;U targets</td>
<td>80% at or above initial score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
» Longitudinal Databases
  > CLA+
  > NSSE
  > Group videos

» Comparisons
  > Over time
  > Freshmen to transfers
  > UT Dallas to national averages

Results
» Share aggregate results with applicable departments, faculty

» Identify trends

» When necessary:
  > Drill down to particular courses
  > Identify students who are not improving

Analysis
» Identify problem areas in meeting core objectives goals
» Identify problem areas for incoming students
» Reassess available student resources
» Reassess admission standards
» Reassess curriculum

Action Plan
Costs for the instruments
Costs to run the UNIV 2020
  > Could be one large section per semester in the ATEC auditorium
Less reliance on faculty
Less reliance on grades
Consistent data
Comparable data
Since this is a plan, it may be modified at any time
Future legislation may require CLA+

Advantages/Disadvantages
### 2014-2015 Undergraduate Catalog
Course Descriptions Overview of Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status/School</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>BBSC</th>
<th>ENCS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th>UGRD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New courses added</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses edited</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses renumbered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses removed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of courses (without core courses)</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The phrases of “credit hours” and/or “semester hours” have been changed to “semester credit hours due to the upcoming policy change on semester credit hours. As a result, every undergraduate course has been updated to reflect this change.