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
September 18, 2013

Present:  David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Robert Ackerman, Shawn Alborz, Peter Assmann, Poras Balsara, Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Gail Breen, Matthew Brown, Gerald Burnham, John Burr, R. Chandrasekaran, Pankaj Choudhary, David Cordell, Ovidiu Daescu, Gregg Dieckmann, Vladimir Dragovic, Simon Fass, John Ferguson, Nicholas Gans, John Geissman, Lev Gelb, Jennifer Holmes, D. T. Huynh, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Murray Leaf, Jin Liu, William Manton, Dennis Miller, Jessica Murphy, Steve Nielsen, Simeon Nafos, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Michael Rebello, Fabiano Rodrigues, Mark Salamasick, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Subbarayan Venkatesan,


Visitors:  Andrew Blanchard, Serenity King, Elizaeta Liberman, James Marquart, Emily Tobey

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
The President had one large announcement for the Senate as of the morning of September 18. Leah Teutsch was no longer Chief Information Security Officer. While the President does a nationwide search, Sue Taylor will be the interim Chief Information Security Officer. Members of the Faculty Senate will be involved in the search.

Last year there was a report to the Faculty Senate on Salary Compression and Inversion. The report has been on the President’s desk waiting for him to form a committee to address the concerns listed in the report. The President is now forming the committee, and working with Colleen Dutton who has had experience in this area. The President will work with Faculty Senate to assure that the right committee is formed.

2. Introduction of Randall Rikel, University Controller
Randall Rikel wanted to meet everyone on campus. His group is currently working on refining the business processes of the university. One of his main goals is to get rid of the massive amounts of paper used in our processes. He also would also like to focus on customer service. His group will work on policies and procedures to make sure they still work for our growing university. He asked the Senate to submit any ideas they may have to him for consideration.
3. Approval of the Agenda
Richard Scotch moved to accept the Agenda. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried.

4. Approval of Minutes
Simon Fass moved to approve the minutes. Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki seconded. The motion carried.

5. Speaker’s Report – Murray Leaf
1. Appointment letters for committees have been sent. Six faculty have declined appointments to committees. In addition, one has declined appointment as vice chair but will remain on the committee. This is actually a fairly small number. We attribute it in part at least to the letters going out very promptly. I have asked the Committee Committees to suggest alternatives.

2. At the last meeting you authorized me to choose between two possible members for the Committee on Qualifications. As this evolved, we have a different nominee: Professor Marion Underwood. I have asked the Committee on Committees to approve the appointment as being within the intent of the mandate and they agree, but in view of the importance of the committee, I have placed it on the agenda Senate confirmation as well.

3. President Daniel has appointed Sue Taylor, Associate VP for Information Resources, to the Position of Chief Information Security Officer. I expect this to lead to closer cooperation between that office and the Senate Information Security Advisory Committee.

4. Dr. Wildenthal has circulated a new directive on peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness from the UT System. This reflects more intrusions by certain regents into matters they should not be dealing with, but on the whole what is being demanded appears to be consistent with what we are already doing. I have forwarded the material to the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness to recommend a response.

   In discussion, members of Council also wanted to see the directive and material. Speaker Leaf agreed to forward it.

5. Everything else is on the agenda.

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

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

In response, last Winter the FAC passed several resolutions. Essentially, they reasserted long standing and long recognized rights that faculty members have as human beings, citizens, and scholars. The conclusion was that it should be up the concerned faculty and staff themselves to make a prima facie judgment of whether there was the reasonable appearance of a conflict, and if so they should disclose it. Religious, political, and other non-work related associations were their own concern. Activities we normally engage in as scholars in our respective disciplines, and report in our annual reports, did not need to be reported again and we did not need to get permission to engage in them.

Evidently, the presidents and others all reacted along the same lines. At the Spring meeting of the FAC, Chancellor Cigarroa promised to establish a committee to consider revising the policy further. He also promised that once the revision was completed, the draft would come back to the FAC for further comment. The purpose of the meeting with Dr. Reyes and Mr. Sharpnorn was to describe the revisions and hand the draft policy back to the FAC accordingly. It will be on the agenda for the Spring meeting. But I can convey the most important point now. The draft is intended to conform to the FAC resolutions. In my opinion it does so. Normal scholarly activity does not need to be disclosed; it can be considered preapproved. The only information that will be on the database is prima facie conflicts, along with the plans for managing them. We are still discussing who will be able to access, but along with the draft of the new SP 180 Dr. Reyes circulated a report from the National Academy of Public Administration on a similar proposal to disclose financial interests of members of Congress. Even though such information is already otherwise available, they unequivocally recommended against putting on a public, searchable, database—for all kinds of reasons both of personal security and national security.

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

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

7. Student Government Liaison Report
Student Government President Liza Liberman reported that she had been in office for four months. The student government has been meeting with students and dealing with their concerns. The major concern of students is dining on campus, specifically service and food quality. Changes are being made to address these concerns. The Student Government office is taking over the student part of the Comet discount program; previously it was handled by IIR. Student Government is conducting town halls with each of the deans to address the concerns of students.
As Student Government President Liza Liberman acts as the University’s representative in Austin as part of the UTS Student Academic Council. SAC is working set up bare minimum sustainable practices system wide. There are many schools that do not have a recycling program, or if they do have recycling spots that are seriously under used. They are working to create a UT system wide process to welcome international students to campus. Many UT system campuses do not have procedures to welcome international students. UTSAC is planning to use our university’s welcoming plan as a template in developing the system wide plan. UTSAC followed the handguns on campus bill, which did not pass. UTSAC will be writing a letter of support on the previous incentive where each university can make the decision themselves. They wish to have a record stating their opinion should it come up in the legislature again.

8. School By Laws
Speaker Leaf circulated the final draft of school bylaw revisions made by the 4+4 committee. Everyone is not unanimously agreed on every word, but everyone agreed on content and spirit - i.e. mutual responsiveness and transparency. During discussion Viswanath Ramakrishna expressed his concern that departments were mentioned in the bylaws. R. Chandrasekaran suggested a minor change. The line on page three, “School bylaws may allow for departmental by laws.” Was struck and replaced with, “For schools that have departments, the departments shall have bylaws.”

Dr. Ramakrishna continued to express his concern that the wording was not specific. Dean Spong responded that the committee did not want to constrain the schools because each school is different. Dr. Ramakrishna continued to express his concern that that the requirement for strong consultation of the faculty in the makeup of executive committees may be construed as suggesting that such strong consultation was not required at another point in the document. Speaker Leaf responded that the intent was to have strong consultation, but that the committee could not agree on how to specify it and felt that it should be up to the schools. Once the schools themselves created their bylaws they would be returned to the Senate for debate. A request was made that once the bylaws has been created a policy can be developed to describe what happens if the bylaws are not followed. Speaker Leaf promised to do so, and noted that we presently have guidelines for departmental bylaws, which will now also be revised to accord with the school revisions. Richard Scotch moved to approve the draft as amended. Simon Fass seconded. The motion carried.

The draft will be distributed to schools.

9. Faculty Personnel Review Committee Charge
The Faculty Personnel Review Committee is mentioned in the bylaws. It combines two previous committees, the Peer Review Committee, and the Faculty Personnel Review committee. The Peer Review Committee is mentioned in our standards for promotion and tenure but did not have a charge apart from the functions assigned in that policy. The Faculty Personnel Review committee is mentioned in our annual review and periodic performance evaluation policies and did have a separate charge. The committees had nearly identical functions, and our policies noted that they could be combined. This charge combines them and eliminates the possible
duplication. Both were elected faculty committees to oversee peer review and the post tenure review process. Kurt Beron moved to approve the policy. Jessica Murphy seconded. Motion carried.

10. Committee on Committees recommendations.
A. Academic Program Review Committee Charge
   There are two main changes to the charge. The first is to expand the committee to six members and second is to reduce the term of service to one year. The committee reviews up to 16 programs per year that vary between schools each year. The changes are intended to assure that the committee will have a member from each unit with programs being reviewed and will be flexible enough from year to year. R. Chandrasekaran moved to approve the charge. Viswanath Ramakrishna seconded. The motion carried.

B. Information Resources, Planning and Policy Committee
   The charge was updated to compliment the Information Security Advisory Committee. This committee will now be concerned only with long-range planning. Given recent changes in the information resources and security areas the update has become more important. Richard Scotch moved to approve the amendments. Ravi Prakash seconded. The motion carried.

11. Resolution on the installation of invasive software on University Computers
   Ravi Prakash outlined the resolution that was distributed. Starting September 1 2013 all new desktops must be encrypted. The resolution was based on the UT Austin Information Security policies. It is possible for faculty to request exemptions. It also allows every school and program to have discretion. Andrew Blanchard and Ravi Prakash have had lengthy discussion on the topic. UT System is very clear and direct on what their expectations are. The process will be to evaluate and then implement. As the encryption process goes forward there will be more collaborative discussion on how best to proceed. It is in both the faculty and administrations best interest to make this a collaborative effort. President Daniel reminded the Senate that the university must comply with the rules but the key will be the conversations on how to proceed appropriately. There was a general consensus that if a desk top was new to the university it would be encrypted. How many of the older computers would need to be encrypted is unknown. It could be 15, 20, or 50% but what is known it will not be 100%. In the meantime a procedural policy regarding the process will be developed. Ravi Prakash moved to approve the resolution. Viswanath Ramakrishna seconded. The motion carried.

12. Annual Reports from Committees
   Jessica Murphy moved to accept the annual reports for the Academic Program Review Committee, the Committee on the Support of Diversity and Equity, and the Advisory committee on the University Budget. Liz Salter seconded. The motion passed.

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