APPROVED AND CORRECTED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Senate. They have been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are the official minutes.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
August 15, 2018

Present: Richard Benson, Inga Muselman, Elizabeth Bell, Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia, Andrew Blanchard, Denise Boots, Elizabeth Boyd, Judd Bradbury, Patrick Brandt, Monica Brussolo, Mathew Brown, Jonas Bunte, Adam Chandler, R. Chandrasekaran, Lev Gelb, Michele Hanlon, William Hepley, D.T. Huynh, Joe Izen, Murray Leaf, Paul Lester, Syam Menon, Mehrdad Nourani, Catherine Parsoneault, Nicole Piquero, Ravi Prakash, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Tonja Wissinger


Visitors: Eric Chea, Colleen Dutton, Naomi Emmet, Frank Feagans, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Jennifer McDowell, Terry Pankratz

1. Call to Order for the Academic Senate Meeting

President Benson called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM. Sadly there were no raises this year, but the President reiterated why there were no raises. The state legislature did not fund the university as expected. The University is carrying a great deal of debt due the amount of new buildings on campus. The University has seen a decline in master’s degree seeking students this past year, and that trend appears to be continuing into FY19.

The university had a record year of freshmen incoming, approximately 3900+. In our Strategic plan our goal was to be to 4000 incoming students within five years, and we are already nearly there. The university did get a tuition rate boost from the Board of Regents, however we currently have a four-year fixed rate and thus it will take a year or two before the higher tuition rate will begin to seriously affect us. Going forward all of the entering students have the choice of either a 4-year fixed rate or a 1-year adjustable rate. The university’s research portfolio is expanding, which is another source of income. For some time, the university has graduated approximately 200 PhD students per fiscal year. Our Strategic plan notes we wish to be at 300 within five years. In FY 18 the university graduated 243 PhD’s. It is President Benson’s expectation the university will stay at that level and go up.

The Dallas Morning News picked up the fact that we now qualified for the National Research University Fund (NRUF). Texas Tech, UT- Houston, and now ourselves are the Texas schools with this designation. This was put into place in 2009 with significant challenges. At the time, the university’s endowment and our spending on restricted research was half of what it needed to be.
The university has now risen to reach those marks. It is good that others have taken note of our achievement. President Benson opened the floor to questions. There were none.

2. **Approval of the Agenda**
   Richard Scotch moved approve the agenda as circulated. Murray Leaf seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. **Speaker’s Report – Ravi Prakash**
   - The Committee on Committees met on June 19, 2018. The appointment letters began going out on August 1st, and responses are returning quickly. On August 24th at 1 PM the committee will meet again to discuss feedback and identify any needed replacement members.
   - The four finalists in the BBS Dean search are coming to campus on August 21st, August 28th, August 30th, and September 5th. Two representatives from the Academic Senate, Richard Scotch and Ravi Prakash, and the other school Deans will meet with the prospective candidates. There will also be an open forum with the candidates from 10-11 AM each of those days and everyone is invited to attend.
   - The Academic Program review is likely to be changed from a 7-year cycle to a 10-year cycle. Academic Governance will work to incorporate this change, when it takes place, in the relevant policy documents.
   - Starting from the August 2018 Senate meeting, Staff Council will be giving a report to the Academic Senate just as Student Government does.
   - All other items are on the agenda.

4. **Student Government Report – Eric Chen**
   SG president Eric Chen requested that he be moved up in the agenda as he is speaking at an event. SG officers had an opportunity to go to Orlando, Florida to attend a conference with American Student Government Association (ASGA), and work with other SG officers at other campuses across the country. Mr. Chen noted how lucky our students were at UT Dallas compared to other schools. SG will be holding short training sessions for Student Government so that members could meet departments that different committees will interact with throughout the year. SG will be hosting a welcome week event. Voter Registration will be a large project for SG this year. Bob Fishbein noted that the Office of Parking and Transportation would be willing to assist students with transportation to local voting locations. SG was able to interact with international students more this past summer than previous years. They were able to present at their orientation. He opened the floor to questions, and there were none.

5. **SACSCOC/ Coordinating Board Updates – Serenity King**
   UT Dallas is in its SACSCOC affiliation period. We had the submission of our compliance report, and had our onsite visit in March 2018. There were two findings that the university had to respond to which were in relation to a self-disclosure issue with one of our graduate programs, and the other was a finding on Institutional Capacity and assessment of our QEP. The university had to respond to those, and a report was submitted before the August 8, 2018 deadline. SACSCOC have received the report which will be reviewed by the SACSCOC board of trustees. This is a separate group from our offsite review team in fall 2017 and the on-site visit team in March of 2018. Serenity King noted that any of the principles are still open for review. The board of trustees could cite the university on any of the principles, including ones that the on-site visit team felt that the university had met. If
they were to do that, the university would go on what is considered ‘monitoring’. That is not a published sanction. If the board of trustees finds the university as non-compliant with the two principles that the university was cited upon by the on-site committee, the university could either go on monitoring or go to ‘warning’, which is a public sanction. A warning is where press releases are made and is submitted to the Department of Education. The DoE will post it upon their website. While it is unlikely that the university will be put on public sanction, Ms. King wanted to make sure the Academic Senate was informed of the possibility. UT- El Paso was put on public sanction in June, and, therefore, it is possible. The final decision will not be made until December 2018. Ms. King expressed her gratitude to the Academic Senate for their hard work in the past two years.

The principle review conducted by SACSCOC, which led to revised principles, benefited faculty in a number of ways. The most significant is in the credentialing process. SACSCOC no longer has such strict guidelines on faculty credentialing. Also, the university no longer has to credential courses for which faculty have already been credentialed if the course has not changed. That is a large administrative stressor removed from the Provost’s office.

SACSCOC released a newly created dual credit policy that had not existed before. It is in response to what the Texas Legislature did when they lifted the restrictions on the level of the student in high school who can participate in dual credit, and they removed the restriction of hours for dual credit. SACSCOC was not happy with that situation. The new policy stipulates that students who are only taking the course for high school credit cannot be in the same class as students who are taking it for dual credit. However, this was passed in June 2018, and should have gone into immediate effect, but the high schools and community colleges have pushed back. Therefore, SACSCOC is delaying for one year to allow high schools and community colleges to become prepared for the situation. This should only affect our university for incoming freshman. Related to this issue, there are two dual credit studies being conducted. One study is being done by the UT System and the other by the American Institutes for Research, under contract with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The preliminary report to the Coordinating Board was presented at the July board meeting. It was opened up for public comment. At the October Coordinating Board meeting, they will be making policy decisions based upon this report. Ms. King noted that her office is pushing for the Coordinating Board to also consider UT System’s report as well.

As the liaison to the Coordinating Board, Ms. King gave a report on issues which the Coordinating Board has been working upon during the FY18 summer months.

1. The first is that the Graduate Program review schedule is dictated by the state now, it was not before the case. Many of the other institutions did not have a Program Review schedule, and our university was one of the few institutions that did have one in place. The state was overwhelmed, and in response the cycle was changed from seven years to ten years. This will give them the bandwidth to review all the documentation that is coming to them. This Academic Year, FY19, is the final year of the 7-year review cycle. It is highly possible that FY20 will be taken off to allow the scheduling to be reconstitute at all the institutions across the state. And then, the review cycles will return anew on the 10-year cycle beginning fall 2020. This will require a slight modification in the Academic Program Review policy in which the word “seven” is replaced by the word “ten”.

2. A critical issue that has come from the Coordinating Board is Field of Study (FOS). Ms. King has spoken upon this issue before. Field of Study is a block of courses, separate from the core curriculum, that have to be transferred in and count toward transfer credit at the
transfer students' new institution. The Coordinating Board is working on 20+ Field of Study curricula. The university has been trying to get faculty onto all of the committees. The university wants to make sure our voice is heard. So far only three of the sixteen that have already passed impact UTD programs, and each has had significant issues. Electrical and Mechanical Engineering both had issues that they had to address in their degree program, but the most significant issue was with Psychology. For the Psychology field of study that was just passed, our university submitted a 7-page data informed objection to the Coordinating Board. This was a joint objection with UT Arlington. The objection was completely dismissed and the changes were made regardless. The university is now reviewing the Computer Science field of study. The Math field of study was just approved, and will be sent out for public comment. This is a very frustrating issue for the university. Legislation was written in 2016 to give the Coordinating Board the authority to do the fields of study, but it did not pass. The Coordinating Board has proceeded anyway. There is little the university can do until someone steps in. UT System has attempted to step in, but they have had little success. The Provost’s Office is attempting to work with the concerned faculty. Ms. King encouraged faculty to respond when she sends emails to be on the committees in Austin. It is critical to the university to have representation in the committees as the community colleges are driving this conversation. Ms. King noted that Fields of Study are already in place, it is the expanded scope by the Coordinating Board that is the issue. President Benson will be signing off on an annual compliance statement stating that our university will be compliant with the fields of study requirements. Ms. King opened the floor to questions regarding field of study.

A Senator asked if SACSCOC was aware of the situation. Ms. King responded that they are not addressing it yet. Another Senator noted that every discipline has an international or national organization that proposes curriculum. He was curious if the Coordinating Board ignores those recommendations. The fields of study are created by groups of 2-year community college representatives and 4-year university faculty. An example of what has occurred is with Engineering. It was found that the 4-year faculty, who were from UT Austin, did not attend the meeting. That is one of the problems. There are slots for the 4-year university representatives but there are several instances where people are not attending as our voice. Hence Ms. King’s insistence on volunteers for the committees. Further the senator was curious if the field of courses were 3000 or 4000 level courses. The answer was no, but there are instances where a 3000 level course at our university is a 2000 level course at a community college. It is highly recommended that students do not take this course until they are in upper levels due to the level of maturity necessary to understand course material. Also those upper level courses have pre-requisites in order to take them. The university would have to remove the pre-requisite requirement in order for the field of study to be accepted.

3. There are also difficulties with the Coordinating Board in regards to Core Curriculum. This is specifically in regards to their approval and denial of core curriculum courses. The Coordinating Board did deny some of the university core curriculum courses that the university had put forward. They also denied one of the decades old core curriculum courses in ECS. This course was an upper division course, and the Coordinating Board was enforcing the policy that core courses should be 1000-2000 level courses. ECS 3361 will only be core for this academic year. They are working with the registrar’s office and others in ECS to make sure existing student who need that course are able to take it this year. It
was noted there were several hundred students that required that course. Following this year it will be a lower division course. The other course that was denied was a history course. This was appealed, and it was again denied. All provosts in UT System signed a letter of objections, but it was ignored.

4. Program Proposals are reviewed by the Provost and Academic Governance before going to the Coordinating Board. The university has not had a denial since 2007, but it was noted that the Coordinating Board does deny a lot of programs, 93 in FY18. The Coordinating Board is looking to change the criteria that do not go through full review. The Coordinating Board would like feedback on what their criteria should be. Ms. King will send the Senate leadership what has been proposed, and will get feedback from that. The Coordinating Board is reaching out to faculty for comments when getting proposals from other institutions. They are asking that if they approve the program what it does to our program. Ms. King noted that she would like faculty to copy on the responses back to them. This will allow the Provost Office to track what they are doing with the other institutions. If a faculty member does not want to answer any of those questions, the Provost Office will be able to answer those questions for them.

5. As the liaison to the Higher Education Center in McKinney, Texas, Ms. King notified the Academic Senate that they are changing the way that program approvals are being done. Previously our university had a say in what programs could be offered at that center; however now our university has no vote in what programs can be offered at the center. The university can advise but it will be the Center’s say on what is allowed and what is not. It is possible that the Center will be offering programs that neither our university nor the Coordinating Board has a say in. Also, if there is any current program that the university has ‘laid claim’ to but is no longer offering, it can be offered by other institutions. University of North Texas has already noted that they want to offer Computer Science at the Center. Our university has claim to it, but we have not offered it in three years. Ms. King opened the floor to any final questions. There were none.

6. FAC Report – Murray Leaf
   No items to report.

7. Staff Council Report- Naomi Emmet
   Staff Council President, Naomi Emmet, introduced herself to the Academic Senate. President Emmet advised the Senate of the structure of Staff Council. SC is an advisory board that reports to the President. The SC elections for FY19 took place in June, and the members will have two-year terms. The Executive Elections will take place in September. Currently, SC is working on the Staff Council Scholarship, which awards $250 to 10 recipients each semester. The application is now online and can be accessed from their website. The deadline is September 15, 2018. There are 5 recipients of the Care Award in the fall and spring. The deadline for the Care Awards is October 31st. Ms. Emmet noted that she appreciated the Academic Senate for allowing Staff Council to present at the Academic Senate meeting.

8. Presentation: Improvements to the Course Material Adoption Process- Bob Fishbein
   Bob Fishbein gave a presentation on the new process for Course Material Adoption. Rawn Johnson distributed a handout to the Senate members. Following an audio-visual presentation Mr. Fishbein opened the floor to questions. Joe Izen noted that this new process had not gone through the c-
forms committee. It would have been helpful to have this system go through the committee in order for it to be properly tested before rolling out to all faculty. Mr. Fishbein indicated that he had not been aware of the committee. He will contact them. The program will roll out for Spring 2019; however books will need to be assigned in the system before October 31, 2018. Several senators noted that that did not allow for the ‘6-months’ of lead time that the bookstore anticipated. The bookstore will be offering classes, lunch and learn, as well as one-on-one sessions with faculty in order for them to become familiar with the program. The bookstore is expecting the acceptance rate to go from 60% at time of registration to 80%, starting with spring 2019. The discussion concluded with several senators expressing skepticism about the proposed software and its rollout timeline, considering it has not been properly tested by users at UTD.

9. Presentation: Consensual Relationships Training—Colleen Dutton
Colleen Dutton gave a presentation on annual Consensual Relationships Training. Copies of the slides were distributed via the agenda packet to the Senate members, and a copy is included Appendix A.

10. Approval of April 2018 Senate Caucus Minutes—Ravi Prakash
Matt Brown moved to approve the caucus minutes. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

11. Results of Summer Voting – Bill Heffley
Concerns were raised over how the summer email voting was handled with email votes not allowing for discussion. Later votes were solicited through email and through an Academic Senate site established in eLearning that supported voting and discussions. There were no discussions on the second set of email votes using eLearning. Ravi Prakash and Bill Heffley requested recommendations on improving this process for the future. Throughout the year they will explore options on how to make the process smoother.

- May 2018 Academic Senate Minutes – 25 yes, 2 abstain, and 1 nay vote.
- CEP Item- Graduate Degree Program Pages to be updated in the 2018-2019 Catalog – 26 yes, 1 abstain, and 1 nay vote.
- Approval of Summer 2018 Graduates- 30 yes, zero abstain or nay votes.
- Approval of Committee on Committee Appointment Recommendations- 29 yes, zero abstain or nay votes.

12. Final Charge on Academic Records Retention Committee – Ravi Prakash
The issue came from the Handbook of Operating Procedures Committee. A charge for an ad hoc committee was created to address the issue. The charge was reviewed by, and approved by the Academic Council. They will present a report to the Academic Senate in October 2018.

13. Informational: Revised Committee on Qualification of Academic Personnel Bylaws- Ravi Prakash
As per the policy that governs the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel (CQ), the committee has the power to change their own bylaws with a two-thirds majority. CQ has reviewed their bylaws, and found they had last been reviewed in 2008. A marked up copy of the changes to the committee bylaws were included in the Academic Senate packet. The only significant change is that non-tenure track faculty also went through CQ, per the bylaws. That was not the case in
actuality. The bylaws were updated to remove that requirement. As this was informational, no vote was required.

14. **Approval of Schedule of Senate Meetings for Academic Year 2018-2019 – Bill Hefley**
R. Chandrasekaran moved to approve the proposed schedule, and should it be necessary, email votes. Monica Evans seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

15. **Adjournment**
There being no further business, Provost Musselman adjourned the meeting at 2:53 PM. Murray Leaf moved to adjourn the meeting. Andrew Blanchard seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

APPROVED: [Signature]

DATE: 1/16/2019

Ravi Prakash
Speaker of the Faculty
Consensual Relationships
UTDBP3103

Contact:
Colleen Dutton, Chief Human Resources Officer
colleen.dutton@utdallas.edu 972-883-2130  AD2.208

The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to maintaining learning and work environments as free as possible from conflicts of interest and favoritism. The University recognizes that two consenting adults should be free to conduct a personal relationship if they so wish when the relationship does not interfere with the goals and policies of the University; some romantic, dating and/or sexual relationships, although consensual, do create conflicts of interests.

This policy addresses those consensual relationships.
• http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3103
Persons Affected

- This policy applies to all University administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

- This policy is applicable regardless of the gender of the University employee with supervisory, teaching, evaluation or advisory authority and/or the gender of the employee, student or student employee who is directly or indirectly supervised, taught, evaluated, or advised by the supervisory employee.

Prohibited Consensual Relationships. The following consensual relationships, even if a single event, are prohibited:

(a) A consensual relationship between a supervisor (as defined below and is defined as including faculty members) and supervisee regardless of whether the supervisory relationship is direct or indirect, unless the supervisor discloses the relationship in advance and a management plan is in effect;

(b) A consensual relationship between a coach or athletic staff and any student athlete or student assigned to or associated with the athletics department, such as interns and student employees, including any coach or student associated with an intellectual competition team, unless waived by the President or his or her designee for good cause. This prohibition does not apply to a student assistant coach who serves on a voluntary basis unless the student assistant coach has direct or indirect authority, including the appearance of such authority, over a student or student athlete assigned to or associated with the athletics department.

*If the prohibition is waived, a management plan must be completed.
Reporting Requirements

(a) The supervisor must report a consensual relationship as described in 3.1. to the Dean/Vice President/Executive-level administrator and the Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO). The supervisor must make the report prior to entering into the relationship or if the relationship exists, with as much advance notice as possible prior to the supervisor accepting supervisory authority.

(b) The individuals receiving the report must immediately collaborate to attempt to manage the conflict of interest. If management of the conflict is not possible, the relationship is prohibited.

A management plan will:

(1) provide an alternative means for the supervision, teaching, advising, evaluation of the supervisee or otherwise mitigate the conflict;

(2) give priority to the interest of the subordinate individual;

(3) be written;

(4) be acknowledged and signed by the parties to the relationship; and

(5) be maintained by the Office of Human Resources and reviewed by the CHRO on an annual or as needed basis.
Reporting Alleged Violations:

(a) Violations of this policy should be reported to:

Colleen Dutton, Chief Human Resources Officer:
phone: 972-883-2130
email: colleen.dutton@utdallas.edu

(b) An individual in a supervisory role over a supervisor who is notified of or becomes aware of an alleged violation of this policy must immediately report the information to the CHRO.

Investigation and Discipline

a) The matter will be investigated and if a policy violation occurred, the University may take disciplinary action, which may include termination. If there is a complaint of sexual harassment about a relationship covered by Sec. 3.1, above, and the relationship has not been disclosed and a management plan implemented, the burden shall be on the supervisor to explain the failure to comply with this policy and such failure will be a factor in determining whether the relationship was consensual and free of sexual harassment. Allegations of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct (and any associated retaliation) may also be subject to investigation in accordance with applicable University policy.

b) Disciplinary action will be handled under the University’s policies for discipline and dismissal of faculty or employees depending on the supervisor’s status.
Retaliation is Prohibited!

Retaliation of any kind against anyone for reporting a consensual relationship or for participating in any proceeding pursuant to this Policy is prohibited.

Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance [https://www.utdallas.edu/oiec/equity/](https://www.utdallas.edu/oiec/equity/)

Counseling Resources for Employees and Students

**Employees:** Confidential counseling services are available to employees through the Employee Assistance Program provided by UT Southwestern and may be reached by calling 800-386-9156 or 214-648-5330 or by email at eap@utsouthwestern.edu.

**Students:** Counseling services are available to students through the Student Counseling Center located in the Student Services Building, suite 4.600. The 24 hour phone line is 972-883-2575 and the website is [http://www.utdallas.edu/counseling/](http://www.utdallas.edu/counseling/).

Galerstein Gender Center located in the Student Services Building, suite 4.300. The phone line is 972-883-6555 and the website is [http://www.utdallas.edu/gendercenter/](http://www.utdallas.edu/gendercenter/).
Additional Resources and Policies:

- University of Texas System Systemwide Policy, UTS 184 Consensual Relationships
- University of Texas System Regents' Rules and Regulations, Rule 30105
- UTDBP3103 – Consensual Relationships http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3103
- UTDBP 3090 - Nondiscrimination Policy http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3090
- UTDBP3102 - Prohibited Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Sexual Harassment Policy http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3102

For questions or additional information contact:

Colleen Dutton, SPHR, SHRM-SCP
Chief Human Resources Officer
AD 2.208
colleen.dutton@utdallas.edu
972-883-2130
Questions?

Thank You!