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AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
May 17, 2017

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  Dr. Benson
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  Dr. Redman
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - April 19, 2017 Meeting  Dr. Redman
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT  Dr. Redman
5. Presentation: Annual Consensual Relationship Training  Colleen Dutton
6. Presentation: Tobacco Free Campus Updates
   A. UTDBP3089-Tobacco Free Campus Policy  Calvin Jamison
7. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates  Serenity King
8. TXCFS/FAC REPORT  Drs. Leaf & Cordell
9. Student Government Report
10. CEP Recommendations
    A. CORE Changes
    B. MS in Leadership and Organizations Development
    C. Undergraduate Program changes
    D. Graduate Program changes in spreadsheet
    E. Undergraduate Course Inventory
    F. Graduate Course Inventory
    G. Admissions Consideration for Applicants with 3-year Degrees
11. New Charge: University Committee on eForms  Frank Feagans and Scott Simpson
12. Discussion: Shadow Work Survey  Matt Goeckner
13. Approval of Revised BBS School By-laws (Pending Approval)  Chris Dollaghan
14. Hearing Tribunal Appointments  Dr. Redman
15. Adjournment  Dr. Benson
Item 3:
Previous Meeting Minutes
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Senate. They have not been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are not the official minutes.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
April 19, 2017

Present: Richard Benson, Hobson Wildenthal, Inga Musselman, Robert Ackerman, Naofal Al-Dhair, Poras Balsara, Karen Baynham, Elizabeth Bell, Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia, Patrick Brandt, Thomas Brikowski, R. Chandrasekaran, Nadine Connell, David Cordell, Chris Davis, Vladimir Dragovic, Frank Dufour, Eric Farrar, Julie Haworth, William Hefley, Annelise Heinz, Kimberly Hill, D.T. Huynh, Joe Izen, Dohyeong Kim, Midori Kitagawa, Murray Leaf, Naim Ozel, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Tim Redman, Christopher Ryan, Mohammad Saquib, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Shilyh Warren, Tonja Wissinger, Alejandro Zentner

Absent: Gail Breen, Ovidiu Daescu, Gregg Dieckmann, Gopal Gupta, Jennifer Holmes, M. Ali Hooshyar, Syam Menon, Radha Mookerjee, BPS Murthi, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Betsy Schlobohm, Subbarayan Venkatesan, Jeremy Vickers,

Visitors: Cristen Casey, Galia Cohen, Kutsal Dogan, Naomi Emmet, John P Ferraris, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Michele Lockhart, Jessica Murphy, Akshitha Padigela, Clint Peinhardt, Nicole Piquero, Marion Underwood, JW Van Der Schans

1. Call to Order for FY 2017 General Faculty Meeting
Speaker Redman called the meeting to order at 1:01PM. There was no business.

2. Adjournment for FY 2017 General Faculty Meeting
There being no further business, Speaker Redman adjourned the meeting at 1:02 PM.

3. Call to Order for April 2017 Academic Senate Meeting
President Benson called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM. Administration continues to watch with great interest the budget bills in the state Senate and House. The university is expecting a significant cut of approximately $10 million. President Benson did remind the Academic Senate that the university will have increased enrollment for FY18; therefore income from tuition will increase. However, the state legislature is adjusting the tuition rates, which could be worrisome. This would require the University to budget even more carefully in the future.

President Benson commented on the visit of Tony Cucolo as part of the UT System Shared Governance Committee visit to our campus. It was noted that Tony Cucolo liked what was being done on our campus in regards to shared governance. President Benson opened the floor to questions. There were no further questions.

4. Approval of the Agenda
Richard Scotch move to approve the agenda. Bill Hefley seconded the motion. The motion carried.
5. **Approval of the March 22, 2017, Minutes**  
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

6. **Speaker's Report – Tim Redman**  
   1. On April 18, 2017, members of the Academic Council met with UT System representatives to discuss Shared Governance. They are visiting all 14 UT System campuses. The meeting went well.  
   2. All other items are on the agenda.

7. **SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates – Serenity King**  
Serenity King introduced herself to the new Academic Senate members, and explained what her office does for the University. UT Dallas was able to participate fully in a site visit to another university in March. This allowed our representatives to observe the hosting process and to identify site visit issues that will be helpful in our preparation. Those findings have been shared with the leadership team and the steering committee. Ms. King will share more information with the Academic Senate going forward into fall in preparation for the spring 2018 site visit.

   The December annual meeting for SACSCOC will be held in Dallas, Texas. The Provost’s office is providing funding for several attendees with priority to those who have never been to this event and would like to go. There were nine submissions for presentations at the meeting, a vast improvement over previous years. One the nine, three were from faculty. Ms. King encouraged the faculty to submit more in the future.

   The principles for accreditation are undergoing revision. They are now open for comment. Ms. King assured the Senate members that this does not affect our upcoming 2018 accreditation. The new principles are posted for faculty in anticipation of the subsequent fifth year review.

   The QEP is going through a naming contest that is open to faculty. The prize is a purple parking permit for faculty/staff, and an orange for students starting fall 2017. Ms. King encouraged the Senate members to submit ideas. The QEP marketing committee will select the winner, and should there be a tie, they will defer to Loraine O'Neil.

   The compliance certification report has been processed. This required reviewing hundreds of pages of supporting documentation. The narratives are not visible, but are being worked on. They hoped to have them visible by the end of May. They are moving along with the compliance report and it is on target.

   Ms. King has been reviewing the legislative bills. She has personally reviewed 87, and of those eight were of concern, and four of those are moving through committees with strong support. She advised school/department/program heads that she will be sending emails asking how these bills will impact their school/departments/programs. She noted that responses may need to be back to her in 30-60 minutes. She noted that it was unrealistic but it was necessary for the process.

8. **Texas Council of Faculty Senates and UT System Faculty Advisory Council Reports- David Cordell**
David Cordell summarized the April 13-14, 2017 meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council. The abbreviated minutes are in appendix A.

   The April Academic Senate meeting was Ms. Padigela's last meeting at Student Government President. Ms. Padigela noted that the campus Green Initiative would continue under the next administration as well as the use of student art work across campus, especially in the student union. Richard Scotch moved to acknowledge Akshitha Padigela and Joseph Campain for their hard work during the FY 17 terms in Student Government. Joe Izen seconded. It was approved unanimously and was accompanied with applause.

10. CEP Proposals- Clint Peinhardt
   A. Name Change from BA in Art & Performance to BA in Visual & Performing Arts
      The proposed name better represents the current content and focus of the degree and its areas of concentration. The proposed name also reflects the desire of the program faculty to express more clearly the nature of the program to prospective students and other interested parties, such as potential employers or graduate school committees who are reviewing the program's graduates for jobs and/or graduate school admissions. There were no changes in the degree plan or courses. Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the name Change from BA in Art & Performance to BA in Visual & Performing Arts. The motion carried.

   B. Undergraduate First 40 Policies
      The “First 40” refers to what once was the first forty pages of undergraduate catalog, which contained policies pertaining to undergraduate students. The changes were made to reflect administrative updates, as well as provide room number changes, links and wording clarification. Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the Undergraduate First 40 Policies. The motion carried.

   C. Graduate First 40 Policies
      As with the Undergraduate First 40, changes were made to reflect administrative updates, as well as room number changes, links and wording clarification. Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the Graduate First 40 Policies. The motion carried.

   D. Revisions to UTDPP 1052-Procedures for Completing a Graduate Degree
      The revisions remove the graduate dean from the approval of online courses for transfer graduate credit, and allow individual programs to approve/decline the online courses on a case-by-case basis. Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the revisions to UTDPP 1052-Procedures for Completing a Graduate Degree. The motion carried.

11. Recommendation for additional non-UTD member to the IRB Committee – Tim Redman
    Richard Scotch moved to add Dr. Stennis Watson, PhD, to the committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (Institutional Review Board) as a community member of the committee. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

12. Recommended members for the E-forms ad hoc committee - Frank Feagans & Brian Dourty
Frank Feagans and Brian Dourty presented the proposed charge for an ad-hoc committee on e-Forms, and suggested membership. The presentation is included in appendix B. Dean Underwood recommended that Susan Jerger be removed as she had left the university. Murray Leaf move to create a University e-Forms committee with Frank Feagans as chair. Joe Izen seconded. A charge for the new committee will be written by Murray Leaf, Frank Feagans, and Brian Dourty and will be presented at the May Academic Senate meeting. The motion carried.

Speaker Redman reviewed the amendments to Regents Rules 31001 and found nothing of concern. He suggested that the changes be placed on the May Academic Council agenda for further discussion. Murray Leaf noted that at the April Academic Council meeting this issue was referred to the Committee on Undergraduate Education and the Graduate Council, which were going to notify the Academic Senate of recommendations.

Joe Izen motion to approve the following acknowledgement of John Hoffman.

“The Faculty Senate of University of the Texas at Dallas wishes to mark the retirement of our long-time colleague, Professor John H. Hoffman. Professor Hoffman has been at the University of Texas at Dallas longer than there has been a University of Texas at Dallas, for he joined our predecessor institute, the Southwest Center of Advanced Studies in 1966. During his active and lengthy career, mass spectrometers built by Prof. Hoffman at UTD have explored the Moon, Mars, Venus, and Halley’s Comet. While his instruments were gallivanting around the solar system, Professor Hoffman has had a terrestrial impact here at UT Dallas. The campus shows he’s held in more than his half century of service include Physics Head, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies of the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (aka the College Master), and Chair of the Physics Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The titles belie Professor Hoffman’s accessibility and approachability, particularly by undergraduates. His enthusiasm for teaching was evidenced by the demonstrations that pervaded his Physics and NATS courses, and that he regularly took on the road to area schools.

We on Senate take pride in the fact that Professor Hoffman has served on this body for fifty years past. We have been proud to call him our colleague. The most fortunate amongst our ranks can claim him as a mentor and a friend.”

Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried unanimously by acclamation.

15. Approval of Spring 2017 Graduates – David Cordell
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. Bill Hefley seconded. The motion carried.

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. Bill Hefley seconded. The motion carried.

16. Informational: Conditions of Classroom Buildings 1&2 – Tim Redman
    Calvin Jamison is working to address the issues noted at the Academic Council Meeting. There was no further discussion.

17. Adjournment
    There being no further business, Richard Benson adjourned the meeting at 2:00 PM.

APPROVED: ___________________________  DATE: _____________

Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty
The University of Texas System Faculty Advisory Council  
Ashbel Smith Hall, 2001 West 7th Street, 2nd Floor  
Austin, TX  
April 13-14, 2017  

The minutes of the January 19-20, 2017 meeting were approved as corrected.  

Several Campus Reports were presented orally.  

10:00-11:00 a.m. Chancellor William McRaven  

Governance Committee Co-Chairs, Julie Izzo and Dan Cavanagh, reported on the site visits with Tony Cuocolo and Jocelyn Greves to introduce the Chancellor’s Shared Governance Philosophy to campuses. Two campuses, UT Tyler and UTHSC-Houston have been visited thus far.  

Academic Affairs and Faculty-Catherine reported that the Dual Credit Study was continuing. Elena Izquierdo reported that the committee was examining the roles and policies for non-tenure track (NTT) faculty. David Cordell reported that in some instances NTT faculty have full voting rights. In one instance, NTT comprise 65% of the faculty in a department.  

Health Affairs Committee: Data have been gathered on physician burn out. There will be a symposium held in the Fall. It is important to note that the UT System is taking a lead on this important topic.  

Chancellor’s Remarks. Chancellor McRaven discussed a variety of topics with the UTSFAC.  

- How do we make the System great?  
- We need to take on challenges such as Physician Burnout, Sexual Assault and Shared Governance.  
- Our institutions need to prepare students to be great citizens via Discovery, Debate, and respectful Dissent. (See his blog at utsystem.edu/chancellor)  

He cautioned the group against overthinking problems. He does not want us to study problems to death. We need to take actions.  

We need to be prepared to continue justifying research as a benefit of higher education institutions.
He believes that the Shared Governance Initiative will be adopted by Presidents when they become convinced that the institutions will be so much better when Shared Governance is implemented.

Chancellor McRaven also believes that the UT System’s Dual Credit Study will provide valuable information that will help students with transferability, mapping coursework and quality. Another challenging issue is the Workload issue.

He stated that all these issues—burnout, morale, effectiveness, efficiency and shared governance—are connected. We need to find common solutions and speak openly about our concerns. We need to find a better way to communicate to our Faculty Senates. We need to build personal relationships with each other so that we can effect change in the workplace in a constructive way. Conflict is easier to work through with each other when parties have developed healthy relationship.

The UT System has tackled the Sexual Assault problem head on. It is the only way that we can get ahead of it.

The Chancellor’s Women’s Leadership Initiative has been rolled out for women (faculty and staff) to have a voice. Gender Pay Equity, the Rooney Rule and fairness are key issues. There is a need to “close the gap.”

Chancellor McRaven urged faculty to “Step up,” and not worry about retaliation. Faculty (and others) must step up for what is right. If there is retaliation, “rest assured, we will address it.”

The local faculty senates should be supportive of faculty trying to do the right thing.

Chancellor McRaven’s remarks were well received and acknowledged with a standing ovation from the FAC members.

11:00-11:50 Regent Ernest “Ernie” Aliseda, Chair Academic Affairs Committee
Chair Ross had the three committees report their activities to Regent Aliseda.

11:50-12:00 Meredith Goode, Director of Academic Policy and Analytics, briefly visited with the FAC to ask for help with the Online Education project. There will be an assessment of online teaching that will hopefully identify Best Practices. She engaged in discussion with the FAC on a variety of issues regarding Online (OL) Education. Topics included:
1) What support is there for faculty who teach OL courses?
2) How can we align course evaluations with OL courses? Hybrid courses?
3) There needs to policy/guidelines on how and by whom OL courses are initiated on local campuses.
4) How can peer reviews of teaching be adapted to OL teaching/courses?
5) Online teaching in the Consortium may need to be examined.
6) Should faculty be REQUIRED to teach online courses against their will?
7) Should classes be offered online because of no classroom space?
8) The decision to offer OL courses should not be driven by the revenue generation.

**12:00-1:00 p.m. Dr. David Daniel, Deputy Chancellor**

Dr. Daniel gave a brief talk about the future of higher education. Some of the highlights of his talk are outlined below.

- There will continue to be a decrease in state funding.
- There will continue to be an increase in online learning.
- There will be increased pressures to increase graduation rates.
- There will be more changes in the way we teach and the way young people learn (technology).
- Community Colleges will continue to become more and more important. They are supported by local taxes, and they hire part time faculty which keeps their costs down.
- We need to continue to hire the best possible faculty and create environment where they can do their best work
- Higher education will remain important as will research.
- Students will continue to get better and better.
- Students want to attend the most prestigious school possible given their personal circumstances.

Some concerns for the future (nationally):
- The gubernatorial appointment of Regents across the nation.
- Increased international competition from universities around the globe trying to duplicate the American university academic programs.
- Universities will need to remain public schools but adopt some of the practices of private schools by seeking private support.
- There is a need for us to seek more partnerships with businesses that can help fund scholarships.
- There will be an increased need to focus on how faculty impact student success as well as the student’s role in his/her own success.
- Strong alumni relations show that alumni remember a professor who inspired them, mentored them, “took (them) under (his/her) wing.”
- There will be more ONLINE courses. We won’t trust the administration to get this right without asking the faculty (for their input).
- Do Research Universities have value? We need to communicate the benefits of research
universities in a better way. We do an awful job of showing how research benefits the public.
- We need to showcase how successful our students/alumni are (Student Outcomes).
- Faculty need to continue their roles as Mentors.
- Faculty need to be involved to get “online learning just right.”
- We need to view Community Colleges as allies in making higher education affordable for students.

A Q&A period ensued. The issues/questions raised included:
- The lack of merit pay since 2008 and the destructive “normative” ranking system that deprives hard working faculty of raises was raised. Recommendation: Criterion based evaluation systems that reward all hard working faculty. This will help raise morale and provide a more equitable means of recognizing a variety of faculty contributions to the university, especially service contributions.

Dr. Daniel responded with the suggestion that more endowment money be raised for salary supplements.

Dr. Daniel stated that the cost structure is higher for 4 year institutions than for community colleges.

He also stated we need to look at our pay scales compared to other states.

There is a concern that there is too much emphasis on graduation rates instead of education. Regent Sarah Martinez Tucker had eloquently stated that graduates need the “credential and the acumen to be successful in life.” It is great when we hear alumni state that their education has provided them with skills needed to be successful.

1:00-2:00 Mr. Barry McBee, Vice Chancellor & Chief Governmental Relations Officer and Laura Hartmann—Legislative Update

Barry McBee and Laura Hartmann provided the FAC with updates on the legislative session.

2:00-3:00 Dr. Rebecca Karoff, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs—Belonging Pillar

Dr. Karoff led a discussion with the FAC on how faculty can be involved with the “belonging pillar” that the Chancellor has identified for Student Success. Issues raised during the discussion included:
- Faculty, in particular, adjunct faculty also need to feel they “belong” in order to facilitate that “belongingness” to their students.
- Advising is a role that many faculty enjoy. They mentor students and help retain them.
- What is the Leadership Narrative about “belonging” at each institution?
- Perhaps we should have a Certificate of Effective Teaching for Adjunct/Contingency faculty.
UT System Faculty Advisory Council Meeting  
Friday, April 13, 2017

10:00-11:00 am  Dr. David Troutman, Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives-Dual Credit Study
Dr. Troutman presented preliminary data analysis results to the FAC on the Dual Credit Study. Dr. Troutman described how the data were collected; how the data are being analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively, some of the preliminary results that cannot be released publicly yet.

Dr. Wanda Mercer, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs-Dual Credit Taskforce
Dr. Mercer reported on the statewide 40 member Dual Credit Taskforce. The Co-chairs for this taskforce are Steve Johnson (Community College) and Wanda Mercer. The taskforce has been organized into 6 research groups:
   1) Access and Equity
   2) CTE (Certificate & Technology Education) & Workforce Credits
   3) Transferability
   4) Funding
   5) Law and Policy
   6) Program Qualities (such as grades, credits, curriculum)

ACTION ITEM: After her presentation, the FAC discussed the Dual Credit Taskforce membership. Jody Jensen moved and Zero Eldridge seconded the motion that a FAC member be appointed to the Dual Credit Taskforce. The motion carried.

12:00-1:00 p.m. Dr. Steve Leslie, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dr. Kevin Lemoine, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs-Faculty Workload
Drs. Leslie and Lemoine presented the report on the Workload Taskforce. FAC members had been provided electronic copies of the report before the meeting. Jill Hernandez, Catherine Ross, and Elizabeth Heise were all members on this taskforce. The policy developed is broad and gives institutions to develop their own workload policies.

FAC endorse the Workload Taskforce Report. 
The motion carried.
1:00-1:30 p.m.  Dan Cavanagh on faculty role in making important academic decisions about curriculum and pedagogy.

Dr. Cavanagh brought up the concern that there are cases where decisions to offer online classes have been made by administration instead of by the program faculty who are affected by the decision. In one case, a course that the program faculty did not believe was well suited pedagogically to be taught online was mandated as an online course. The program was then cancelled when the online mandate was not fulfilled by the faculty member. The issue of who makes curriculum based decisions is one that also encompasses shared governance. We are the conscience of the University, and we must protect the curriculum quality.
**eForms Working Committee Idea**

**Charge.** Determine the optimal process for integrating faculty and academic staff feedback into PeopleSoft “eForms” development.

**Membership.** Proposed committee representation will include faculty (2-3), Dean’s office (1-2), Department heads (1-2), academic staff (3-4), PeopleSoft functional stakeholders (4), Office of Research (1), and OIT (1).

**Provisional.** Report back to Senate within 1 year to assess.
eForms Working Committee (Proposed)

Faculty: Joe Izen, Bill Hefley, Ravi Prakash, Susan Jerger
Dean's office: James Bartlett, Matt Goeckner
Department Heads: Jennifer Holmes, Gopal Gupta
Academic staff: TBD by department heads
PeopleSoft administrative stakeholders: Reda Bernoussi, Tina Sharpling, Franklin Foxworthy, Adam Cantwell
Office of Research: Kelly McKinney
Office of Information Technology: Scott Simpson
Chair: Frank Feagans
UPDATE ON OPEN TICKETS

Currently 15 open tickets related to issues identified by initial effort. Initial review of each ticket has taken place and they are in the process of being prioritized into the work flow with tickets created by functional areas.

Academic Council Follow-up - Applications report request

JIRA: PMPS-3486 & EM-12225
Status: Resolved
Detail: The EMDataMart report m506, 'NSMT Physics PHD Report' is now being sent to department daily. This report replaces a time consuming manual effort by the department to create a spreadsheet with applicant related information. The solution was finding an existing report that met the departments needs.

Academic Council Follow-up - System timeout complaint

JIRA: EAST-5156
Status: Open
Detail: A solution has been developed that will allow the session idle timeout to be set based on security roles. However, there is some risk related to the current hardware’s ability to handle the proposed 60 minute duration. OIT recommends implementing this solution as part of UTShare’s On Premise hardware upgrade project slated for June.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Assignee</th>
<th>Reporter</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM-2312</td>
<td>Time Sheet Approval - Grouped Approval Functionality</td>
<td>Hanish Sharma</td>
<td>Joseph Izen</td>
<td>Open-Pending User Group Approval</td>
<td>3/13/17 10:21</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM-2313</td>
<td>Time Approvals: Auto-generate reminder emails to PI/Head/Supervisor</td>
<td>Hanish Sharma</td>
<td>Joseph Izen</td>
<td>Open-Pending User Group Approval</td>
<td>3/13/17 12:01</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM-2316</td>
<td>Timesheet Approval: Submit and Approve buttons</td>
<td>Hanish Sharma</td>
<td>Joseph Izen</td>
<td>Open-Pending User Group Approval</td>
<td>3/14/17 11:58</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM-2326</td>
<td>Delegation Functionality</td>
<td>Alan V Nguyen</td>
<td>Joseph Izen</td>
<td>Open-Pending User Group Approval</td>
<td>3/20/17 9:30</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST-5155</td>
<td>Follow-up - Navigation Collection Research/Development</td>
<td>Hema Sarnala</td>
<td>Alison B Lewis</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>3/10/17 12:00</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST-5156</td>
<td>Follow-up - System timeout complaint</td>
<td>Hema Sarnala</td>
<td>Alison B Lewis</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>3/10/17 12:05</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST-5181</td>
<td>Time Sheet Approval Page - Employee Search Look-up</td>
<td>Hema Sarnala</td>
<td>Alan V Nguyen</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>3/13/17 10:44</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMS-2958</td>
<td>ARA Enhancements</td>
<td>Richard Marler</td>
<td>Lonnie Nealy</td>
<td>Open-Pending User Group Prioritization</td>
<td>3/20/17 9:01</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMS-2962</td>
<td>Create self-service tool for PIs and AAs to transfer funds</td>
<td>Richard Marler</td>
<td>Lonnie Nealy</td>
<td>Open-Pending User Group Prioritization</td>
<td>3/21/17 10:20</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMS-2963</td>
<td>Provide a summary page for PIs/Heads showing Balances as described</td>
<td>Richard Marler</td>
<td>Lonnie Nealy</td>
<td>Open-Pending User Group Prioritization</td>
<td>3/21/17 10:29</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMS-3026</td>
<td>Provide a summary page for PIs/Heads showing Balances as described</td>
<td>Richard Marler</td>
<td>Lonnie Nealy</td>
<td>Open-Pending User Group Prioritization</td>
<td>4/18/17 10:34</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consensual Relationships
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Presented by:
Dr. Inga Musselman, Interim Provost; Professor of Chemistry
Colleen Dutton, Associate Vice President Human Resources
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](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 Associate Vice President for Human Resources (AVPHR). 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 AVPHR on an annual or as needed basis.
(a) Violations of this policy should be reported to:

Colleen Dutton, Associate Vice President Human Resources:
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 AVPHR.
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.
Consensual Relationships
UTDBP3103

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/
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/.

Galerstein Women’s 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/womenscenter/.
• 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
Consensual Relationships Policy

- **For questions or additional information contact:**

- Colleen Dutton, SPHR, SHRM-SCP
  Associate Vice President Human Resources, AD 2.208
  colleen.dutton@utdallas.edu  or 972-883-2130
Tobacco-Free Campus Policy - UTDBP3089

Policy Statement

The University of Texas at Dallas (UT Dallas) is committed to promoting a healthier work, research, education and living environment. In order to better accomplish this goal and align UT Dallas with the best practices of leading employers and research universities, the UT Dallas prohibits the use of all forms of tobacco products on University property. Any advertising, sale, or free sampling of tobacco products on University property is prohibited. Improper disposal of and/or littering the campus with the remains of tobacco products or any other related waste product also is prohibited.

The University does not require faculty, staff and students to stop using tobacco products; however, it is expected that individuals follow the policy while on University property. UT Dallas is committed to linking individuals with resources to help break nicotine and tobacco addiction as detailed in Section G of this policy.

B. Scope

This policy applies to all faculty, staff, students and visitors of UT Dallas, including contractors, subcontractors and their respective employees. It also applies to individuals, including contractors and employees of any entity leasing UT Dallas property while on said property.

This policy is applicable twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

C. Definitions

1. **Tobacco** refers to all forms of tobacco products, including but not limited to cigarettes, cigars, pipes, water pipes (hookah), bidis, kreteks, smokeless tobacco, snuff and chewing tobacco. It also prohibits innovations in smoke or tobacco products, such as electronic nicotine delivery systems, e-cigarettes or vape pens.

2. **Property** means all property that is owned, operated, leased, occupied or controlled by the University or the UT System on behalf of UT Dallas. For purposes of the Tobacco-Free Campus policy, this includes, but is not limited to, all buildings and structures, sidewalks, parking lots, walkways and parking structures owned or controlled by the University and all University-owned vehicles.

D. Enforcement

This policy’s effectiveness relies on the courtesy, respect and cooperation of all members of the University community.
Students, staff and faculty are empowered to respectfully and politely inform individuals in violation of this policy about the policy requirements and encourage compliance.

If direct appeal fails, policy violations may be referred to the Office of Administration, which will then refer the offending individual to the relevant office for counsel:

1. The Office of Human Resources and the appropriate supervisor, when the concern is related to a staff member.
2. The Office of the Dean of Students, when the concern is related to a student.
3. The appropriate chair or dean, when the concern is related to a faculty member.
4. The Office of Administration, when the concern is related to visitors.

Repeated violations of this policy may result in discipline as established by the responsible office.

E. Exceptions

Tobacco use may be permitted under the following circumstances:

1. Sponsored research involving tobacco or tobacco products, provided the University employee obtains the prior approval of the Vice President for Research and a waiver is requested and granted in accordance with sponsored research requirements, if any. Smoke, like any other laboratory air contaminant, shall be controlled.
2. By artists or actors who participate in University authorized performances that require smoking or vapor as part of the artistic production.
3. Educational or clinical purposes with prior approval of the dean or director responsible for the facility or the Vice President for Research, and in the case of smoking, the University Fire Marshal.
4. Other uses as approved by the Vice President for Administration, which will be considered on a case-by-case basis, with approval reserved for exceptional circumstances.

F. Education

The implementation of this policy is augmented by an awareness and education effort that includes:

1. Notification to current and prospective students and employees of our Tobacco-Free Campus policy through University websites;
2. Notification during the admission and enrollment process and/or during new hire orientation for faculty and staff, as applicable;
3. Informational meetings, postings and electronic notifications;
4. Tobacco cessation programs for students and employees;
5. Notices bearing the message "Tobacco-Free Campus," the international "No Tobacco" symbol or similar signage will be posted throughout campus at major points of vehicular or pedestrian traffic. However, the Tobacco-Free Campus policy applies to all University
property regardless of posted notices, unless specified as an approved exception in Section E.

Organizers and attendees at public events, such as conferences, meetings, public lectures, social events, cultural events and sporting events using University facilities will be required to abide by the Tobacco-Free Campus policy. Organizers of such events are responsible for communicating the policy to attendees.

G. Cessation

The University is committed to supporting all students and employees who wish to stop using tobacco and nicotine products. For a full listing of available tobacco cessation resources, please visit: www.utdallas.edu/tobaccofree.

H. Related Information

Tobacco-Free Campus website: www.utdallas.edu/tobaccofree
Frequently Asked Questions

Board of Regents' Rule 80111 – Smoke Free Facilities

Texas Administrative Code, Title 25, Health Services, Part 11, Cancer Prevention and Research Institute of Texas (CPRIT), Chapter 703, Grants for Cancer Prevention and Research, Section 703.20
Tobacco Free Policy – UTDBP3089

Policy Statement

The University of Texas at Dallas (UT Dallas) is committed to promoting a healthier work, research, educational and living environment. In order to better accomplish this goal, as well as to ensure compliance with external cancer research grant requirements, including the Cancer Prevention and Research Institute of Texas (CPRIT) regulations, the University prohibits tobacco product use as set forth below. Any advertising, sale, or free sampling of tobacco products on University property is prohibited. Improper disposal of and/or littering the campus with the remains of tobacco products or any other related waste product also is prohibited.

B. Scope

This policy applies to all faculty, staff, students and visitors of UT Dallas, University contractors, subcontractors and their respective employees, and individuals, including contractors and employees of any entity leasing UT Dallas property while on said property. This policy is applicable twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

C. Definitions

1. Tobacco refers to all forms of tobacco products, including but not limited to cigarettes, cigars, pipes, water pipes (hookah), bidis, kreteks, electronic cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, snuff and chewing tobacco.

2. Cancer Research Facility means any property in which cancer research funded by a grant, including CPRIT-funded research takes place. It includes immediately adjacent walkways, parking structures, parking lots and any outdoor area or green space to the extent that UT Dallas has the authority to control the rules governing said building, outdoor space, sidewalk, parking lots and parking structures. Cancer Research Facilities may expand or contract with the distribution of CPRIT funding or other cancer research funding.

3. Property means all property, buildings and vehicles owned or leased by UT Dallas or the UT System on behalf of UT Dallas, including outdoor areas, green spaces, adjacent walkways, parking lots and parking structures, to the extent that UT Dallas has the authority to control the rules governing said property, outdoor space, buildings, sidewalks, parking lots and parking structures.

D. Policy

The use of tobacco is prohibited in/on:

1. All Cancer Research Facilities (refer to section C. 2. for definition of "Cancer Research Facility").
2. Any University owned or leased buildings or vehicles regardless of location, and within a distance of no less than 10 meters or 33 feet of any gate, entryway, arch, doorway, air intake or operable window.

E. Enforcement

Students, staff and faculty are empowered to respectfully and courteously inform others of this policy to enhance awareness and encourage compliance.

If direct appeal fails, policy violations may be referred to the Office of Administration, which will then refer the offending individual to the relevant office:

1. The Office of Human Resources, when the concern is related to a staff member.
2. The Office of the Dean of Students, when the concern is related to a student.
3. The appropriate chair or dean, when the concern is related to a faculty member.
4. The Office of Administration, when the concern is related to visitors.

Repeated violations of this policy may result in discipline as established by the disciplinary policy applicable to the individual violator.

F. Exceptions

Tobacco use may be permitted under the following circumstances:

1. Sponsored research involving tobacco or tobacco products, provided the University employee obtains the prior approval of the Vice President for Research and a waiver is requested and granted in accordance with sponsored research requirements, if any. Smoke, like any other laboratory air contaminant, shall be controlled.
2. By artists or actors who participate in University authorized performances that require smoking as part of the artistic production.
3. Educational or clinical purposes with prior approval of the dean or director responsible for the facility or the Vice President for Research, and in the case of smoking, the University Fire Marshal.
4. Other uses as approved by the Vice President for Administration, which will be considered on a case-by-case basis, with approval reserved for exceptional circumstances.

G. Education

The implementation of this policy is augmented by an awareness and education effort that includes:

1. Notification to current and prospective students and employees of our Tobacco Free policy through University websites;
2. Notification during the admission and enrollment process and/or during new-hire orientation for faculty and staff, as applicable;
3. Informational meetings, postings and electronic notifications;
4. Notices bearing the message "Tobacco Free Building" or the international "No Tobacco" symbol or similar signage posted at building entrances. The Tobacco Free policy applies to all University buildings regardless of posted notices unless specified as an approved exception in Section F above.

H. Cessation

Tobacco cessation assistance will be made available to students, staff and faculty.

Policy History

- Issued: July 20, 2007
- Revised: May 26, 2010
- Revised: November 18, 2013

Policy Links

- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3089
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdbp3089
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdbp3089
**Tasks completed in anticipation of becoming a tobacco-free campus as of Dec. 6:**

- Tysh Coleman named as UTD’s representative for the ‘UT Eliminate Tobacco Use Summit – Steering Committee
- Teamed with Dr. Lakey and others with MD Anderson and UT System in effort to become tobacco-free
- Participate in monthly phone conferences/webinars to discuss progress, exchange ideas and discuss tobacco prevention, cessation and policy.
- Attended Eliminate Tobacco Use Summit working group meeting in Austin, June 2015
- Attended Eliminate Tobacco Use Summit Steering Committee meeting, Nov. 2015 at MD Anderson
  - Presented PowerPoint presentation on UTD’s current policy
  - Completed action plan worksheet siting UTD’s implementation strategy
- Attended Eliminate Tobacco Use Summit working group meeting in Austin, June 2016
- Attended Eliminate Tobacco Use Summit working group meeting in Austin, Oct. 2016
- Coordinated a meeting with Jenifer Cofer/Alex Hurst of MD Anderson and Jay Morrow with UT System held at UTD. Meeting attendees included Dr. Calvin Jamison, Chief Larry Zacharias, Deborah Hamlin – Employee Wellness Manager, David Liner – Director of EH&S, Chase York – Communications Manager
- Teamed with Shirlee Sow, Director of HR at UT Southwestern – discussed how UTSW could assist UTD in becoming tobacco-free
- Four staff members received training from American Lung Association to facilitate 7-week smoke-free course
- Partnered with the Student Wellness Center and held an event at Chess Plaza, Nov. 16 to promote awareness during the Great American Smokeout – informed employees of cessation resources, provided information on first, second and ‘third’ hand smoke, collected surveys administered by MD Anderson staff, welcomed representatives from Peers Against Tobacco, Mosaic Family Services and Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse
- Tobacco grant has been submitted to UT System, requesting funding to support several tobacco/cessation related lunch and learns, materials needed for participants in the 7-week smoke free course, and to host an event, March 15, 2017 for National, “Kick Butts Day”.
- Most ashtrays removed from areas around campus
- Additional tobacco-free signage posted near Bioengineering and Sciences building
- Participated in webinar titled, “Creating Tobacco-Free Colleges and Universities”, Nov. 15
- Conference call held with members from MD Anderson and UTD regarding going tobacco-free
- 1/19 – Interview with The Mercury student newspaper and Dr. Jamison regarding the transition to a tobacco-free campus
- Worked with Marketing to design new campus signage and education cards
  - Prepare to be Tobacco-Free signs prior to June 1; Tobacco-Free Campus permanent signs after June 1
    - TV monitors and the HR TV screen; electronic signs
- Fliers
- Real estate signs/sandwich boards
- Window clings
- Campus entrance signs
- Include on campus maps (online and printable)? Outdoor kiosk if it is redone?

- Updating Website – [http://www.utdallas.edu/tobaccofree](http://www.utdallas.edu/tobaccofree) (text, links)
- Drafting Ask Yoda FAQ updates
- Publicized tobacco cessation events on Comet Calendar, in Intercom (twice), on social media
- Posted the Prepare to be Tobacco-Free ads on social media
- Distributed follow up memo from Dr. Jamison
- Announced updates at Student Government, Staff Council, Academic Senate meetings
- Announced updates at student and employee orientations
- Prepared Bus ads – 1 on each of the six buses
  - Prepare signage in April and May
  - Tobacco-free signage in June, July, August – longer if possible
- Researched ad rates and deadlines for The Mercury – looking at a full color, half page print ad possibly for the kickoff event
- Public Service Announcement requests to Radio UTD and UTD-TV
  - Emailed TV editor 3/21 to ask if they offer PSAs; they do not offer them at this time
- 3/15/17 – Met with task force
- 3/29/17 – Breathe Easy Education and Resource event with HR Benefits, EAP, Office of Administration, Campus Wellness Committee, Student Wellness Center and Center for Recovery
- 3/29/17 – Lunch and Learn presentation on Effects of Smoking and Tips to Successfully Stop Using Tobacco from Holly Torres at American Lung Association
- 4/18 – 5/30/17 – Freedom from Smoking pilot class
- Prepared PowerPoint of UT Dallas updates to share with System Conference
- 4/20/17 – Met with task force
- HR starting to include wording in job postings that UT Dallas is a tobacco-free environment so applicants are informed from the beginning of the hiring process
- 4/24/17 – Call regarding the Tobacco Free Policy Exception Clause wording with MD Anderson and UT Dallas task force representatives
Are cessation programs and/or tobacco alternatives available?

Members of the campus community who currently use tobacco products will find programs for becoming tobacco free through a variety of resources, including:

- UT Dallas Employee Assistance Program (800.386.9156 / 214.648.5330 / eap@utdallas.edu)
- BlueCross BlueShield of Texas
- Student Wellness Center (SSB 4.500 / 972.883.4275)

For a complete list of resources, visit www.utdallas.edu/tobaccofree.

Are there exceptions to the Tobacco-Free Campus policy?

The use of tobacco or vape products may be allowed in sponsored research, during University authorized artistic performances or for educational or clinical purposes. Prior approval is required. Further exceptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis, reserved for exceptional circumstances.

Are there signs to tell people they can't use tobacco products on campus?

Yes, signs are posted stating UT Dallas is a tobacco-free campus.

Have major campus stakeholders been consulted about the Tobacco-Free Campus policy?

Yes, Academic Senate, Staff Council and Student Government representatives were consulted on the policy change. In addition, a task force comprised of staff, faculty and student representatives helped with the preparation of the tobacco-free campus policy and its implementation.

Have other colleges and universities implemented a tobacco-free campus?

Yes, many colleges and universities across the country have become tobacco free environments. In the UT System, our 13 sister institutions are all tobacco free.

How will the tobacco free policy be enforced?

Awareness and education are keys to implementing the policy. We will build awareness of the policy through electronic notification, signage and informational meetings. The policy will be explained during the admission and enrollment process for new students and during new hire orientation for faculty and
staff. It is expected that students, employees and visitors will voluntarily comply with this campus-wide policy. Students, staff and faculty may respectfully inform others of this policy to enhance awareness and encourage compliance.

**Is the University requiring people to stop using tobacco products?**

No, but tobacco products may not be used on UT Dallas property. The University is committed to supporting all students and employees who wish to stop using tobacco and nicotine products. A full listing of available tobacco cessation resources is available at www.utdallas.edu/tobaccofree.

**What does the Tobacco Free Building Policy prohibit?**

The policy prohibits all forms of tobacco products, including but not limited to cigarettes, cigars, pipes, water pipes (hookah), bidis, kreteks, smokeless tobacco, snuff and chewing tobacco. It also prohibits innovations in smoke or tobacco products, such as electronic nicotine delivery systems, e-cigarettes or vape pens. The policy also prohibits the advertisement, distribution and improper disposal of tobacco products on UT Dallas property.

**What if people don’t follow the Tobacco-Free Campus policy?**

Violations may be reported to the Office of Administration, and will be referred to the appropriate University officials. Repeated violations of this policy may result in discipline as established by the responsible office.

**What is CPRIT?**

Created in 2007, the Cancer Prevention Research Institute of Texas (CPRIT) is a state-funded agency charged with increasing innovation in the field of cancer research and expanding access to cancer-prevention programs. CPRIT awards grants for a wide variety of cancer-related research.

**What was UT Dallas’ previous policy on tobacco use on campus?**

The previous policy banned the use of any tobacco products within all UT Dallas buildings and within 10 meters of any building. Tobacco use was also prohibited in parking lots and sidewalks immediately adjacent to Lloyd V. Berkner Hall and the Natural Science and Engineering Research Laboratory (NSERL), the buildings in which CPRIT-funded research took place.
Where does the Tobacco-Free Campus policy apply?

Beginning June 1, 2017, the use of any tobacco or vape products is prohibited on all property that is owned, operated, leased, occupied or controlled by the University or the UT System on behalf of UT Dallas. This includes, but is not limited to, all buildings and structures, sidewalks, parking lots, walkways and parking structures owned or controlled by the University and all University-owned vehicles.

Why is UT Dallas adopting a Tobacco-Free Campus Policy?

On Jan. 10, 2017, President Benson announced UT Dallas would transition to a tobacco-free campus effective June 1, 2017. The decision was made to create a healthier campus environment and support the initiative by UT System to establish a system-wide tobacco-free culture.
The Platform leads transformational prevention and early detection initiatives in partnership with the Moon Shots Program

50% of cancers can be prevented

Source: Colditz et al, Science & Translational Medicine, 2012

Platform Mission: to accelerate the development, dissemination, and amplification of evidence-based strategies, community services, policy interventions, and knowledge targeting measurable reductions in cancer mortality at a population level
An unprecedented and sustained institutional commitment by MD Anderson Cancer Center to advance evidence-based tobacco control as a core element of our mission through leadership, investment, and collaboration

- Program developed by 18-member working group of MD Anderson scientists, clinicians, administrative leaders & public health practitioners in response to charge from Dr. Ronald DePinho

- Structured process to review & recommend evidenced-based & best practices from the CDC & WHO, as well as best practices from across the U.S.

- Actions that MD Anderson is initiating & implementing, working thru partnerships, to ultimately end tobacco at multiple levels
The Platform’s EndTobacco® initiative is advancing evidence-based tobacco control as a core element of our mission

Goals:
• Reduce smoking among youth
• Reduce the proportion of nonsmokers exposed to secondhand smoke
• Increase counseling and smoking-cessation attempts among current smokers

Key Initiatives:
Cancer Prevention & Control Platform

End Tobacco
An MD Anderson Cancer Center program

Policy

• Tobacco 21
• Smoke Free Laws
• Tobacco Free Places: College & University Campuses, Ballparks, Housing
• Tobacco Free Hiring (health systems & large employers)
• Initiating the conversation for Prohibiting the sale of Flavored Tobacco/Menthol

Cessation

• Tobacco Treatment Program: algorithms; automatic referral
• In 2017, offer the Certified Tobacco Treatment Training Program
• Knowledge Transfer to healthcare professionals working with the population still smoking:
  • Behavioral Health
  • Pregnant Women

Prevention & Education

• Youth K-12
• College/Young Adult
• UT System employees & families
College Campus 100% List

- Published Quarterly [http://nosmoke.org/pdf/smokefreecollegesuniversities.pdf](http://nosmoke.org/pdf/smokefreecollegesuniversities.pdf)

- Lists Institutions of Higher Learning with 100% Smoke free and Tobacco-Free Campuses

- Notation for inclusion of E-Cigarette, Hookah, and Marijuana in policies

- 1,827 smoke free campus sites, 1,536 tobacco-free; 1,400 prohibit e-cigarette use, 701 prohibit hookah use, and 120 prohibit marijuana use.

  - In 2006: fewer than 40 smoke free campuses.
Sample Overview of Policy Trends by Type of Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Secondary Campus Type</th>
<th>100% Status</th>
<th>Additional Products Prohibited by 100% Campus Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% Tobacco-Free Site (smokeless tobacco <em>prohibited</em>)</td>
<td>100% Smokefree Site (smokeless tobacco <em>permitted</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Types of Campuses</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Nonsmokers’ Rights Foundation, College Campus Tobacco Policy Database®, summary as of April 2017.
Enforcement

Policy Planning: Get Creative

HAVE AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
Sit down with key parties at your school to develop an implementation plan.

- Plans often include a timeline, alliances, identification of challenges, a communication strategy, signage and a strategy for enforcement.
- Involve as many parties as possible early in the planning process, especially those who will be enforcing the policy and those who use tobacco products and will be affected by the policy.
- Full administrative support of the plan and the policy is essential.

FORM ALLIANCES AND PARTNERSHIPS
You may not realize it, but your school has a number of groups to help support tobacco-free efforts.

- Consider partnerships with sports teams, sororities and fraternities, health professional student organizations, student government, community tobacco control organizations and programs offered through campus health education and promotion departments.

REMOVE THE ASHTRAYS FROM YOUR CAMPUS
Seeing ashtrays around campus could trigger a smoker’s craving, and eliminating them reinforces that smoking is not allowed on the premises.

WORK THE POLICY INTO THE CLASSROOM
There are a variety of ways the new policy can be incorporated in classrooms.

- Make the new policy the subject of art contests, writing contests, writing assignments, etc.
- Have students develop campaigns supporting the tobacco-free policy as part of advertising and public relations classes.
- Encourage your professors to work tobacco-free discussions into class curriculum.

Who to Educate?
How to Enforce?

- Educate
- Signage
- Offer Cessation Resources
- Be Supportive
- Celebrate Successes
Policy Enforcement Strategies

• **Passive**
  • Voluntary compliance
  • Signage

• **Active**
  • Enforcement/Reminder Cards
  • Positive Enforcement
  • Signage
  • Student Code of Conduct/ Employee Personnel Policies
  • Policy Ambassador Programs
  • Online Compliance Trainings (with and without fees)
  • Community Service

Slide Source: California Youth Advocacy Network
Hot Spots...

How to take Action?
Available Resources for Bystander Intervention

**Peers Against Tobacco**

Peer-led program designed to prevent and decrease the use of cigarettes and alternative tobacco products on Texas college campuses.

**Components**

- Campus Peer Group
- Peer-led Media Campaign
- Online Prevention Curriculum
- Campus & Environmental Scans
- Tobacco-Free Campus Policy Initiative

**Students Age 18 - 25**

- Youngest legal targets of tobacco industry
- New found freedom
- Socialization
- Initiation and progression to regular use
- Highest rates of alternative tobacco product use
E-cigarette: Overview

© 2015 Copyright France 24 – All rights reserved
How E-cigarettes Work

- The lithium battery powers the E-cigarette
- The battery is connected to the vaporization chamber that contains the atomizer
Types of E-cigarettes (by design)

• Ciga-likes: with the appearance of cigarettes

• eGos: larger than cigarettes, with tanks that can be filled and refilled

• Mods: stands for modification of the commercially available products
Should we be concerned about the E-cig Generation?

Nicotine plasma levels: First vs. second generation (V2)

Plasma nicotine levels at baseline and at 5, 20, 35, 50 and 65 minutes after using the first- and the new-generation device

Error bars represent 1 SEM. There was a statistically significant difference between devices at all time points except baseline.
Why Are E-cigarettes Troublesome?

- Vapor (second hand aerosol) particles of nicotine can reach the inner areas of the lungs (alveoli) where it can be absorbed.

- The aerosol and gases produced contain nicotine, glycerin/glycols, artificial flavorings, preservatives (potentially harmful if inhaled).

- Not regulated and therefore the actual amount of nicotine and composition might not be disclosed, consistent or accurate.

- Renormalize Smoking.
What We Know About E-cigarettes

The dual use of traditional cigs and E-cigs might prolong exposure to tobacco and delay cessation

- Hazards (explosion!)
- Toxic components:
  1) traces of carcinogens
  2) heating element residue

*American Heart Association position:
- Clinicians should not recommend their use as the primary smoking cessation method.
- If a patient is using an E-cig and succeeded to stop smoking, an E-cig quit date should be advised.
ELIMINATE TOBACCO USE

- 8 Academic Institutions
- 6 Health Science Centers
  - 6.78 million unique outpatient visits
  - 1.38 million hospital days annually
- 221,000 Students
- 100,000 Faculty & Staff
- UT Select Benefits covered lives >199,000

Texas population (2010 US census): 25.1 million
EndTobacco: University of Texas System Dissemination Project

Purpose:
- Create a tobacco-free culture through policy, prevention and cessation efforts
- Each institution created action plans including next steps and major goals for policy, prevention, and cessation on their campus.
End Tobacco
An MD Anderson Cancer Center program

Collaborative Partnerships

- ANR
- Cancer Action Network
- American Lung Association
- Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids
- CDC
- American Heart Association
- American Stroke Association
- Texas Department of State Health Services
- Paso del Norte Health Foundation
- Texans Standing Tall
- The University of Texas System

Fourteen Institutions. Unlimited Possibilities.
Jennifer Cofer, MPH, CHES, Director, EndTobacco
Alex Hurst, MHA, Program Manager, EndTobacco
Cancer Prevention and Control Platform
jcofer@mdanderson.org
anhurst@mdanderson.org

This project supported by the generous philanthropic contributions to The University of Texas MD Anderson Moon Shots Program from the Lyda Hill Foundation.
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1. Reaffirmation Updates

   A. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) & Compliance Certification Report (CCR)
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Proposal: Revisions to the Core Curriculum Assessment Process

Summary

Those responsible for the current core curriculum assessment process have identified the need for a revised assessment process that will relieve the burden felt by Freshman Seminar instructors. The following proposal removes the core curriculum assessment process from the Freshman Seminar course and instead recommends the development of a core curriculum assessment project that is capable of measuring all six of the core objectives, and completed outside of the classroom. The proposal includes suggested measures, alternative methods of assessment, and strategies for integrating project-based and service learning into the culture of UT Dallas.
**Issue**

Multiple conversations with Freshman Seminar instructors have revealed that the core curriculum assessment process has become onerous and difficult for faculty to sustain, resulting in incomplete and potentially invalid data (see Appendix I for detailed workload). This proposal outlines suggested revisions for reducing the burden on faculty while at the same time ensuring the integrity of UT Dallas’ core curriculum assessment process.

**Brief History of Core Curriculum Assessment at UT Dallas**
(Before Fall 2014)

Prior to fall 2014, UT Dallas conducted course-level assessment for every core-curriculum course. This required instructors to demonstrate students’ abilities to meet student-learning outcomes, and then map those learning outcomes to the core objectives of their respective course. Because many instructors were unaware of this responsibility, it was virtually impossible to build assessment into the structure of their course. This led to missing reports, and ultimately the Core Curriculum Committee voted to suspend the core curriculum assessment process for a year while revisions were considered.

**Current Core Curriculum Assessment Process**
(Fall 2014-Present)

In line with changes instituted by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), in fall 2014 UT Dallas restructured its core curriculum to incorporate six core objectives: critical thinking skills, communication skills, empirical and quantitative skills, teamwork, personal responsibility, and social responsibility (see UT Dallas Core Curriculum). To determine if students have met these objectives after completing their core curriculum, UT Dallas implemented a pre-/post-test methodology that employs two distinct assessment methods:

1. **Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA+)**
   - Performance task in which students are asked to address real-world scenarios and identify appropriate course of action
   - Designed to measure critical thinking skills, written communication skills, and empirical and quantitative skills
2. **Student Portfolio and Group Projects**
   - Students work individually and collectively to complete the projects
   - Designed to measure teamwork, oral communication, social responsibility, and personal responsibility
Baseline data are collected for all first-time-in-college (FTIC) freshmen and non core-complete transfer\(^1\) students during their first semester at UT Dallas. Students complete the CLA+ as part of a graduation requirement, while the portfolio and group projects are completed during students’ Freshman Seminar course. Freshman Seminar course instructors conduct individual rubric-based evaluations of the projects to ensure consistency in the assessment of the core objectives. After students have completed their core curriculum, a secondary measure is collected for both the CLA+ and the portfolio and group projects. Data from the two assessment periods are then compared to identify any changes in students’ skill levels for all six objectives.

Theoretically, this process should yield longitudinal data that highlight the progress our students have made with respect to these six core objectives. However, the workload and time commitment imposed on Freshman Seminar instructors has negatively impacted the submission of data and the validity of our assessment methods. Thus, the current core curriculum assessment process is neither practical nor effective.

**Suggested Revisions to the Core Curriculum Assessment Process**
(Effective Fall 2017)

The proposed revisions to the core curriculum assessment process remove the project and assessment responsibilities from the Freshman Seminar course and instead require students to participate in an interdisciplinary group project outside of the classroom. Assigned groups of eight students—one from each school—will work together for six weeks to develop a solution or method for taming a specified wicked problem (i.e., problems that are difficult to solve because of incomplete, contradictory, or changing requirements), such as the water crisis (Rittel & Webber, 1973)\(^2\). Students will begin working on this project three weeks before the start of the fall semester\(^3\), and will submit individual responses for review by a faculty committee approximately three weeks into the semester\(^4\). Students’ individual responses will be used to measure their oral communication skills, teamwork, personal responsibility, and social responsibility.

---

\(^1\) Baseline data are collected from both FTIC and non core-complete transfer students for the CLA+, however transfer students do not participate in the Freshman Seminar course and therefore, are not assessed on their oral communication skills, teamwork, personal responsibility, or social responsibility.

\(^2\) Some of the nation’s top institutions have adopted similar projects in which their students work in groups to address local and global problems (Purdue University, 2017; Carnegie Mellon, 2017).

\(^3\) Only students admitted for the fall semester will be required to participate in the core curriculum assessment process.

\(^4\) Students who attend late orientation or wait to register for classes will be given a three-week extension.
• **Project Details**
  
  o Students will receive their project assignments as part of their pre-arrival checklist of tasks to accomplish before classes begin.
  
  o The project is designed to be a hybrid group project where students have the ability to work both online and face-to-face. Students will work strictly online for the first three weeks and then meet face-to-face once the semester begins.
  
  o Students will work as a group to develop their proposed solutions to the specified wicked problem, however they will submit individual responses to the faculty committee. These responses will include the following:
    
    ▪ A 3-5 minute video pitch
      
      • Each student will serve as the public representative for his/her group, pitching the group’s proposed solution to potential investors or a grant review board (i.e., the faculty committee). Students will be instructed to communicate the utility of their proposed solution, the potential challenges/unintended consequences, and the estimated budget. This portion of the project will be used to measure students’ oral communication skills.
    
    ▪ Answers to targeted questions on personal and social responsibility
    
    ▪ Peer evaluations of group members’ teamwork and overall contributions to the project
    
    ▪ A brief explanation of how the student’s major is relevant to the project
  
  • **Logistics**
    
    o **Video Pitch**
      
      ▪ Students will be given the option to record themselves using a smartphone or video camera, however they will be encouraged to use one of the campus video labs (e.g., CommLab or classrooms equipped with Echo 360). Students who choose to use a campus video lab will receive a copy of their recording via email after their recording session is complete. For quality control, students will be given a list of recording suggestions (e.g., tips on lighting and camera position) and will be asked to obtain their group members’ approval prior to submitting their video pitches.
    
    o **Project Submission**
      
      ▪ Student responses will be collected via personalized links to a Qualtrics survey, which will serve as a portal for students to upload their video pitches and written responses.
    
    o Every group will attempt to solve the same wicked problem, and the specified problem will change annually. Each spring, faculty will vote to decide which problem will be addressed the following fall. The
project could also be linked to the common freshman reading program that is discussed in the QEP proposal (see Appendix IV).

Assessment Methods

The pre-/post-test methodology from the current assessment process will be retained, whereby a baseline measure will be collected from all FTIC students and non core-complete transfer students during their first month at UT Dallas, along with a secondary measure at the beginning of students’ junior year when most have completed their core curriculum\(^5\). The secondary measure will include transfer students who arrive at UT Dallas core complete.

- Measures
  - The CLA+ will continue to serve as the assessment measure for critical thinking skills, written communication skills, and empirical and quantitative skills. Consistent with the current process, students will be required to complete the CLA+ within the first two weeks of the fall semester.
  - Oral communication skills, personal responsibility, and social responsibility will be assessed via the core assessment project, which will be reviewed by the Core Assessment Panel (CAP)\(^6\)—a newly developed faculty committee.
    - CAP will use rubrics to assess a representative sample of approximately 25% of submitted student projects.
    - Faculty will be trained to use the rubrics and given from October 15\(^{th}\) to March 9\(^{th}\) to assess these projects on their own time\(^7\).
    - Faculty members will assess projects in pairs for inter-rater reliability purposes. They are welcome to work as a group or independently as long as they compare, discuss, and agree on their final scores.
  - Teamwork will be evaluated using the peer evaluations submitted via Qualtrics.
  - Similar to the current assessment process, student participation in the CLA+ and the core assessment project will fulfill a graduation requirement that is captured through UNIV 1010 and UNIV 2020, both of which are zero credit hour courses. This graduation

---

\(^5\) Some students will not fully complete their core curriculum until their senior year. Generally this is limited to students in NS&M and ECS, and these students are often only lacking one or two courses. A secondary measure will still be collected from these students, however they will be flagged as not fully core-complete.

\(^6\) The name for this committee is tentative, pending approval by the Core Curriculum Committee.

\(^7\) These dates are specific to the 2017-2018 academic year, but a similar timeline will exist for subsequent years.
requirement, along with promotion of the core assessment project during orientation and discussion of the project (and potentially the CLA+) during the Freshman Seminar course will be used to incentivize participation.

- Core Assessment Panel
  - The CAP will consist of 8 subcommittees, which will contain a representative group of 8-10 faculty members per subcommittee.
  - Subcommittees should be diverse, including:
    - Core and non-core instructors
    - Tenure track, non-tenure track, and adjunct faculty
  - CAP membership and term length will be designated by Academic Senate, and will count toward university service.
  - Based on projected enrollment for fall 2017, each pair of faculty members would be asked to review 40 projects, which would amount to approximately 10 hours of time spent reviewing projects over a 5 month period.

![Diagram of organizational structure of subcommittees]

Figure 1. Example of the organizational structure of the subcommittees

**Supplemental Assessment Methods**

In addition to the direct measures outlined above, the revised core curriculum assessment process would incorporate two indirect methods of assessment:

- **Focus Group**
  - A sample of core-complete students will be asked about their opinions and experiences with the assessment project, their core courses, and the degree to which they have improved with respect to the six core objectives.

- **Student Survey**
  - Core-complete students will be asked to report their perceived level of mastery of the six core objectives.
Building Social Responsibility and Service Learning into UT Dallas’ Culture

While this project is designed for the purposes of core curriculum assessment, it is also an opportunity to promote social responsibility, project-based learning, and service learning at UT Dallas. Instead of confining the project to the first month of the fall semester, students can continue to build upon their research and cultivate their marketable skills throughout their educational career at UT Dallas.

• Best Proposed Solutions
  o A peer-review process will be employed to select the top 5 proposed solutions for FTIC/non core-complete transfer students and the top 5 proposed solutions for core-complete students. FTIC/non core-complete transfer students will vote on the best first-year projects at the end of their Freshman Seminar and Transfer Seminar courses. Similarly, core-complete students will vote on the best core-complete projects during their UNIV 2020 course.
  o Selected projects will be presented during Research Week in April.
  o Prospective employers and corporate sponsors will be present.

• Beyond Core-Complete
  o Project-Based Service Learning
    ▪ Core-complete groups who have been awarded one of the 5 top solutions will be paired with a faculty mentor to continue to develop their project throughout their senior year.
    ▪ During spring semester of their senior year, students will present updated projects to the entire university on the last day of Research Week.
    ▪ Students will receive a research award that can be applied toward implementing their solution or be used as a scholarship for graduate school.
    ▪ For some students, this project could also serve as the foundation for a senior thesis.
  o Faculty mentors
    ▪ A total of 8 faculty mentors—one from each school—would supervise all 5 groups (40 students). Students could work with all 8 of the faculty mentors simultaneously, or in stages.
    ▪ Faculty mentors would receive a course buy-out for the year.
    ▪ A Center for Teaching and Learning sponsored book club or workshop would be developed to train faculty on strategies for mentoring students.
      ▪ Faculty would be required to participate in this training before serving as a mentor.

---

8 Transfer Seminar courses will be added to the UT Dallas course inventory in Fall 2018 as part of the QEP pilot.
Figure 2. Illustration of the relationship between faculty mentors and the top 5 groups of students

- **UNIV 2020**
  - UNIV 2020 will be redesigned as a service-learning course that meets one day per month (e.g., early Friday or Saturday mornings).\(^9\)
  - The course will focus on the local implications of the wicked problem addressed in the core assessment project. Students will go into the field to learn about the problem and potential solutions from their community.\(^10\)
  - Students in this course will select top core-complete projects.
- **Student Belonging**
  - This project also promotes student belonging for both native UT Dallas students and transfer students, which directly ties to UT Dallas’ QEP Proposal (Murphy & Smith, 2017) and UT System’s ninth Quantum Leap on Student Success (McRaven, W.H. 2016).
- **Civic Engagement**
  - Interdisciplinary, collaborative work toward the solution of a wicked problem prepares students to become civically engaged citizens after graduation (Bauer et al., 2015; Car casson 2013; Najmabadi, 2017; Theis & Forhan, 2017).

---

\(^9\) See Tulane University’s Center for Public Service for an example of a well established service-learning curriculum (Tulane University, 2017).

\(^10\) To continue the water crisis example, students in UNIV 2020 could work with communities in North Texas to learn about the potential impact of fracking on the local water supply (Hildenbrand et al., 2015).
Timeline

The proposed timeline for the core curriculum assessment project is outlined Table 1.

Table 1. Core Curriculum Assessment Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 2017</td>
<td>Project Assigned</td>
<td>Students will receive their project assignments via the pre-approval checklist. Group assignments will be emailed to the students on this date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6, 2017</td>
<td>Census Day</td>
<td>Census Day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15, 2017</td>
<td>Project Due</td>
<td>Students will submit their individual responses via the Qualtrics survey &quot;portal&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2017</td>
<td>Extended Project Deadline</td>
<td>Extended project deadline for students who attend late orientation or who register late for classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14, 2017</td>
<td>Fall 2017 Midterm Grades Due</td>
<td>Deadline to submit fall 2017 midterm grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2017</td>
<td>Sample of Projects Given to CAP</td>
<td>The faculty committee will receive a sample of projects to assess. Freshman Seminar and UNIV 2020 students will review the video presentations of their classmates and subsequently vote on the top “solution” for their course. Once the top solutions have been selected for each course, students will vote again to determine the top 5 solutions for their cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 27, 2017</td>
<td>Peer Review: Students Select Top Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 2018</td>
<td>Spring 2018 Midterm Grades Due</td>
<td>Deadline to submit spring 2018 midterm grades. The faculty committee will make their final decision on assessment scores for their sample of projects and submit those scores to the Office of Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2018</td>
<td>CAP Meets to Discuss Scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 2018</td>
<td>Spring Break</td>
<td>Spring Break: March 12-18, 2018. Groups with projects selected as a &quot;top solution&quot; will present their solution to all of UT Dallas, as well as prospective employers and corporate sponsors during Research Week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 2018</td>
<td>Research Week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits of the Revised Assessment Process

Additional benefits include:

- UT Dallas’ pre-/post-test approach tracks the same students over time, which allows us to account for the difference in skill level between native UT Dallas students and those who transfer from other institutions by determining what students know both before and after they have completed their core curriculum at UT Dallas. Therefore, we can compare the skill levels of students who completed their entire core curriculum at UT Dallas to those who only completed a portion of their core curriculum at UT Dallas and to those who did not complete any of their core curriculum at UT Dallas.
  - The assessment processes used by our UT System peer institutions only measure what students know at a single point in time, making it impossible for them to differentiate the impact that their core curriculum has on native versus transfer students.
- This methodology also allows us to account for student demographic information and prior knowledge (e.g., AP/IB credit, dual credit, SAT/ACT scores, etc.) that might serve as a predictor for student skill development or academic performance.
  - AP/IB exam credit
  - Dual credit
  - SAT/ACT scores
  - High school GPA
  - Extracurricular affiliations (e.g., Student Government, athletics, student organizations)
- The results can be disaggregated across schools and majors.
- Findings can be used to inform and improve core curriculum courses.
  - The Office of Assessment can work with the Office of Undergraduate Education to build a “Skill Lab” that offers tools to help students cultivate the skills associated with the core objectives (Duckworth, A. 2017).
- The results can be used to encourage collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs in terms of developing additional measures for the six core objectives and marketable skills outlined by the THECB.

Challenges

Faculty may be hesitant to embrace the interdisciplinary approach outlined in these proposed revisions. In an effort to capture the unique contributions from each discipline and simultaneously promote interdisciplinary working relationships, students will be asked to address the explicit role their major/field plays in the solution proposed by their group. Ideally, this will showcase the importance of collaboration across disciplines.
Additionally, participation on the CAP and as faculty mentors will require buy-in from those involved, as well as the willingness to contribute the time and energy to assisting with assessment and mentorship. Some resistance is expected, however it is anticipated that faculty will appreciate the value of the associated projects and volunteer their service for the sake of student success both at UT Dallas, and post graduation (Ray & Kafka, 2014; Webb, 2007). To encourage participation, faculty will be offered the following incentives:

- Formal university service recognition for CAP participants
- Course buy-out for faculty mentors
- Certificate and small research grant for “best research mentor”, to be voted on by mentees

**Budget**

The estimated budget for the revised core curriculum assessment process is outlined in Figure 3. Please note that the costs associated with the CLA+ are already incorporated into the current assessment process. The revised process would require an estimated $34,000 (i.e., 17.5% increase) in additional costs, resulting in a total annual budget of $194,000.

![Figure 3. Estimated Budget for the Revised Core Curriculum Assessment Process](image-url)
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APPENDIX

I. Current Core Curriculum Assessment Responsibilities

Freshman Seminar Instructors

In addition to their general teaching obligations, Freshman Seminar instructors are tasked with the following core curriculum assessment responsibilities:

- Advertise the CLA+ and discuss the importance of the exam
- Dedicate class time to the completion of the portfolio and group projects
- Dedicate the last two weeks of the semester to group presentations
- Re-watch recorded presentations after the semester ends to assess student performance with respect to oral communication, personal responsibility, and social responsibility
  - For class with 30 students, if each student requires 5 minutes to evaluate, that is about 2.5 hours of assessment per class and many instructors have multiple sections
- Collect teamwork evaluations from every student
- Submit final assessment data to the Office of Assessment

Instructors complete this work for a 1-semester credit hour course, which is often in addition to a full teaching load.

Office of Assessment

The Office of Assessment works with the Associate Deans and Freshman Seminar instructors as requested to assist with core curriculum assessment needs, including but not limited to the following tasks:

- Develop and/or adapt rubrics for oral communication, teamwork, personal responsibility, and social responsibility to meet the needs of core curriculum assessment
- Create individualized, online rubrics for each student (i.e., over 3,000 students) using Qualtrics and eLearning
- Collecting assessment data from Freshman Seminar instructors
- Analyze CLA+ data and rubric-based data to determine students’ progress with respect to the skills associated with all six core objectives
II. THECB Quick Reference Guide
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational Component Area</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>EQS</th>
<th>TW</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>PR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in this category focus on developing ideas and expressing them clearly, considering the effect of the message, fostering understanding, and building the skills needed to communicate persuasively. Courses involve the command of oral, aural, written, and visual literacy skills that enable people to exchange messages appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in this category focus on quantitative literacy in logic, patterns, and relationships. Courses involve the understanding of key mathematical concepts and the application of appropriate quantitative tools to everyday experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life and Physical Sciences</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in this category focus on describing, explaining, and predicting natural phenomena using the scientific method. Courses involve the understanding of interactions among natural phenomena and the implications of scientific principles on the physical world and on human experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language, Philosophy &amp; Culture</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in this category focus on how ideas, values, beliefs, and other aspects of culture express and affect human experience. Courses involve the exploration of ideas that foster aesthetic and intellectual creation in order to understand the human condition across cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative Arts</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in this category focus on the appreciation and analysis of creative artifacts and works of the human imagination. Courses involve the synthesis and interpretation of artistic expression and enable critical, creative, and innovative communication about works of art.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American History</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in this category focus on the consideration of past events and ideas relative to the United States, with the option of including Texas History for a portion of this component area. Courses involve the interaction among individuals, communities, states, the nation, and the world, considering how these interactions have contributed to the development of the United States and its global role.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government/Political Science</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in this category focus on consideration of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the states, with special emphasis on that of Texas. Courses involve the analysis of governmental institutions, political behavior, civic engagement, and their political and philosophical foundations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social and Behavioral Sciences</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in this category focus on the application of empirical and scientific methods that contribute to the understanding of what makes us human. Courses involve the exploration of behavior and interactions among individuals, groups, institutions, and events, examining their impact on the individual, society, and culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component Area Option</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a. A minimum of 3 SCH must meet the definition and corresponding Core Objectives specified in one of the foundational component areas  
b. As an option for up to 3 semester credit hours of the Component Area Option, an institution may select course(s) that:  
  (i) Meet(s) the definition specified for one or more of the foundational component areas; and  
  (ii) Include(s) a minimum of three Core Objectives, including Critical Thinking Skills, Communication Skills, and one of the remaining Core Objectives of the institution’s choice. |
Texas Core Curriculum 2014
Chapter 4 B §4.28 – 4.31

Statement of Purpose

Through the Texas Core Curriculum, students will gain a foundation of knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world, develop principles of personal and social responsibility for living in a diverse world, and advance intellectual and practical skills that are essential for all learning.

Core Objectives

- **Critical Thinking Skills** - to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information
- **Communication Skills** - to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication
- **Empirical and Quantitative Skills** - to include the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts resulting in informed conclusions
- **Teamwork** - to include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal
- **Social Responsibility**: to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities
- **Personal Responsibility** - to include the ability to connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making

Guidelines

- Core = 42 SCH
  - FCA over-flow hours must be accounted for in CAO or degree requirements
- Courses must meet FCA definition and include required Core Objectives
- Component Area Option
  - min 3 SCH must match FCA definition & Core Objectives
  - max 3 SCH match FCA + Core Objectives Critical Thinking, Communication Skills, & one other (institution’s choice)
- Unique needs courses are no longer allowed in the core curriculum
- One change per year per institution
  - Schedule that suits the institution
  - Request received before March 1 will be approved for following Fall semester
- Website: [http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/corecurriculum2014](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/corecurriculum2014)
III. THECB Report on Revisions to the Core Curriculum
Revising the State Core Curriculum: A focus on 21st century competencies

A Report with Recommendations from the Undergraduate Education Advisory Committee

April 2011

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Fred W. Heldenfels IV, CHAIR  
Harold Hahn, VICE CHAIR  
Joe B. Hinton, SECRETARY  
Durga D. Agrawal  
Dennis D. Golden  
Lyn Bracewell Phillips  
A.W. "Whit" Riter III  
Amir H. Barzin, STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE

Raymund A. Paredes, COMMISSIONER OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mission of the Coordinating Board

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board’s mission is to work with the Legislature, Governor, governing boards, higher education institutions and other entities to help Texas meet the goals of the state’s higher education plan, Closing the Gaps by 2015, and thereby provide the people of Texas the widest access to higher education of the highest quality in the most efficient manner.

Philosophy of the Coordinating Board

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will promote access to quality higher education across the state with the conviction that access without quality is mediocrity and that quality without access is unacceptable. The Board will be open, ethical, responsive, and committed to public service. The Board will approach its work with a sense of purpose and responsibility to the people of Texas and is committed to the best use of public monies. The Coordinating Board will engage in actions that add value to Texas and to higher education. The agency will avoid efforts that do not add value or that are duplicated by other entities.

This document is available on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Website: [http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/ueac](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/ueac)

For more information, contact:

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board  
P.O. Box 12788  
Austin, TX 78711  
512/427-6101

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age or disability in employment or the provision of services.
Revising the State Core Curriculum: A focus on 21st century competencies

Executive Summary

The Undergraduate Education Advisory Committee (UEAC) was established in November 2006. In January 2009 it completed work on its first report, *Designing Texas Undergraduate Education in the 21st Century*. One of the recommendations the committee made was to review the Texas Core Curriculum and determine whether revision was necessary. The current Core Curriculum was implemented in 1999. During the decade of its existence, several factors have combined to make a revision worthwhile, including increased attention to general education (core curriculum) by the regional accrediting organization, and new legislation limiting the number of semester credit hours appropriate for a baccalaureate degree in Texas. The UEAC was charged with conducting the review.

In the pages that follow, the rationale for, the process used in, and the recommendations stemming from that review are presented. The committee began with the basic question. “Does the existing Core Curriculum adequately serve the needs of students?” Given the rapid evolution of necessary knowledge and skills and the need to take into account global, national, state, and local cultures, does the Core Curriculum ensure that students will develop the essential knowledge and skills they need to be successful in college, in a career, in their communities, and in life? Given recent changes in legislation, does the Core Curriculum in its current structure still serve the needs of students? In other words, does the existing Core Curriculum facilitate student success and excellence, or act as an unintended barrier to achieving those goals?

After much discussion, the UEAC is confident that, while the existing Core Curriculum has much to recommend it, it does not adequately address the kinds of knowledge and skills students need to be successful in the 21st Century. It also does not necessarily serve students in terms of ensuring a seamless transition from Core Curriculum completion to degree completion. In the interest of providing workable solutions to improving the Core Curriculum in Texas, the UEAC has divided its work into two phases. Phase I deals with those recommendations that can be accomplished within the existing legislative framework. Those recommendations include:

- **Purpose of the Core Curriculum** – Recommend a new purpose statement;
- **Six Core Curriculum Objectives** – Recommend that the current Basic Intellectual Competencies, Perspectives, and Exemplary Educational Objectives be replaced with six Core Objectives: Communication Skills, Critical Thinking Skills, Empirical and Quantitative Skills, Teamwork, Social Responsibility, and Personal Responsibility;
- **Foundational Component Areas** – Recommend eight content-related component areas and an institutional option that define subject matter content for the Core Curriculum;
- **Core Objective Mapping** – Recommend required and optional Core Objectives to be addressed in each Foundational Component Area;
• Allocation of Semester Credit Hours (SCH) by Component Area – Recommend a distribution of SCH across the Foundational Component Areas of the Core Curriculum to ensure breadth of knowledge;
• Assessment of each institution’s Core Curriculum, and the reporting mechanisms required in legislation; and
• Development and approval timeline and guidelines for revised institutional Core Curricula.

Once the Coordinating Board has acted to officially revise the Texas Core Curriculum, a definitive timeline for the re-development of core curricula by individual institutions and the phased-in implementation of the revised Texas Core Curriculum should provide appropriate time for the redevelopment to proceed as a faculty-owned process, and for the transition from one curriculum to another to be implemented in a student-centered process.

Phase II will further review the Core to determine whether changes in the governing legislation may be necessary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Establish the Statement of Purpose of the Core Curriculum.

Purpose: Through the Core Curriculum, students will gain a foundation of knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world; develop principles of personal and social responsibility for living in a diverse world; and advance intellectual and practical skills that are essential for all learning.

Recommendation 2: Establish six Core Curriculum Objectives.

- **Critical Thinking Skills** to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information.
- **Communication Skills** to include effective written, oral, and visual communication.
- **Empirical and Quantitative Skills** to include applications of scientific and mathematical concepts.
- **Teamwork** to include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal.
- **Social Responsibility** to include intercultural competency, civic knowledge, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities.
- **Personal Responsibility** to include the ability to connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making.
Recommendation 3: Revise Foundational Component Areas.

1. Communication
2. Mathematics
3. Life and Physical Sciences
4. Language, Philosophy, & Culture
5. Creative Arts
6. American History
7. Government/Political Science
8. Social and Behavioral Sciences
9. Institutional Option

Recommendation 4: Map Core Curriculum Objectives to Foundational Component Areas.

Any course developed and approved for use in an institution’s core curriculum must address at least three of the Core Objectives, mapped to specific Foundational Component Areas (see Table 1, page 14). Institutions must include the required objectives designated for a particular Foundational Component Area, and may include any additional objectives (designated as optional on the chart) for that component area.

Recommendation 5: Establish allocation of semester credit hours for each Foundational Component Area to total 42 semester credit hours.

1. Communication with six semester credit hours
2. Mathematics with three semester credit hours
3. Life and Physical Sciences with six semester credit hours
4. Language, Philosophy, & Culture with three semester credit hours
5. Creative Arts with three semester credit hours
6. American History with six semester credit hours
7. Government/Political Science with six semester credit hours
8. Social and Behavioral Sciences with three semester credit hours
9. Institutional Option with six semester credit hours

Recommendation 6: Establish an assessment reporting process to the THECB for institutions that is aligned with SACSCOC practices.

Recommendation 7: Establish a timeline and guidelines for development and approval of revised institutional Core Curricula.
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**INTRODUCTION**

In January 2009, the Undergraduate Education Advisory Committee (UEAC) submitted to the Coordinating Board a report with recommendations entitled *Designing Texas Undergraduate Education in the 21st Century*. The report stated clearly that higher education must transform itself to meet the needs of a changing, global society, as well as the social and economic needs of Texas and the United States.

Further, the report identified four major areas for improvement: 1) improving students’ access and success; 2) improving quality through enhancing the learning process; 3) assuring excellence through evaluation and assessment; and 4) strengthening funding for undergraduate education. It is within the second area -- improving the quality of undergraduate education through enhancing the learning process -- that the UEAC recommends reconsideration of the Texas Core Curriculum to ensure that it reflects current and future demands on student knowledge and skills.

As soon as the report was accepted by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, the UEAC began its next phase of work, planning how to implement the recommendations from the report. One of the first recommendations to be implemented was the call to reconsider the statewide Texas Core Curriculum.

**RATIONALE**

The Texas Core Curriculum was last revised over 10 years ago with the aim of creating a common statewide framework for general education and specifying certain content requirements to facilitate the transfer of credit. However, the basic intellectual competencies of reading, writing, speaking, listening, critical thinking, and computer literacy specified in the 1999 Core Curriculum have become insufficient to the task of educating students for the 21st Century. The competencies of reading, writing, listening, and speaking continue to be necessary to a well educated, well rounded person, but are incomplete in preparing students for work, fulfilling civic responsibilities, and leading meaningful lives. In addition, with the massive transformation in technology, “computer literacy” in the year 2010 and beyond is not the same as what was needed in the late 1990's.

Considering the new and ever shifting global economy and a population in Texas that is also changing, the current core curriculum is simply outdated and unwieldy. Assessing the core curriculum in any meaningful way at the institutional level and across the state is also cumbersome. Therefore, the time is right for Texas to reconsider its core curriculum, which makes up about a third of the requirement for a baccalaureate degree.
DESIGNING THE TEXAS CORE CURRICULUM IN THE 21ST CENTURY

UEAC urges a paradigm shift in the focus of the Core Curriculum. Too often the Core Curriculum is regarded as a set of individual courses to be taken in between and around the discipline-area coursework. The focus of the Core Curriculum as a coherent knowledge unit is easily lost amidst discussions of transfer credit and semester credit hours. UEAC wants to ensure a focus on the Core Curriculum as a whole while at the same time recognizing the procedural ramifications of its decisions.

UEAC members fully understood that six Core Objectives should drive the creation of the Core Curriculum, not just the content: Communication Skills, Critical Thinking Skills, Empirical and Quantitative Skills, Teamwork, Social Responsibility, and Personal Responsibility. Moreover, because both Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) and Texas statute outline the parameters for general education in which the current and proposed Core Curriculum fit, the current Core Curriculum has become mired with complexity as the purpose has shifted to assessment of student learning. The pedagogical decisions, assessment role and procedural aspects of the Core Curriculum as a whole must defer to the Curriculum’s main purpose – for students to gain a foundation of knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world; develop principles of personal and social responsibility for living in a diverse world; and advance intellectual and practical skills that are essential for all learning.

Existing Parameters

Two specific sets of requirements constitute the parameters of the new Core Curriculum, and shape its boundaries. First, regional accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) dictates certain requirements. Under the SACSCOC Core Requirement 2.7.3, associate degrees must include a general education requirement of at least 15 SCH, while baccalaureate degrees must require a minimum of 30 SCH of general education. These credits are also to be drawn from and include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural science/mathematics. Core Requirement 2.7.3 also states that coursework used to fulfill general education requirements must not “…narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession.” Comprehensive Standard 3.5.1 requires each institution to identify “…college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them.”

The Texas Legislature has mandated other requirements. In Section 61.821 of the Education Code, the core curriculum is defined as “the curriculum in liberal arts, humanities, and sciences and political, social and cultural history that all undergraduate students of an institution of higher education are required to complete before receiving an academic undergraduate degree.” Section 61.822 specifies a minimum of 42 semester credit hours, “…including a statement of the content, component areas, and objectives of the core curriculum.” Moreover, Sections 51.301 and 51.302 require colleges and universities to ensure that each student has
completed at least six semester credit hours (SCH) of Government and Political Science (including “consideration of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the states, with special emphasis on that of Texas”), and another six SCH of American or Texas History, before awarding a baccalaureate or lesser degree or academic certificate.

The Current Core Curriculum: Range, Assumptions, Defining Characteristics, Perspectives, Components, and Exemplary Educational Objectives

One problem with the current Core Curriculum is its complexity. Although it looks simple on paper, six Basic Intellectual Competencies, eight Perspectives, and thirty-seven component-area-related Exemplary Educational Objectives associated with the Core Curriculum make this a very daunting task to assess and account for student success. The Core Curriculum itself consists of a minimum of 42 SCH but can range from 42 to 48 SCH. Within those parameters, institutions have 36 SCH of their Core Curriculum requirements designated in common, with 6 to 12 additional SCH as individual institutional options.

The Core Curriculum is fully transferable among Texas public institutions of higher education that offer undergraduate degrees. Requirements completed at one college or university must be accepted and substituted for those of the institution receiving the transfer student, even if the sending institution’s Core Curriculum is not an exact match for that of the receiving institution.

In addition, if a student successfully completes the 42-hour Core Curriculum at one institution, the entire block of credits must be substituted for the receiving institution’s core curriculum. Students may not be required to take additional Core Curriculum courses unless the Board has approved a larger Core Curriculum at the receiving institution. Students who transfer without completing the Core Curriculum shall receive academic credit in the appropriate component area for each area successfully completed in the Core Curriculum of the sending institution.

The Proposed Core Curriculum Revision

Resources Used

The UEAC developed a comprehensive list of resources to guide its discussions and deliberations. First, the regulations and statutes that govern the Texas Core Curriculum were reviewed. The committee examined the purpose and content of other statewide general education requirements. UEAC members also surveyed the core curricula of a number of public and private colleges and universities across the U.S. to better understand the variety of different curricular models and to identify promising practices in general education. Most importantly, the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative of the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) was considered carefully. The AAC&U has been working on reforming general education for almost 30 years, not only for general undergraduates but also for transfer students. To assist with assessment, the LEAP project
includes a set of sample rubrics normed at more than 80 colleges and universities, as part of the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) assessment guidelines.

**Guiding Parameters**

After a detailed review of the current Core Curriculum, and exploration of available resources, including an assessment of other core curricula in various public and private institutions across the United States, especially those that center on student learning and student success, the UEAC drafted four guiding parameters as it underwent discussions in reshaping the existing Core.

*I. Statutes and THECB Rules*

First and foremost, the UEAC understands that legislation and the corresponding administrative rules are a political process not necessarily subject to quick or easy change. Therefore, in formulating the revised Core Curriculum, UEAC adopted an approach that encompasses a two-phase process. In Phase I, all recommendations are crafted with the notion of improving the Core Curriculum, while staying within the current statutes and rules. In Phase II, UEAC would consider altering the number of semester credit hours and other statutorily mandated characteristics of the Core Curriculum, issues of transferability and applicability, and the inclusion of capstone or orientation courses.

*II. Alignment*

One of the major problems with the current Core Curriculum is the assessment and evaluation of all the Basic Intellectual Competencies, Perspectives, and Exemplary Educational Objectives. In addition, the SACSCOC has mandated that the assessment of student learning outcomes at the program and course level must be an integral part of every institutional effectiveness plan. Therefore, the second guiding parameter is a better alignment of the new Core Curriculum with program and course-level student learning outcomes, with SACSCOC general education outcomes, and with each institution’s general education objectives. To that end, the UEAC has worked very closely with the Accountability System Peer Groups as those groups spent eighteen months considering how to measure “value-added” components of general education; UEAC members invited two representatives of those Peer Groups (one two-year and one four-year) who are both assessment professionals to assist them as they continued the process of deliberation and discussion.

*III. Pedagogy*

The third guiding parameter is pedagogy. While subject matter content is important, how the content is delivered is at least as important to ensure increased student engagement and learning. Therefore, the new Core Curriculum must directly affect how faculty members incorporate the new objectives into the classroom, to encourage students to learn actively in a participatory manner that allows them to take charge of their education.
IV. Assessment

Finally, the success of any process lies in the results. In the case of a more beneficial and productive Core Curriculum, the assessment of student learning and success must be considered as an intrinsic part of any revision to the current Core Curriculum. The assessment process itself needs to be meaningful and improvement-oriented. Each institution also needs their faculty members to be active partners in this process. The committee’s recommendations regarding assessment are discussed later in this document. In crafting those recommendations, the UEAC was guided by three principles: (1) recognition that students can benefit from a common foundation of knowledge and skills, but also recognizing that institutions have different student populations with different needs, different cultures, and different missions; (2) institutions must satisfy demands for institutional effectiveness from many different sources, including the federal-level Department of Education, the state-level Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, SACSCOC, and institutional governing boards; and (3) there are multiple ways to assess and evaluate that each institution could develop based on available resources and expertise.

THE REVISION PROCESS

The UEAC went through a series of meetings and deliberations, including the designation of subcommittees, to reach the recommendations of this report.

February 2, 2009:
- Discussion of core curriculum and formation of subcommittees

April 24, 2009:
- Review of current core laws, rules, and documents; SWOT analysis by subcommittee

September 18, 2009:
- Discussion of process for recommending changes and of purpose statement

November 13, 2009:
- Discussion of roles of institutions, the Coordinating Board, and legislation
- Motion approved stating: “All institutions will require a minimum number of core curriculum hours for a baccalaureate degree and a lower number of hours for an academic associate degree. The baccalaureate degree shall include the same number of hours as the associate degree core at the lower level. The remaining hours may be taught at the upper level.”

February 26, 2010:
- Discussion of six new Core Objectives
April 16, 2010:

- Motion approved to accept revision of Core Objective of Communication to state: “Communication Skills, to include effective written, oral, and visual communication.”
- Motion approved to word empirical objective to state: “Empirical and Quantitative Skills, to include application of scientific and mathematical concepts.”
- Motion approved on Core Objective for Social Responsibility: “Social Responsibility, to include intercultural competency, civic knowledge, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities.”
- Motion approved to define final Core Objective on Personal Responsibility to state: “Personal Responsibility, to include the ability to connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making.”
- Motion approved to maintain the component areas in the current core (Communication, Mathematics, Life and Physical Sciences, Humanities, Visual and Performing Arts, U.S. History, Government/Political Science, and Social and Behavioral Science).
- Motion approved to accept the proposed chart mapping the six Core Objectives into the foundational component areas.

June 11, 2010:

- Motion approved to keep same distribution of semester credit hours per component area as reflected in the current core curriculum.

September 24, 2010:

- Motion approved to accept the definitions for the component areas. The definitions include three aspects: focus of the component area, focus of courses for use in the component area, and the Core Objectives or each course developed to fill the component area requirement.
- Motion approved to accept the number of semester credit hours (SCH) for each component area.

February 25, 2011:

- Motion approved to exclude unique needs courses as part of the core curriculum.
- Motion approved to limit the core curriculum to 42 SCH with THECB approval for any institution requesting a core over 42 SCH. Careful academic advising is vital to student success and is strongly recommended.
- Motion approved to retain the practice of allowing institutions to award academic associate degrees with a field of study curriculum or transfer compact agreement without core completion. This does not relieve a transfer student of the requirements to complete the core for a bachelor’s degree.
- Motion approved to not impose a limit to the number of courses an institution may submit for approval. Data from Texas Core Web Center to show a wide range in the
number of courses in similar component areas at each institution. There is little correlation to the enrollment to the number of courses offered. Institutions do not seem to be limiting the number of courses currently. Institutions are urged to self-limit the number of courses based on available resources and faculty requirements based on SACS guidelines.

- Motion approved to adopt the selection and approval of Core Curriculum courses as follows: once approved by the institution, the courses and supporting documentation are forwarded to the THECB for final approval. The subcommittee further recommended that institutions should develop a faculty-based approval process for institution approval and should use the AAC&U VALUE rubrics as guidelines for core objective assessment. Institutions are responsible for maintaining the appropriate level of achievement for each core objective.
- Motion approved to begin work toward statewide articulation agreements for all institutions rather than general area tracks.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The UEAC recommends the reformation of the Core Curriculum for state supported institutions be developed in two phases. In Phase I, UEAC addressed the purpose and definition of the core curriculum, the revision of core competencies, component area definitions, and assessment. During Phase II, UEAC would consider the number of semester credit hours and other statutorily mandated characteristics of the Core Curriculum, issues of transferability and applicability, and the inclusion of unique needs and capstone or orientation courses.

Phase I recommendations include:
1. Establishing the purpose of the Core Curriculum;
2. Establishing six Core Curriculum Objectives to replace the Assumptions, Perspectives, Core Competencies and the Exemplary Educational Objectives;
3. Revising the existing component areas titles and definitions;
4. Mapping the Core Curriculum Objectives to the revised foundational component areas;
5. Designating the number of semester credit hours for each component area;
6. Establishing an assessment reporting process to the THECB for institutions that is aligned with SACSCOC practices; and
7. Establishing a timeline and a set of guidelines for the development and approval of the revised institutional Core Curricula.

Recommendation 1: Establish the Purpose of the Core Curriculum.

Purpose: Through the Core Curriculum, students will gain a foundation of knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world; develop principles of personal and social responsibility for living in a diverse world; and advance intellectual and practical skills that are essential for all learning.

Recommendation 2: Establish six Core Curriculum Objectives and Corresponding Definitions.

1. **Critical Thinking Skills** - to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information
2. **Communication Skills** - to include effective written, oral, and visual communication
3. **Empirical and Quantitative Skills** - to include applications of scientific and mathematical concepts
4. **Teamwork** - to include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal
5. **Social Responsibility** - to include intercultural competency, civic knowledge, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities
6. **Personal Responsibility** - to include the ability to connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making
**Recommendation 3: Revise Foundational Component Areas.**

Revise the existing component areas to clearly define the content, skills and Core Objectives.

1. **Communication**
   
   Courses in this category focus on developing and expressing ideas clearly, fostering understanding, and the potential for effecting change. Courses involve the command of oral, aural, written, and visual skills that enable people to exchange messages appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience. The Core Objectives of critical thinking skills, communication skills, teamwork, and personal responsibility are addressed by each course in this component area.

2. **Mathematics**
   
   Courses in this category focus on quantitative literacy in logic, patterns, and relationships. Courses involve the understanding of key mathematical concepts and the application of appropriate mathematical tools to the everyday experience. The Core Objectives of critical thinking skills, communication skills, and empirical and quantitative skills are addressed by each course in this component area.

3. **Life and Physical Sciences**
   
   Courses in this category focus on describing, explaining, and predicting natural phenomena using the scientific method. Courses involve the understanding of interactions among natural phenomena and the implications of scientific principles on human experiences. The Core Objectives of critical thinking skills, communication skills, empirical and quantitative skills, and teamwork are addressed by each course in this component area.

4. **Language, Philosophy, and Culture**
   
   Courses in this category focus on how ideas and values reflect and impact human experience. Courses involve the exploration of ideas that foster aesthetic and intellectual creation in order to understand the human condition across cultures. The Core Objectives of critical thinking skills, communication skills, and social responsibility are addressed by each course in this component area.
5. Creative Arts

Courses in this category focus on the appreciation and analysis of creative artifacts and works of the human imagination.
Courses involve the synthesis and interpretation of artistic expression and enable critical, creative, and innovative communication about works of art.
The Core Objectives of critical thinking skills, communication skills, and social responsibility are addressed by each course in this component area.

6. American History

Courses in this category focus on the consideration of past events relative to the United States, with the option of including Texas history for a portion of this component area.
Courses involve the interaction among individuals, communities, states, the nation, and the world, considering how these interactions have contributed to the development of the United States and its global role.
The Core Objectives of critical thinking skills, communication skills, social responsibility, and personal responsibility are addressed by each course in this component area.

7. Government/Political Science

Courses in this category focus on consideration of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the states with special emphasis on that of Texas.
Courses involve the analysis of governmental institutions, political behavior, civic engagement, and their political and philosophical foundations.
The Core Objectives of critical thinking skills, communication skills, teamwork, and social responsibility are addressed by each course in this component area.

8. Social and Behavioral Sciences

Courses in this category focus on the application of scientific methods in the understanding of what makes us human.
Courses involve the exploration of behavior and interactions among individuals, groups, institutions, and events, examining their impact on society and culture.
The Core Objectives of critical thinking skills, communication skills, empirical and quantitative skills, social responsibility, and personal responsibility are addressed by each course in this component area.

9. Institutional Option

Institutions must include a minimum of three Core Objectives in each selected course.
Courses in this category may be used in various SCH increments (examples include integrative learning, oral communication, foreign language, science labs, etc.).
Courses in this category may be used for component area completion.
Recommendation 4: Map Core Curriculum Objectives to Foundational Component Areas.

Any course developed and approved for use in an institution’s core curriculum must address at least three of the Core Objectives, mapped to specific Foundational Component Areas (see Table 1). Institutions must include the required Core Objectives designated for a particular Foundational Component Area, and may include any additional Core Objectives (designated as optional on the chart) for that Foundational Component Area.

Table 1: Core Objectives and Foundational Component Areas Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language, Philosophy and Culture</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Political Science</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Behavioral Science</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Option*</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Institutional Option must contain a minimum of 3 Core Objectives selected by the institution.

REQUIRED = required Core Objectives to be addressed in each course selected for inclusion in the Foundational Component Area. OPTIONAL = institution may include Core Objective for each course selected for inclusion in the Foundational Component Area.
Recommendation 5: Establish the allocation of semester credit hours by Foundational Component Area to total 42 semester credit hours.

Table 2: Required Semester Credit Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational Component Area</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language, Philosophy, &amp; Culture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Political Science</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Option</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum limit of the Core Curriculum will be 42 SCH with THECB approval required for any institution requesting a core over 42 SCH.

Recommendation 6: Establish an assessment reporting process to the THECB for institutions that is aligned with SACSCOC practices.

Accountability for assessment of the Core Objectives is at the institutional level. Institutions will continue the assessment practices required by SACSCOC. Institutions will assess the six Core Objectives using the following practices and submit the report to the THECB every ten years.

1. Assessment methods
   - Explanations of measures, methodology, frequency and timeline of assessment
2. Criteria/Targets
   - Explanation of targets or benchmarks of Core Objective attainment
3. Results
   - Evidence of attainment of the six Core Objectives
4. Analysis
   - Interpretation of assessment information
5. Actions & Follow-ups
   - Use of results for improving student learning

Recommendation 7: Establish a timeline and a set of guidelines for the development and approval of revised Core Curriculum.

The UEAC recommends two considerations regarding the timeline:
1. Allow a minimum of two academic years for the institutional redevelopment of institutional core curricula, specifying a faculty-centered process as the means for any redevelopment. Allow Coordinating Board staff sufficient time to evaluate the revised core curricula from each institution and to establish that each institution is in compliance with the new standards.

2. Provide for a phase-in year, during which incoming new students would be required to fulfill the requirements of the newly-revised Core Curriculum, while previously enrolled students would be able to choose between the requirements they have been expecting to complete or the new requirements, depending on their perception of educational advantage and timely degree completion.

In addition, the UEAC recommends the following guidelines for institutions to use in approval their new Core Curricula:

1. Number of courses in the core curriculum. Although no limit is placed on the number of courses an institution may submit for approval, it is strongly encouraged that institutions self-limit based on available resources and faculty credentials.

2. Selection and approval of core curriculum courses. Once approved by the institution, the courses and supporting documentation will be forwarded to the THECB for final approval. Institutions should develop a faculty-based approval process for institution approval. The mechanism and guidelines for course approval should be the same for all institutions, and the AAC&U VALUE rubrics should be used as initial guidelines for core objective assessment. Institutions are also responsible for maintaining the appropriate level of achievement for each core objective.

3. Disciplinary tracks: Instead of pursuing general core curriculum area tracks, the direction should be toward statewide articulation agreements that all institutions will follow.

4. The practice of allowing institutions to award academic associate degrees with a field of study curriculum or transfer compact agreement without core completion should be retained; however, this does not relieve a transfer student of the requirements to complete the core for a bachelor’s degree.

5. Unique needs courses should not be part of the core curriculum.
ASSESSMENT

Purpose, Values, and Definitions:

The UEAC, with the assistance of two representatives of the Accountability Workgroup, Dr. Loraine Phillips of Texas A&M University and Dr. Danita McAnally of Amarillo College, developed some guidelines in assessing the new proposed core. The purpose of assessment is for institutions to discover, document and seek to improve student attainment of the six Core Objectives of the UEAC proposed General Education Core Curriculum. As such, the values for assessing the Core Objectives are:

1. UEAC’s Core Objectives form the foundation of the institution’s General Education Core Curriculum.
2. Institutions use assessment of UEAC’s Core Objectives to improve student learning.
3. Faculty participation is integral throughout the assessment cycle.
4. Institutions use multiple measures for effective assessment, including at least one direct measure per Core Objective. Externally informed benchmarks are encouraged.
5. Assessment practice is evolving.

NOTE: The selection of courses for inclusion in the core is a separate process based on the Objectives and Component Area Mapping.

Certain definitions are helpful in considering assessment –

(A) Assessment cycle – The systematic collection, review and use of evidence for the purpose of improving student learning.
(B) Direct measure – Students’ demonstration of learning.
(C) Indirect measure – Students’ perceptions of their learning or other measures not derived directly from student work.
(D) Externally informed benchmarks – Targets for student attainment set by and/or in collaboration with constituencies outside the institution. Examples include advisory boards, peer institutions and national norms.

Current Core Assessment Processes:

According to Erisman’s report¹, the following practices or forms of measurement are commonly used by institutions to measure institutional effectiveness:

- Institutional portfolios – student work gathered at the institutional level
- Embedded assessment

- Standardized testing
- Other – locally developed exams, student portfolios, etc.

Currently, for Coordinating Board Rule 4.30 *Criteria for Evaluation of Core Curricula*, institutions are required to submit assessment of their current core curriculum based on the Assumptions & Defining Characteristics. Institutions report this information to Coordinating Board staff prior to SACSCOC reaffirmation of accreditation.

At the regional assessment level, SACSCOC requires institutional effectiveness processes through the following Core Requirement and Standards:

- **SACS Principles of Accreditation**
  - 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness
    The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.
  - 3.3.1.1 Institutional Effectiveness
    The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness) 3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
  - 3.5.1 College-Level Competencies
    The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them.

**Assessment Recommendations:**

UEAC recommends that institutions continue the assessment practices required by SACSCOC. Institutions will assess the six Core Objectives using these practices and submit the report to the THECB every ten years. Accountability for assessment of the Core Objectives is at the institutional level.

The review process will consist of two requirements and three options.

For requirements:

1. Institutions will electronically submit the Assessment Report of the Core Objectives to THECB every 10 years.
2. Coordinating Board staff will process the report to confirm assessment of the six Core Objectives.
For options:

1. Institutions are encouraged to voluntarily participate in a peer review of the assessment of the six Core Objectives
2. Institutions are encouraged to select peer reviewers from across the state
3. Peer reviewers provide feedback to the institution

The assessment report of the Core Objectives will describe the assessment for each of the six Core Objectives:

1. Assessment methods
   - Explanations of measures, methodology, frequency and timeline of assessment
2. Criteria/Targets
   - Explanation of targets or benchmarks of Core Objective attainment
3. Results
   - Evidence of attainment of the six Core Objectives
4. Analysis
   - Interpretation of assessment information
5. Actions and Follow-ups
   - Use of results for improving student learning

For continuous improvement, the review of the assessment process will describe the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment process and also describe possible changes that the institution may apply to the assessment process.
TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Once the Coordinating Board has acted to adopt a revised Texas Core Curriculum through the amendment of its existing rules (Texas Administrative Code), appropriate time must be designated for institutions to make revisions in their core curricula that will match the statewide changes. Because the statute requires each institution to designate its own courses, and because the process needs to be a reflective, deliberative, and faculty-centered process, a minimum of one academic year should be allowed for institutional revisions.

Coordinating Board staff would need to receive summary reports from each institution of higher education, including the newly revised core curriculum for each institution, and would need to determine essential compliance with the newly revised rules. That process, depending on staff availability, will take about six weeks.

Following the revision of institutional curricula and approval of those revisions by staff, an implementation year should be designated, during which time all institutions would implement the revised core curriculum for their incoming freshman students, and a phase-out of the previous ("old") core curriculum for continuing enrolled students the choice of completing their core curriculum requirements under the "old" core curriculum, or switching to the "new" core curriculum, depending on the student’s perception of advantage in completing one set of requirements or the other.

FURTHER DISCUSSION FOR UEAC CORE CURRICULUM REVISIONS

Recommendations included in Phase I have been intentionally kept within the parameters established by existing legislation regarding the Core Curriculum in Texas. Phase II of the review of the Core will look at possible modifications to the Core Curriculum that might entail the need for changes in the legislation governing the Core Curriculum.

Issues that do not depend on legislative action:

- Inclusion of proficiency in a second language

Issues that would require legislative action:

- Reduction of minimum of 42 SCH to 36 SCH
  - Change TEC 61.822
  - TEC 61.0515 (79th Legislature) placed a limit on the minimum requirement of all bachelor’s degrees to be no than the SACSCOC minimum SCH requirement (currently 120 SCH), unless approved to require a higher number due to a “compelling academic reason.”
    - Closer alignment with SACSCOC recommendation of 30 SCH for a bachelor’s degree

- Reduction of American History and Government/Political Science from 12 SCH to 6 SCH
- Change TEC 51.301 and TEC 51.302
- Current requirements account for ten percent of the requirement for a bachelor's degree
- Align with national average of 6 SCH for both government and history
- Allow for the flexibility beyond the parameters of only American or Texan historical and political studies
SELECTED REFERENCES

American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) –  
*College Learning for the New Global Century.*  
(Full-text version at: [http://aacu.org/leap/index.cfm](http://aacu.org/leap/index.cfm))

*Liberal Education and America’s Promise* (LEAP)  
*Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education* (VALUE)

Assessment of Student Learning: Introduction to Bloom’s Taxonomy.  


Websites of core curriculums, general education, and transfer information of various states and universities:

Alabama – [Articulation & General Studies Committee Handbook](http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Accreditation/AccreditationHandbooks/ArticulationAndGeneralStudiesCommitteeHandbook.pdf)

Arizona – [Arizona General Education Curriculum - Discipline Tracks](http://azcollegeprep.org/azgenedcurriculum/)

California –  
California Community Colleges – [Transfer and Articulation](http://www.asbchighered.org/GE/TransferAndArticulation.aspx)  
California State University System – [General Education and Transfer](http://wwwлежа.org/CalStateGE.html)  
University of California System – [General Education & Transfer Credits](http://www.registrar.university.edu/transfer/)

Connecticut –  
[Wesleyan General Education Requirements](http://www.wesleyan.edu/hs/graduationRequirements/GenEdReqs.html)

Florida – [Pathways to Success - 2+2 System](http://www.floridaeducationalresources.org/2plus2system/)

Georgia – [Academic Affairs Handbook – Core Curriculum](http://www.georgiasystem.org/aoa/aoa/)

Illinois –  
[Illinois Articulation Initiative's General Education Curriculum Requirements](http://www.areadata.org/illinoisarticulation/GE/GERequirements/)  
[University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Guidelines for General Education Courses](http://www.illinois.edu/higher-education/undergraduate/curriculum/guidelines/g8comp/)  
[UCIC General Education Requirements](http://www.uchicago.edu/admissions/recruitments/academic/GenEd/)

Maryland - [University of Maryland CORE Learning Outcomes](http://www.umd.edu/grad/requirements/)
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Michigan –
  MACRAO Articulation Agreement Handbook
  Kettering University Core Curriculum
  Michigan State University Liberal Learning Goals

Montana - Montana University System Core Curriculum

New York –
  Wagner College Experiential Learning
  State University of New York General Education Requirements

North Carolina - Articulation Guide between University of North Carolina and the North Carolina Community College System

Ohio –
  The Ohio State University General Education Curriculum
  The Ohio State University Expected Learning Outcomes

Pennsylvania –
  Drexel University Center for Civic Engagement
  Penn State Policies and Rules for Undergraduate Students – Appendix A.1 General Education
  PA System of Higher Education Academic Passport and Student Transfer Policy

South Dakota – Board of Regents Baccalaureate General Education Curriculum

Texas –
  Texas Core WebCenter (Hosted by Texas State University-San Marcos)
  Texas Common Course Numbering System
    (Hosted by The University of Texas-Pan American)

  Chapter 4 Subchapter B Transfer of Credit, Core Curriculum and Field of Study Curricula
  THECB Essential Core Curriculum Information
  THECB Core Curriculum Reporting
  Core Curriculum Assumptions and Defining Characteristics
  Lower Division Academic Course Guide Manual

Wisconsin –
  University of Wisconsin Colleges' General Education Requirements
  UW System Liberal Education Initiative
  UW-Green Bay General Education Learning Outcomes
IV. QEP Proposal
Proposal: The Quality Enhancement Plan

“No student [will give] up on their education for lack of engagement, for a sense that somehow they don’t belong.”
   - Chancellor McRaven, Quantum Leap 9: Student Success

Summary

In early March of 2016, a group of UT Dallas faculty, staff, students, and administrators convened to begin the process of topic selection for the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). Through a robust selection process which included the broad-based vetting of proposals to multiple campus constituency groups, and analysis of assessment data from both the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the UT Dallas Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis (OSPA), it became clear that increasing levels of students’ engagement in their first year at UT Dallas, as an evidence-based practice, would serve the purpose of improving retention rates and ultimately student success. With the expansive growth of the UT Dallas student population since 2005, there exists a recognized need to concentrate a focused effort on engagement initiatives and to ensure all new students are recipients of these efforts. To further lend to the importance of improving student engagement, in September of 2016, UT System Chancellor, William McRaven, declared student engagement and students’ sense of belonging as crucial components of the ninth quantum leap related to student success. The expectation that all UT System campuses will commit to improving student engagement speaks to the abilities of UT Dallas to implement and sustain this QEP.

Figure 1: The University of Texas at Dallas Enrollment Growth 2005-2016
Issue

There is a need for increased engagement, leading to a sense of belonging, among students in their first year at UT Dallas.

Specific Populations Targeted for Inclusion in the QEP

- undergraduate first-time-in-college students (FTIC)
- new undergraduate transfer students
- new graduate students
- new international students

QEP in Support of the UT Dallas Mission

As stated in the UT Dallas mission statement, “The University of Texas at Dallas provides the State of Texas and the nation with excellent, innovative education and research. The University is committed to graduating well-rounded citizens whose education has prepared them for rewarding lives and productive careers in a constantly changing world; to continually improving educational and research programs in the arts and sciences, engineering, and management; and to assisting the commercialization of intellectual capital generated by students, staff, and faculty.” This QEP is specifically designed to improve persistence and bolster engagement opportunities for students in their critical first year at UT Dallas. The UT Dallas student demographic is culturally reflective of global diversity. This QEP provides an opportunity to prepare students to engage successfully in a similar workplace setting.

Student Learning Outcomes

1. Students will be able to identify the resources they need to navigate successfully toward becoming a UT Dallas graduate.
   Through the Freshman and Transfer Seminars, new student programming, and the New Student Web Portal, students will be able to discover and connect with The University of Texas at Dallas.

2. Students will demonstrate awareness, inclusivity, and sensitivity when interacting with others.
   Through the Freshman and Transfer Seminars’ “Diversity 101” presentation, service learning projects, and intercultural competence course interventions, students will learn to treat others with respect and listen to alternative points of view.
3. Students will garner a sense of belonging by developing a sense that faculty care about whether they learn.

Through the increased faculty development opportunities, the QEP has the potential to foster a sense of belonging through improving faculty-student interactions in the learning environment.

In addition, there will be a number of value-added outcomes to the programming that will be part of the QEP, such as improved communication throughout the university and clearer information for students in transition to UT Dallas.

Goals/Objectives

The QEP will improve student learning and the environment that supports student learning by focusing its programming in the following areas:

- Engagement (Commitment to Success/Partnering in the Learning Experience)
- UTD Readiness (Commitment to Academic Inquiry/Partnering in Knowledge Acquisition)
- Humanitarianism/Civic Engagement/Social Responsibility (Commitment to Self & Environment or Cultural Awareness/Partnering in the Global Experience)

Challenges

- Overall, the QEP will require buy-in from a number of stakeholders in upper-administration positions, including the President, the Executive Vice President, the Provost, the Graduate Dean, the Undergraduate Dean, and the Vice President of Student Affairs.
  - This QEP brings together people from across many different units that are not necessarily accustomed to working with each other.
- Revising the FTIC freshman seminar faces a number of challenges, including:
  - JSOM has adopted a model that works well for them; the other schools are engaging in ongoing revisions
    - variety and diversity are strengths of UT Dallas, but in this case the variety may present a challenge
  - Office of Undergraduate Education is experiencing turnover that has the potential to make the implementation of new ideas for the Freshman Seminar difficult
In addition to the QEP Director, the following positions will play an integral role in successfully implementing this plan:
  o Dean of Undergraduate Education
  o Associate Deans within the Office of Undergraduate Education
  o Provost
  o Vice President for Student Affairs
  o Dean of Graduate Studies
  o Associate Deans within the Office of Graduate Studies
  o Assistant Vice President, International Center

Accordingly, we will make explicit how existing job duties connect to the components of this plan.

- We are revisiting some ideas that we have tried before unsuccessfully.
  o Throughout our meetings in the Development and Implementation Committee, there has been a general agreement that some good ideas are worth trying again.

**Components of the QEP**

**QEP Director**

Job duties include:

- Coordinate the New Student Engagement Board
- Assist with developing the transfer student peer mentoring program
- Assist with the coordination and curriculum development of the seminar classes
- Work with the Office of Graduate Studies and the International Center to develop and coordinate proposed programs
- Data collection and assessment
- Best practices benchmarking
- Monitor and update new student web portal
- Grant writing

**QEP Actions to be Implemented**

**New Student Engagement Board (NSEB)**

The NSEB will oversee the committees on campus responsible for new student engagement and programming and will coordinate all campus-wide efforts that target all first-year-at-UT Dallas students. This coordinated effort will facilitate
awareness and stronger oversight of all campus efforts for students in transition to the university as well as the sharing of best practices across different units.

**New Student Web Portal**

The NSEB will develop a website that will serve as an electronic student engagement handbook. The site will have tabs to direct students of the four target populations (FTIC, new transfer students, new graduate students, and new international students) to content that is specific to the population. Focus groups will be held with current students in each of the populations to determine content.

**Service Learning and Intercultural Competence Faculty Development**

The QEP will establish service learning faculty development through the Center for Teaching and Learning and the Office for Student Volunteerism. In this initiative, we will create six small grants for each of two years (see Years 3 and 4 in timeline) for faculty teaching upper-division undergraduate and graduate courses to develop a service-learning component for their existing courses. This intervention uses a high-impact practice (service learning) to reinforce the work of “Diversity 101” presentations in the first-year seminars (another high-impact practice). It also has the potential to outlast the QEP as a faculty development opportunity. As indicated in the literature, programs aimed at first-year students should create ways for them to develop these ideas and skills later as well. The service learning course interventions will allow students the opportunity to continue addressing the humanitarianism objective beyond their first year.

**First-Time-In-College (FTIC) Student Engagement**

**Mandatory Seminar Course for FTIC Students**

The intent of this existing course is to assist first-time-in-college students with navigating the college experience, while introducing them to information that will provide a connection with engagement opportunities on the UT Dallas campus. The course is currently supported by **First Year Leaders** who also provide one-on-one mentoring sessions outside of the classroom.

**Recommended Additions to FTIC Seminar Components**

- Required summer reading
  - Topical book to change each year
Active discussion/assignment in the seminar class

• Required service learning activity
  o To be coordinated by the Office of Student Volunteerism as an expansion of the Freshman Engaged in Service Together program

• Cultural Awareness through the Multicultural Center’s “Diversity 101” presentation in every section
  o Required intercultural competence writing assignment following the presentation

• Exploration of campus involvement opportunities with the assistance of the Student Affairs Center for Student Engagement
  o Student Organizations
  o Leadership development opportunities
  o Introduction to the Student Affairs Marketable Skills Co-Curricular Mapping Program (yet to be named)

• Health and Wellness awareness
  o To be coordinated with Student Affairs Health and Wellness Initiative (Student Counseling Center, Health Center, Student Wellness Center)

• Career Center information
  o Campus employment opportunities
  o Internship opportunities
  o Marketable Skills Co-Curricular Mapping Program reinforcement through resume integration

• Student Success Center presentation

• Financial Literacy
  o Success Center will present their Comet Cents Introduction Seminar to inform students about their Financial Success Program and workshop opportunities

• Academic Advisor session (general process information, and degree plan explanation)

• Faculty Engagement
  o Faculty representative will provide students information related to appropriately engaging with professors

New Transfer Student Engagement

Development of a Transfer Student Peer Mentoring Program

This program will be reflective of the existing Freshman Mentor Program. All students selected as peer mentors will have been transfer students. Additionally, the transfer peer mentors may also serve as Transfer Year Leaders, leading the transfer seminar courses and providing one-on-one mentoring sessions to new transfer students outside of the classroom.
Mandatory Seminar Course for New Transfer Students

The intent of this course is to assist first-time at UT Dallas transfer students with navigating the college experience, while introducing them to information that will provide a connection with engagement opportunities on the UT Dallas campus.

Transfer Student Seminar Components

- Required summer reading
  - Topical book to change each year
  - Active discussion/assignment in the seminar class
- Required service learning activity
  - To be coordinated by the Office of Student Volunteerism
- Cultural Awareness through the Multicultural Center’s “Diversity 101” presentation
  - Required intercultural competence writing assignment following the presentation
- Exploration of campus involvement opportunities with the assistance of the Student Affairs Center for Student Engagement
  - Student Organizations
  - Leadership development opportunities
  - Introduction to the Student Affairs Marketable Skills Co-Curricular Mapping Program (yet to be named)
- Health and wellness awareness
  - To be coordinated by the Student Affairs Health and Wellness Initiative (Student Counseling Center, Health Center, Student Wellness Center)
- Career Center information
  - Campus employment opportunities
  - Internship opportunities
  - Resume writing
  - Career preparation
  - Marketable Skills Co-Curricular Mapping Program reinforcement through resume integration
- Student Success Center presentation
- Academic Advisor session (general process information and degree plan explanation)
- Faculty Engagement
  - Faculty representative will provide students information on how to appropriately engage with professors
  - Engaging in research opportunities
New Graduate Student Engagement

• Enrichment of the pre-orientation eLearning modules presenting information related to:
  o Research opportunities and engaging with faculty
  o Student Volunteerism Opportunities
  o Student engagement opportunities specific to graduate students
  o Cultural awareness education through a modified “Diversity 101” electronic presentation
  o Career Center services

• Development of a Graduate Student Association (similar to Student Government)
  o Approved by Marion Underwood and with the support of Briana Lemos (Student Government Advisor)
  o The Graduate Student Association will assume a primary role in aiding in the development of student engagement opportunities for new to UT Dallas graduate students.

• Viva Volunteer project and Alternative Spring Break trip specific to graduate students

New International Student Engagement

• Peer mentoring programs lead by domestic students. This could be an expansion of the iFriend program.

• Optional seminar course for international graduate students. Above peer mentors would serve as leaders for this course.

• International competency programs, offered by the International Center, to complement “Diversity 101” that will eventually become part of the seminar courses. This program will not only emphasize diversity, inclusivity and sensitivity when interacting with international UTD students, but will also enhance students’ preparation to compete in a global business environment.

• Formation of a UT Dallas Global Engagement Board. Goals:
  o Provide a dedicated forum for issues affecting new international students.
  o Maintain open channels of communication among international students, international student groups, and UT Dallas.
  o Participate in the planning and implementation of campus events and initiatives.
  o Represent the international student body as needed in campus focus groups and other discussions with campus stakeholders.
**Timeline**

All years of the QEP will have ongoing work and assessment by the NSEB. Assessment will involve the development and administration of a survey. Michael Carriaga, Accreditation and Assessment Coordinator, will design an instrument and help with data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>QEP Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Year:</strong> &lt;br&gt;2016-2017</td>
<td>• Fall 2016: Development and Implementation Committee meetings, drafting of ideas for proposal&lt;br&gt;• Spring 2017&lt;br&gt;  • Proposal to President Benson&lt;br&gt;  • Establishment of New Student Engagement Board&lt;br&gt;  • Naming contest for QEP&lt;br&gt;• Summer 2017: Pilot design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 0: 2017-2018</strong></td>
<td>• Pilot development and implementation&lt;br&gt;  • Run one section of revised freshman seminar in Fall 2017&lt;br&gt;  • Make revisions to freshman seminar pilot in Spring 2018&lt;br&gt;• Report writing&lt;br&gt;• Begin process of establishing the Graduate Student Association&lt;br&gt;• Focus groups for web portal design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1: 2018-2019</strong></td>
<td>• Launch freshman seminar course&lt;br&gt;• Develop transfer seminar course&lt;br&gt;• Develop transfer peer mentor program&lt;br&gt;• Expand iFriend program to include a peer mentoring component&lt;br&gt;• Design New Student Web Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>QEP Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Year 2: 2019-2020 | • Launch the transfer peer mentor program  
• Pilot one section of the transfer seminar course  
• Design pre-orientation module for graduate students  
• Open Viva Volunteer project and Alternative Spring Break opportunity specifically for graduate students  
• Launch New Student Web Portal  
• Establish UT Dallas Global Engagement Board  
• Develop common reading program |
| Year 3: 2020-2021 | • Launch transfer seminar course  
• Launch pre-orientation module for graduate students  
• Design optional international graduate student seminar  
• Launch common reading program; incorporate into all first-year programming  
• 6 service learning faculty development grants awarded  
  • Faculty chosen work throughout the year to develop service learning projects for their select existing courses |
| Year 4: 2021-2022 | • Pilot one section of optional international graduate student seminar  
• Design international competency program  
• Launch the 6 service-learning-enhanced classes developed as part of the grant program in Year 3  
• Award 6 more development grants for service learning  
• Continue common reading program |
Table 1: Implementation Timeline

**Budget**

Overall estimate for the cost of the QEP over the five years of the plan is $1,322,750, with $1,160,000 consisting of additional costs. Our preliminary budget is organized by the Goals/Objectives listed above. Each of the interventions associated with the different target populations falls under one of these goals. Figure 2 includes a breakdown of the budget using these goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP Goals and Interventions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment to Success</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish New Student Engagement Board (NSEB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed funding for staff/student organizations</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish New Student Engagement Board Subtotal</td>
<td>10,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of Graduate and Undergraduate Pre-Orientation Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed funding for staff/student organizations</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of Graduate and Undergraduate Pre-Orientation Activities Subtotal</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Transfer Seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/Course Development</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Materials</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Transfer Seminar Subtotal</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Graduate Student Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Costs</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Projects &amp; Student Travel</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Elections</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Graduate Student Government Subtotal</td>
<td>202,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment to Success Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>242,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment to Academic Inquiry</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Freshman Seminar Curriculum to Promote Intellectual Curiosity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning Development</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Freshman Seminar Curriculum to Promote Intellectual Curiosity Subtotal</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Common Reading Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and Course Materials</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Speaker</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Facilitators</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Common Reading Program Subtotal</td>
<td>146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Goals and Interventions</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment to Academic Inquiry</strong></td>
<td><strong>154,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment to Self &amp; Environment Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate Service Learning Components into Existing Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning Workshops/Faculty Development</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Development</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incorporate Service Learning Components into Existing Courses</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop Cultural Awareness Writing Assignment for Existing Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness Workshops/Faculty Development</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Development</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop Cultural Awareness Writing Assignment for Existing Courses</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment to Self &amp; Environment Awareness Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create Supporting Institutional Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Marketing</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (directors/program managers)</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create Supporting Institutional Infrastructure Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Oversight and Support</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Release Time</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Assessment Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>176,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Management and Faculty Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>362,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistants</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Management and Faculty Leadership Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>606,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,322,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Budget Detail for Life of Plan
Assessment Plan

1. We will assess the QEP using rubrics and surveys derived from programs as well as data from the National Survey of Student Engagement.
   a. Suggestions from our assessment experts include:
      i. Select items from the NSSE (would apply to FTIC students, only)
      ii. Select items from program assessments
      iii. Integrate a survey for each of the eLearning modules
      iv. Service learning outcomes will be measured through reflective writing. This will require development of writing prompts and a rubric, as well as recruitment of staff and faculty to review and score students’ reflection papers.
      v. Use the AAC&U Rubrics to score students’ writing assignments. The rubric may need to be adapted to align with specific outcomes of these assignments.
      vi. Tracking use/participation in programs/experiences/services
      vii. Co-curricular program assessments
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New Program Request Form for Bachelor’s and Master’s Degrees

Directions: An institution shall use this form to propose a new bachelor’s or master’s degree program that is in the field of engineering or has costs exceeding $2 million for the first five years of operation. In completing the form, the institution should refer to the document *Standards for Bachelor’s and Master’s Programs*, which prescribes specific requirements for new degree programs. Note: This form requires signatures of (1) the Chief Executive Officer or Chief Academic Officer, certifying the adequacy of funding for the new program and the notification of other institutions; (2) a member of the Board of Regents (or designee), certifying Board approval. NOTE: Preliminary notification is required for all engineering programs. Prior to submission of an engineering program proposal, the institution should notify the Division of Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research of its intent to request such a program.

For more information: Contact the Division of Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research at 512/427-6200.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Institution:</strong> The University of Texas at Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Program Name</strong> – Show how the program would appear on the Coordinating Board’s program inventory (e.g., <em>Bachelor of Business Administration degree with a major in Accounting</em>): Master of Science in Leadership and Organizational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Proposed CIP Code:</strong> 52.0213 Organizational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Number of Required Semester Credit Hours (SCHs)</strong> <em>(If the number of SCHs exceeds 120 for a Bachelor’s program, the institution must request a waiver documenting the compelling academic reason for requiring more SCHs):</em> 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Brief Program Description</strong> – Describe the program and the educational objectives: The Master of Science in Leadership and Organizational Development will explore key issues associated with leadership and human systems to conduct planned interventions, using behavioral-science knowledge that will increase an organization’s effectiveness and health. The courses in the program will address concepts dealing with the motivational determinants of leadership, organizational diagnosis, and interventions and elements of organizational transition as they relate to leadership and employees, group process and inter-organizational theory and systems. The ultimate objective of the program is to educate students in using inclusive methodologies and approaches to strategic planning, organization design, leadership development, change management, performance management, coaching and team building. The program will ensure that students will acquire knowledge of leadership and organizational development concepts as well as develop the competencies needed to make professional contributions to the implementation of sustainable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strategic change in organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes

The student will be able to:

- Demonstrate a strong foundation in leadership and organizational development theory to design interventions at the system, group, and individual levels.
- Apply theory, empirical research and practice issues relevant to changing individuals and groups in organizational cultural contexts and organizations themselves to improve effectiveness.
- Manage and analyze change initiatives while utilizing assessment tools and diagnostic methodologies.
- Use leverage points in organizations and the human side of motivating others to take advantage of the opportunities these points represent.
- Acquire a knowledge base in the management and leadership literature, particularly as it applies to initiating large-scale organizational change and transformation.
- Use the theory and skills to design interventions at the system, group, and individual levels.
- Know the concepts related to complexity and large systems, as well as the application of assessment and intervention methods for creating and managing.
- Know the intervention methods for improving group, intergroup, and interpersonal effectiveness.

6. Administrative Unit – Identify where the program would fit within the organizational structure of the university (e.g., The Department of Electrical Engineering within the College of Engineering):

Naveen Jindal School of Management:
The Organizational Behavior, Coaching and Consulting Program, Executive Education

7. Proposed Implementation Date – Report the date that students would enter the program (MM/DD/YY):

01/08/2018

8. Contact Person – Provide contact information for the person who can answer specific questions about the program:

Name: Dr. Hasan Pirkul
Title: Dean, Naveen Jindal School of Management
       The University of Texas at Dallas
E-mail: hpirkul@utdallas.edu
Phone: 972-883-6813

Program Information
I. Need

A. Job Market Need – Provide short- and long-term evidence of the need for graduates in the job market.

It is well documented that there has been an explosion in the study and application of leadership principles in organizations. In fact, developing leaders has become a U.S. billion-dollar industry and shows no signs of slowing down. The leadership industry has spawned and supports the establishment of leadership institutes and centers inside and outside business schools, new executive, and C-suite level leadership development within organizations, corporate/internal leadership training programs, as well as coaching and mentoring initiatives. The quest for knowledge about leadership is easily demonstrated by the growing size of the leadership book sections of online and brick and mortar booksellers.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, management-level employment will continue to grow by almost 25% in the next decade. For most of these management positions, a master's is considered the terminal degree. While earning any accredited graduate degree in business is desirable, earning a master’s with an emphasis in leadership gives applicants an immediate career edge.

In the 21st-century, leadership and organizational development go hand-in-hand. Organizational development—a relatively new field—is the study of the systematic process of implementing effective organizational change for the purpose of improving organizational performance and enhancing individual development. It is not disputed that organizational change is a given because of the need to respond to the vicissitudes of technology, customer needs, the economy, growth opportunities, competition, performance gaps, and other variables that impact the well-being of any organization. Nor is it disputed that the pace of change in organizations is increasing rather than diminishing in today’s fast-moving environment. Therefore, leaders are entrusted with the responsibility of navigating their organizations through the turbulent waters of a variety of change processes that are ongoing and inherently complex. Ryan Quinn and Robert Quinn, authors of a Harvard Business Review article, “Change Management and Leadership Development Have to Mesh” (January 07, 2016)¹, have observed that leadership development and change management tend to be top priorities for most organizations. However, Quinn and Quinn correctly point out that a major reason for the struggles of organizations is that “they treat leadership development and change management as separate rather than interrelated challenges.”

Given the interdependence of leadership and change management, degrees that integrate the two disciplines will be highly valued in the job market. The Center for Career Development at Saint Joseph’s University reports that graduates with degrees that combine both leadership and organizational development are attractive to a variety of industries – as can be seen from the distribution of people hired (graph below)² with such a degree into various career fields.

Leadership aside, organizational development (OD) in and of itself is a valued function in organizations. The OD function usually reports to the VP of Human Resources. However, in some organizations, this function reports directly to the Senior Leadership Team. OD professionals act as business partners and help senior leaders deal with issues that impact business strategy as well as impending change. The role of the OD Professional is to help senior leaders analyze the organizational culture and recommend changes to help solve problems, improve performance, and enhance organization effectiveness. Therefore, OD practitioners must develop the expertise and skills to support the senior leadership team and provide them with the processes, tools, and skills they need to implement change effectively. Because of the critical nature of this role, companies prefer that job applicants have a master’s degree in this field. According to Monster.com, the field of OD is doing well as a result of improving economic conditions and the demand for OD professionals is growing. “At present, there are approximately 102,700 people employed [in this field] with a projected growth of 13 percent by 2022.”\(^3\) These estimated figures do not take into account OD consultants included in general HR groups or those that are external consultants to organizations.

In summary, a master’s degree in Leadership and Organizational Development is attractive to all industry sectors and a variety of professionals because it provides recipients with the knowledge and competencies needed to lead and/or assist organizations in achieving their strategic and cultural goals. All indicators point to an increased demand for this skill set in the 21st-century.

B. Student Demand – Provide short- and long-term evidence of demand for the program.

GetEducated.com’s online continuing education directory catalogs nearly 400 accredited online MBA degrees versus 131 master’s degrees in management and 45 master’s degrees in leadership degrees. Clearly, despite the need for graduates in the job market, there is a dearth of online graduate degrees that are available and yet—according to this

same source—the demand for an accredited online master’s degree with leadership as all or part of its emphasis is twice as popular now as it was ten years ago. Professor Peter Bemski, former director of the online master’s in organization leadership program at Regis University in Denver and currently the dean of Northcentral University’s School of Business and Technology Management, argues that the rise in demand is due to perceptual changes in the business population. Specifically, he asserts that a master’s in leadership is considered to be a “more contemporary,” 21st-century degree, focusing on big-picture leadership skills rather than the nuts and bolts of finance, accounting or marketing. When combined with organizational development, the degree becomes immediately attractive for those professionals that want to work on the people side of the organizational equation. For example, human resources professionals, consultants, coaches, and trainers are more likely to find a Leadership and Organizational Development master’s a more comfortable fit for online education than a purely business oriented degree. Indeed, the human skills emphasized in Leadership and Organizational Development graduate degrees – such as communication, change management, conflict resolution, and teamwork – have become as important in the business world today as hard-nosed accounting and finance skills were in the 1980s when Wall Street investment careers and the MBA surged in popularity.

Since its inception, the Executive and Professional Coaching Program within Executive Education at the Jindal School of Management has graduated approximately 450 students with the MS degree in Management and Administrative Sciences (MS-MAS, subsequently renamed the MS in Management Sciences). These students, almost to a person, have expressed the desire to enroll in a degree such as the MS in Leadership and Organizational Development and were only willing to accept the MS-MAS degree because the electives were all classes that addressed some aspect of organizational behavior. From historical data, e.g. interviews and surveys, it can be stated that approximately 30% more coaching students would have enrolled in the master’s degree if it were in Leadership and Organizational Development. Therefore, based on enrollment trends from the last five years it can be stated, unequivocally, that there is an existing pipeline of approximately 30 to 40 students from Coaching Certificate program that, on a yearly basis, will enroll in the MS in Leadership and Organizational Development degree program.

In the end, the best graduate degree is one that enriches the skill set most widely used in one’s career. Given the academic content included in this proposed degree, it will attract not only coaching students but other professions more attuned to the MS in Leadership and Organizational Development curricula such as those in the fields of organizational psychology, human relations, conflict resolution, mediation, labor, and talent management.

Finally, the fact that this is an online degree will make it an attractive academic option for working professionals. According to U.S. News & World Report, online course enrollment has climbed for ten straight years. The Executive and Professional Coaching Graduate Certificate program is a good example. This is a distance-learning program that has grown on a yearly basis and has fed the online MS-MAS degree program. Because it is delivered online, it has reaped the benefit of being able to provide quality, flexible

---

education that meets the demands of the 21st-century workforce to a nationwide, and in some cases a worldwide audience. The proposed MS in Leadership and Organizational Development degree will follow suit. Furthermore, while there is clearly a job market need for this graduate degree (see graph above), there are few options for attaining an MS degree that integrates both leadership and organizational development and fewer options still for those who seek to pursue such a degree online from a major university. To illustrate the point, only eight schools in Texas offer online graduate degrees that emphasize leadership, and of those only one, the University of the Incarnate Word, offers a graduate degree that combines both leadership and organizational development (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Cost (credit/hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abilene Christian University</td>
<td>Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>$950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock Christian University</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood University</td>
<td>Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of the Lake University</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Business and Leadership</td>
<td>$775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>Leadership Studies</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>$955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Incarnate Word</td>
<td>Organizational Development and Leadership</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>UIW Online</td>
<td>$815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayland Baptist University</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>Management and Leadership</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Business and Technology</td>
<td>$545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the demand for an MS in Leadership and Organizational Development, as well as the increasing enrollment in graduate online education, such a degree from The University of Texas at Dallas will have high market value.

C. Enrollment Projections – Use this table to show the estimated cumulative headcount and enrollment for the first five years of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTSE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five-year enrollment projection is based on historical data and the ongoing, consistent enrollments in the MS Management Science (MS MSc) degree from the Executive Coaching Program.
II. Quality

A. Degree Requirements – Use this table to show the degree requirements of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Semester Credit Hours</th>
<th>Clock Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education Core Curriculum <em>(bachelor's degree only)</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Courses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Courses</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other <em>(Specify, e.g., internships, clinical work)</em></td>
<td>(if not included above)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Curriculum – Use these tables to identify the required courses and prescribed electives of the program. Note with an asterisk (*) courses that would be added if the program is approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB 6301</td>
<td>Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6321</td>
<td>Principles of Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6334</td>
<td>Foundations of Organizational Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6340</td>
<td>Leading Strategic Change Processes in an International Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Elective Courses</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPS 6332</td>
<td>Strategic Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6303</td>
<td>Managing Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6305</td>
<td>Foundations of Work Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6322</td>
<td>Interpersonal Dynamics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6326</td>
<td>Organizations and Organizing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6331</td>
<td>Power and Politics in Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6333</td>
<td>Managerial Decision Making</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6337</td>
<td>Motivational Leadership in Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6335</td>
<td>Organizational Development Process and Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6340</td>
<td>Leading Strategic Change Processes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Students will enroll in 8 elective courses totaling 24 SCH.

C. Faculty – Use these tables to provide information about Core and Support faculty. Add an asterisk (*) before the name of the individual who will have direct administrative responsibilities for the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Core Faculty and Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree and Awarding Institution</th>
<th>Courses Assigned In Program</th>
<th>% Time Assigned To Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Robert F. Hicks Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Educational Psychology, The University of Southern California</td>
<td>OB 6334 Foundations of Organizational Development</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Picken Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Business Administration, The University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>OB 6321 Principles of Leadership</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sora Jun</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Human and Organization Behavior, Stanford University</td>
<td>OB 6301 Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riki Takeuchi</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Human Resources Management, The University of Maryland</td>
<td>OB 6340 Leading Strategic Change Processes in an International Environment</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Support Faculty and Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree and Awarding Institution</th>
<th>Courses Assigned In Program</th>
<th>% Time Assigned To Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily Choi Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D. Management and Organizations, University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>OB 6326 Organizations and Organizing</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Dess Endowed Chair</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Administrative Theory and Organizational Behavior, University of Washington (Seattle)</td>
<td>BPS 6332 Strategic Leadership</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junfeng Wu</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management, University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>OB 6305 Foundations of Work Behavior</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livia Markoczy Associate Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Management, University of Cambridge</td>
<td>OB 6333 Managerial Decision Making</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Salk Associate Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>OB 6303 Managing Organizations</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Degree and University</td>
<td>Courses Offered</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Solomon</td>
<td>Masters of Business Administration, The University of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>OB 6335 Organizational Development Process and Practice</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Rockett</td>
<td>Ph.D. in International Management Studies, The University of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>OB 6331 Power and Politics in Organizations</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Behrendt</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology, Washington University, St. Louis</td>
<td>OB 6322 Interpersonal Dynamics OB 6337 Motivational Leadership</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. **Students** – Describe general recruitment efforts and admission requirements. In accordance with the institution’s Uniform Recruitment and Retention Strategy, describe plans to recruit, retain, and graduate students from underrepresented groups for the program.

Admission requirements for the MS in Leadership and Organizational Development program include a bachelor’s degree from an university in the United States or its equivalent and five years of satisfactory work experience, an application essay, one letter of recommendation, and official transcripts.

The Naveen Jindal School of Management (JSOM) will make every effort to recruit and retain underrepresented students into the MS in Leadership and Organizational Development program. Such efforts will include but are not limited to, communicating the program widely to communities and organizations with underrepresented populations; providing needed advising to such students on their academic work; and helping them on their career path. The JSOM Career Management Center provides student recruitment resources that maintain active involvement in The National Women’s, National Hispanic and National Black MBA Associations, Texas Association of Black Personnel in Higher Education, and The North Texas Collegiate Consortium and attend events that are targeted to recruiting underrepresented students such as the A&M Diversity Fair, The National Black MBA conference, Huston-Tillotson Graduate Fair, The National Society of Hispanic MBA conference and the Diversity Leadership Conference.

E. **Library** – Provide the library director’s assessment of library resources necessary for the program. Describe plans to build the library holdings to support the program.

A Library Collection Assessment was conducted with the guidance of the program management providing the following results:

The number of titles including in the library collection appears to be adequate to begin the degree. However, the proposed degree will almost certainly require specific acquisition requests. According to the 2016 *Library and Book Trade Almanac*, the average cost per book in the subject area of Business and Economics is $146.90 for print books (increased 24% over the previous year) and $21.41 for e-books (down 60% from the previous year). The estimated cost of adding 20 titles per year would be approximately $1,775 (assuming a 50% balance between print and ebooks) per year.

The Library will add approximately 20 additional monographic titles each of the first 5 years of the program when it is approved.
The library holdings at UT Dallas were assessed using the Library of Congress subject headings of ‘Leadership’ and ‘Organizational Development’:

- There are currently 4,897 titles and 76 journals related to ‘leadership’ and ‘organizational development’ currently in the library collection.
- All specified journals titles were checked in the library catalog and found that all titles are immediately available. No new journal titles in support of the degree are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>Holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Business Review</td>
<td>1922-current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan MIT Management Review</td>
<td>1960-current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Organization Development Journal</td>
<td>1980-current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Dynamics</td>
<td>1972-current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>1980-current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Development Journal</td>
<td>2004-current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in Organizational Change and Development</td>
<td>1987-current</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: The collection available at the McDermott Library is adequate to begin the program. During the program’s first 5 years, an additional 20 books/eBooks will be purchased at an approximate cost of $1,775 per year or $8,875 plus processing costs of $900 for a total of $9,775.

F. Facilities and Equipment – Describe the availability and adequacy of facilities and equipment to support the program. Describe plans for facility and equipment improvements/additions.

The Naveen Jindal School of Management Building was constructed in 2002, with cutting-edge computing and other teaching facilities and technologies. The new building addition, which houses the new Executive Education Center, was opened in Fall 2014. The buildings offer adequate facilities and equipment to accommodate the program management team for the proposed program. As the MS in Leadership and Organizational Development is an online program, the facilities, and equipment in place will adequately support the program, so we do not see the need for an additional budget for facility and equipment improvement or additions.

G. Accreditation – If the discipline has a national accrediting body, describe plans to obtain accreditation or provide a rationale for not pursuing accreditation.

Currently, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) is the accreditation body that accredits business school programs. AACSB standards for a business school can be found at [http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards.asp](http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards.asp).

The Naveen Jindal School of Management was accredited by AACSB in 2002. The accreditation was reviewed and re-affirmed in 2012. The cycle for the continuous improvement review (re-affirmation) of accreditation is every five years by AACSB. If approved, the proposed degree (being a part of our current MS degree programs) is considered to meet the stated standards until the next review in 2017.
H. **Evaluation** – Describe the evaluation process that will be used to assess the quality and effectiveness of the new degree program.

1. Proper records to be maintained and analyzed about applicants, admission and retention rates, job placements, etc.

2. Surveys of current and former students to be done annually, on their performance and satisfaction about the program.

3. Bi-annual surveys of employers to be done, about industry trend pertaining to supply chain management profession and needs.

4. Program assessments based on student performance on specific evaluation questions on exams, teach evaluations and placement data will be done annually. The Masters Committee and Area Coordinator evaluate and make changes to programs based on the assessments.

5. Program assessments provided in the university’s academic program review policy as outlined in the UTDPP1013 (Academic Program Review), which governs the periodic review of academic programs and charges the review team to provide an “assessment of the goals, plans, staffing, resources, existing and potential strengths, etc., of the unit, and those areas needing improvement.” The Office of the Provost maintains the schedule of reviews and works with the Program Review Committee (PRC) and the unit under review to facilitate the review. The process is peer review oriented and includes a review team that incorporates both internal and external members.

III. **Costs and Funding**

**Five-Year Costs and Funding Sources** - Use this table to show five-year costs and sources of funding for the program.

This program will be **self-funding** as student tuition and fees will cover all of the program expenses. The self-funding figure is listed in the “Other” line item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Year Costs</th>
<th>Five-Year Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel¹</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library, Supplies, and Materials</td>
<td>$9,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other²</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,775</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Report costs for new faculty, graduate assistants, and technical support personnel. For new faculty, prorate individual salaries as a percentage of the time assigned to the program. If existing faculty contributes to the program, include costs necessary to maintain existing programs (e.g., the cost of adjunct to cover courses previously taught by faculty who would teach in the new program).
2. Specify other costs here (e.g., administrative costs, travel).

3. Indicate formula funding for students new to the institution because of the program; formula funding should be included only for years three through five of the program and should reflect enrollment projections for years three through five. This will be supported by the Executive Education program fees, a self-funded program.

4. This will be a self-funded program with the student tuition and program fees, covering the program expenses.
1. **Adequacy of Funding and Notification of Other Institutions** – The chief executive or chief academic officer shall sign the following statements:

   *I certify that the institution has adequate funds to cover the costs of the new program. Furthermore, the new program will not reduce the effectiveness or quality of existing programs at the institution.*

   *I certify that my institution has notified all public institutions within 50 miles of the teaching site of our intention to offer the program at least 30 days prior to submitting this request. I also certify that if any objections were received, those objections were resolved prior to the submission of this request.*

  

   ________________________    _______________________
   Chief Executive Officer/Chief Academic Officer Date

2. **Board of Regents or Designee Approval** – A member of the Board of Regents or designee shall sign the following statement:

   *On behalf of the Board of Regents, I approve the program.*

   ________________________    Date of Approval
   Board of Regents (Designee)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>url</th>
<th>title</th>
<th>What Changed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-undergraduate/programs/ecs/biomedical-engineering">https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-undergraduate/programs/ecs/biomedical-engineering</a></td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>Added major core class (BMEN) removed elective hours; Added section on Pre-Med Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-undergraduate/programs/epps/geospatial-information-science">https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-undergraduate/programs/epps/geospatial-information-science</a></td>
<td>Geospatial Information Sciences</td>
<td>Updated core and major prep courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-undergraduate/programs/is/minors">https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-undergraduate/programs/is/minors</a></td>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>Updated minor in Gender Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-undergraduate/programs/ecs/computer-engineering/v1-v3">http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-undergraduate/programs/ecs/computer-engineering/v1-v3</a></td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Updated intro language, mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-undergraduate/programs/ecs/mechanical-engineering/v1-v2">http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-undergraduate/programs/ecs/mechanical-engineering/v1-v2</a></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Course updates, addition of prescribed electives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017/undergraduate/programs/ah/minors">http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017/undergraduate/programs/ah/minors</a></td>
<td>A&amp;H Minors</td>
<td>Minor changed from Drama to Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>url</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>What changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-graduate/programs/ecs/electrical">https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-graduate/programs/ecs/electrical</a></td>
<td>Department of Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>updated concentrations went from nine to five concentrations (circuits, computing systems, devices, power electronics and energy systems, signals and systems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-graduate/programs/ecs/systems-">https://catalog.utdallas.edu/2017-graduate/programs/ecs/systems-</a></td>
<td>Department of Systems Engineering</td>
<td>Removal of certificate from systems engineering. Will now be housed in JSOM (Cybersecurity Systems)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Undergraduate Courses to be offered in 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th>UGRD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removals</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeatable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## New – 8 Courses (ARHM listed separately below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ECSC 3100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Removed – 3 Courses (ARHM listed separately below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATEC 4353</td>
<td></td>
<td>ECSC 4100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATEC 4368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Tables below only contain courses that were added or edited. Removed courses are not counted.

## Repeatable – 2 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>UGRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*ECSC 3100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#UNIV 4174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Online – 0 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>UGRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Additional Changes – 0 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>UGRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Legend

- `*` New as repeatable
- `#` Update made to existing repeat
- `-` Renumber - no additional info required
- `.` Reinstate - no additional info required

---

Climer, Registrar’s Office, 04-19-17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2017</td>
<td>remove * atec4353 (r4) atec4353.11 group_head series_head</td>
<td>request to remove this course from catalog</td>
<td></td>
<td>ATEC 4353 Game Production Lab II (3 semester credit hours). This course is a continuation of the ATEC 4350 Game Production Lab I course. The course functions as a simulation of the game development industry, in which students will take a selected game concept through multiple iterations and milestones toward a professional-level release. Students in this course further refine their skills and expertise in an area of interest, including but not limited to programming, art, animation, sound design, game design, level design, project management, and project direction. Registration for this course will be based on the faculty's review of the student's portfolio. May be repeated for credit as projects vary (6 semester credit hours maximum). Instructor consent required. (0-3) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve status: approving audit: 101</td>
<td>srx090100 2017-02-28 22:49:01 014387 50.0411.00.03 audit: -31302.1 m index: -31302.1 m</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course removal confirmed by M. Evans. SRR-2.28.17**

**repeat reason**

This course provides students with industry-like experience. Repeating the course provides students with the opportunity to gain experience on more than one project.

**show fields: atec4353.11**

- cat_repeat_units: 6
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: yes_subtitles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2017</td>
<td>remove *</td>
<td>atec4368 (r5)</td>
<td>request to remove this course from catalog ATEC 4368 User Experience Design for Games II (3 semester credit hours) Continuing study in digital game design with a focus on the human factor of games, including player feedback, data-driven decision making, interface design, and user experience design strategies. Students in the course will focus on developing viable games through rapid concept generation and iteration, analog and digital prototyping, data-driven production strategies, and pitch processes in commercial, research, or experimental areas. Registration for this course will be based on the faculty's review of the student's portfolio. Prerequisites: ATEC 3352 and instructor consent required. (0-3) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>audit: 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atec4368.7</td>
<td>Course removal per M. Evans SRR-2.28.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td>show fields: atec4368.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |           | series_head  | • cat_repeat_units: 3  
• cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100  
• cat_core:  
• cat_subtitles: no_subtitles                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |               |                 |               |

update req group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start end</th>
<th>req type course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>add * biol1350 (r1)</td>
<td>BIOL 1350 Body Systems (3 semester credit hours) BIOL 1305 Body Systems (3 semester credit hours) Examines the organ systems of mammals, predominantly the human. Function in relation to structure is emphasized. The effects of one organ system on others is stressed. The overall objective of the course is an appreciation of the integration and control of all systems. This course is specifically designed for non-majors. (3-0) S (3-0) S</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130 2017-04-11 14:19:48</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>biol1350.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>26.0102.00.02 audit: -11175.4 m index: -11175.4 m match fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>series_head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### request notes
NEW NON-LABORATORY COURSE FOR NON-MAJORS - DM. Requested by Dennis Miller on 2017-02-24 16:43:12 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 - (DDC - 03.22.17).

### peoplesoft diff:
BIOL 1350 Body Systems (3 semester credit hours) BIOL 1305 Body Systems (3 semester credit hours) Examines the organ systems of mammals, predominantly the human. Function in relation to structure is emphasized. The effects of one organ system on others is stressed. The overall objective of the course is an appreciation of the integration and control of all systems. This course is specifically designed for non-majors. (3-0) S (3-0) S

### show fields: biol1350.2
- cat_repeat_units: 0
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles

https://coursebook.utdallas.edu/catbookreport/6f6a673676b42fd5d05cd5aab71f9a5f/makepdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start end</th>
<th>req type course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>edit * biol3303 (r1) biol3303.2 group_head series_head</td>
<td>BIOL 3303 Introduction to Microbiology (3 semester credit hours) Microbes contribute to major biogeochemical processes, live in environments inhospitable to other organisms, and may comprise the majority of biomass on Earth. They form beneficial symbioses with multicellular organisms and play critical roles in the development of those organisms. In contrast to these beneficial roles, certain microbes are global public health concerns. This course surveys the form and function of the microbial world. Prerequisites: BIOL 2281 and BIOL 2311 and BIOL 2312 or their equivalents. (3-0) S</td>
<td>phase: approve status: approving audit: 13</td>
<td>ddc130130 2017-03-22 11:41:06 NOLINK 26.0502.00.02 audit: -31298.7 m index: -31298.7 m match_fail</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

New course UL UG elective - DM. Requested by Dennis Miller on 2017-02-27 12:33:15 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 - (DDC - 03.22.17).

**peoplesoft diff: NOLINK**

BIOL 3303 Introduction to Microbiology (3 semester credit hours) Microbes contribute to major biogeochemical processes, live in environments inhospitable to other organisms, and may comprise the majority of biomass on Earth. They form beneficial symbioses with multicellular organisms and play critical roles in the development of those organisms. In contrast to these beneficial roles, certain microbes are global public health concerns. This course surveys the form and function of the microbial world. Prerequisites: BIOL 2281 and BIOL 2311 and BIOL 2312 or their equivalents. (3-0) S

**show fields: biol3303.2**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

BIOL3303

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Elective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

Yes ☐ No ☑

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

☐ 1 BIOL3520
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

BIOL3303 differs from BIOL3520 in that it is intended as an introductory, survey course, and does not have a lab component. BIOL3520 is directed to bacterial identification (in the lab) and medical applications of microbiology.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Kelli Palmer

7. This form submitted by:

Dennis Miller
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>edit *</td>
<td>biol3312 (r1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>BIOL 3312 Introduction to Programming for Biological Sciences (3 semester credit hours) This course is an introduction to programming practices using C++ designed specifically for students in the biological sciences. Special emphasis will be put in particular features of C++ like object oriented programming, some data structures as well as applications to process, model and analyze biological data. One goal of this course is to provide a strong background on programming skills on a basic level while leaving more advanced techniques of software development and algorithms for other advanced courses. This course also covers an introduction to data analysis with R, a statistical platform used widely in the biological sciences community. Prerequisites: BIOL 2311 and BIOL 2312 and BIOL 2281. (3-0) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130 2017-03-22 11:52:21 NOLINK 26.1104.00.02 audit: -31287.2 m index: -31287.2 m match_fail</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New course UL UG elective - DM. Requested by Dennis Miller on 2017-02-27 13:45:54 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 - (DDC - 03.22.17).

**peoplesoft diff: NOLINK**

BIOL 3312 Introduction to Programming for Biological Sciences (3 semester credit hours) This course is an introduction to programming practices using C++ designed specifically for students in the biological sciences. Special emphasis will be put in particular features of C++ like object oriented programming, some data structures as well as applications to process, model and analyze biological data. One goal of this course is to provide a strong background on programming skills on a basic level while leaving more advanced techniques of software development and algorithms for other advanced courses. This course also covers an introduction to data analysis with R, a statistical platform used widely in the biological sciences community. Prerequisites: BIOL 2311 and BIOL 2312 and BIOL 2281. (3-0) Y

**show fields: biol3312.2**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

BIOL3312

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

Major    Core    Elective
☐        ☐        ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

Yes    No
☐        ☐

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☑ None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Faruck Morcos

7. This form submitted by:

Dennis Miller
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>add *</td>
<td>biol3315</td>
<td>BIOL 3315 Epigenetics (3 semester credit hours) Almost all cell types in our body share the same genetic information, but they perform very different functions. For example, our nerve cells are morphologically and functionally distinct from our muscle cells. How can the same genome give rise to hundreds of distinct cell types in our body? How can different diseases affect identical twins sharing the same genetic information? Why our parents and grandparents diet and health may have lasting influences in our own health? The field of epigenetics emerged over the past decades to tackle these fundamental questions that intersect our genome, development, environment and disease. This course will provide a broad overview of epigenetic phenomena and epigenetic mechanisms with weekly lectures and small group discussion of primary literature. The course will introduce students to seminal works in epigenetics and recent developments with the goal of instilling critical knowledge of the field. Prerequisites: (BIOL 3301 and BIOL 3101) or equivalent or permission of instructor. (3-0) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>2017-03-22 11:56:41 NOLINK 26.0802.00.02 audit: -31285.2 m index: -31285.2 m match_fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

New course UL Biology elective - DM. Requested by Dennis Miller on 2017-03-02 11:07:19 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 - (DDC - 03.22.17).

**peoplesoft diff: NOLINK**

BIOL 3315 Epigenetics (3 semester credit hours) Almost all cell types in our body share the same genetic information, but they perform very different functions. For example, our nerve cells are morphologically and functionally distinct from our muscle cells. How can the same genome give rise to hundreds of distinct cell types in our body? How can different diseases affect identical twins sharing the same genetic information? Why our parents and grandparents diet and health may have lasting influences in our own health? The field of epigenetics emerged over the past decades to tackle these fundamental questions that intersect our genome, development, environment and disease. This course will provide a broad overview of epigenetic phenomena and epigenetic mechanisms with weekly lectures and small group discussion of primary literature. The course will introduce students to seminal works in epigenetics and recent developments with the goal of instilling critical knowledge of the field. Prerequisites: (BIOL 3301 and BIOL 3101) or equivalent or permission of instructor. (3-0) Y

**show fields: biol3315.2**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cat_repeat_units: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cat_delivery_method:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deliverymethod_100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cat_core:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cat_subtitles: no_subtitles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Course Subject and Number

BIOL3315

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

   Major   Core   Elective
   □       □       □

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

Yes  ☑  No
    ☑

3.5. Which course is being replaced?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

   □ 1
   □ 2
   □ 3
   □ None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, context, learning outcomes, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

   Tae-Hoon Kim

7. This form submitted by:

   Dennis Miller

Location Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td></td>
<td>add * biol3320 (r1)</td>
<td>BIOL 3320 Applied Genetics (3 semester credit hours) Genetic model organisms such as the</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>ps info orion overview change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>biol3320.2</td>
<td>flatworm (Planaria), fruit fly (Drosophila melanogaster), nematode (Caenorhabditis elegans),</td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>2017-03-22</td>
<td>process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group_head series_head</td>
<td>and the zebrafish (Danio rerio) are the cornerstones of biomedical research. These</td>
<td>audit: 12</td>
<td>10:57:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organisms known for their simplicity of structure and gene similarity to humans have been</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOLINK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seminal in advancing our understanding of many biological processes and human</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.0801.00.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diseases. In this inquiry-based course, learners will apply basic principles of genetic</td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: -31283.5 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>model systems, transmission genetics, and molecular genetics to investigate important</td>
<td></td>
<td>index: -31283.5 m</td>
<td>match_fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>biological concepts such as embryonic cell division, stem cells and regeneration,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mendelian inheritance, gene mutations, and phenotypes. Throughout this exploratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>course, students will gain practical hands-on experience conducting basic culturing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>genetic manipulation and phenotypic analysis necessary to utilize genetic model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organisms in their investigation. Learners will engage in class discussions and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to draw connections between the concepts learned in class and their real-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>application(s) in biomedical sciences. Instructor consent required. Prerequisites: (BIOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2311 AND BIOL 2111) or equivalent and (BIOL 2312 AND BIOL 2112) or equivalent and BIOL 2281.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3-0) S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

New course - biology UL elective - DM. Requested by Dennis Miller on 2017-02-25 17:24:13 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 - (DDC - 03.22.17).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start end</th>
<th>req type course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>engage in class discussions and activities to draw connections between the concepts learned in class and their real-time application(s) in biomedical sciences. Instructor consent required. Prerequisites: (BIOL 2311 AND BIOL 2111) or equivalent and (BIOL 2312 AND BIOL 2112) or equivalent and BIOL 2281. (3-0) S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

show fields: biol3320.2

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core: 
- cat_subtitles: yes_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

BIOL3320

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

- Major
- Core
- Elective

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

- Yes
- No

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

- 1
- 2
- 3

- None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

- This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Vinita Hajeri

7. This form submitted by:

Dennis Miller
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>edit *</td>
<td>biol3357 (r1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>BIOL 3357 Mammalian Physiology with Lab (3 semester credit hours) This course will focus on human body systems and physiological pathways related to organ system functions and control including, but not limited to, central nervous system control and feedback, cardiovascular, respiratory, and neuromuscular physiology as well as topics such as blood pressure regulation and exercise physiology. This course will use computer software and electronic instrumentation for performing electrocardiography, electromyography, electroencephalography, plethysmography, pulmonary function analysis, polygraph analysis, and biofeedback. Instructor consent required. Prerequisites: BIOL 3455 or equivalent and BIOL 3456 or equivalent. (3-1)</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>ps info orion overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>biol3357.2</td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td></td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>2017-03-22 11:31:36</td>
<td>info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>series_head</td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: 13</td>
<td>NOLINK</td>
<td>info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

New course - UL Biology Lecturelab - DM. Requested by Dennis Miller on 2017-02-25 18:46:58 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 - (DDC - 03.22.17).

**peoplesoft diff: NOLINK**

BIOL 3357 Mammalian Physiology with Lab (3 semester credit hours) This course will focus on human body systems and physiological pathways related to organ system functions and control including, but not limited to, central nervous system control and feedback, cardiovascular, respiratory, and neuromuscular physiology as well as topics such as blood pressure regulation and exercise physiology. This course will use computer software and electronic instrumentation for performing electrocardiography, electromyography, electroencephalography, plethysmography, pulmonary function analysis, polygraph analysis, and biofeedback. Instructor consent required. Prerequisites: BIOL 3455 or equivalent and BIOL 3456 or equivalent. (3-1) S

**show fields: biol3357.2**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

BIOL3357

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

- Major
- Core
- Elective

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

- Yes
- No

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

- 1
- 2
- 3

- None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

- This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Brenna Hill

7. This form submitted by:

Dennis Miller

Location Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>edit *</td>
<td>biol4325</td>
<td>r1</td>
<td></td>
<td>BIOL 4325 Nutrition and Metabolism (3 semester credit hours) This course examines nutrient utilization and requirements with an emphasis on multifaceted links between diet, health, genetics, microbiome, and diseases. The course intends to support studies towards medicine, health professions, biomedical research, and biotechnology. Topics cover the basis of nutritional physiological phenomena and metabolic hemostasis in the context of human development, aging, exercise, health and diseases. Integration of energy metabolism and physiological requirements concerning macronutrients and major vitamins and minerals as well as benefits of potentially-protective compounds in food are reviewed. How unbalanced intake of nutrients contributes to the initiation, development and severity of various chronic diseases, including coronary heart disease, atherosclerosis, lipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, obesity, osteoporosis, thyroid disorders, immune dysfunction, inflammatory conditions, cancer, and dysbiosis are discussed with relevance to clinical nutrition and public health. The course also introduces the fields of microbiomics, nutrigenomics, nutrigenetics and chrononutrition to explore evolving concepts concerning the influence of diet on intestinal microbiota and the effect of foods and sleep on metabolism and genes. Instructor consent required. Prerequisites: (BIOL 3361 and BIOL 3161) or equivalent and (BIOL 3362 and BIOL 3162) or equivalent. (3-0) S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

New course - UL elective Biology - DM. Requested by Dennis Miller on 2017-02-25 17:51:01 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 - (DDC - 03.22.17).

**peoplesoft diff: NOLINK**

BIOL 4325 Nutrition and Metabolism (3 semester credit hours) This course examines nutrient utilization and requirements with an emphasis on multifaceted links between diet, health, genetics, microbiome, and diseases. The course intends to support studies towards medicine, health professions, biomedical research, and biotechnology. Topics cover the basis of nutritional physiological phenomena and metabolic hemostasis in the context of human development, aging, exercise, health and diseases. Integration of energy metabolism and physiological requirements concerning macronutrients and major vitamins and minerals as well as benefits of potentially-protective compounds in food are reviewed. How unbalanced intake of nutrients contributes to the initiation, development and severity of various chronic diseases, including coronary heart disease, atherosclerosis, lipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, obesity, osteoporosis, thyroid disorders, immune dysfunction, inflammatory conditions, cancer, and dysbiosis are discussed with relevance to clinical nutrition and public health. The course also introduces the fields of microbiomics, nutrigenomics, nutrigenetics and chrononutrition to explore evolving concepts concerning the influence of diet on intestinal microbiota and the effect of foods and sleep on metabolism and genes. Instructor consent required. Prerequisites: (BIOL 3361 and BIOL 3161) or equivalent and (BIOL 3362 and BIOL 3162) or equivalent. (3-0) S
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>various chronic diseases, including coronary heart disease, atherosclerosis, lipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, obesity, osteoporosis, thyroid disorders, immune dysfunction, inflammatory conditions, cancer, and dysbiosis are discussed with relevance to clinical nutrition and public health. The course also introduces the fields of microbiomics, nutrigenomics, nutrigenetics and chrononutrition to explore evolving concepts concerning the influence of diet on intestinal microbiota and the effect of foods and sleep on metabolism and genes. Instructor consent required. Prerequisites: (BIOL 3361 and BIOL 3161) or equivalent and (BIOL 3362 and BIOL 3162) or equivalent. (3-0) S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

show fields: biol4325.2

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core: 
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

BIOL 4325

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

Major ☐ Core ☐ Elective ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

Yes ☐ No ☑

3.5. Which course is being replaced?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☑ None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Mehmet Candas

7. This form submitted by:

Dennis Miller
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td></td>
<td>edit *</td>
<td>bmen4342 (r2)</td>
<td>BMEN 4342 Introduction to Robotics (3 semester credit hours) Fundamentals of robotics, rigid motions, homogeneous transformations, forward and inverse kinematics, velocity kinematics, motion planning, trajectory generation, sensing, vision, and control. Prerequisite or Corequisite: BMEN 4310 or EE 4310 or MECH 4310 or equivalent. (Same as EE 4342) (2-3) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bmen4342.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>2017-04-17 09:44:24 014860 14.0501.00.06 audit: -2809.8 m index: -2809.8 m match_fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td>series_head</td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prerequisite updated per Dr. Ntafos (DDC - 04-04-17). Updated course offering to fall in line with crosslisting (DDC - 04.17.17).

peoplesoft diff: 014860 2017-08-20 ddc130130

BMEN 4342 Introduction to Robotics (3 semester credit hours) Fundamentals of robotics, rigid motions, homogeneous transformations, forward and inverse kinematics, velocity kinematics, motion planning, trajectory generation, sensing, vision, and control. Prerequisites: (ENGR 2300 and EE 3302) and (BMEN 4310 or EE 4310 or MECH 4310) or equivalent. (Same as EE 4342) (2-3) Y

show fields: bmen4342.6
- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method:
  - deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>edit *</td>
<td>cs3305 (r10) cs3305.12 group_head</td>
<td>CS 3305 Discrete Mathematics for Computing II (3 semester credit hours) Advanced counting methods; recurrence relations, divide and conquer algorithms, principle of inclusion and exclusion. Partial orders and lattices, Algorithmic complexity. Graph theory. Strings and languages. Number theory. Elements of modern algebra. Credit cannot be received for both courses, CS 3305 and SE 3306. Double majors are required to take CS 3305. Prerequisites: (CE 2305 or CS 2305 or TE 2305) with a grade of C or better, and (MATH 2414 or MATH 2419). (3-0) S</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>sxr090100 2017-03-28 14:51:22 003480 30.0801.00.06 audit: -31304.9 m index: -31303.5 m match_fail</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

Change requested by Dr. Ntafos 3-28-17. srr

**peoplesoft diff: 003480 2014-08-24 ddc130130**

CS 3305 Discrete Mathematics for Computing II (3 semester credit hours) Advanced counting methods; recurrence relations, divide and conquer algorithms, principle of inclusion and exclusion. Partial orders and lattices, Algorithmic complexity. Graph theory. Strings and languages. Number theory. Elements of modern algebra. Credit cannot be received for both courses, CS 3305 and SE 3306. Double majors are required to take CS 3305. Prerequisites: (CE 2305 or CS 2305 or TE 2305) with a grade of C or better, and (MATH 2414 or MATH 2419). (3-0) S

**show fields: cs3305.12**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>add_renumber *</td>
<td>ecsc4100 ecsc3100 (r1) ecsc3100.1 group_head series_head</td>
<td>ECSC 3100 Engineering Project in Community Service II (1 semester credit hour) Design course in which multidisciplinary teams solve engineering-based problems benefiting service organizations and the local community. Students will refine the skills and knowledge gained in ECSC 2100, by continue working on projects from previous semesters, and lecture topics will focus on leadership and project management skills, communication skills, and more. This course will include lectures and instruction in UTDesign Studio. May be repeated for credit (3 semester credit hours maximum). Prerequisite: ECSC 2100. (1-1) S</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130 2017-04-17 17:24:09</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

Requested by Simeon Ntafos on 2016-02-09 at 12:51:56 via eForm and course to be offered in fall 2016 (DDC - 02/12/16). Consent removed per Dr. Ntafos (DDC - 10.18.16). Renumbered 4100 to 3100 per Dr. Ntafos (DDC - 04.17.17).

**peoplesoft diff:**

ECSC 3100 Engineering Project in Community Service II (1 semester credit hour) Design course in which multidisciplinary teams solve engineering-based problems benefiting service organizations and the local community. Students will refine the skills and knowledge gained in ECSC 2100, by continue working on projects from previous semesters, and lecture topics will focus on leadership and project management skills, communication skills, and more. This course will include lectures and instruction in UTDesign Studio. May be repeated for credit (3 semester credit hours maximum). Prerequisite: ECSC 2100. (1-1) S

**repeat reason**

Allow students to continue working on the project they have started and keep gaining skills such as leadership and project management, and applying those skills.

**show fields: ecsc3100.1**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core: 
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start end</th>
<th>req type course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2017</td>
<td>remove_renumber</td>
<td>* ecsc4100 (r2)  &lt;br&gt; -&gt; ecsc3100  &lt;br&gt; ecsc4100.4  &lt;br&gt; group_head  &lt;br&gt; series_head</td>
<td>request to remove this course from catalog</td>
<td>phase: approve  &lt;br&gt; status: approving  &lt;br&gt; audit: 210</td>
<td>ddc130130 2017-04-17 17:24:09 015094 14.0101.00.06 audit: -13.9 m index: -13.9 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**catalog course description**

ECSC 4100. Engineering Project in Community Service II (1 semester credit hour) Design course in which multidisciplinary teams solve engineering-based problems benefiting service organizations and the local community. Students will continue working on projects from previous semesters, and lecture topics will focus on leadership and project management skills, communication skills, and more. This course will include lectures and instruction in UTDesign Studio. May be repeated for credit (3 semester credit hours maximum). Prerequisite: ECSC 2100. (1-1) S

**request notes**

Requested by Simeon Ntafos on 2016-02-09 at 12:51:56 via eForm and course to be offered in fall 2016 (DDC - 02/12/16). Consent removed per Dr. Ntafos (DDC - 10.18.16). Renumbered 4100 to 3100 per Dr. Ntafos (DDC - 04.17.17).

**repeat reason**

Allow students to continue working on the project they have started and keep gaining skills such as leadership and project management, and applying those skills.

**show fields: ecsc4100.4**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>edit *</td>
<td>ee4342</td>
<td>ee4342.6</td>
<td>EE 4342 Introduction to Robotics (3 semester credit hours) Fundamentals of robotics, rigid motions, homogeneous transformations, forward and inverse kinematics, velocity kinematics, motion planning, trajectory generation, sensing, vision, and control. Prerequisite or Corequisite: BMEN 4310 or EE 4310 or MECH 4310 or equivalent. (Same as BMEN 4342) (2-3) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130 2017-04-04 15:54:30 014432 14.1001.00.06 audit: -2809.5 m index: -2809.5 m match_fail</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td>series_head</td>
<td></td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

Prerequisite updated per Dr. Ntafos (DDC - 04-04-17).

**peoplesoft diff: 014432 2015-08-23 sxr090100**

EE 4342 Introduction to Robotics (3 semester credit hours) Fundamentals of robotics, rigid motions, homogeneous transformations, forward and inverse kinematics, velocity kinematics, motion planning, trajectory generation, sensing, vision, and control. Prerequisites: (ENGR 2300 and EE 3302) and (BMEN Prerequisite or Corequisite: BMEN 4310 or EE 4310 or MECH 4310 or equivalent. (Same as BMEN 4342) (2-3) Y

**show fields: ee4342.6**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2017-open |   | edit * | mkt4380 (r5) | mkt4380.6 | MKT 4380 Capstone Course in Marketing (3 semester credit hours) C3 Certified. Students (in teams) are expected to make marketing decisions and compete with other teams to achieve superior performance in terms of market share, profitability and stock price. The course will use marketing simulation to teach practical decision making. Students will make decisions regarding new product specifications, price, production, sales force, and advertising as in a real life situation. This course integrates the strategic and the tactical aspects of marketing. Prerequisites: MKT 3330 and MKT 3340 and MKT 4330 and ITSS 3300 and FIN 3320. (3-0) Y | phase: approve
status: approving
audit: 31 | sxr090100
2017-04-03
17:01:13
013918
52.1401.00.16
audit:
-22527.8 m
index:
-22527.8 m
match_FAIL | ps_info
orion
info
overview
change
process
modify |

**request notes**

Updated MIS prefix to ITSS. Updated course prerequisite per Dr. Kaplan's 4-3-17 email. srr  

**peoplesoft diff: 013918 2015-08-23 sxr090100**

MKT 4380 Capstone Course in Marketing (3 semester credit hours) C3 Certified. Students (in teams) are expected to make marketing decisions and compete with other teams to achieve superior performance in terms of market share, profitability and stock price. The course will use marketing simulation to teach practical decision making. Students will make decisions regarding new product specifications, price, production, sales force, and advertising as in a real life situation. This course integrates the strategic and the tactical aspects of marketing. Prerequisites: MKT 3320 and MKT 3330 and MKT 3340 and MKT 4330 and ITSS 3300 and FIN 3320. (3-0) Y

**show fields: mkt4380.6**

- **cat_repeat_units**: 3  
- **cat_delivery_method**: deliverymethod_100  
- **cat_core**:  
- **cat_subtitles**: no_subtitles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start end</th>
<th>req type course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>edit * nsc4352 (r8) nsc4352.14 group_head series_head</td>
<td>NSC 4352 Cellular Neuroscience (3 semester credit hours) The cell biology and cellular physiology of the neuron. Growth and maintenance of dendrites, axons and synapses, and the underlying processes of macromolecule synthesis, packaging, and transport are the central biological issues. Electrical signaling, ion channel functions, and synaptic transmission are covered. Prerequisites: NSC 3361 and CHEM 1311 and CHEM 1312. Prerequisite or Corequisite: BIOL 2311. (3-0) Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

Transitional core designation removed, but course will remain active in catalog per Melanie Spence. 08/31/15. Updated prerequisites per Leah Barfield (DDC - 04.17.17).

**peoplesoft diff: 009649 2017-08-20 ddc130130**

NSC 4352 Cellular Neuroscience (3 semester credit hours) The cell biology and cellular physiology of the neuron. Growth and maintenance of dendrites, axons and synapses, and the underlying processes of macromolecule synthesis, packaging, and transport are the central biological issues. Electrical signaling, ion channel functions, and synaptic transmission are covered. Prerequisites: NSC 3361 and CHEM 1311 and CHEM 1312. Prerequisite or Corequisite: BIOL 2311. (3-0) Y

**show fields: nsc4352.14**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>edit *</td>
<td>se3306 (r7)</td>
<td>se3306.7</td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td>SE 3306 Mathematical Foundations of Software Engineering (3 semester credit hours) Boolean logic, first-order logic, models of first-order logic. Introduction to program verification, applications in software engineering.Completeness Theorem. Regular expressions, regular sets, finite-state machines, and applications in software engineering. Graph Theory, graph algorithms. Statecharts, Petri Nets and their role in software engineering. Credit cannot be received for both courses, CS 3305 and SE 3306. Double majors are required to take CS 3305. Prerequisite: (CE 2305 or CS 2305 or TE 2305) with a grade of C or better or equivalent. (3-0) S</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>sxr090100</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>2017-03-28 14:51:33</td>
<td>info overview process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: 31</td>
<td>011351 30.0801.00.06</td>
<td>info overview process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-31304.8 m index: -31302.8 m match_fail</td>
<td>info overview process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

Change requested by Dr. Ntafos 3/28/17. srr.

**peoplesoft diff: 011351 2014-08-24 ddc130130**

SE 3306 Mathematical Foundations of Software Engineering (3 semester credit hours) Boolean logic, first-order logic, models of first-order logic. Introduction to program verification, applications in software engineering. Completeness Theorem. Regular expressions, regular sets, finite-state machines, and applications in software engineering. Graph Theory, graph algorithms. Statecharts, Petri Nets and their role in software engineering. Credit cannot be received for both courses, CS 3305 and SE 3306. Double majors are required to take CS 3305. Prerequisite: (CE 2305 or CS 2305 or TE 2305) with a grade of C or better or equivalent. (3-0) S

**show fields: se3306.7**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req_type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog_course_description</th>
<th>request_status</th>
<th>request_metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>edit *</td>
<td>univ4174 (r4)</td>
<td>univ4174.5</td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td>series_head</td>
<td>UNIV 4174 Theory and Practice of Group Motivation and Leadership (1 semester credit hour) An elective course designed to provide students with a basic understanding of the theoretical knowledge and skills needed to lead and motivate groups engaged in personal or professional transitions. Includes supervised and paraprofessional experience. May be repeated for credit (3 semester credit hours maximum). Prerequisites: UNIV 4074. (1-0) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>status: approving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Courses to be offered in 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeatable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New – 4 Courses</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMD 7219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIOL 5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIOL 6343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIOL 6355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Removed – 0 Courses</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: Tables below only contain courses that were added or edited. Removed courses are not counted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repeatable – 0 Courses</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online – 0 Courses</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>JSOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

New course - DM. Requested by Dennis Miller on 2017-03-07 12:35:29 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 - (DDC - 03.22.17).

**peoplesoft diff: NOLINK**

BIOL 5303 Introduction to Microbiology for Graduate Students (3 semester credit hours) Microbes contribute to major biogeochemical processes, live in environments inhospitable to other organisms, and may comprise the majority of biomass on Earth. They form beneficial symbioses with multicellular organisms and play critical roles in the development of those organisms. In contrast to these beneficial roles, certain microbes are global public health concerns. This course surveys the form and function of the microbial world. Instructor consent required. (3-0) S

**show fields: biol5303.2**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

BIOL5303

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

Major  Core  Elective
☐  ☐  ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

☐ Yes  ☑ No

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3  ☑ None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Kelli Palmer

7. This form submitted by:

Dennis Miller
BIOL 6343 Molecular Neuropathology (3 semester credit hours) This course is designed to give students a 300 degree view on pathology and the corresponding molecular basis of this pathology in different diseases linked to the brain and spinal cord. Here students acquire an in depth understanding of these diseased states and are able to analyze and critically review published journal articles. Instructor consent required. (3.0) S

New graduate course - DN. Requested by Dennis Miller on 2017-02-27 12:08:43 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 - (DDC - 03.22.17).

show fields: biol6343.2
- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

BIOL 6343

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

Major  Core  Elective
☐  ☐  ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

Yes  No
☐  ☑

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

☐  1
☐  2
☑  3

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Heng Du and Uma Srikanth

7. This form submitted by:

Dennis Miller

Location Data
BIOL 6355 The Nucleus (3 semester credit hours) The nucleus is the defining feature of all eukaryotes. It contains our chromosomes and is the command center of all our cells. In the nucleus, our genetic information is interpreted, protected, duplicated and modified. Central control of gene expression occurs in the nucleus by transcription and post-transcription mechanisms. Moreover, the nucleus is organized into various functional compartments that specialized in transcription, splicing, rRNA processing and repression. The course will provide a broad overview of functional organization of the nucleus using recent primary literature from the field, focused particularly on genomic analyses of nuclear function. The course will introduce students to seminal works in the field and recent developments with the goal of instilling critical understanding of structure and function of the nucleus. Advanced knowledge of molecular biology is essential. Prior course work on genetics, genetic analysis and genomics is strongly recommended. Instructor consent required. (3-0) Y

New course graduate elective - DM. Requested by Dennis Miller on 2017-02-25 18:04:22 through Eform and course to be offered in spring 2018 - (DDC - 03.22.17).

peoplesoft diff: 001916 2005-08-01

BIOL 6355 The Nucleus (3 semester credit hours) The nucleus is the defining feature of all eukaryotes. It contains our chromosomes and is the command center of all our cells. In the nucleus, our genetic information is interpreted, protected, duplicated and modified. Central control of gene expression occurs in the nucleus by transcription and post-transcription mechanisms. Moreover, the nucleus is organized into various functional compartments that specialized in transcription, splicing, rRNA processing and repression. The course will provide a broad overview of functional organization of the nucleus using recent primary literature from the field, focused particularly on genomic analyses of nuclear function. The course will introduce students to seminal works in the field and recent developments with the goal of instilling critical understanding of structure and function of the nucleus. Advanced knowledge of molecular biology is essential. Prior course work on genetics, genetic analysis and genomics is strongly recommended. Instructor consent required. (3-0) Y

show fields: biol6355.4

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

BIOL6355

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

   Major    Core    Elective
   ☐         ☐       ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

   Yes ☐ No ☑

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

   ☐ 1 □
   ☐ 2 □
   ☐ 3 □
   ☑ None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

   This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

   Tae-Hoon Kim

7. This form submitted by:

   Dennis Miller
| 2017-open | reinstate * comd7219 (r3) comd7219.3 group_head series_head | COMD 7219 Birth-To-Three (2 semester credit hours) Typical and atypical development patterns and assessment and treatment approaches of infants and toddlers with a variety of speech, language, and feeding disorders. Prerequisites: COMD 6308 and BBSC majors only and Department Consent required. (2-0) Y
| phase: approve | status: approving | audit: 31 |
| stilman | 2016-05-25 17:32:10 | 012559 | 51.020100.14 | audit: -18810.5 m | index: -18810.5 m | match_fail |

Re replacing COMD 7V10

peoplesoft diff: 012559 2012.08.14 sXh121431

COMD 7219 Birth-To-Three (2 semester credit hours) Typical and atypical development patterns and assessment and treatment approaches of infants and toddlers with a variety of speech, language, and feeding disorders. Prerequisites: COMD 6308 and BBSC majors only and Department Consent required. (2-0) Y

show fields: comd7219.3

- cat_repeat_units: 2
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
Admissions Consideration for Applicants with Three-Year Undergraduate Degrees

Applicants with three-year undergraduate degrees will be considered for admission into our master's programs. Their candidacy will be reviewed holistically considering all of the following variables: admission test scores, English proficiency scores if applicable, undergraduate grade point average, official transcripts from all previous institutions, undergraduate degree major and awarding institution, resume, recommendations and personal objective statement.
University Committee on eForms- UTDPPxxxx

Policy Charge

University Committee on eForms

Policy Statement

The University committee on eForms is a University-wide Standing Committee.

The purpose of the committee is to integrate faculty and academic staff review and consultation into existing and proposed new electronic forms (eForms), including but not limited to PeopleSoft e-forms. Faculty and staff members of the committee will advise the Office of Information Technology, their governance groups, and other application development teams on campus on the creation of eForms and on how to test eForms with other segments of the university community before they are generally released.

The committee shall have fifteen members as follows: three faculty approved by the Academic Senate, two from offices of school deans recommended by the academic Senate, four academic staff selected by the Staff Council from a pool nominated by academic program and department heads, four PeopleSoft functional stakeholders recommended by the PeopleSoft Executive Committee, one from the office of sponsored projects recommended by the office of sponsored projects, one from the distributed IT community recommended by the Chief Information Officer, and one from the Office of Information Technology recommended by the Chief Information Officer. All appointments shall be coordinated by the Committee on Committees of the Academic Senate and confirmed by the Senate as for other University Committees.

All members are voting members. Votes are advisory for the RUO, not binding.

The term of service of the Committee members shall be two years, effective September 1 to August 31. The Committee on Committees may adjust terms to one or three years in order to assure continuity of experience as necessary. Individuals may be reappointed. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

The Chair shall be the RUO or his/her designee. The Committee shall designate a Vice Chair.

The vice president for information technology and chief information officer will be the responsible university official (RUO).

Areas of concern for the committee will include:

- Issues of productivity affecting faculty and their administrative support.
- Timely and helpful responses to specific concerns and complaints
• Assuring that solutions are sustainable, user-friendly, non-redundant, and consistent with university policies and values.

The Committee shall meet on a schedule established by the RUO. The Vice-Chair may call a meeting in the absence of the Chair.

The Committee shall report annually on its activities to the Academic Senate. It will also maintain a webpage on the Academic Senate website, with other University Committees.
Shadow work survey

Matthew Goeckner
Survey to NSM faculty and staff

- Email addresses were obtained from NSM’s employee email list.
  - “Student workers” were removed from the list
    - (Intent was remove all undergraduates from the survey)
  - TAs/RAs were kept as they are continuing employees
  - Part time lecturers were kept as well
- Sent to 665 email addresses – 9 bounced
- 193 surveys were started
- 176 responses (partial completion) - 74 faculty & 61 staff
- 39 surveys were completed
Dear

As part of our school wide committee to streamline processes in the school we discovered a recent report from Cornell on “shadow work”. “Shadow work” is defined as unpaid unseen work not directly related to a job.

What Cornell found can be seen here:

- https://hr.cornell.edu/hr-professional-tools/organizational-and-workforce-development/lean-process-improvement

They claim to have saved more than $4 Million in costs since they took on reducing “Shadow work”.

At this point, we would like to find out where “shadow work” is having the largest impact on your day-to-day work. Hence this survey is to find your top three shadow work issues and how much time each takes from your weekly activities.

Thanks!

Matthew Goeckner, PhD, Associate Dean of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Survey to NSM faculty and staff

Your position at UTD

Faculty

Staff

The number of years you have been at UTD

Powered by Qualtrics
Survey to NSM faculty and staff

Your first shadow work issue:

Approximate time in hours per month on this activity. (If the activity occurred once a semester or year - give an average.)

Why and how might it be improved (1000 characters max):

<<

>>

Powered by Qualtrics
Survey to non-NSM faculty and staff

• Email addresses were obtained from PeopleSoft HR Production database (HRPRD) via the Office of Information Technology.
  • Thank you to: Cary Delmark, Darren Crone, Jaideep Chitkara and Hema Sarnala
• NSM employees were removed from the list (so as to not repeat)
• “Student workers” were removed from the list
  • (Intent was remove all undergraduates from the survey)
• TAs/RAs were kept as they are continuing employees
• Part time lecturers were kept as well

• Sent to 2915 email addresses – 0 bounced – 104 were duplicates
• 575 surveys were started
• 506 responses (partial completion) 215 faculty & 223 staff
• 131 surveys were “completed”
Survey to non-NSM faculty and staff

Dear

As part of an internal review of general processes in NSM, we have been conducting a survey related to "Shadow work". Academic Council has asked that I include all faculty and staff at UTD in this survey. “Shadow work” is an economic term and is generally defined as unpaid unseen work not directly related to a job. The Wikipedia description of "Shadow work" is given here:


Cornell recently completed a review of Shadow work on their campus. What they found can be seen here:

- https://hr.cornell.edu/hr-professional-tools/organizational-and-workforce-development/lean-process-improvement

They claim to have saved more than $4 Million in costs since they took on reducing “Shadow work”.

At this point, we would like to find out where “shadow work” is having the largest impact on your day-to-day work. Hence this survey is to find your top three shadow work issues and how much time each takes from your weekly activities.

Thanks!

Matthew Goeckner, PhD, Associate Dean of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Survey to non-NSM faculty and staff

Your position at UTD

Faculty

Staff

The number of years you have been at UTD

Powered by Qualtrics
Survey to non-NSM faculty and staff

Your first shadow work issue:

Approximate time in hours per month on this activity. (If the activity occurred once a semester or year - give an average.):

Why and how might it be improved (1000 characters max):
Distinctions and other issues

• It is noted that NEITHER database is complete
  • I know this because I know of people who did not receive the survey

• The NSM and university wide databases have slightly different information
  • Because of this I ran the surveys separately
    • The survey questions are identical
    • Some of the retained information is different
  • I kept enough information so that I should be able to divide results by school/department for non NSM.
Distinctions and other issues

- The survey to non-NSM faculty and staff “broke the university”
  - There were a large number of people who thought that the survey was a phishing email.
  - IT answered an unknown number of emails questioning the validity of the survey (I helped them draft a standard response.)
  - I answered ~20-30 such emails.
  - In comparison, I only got one such email from an NSM faculty or staff
  - I believe this is because I have been using the Qualtrics survey system in NSM for 6-8 months. (To seek nominations for teaching awards, etc.) In comparison, it seems as if Qualtrics (or any other) surveys have never been sent to most other faculty and staff.

=> It might be beneficial to develop regular (yearly?) surveys of faculty and staff
Results – NSM

• Gave no Shadow work
  • 53 faculty (ave years at UTD = 8.2)
  • 53 staff (ave years at UTD = 4.0)

• At least 1 Shadow work item
  • 21 faculty (ave years at UTD = 8.8)
  • 8 staff (ave years at UTD = 8.5)

• At least 2 Shadow work items
  • 12 faculty (ave years at UTD = 9.2)
  • 3 staff (ave years at UTD = 8)

• 3 Shadow work items
  • 9 faculty (ave years at UTD = 9.1)
  • 3 staff (ave years at UTD = 8)
Results – NSM

• Shadow work items
  • 42 given by faculty
    • Ave years at UTD = 9.0
    • Ave est time of SW 6.3 hrs/month
  
• 14 given by staff
  • Ave years at UTD = 8.3
  • Ave est time 10.6 hrs/month

NOTE: Time estimates are averages of the numbers which I could understand. Some reported numbers appeared as dates in MS Excel...
Results – Non NSM

• Gave no Shadow work
  • 141 faculty (ave years at UTD = 8.4)
  • 180 staff (ave years at UTD = 4.0)

• At least 1 Shadow work item
  • 73 faculty (ave years at UTD = 10.0)
  • 42 staff (ave years at UTD = 6.0)

• At least 2 Shadow work items
  • 46 faculty (ave years at UTD = 11.0)
  • 22 staff (ave years at UTD = 5.6)

• 3 Shadow work items
  • 28 faculty (ave years at UTD = 14.3)
  • 12 staff (ave years at UTD = 7.7)
Results – Non NSM

• Shadow work items
  • 147 given by faculty
    • Ave years at UTD = 11.1
    • Ave est time of SW 7.3 hrs/month
  
• 75 given by staff
  • Ave years at UTD = 6.2
  • Ave est time 11.7 hrs/month

NOTE: Time estimates are averages of the numbers which I could understand. Some reported numbers appeared as dates in MS Excel...
## Results – Non NSM

### Departments with >3 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral And Brain Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Political and Policy</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Science Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Tech And Comm</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results – Non NSM

Job titles with >3 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer I</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer I</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall results

Reported shadow work appears to be consuming

• ~6 to 7 hrs/month for faculty => ~ 3% of all faculty time
• ~10 to 11 hrs/month for staff => ~ 5% of all staff time

List of all reported shadow work items will be provided in an MS Word document.
Interesting noted items

• A number of the reported Shadow Work items would suggest that there is an issue with life-work balance. While it was not the purpose of this survey to look at life-work balance, the university needs to be aware that it could be an important issue going forward.

• It would appear that surveying the faculty and staff has not be a regular practice. (Based on the number of people who thought this was a phishing email.) It might be beneficial for the university to engage in well designed yearly surveys of faculty and staff.
## NSM reported Shadow work items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your shadow work issue:</th>
<th>Approximate time in hours per month on this activity.</th>
<th>Why and how might it be improved (1000 characters max):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Account Reconciliation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>First determine what we are trying to accomplish by reconciliation. The system itself should be able to determine if the costs charged to cost center match the costs from the feeding system like payroll, eprocurement, orion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval process of day to day activity. Reconciliation, Travel, Payroll</td>
<td>Day to Day</td>
<td>I understand in these days we need dual control, however the job I was hired to do is now being put on my supervisor who is a research faculty. I was given the approval for all manner of processing in our office but after PeopleSoft the brunt of processing was put off on him. Before I had access to process entries or items up to a limit of funds on accounts up to $25,000. I no longer can order for the office above $500. I understand I cannot approve my time (he does) but I'm not allowed to approve time for staff, he has to do the inventory, travel, reconciliation and on and on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>availability of people to work- having to do tech work</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Many undergrads and even graduate students have demanding class schedules. They are unable to work at times that would be helpful. It almost seems that every time that we have a significant workload, they all have multiple exams during that week. Unfortunately, there is probably nothing to be done about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being the Laboratory Technician for a complicated laboratory while Department Head and Full Professor</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Please hire a laboratory technician. I would be better off, and all of my students would be better off!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioraft and Other Compliance Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>This compliance should last more than one year- fire extinguisher training etc should not need to be completed every year (it does not change).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with various compliances and regulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>only new update needs to know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>departmental emails</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taking a look at all the &quot;junk&quot; mail that is sent to faculty that is read and then deleted. Maybe making certain types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of common/repeating emails be part of a list-serve that you can sign up for to receive.

| document expenses | 20 | talk to each other - central cloud storage of receipt accessible to all parties involved. / • Documentation for expenses – multiple documenting opportunities for one expense / o One card reconciliation requires “expense description” and receipt / o Contracts and grants will email for “expense description” and receipt / o Procurement emails “ACL” survey with multiple questions and uploaded receipt / o Cost center reconciliation requires receipt / o Procurement “randomly” audits 6 months later seeking receipt. I say randomly because the majority of my department was recently audited for summer one card expenses. Additionally, expense/ travel reimbursements require uploading receipts. / • / Yesterday was the first time we were subjected to the ACL survey. One has to wonder how many more opportunities to document this expense will arise. /

| Doing paper work | 5 | more competent staff

| Emails that are not that important to me | 0.5 | Reduce the amount of emails

| Grant Reports | | I am giving out the same information to all of my endowment partners in 8 different formats. Is there any way the university could have a generic endowment report form that could be sent to multiple donors?

<p>| Grant reports, grant writing, and proposal IRBs | 40 | I spend a tremendous amount of time writing grant proposals to fund my academic programs and departmental outreach programs that are essential recruiting for the academic ones. (I'd love to be able to write proposals to fund research, too!) I have numerous reports, an extensive DataCenter for Texas Regional Collaboratives, and my lead Master Teacher and I must write quarterly and annual reports for every single contributor to the UTeach Dallas endowment. Wouldn't one generalize report make more sense? When I do grant proposals that involve human research subjects, the IRB folks want all the instruments we'd use, if funded, all consent forms, everything up front. We don't have funding to do the work yet. The NSF requires an IRB be submitted before we can submit the application. I'd love a general overview sign off of the plan, with specifics worked out IF FUNDED. I work in education, not medical experiments. I'm talking about surveys, content tests, interviews, and observations. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues with presentation PC in podium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>System is extremely complicated and not well documented. Had to reboot the system to get the screen to wake up. System has been replaced with a new one, and now relearning how to run the new system. Presentation PCs should all have a set of brief, clear instructions on a laminated sheet posted next to the PC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of hiking and carting to carry out my job</td>
<td>40? 60?</td>
<td>Having Physics in one building will help a lot. / Having a place to do my job would help. By that I mean all the tools and supplies are in one location so a &quot;simple&quot; repair doesn't require going to 3 different buildings. And it means I don't have to take things to my house to work on them because I don't have the tools here. And it means I don't have to spread out over a big portion of PML to have the space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing generation of receipts for consumables and chemical purchases on e-Procurement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Confirmation of item delivery can be submitted directly by central receiving personnel through e-procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing/maintaining department vehicles, trailers, equipment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The department which manages UTD-owned vehicles/facilities should be responsible for organizing or performing repairs, maintenance, and registration of vehicles and trailers. Each month I have to personally perform inspections of 2-3 vehicles. When they need repairs or Texas DOT inspections, I have to physically drive them and have those operations done, and coordinate with the vendors we use. Once a year I have to register/inspect the trailers we use, repaint their floors, replace/check batteries, and inspect/inventory/replace/procur the equipment that is taken in them. / / Hiring a department technician could alleviate this burden on myself, and also provide more consistency, continuity (as this responsibility was passed off to me after a previous student/TA left), and ensure that such tasks are done properly and in a timely fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Club weekly meetings</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Not really a problem, it is work I am happy to do, but it is shadow work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Search</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not really sure how this could be improved. As a program increases so does the need for more Mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td>As department head, I do many approvals online: purchasing, account reconciliation, ePar, eCat, timesheet approvals for around 55 personnel, PA7 job postings, door access approvals, eLor. Many of these require interaction with a different portal and a separate learning curve. Some are very time consuming - timesheet approvals especially, requiring multiple mouse operations for each individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval (previously I signed one sheet of paper for each individual).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying honorarium to a visitor, applying for visas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many forms that a foreign visitor has to fill in, if he/she gets a honorarium from UTD. If the visitor is my good colleague, then I need to help him with filling those multiple forms (vendor request, FNIS forms). Perhaps it is just my problem, because I can in principle opt to not help my visitors with those forms. / / I am not attending conferences abroad because preparing visa documents is too time consuming. That would be a great burst to my international cooperation, if our travel office can help with preparing visa application packages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing expenditure report for granting agent.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It happened a while ago, but at that time, I had to do this because the person at the financial department did not do it right and it would have look bad to the funding agency. Thus, I had to get the raw data and do it myself and gave it to them for submitting to the funding agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepping for physics review sessions when I was a tutor in the math lab.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well they ended doing physics reviews/tutoring so</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing tests.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just plain waste of my time on campus. some staff is willing to help but others do not. One does not need a PhD degree to print quizzes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing and Reconciling accounts (pcard, grants).</td>
<td>5 to 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While some element is necessary to do for the PI of a grant, some elements could clearly be accomplished by administrative staff. Matching receipts with charges, calling in orders, obtaining competitive pricing, etc. However, this cannot simply be transferred to our current admins, who are overbooked already.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescheduling Gen Chem students for make-up exams.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Gen Chem exams on Saturdays, many sports teams need alternative times. However, trying to reschedule even 5 undergraduates typically results in no less than 2 additional exam time slots as they cannot find 1 common time. And then we have to find locations to allow these students to take the exam. If we better utilized our teaching assistants, we could potentially offer 1 early morning option and 1 evening option that may better concentration our students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timesheet</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do away with it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type notes and write solutions for homework assignment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to change textbooks frequently, so that we can minimize the workload to formulate/organize new teaching materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Letters of Recommendation for Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I'm not really sure how or even if this can be improved. It's part of being a professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yearly training modules, 13 this year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>training modules should only be required only once when new procedures are introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account reconciliation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>clear description of items purchased next to the amount, instead of obscure code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving Orders on Grants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am still not certain why I need to approve certain requisitions in eProcurement. Our staff are excellent at communicating with us, and while I do need and want to know what has been done, this is something that would be just as effective once a month in a summary as opposed to every single order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auxiliary paperwork for grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some auxiliary paperwork required by OSP takes really hours! For example, after I describe my budget in the proposal, I'm asked to plug in these numbers into the Excel form. If there are changes, I need to prepare a new Excel form, new certification form etc. I know that other Departments/Schools have assistance with this paperwork, even with preparing short bios and list of collaborators. We do not, and it took me quite a lot of really precious pre-deadline time to put collaborators in a column form, removing commas, and fixing over very minor issues that OSP was insisting on. In contrast, all these issues for my collaborator in Princeton whom we submitted together, were taken care by his Departmental assistant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget overview</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No reports available to provide the PI or me with a convenient summary of the account balances by category; no reports available to provide expense detail in understandable. Therefore I produce periodically the summary view but I am not able to produce the expense detail. Both of these should be provided conveniently by the financial software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>We need a way to streamline the assessments of programs and classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class duties, printing, entering data, participation reporting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Consistent TA appointments. I have taught 250 student classes before without an assigned TA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defusing personnel matters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I am trying to establish sanity. It is not straightforward at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of documentation for reimbursement of travel expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>No need of itemized receipts (e.g. meal) for expenses below a certain minimal threshold (e.g 20$ per meal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting ID and office key</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Had to trek clear half way across campus to get an ID card, and then all the way across campus to get an office key. These items should be available in the same building. Better yet, deliver the key to the administrative assistant, who would get signature from faculty and issue the key.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Management (part 1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>UTD needs to hire &quot;laboratory coordinators&quot; for their undergraduate teaching labs. A laboratory coordinator is a staff position (typically someone with a B.S. or M.S) that oversees several labs simultaneously. For example, a lab coordinator in biological sciences might be responsible for general biology, microbiology, and anatomy and physiology labs. Almost all colleges and universities have laboratory coordinators, or equivalent positions. A lab coordinator would ensure that faculty members have all of the materials and equipment they needed to run their lab courses properly. They would be responsible for setting up and maintaining the labs, including the equipment, chemicals, and models in the storage areas. They hand the implementation of safety regulations, equipment repair, work orders, repairs, improvements, inventory lists, and supervision of TAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining laboratory equipment/instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hiring a department technician who oversees all scientific instrumentation, facilities maintenance, organization, and software. This is a huge problem in every lab in the geosciences department. Tenured faculty and their students are left to deal with equipment problems and maintenance instead of spending their time efficiently, using the instruments, writing, and teaching. This also relates to equipment and instruments such as microscopes, mineral specimens, and lab materials (coursework + supplies) that undergraduates must use; there are problems with inventory control and the discontinuity of lab coursework from one TA to the next: there is a wide range of quality of the labs that are used, year-to-year, because they often must be remade every 1-5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly sensitive safety inspection reports</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I agree that safety in the lab should be put as the first priority. However, the safety inspection committee keeps pointing minor issues. For instance, small volume of organic solution in closed containers in normal refrigerator would not likely make refrigerator in fire. However, they are making us to buy a brand new flammable refrigerator to eliminate the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam Competition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Once a year activity, with high overhead concentrated into various times. Again, work I am happy to do, but work that is not considered part of my regular duties. Help would be welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Compliance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>We have a multi-use classroom, in which we do things like kitchen chemistry and some biology experiments. We know not to put things down our sinks that we wouldn't put down a kitchen sink. Special permission for disposing of vinegar and baking soda after they react seems more than a bit silly. Labeling all of our individual containers of vinegar, corn starch, spaghetti noodles (great for talking about stress and strain) sugar, etc. with little labels as food safe or not for human consumption seems a like a lot of work in a very low risk situation. Bless the safety people for allowing me the food-safe area in my classroom where we have all-day teacher workshops, however!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the administrative time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Working with student scheduling as well as bringing in students to the lab requires administrative time to be spent. Making sure that they have door access and are up to date on BioRaft. I am unsure what, if anything, could be done about this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Activity Reports, Periodic Performance Reviews, and Evaluations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collection of data and evaluation of faculty and staff are important. Is there a need for so many forms, however? For example, there are a lot of little boxes in staff evaluation forms, five pages worth of little boxes. The faculty form is, if anything, too minimal in comparison. For the Periodic Performance Reviews, why can't the last five years of Annual Activity reports be used? I realize not everyone has so very many proposals, grants, and presentations to re-report, but for me it seems like a lot of busy work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic lab training</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>We try to take in students that have previous laboratory experience or have at least taken the undergraduate lab classes. I have also trained some incoming freshmen, and they did turn out to be excellent. There is no way to get around this for undergrads. However, I do wish a lab class was required for incoming graduate students. Some of them do not have any wet lab experience, and they must do rotations. Usually by the time that they are competent enough to be turned loose, the semester and their rotation is almost over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collecting data on previous courses, grants, students etc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Our Head often asks again and again for the data on previous courses, grants, students etc (although these data never become public afterwards). All these data are already available from OSP, grad program coordinator and annual reports. Nevertheless, the burden of re-collecting and re-reporting the data are on faculty members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>through email/skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General student registration questions</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students simply don't know where to go for some basic things like registering for classes or who to speak to about scholarship. As physics undergrad mentor, I'm happy to answer questions about our major. But technical registration and financial aid questions need to go elsewhere. I'll check our department webpage for how we present my duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laboratory Management (part 2)</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Continued from previous shadow work item: A laboratory coordinator would develop lab operating costs and capital budgets. They would be responsible for lab-related purchasing. They would be a point of contact and reference for any safety-related issues in the lab. They would allocate and assign lab space and resources in equitable manner and prevent “territorial disputes” among faculty for lab space and resources. Prevent lab space from being utilized by faculty for non-lab items. They can create operations manuals in case of personnel turnover. Provide for continuity across lab sections and prevention of loss of resources from theft or breakage. In reality lab coordinators do much more than this, however, at in certain departments at UTD faculty members are currently acting as laboratory coordinators and I believe this is a tremendous amount of shadow work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logistical preparations for Summer Field Course</strong></td>
<td>once a year, 10-20 hours</td>
<td>If a department technician or similar position existed, they could handle reserving hotel/campsites, renting vehicles, procuring/maintaining perishable supplies (map paper, tape, office supplies, handling invoice/billing issues related to procurement, etc). I am paid during the month I am serving as a TA for the summer field geology course, but I do a significant amount of that work in the 1-2 months before the time period I am paid/employed for. During that time I am also paid as a Teaching Assistant, but in an unrelated course with its own responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding approvals</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I spend time determining what has not been approved in eprocurement, time and attendance, ePar. There must be a better way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paperwork for Summer Camps</strong></td>
<td>???</td>
<td>They have started a NEW office to help us with Programs for Minors (PACE). Hopefully this is going to make this situation better instead of worse. / Having an online portal to upload important documents instead of having them copied in a binder on a shelf would make ensuring that each participant has the proper forms and permissions from parents and guardians much easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading and commenting on incomprehensible student</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>I wish students today had the opportunity to learn, very early on, how to construct sentences. I also wish that they learned how to write introductory sentences for paragraphs, to facilitate a smooth transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments, research proposals, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>We used to have secretaries and grant officers to assist us with overseeing research grants and contracts- most of the burden has been moved to the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syncing files from home and office computers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This problem is not unique to UT Dallas. I have gathered many course materials, but some of these were downloaded at home and some on the office computer. I could move everything to cloud storage, but that is where I sync personal files. Perhaps our office drive could be made accessible from home, or we could switch all file systems on office computers to the cloud.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Non-NSM reported Shadow work items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your shadow work issue:</th>
<th>Approximate time in hours per month on this activity</th>
<th>Why and how might it be improved (1000 characters max):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABET documentation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The time given might be greater this year. ABET documentation includes making up the grade matrices that can feed the ABET on-line measurement charts plus copying class work for inclusion in the documentation of teaching/learning goals and results. The way to fix this is to have personnel (probably at least two) whose job is to document class processes by working with faculty, collecting samples, organizing data into volumes (either paper or electronic), and filling out the class review forms, given certain information from the faculty member for each class. This is an important issue, since with faculty responsible (at least in my opinion), the quality of input is low and the organization is more than likely poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABET reporting</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abet tracking of clos, if done correctly takes lots of work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tas can be trained to this, faculty should need to do minimal, if any, work on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Reconciliation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>While it does make some sense to have individual units do account reconciliation since the documentation for purchases resides in the units, this is a time consuming task that might be more efficiently handled by either providing specialized training or having people who have the specialized training doing the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account reconciliation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Approve only when issues are identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting II</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Training courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The people soft system requires that we approve all accounts (which I note are as clear as mud). The assistant staff have to keep double books too!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional signature needed on every document for payments for the JSOM.</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Needs to be a way to communicate necessary procedures are changed or changing in Finance, Payroll and HR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of tests.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>All undergraduate tests are written. They can be either administered in the lab environment or by the testing center. Neither have the capacity to accommodate so many students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative work at UTD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Have more support staff to provide support staff so that professors can spend time teaching and doing research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising for my group programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I should not have to market my services as a speech pathologist and should not be in charge of finding and enrolling patients in my groups. I should be free to plan the group and implement the therapy rather than having to prepare mailings and make phone calls. We have made a lot of improvements in the process that have helped, but the only way to fix this would be to hire someone for this job. It does not make sense to me that we do not have someone whose full-time job is to market our services at the Callier Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>I feel my entire job could be described as shadow work. The organic nature of being a consierge for the university means that I am to be adaptive and fluid. So my day is taken up by helping artists with whatever they need. This ranges from physical needs such as getting groceries and the like, to collecting supplies for their projects, being transported to events etc. I also help artists with their technical issues, building things, working out designs and custom hanging or presentation devices etc. It is difficult to separate the clearly stated aspects of my job from the ambiguous needs of its completion,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual compliance training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Less brain dead material; avoid repetitive information year after year; avoid long referrals to Policy memoranda that no one will remember; avoid jargon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual percent effort reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>make this a one or two click process, not the multiple steps currently required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answering emails</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I usually get bombarded with emails closer to tests or due dates. But students expect answers in this day and age within HOURS of sending, not 24-48 hours. the questions they ask tend to be broad in nature rather than specifically related to course material. It would be nice to refer students to WORKSHOPS? offered by the university: how to study for an exam, how to take notes, how to write an essay, how to register/add/drop classes, how to take public transportation to the museum. If some kind of easy handout sheet where I could refer them to someone else better equipped to answer these broad learning or registration questions, I would spend ALOT less time writing emails and ALOT more time doing things relevant to MY job duties. I maybe I should just make all of these handouts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answering phones/email</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>provide staff support to do the work that used to be done by support staff. Answering emails, phone calls etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any work done outside a 9-month contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate TAs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>My college does not allow faculty input on TAs which means I often get assigned TAs who cannot perform the duties I need assistance with. This leave me with extra grading and extra class management. It's really stressful, especially when I have a student load that's 120+ per semester and I don't have a TA to help me keep up on student emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving hourly timesheets for SS IIs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Put the SSII FTE position back on salary instead of hourly. The rigid and narrow interpretation of work classification in the position survey predisposed reclassification of the positions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Approving student work hours              | 2     | Students with hourly paid positions used to generate an hourly log sheet, which their
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty or staff supervisor would sign off on for their total hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>for each biweekly period. Currently, this process has been moved to Galaxy, where the supervisor now has to approve the hours reported by each student worker for each day, across each biweekly period. Although I understand moving the process to Galaxy, approving each daily set of hours for each student for every day across every biweekly period is quite inefficient. The interface for approval on Galaxy could be vastly improved, by Galaxy simply pulling up ALL of the days and hours that need to be approved for ALL the student workers in one screen. Currently, Galaxy only displays the daily hours for one week period for one student in every screen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange students papers in order</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There can be a process for students to follow or a machine to help with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>- Rewrite learning objectives so they line up better with assessments. In other words, let exam 1 assess CLO 1, exam 2 assess CLO 2, etc. instead of requiring that I divide each assessment score into multiple CLOs. The CLOs for the lab I'm teaching are particularly annoying. - Clarify what's needed for assessment. I'm chasing a moving target, which is time consuming and frustrating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending conferences and community venues where I read my work and</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>I don't think this can or should be eliminated, but it would be nice if I always got travel money and/or recognition from my school for doing this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speak about my research. Doing this has proved to be a good recruiting</td>
<td>times a</td>
<td>tool for the School of Arts &amp; Humanities, but I get no pay for doing any of this. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool for the School of Arts &amp; Humanities, but I get no pay for doing</td>
<td>semester,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any of this. A</td>
<td>for a few</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes for an entire weekend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending group meeting every week in 2011</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Since the group is big that includes at least 3 small groups, the meeting is very annoying. Some researcher would like to talk about the details for problems, then the meeting becomes a tedious discussion. Some researchers liked to make long presentation to present the progress. / / The group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meeting becomes concise after two years, each group will have its own meeting to discuss details, and the big group meeting is cancelled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Being a parent, more specifically being a mom of two young children</th>
<th>At least 350 hours a week</th>
<th>Being a mom I am responsible for their life and future path. Obviously, only school won't be enough to nourish their curious and enthusiastic mind. Also, there are many topic that they never get a chance to be introduced in school. On the top of that, there are school work and every day life responsibilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being assigned to work with an incoming professor who is unprepared</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Incoming professors should be coached by the administration and other faculty in regards to effectively detailing and communicating their research goals, before graduate students and staff are brought in to begin the work. Otherwise there will be many wasted meetings simply trying to figure out what is going on and what is expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget reconciliation</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>This could default to auto-approve after some number of days. Also, the PeopleSoft system is so difficult to interpret that I rely entirely on the dept. business admin's spreadsheet version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budgeting for grants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I write two hours per month but really the largest impact is in the summer months when I devote time to writing for grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budgeting/accounting of sponsored projects</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>As a professor, my budgets for grants require a huge slice of the funds to be reserved for &quot;indirect costs,&quot; most of which go to the university (e.g., OSP) for managing the accounting of the contract. But in practice, professors are tasked with much of this accounting work---probably more than half. I spend many hours performing account reconciliation, effort certification, budget certification, writing rebudgeting justifications, allocating personnel to cost centers, etc. In many cases I'm tasked with work that I don't even feel qualified to do (e.g., account reconciliation steps that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
require me to individually "approve" hundreds of spreadsheets that I only half comprehend). Either PIs should get less of this work, or we should be compensated more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buying program supplies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Because we need to have all the materials and supplies to work with the children and parents we serve. It could be improved by sending someone else to the store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying Scantrons/Blue Books/Pencils/Supplies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Having these supplies more available for staff/faculty on campus for classes that utilize them more often, or having students supply it for themselves. Often, we are required to bring &quot;extra&quot; for students who forget. It would be nice if we had some already available as I have had to make several trips off-campus to get them from the shop. I don't have to pay for them, but it is still a bit tedious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteia</td>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>The cafeteria inside UC is always busy so when I go get some food I stay in a line for approximately 25 minutes each day. Authority needs to add some more restaurants and lower the price as well. Because some of the food are way over price.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling or texting clients to remind them of the program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I have to call our clients to remind them of attending our program because it is important for us to retain a good number of participants. It would be improved if I had a system that would allow me to save participants information and send them group messages instead of having to enter their phone number one by one to send them a text message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advising and job/internship search assistance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Students do not feel they get the assistance they need elsewhere; Possible solution is to have a designated person in each school to supplement the Career Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO; department does the work then has to route to CBO for 'processing'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>return startup funds to school/department. the department is doing the purchasing, appointments and travel plans for the faculty, and then has to play intermediary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with CBO. Department cannot budget check or see the respective cost centers, so has to 'check' with CBO on things routinely instead of just being able to look it up. CBO has several staff now, who are basically 'checking' and recording the work of others. There is already oversight built into purchases, etc., via the approval of the respective purchase requisition, PRR/ePAR, etc. processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checking luggage at the airport</th>
<th>the activity occurred once a year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CitiBank OneCard Expense Reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the past, the monthly OneCard expense reports were generated and distributed to the faculty. The respective faculty member would simply need to enter a brief description of each expense item (e.g., &quot;equipment&quot;) and could indicate repeating descriptions with &quot;&quot;&quot;&quot;. / This process was recently replaced with an online CitiBank reporting system, where the faculty member has to now generate their own report, aside from providing a description of each expense item. It would be ideal if the expense reports were generated for the faculty as before, so that the faculty would simply need to add a description to each item before finalizing the expense report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Classroom reservation                          | 0.5      | All instructors should receive the access code for the equipment at their room at the beginning of each term without having to request. |

| Cleaning Office                                  | minutes  | Have staff dust bookcases and desks, clean up bugs, and empty recycling receptacles as they empty trash. |

| Cleaning office and emptying recycle receptacles | 1        | Have staff dust bookcases and desks, clean up bugs, and empty recycling receptacles as they empty trash. |

| Coaching and mentoring students in order to get them ready for sales competitions | 10       | Not attending the external sales competitions might be one way, but the students seems to be enjoying these trips a lot and it has a very positive impact on the university's image. Relying on the alumni of |
Coaching competitive programming teams | 10 | More assistance by students, perhaps other faculty

Collecting Data | 0.2 |

Committees | 15-30 | I get asked to serve on way too many committees at the department, school, and university levels (part of the problem being that I'm involved with two schools - ECS and ATEC). Being an assistant professor, I feel politically compelled to accept all of the committee requests that I receive. / A solution would be to keep a central website/database of committee service and having a University-wide rule that limits the number of committees that a professor can serve on. Then, popular professors would not have to worry about additional committee requests once their limit was reached.

Commute to work | 3 | Plan a week's meeting in 1-2 days

Compliance | | In addition to the annual compliance training, which has improved but is still too burdensome, our title ix and academic dishonesty programs can require a lot of work.

Computer confusion | 4 | The systems are changed during summer and breaks. It takes a lot of my time to figure out the changes and why the systems I use are not performing correctly. After finally figuring out something has changed, which happens on weekends when I am catching up on work, there is no tier 2 support available.

Computer maintenance | 2 | Schedule office visits to update computers.

Conference planning | 10 | We lack staff in EPPS for activities such as conference planning. We have an annual Alumni conference for our grads. in Public and Nonprofit Management. We use two tenure track faculty and two senior lecturers to pull this off. Easy to imagine that a simple activity-based cost analysis would show one staff person at $60K for EPPS
would more than pay for the many conferences faculty end up managing. I sometimes call myself (I am paid 6 figures) as an overpaid conference planner!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copying exams and lecture powerpoints for classes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>not really certain how these activities could be outsourced to automation. Outsourcing to another entity would result in recognizing a true cost for the efforts offered by faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering for my supervisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I catch the &quot;to do&quot; items that fall behind. I have to send reminders or offer availability to help to complete those tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating &amp; upkeeping online materials (gradebook, tests and quizzes)</td>
<td>20 per class</td>
<td>elearning should have a way to transform an existing document into a test and/or quiz instead of requiring every question and answer choice be re-written in the module. / / Provide more specific training on how to utilize the elearning system most efficiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating powerpoints and/or visual aids for lectures</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Create and provide university instructional resources by department and/or subject topic for instructors to share materials they have used to assist teaching topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current &amp; Pending Support Tracking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faculty in computer science typically submit many NSF grant proposals per year. For each one, we must include a &quot;Current &amp; Pending (C&amp;P) Support&quot; document that reports details for all our prior/current proposals. Theoretically, OSP has all this information (since all proposals pass through them), but presently the individual PIs are tasked with separately tracking this information in order to create their own C&amp;P documents. This can be very difficult, because many times I don't even know that I was listed on a prior proposal with many PIs (e.g., all faculty members in my research division), so I fail to include required information. I've asked why OSP doesn't have a means of auto-generating the C&amp;P docs for each professor, but have been told that somehow that information isn't being tracked suitably in PeopleSoft. This should be rectified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with eLearning site maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The software is overly complex and slow. It's useful to have a repository for the class, but a basic website would be better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with ridiculously picky issues with the IRB office, both for research and for my classes.</td>
<td>4 hr/semester</td>
<td>A good example is a case where a student applied for IRB approval for a project, and wanted to recruit volunteers with fliers. The student submitted a PDF image of the flier, but the IRB office demanded a printed copy on paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deleting announcement emails (seminars, university news, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>all announcements - including departmental seminar announcements, university news, defense announcements, etc. should be on website(s) instead of sent to my email box, where they currently serve as a distraction and frequent interruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district employment surveys</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I don't see how it could be improved except that I get paid for my time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing cleaning work at every program site before and after every class</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Because I work with children 0 to 3 years and have to make sure the rooms we use for our program are clean and safe for the families with serve. I don't think there is a way to improve this unless the sites were we have the program (libraries, school and community rooms) leave the room ready to get to the location and start setting up for the day,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downloading and updating annual license on statistical program(s) used for research</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Our administrative department or IT department should be in charge of getting licenses for statistical software and updating our computers. This only occurs once per year and would be very easy for an IT department to perform this task for 20 or so people. However, the time for each of those 20 individuals to figure out the ins-and-outs of doing it themselves is much higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving from Callier Center Dallas to Main Campus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>There is geographic separation between the Callier Center in Dallas and Main Campus. My home base is at the Callier Center in Dallas, but I often have to drive to Main Campus to attend meetings and events. I do not know how this could be improved, aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving to work</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Due to the fact that UTD is higher education, I can usually swing driving to and from work around traffic which puts my commute time at about half. If DART actually had a train directly to campus rather than having to take a bus from the dart station I would take public transport save time and money!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties that previously belonged to others are now my job duties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Previously duties belonged to others. I am told that these are now my responsibilities and they end up absorbed into my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail, mostly with students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I don't see how to fix this. I could be stricter about working with them only during office hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Check email on schedule maybe 5 times a day on 5 regular time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>We receive a lot of email that is not pertinent to our department or area. When I taught at other institutions, we only received email that pertained to our department, rather than the entire campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>I am receiving a ridiculous amount of emails. Even after extensively filtering spam, I receive an excessive number of listserv emails, general announcements, and emails from course students, research students, colleagues, staff, administration, industry folks, local community members, research community members, and service/review requests. I have created numerous email filtering rules to combat this issue, including separating emails into high priority, moderate priority, regular priority, and spam. Despite these filters, I still struggle to keep up with email while also taking care of my research and teaching duties. One improvement would be a university initiative to reduce listserv emails and to stop re-forwarding listserv emails. Another potential improvement would be to not make professor email addresses public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(though this could have negative...
consequences, such as not being reachable by funding agencies and program managers). It's a difficult problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Hours/Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>I think it would be nice if the school were to recognize how many hours all of us spend a day answering emails -- and I am talking about emails beyond what we'd normally do in response to those from students and bosses, etc. It would help if this is broadly considered when we are being evaluated for how much we work (Not that we should count the hours, because that's just more work, but to at least acknowledge the elephant in the room since everyone experiences the same issue... )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrollment outreach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The staff of student counselors' office or the school in general could have a dedicated professional to do the outreach and market classes to the prospective students in the university and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entering grades online for large courses</td>
<td>3 hr/semester</td>
<td>The problem is largely in the clumsiness of the programs. E.g., the main grade-recording program uses pull down menus which much be used for each student individually. This makes it more time-consuming than simply entering a grade. Another example is in eLearning. In grading papers I have to be sure to set the cursor to the right of a vertical slash in the box. If I aim wrong, the grade will appear as zero.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entering hours online</td>
<td>1 hr/semester</td>
<td>This is the only place I've worked where they did this this way. I admit I often forget to do it, and nothing bad seems to happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining external visitors to the center</td>
<td>5 hours per months</td>
<td>The 4 to 5 external speakers visiting the center each semester are scheduled to be taken out for dinner by the faculty on Sunday evening. This can be improved by either reducing the number of external speakers or moving the dinner to a weekday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entertaining guest visitors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have regular events in my research lab group but no asdministrative support to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling out surveys and similar tasks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Make sure they are really necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Much of the work of managing research accounts -- reimbursements, wages, purchases, account reconciliation -- is performed by faculty members. The secretarial help is sparse (one secretary for 15 faculty members) and unfamiliar with finance (an English major). Hence, we must learn accounting methods and regularly perform financial and accounting tasks. The university could save much by providing expert help, which is likely to be more productive and less expensive than faculty time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilling requests for filling out forms like this one and reports like SACS and taking compliance training for things like Title 9.</td>
<td>At least a couple of hours a week and sometimes more.</td>
<td>Often the links given to do these things don't work as they should and extra time is required to contact the person who sent the message and find out what to do instead. If this step could be eliminated it would eliminate a lot of wasted time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administrative support.</td>
<td>10-20, depending</td>
<td>There is a clear need for more administrative personnel. We are so understaffed now that I hesitate to ask our AA’s for anything, as they are clearly overworked. Faculty should primarily teach and do research, but an amazing amount of time seems to be taken up with day to day tasks that could be better handled by the AA’s. This includes copying, help with ABET items, filing, and any number of other support actions. If we can't hire enough AA's, how about androids/smart assistants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting keys</td>
<td>1 hour?</td>
<td>I had to get keys at the key office (inconvenient) and then they didn't work, so I had to go back and get the refitted. Maybe someone in the department could give out the keys in the actual building where they are being used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to meetings</td>
<td>2 to 6 hrs. per month</td>
<td>I really don't know how this time could be reduced or eliminated, but some of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
things that are currently discussed might be addressed via email. If so, this would eliminate time spent traveling to and from campus as well as time spent in meetings that often have little to do with teaching students creative writing.

<p>| Grading | 80 | While grading is considered a natural part of graduate school work, it is a huge drain of time and mental energy for what is essentially a repetitive task. / My personal experience with grading is that the amount I learn is miniscule compared to what real work I could have accomplished with the same amount of time. Once you graded the first paper, the next 40-200 paper don't offer any learning opportunities. I can say with certainty that being a grader has delayed my graduation by at least a year, if not two years, due to the inefficiencies created by grading. / I'm not sure what is a good solution, but I do know that a solution would more than double the research work-product. It is likely that only a combination changes in student numbers, homework amount and frequency, and perhaps new technologies such as online submissions and auto grading softwares, make up, in part, a solution recovering the 20 hours a week lost to mindless grading instead of productive research and learning. |
| Grading videos | 20 hours per semester | Another school I work for transitioned to canvas this semester. It has a lot more options that makes grading faster—from loading time to multiple submissions to calculating various percentages, such as attendance and assignments. My grading time has been cut in half at this school. |
| Grading, logging and posting grades. | 2.5 | One way might be to train students to do it or maybe look for some mechanical options to do the video watching. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant accounting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>checking a balance of an account for a funded research took much time. The people soft does not offer a convenient way to match expenses on the system with what I recorded. There were often a discrepancy between them. It took much time. A proper assistance would be greatly helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping staff with questions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring process</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Too many items to be done: PRR (hard copy) taking up to 1 month to route and get approved; PA7 to post job taking 1-2 weeks to complete; hiring proposal taking 1-2 weeks to complete. Consolidate need to resubmit data on PRR and job posting. If PRR is denied, posting can be denied also. Routing of forms is also time consuming and can disappear in several locations. Vague accountability in searching for lost items due to the trend of 'group' email boxes for <a href="mailto:budget@utdallas.edu">budget@utdallas.edu</a>, <a href="mailto:hr@utdallas.edu">hr@utdallas.edu</a>, <a href="mailto:compensation@utdallas.edu">compensation@utdallas.edu</a>, <a href="mailto:visashr@utdallas.edu">visashr@utdallas.edu</a>, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework(cooking, cleaning house and laundry, etc.)</td>
<td>140 hours</td>
<td>My husband is out of the country all the time. Therefore, I have to do the all of the housework. (I have two children.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an Adjunct and I speak and write as a sales trainer</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>If I can be more efficient and organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure how this is defined. I do a great deal of work with respect to planning and setting of schedules.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I probably should receive an administrative stipend for this work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot think of any</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't have any more issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no shadow work issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sponsor student organizations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I probably should be compensated for this work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in documentation proliferation/ duplication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good question!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoSecurity risk controls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stop treating all departments with a one-size-fits-all security policy and implementation. Academic computing systems, especially Computer Science using Open Source and public research, do not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
require most of the risk controls of administrative IT systems. Focus InfoSecurity where risk really exists instead of treating all systems as potential massive risk vulnerabilities. / Put OIT systems which students access in a different security zone; instead of sharing a security zone with Finance, Research, and Administration. / Hire some Network Architects and Engineers who are capable of providing the necessary segmentation instead of policy administrators and technicians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>junk email</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No way to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No way to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab cleaning, maintenance, organization, restocking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming students don't know how to run/maintain their labs. Professors are often too busy to train students. Senior lab member are too focused on finishing their work, to train new comers, or may not know themselves. / Hiring someone who can maintain all labs on a floor would ease the shadowwork from students and professors alike. We can have that someone provide proper training to new students, organize equipment, maintain msds and safety items, maintain backup softwares and operation manuals, inventory supplies, fill out forms for hazardous waste, etc. / Much of these tasks are often not done due to higher priority work, leaving the labs looking unprofessional, disorganized, and open to hazards. / Additionally, the problem of lost knowledge of inventory and in house methods can be minimized by having a the lab maintainable personnall keep a knowledge base of techniques and methods for future students. /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning all the administration requirements as a new adjunct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A detailed new instructor manual that is department specific that describes both the academic and administrative requirements and systems. If not for a relative who was a long time faculty I would have had no idea what was required prior to class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading the grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>this process can be modified and become more smooth through the upgrade of system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking up class rosters</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
<td>Provide each instructor with a roster of his/her course after two, four and six weeks of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking up teaching evaluations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide hard copies of end of semester teaching evaluations to all instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining documents for university and program committee work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make copies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Have TAs available to help with such tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making copies</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>Get a copy person for each department. By that I mean have someone else make the copies for us. There could be a standard form to fill out with how many copies need to be made, if they need to be stapled, etc. The copy person could put our copies in our boxes and email us when they are ready for pick-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making copies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Paid Student help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Teaching Materials</td>
<td>130 hours</td>
<td>Since I am a part-time Lecturer at UTD, therefore, I have three other jobs. / I have to make all different teaching materials. / I could ask other person to help me, but that is hard to do! /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making travel arrangements and One Card paperwork associated with travel expenses</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>This process should be streamlined where there is a staff person responsible for coordinating travel details and then collecting receipts that will be used in the reconciliation of the One Card statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manual creation and dissemination of catalog updates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>We have recommendation purchasing catalog software that would allow faculty to submit proposals for course and degree changes and would use a workflow system. Currently I have to collect word documents from faculty and cut &amp; paste or type them into a system that does not allow workflow for faculty and committees and does not produce usable savable documents for committee discussion. / 3 hours per month average is actually concentrated over 2 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many talks to communities</td>
<td>3 to 4 per year</td>
<td>Instead of asking one or two faculty to present at the community events (e.g., church talks, senior citizen centers, etc.), it would be useful to rotate faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meetings and committees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>With non-tenure/non-tenure-track faculty, acknowledging that these activities -- being on committees, working with student organizations, supervising capstones -- have value just as it does coming from tenure faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meetings over the summer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>payment for service work outside of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much more typing and preparing documents for myself for both teaching and administrative work. Email.40</td>
<td>40 +</td>
<td>I do not see a solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple logins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We should have single sign-on for university applications like galaxy, elearning, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple versions of my CV or annual report</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I literally have 6 versions of my CV. Some are unavoidable (NSF/NIH), but some are the creation of UTD. I have to maintain a UT public CV, an ABET CV, a Standard CV, and my own personal CV. I also have to produce multiple versions of my annual report: one for UTD, one for my department, one for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, etc. I spend SO MUCH TIME repackaging the same damn information over and over again into different formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough administrative support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A number of tasks were delayed because an administrative person did not process or did not follow up them. I had to work that was supposed to be done by an assigned administrative person. Often the administrative person was not in her/his office during business hours, which was another cause of wasting time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online forms are not easily accessible for instructor textbooks or for dual or outside employment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Put all such online reporting forms in one place. Have all forms delivered to one place instead of 2 possible places for dual or outside employment. If there is no change from semester to semester in text, provide a &quot;no change&quot; button or have the form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open door in office</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Our office area have limited access I need the commet card to open the door, but many people come asking by professors, I think the office hours or delivered of homeworks must be in other place, because we spend a lot of time each day taking care of open the door. Or may need to have a front desk to attend this people and provide access to professor's office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering books</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The campus bookstore requires a lot of information, and then they never quite manage to actually order all the books I request, which makes me have to go there to check and fix things. They also do not order desk copies, and make me do that myself. Off-Campus Books is much easier -- just the title and author and they order you desk copies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package pick up from central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Better update of when packages ordered are delivered to central and approximate times of delivery to labs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper file management system</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>We need to digitize our files so that we are not taking up storage space with paper files. In addition, it would be easier to pull up student records on the computer than to have to go find the file and review records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper work related to my grant budget</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Right now I spend a lot of time justifying every purchase I make that is linked to my grant and sending documentation of those purchases to multiple people at the university (in my department, school and university level). It seems like this is something an admin would have done at some point. It is tedious and time consuming and most definitely redundant. I have no idea why the different levels who need this documentation for different reasons can’t coordinate among themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork/Approvals</td>
<td>15-30</td>
<td>There is way too much work that requires a professor's input/approval: TA performance reviews, RA performance reviews, RA hiring forms, independent study forms, undergraduate research forms, Ph.D. committee forms, conflict of interest forms, cost center approvals, and tons of other unimportant forms that take time to review, complete, sign, and return. / / There should be a central, user-friendly (&lt;= PeopleSoft is NOT user friendly, especially the financials) website for all professor forms. A professor could simply login, click a few boxes, and apply their electronic signature. The forms could be sorted by deadline to facilitate submission of forms on time. Additionally, the ability to autocomplete a form with the previous input would be extremely helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking issues</td>
<td>varies, 10-30 hours</td>
<td>UTD need STAFF/FACULTY lots so that we do not spend valuable time in the morning and after off-site meetings looking for parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picking up and returning homework</td>
<td></td>
<td>Showing up early to hand stuff back and waiting late for everyone to arrive takes a lot of time. / Have an email system or a pick up drop off system for grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>placing my own orders online</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting vegetables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hire someone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting flyers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep for committees</td>
<td>It depends</td>
<td>Some committees are more time-consuming than others, but that is not necessarily reflected in the name of the committee. I don't necessarily see an improvement since I know some committees do work on things that require more time...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing lectures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Again, I don't think in terms of improving the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing JSOM from duplicating courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>It would be nice to stop JSOM's policy of offering ALL the courses that their students take regardless of whether they are being offered elsewhere on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement forms</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>While the intent was to make processing easier, the new procurement forms cost additional time in preparing documentation to upload. They require more work on the part of the end users. Procurement procedures are often changed without giving end users much, if any, notice. We find out about the changes when something doesn't work the way it previously did. Procurement tasks in themselves aren't frustrating, although we do way more of them than we used to do. The frustrating and time consuming part is making corrections and changes due to not receiving timely updates of process changes. By announcing and providing training aids well in advance of making process changes, we wouldn't be doing the work of correcting documents--only doing them the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Copyediting</td>
<td></td>
<td>With many students for whom English is not a first language, there is an imminent need for people with a strong knowledge of technical writing and copy editing skills for writing articles, proposals, and dissertations. Since there is none that I'm aware of, this work currently goes to graduate students who know English well. I have spent many hours helping my colleagues fix their grammar, spelling, and other writing issues. I'm sure there are many native and nonnative English speakers for whom this a big drain of time. It wouldn't surprise me if many professors as well have become copyeditors for their non-native English speakers. The solution would be to have a small team of copy editors who will work with students and professor to create high quality papers and proposals. It's obvious that this will improve the chances of papers being accepted in high journals, and of proposals winning grants, leading to a boost in the rankings of the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump gas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumping gas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing esp. chemicals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Justification of all processes as being for research - of course it is. Fighting with purchasing over service contracts as if they know what's best. Why can't purchasing accept our views?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing selection limit on Dell catalog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Return the Dell Premier catalog back to the original full catalog listing of all available items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCR Compliance Courses</td>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>This is an excellent example of shadow work. Rather than sitting through a 1-hour seminar, research assistants are responsible for training ourselves via an online course and taking a quiz at the end. Scoring an 80% or higher is required (not sure who set this standard?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and grading student assignments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>It is part of the job. I don't think the idea to improve is the way to approach the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Irrelevant Email</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>I find myself spending a great deal of time – at least an hour per day – reading and deleting email messages that are irrelevant. I found even more time when I realize that an important message has been overlooked because of the volume of unsolicited messages from university sources. The university could economize on the time of faculty and staff by limiting the amount of unsolicited email sent by individuals and offices within the university. The university should allow individuals to opt-out of such messages. We must be aware that sending email is free, but reading and deleting it is not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant and offensively boring training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stop training on the same thing over and over and hire real designers for this poor quality communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant reporting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I don't know whether this constitutes &quot;shadow work&quot;, but UTD requires its personnel to redundantly assemble and submit the same information in many different reports. For example, each faculty member's Annual Report for EECS must list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformatting ABET Reports</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>In our department, reformatting ABET reports for compliance purposes is frequently off-loaded to graduate students - who could better spend their time on research / thesis tasks, or finding an advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering Nothing To Report once a month on payroll form</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>This is entirely unnecessary; it should default to this unless separate action is taken within some number of days of the end of the pay period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Holds/Add Holds</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Advisors and the higher ups have the authority to add and release holds but since we can become so busy, I have to add holds to students and sometimes it takes me a long time since there are thousands of students in JSOM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetative Time Reporting Reminders to Faculty and Employees</td>
<td>4.5-6 hours depending on reminders neccessary</td>
<td>While I take responsibility for sending out timesheet reminders for Faculty and EEs, it is cumbersome to be expected to follow up repeatedly within the same pay period with the same people. Time reporting is a repetitive action that should not require hand holding each pay period like clock work. If an employee does not report on time or correctly, their pay can be effected creating extra work on my end as well as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
others. Not to mention the frustration and wasted time that results from sending the same reminder several times within a week instead of EEs taking accountability for their own paychecks. Resources are always available on the webpage, but for whatever reason the same employees either disregard my reminders, or request to be retaught how to submit time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetitive Compulsory training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>We are asked to repeat training for items that have been delivered in prior periods or by previous employers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting sick days and vacation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Let person's supervisor, department chair, program head handle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting sick time</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>This doesn't take long, now that someone created a handy NTR button. I have to remember to do it by setting it to pop up in my outlook calendar, but it seems silly that it needs to be done at all (as far as I can tell, but of course there may be circumstances outside of my awareness).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request paper, or supplies stuff for printers and also pickup the supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The printer is used for a lot of people in the building and I think some one must be on charge of control the supplies, many times the paper is not there or the ink is empty. The after report we have to wait a long time or pick up the supplies for myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research required for promotion, but requiring summer work</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>calendar year contracts /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, daily content reading and online continuous search for professional communication related material.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest room</td>
<td>6 hours per month</td>
<td>We do not have our staff restroom inside the suit. We are using toilet with everyone else. The closest one from my office is always dirty so I have to walk to a different toilet which is cleaner than the one next to us. To prevent this problem I think authority can build some restroom inside our suit for staff and faculty members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning phone calls that could be returned by anyone</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have discussed this with my supervisor and it's difficult. Many times people call me and want to tell me their life story only to ask a simple question that could have been answered by a quick visit to our website. We are trying to direct these calls to administrative assistants, but many people have my direct number and it ends up being easier for me just to answer their questions. The only way this could be fixed is if I get a new phone extension that nobody knows and I don't give it to anyone, which would require a transfer for every call that needs to come to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewing journal articles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing manuscripts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running high school programming contests</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing with other faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS reports</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well, this isn't exactly work that is not part of my job, and it is one that's intended to actually create metrics for job success. Yet it's definitely the most time-consuming thing I do unrelated to teaching and research. I grasp the value of it, but it's unrelenting and often seems like it gets socked away without being looked at.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning documents</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes the work study students don't show up so I take on more work by doing their job. We need consistent and hard working work study students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheduling of classes for program and then reviewing the input multiple times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As cost saving strategies, staff have vacated positions that have been subsequently cut or unfilled. This means that faculty responsible for program course schedules end up doing all the work including input into a spreadsheet format and them closely monitoring mistakes that take place as other staff have their hands in the process. This used to be done by a staff person where a particular format didn't have to be followed - just listing of courses, days and times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scholarship for non-tenure or non-tenure-track faculty | 25 | More of an understanding that scholarship is not just what tenure faculty do, but that it informs the work of clinical faculty and lecturers, as well. Also, having some sort of system where this is officially recognized in some way would go a long way at expanding inclusiveness at UTD and showing that this kind of work by non-tenure faculty is valued.

See below

Matthew - I am a graduate TA in Arts and Humanities. As a TA, my work is directed by, and consists of, whatever the professor I work for needs me to do. As such, I don't feel I can add significantly to your study.

See first question

Self Checkout at different places | 1 |

self checkouts at the grocery store | 1-3 hrs |

Not sure, most of the time it's faster and I get my groceries bagged the way I want if I do it myself.

self-check-out | less than 1 |

semester assessment reports | 10 |

We are required to assess core objectives for classes each semester. I do not think that adjunct faculty should be required to participate in these reports, since it is very time consuming and we are not paid extra for this. The department is supposed to be working on a template that would make this easier.

Service time | 5 |

I'm again not sure how to improve this other than not being involved, which for me is not an option. I like the areas in which I serve. At the same time, students and others seem not to respect time boundaries.

sick leave reporting | 0.1 |

make the default no reporting required; report only WHEN leave is used!

Signing forms | 20 |

These forms could easily be auto-populated with data, and if the data meets a criteria level, be automatically approved. Those not meeting the criteria could be in a workflow queue. / In addition to the hours wasted by me - we are wasting paper and handling time by other departments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small tasks a student worker could do</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Hire more student workers. ECE hires student workers to staff the reception desk. Many times it does not even cover the needed M-F 8am-5pm and AA's must take care of reception desk duties. We need multiple workers so the AA staff can have a worker available to assist with tasks that cannot be accomplished at the front reception desk, such as setting up/tearing down a meeting/lecture, printing and posting flyers for advertisement, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Running social media accounts for the program is time consuming (and everyone has an option). It requires me to spend extra time on social media in ways that waste my research time. Additionally, it means wrangling faculty to tell me information and send me things like press releases. Surely there is a way to centralize this for programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software updating on two computers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solving medical insurance issues</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Most insurance issues I have to solve, both for myself and my folks. It used to be that the staff at the doctors office took care of insurance related forms for dental and medical care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorting through data</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>We have data warehouse reports available, but the data should be presented in dashboards - there are too many separate reports with data in different places that must be merged. We also need a simple query system - for example I should be able to pull the number of students in a major who are not core complete - this is not available without a special request. We do not have good school level retention data available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spreadsheets and graphs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>People who actually know what they are doing could be setting these up, so I don't have to spend many hours trying to format things. Hard to remember what to do when you do it rarely and are untrained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student advising outside of my normal duties</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>For the last two semesters I have been asked by students and the ATEC department to be a member or advisor on capstones and Graduate projects. I’m not tenure track so these kinds of responsibilities aren’t a normal part of my job duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student mentorship, resume reviews, intern applications, etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Now provide personal assistance, could have some guidance from career placement office on any protocols, policies, procedures, practices, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Paper Sign-In Log</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>We currently have our students sign-in on a paper sheet when they arrive at our office. We need an automatic, computer-based system that would allow students to swipe in with their Comet Card. So far we have been denied when we have requested and our student workers spend hours entering the visitor log into a spreadsheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submitting grades to the registrar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The web page that we use to submit course grades, the one that requires a pull-down menu for every single letter grade for every student, is extraordinarily tedious to use. I don’t know how to design web pages so I don’t know how to improve it, but I’m sure there must be a better way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submitting paperwork for travel approval, making hotel reservations, making airline reservations, submitting international travel information to SOS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not certain how this could be automated any more than it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submitting same/similar information in several formats required by varying departments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ex: RA/TA appointments require several notifications: notification for scholarships, notification to Grad Dean’s office, notification to HR for new appointments, ePARs, etc., all requiring the same information in different formats (spreadsheets.) Resolution is the various areas meet and decide on one format which provides the required info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Graduate Tracking</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>This may seem like an insignificant amount of time, but it is an hour and a half spent on inputting information that could already be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking student teams to ACM ICPC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Taking turns with other faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking work surveys like this one</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Find a different way to collect the desired data points that doesn't contribute to the problem that the survey is trying to find solutions for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to students about job and academic prospects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook orders and book orders for desk copies</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Again, the process needs to be streamlined so that book orders to all possible locate textbook stores can be handled in one step. Further, ordering desk copies of books is time consuming and could be handled by a staff person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main one is account reconciliation, but I have not been doing that lately</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Eliminate it or make it once a year or semester. Or if you have no money in the account (which was usually my situation) it should not be needed at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things like filling the copier machine in my office</td>
<td>10 minutes a week</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time consuming on Administrative issue</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>It would help to have a half a day session, introduction new or part time faculty to administrative processes/requirements. Lot of time was spent in trying to figure out who the right contact is and how it requires to be done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time supporting student teachers in adapting to the classroom, securing a teaching position, coaching through difficult life situations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timesheets</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Approve by designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timesheets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Why do I have to submit a timesheet if I can only say &quot;NTR&quot;? Why do I have to approve my RA timesheets if they can only say &quot;NTR&quot;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timesheets</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I would imagine that managers of larger teams would need to spend much more time than I have estimated if they were to verify each hour their team members worked. In many cases, especially with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
multiple shift teams, it seems like providing sign-off does not, perhaps can not, easily include verification. In such cases, I would wager that this task is not only draining hours, but also has become a click-thru.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracking down policies</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>Technical writing course requires following IRB requirements for all studies conducted on campus. All contact information should be centrally located and made available to all instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking down relevant text</td>
<td></td>
<td>There should be a general policy that faculty/staff receive teaching copies of their required text materials. Those materials should be delivered in a timely fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking personal work output for schoolwide performance metrics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I am required to keep a log of my activities, which I agree should be required. I could send to a &quot;clerk&quot; type person the URLs or my output (I am primarily a writer/PR person for JSOM) and have that person track. (I use a simple excel spreadsheet for this.) This task is not technically difficult, but it is time consuming and does require situational awareness of what my job requires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training my supervisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Creation of standardization of policies/procedures/forms/trainings and them publishing them even if in an internal method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>We used to send travel requests to the travel agency. Now for every student team trip and every faculty trip, we make the arrangements ourselves, so in addition to collecting required forms, we also have to find and book the trips. The software we use isn't always user friendly and that sometimes results in wasted time because we still have to get assistance from a travel agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>The university insists that we purchase travel through a travel agent. The travel agent is hard to reach, and when you do – their prices are often higher than a direct purchase, they are slower, and they</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
frequently make booking mistakes. On top of that, they charge a fee for each booking. The university would save money, by paying lower fares and freeing up faculty time, if we could purchase travel directly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Have to attend conferences and meet family, hard to improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Purchasing procedures</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Procedures changes create more work. PeopleSoft Travel and Expense module not being utilized. Faculty Senate committee making decision to lessen their load; however, it puts the burden on the low paying, overworked clerical staff. I feel they do not comply with the DS2 policy or the OMB circular. I don't feel the faculty have a large amount of &quot;shadow work&quot;. They should be aware of and proficient in the administrative aspect of their duties, especially when grants are involved. Furthermore, their RAs do most of their grunt work. Since we are a state funded institution, the faculty should be accountable for their spending and the UT System policy and procedures. We should not be comparing the UT System with Cornell. We are not in the same league as them and we are not funded in the same manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel arrangements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>While the actual time spent making arrangements is small, the anxiety around getting approval, getting the card for registration, and not having a seamless system in place for managing these travel-related practices creates more emotional (worrying) and scheduling (arriving in the office when I need a card, for instance, at a time when someone is ready for me) work than is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel plans &amp; reimbursements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>It would be great to have staff who could make travel plans and help with the red tape associated with travel authorizations and reimbursement. Other universities I've been at have such assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel related arrangements and paperwork</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Having to organize and plan all of the travel related paperwork is very time consuming. Between dealing with Concur (it was way easier when I could just call Concur and have a travel agent do it), finding the correct forms, filling them out, and routing them to the correct place, the entire process and tedious and time consuming. This is especially true in light of the fact that it's the same process every time. Surely there's a way to automate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Conference</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Booking of hotel and travel reimbursement required detailed documentation. My recommendation is either just give a flat too and from if driving via google, flight reimbursement, hotel reimbursement, and a flat per diem. Tracking every receipt is difficult. Especially in groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troubleshooting technology problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I teach one class which meets 2 nights per week. I have attempted to call Technology or Media for help, but assistance is not immediate and it is difficult for class to proceed. Training on how to use the technology would be helpful. Immediate reaction times when something doesn't work would also be helpful. Phone numbers posted in every classroom of who to call for specific tech issues would also be helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updating information in my vita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish a central database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uploading Documents to Onbase</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sometimes the work study students don't show up so I take on more work by doing their job. We need consistent and hard working work study students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uploading syllabi to multiple sites</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allow elearning to draw syllabi from coursebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various people review expense reports over and over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teach admin people how to do it right once and monitor them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verifying locked doors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>My primary work place includes a special venue that requires extra caution to security. The equipment within is sensitive, and is often setup in a particular configuration for activities the following</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
day(s). We recently installed security cameras, which also takes time to review the footage when we occasionally discover overnight anomalies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verifying Receipt of Requisitions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>On certain purchases it is important that skilled folks verify that the equipment delivered is what was purchased and functions as such. On the other hand, everyday consumables such as extension cords, batteries, and office supplies, don't necessarily need to be counted by the end user, in order to create the required receipt of goods needed by the fiscal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting for old UTD lab computers to start up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Upgrade outdated computers with modern PCs or at least solid state drives. Sometimes you can have three lab members waiting for a PC to turn on to perform an experiment. Even at $10/hr X 3 employees thats already $30/hr or half way towards a computer hard drive upgrade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking from parking lot to my office building</td>
<td>7 hours per month</td>
<td>Every corporate office has designated parking spot for employees unlike us UTD employees constantly fighting for our paid parking spot with thousands of students. It would have been better if we have either parking area near our office building or separate lot for faculty and staff only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watering vegetables/plants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Set up an automatic watering system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing letters of recommendation for students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing papers, preparing reports, working on research projects</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Providing credit to people involved in the specific project, providing some type of compensation or reward, either monetary or non-monetary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Item 13: Approval of BBS Bylaws
School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences

Bylaws Revision Approved at BBS Faculty Meeting, May 9, 2017

PREAMBLE

The mission of the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences is to understand the intersection of mind, brain and behavior; to enhance the health, education, and quality of life of children and families; and to create and implement technologies and therapies that repair and strengthen human abilities. We accomplish these goals by recruiting and supporting outstanding faculty to do innovative research and offer student training in a climate that fosters collaboration across disciplines. The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences offers excellent educational programs at all levels, including carefully designed courses and ample opportunities for mentoring in research laboratories and in internship settings. We seek a high level of engagement with the Dallas, Richardson, Plano, and other North Texas communities by offering a broad array of clinical services, public lecture series, and faculty experts as consultants and speakers for community groups.

The academic programs of the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences are organized into three major areas: Cognition and Neuroscience, Communication Sciences and Disorders, and Psychological Sciences. The Cognition and Neuroscience Area includes undergraduate programs in Cognitive Science and in Neuroscience, a master’s program in Applied Cognition and Neuroscience, and a doctoral program in Cognition and Neuroscience. The Communication Sciences and Disorders Area includes an undergraduate program in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, a master’s program in Communication Disorders, and doctoral programs in Audiology and in Communication Sciences and Disorders. The Psychological Sciences Area includes undergraduate programs in Psychology and in Child Learning and Development, master’s programs in Psychological Sciences and in Human Development and Early Childhood Disorders, and a doctoral program in Psychological Sciences. Each major area is guided by an Area Head and an Associate Area Head who lead the faculty in developing and delivering the academic curriculum. Faculty members have a primary affiliation with one major Area but are encouraged to participate in multiple areas.

The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences faculty also participate in four vibrant Centers: the Callier Center for Communication Disorders, the Center for BrainHealth, the Center for Children and Families, and the Center for Vital Longevity. The Centers enhance the academic programs by housing research activities and providing important training opportunities for students as well as clinical services and outreach programs for the community. Each Center has its own leadership, operating procedures, and bylaws.

The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences conducts business through the regular meetings of Area faculty, and at least twice yearly meetings of the entire school faculty, conducted by the Dean. We have long maintained a collegial, collaborative atmosphere in which Deans, Associate Deans, and Area Heads regularly consult with faculty members, and in which suggestions and concerns are openly shared with the leadership of the school.
**FACULTY**

The voting members of the faculty in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences are individuals defined as voting members of the General Faculty per UTDPP1088:

1. Faculty appointed half-time or more to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Regental Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor.
2. Faculty appointed half-time or more to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Instructor (Note: Per UTD P1057, the rank of Instructor is a probationary appointment and is reserved explicitly for those cases in which a faculty member's appointment is initiated prior to receipt of the highest professional degree in his/her field. It is otherwise equivalent to the rank of Assistant Professor and requires that the standards for that rank be met).
3. Faculty appointed full-time to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, or Senior Lecturer, i.e., includes (1) faculty appointed half-time or more to UTD who hold the rank of Regental Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Instructor; and (2) all tenured and tenure-track professors faculty appointed full-time to UTD who hold the rank of Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, or Senior Lecturer.

Also consistent with UTDPP1088, non-voting members of the faculty of SBBS are all persons who hold the following titles:

1. Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Assistant Professor
2. Clinical Instructor and Instructor (less than half-time appointment)
3. Lecturer, Adjunct Professor (Assistant/Associate/Full), Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Assistant Professor; Professor Emeritus, Associate Professor Emeritus and Associate Professor Emeritus; and Research Scientists and Research Associates holding appointments outside the classified pay plan of the University. All faculty meetings are open meetings and instructors may attend, except for meetings involving faculty personnel decisions, which may only be attended by above rank faculty.

Faculty members are assigned to academic programs within the school by self-selection. There is no limitation on the number of programs with which a faculty member can affiliate. For administrative purposes, each BBS faculty member is required to select one of the three major Areas of BBS (Cognition and Neuroscience, Communication Sciences and Disorders, and Psychological Sciences) as his or her primary academic home, but faculty may select an unlimited number of secondary affiliations with other BBS Areas and programs. Faculty members may be affiliated with one or more of the School's Centers in the School by mutual agreement of the faculty member, the Center Director, the relevant Area Head, and the Dean. Disputes regarding faculty affiliations with programs or centers will be resolved first by discussion between the faculty member and the Area Head or the Center Director, and if they cannot be resolved, then by discussion with the Dean.

**SBBS FACULTY MEETINGS AND VOTING BY THE SCHOOL FACULTY**

Regular Meetings
At minimum, two regular meetings of the voting faculty of BBS will be held each academic year, in one near the start of the fall and spring semesters and one near the beginning of the spring semester. Additional meetings may be called by the Dean if necessary for academic reasons, or if requested by members of the voting faculty. Regular meetings will be chaired by the Dean or the Dean’s Designee. All SBBS faculty members, voting and non-voting, may attend regular SBBS faculty meetings. A quorum for a regular faculty meeting will be a majority of the voting faculty who are in residence that term. A quorum of the voting faculty is required for any votes on major changes in academic policy. Minutes will be kept by the Associate Dean for Programs and Administration and will be made available to faculty via email. Meetings will be announced at least two weeks in advance with an agenda distributed at least one week in advance. Additional items proposed during the meeting not on the published agenda will be accepted by majority vote. Major decisions will be confined to meetings held during the nine month terms for which most faculty members are appointed.

Caucus Meetings

Caucus meetings of the voting faculty may be held without the Dean or Associate Deans being present, though caucus meetings cannot make policies for the school that require the assent of the Dean. Caucus meetings can formulate positions to be considered with the Dean at regular meetings. A faculty member or a group of faculty members can call a caucus meeting of the faculty via email. Every effort should be made to announce a caucus meeting two weeks in advance and to circulate an agenda, but in the case of urgent matters, meetings may be called on shorter notice.

Conduct of Business

Given our long history of cooperation and collaboration among faculty members and leaders in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, meetings will be led by the Dean, with ample opportunity for questions and discussion by faculty members. Faculty meetings will not be conducted following Robert’s Rules of Order unless the majority of faculty members present vote to invoke these rules at a particular meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

Dean

The Dean of the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences leads and supports the faculty in the school’s missions of understanding the intersection of mind, brain and behavior; enhancing the health, education, and quality of life of children and families; and creating and implementing technologies and therapies that repair and strengthen human abilities. The Dean works with the Associate Deans and Area Heads to recruit and support outstanding faculty to do innovative research and offer student training in a climate that fosters collaboration across disciplines. The Dean works with the Associate Deans and Area Heads to offer excellent educational programs at all levels, including carefully designed courses and ample opportunities for mentoring in research laboratories and in internship settings. The Dean fosters a high level of engagement with the Dallas, Richardson, Plano, and other North Texas communities by supporting the faculty in offering a broad array of clinical services, public lecture series, and faculty members as consultants and speakers for community groups. The Dean is responsible for the finances and physical resources of the school, and represents the school to the Provost and President. The Dean recommends the appointment of new faculty to the Provost, in consultation with faculty search committees. With the exception of the elected Academic Advisory Council and the Faculty Personnel Review Committees, the Dean appoints the members of school faculty committees in
consultation with the Academic Advisory Council. The Dean appoints members of search and Ad Hoc tenure and promotion committees in consultation with the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. The Dean is primarily responsible for annual reviews of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members, and conducts Periodic Performance Reviews in consultation with the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. The Dean works collaboratively with the Associate Deans and the Area Heads to foster a collaborative, collegial environment where different disciplines are respected, newer faculty are mentored and supported, open communication about challenges is fostered, and new initiatives are welcomed and carefully considered.

**Associate Dean of Graduate Studies**

The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies leads all efforts to enhance graduate education across programs in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences (BBS). This includes coordination across graduate degree programs in curricula, semester course offerings, graduate student recruitment, compliance with institutional and state policies related to graduate education, and appointment and assignment of teaching and research assistants. The Associate Dean convenes and works with the School’s Graduate Studies Committee to oversee and advance graduate education in the School. With the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies coordinates course scheduling and faculty teaching assignments across school programs. The Associate Dean works with graduate students having academic difficulty, and responds to graduate students’ concerns and academic grievances, often by involving the relevant Area Head. The Associate Dean for Graduate Studies serves as the BBS Representative on the Committee for Graduate Education, develops curriculum and program milestones so as to comply with state mandates, and communicates all institutional and state policies to faculty. The Associate Dean is responsible for coordinating the periodic evaluation of graduate programs. The Associate Dean is charged with maintaining the quality and integrity of graduate education across programs in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies is appointed by the Dean in consultation with BBS faculty. The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies must be a tenured faculty member.

**Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies**

The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies leads all efforts to enhance undergraduate education across programs in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences. The Associate Dean convenes and works with the Undergraduate Studies Committee to oversee and advance undergraduate education in the School. The Associate Dean oversees the development of all recruitment activities and materials to attract outstanding undergraduates. The Associate Dean supervises the academic advisors in implementing university policies and advising undergraduates. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies supports high quality teaching by developing teaching policies and communicating these to faculty; and consulting with new faculty on teaching needs, expectations and policies. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies is responsible for developing and revising webpages to communicate with undergraduate students about academic issues, and for holding a yearly majors meeting and other professional development events for undergraduate students. With the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies coordinates course scheduling across school programs. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies works with undergraduate students having academic difficulty, and responds to undergraduates’ concerns and academic grievances, often by involving the relevant Area Head. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies serves as the BBS Representative on the Committee for Undergraduate Education (CUE), develops Core curricula so as to comply with state mandates, and communicates all
institutional and state policies to faculty. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies is responsible for coordinating reviews for accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) for undergraduate programs. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies is charged with maintaining the quality and integrity of undergraduate education across programs in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies is appointed by the Dean in consultation with BBS faculty. The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies must be a tenured faculty member.

**Associate Dean for Programs and Administration**

This position in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences is charged to work with the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the Dean to ensure that School programs are effective and in compliance with institutional policies and objectives. Specifically, the holder of this position facilitates activities such as faculty reviews, faculty hiring, faculty governance, program reviews, accreditation compliance, teaching effectiveness, research infrastructure, community outreach, faculty mentoring and other operational domains. The Associate Dean for Programs and Administration also guides special projects and participates with the other Associate Deans, the Academic Advisory Council, Area Heads and Center Directors to develop priorities for new initiatives.

The Associate Dean for Programs and Administration is appointed by the Dean in consultation with BBS faculty. The Associate Dean of Programs and Administration must be a tenured faculty member.

**Area Head for Cognition and Neuroscience**

The Area Head for Cognition and Neuroscience leads the faculty in enhancing programs and curricula in Cognition and Neuroscience, with the support of the Associate Area Head and in coordination with the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. The Area Head oversees the development and the review of the Cognition and Neuroscience curriculum at the undergraduate, masters, and doctoral levels. The Area Head provides information to the Associate Deans of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies for SACS reviews. The Area Head reviews and updates the catalogue annually, and insures that all courses are offered as indicated in the catalogue. The Area Head leads the faculty in developing priorities for new faculty hires. The Area Head communicates with faculty and lecturers about teaching assignments and provides the Cognition and Neuroscience portions of the schedule to the Associate Deans for Undergraduate and Graduate Studies for coordination across programs. The Area Head is responsible for selecting, appointing, and evaluating all lecturers in Cognition and Neuroscience. The Area Head supervises the recruitment of doctoral students in Cognition and Neuroscience, oversees admissions decisions, and plans a variety of activities for Cognition and Neuroscience doctoral students to create an intellectually rich graduate student culture that prepares students for professional careers. The Area Head provides input to the Dean for consideration in annual evaluations and Periodic Performance Evaluations of faculty.

The Area Head is appointed by the Dean in consultation with area faculty, for a term of five years, renewable. The Area Head must be a tenured faculty member.

**Area Head for Communication Sciences and Disorders**

The Area Head for Communication Sciences and Disorders leads the faculty in enhancing programs and curricula in Communication Sciences and Disorders, with the support of the Associate Area Head and in coordination with the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Associate
Dean for Graduate Studies. The Area Head oversees the development and the review of the Communication Sciences and Disorders curricula at the undergraduate, masters, and doctoral levels. The Area Head provides information to the Associate Deans of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies for SACS reviews and for reviews by accrediting bodies for professional degrees in speech-language pathology and in audiology. The Area Head reviews and updates the catalogue annually, and insures that all courses are offered as indicated in the catalogue. The Area Head leads the faculty in developing priorities for new faculty hires. The Area Head communicates with faculty and lecturers about teaching assignments and provides the Communication Sciences and Disorders portions of the schedule to the Associate Deans for Undergraduate and Graduate Education for coordination across programs. The Area Head is responsible for selecting, appointing, and evaluating all lecturers in Communication Sciences and Disorders. The Area Head supervises the recruitment of doctoral students in Communication Sciences and Disorders, oversees admissions decisions, and plans a variety of activities for doctoral students to create an intellectually rich graduate student culture that prepares students for professional careers. The Area Head provides input to the Dean for consideration in annual evaluations and Periodic Performance Evaluations of faculty.

The Area Head is appointed by the Dean in consultation with area faculty, for a term of five years, renewable. The Area Head must be a tenured faculty member.

**Area Head for Psychological Sciences**

The Area Head for Psychological Sciences leads the faculty in enhancing programs and curricula in Psychological Sciences, with the support of the Associate Area Head and in coordination with the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. The Area Head oversees the development and the review of the Psychological Sciences curricula at the undergraduate, masters, and doctoral levels, as well as the undergraduate program in Child Learning and Development (CLDP). The Area Head provides information to the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies for SACS reviews. The Area Head reviews and updates the catalogue annually, and insures that all courses are offered as indicated in the catalogue. The Area Head leads the faculty in developing priorities for new faculty hires. The Area Head communicates with faculty and lecturers about teaching assignments and provides the Psychological Sciences and Child Learning and Development portions of the schedule to the Associate Deans for Undergraduate and Graduate Education for coordination across programs. The Area Head is responsible for selecting, appointing, and evaluating all lecturers in Psychological Sciences. The Area Head supervises the recruitment of doctoral students in Psychological Sciences, oversees admissions decisions, and plans a variety of activities for Psychological Sciences doctoral students to create an intellectually rich graduate student culture that prepares students for professional careers. The Area Head provides input to the Dean for consideration in annual evaluations and Periodic Performance Evaluations of faculty.

The Area Head is appointed by the Dean in consultation with area faculty, for a term of five years, renewable. The Area Head must be a tenured faculty member.

**CENTERS AND INSTITUTES**

Members of the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences faculty have the opportunity to participate in four affiliated research Centers: the Callier Center for Communication Disorders, the Center for BrainHealth, the Center for Children and Families, and the Center for Vital Longevity. The Centers enhance the academic programs by housing research activities and by providing important
training opportunities for students as well as clinical services and outreach programs for the community. Each center has its own leadership and operating procedures, and its own by-laws. Center Directors will only propose new hires in consultation with Area faculty, consistent with Area priorities for hires, and will notify the Dean and program area faculty prior to proposing new positions.

**EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS**

Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and Area Heads are subject to upward evaluation under the UTD policy on *Evaluation of Academic Administrators - UTDPP1047*.

**STANDING COMMITTEES**

**Academic Advisory Council**

The Academic Advisory Council consists of the Dean, the three Associate Deans, the three Area Heads, and three *tenure-system faculty elected members of any rank elected each spring*: one from Cognition and Neuroscience, one from Communication Sciences and Disorders, and one from Psychological Sciences. The Academic Advisory Council will meet monthly to discuss academic policy. The Associate Dean for Programs and Administration will prepare minutes of each Academic Advisory Council meeting which will be shared with all BBS faculty.

**Faculty Personnel Review Committee**

The Faculty Personnel Review Committee (FPRC) is an elected faculty committee that consults with the Dean on the appointment of Ad Hoc Committees for promotion and tenure reviews, policies on annual reviews of faculty, Periodic Performance Evaluations, reviews of applications for Special Faculty Development Assignments, and appointment of all search committees. As stated in UTDPP1077, Faculty Personnel Review Committees are chaired by the Dean of the School and must include at least four tenured faculty members from the School elected by the faculty. Because only equal or above-rank faculty can participate in these reviews, this committee should consist of tenured full professors. Members of the committee will be elected for two year terms with no members succeeding themselves. The election of the Faculty Personnel Review Committee will be conducted each spring by the Associate Dean for Programs and Administration.

All *tenured and tenure-system* faculty members other than *tenured* Professors will have their previous year’s work reviewed annually by the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. This annual review can lead to:

1. A recommendation that an Ad Hoc committee be composed to assess the faculty member's suitability for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, or
2. In the case of faculty in their first or second year of service, a recommendation that the faculty member not be reappointed.

These recommendations will be communicated by the Dean to the Provost according to the schedule. A faculty member may request an Ad Hoc committee review even if the School’s initial decision is not to initiate such a review. Such requests will be submitted to the Dean of the School for recommendation to the Provost.
Teaching Effectiveness Committee

Consistent with As mandated by POLICY MEMORANDUM 96-III.21-201UTDPP1006, the BBS Teaching Effectiveness Committee (TEC) is an independent faculty committee charged with developing a teaching evaluation process for faculty with classroom or class-laboratory teaching responsibilities, compiling information on teaching performance, providing teaching performance feedback to the individual faculty member and to the dean, and identifying individual faculty deserving recognition or needing improvement. UTDPP 1006 mandates that the process will conduct systematic evaluations of teaching following procedures developed by the committee. Procedures for evaluating faculty teaching must include: written objective standards for evaluating teaching performance, including student course evaluations, teaching load contributions, diversity of courses covered, course development and administration, and factors such as thesis and dissertation supervision. Standards must also include procedures for periodic collection of reliable and verifiable information related to teaching performance including periodic classroom visits by designated faculty to gather direct observation information that supplements information taken from sources such as course syllabi, the learning assessment activities portion of the Annual Reports of Professional Activities and Accomplishments, and student course evaluations, classroom observations by designated faculty members, examination of syllabi and student evaluations, and aThe process should specify a specified mechanism for communicating results of the evaluation to the faculty member, who in turn may comment on the results of his or her evaluation and provide information they feel is pertinent to the teaching evaluation process.

The Chair of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee will be appointed each year by the Dean, and the Associate Dean for Programs and Administration will support the work of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee. Members of the committee will be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Chair for one year terms, renewable. Each year, the TEC will prioritize the evaluation of tenure-system track and tenured faculty members coming up for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure in the subsequent year, so that TEC reviews will be available in the early fall of the year of the promotion review. Results of TEC reviews will be shared with the faculty member, with being reviewed and with the area head, and with the chair of the TEC, who will provide the appropriate administrative assistant with a copy of the review for inclusion in the faculty member’s promotion materials/portfolio.

Committee for Undergraduate Studies

The Committee for Undergraduate Studies will be chaired by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and will advise on matters related to academic policy, including but not limited to: curriculum review and development, honors programs, activities to increase undergraduate engagement and retention, and future goals for strengthening all undergraduate programs. Committee members will be appointed to one-year terms, renewable, by the Dean in consultation with the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, with representation across the three major areas of BBS: Cognition and Neuroscience, Communication Sciences and Disorders, and Psychological Sciences. The committee will meet at least once in each fall and spring semester, and more frequently as needed.

Committee for Graduate Studies

The Committee for Graduate Studies will be chaired by the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and will advise on matters related to academic policy, including but not limited to: curriculum review and development, requirements and timelines for progress toward the degree, professional development activities to enhance graduate student culture, and future goals for strengthening all graduate programs. Committee members will include each Area Head and other members to be appointed to one-year terms,
renewable, by the Dean in consultation with the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. The committee will meet at least once in each fall and spring semester, and more frequently as needed.

OTHER COMMITTEES

Other temporary committees may be established and appointed by the Dean to meet academic and administrative needs. Faculty members wishing to establish such committees or to participate in them should consult with the Dean and with the Associate Deans. These committees may be dissolved when the designated project is complete or when committee members decide that further work on the particular project would no longer be fruitful.

KEY ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES

State of the School Report and Consultation
The Dean will present a “state of the school” report to the faculty at the beginning of each academic year at a meeting of the school faculty. This will include plans for searches and other program initiatives. The meeting should provide opportunity for discussion. At the end of each spring term, the Dean will report on the outcomes of plans and initiatives and the faculty should again have the opportunity to discuss and offer suggestions.

Appointments of Tenure System Faculty
All appointments of tenure-system faculty in the University of Texas at Dallas shall be made in accordance with UTDPP1057, the General Standards and Procedures: Initial Appointments to the Ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor—UTDPP1057. Hires of tenure system faculty in BBS will follow the guidelines below.

Each tenure-track faculty search is an opportunity to fill critical needs for our current programs, strengthen our teaching and research and thus our national reputation, and broaden the expertise needed to best serve our students. Therefore, in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, proposals for academic positions will always be formulated with broad faculty input from faculty members in the Areas that the new appointment would serve. Faculty searches are initiated by the relevant Area faculty and are the outcome of the Area faculty’s assessment of expansion and replacement needs. Proposals for a particular search will be made in the context of established Area priorities. Area faculty will meet annually to discuss general hiring priorities and make recommendations to the Dean regarding needed specific searches. Recommendations to the Dean will include key phrases for the search ad formulated to attract the broadest possible pool of candidates most likely to best meet Area priorities. The language of search ads will be sufficiently broad to attract a sizable pool.

The following set of guidelines for tenure-system searches in BBS is designed to augment the detailed search procedures outlined in the UTD policy titled “General Standards and Procedures: Initial Appointments to Ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor [UTDPP1057]”. The heart of this policy is contained in the following steps taken quoted directly from this university policy guidelines.

The appointment process is shown below. It should be followed strictly.
1. **Executive Vice President and Provost** approve Approval of academic positions by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the SBBS School Dean.

2. **SBBS Dean submits** Submission of search plan including documentation of compliance with affirmative action procedures **for approval by** the Provost **by the School Dean**.

3. Approval of the search plan **SBBS Dean recommends a Search Committee for approval by the Provost**. Search committees must include at least three SBBS faculty members, -faculty members from other Schools may be appointed at the discretion of the Dean and must be approved by the Provost by the Provost.

4. **Search Committee solicits applications for the position, reviews files of all applicants, notifies those candidates deemed unqualified for the position, and conducts interviews with preferred candidates. All SBBS faculty should be invited in advance to attend public presentations by candidates during their interviews.**

4.5. Search Committee assesses the qualifications of candidates in relation to the nature of the position and in terms of the University's standards, using information from whatever sources might be necessary to conduct a thorough review. Particular attention should be paid to eliciting the opinions of faculty in the Areas in which the candidate will be active. For tenured appointments, the Search Committee should solicit at least five independent judgments of the candidate's qualifications (these may include, but must not be limited to, individuals recommended by the candidate). For non-tenured appointments, at least three independent judgments of the candidate's qualifications are required. Requests for evaluation of the candidate should state clearly that the candidate's file may be inspected by the candidate. Ad hoc committees should certify credentials of candidates using the University's Certification of Credentials and Qualifications form for faculty positions. Evaluation of applicants and identification of preferred candidates by the Search Committee.

5. **Search Committee presents its Vote of the Area faculty on the recommendations concerning candidates at a meeting of the Search Ad Hoc Committee to which. The voting faculty should include all appropriate rank tenure-track faculty in the Area in which the appointment will be made have been invited.**

6.7. After discussion at this meeting, all appropriate rank tenure-track faculty in attendance vote by secret ballot to accept or reject the Search Committee’s recommendation concerning each candidate, with results tallied and announced immediately.

6.8. **Search Committee forwards its recommendations for appointment of all candidates deemed acceptable by the Search Committee, including attendant evidence, minority reports and a summary report of compliance with University affirmative action procedures to the School Dean, and summary report of compliance with University affirmative action procedures added to candidate's file and forwarded to the School Dean.**

8.9. **After consultation with Provost, School Dean Recommendation by the School Dean added to the candidate’s file and file forwards preferred candidate’s file for review by ed to the Committee on Qualifications (CQ).**

10. **CQ forwards file including its recommendation to the Provost**

Note that both a preferred and one or more alternate candidates may be recommended for appointment through this process.

A note regarding Internal Candidates - Hiring internal candidates is not encouraged and should present an exceptional opportunity. Internal candidates may choose to apply for an advertised position.
and this will require sensitivity in handling communication regarding the search process. A recommendation to hire an internal candidate will require strong arguments that no other candidate could better serve program needs, and stringent documentation that external candidates were recruited energetically and that the search was conducted fairly and impartially. Searches that result in recommendations to hire internal candidates will receive additional scrutiny at each step of the process.

**Opportunity Hires** - In exceptional situations, an opportunity to recruit a faculty member(s) may require an expedited search process, because of the necessity of rapid response and/or the sensitivity of the situation. Examples might include candidates who help to achieve institutional and school goals of increasing faculty diversity or high profile senior faculty who might not have emerged through the usual search mechanisms. Although such searches may be expedited, Area faculty must first be consulted before the expedited process is initiated. In addition, as described above, the search must be conducted through a specially appointed faculty search committee and candidates approved by a vote of the relevant Area faculty.

**Appointments and Annual Reviews Of Non-tenure-System Faculty**

The term “Non-tenure-system track faculty” has two meanings at UTD. The first meaning is specified in UTDPP1062, which defines nontenure-system faculty as those with classroom or class-laboratory responsibilities who are hired for a fixed term of service and who are not subject to the various rules and regulations pertaining to tenure-system faculty; their titles include Senior Lecturers and Clinical Assistant/Associate/Full Professors. To hire these faculty, UTDPP1062 specifies that the School or Department should appoint or designate a search committee that should include, whenever possible, at least one nontenure-system faculty member at the highest rank. The search committee recommends a candidate and an initial hiring ranks to the Dean and/or Program Head and program faculty should have the opportunity to comment on the recommendation prior to any formal job offer, whenever possible.

By contrast, UTDPP1061 governs a different type of nontenure-system faculty, defined as those who are hired to teach specific courses, offered for academic credit, on a course-by-course basis and who are not subject to the procedures for tenure-system faculty. As specified in UTDPP1061, states that the responsibility for the initial hiring of these faculty, and for evaluating their performance, will be hired and reappoints primarily placed with the Dean, using whatever advice and recommendations from Area Heads or other members of the Dean’s administrative structure as appropriate in the School. The Dean, Area Head or Program Head certifies the credentials of selected candidates using the University’s specified process and form; these forms along with search plans and results of each pool of applicants are is submitted each semester to the OEVP and Provost.

All UTD faculty are subject to an annual administrative review. Nontenure-system faculty as defined in UTDPP1062 will submit annual review documents in the same manner and schedule as tenure-system faculty, to the Dean, the Area Head, and the Program Head. The review file submitted to the Office of the Dean for evaluation by the designated reviewing committee should include a complete professional curriculum vitae covering the areas of his or her assigned responsibility, including statistical summaries of the UES teaching evaluation form for each course taught during the previous six regular long semesters (including transcripts of or original comments by students) and other course information such as syllabi and exams. The review committee can add clearly identified material to the review, such as evaluation letters, the committee’s review of teaching performance in consultation with the Area faculty.
and the Associate Deans, and when relevant, the Center Directors. The teaching of non-tenure-track faculty will be evaluated by the Area Head in consultation with the Associate Deans.

For nontenure-system faculty as defined by UTDPP1061, evaluation of performance is primarily placed with the Dean in consultation with the faculty. Consistent with UTDPP1006, BBS Area Heads have developed evaluation procedures appropriate for their circumstances, including the opportunity for the faculty member to respond to the review report.

**CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Tenure system faculty will be evaluated for promotion and tenure following the procedures outlined in Policy Memorandum in university policy, UTDPP1077, General Standards and Procedures, Faculty Promotion, Reappointment and Tenure.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievement will be assessed in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The candidate's research has contributed significantly to the field and, where appropriate, the candidate's clinical innovations have had an impact on clinical practice.
2. The candidate has demonstrated through performance at UTD the ability to conduct independent research.
3. The candidate's independent research has contributed significantly to the field.
4. For candidates with clinical responsibilities as part of their academic appointment, evidence that clinical duties are performed in an excellent manner and that the candidate provides innovative and creative contributions in the clinical domain.

For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievements will be assessed as follows:

1. Scholars in related fields recognize as notable the contributions of the candidate.
2. The candidate has made an impact in the field of the candidate's scholarly pursuits.
3. For candidates with clinical responsibilities as part of their academic appointment, evidence that clinical duties are performed in an excellent manner and that the candidate provides innovative and creative contributions in the clinical domain.

As do all schools at UTD, BBS has supplementary guidelines that appear in as part of this policy; these are summarized below. These guidelines may be amended or revised by a majority vote of the tenured faculty in BBS.

As stated in UTDPP1077, the following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standard of Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement for the review of faculty in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

The candidate must present evidence of an ability to maintain a successful scholarly career. The most significant evidence of creative productivity and professional achievement for faculty members in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences is publication in peer-reviewed journals, chapters, books, or monographs. Other forms of evidence of scholarly contributions are success in
attracting extramural support, abstracts of presentations before professional groups, and invited presentations. Although the pattern may vary across individual faculty, a significant record of contribution in these various categories is expected from a typical faculty member in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

The Callier Center for Communication Disorders’ presence in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences gives not only a distinctive quality to the School, but also a distinctive quality to some faculty appointments within the School. Faculty may have small to significant clinical service and/or clinical supervision responsibilities as part of their faculty duties. These clinical duties naturally influence the amount of effort that is devoted to other forms of teaching and scholarly productivity. These clinical responsibilities also introduce distinctive issues in the evaluation of contributions in the clinical role. The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences recognizes clinical contributions as being a component of the overall assessment of faculty contributions for those faculty holding members whose appointments include clinical responsibilities. In general, faculty holding clinical appointments are expected to make teaching and scholarly contributions of equal quality to other faculty in the School but with a lesser expectation of the quantity of such contributions, proportionate to the percentage of time committed to clinical activity. The qualitative evaluation of clinical contributions is difficult given the private nature of the clinical process but there are some measures by which candidates may be reasonably evaluated. Criteria by which the School will evaluate clinical contributions may include: evidence that the candidate's clinical innovations have had an impact on clinical practice, testimony from knowledgeable professionals who regularly interact with the clinical role of the candidate, sampling of client satisfaction with the candidate's services, leadership roles in clinical professional organizations on a state, regional, or national level, appointments to government or professional committees who oversee clinical preparation and certification, other evidence of clinical contributions including preparation of professional materials for dissemination of information, professional presentations and writings of a primarily clinical nature, and indices of clinical contributions to the community as well as the Callier Center.

**Joint, Adjunct, and Affiliated Faculty Appointments in SBBS**

Eligible individuals can receive one of three additional kinds of appointment described below. Candidates for such appointments can be recommended by colleagues in BBS or may request that they be considered by contacting the relevant Area Head; the Area Head and Area faculty can then recommend the appointment for the Dean’s consideration. If the Dean agrees with the appointment, he, the Area Head, and the candidate will agree on the appointment type and title and the responsibilities and privileges associated with the appointment; these will be specified in writing to the candidate along with the initial duration of the appointment and the conditions necessary to maintain it. Appointments should be reviewed every two years and discontinued if these conditions are no longer in force by agreement of the Dean, the Area Head, and the faculty member.

1. Individuals who are salaried by BBS and other unit(s) of UTD may hold a [joint appointment](#) in BBS. Salary and commitment-of-effort distributions should be agreed upon before the appointment is accepted and reviewed annually by the relevant department/area heads, deans, and the appointee. BBS responsibilities and privileges, including voting on personnel decisions (appointments, reviews, promotion) and academic policy decisions, as well as eligibility to chair student committees independently and apply for internal BBS funds, should be agreed at the outset and reviewed annually.
2. Individuals from institutions outside UTD, including business, industry, government, private practice, or another institution of higher education, may receive an **adjunct appointment** to participate in teaching or research in BBS. For those holding tenure system academic appointments in another university, the title will be **adjunct assistant/associate/full professor**; all others will be referred to as **adjunct faculty**.

- Adjunct assistant/associate/full professors are non-voting members of the General Faculty (UTDPP1088). As such, they may not independently chair doctoral supervising committees but may serve as co-chairs with BBS faculty members (see UTDPP 1052). With respect to doctoral dissertation and master’s thesis committees, adjunct faculty can be appointed as chair if they receive a 2/3 majority recommendation of the Professors of the student’s academic discipline and approval of the Academic Dean of the School offering the degree.

3. Individuals may receive a courtesy appointment in BBS as a **Faculty Affiliate** or **Affiliated Faculty**. Such appointments are appropriate when faculty in other UTD schools or Centers become active in research or education in BBS, such as research collaborations or team-taught courses. With support of BBS Area faculty and approval of the Dean, such appointments may be made without salary obligations or formal responsibilities, though if agreed and approved, additional courtesies may be extended, such as use of letterhead, access to space, instrumentation, supplies and secretarial assistance, and inclusion as a “Faculty Affiliate” on the BBS webpage. Faculty Affiliates in BBS may attend faculty meetings, but as non-voting members of the faculty.

**Example 1**
- Dr. X is a biostatistician with an appointment at UTSW as a clinical assistant professor; she has no formal association with UTD. Dr. Y is a BBS professor whose primary Area is CSD; she has met Dr. X and wants to include her as a consultant/collaborator on a federal grant application; a formal appointment would strengthen the proposal.
- Because Dr. X is from an institution outside UTD, the appropriate appointment and title for her would be “Adjunct Assistant Professor of CSD.” Dr. Y should contact her Area head and the Dean to obtain their approval for such an appointment and to outline its conditions and terms for discussion with Dr. X. If Dr. X agrees, the Dean should send her a letter offering the appointment and specifying the conditions.

**Example 2**
- Dr. No is an assistant professor in ATEC who has been co-supervising a graduate student with Dr. Maybe, a BBS faculty member whose primary home is CGN. Dr. No would like to make his association with BBS more visible; in particular, he would like to be listed on the BBS webpage.
- Because Dr. No already has a faculty appointment at UTD and will not receive a salary from BBS, the appropriate appointment for him would be as a BBS Faculty Affiliate. Dr. Maybe should initiate a request for such an appointment with the CGN Area Head; if the Area Head and Dean approve the appointment, they and Dr. No should agree on its conditions, including the way in which Dr. No’s status as Affiliated Faculty will be shown on the BBS webpage.
For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievement will be assessed in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The candidate’s research has contributed significantly to the field and, where appropriate, the candidate’s clinical contributions and innovations have had an impact on clinical research and/or practice.
2. The candidate has demonstrated through performance at UTD the ability to conduct independent research.
3. The candidate has the ability to attract external support at a level appropriate to the development and sustenance of an active research program in his or her area.
4. The candidate has demonstrated the ability to successfully guide doctoral students’ research and dissertations.
5. The candidate’s independent research has contributed significantly to the field.
6. For candidates with clinical responsibilities as part of their academic appointment, evidence that clinical duties are performed in accordance with best clinical practices and that the candidate provides innovative and creative contributions in the clinical domain.

For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievements will be assessed as follows:

1. Scholars in related fields recognize as notable the contributions of the candidate.
2. The candidate has made a significant impact in the field of the candidate’s scholarly pursuits.
3. The candidate has a sustained record of scholarly contribution through publications, invited presentations and extramural support.
4. For candidates with clinical responsibilities as part of their academic appointment, evidence that clinical duties are performed in accordance with best clinical practices and that the candidate provides innovative and creative contributions in the clinical domain.

CREATING NEW DEGREE PROGRAMS

The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences welcomes initiatives for possible new degree programs and is committed to considering these carefully. Proposals for new programs may originate from the BBS Dean, Associate Deans, Area Heads, Program Faculty, or Center Directors. All proposals for new degree programs must be discussed at regular Area faculty meetings to which all faculty members are invited. Area faculty will approve written proposals of new degree programs by majority vote. If a new degree program involves multiple Areas or Centers, then approval of new degree programs will be by majority vote of all program faculty members. Results of the votes should be reported to the Committee on Educational Policy and the Faculty Senate in requests for Senate approval of the new programs.

CLOSING EXISTING DEGREE PROGRAMS

Combining or eliminating degree programs and transferring their faculty to other programs in the school requires majority, in-person votes by the Area faculty and voting school faculty with a quorum present, at a meeting announced at least two weeks in advance. Votes in Areas should be taken before a school wide vote. Votes in Areas should be made available to program faculty (if any) before they vote; results of the vote in Areas and programs should be made available to entire school faculty before they vote.
Elimination of programs that would result in termination of tenured faculty requires conformance to Regents Rule 31003, Section 2, Elimination of Academic Positions of Programs: Elimination for Academic Reasons as implemented in the UTD *Academic Program Abandonment Policy - UTDPP1000.*

**AUTHORITY**

No provisions in the various bylaws may override or contravene established university or Regents’ policies.

**PROVISIONS FOR AMENDING THE BYLAWS**

By-laws may be amended by majority vote of a quorum of the BBS voting faculty at a school wide faculty meeting, with a quorum present, which must be announced two weeks in advance.
Item 13:
Appointment of Academic Dishonesty Pool
Committee Name: Academic Tribunal Pool

Charge: Policy Regents Rules 31008

Special Requirements:
20 members in pool
Representatives from each of the schools
One year term, may be reappointed

Members Whose Terms are Continuing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replacements Needed</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fonseka (ECS)</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murat Kantarcioğlu (ECS)</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Rotea (ECS)</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovidiu Daescu (ECS)</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euel Elliott (EPPS)</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Yuan (EPPS)</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Jacobs (EPPS)</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Assmann (BBS)</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Prager (BBS)</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne van Kleeck (BBS)</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Dess (SOM)</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Liebowiz (SOM)</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijay Mookerje (SOM)</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George McMechan (NSM)</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Heelis (NSM)</td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Sherry (NSM)</td>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Malina (ATEC)</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fishwick (ATEC)</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Cohen (AH)</td>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Waligore (AH)</td>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>