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AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
May 18, 2016

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  Dr. Wildenthal
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  Dr. Redman
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  April 20, 2016 Meeting  Dr. Redman
4. SPEAKER'S REPORT  Dr. Redman
5. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates  Serenity King
6. TXCFS/ FAC Report  Dr. Leaf
7. Student Government Report  Akshitha Padigela
8. CEP Recommendations  Dr. Peinhardt
   A. Addition to Syllabus template on Title IX
   B. UG / Grad. - Scholarship Programs
   C. Graduate Courses for possible future use
   D. Allowing electronic submissions of dissertations
      a. Amendments to UTDPP 1052
      b. Catalog updates
9. Hearing Tribunal Appointments  Dr. Redman
10. Updated UTS 180  Tim Shaw
11. Amendments to UTDPP1013- Academic Program Review Committee  Dr. Leaf
12. Amendments to UTDPP1003- Information Technology Resources Security Planning and Policy Committee  Dr. Redman
13. Amendments to UTDBP 3050- Scholarships, Fellowships and Other Appointments and Monetary Awards to Students  Abby Kratz
14. ADJOURNMENT  Dr. Wildenthal
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 20, 2016

Present: Hobson Wildenthal, Inga Musselman, Robert Ackerman, Naofal Al-Dhair, Frank Anderson, Karen Baynham, Elizabeth Bell, Dinesh Bhatia, Gail Breen, Matthew Brown, John Burr, R. Chandrasekaran, Nadine Connell, David Cordell, Mieczyslaw Dabkowski, Gregory Dess, Gregg Dieckmann, Vladimir Dragovic, Monica Evans, Eric Farrar, Nicholas Gans, Lev Gelb, Jennifer Holmes, Dorthee Honhon, M. Ali Hooshyar, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Joe Izen, , Carie Lambert, Murray Leaf, Syam Menon, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Michael Rebello, Tim Redman, Christopher Ryan, Betsy Schlobohm, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Michael Tiefelsdorf, Tonja Wissinger,

Absent: Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Patrick Brandt, Bernard Ganglmair, D.T. Huynh, Michele Lockhart, BPS Murthi, Ramachandran Natarajan, Simeon Ntafos, Sabrina Starnaman, Murat Torlak, Alejandro Zentner

Visitors: Andrew Blanchard, Cristen Casey, Chris Davis, Naomi Emmett, Julie Haworth, Bill Hefley, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Jennifer McDowell, Jessica Murphy, Terry Pankratz, Elisabeth Samuel, Debbie Reynolds Marion Underwood,

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
Interim President Wildenthal called the meeting to order at 2:02 PM. The university made an application to the Governor’s University Research Initiative, Governor Abbot’s program to encourage research in the state. They had dedicated $40 million toward to change the face of Texas research. UT Dallas was encouraged to submit a proposal for a grant, the maximum value of which was limited to $5 million. On April 18, 2016 the university was notified it had been granted $4 million. The only drawback was that the university is required to complete staffing within 30 days. Receiving the grant is a great success for the research for the university.

The hearings for the University Budget occurred on April 19, 2016. Our incoming President Benson was in attendance. The discussions were fruitful. One topic discussed was what the university needed to do to continue to be great. It was noted that the special accomplishments of the university need attention, and the words of praise need to be backed up with actions. He opened the floor to questions. There were none.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Richard Scotch moved to move the presentation by Colleen Dutton to item 5, and approve the amended agenda. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of the March 23, 2016 Minutes
Mary Jo Venetis emailed a correction to the March meeting minutes. Dr. Venetis requested the following paragraph be updated to reflect that “she” was actually “Dr. Belle Wheelan”.

She encouraged the Senate members to submit their suggestions. Our university had the privilege to host the president of SACSCOC, Beth Wheelan. She met with a wide variety of stakeholders on campus. It was Serenity’s opinion that it was a mutually beneficial visit. She got a sense of who our campus was, as she had never been to our campus. She reminded the university how much she advocates for institution on our behalf; in fact she left our campus and went to visit with the Chancellor, and on to meet with the Commissioner at the coordinating board. She remarked that our university should use her as a resource in the legislative session more that we have in the past. In particular, she would have liked to have been called about campus carry legislation. She does testify before legislatures quite often.

The corrected paragraph follows:

Serenity King encouraged the Senate members to submit their suggestions. Our university had the privilege to host the president of SACSCOC, Beth Wheelan. Dr. Wheelan met with a wide variety of stakeholders on campus. It was Serenity’s opinion that it was a mutually beneficial visit. Dr. Wheelan got a sense of who our campus was, as Dr. Wheelan had never been to our campus. Dr. Wheelan reminded the university how much she advocates for institution on our behalf; in fact Dr. Wheelan left our campus and went to visit with the Chancellor, and on to meet with the Commissioner at the coordinating board. Dr. Wheelan remarked that our university should use her as a resource in the legislative session more that we have in the past. In particular, Dr. Wheelan would have liked to have been called about campus carry legislation. Dr. Wheelan does testify before legislatures quite often.

Richard Scotch moved to approve the amended minutes. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

4. Speaker’s Report – Tim Redman
   1. Speaker Redman had recently read about the recipients of the Success in Mentoring honor. He was concerned that the qualifications for the award were not addressed. It was Dr. Redman’s hope that the arts would not be excluded from these honors.
   2. Speaker Redman presented an information item. Staff Council was informed that Kent Mecklenburg had left the University. Staff Council appointed Melissa Whiter to replace him in his staff committee appointment. A formal appointment letter will be sent to Melissa Whiter following the meeting.
   3. All other items are on the agenda.

5. Presentation: Time and Labor- Colleen Dutton

Colleen Dutton gave a presentation to the Academic Senate on the Time and Labor position. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is in Appendix A. In January 2016, UTD implemented a new process for faculty to record the use of sick time that uses the time and labor and absence management modules of PeopleSoft. Faculty are required to record the use of sick time under Texas Labor Code Section 661.203 which reads as follows:

A faculty member at an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, must submit prescribed leave forms for all sick leave the faculty member takes if the absence occurs during the normal workday for regular employees, even if no classes are missed.
UT Dallas had been inconsistent with this practice, thus the electronic format was implemented to make it easier for faculty to record and report absences. The same process had already been rolled out for all staff.

In addition to reporting use of sick time, UT Dallas is required to track hours worked so we may remain in compliance with the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Instead of requiring faculty to record the hours they worked each day, if they do not take any time off (i.e. sick time, bereavement, jury duty, etc.), then they only need to enter NTR (Nothing To Report) for the month, confirming that they worked their regular hours. ACA requires us to monitor and track hours worked to determine benefits eligibility under ACA. Using the absence management module, which is aligned with the FTE percentages listed in PeopleSoft, is the best way to meet all of our compliance regulations.

The most common concern expressed by the senate members was that the directions initially distributed to the faculty members on how to properly use the system were confusing, and not user friendly. Speaker Redman suggested that Human Resources review the handout that were distributed and using the feedback given, update the documents accordingly. After a lengthy discussion Speaker Redman suggested that senate members email their further concerns directly to Colleen Dutton.

6. Presentation: One Card- Terry Pankratz and Debbie Reynolds
Terry Pankratz, Vice President for Budget and Finance, noted that he had been invited to address the concerns that the faculty had regarding the new process and procedures for the One Card system. He opened the floor to questions and concerns. The initial concern was that the relevant website for users is not intuitive, and does not allow for incremental changes to be made after submission. Users found that if they made a change, they were locked out from making any more changes. Debbie Reynolds noted that Procurement is aware of the situation, but that the site is under a UT System contract and the university is not allowed to have its own version. There are two possible reasons for a lockout. First, an approver has approved the information before the user has completed their changes. Second, Procurement has pulled down the data. The data is pulled down on the 10th of every month.

Clarification was requested on the situation in which a user becomes busy and doesn’t complete their report before the deadline on the 10th day of the month. This means that the cost center is wrong, and the only way to fix that is to do an internal departmental transfer (IDT). This causes even more work for the departmental administrative assistants. Many faculty expressed their belief that the new system caused more paperwork, not less. Although the receipts are entered electronically, the user must print the report and get it approved on a paper copy, and the paper receipts must be retained for audit purposes. The user should be able simply to upload the receipts and be finished with the process.

Terry Pankratz assured the Senate members that he would look into the data being locked. He noted that there is a limited window in which one can make changes and that if the deadline is missed procurement must post that transaction as currently entered. The transaction cannot be corrected by that system any longer and requires an IDT. His team will try to assist and will remind everyone that the window is available to make changes. If a user has changes, he/she must make them during that timeframe, otherwise an IDT is required after the transaction is posted to the ledger. He further noted that each of the purchasing cards are hard coded to a default account, and expenditure
code. Both are acceptable, they may not be the correct grant, but they are acceptable account to pay on. If the deadline is missed, Budget will post the transaction to that default account.

Subsequent Senate discussion included comments that the system is not user friendly, that the directions distributed by procurement were not helpful, that the process was even more cumbersome than the previous system, and that it is not respectful of faculty time.

The process is set up so that there are two people reviewing each expense report (cardholder, reviewer, etc.) In order to maintain the integrity of the system, two people must verify expenses. Especially since there has been fraud on some of the cards, someone who has knowledge of the charges must review it, after which a ‘reviewer’ serves as a second pair of eyes to make sure the charges are correct. Jennifer Holmes noted that her concern is that she had to approve the charges 1) in the system, 2) on a paper copy, and 3) at reconciliation. Terry Pankratz noted that because the ‘approver’ approved it in the system, it doesn’t need a signed paper copy. Unfortunately the distributed directions said that approvers must both sign a paper copy as well as digitally approve in the system. Terry Pankratz took note and would be updating the directions to reflect the correct procedure.

Given all the difficulties that faculty has had with the system, Murray Leaf suggested that going forward that new systems, such as this one, be vetted by the Information Resources Planning Committee before being rolled out to the whole university. Terry Pankratz agreed that this would be a good suggestion going forward. Terry Pankratz noted that during the program development there had not been any actual user involvement, although administrative assistants were aware of changes. His team may have overlooked the fact that faculty must interact with the system as well. They did not spend enough time taking faculty’s interaction with the system.

A question was raised concerning why the university chose to move from the paper based system that was used previously to the more digital procedure used now. Terry Pankratz explained that under the old system transactions were downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet, and an employee would parcel those charges out by department and by cost center. This was a manual process done by one employee who had to parcel thousands of records each month. It took roughly a week, and the data were sent via campus mail or email to the card users. The card users reviewed the information. There were errors that had to be corrected and/or updated. The corrections were handwritten on the document, which came back to procurement and then someone had to enter those corrections manually. The potential for errors was very high. Budget would get the MasterCard bill on the 4th of the month, and it would be posted to the general ledger on the 10th of the following month, i.e. 40 days later. Fiscal Officers would call budget saying they were trying to close contracts and asking why transactions were not posted. The response was that the bureaucratic process in place did not allow for them to be posted sooner. This new method reduces a 40 day process to 10 days. It much faster, and it is more accurate because fewer people touch it. The only people that touch it are the people who own it. When someone looks at it, and is approved, it is complete. Procurement doesn’t interface with it at all. This has streamlined the process on a macro level for the university.

It was noted by Jennifer Holmes that many faculty have chosen not to use OneCards, as they have found that the cards not to be helpful. Terry Pankratz noted that the card does not work for everyone, and that faculty are not obligated to use it. Debbie Reynolds offered to provide one-on-one help to those faculty who continued to have difficulties with the system. The Senators’
response was that the difficulties were not isolated, and that one-on-one training would be neither beneficial nor practical given the numbers. The process that Debbie Reynolds uses with her procurement staff is the following: 1) the user confirms that it is a good and valid expense, 2) a ‘reviewer’ who works for Debbie reviews it in the system, 3) when it is ready for Debbie to approve it, they take hard copy documents to her, 4) Debbie gives her formal approval. The reason she approves hard copies is that policies and procedures still require it, and internal audit expects to see her handwritten OK on the report itself. They intend to improve that workflow. However, they needed to improve the former process since grants have close-out dates. They have to get the information into the ledger more quickly to have accurate financial reports. They are continuing to work to make it an easier process, but because the university it tied to Master Card with the state contract, they have limited options.

Due to time constraints the discussion was brought to a close with the final comment by Tres Thompson that it was his belief that Budget was offloading accounting duties to the Administrative Assistants (AAs) in each school. He requested that Budget rethink their procedures and processes as AAs and the faculty themselves are not trained accountants, and it is possible errors would occur because of this situation.

7. UT Dallas’ SACSCOC Reaffirmation Project – Serenity King And Jessica Murphy
Serenity King informed the senate that three people had declined Reaffirmation Committee appointments. The Academic Council suggested the following replacements for the SACSCOC faculty committee. Randall Lehmann was replaced by Jill Duquaine-Watson. David Channell was replaced by Ali Hooshyar, and Erin Smith was replaced by Shilyh Warren. At this point, Serenity King turned the floor over to Jessica Murphy for the QEP update.

A document was circulated during the meeting. A copy can be found in Appendix B. The QEP committee received over 200 suggestions. The committee narrowed those suggestions into five different categories: First Year Experience, Communication Counts, Wellness, Curricular Globalization, and Digital Learning: Innovation and Integration. The QEP webpage now has a guide to help people prepare to submit proposals: http://qep.utdallas.edu/. If one clicks the “Submit your QEP Proposal” button, it will take them to the guide and a sample submission.

8. FAC/ TXCFS Report- Murray Leaf

The University of Texas System Faculty Advisory Council met at Ashbel Smith Hall on April 7-8, 2016. The UTD representatives were Murray J. Leaf and David Cordell.

Background: Before the meeting, Chancellor McRaven had expressed strong interest in supporting faculty governance. In response to that interest, the FAC had done two things. First, in 2015/2016, it surveyed the faculty governance leaders on the several campuses on the state of faculty governance of shared governments on their campus. In the survey, six of the campuses reported serious problems or little-to-no shared governance. Four institutions reported “moderately effective” or mixed results in their shared governance procedures. Only four of the fourteen reported having “very effective” shared governance structures and cultures of communication. Second, a sub-committee of the FAC has been working on a “white paper” on shared governance for the chancellor, to be accompanied by a very brief executive summary. Tony Cucolo, the chancellor’s liaison to the FAC, has been working closely with the group.
1. The first guest was Ernest Aliseda, newly appointed regent and chair of the Academic Affairs committee. He mainly asked questions and the FAC members tried to respond. His first question was how to measure success. The FAC response was to reject the use of four-year graduation rate and argue for a diverse range of indicators. He seemed responsive. The conversation shifted to what the regents could do to enhance faculty governance. Despite some initial disagreement within the FAC, consensus settled on the view that the Regents Rules are adequate in defining the areas of responsibility where faculty traditionally have the major voice in making policy. The basic list is in Regents Rules 40101. The Rules are also clear in saying that the responsibilities assigned to faculty should be understood as carried out by faculty governance organizations. This is most explicit in Regents Rules 20201:4.9(b), which requires each campus president to ensure that all policies that come under Rule 40101 are reviewed by the elected governance body of the campus before they are submitted to the Regents for final approval for inclusion in the campus Handbook of Operating Procedures. The problem is that on most campuses, particularly health campuses, these provisions are not implemented. I also noted our objections to the Regents Rule on intellectual property. The FAC members responded in agreement but we did not go into it.

Dual credit was also discussed. It is a major concern for some member institutions.

2. The next guest was Chancellor McRaven. He reiterated his view of the importance of shared governance. There was some discussion about his “Quantum Leap” initiatives. We also went over the main points of the executive summary of the white paper although he had not yet seen it. As with Regent Aliseda, discussion emphasized that while the current Regents Rules are adequate, most campus administrations are not acting in accord with them. He had also asked for one or two points that he should focus on with each campus president. We agreed that these points would not be provided by the FAC as a whole but rather the FAC would solicit them from each campus faculty governance organization. We emphasized that the chancellor should meet with the leadership of the faculty governance organization on the several campuses. Just talking to the presidents is not enough.

3. The next conversation was with David Daniel, Deputy Chancellor, and Raymond Greenberg, Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs. It paralleled the discussions with the chancellor.

4. Next was Dr. Rebecca Karoff, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. She is new to the UT system and this was her first meeting with the FAC. Her major area of concern will be the Quantum Leaps. We also discussed dual credit.

5. The rest of the first day was devoted to committee meetings. David Cordell is co-Chair of Faculty Quality. I attended the meeting of the Governance Committee. The Governance Committee was charged with recommending final version of the Executive Summary mentioned in the background paragraph above. In response to confusion in the morning’s discussions, I added language noting Regents Rule 20201:4.9(b), and relating it to 40101. It was approved.

I also introduced UTD’s Sense of the Senate resolution on Title IX. It turned out that everyone present had been given the same interpretation on their respective campuses and had the same objections to it. So we agreed to circulate it to the full FAC for wider discussion. Andrea Gore, Chair of the UT Austin Faculty Council, was particularly adamant and supportive.
6. The next morning was devoted to more committee meetings followed by committee reports. Several resolutions were passed. These were:

- To approve the Executive Summary on Governance for the Chancellor.

- To circulate the draft white paper to constituent campuses for common comment before making the final revision.

- To include non-tenured clinical faculty on promotion and tenure review committees on health campuses. (This may have been withdrawn.)

- To circulate to the campuses the results of the UT Health Science Center, Houston faculty governance survey of faculty regarding the office of technology transfer and development of intellectual property.

- To seek advice and consent of FAC on executive actions not covered in Guidelines (bylaws):

  Be it resolved that any time that the Executive Committee establishes a practice not in the guidelines, or interprets the guidelines in a new way, they should advise the full Faculty Advisory Council and seek their consent by at least a majority vote.

7. The next period was for “urgent campus issues.” We discussed Title IX. Although I had circulated the UTD document the night before, apparently no one had read it carefully. So I briefly explained the situation. Andrea Gore elaborated for UT Austin. I called for a show of hands to indicate what other campuses were being given the same interpretation. Although three of the health campuses’ representatives did not seem to know what we were talking about, all of the academic campuses and one health campus (UTMB) said that they were being given the same interpretation as UT Dallas. It therefore seems evident that the source is the UT system legal office. The FAC therefore agreed to place it on the agenda for the next meeting and to ask Dan Sharphorn, head of the Office of General Counsel, to come to discuss it.

8. The final meeting was with Dr. Steve Leslie Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. He began by commenting on the very successful search for a replacement for President Daniel at UTD. Dr. Benson seems well chosen to continue the progress. The overall focus was, again, support for shared governance paralleling the discussion with the Regent Aliseda, Chancellor McRaven, Dr. Daniel, and Dr. Greenberg.

9. The last item of business was election of new Chair-elect. Jonathan Chen, of UT Southwestern, was elected by acclamation.

9. **Student Government Report – Caitlynn Fortner**

Ms. Fortner noted that this would be the final meeting of her as the FY 16 Student Government President. On April 19, 2016 Student Government (SG) approved an allocation of funds to have the Comet Creed installed in specific buildings across campus. Student Government had a kickball tournament that went over well with students. At the last SG meeting Jessica Murphy presented the QEP update to the students. Caitlynn Fortner and Grant Branam will be presenting reports from their representative UT System Student Advisory Council committees to the Board of Regents. SG
passed a green initiative, however they are looking for recommendations. The deadline for recommendations is May 15, 2016. On April 23, 2016 SG will volunteer for Earth Day Texas. Before introducing her successor, Akshitha Padigela, Caitlynn expressed her thanks to Senate members for their support in the past year.

10. CEP Proposals- Clint Peinhardt

The Committee representative presented the following committee report.

A. Questions on New Course Form

CEP had been charged by the FY 16 Faculty Senate to help prevent course duplication. The suggested questions were designed to assist the Committee on Undergraduate Education/Graduate Council, Committee on Educational Policy, and the Faculty Senate on making decisions to prevent course duplication. The questions were the first response by CEP, but they can be fine-tuned in the future. The suggested questions are as follows:

1. How does this course fit in the curriculum? Major/Core/Elective (can select more than one)
2. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum? If so, which?
3. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course identification numbers below.

        __________
        __________

4. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in question 3 (target audience, content, learning outcomes etc.)?
5. Faculty contact person

Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the questions. The motion carried.

B. Revision Concerning Bachelor Degree Equivalencies for Graduate School Admission

The revisions lift the requirements that bachelor degree requirement must be a four year degree. The university has been admitting international students who have less than four years. Previously the international students were required to take an additional 24 credit hours. The university realizes that not all international degrees are equivalent and that some students will still need to complete preparatory work here, but faculty want the flexibility to determine which high-quality students should be admitted without the leveling work. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve. The motion carried.

C. First 40 for Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs

The major changes are to the admission requirements, application deadlines, and financial aid. The application deadlines were aligned to earlier timelines to be more competitive. Administrative updates were made to the tuition and financial aid portion. The student affairs section was updated to reflect the name change to ‘Judicial affairs’. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the amendments. The motion carried.
D. New Graduate Audiology Course
AUD7360 had been a special topics course during the summer for several years. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the course. The motion carried.

E. Non-Academic Withdrawal Process
Some students have abused the system by selectively withdrawing from some courses, but not all, based solely on their likely grades. The system is being amended so that when Non-Academic Withdrawal is requested the deans themselves will be included in the discussions. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the amendments. The motion carried.

F. Second Baccalaureate Degree
This change is recommended due to students who are going for a second bachelor’s degree that is actually a double major. The amendments now spell out the requirements for a second Baccalaureate. This is a clarification in the policy rather than a change in policy. It was noted that later the Graduate Council will address the issue of multiple master’s degrees. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the amendments. The motion carried.

11. Approval of Spring 2016 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. Jennifer Holmes 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. Robert Ackerman seconded. The motion carried.
12. Amendments to UTDPP1003- Information Technology Resources Security Planning and Policy Committee
Previously the committee handled information security concerns, but that responsibility has been taken on by the Information Security Advisory Committee. Since Dr. Harpham took over the committee he has worked with the various stakeholders to make sure that it is mutually beneficial for all concerned. The committee charge referred to policies that no longer exists, and the amendments remove those references and update the membership. It was noted that the students were not represented on the committee. Murray Leaf moved to approve the amended committee charge with the amendment to add an undergraduate and a graduate student representative to the committee. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

13. Amendments to UTDPP1017- Campus Wellness Committee
The proposed amendments came directly from the committee itself. The committee has been working all year to consider updates to the charge. The committee’s aim is now focused on Faculty and Staff versus students, who have their own committee. The money the committee uses for their programs comes from the tobacco fine that faculty/staff pay to smoke. The committee wanted to 1) clarify what it does, 2) remove student membership, 3) tailor the charge to comport with they are doing now, and 4) describe what they want to do in the future. The Campus Wellness Committee moved to approve the amendments to the committee charge. The motion carried.

14. Amendments to UTDPP1088- Faculty Governance
UTDPP1088 currently states the following: “The President of the University convenes the university community, faculty, and staff, for a ‘State of the University Report’ each year in October.” The recommendation is to change the wording to the following: “The President of the University convenes the university community, faculty, and staff, for a ‘State of the University Report’ each year, usually in October.” Speaker Redman suggested that the FY17 State of the University Address take place on the 5th Wednesday of the month of November. Murray Leaf moved to approve the amendments. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

Murray Leaf proposed the following additional amendments.

- Section III.B.2:
  - Current: “The Speaker of the Faculty, and the Secretary of the Faculty are ex officio voting members of the Academic Council.”
  - Proposed: “The Speaker of the Faculty, Vice-Speaker(s) and the Secretary of the Faculty are ex officio voting members of the Academic Council.”

- Section IV.B.4.1:
  - Current: “As soon as possible after June 1, the Speaker of the Faculty shall convene the Academic Council to appoint the Committee on Committees.”
  - Proposed: “As soon as possible starting on or after June 1, the Speaker of the Faculty shall convene the Academic Council to appoint the Committee on Committees.”

Joe Izen moved to approve the additional amendments made on the floor. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

Speaker Redman raised a question on a possible amendment to Section V. The current policy states the following:
Faculties of the schools and departments shall determine their own voting memberships but may not exclude any voting member of the General Faculty administratively assigned to that school or department and teaching courses, for which it is responsible.

There is one school that has a non-tenure system faculty member who has a 100% administrative role. According to Speaker Redman’s reading of the policy, “… and teaching courses” means that that person is precluded from being a member of the voting faculty. A further question was raised about someone who is teaching but also has an administrative load. Reading “courses” as a plural, he inferred that that would be 50% teaching load /50% administrative load. That would then make the person eligible for the school’s voting faculty. Murray Leaf noted that the intention of the senate was always to defer to the schools in matters based on local judgment. Vice Speaker Leaf noted that he did not think that the Senate should specify that level of detail. He felt that a decision regarding someone with 100% administrative load should be left up to the school. Speaker Redman responded that it was against policy. Vice Speaker Leaf noted in the 50/50 situation that it should be up to the schools to handle the ambiguity. Vice Speaker Leaf stated that no amendment was required at this time.

15. New Business

Joe Izen raised a question concerning students who are taking an honors class, but need to move to a non-honors section. These course changes sometimes occur after withdrawal/drop deadline, and sometimes there is a difference between them in the number of credits. A new policy needs to be established so that so that the faculty is not required to go to the registrar every time it occurs. CEP Chair Clint Peinhardt noted his question, and would follow up with him on the concern. Any other concerns Dr. Izen indicated that he had other concerns that he would direct to the Academic Council for its next meeting.

16. Adjournment

There being no further business, David Cordell moved to adjourn. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 3:37 PM.

APPROVED: ___________________________ DATE: _____________

Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty
Timesheet Entry Overview
Faculty Senate – April 20, 2016

Presented by Kosima Ketcham
Benefits Analyst, Office of Human Resources
972-883-5343
kosima.ketcham@utdallas.edu

Accessing Timesheets
Timesheets are accessed from the Galaxy Home page – My Menu – Time and Absence - Timesheet

Time and Absence
Time and absence entry and reporting.
Timesheet
### Entering NTR (Nothing To Report)

On the timesheet, select “Calendar Period” in the View By dropdown box. Make sure the Date is the month you are reporting your time for. If not, use the “Previous Period or Next Period” links to navigate to the correct month. Scroll to the last day of the month and enter 0.00 hours. Select NTR from the Time Reporting Code dropdown menu. At the bottom of the page, click “Submit.”

### Reporting a Full Day Absence

On the timesheet, there is an absence event section. To add an absence, click the “Add Absence Event” button. Enter the start and end dates, the type of absence, in this case Sick. Click the Submit button at the bottom of the timesheet.
## Reporting a Full Day Absence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absence Name</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sick</td>
<td>03/01/2016</td>
<td>03/01/2016</td>
<td>8.00 Hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once you click “submit at the bottom of the Page, the event will show as “Needs Approval”.

If you do not hit the “Submit” button, the timesheet will show “Saved” and the absence will not be processed until submitted and approved.

## Reporting a Partial Day Absence

On the timesheet, there is an absence event section. To add an absence, click the “Add Absence Event” button. Enter the dates, the type of absence. If less than a full day, click the “Details” button to take you to the next screen.
On this screen, in the Partial Days indicator, select from the dropdown box, enter the “All Days Hours” for the duration of the absence, and click OK. This will return you to the main timesheet page.

Once you click “submit at the bottom of the Page, the event will show as “Needs Approval”.

If you do not hit the “Submit” button, the timesheet will show “Saved” and the absence will not be processed until submitted and approved.
Entering Other Leave (Jury Duty, Bereavement, etc.)

On the timesheet, select “Calendar Period” in the View By dropdown box. Make sure the Date is the month your reporting your time for. If not, use the “Previous Period or Next Period links to navigate to the correct month. Enter the number of hours on the corresponding day. Select the proper Time Reporting Code from the dropdown menu. At the bottom of the page, click “Submit.”
Now Accepting Detailed QEP Ideas at qep.utdallas.edu

Form for QEP Idea Submission

Interested in improving student learning or the environment that supports student learning at UT Dallas? Please submit your detailed idea using the form below.

Information collection [name, role, email address]

Topic: [Choose One First-Year Experience (Proposals under this topic may include programs to improve retention and success during and after students’ first year at UT Dallas.), Communication Counts (Proposals under this topic should address ways to improve students’ interpersonal skills and written and oral communication.), Wellness (Proposals under this topic may include programs to support the health of students’ minds, bodies, and social contributions with the goal of improving academic performance and overall lifelong health.), Curricular Globalization (Proposals for this topic should consider ways to enhance cross-cultural exchange and learning opportunities.), Digital Learning: Innovation and Integration (Proposals for this topic may include ideas for improving student learning through digital learning programs and initiatives.), and Other.]

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.1

SACSCOC Principles Associated with the Quality Enhancement Plan

Core Requirement 2.12
“The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. (Quality Enhancement Plan)”2

1 http://www.utdallas.edu/strategicplan/index.php?id=b
Comprehensive Standard 3.3.2
“The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. (Quality Enhancement Plan)\textsuperscript{3}

Summary of Your QEP Idea (no more than 1,000 characters) Please give a clear and concise description of a significant issue directly related to student learning or the environment that supports student learning and clear and concise suggested solution as a starting point for discussions about a Quality Enhancement Plan.

[Open text box here with a 1000 character limit]

References: In support of your idea, please include a list of references. (Refer to the UT Dallas Library’s excellent collection of databases if you have not already: http://www.utdallas.edu/library/index.html.)

Please answer as many of the following questions as possible (your answers can range from a paragraph to a couple of pages for each question):

- What classes, programs, etc., would UT Dallas need to put in place for this QEP? What resources (personnel, financial, physical, academic, etc.) might be necessary for the successful implementation of the QEP? [open text box]
- What are the intended benefits of the QEP to the institution and to its students? [open text box]
- How does the QEP support the mission of the institution? (see Mission Statement above) [open text box]
- What would be the timeline for implementation of the QEP? A QEP should be designed to make an intervention over the course of five years. Please note some of the key milestones over the course of the five-year plan. [open text box]
- An ideal QEP will become part of the campus culture. Does your idea include some sense of a transition strategy for continued success? [open text box]
- What goals would be associated with this QEP and how might the institution go about assessing those goals? [open text box]
- How might we evaluate the success of the QEP? (please be as specific as possible) [open text box]

Item 5: SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates
1. Department of Education (DOE) Letter
   - Waiting on SACSCOC’s formal response

   - Guidelines added to QEP website
   - June 1 deadline for Top 5 Topics
     - First-Year Experience
       - Proposals under this topic may include programs to improve retention and success during and after students’ first year at UT Dallas.
     - Communication Counts
       - Proposals under this topic should address ways to improve students’ interpersonal skills and written and oral communication.
     - Wellness
       - Proposals under this topic may include programs to support the health of students’ minds, bodies, and social contributions with the goal of improving academic performance and overall lifelong health.
     - Curricular Globalization
       - Proposals for this topic should consider ways to enhance cross-cultural exchange and learning opportunities.
     - Digital Learning: Innovation and Integration
       - Proposals for this topic may include ideas for improving student learning through digital learning programs and initiatives.

3. Reaffirmation Committees (Materials and Updates)
   - Meetings – all met in April 2015; reported back to Steering Committee
     - Website will be updated to include future meeting schedule
     - Some committees will meet during summer 2016
   - Materials (minutes, agendas, etc.) will be added to website

4. Program Head meetings completed /documentation online
April 22, 2016

Subject: Flexibility in Application of Accrediting Agency Review Processes; and Emphases in Departmental Review of Agency Effectiveness

Summary: This letter provides clarification for federally recognized accrediting agencies on the flexibility that they have in differentiating their reviews of institutions and programs, and encourages use of that flexibility to focus monitoring and resources on student achievement and problematic institutions or programs.

Dear Federally Recognized Accrediting Agencies:

Students, families, employers, and taxpayers depend on accreditation as a critical marker of educational quality. In November 2015, the Department announced a series of executive actions and legislative proposals “to improve accreditors’ and the Department’s oversight activities and move toward a new focus on student outcomes and transparency.” In a January 20, 2016, memorandum, the Department outlined a number of areas for further action, including the need to provide clarification to accrediting agencies on the flexibility they have in applying their standards and review processes. This letter provides that clarification. A separate letter will be issued to federally recognized accrediting agencies in spring 2016 to clarify terminology used by accreditors and provide additional guidance to accreditors on information to report to the Department.

This letter is directed to all accrediting agencies recognized by the Department, whether institutional or programmatic, as applicable.

Background

Accrediting agencies have varying practices on how they approach their reviews of institutions and programs and how they apply their standards. Some agencies expend approximately the same resources in their accreditation reviews of each school or program, or require all of their schools or programs to provide approximately equal weight to and evidence for each of the required standards. Other agencies have a base review for all institutions or programs but then spend far more time in their inspections and monitoring of those they consider to have significant problems or that they consider otherwise worthy of increased scrutiny.

This memorandum seeks to provide clarity on two areas: 1) the flexibility that accreditors have, based on specific criteria they establish (aligned with statutory and regulatory requirements), to vary their processes, investment of resources, and requirements of schools or programs; and 2) the statutory and regulatory requirements of particular importance in demonstrating an accrediting
agency's effectiveness, so as to maximize the use of this flexibility to enhance quality and accountability.

The intent of this guidance is not only to assist agencies in reducing burden on institutions and programs, but to encourage accrediting agencies to focus their resources most heavily on standards that are particularly important to student achievement and on institutions of particular concern. All agencies are expected to be in full compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements.

A. Accreditors May Differentiate Their Reviews of Institutions or Programs Based on Differing Conditions

Statute and regulations allow an accrediting agency to focus its resources on institutions or programs with higher risk due to poor performance, size, volume of student aid, or other factors.

Under the Higher Education Act (HEA) and implementing regulations, an agency granting or renewing accreditation or preaccreditation must apply and enforce all of its required standards (HEA § 496(a)(4)(A) and 34 CFR 602.20). However, neither the statute nor the regulations require that the same resources be used for each institution or program, or for each required accrediting standard. The statute does require that the agency apply effectively the criteria for recognition (20 USC 1099b(j)(1)), and under the regulations the accreditor must base its decisions on its published standards and have a "reasonable basis for determining that the information [it] relies on for making accrediting decisions is accurate" (602.18(c) and 602.18(d)).

Accrediting agencies may adopt this flexible review process on their own initiative, and subject to 34 CFR 602.27(a)(4), do not need prior approval by the Department. However, the agency's review process, including the specific criteria and risk factors an agency uses to differentiate its processes and requirements, will be analyzed for its effectiveness when accrediting agencies' recognition is before the Department.

The ability of an agency to differentiate its reviews was the subject of discussion when current requirements regarding effective monitoring were added to the implementing regulations. In the notice of final rulemaking, published in the Federal Register on October 27, 2009, the Department said:

The Department recognizes that accrediting agencies and the institutions and programs they accredit are diverse. . . . [W]e expect reasonable and prudent implementation of the statute and regulations by the agencies. For each institution or program accredited, an agency should consider factors such as the size of the institution or program, the number of students, the nature of the programs offered, past history, and other knowledge the agency has about the institution or program, including previous reviews. The regulatory language provides accrediting agencies with flexibility regarding their monitoring of institutions and programs and at the same time ensures they review and analyze key data and indicators.

. . . [S]tudent achievement is one of several areas that an agency must review when monitoring the institutions or programs it accredits. (74 Fed. Reg. 55418)
Section 496 of the HEA and 34 CFR Part 602 provide certain requirements that an agency’s accrediting process must consider for each institution or program, including that the agency establishes appropriate measures for student achievement. Measures widely accepted by accreditors provide one factor in determining agency effectiveness in meeting this requirement. For example, most of the national accreditors have benchmarks for the proportion of students who are expected to be retained from year to year, and for the proportion of students who are placed in employment after leaving postsecondary education.

Section 496 of the HEA provides three criteria that may affect the amount of resources that are spent in the review of an institution or program. Pursuant to these criteria, the review must: 1) be sufficient to apply effectively the policies and processes required for recognition (sec. 496(b)(I)); 2) “comply with due process procedures,” including clear standards and identification of deficiencies (sec. 496(a)(6)), so that an institution or program cannot be held deficient without a sufficient investigation and opportunity to rebut the identified deficiency; and 3) devote sufficient resources for particular factors specified in section 496(c), such as on-site inspections and reviews at regular intervals with well-trained and knowledgeable accreditation team members.

For each of the inquiries required to evaluate an institution or program against accreditation standards in areas the statute requires agencies to address, the accreditor must have a “reasonable basis for determining that the information . . . is accurate” (34 CFR 602.18(d)).

The statute and the regulations reflect that different circumstances may warrant differing degrees of scrutiny and subsequent monitoring. For example, the HEA says that the agency is to consider licensing exam results, course completion, and job placement rates “as appropriate” (HEA §496(a)(5)(A)). The regulations similarly recognize differing circumstances, for example, in allowing differing degrees of monitoring and differing periods of accreditation by taking into account “institutional or program strengths and stability” (34 CFR 602.19 and 602.20).

Because the statute and regulations emphasize educational quality, the Department believes that accrediting agencies should consider allocating resources—and determining the level of resources and evidence to be required of particular institutions or programs—based on those factors in its review process that emphasize quality. In evaluating an agency’s effectiveness, the Department can look at the agency’s utilization of certain factors that relate closely to “the quality of education or training” (HEA 496(a)). For example, an accrediting agency might look at the rates of student retention from one academic period to the next, graduation rates, some measure of student learning, some measure of postgraduation outcomes, and student loan cohort default rates, as well as metrics of financial responsibility for institutions, to determine the level of resources needed in its review for a particular institution or program, or the relative level of resources or evidence to be required of certain institutions or programs. Track record and verifiability of job placement rates and recruiting practices would be important to consider in making this determination for certain types of institutions or programs. Further discussion of how this flexibility might be applied can be found in section C of this document.
B. Accreditors May Differentiate Their Review of Individual Standards, with a Focus on Those with Particular Relevance to Student Achievement and Accrider effectiveness

Overall, the Department notes that certain requirements in the statute and regulations are indicators of the effectiveness of an accreditor. In fulfilling his or her responsibilities under the recognition statute, the Secretary is statutorily charged with determining if an agency has applied effectively the statutory and regulatory criteria (HEA 496(l)(1) and HEA 496(a)). Those criteria include specific requirements for the agency, such as in the nature of its on-site visits and in its review of specific elements of an institution or program, as well as the accrediting standards the agency itself establishes. Section 496(n)(3) requires the Secretary, in the agency recognition process, to take into account deficiencies in performance, and section 496(a) requires the Secretary to determine that the accreditor is a reliable authority on the quality of education offered through measures that the Secretary has promulgated after notice and comment.

While an accreditor must assess institutions or programs for all of the required factors as well as for the agency’s own standards and policies, the Department has said that there are certain factors “that we believe are the most relevant to ensuring quality education,” and on which the Department will “focus with more depth” (letter from Director, Accreditation Group, Office of Postsecondary Education, United States Department of Education, June 3, 2013). Below we emphasize those criteria that are most relevant, and supplement this list with some of the processes that are provided for in the regulations and that are particularly important for quality assurance.

1. Certain Statutory and Regulatory Standards Are of Particular Importance in Demonstrating That an Accrediting Agency Is Effective

a. Standards of Comparable Agencies

One measure of effectiveness, by necessity, involves a comparison against expected results, including comparison with other agencies’ actions or standards. Section 496(l)(2) of the HEA states that the Department may find an agency ineffective if it accredits an institution or program that is the subject of any interim action by another accrediting agency—i.e., compared with another agency’s action. Similarly, the Department may consider what standards those other agencies implement and what results they obtain in the aggregate for the standards in the areas that agencies are required by statute to address. For example, if most of a similarly situated group of accreditors has adopted a particular measure of student achievement but one agency has not, the Department might question the effectiveness of that agency relative to its peers.

Example: Accreditors of a certain type of institution or program generally look at four outcome measures: retention rates, graduation rates, licensure rates, and job placement rates. Accreditor X does not have a metric for retention. Accreditor X may be asked to explain how it can be effective, given that it does not consider retention rates when its peers believe that retention is an important factor in gauging institutional or programmatic quality.

Example: The institutions accredited by agency Y, in the aggregate, show lower levels of student achievement on generally accepted measures of student success, such as completion
and cohort default rates, than the schools, in the aggregate, accredited by similar agencies. Accreditor Y may be asked to explain how its standards are effective in terms of the results its schools achieve in the aggregate.

b. Specific Regulatory Criteria

34 CFR 602.16(a)(1)(i), student achievement: As noted in the Department’s June 3, 2013, letter, to remain recognized, an agency must demonstrate that its standards for accreditation are sufficiently rigorous to ensure the agency is a reliable authority as to the quality of education. To make this demonstration, the agency must show, among other things, that it has a standard or standards that effectively address the quality of each institution’s “[s]uccess with respect to student achievement in relation to the institution’s mission.”

To that end, the agency must show that it has clear standards for success in student achievement in relation to the institution’s mission (602.25(a), 602.18(a)), and how it has reviewed institutions according to this criterion (602.31(a)(2)). Many recognized accreditors, especially national accreditors, have set numerical metrics. We encourage those agencies that currently have that type of metrics to consider whether additional metrics of student achievement that are accurate and effective can contribute to their standards. For example, many accreditors look at completion rates; we encourage those currently without this metric to consider adding it. Similarly, job placement rates have been adopted by many accreditors as a standard of student achievement; success in obtaining employment cannot be ignored in accrediting institutions that offer occupational programs.

Unfortunately, the definition and application of placement standards, along with recruiting practices related to them, have proven to be problematic in many cases. Agencies must assure that the job placement measure is clearly defined, so that an institution cannot claim it misunderstood the agency requirement and so that the agency is consistent in enforcing the requirement; and the agency must assure that strong processes are in place to certify the accuracy of those outcomes, as required under 34 CFR 602.18(d) and 602.19.

Close scrutiny of institutions’ processes to evaluate and validate student learning in meaningful ways is an essential responsibility of all accreditors. Regional accreditors tend to use qualitative measures of student achievement, and tend not to have numerical metrics. We encourage them to consider adding objective, transparent, comparable, and actionable quantitative measures. Important measures, such as retention, graduation, and cohort default rates may be utilized if they are not already. In addition, because applied, professional, and occupational programs focus on employment as a primary goal, a regional accrediting agency that does not consider licensing and placement rates in its initial or continuing accreditation of institutions that offer such programs may be failing to ensure that the education or training offered by those institutions is of sufficient quality to achieve the institution’s stated objective, as required by law.

Regional accreditors must, regardless of the measures used, clearly state their standards for measuring achievement and in recognition proceedings, and must demonstrate how those standards are applied effectively in the agencies’ reviews of institutions.
34 CFR 602.17, objectives and degree and certificate requirements: This regulation requires that recognized accreditors demonstrate that they evaluate whether the institution or program has objectives consistent with its mission, is successful in achieving the objectives, and "[m]aintains degree and certificate requirements that at least conform to commonly accepted standards" (34 CFR 602.17(a)(3)).

Example: School X describes for incoming students the objectives of its liberal arts programs. The accreditor must assure that the amount, nature, and content of the work involved conforms both to the institution's stated mission and to the commonly accepted standards for the respective fields. In addition, the accreditor must ascertain that the institution is successful; this entails assuring that student work conforms to the standards and that students achieve the outcomes that the institution intends for students in the program. That success may be demonstrated by such factors as retention, graduation, and employment, pursuit of graduate studies, and measures of progress in internalizing concepts within the field. There are, of course, other measures that may meet this requirement.

Example: Program Y describes for incoming students the objectives of its technical or vocational program, both substantively and in the nature of employment that may follow. For instance, the program may describe what coursework or field work is involved, and what proportion of students get jobs and with what types of employers, for a credential in medical technology or computer science, or a credential in retail marketing or civil engineering. In addition to the considerations common with a liberal arts program, the accreditor might also look at factors such as employment rates in the field of study, increase in earnings between pre- and post-educational employment, and third-party (e.g., employer or workforce board) recognition of the qualifications of graduates to gauge whether the program has been successful in achieving its employment-related objectives.

34 CFR 602.21, review and revision of standards: This regulation requires that "[t]he agency must maintain a systematic program of review that demonstrates that its standards are adequate to evaluate the quality of the education . . . and relevant to the educational or training needs of students" (34 CFR 602.21(a)). As conditions change, the standards that an agency uses to evaluate quality may need to change with them. 34 CFR 602.21(c) adds that, "If the agency determines . . . that it needs to make any changes to its standards, the agency must initiate action within 12 months to make the changes." Changes can occur in economic conditions, student academic preparation, occupational requirements, accreditation practice, or other areas. Importantly, this criterion also looks to the educational and training needs of the students, so the accreditor’s program of review should ensure that agency standards remain responsive to those needs. It thus requires that all accreditors clarify and clearly state their view of student needs, and that they be ready to charge institutions or programs with updating their objectives and implementation to better assure that institutions or programs are meeting those needs.

Accreditors must regularly assess the effectiveness and validity of their standards in general: Do the standards (and numerical thresholds, if any) effectively ensure quality outcomes for students? If there have been poor outcomes for students or other concerns that have arisen at accredited
institutions or programs, does the agency need to revise its standards and processes to identify and address those issues more effectively?

2. Certain Statutory and Regulatory Processes Are of Particular Importance in Demonstrating That an Accrediting Agency Is Effective

In addition to gauging the effectiveness of specific standards as described in section B.1. above, certain accreditation processes are also of particular importance in determining agency effectiveness.

a. Statutory Requirement for Comprehensive Departmental Review

In discussing the Department’s analysis of an accrediting agency seeking recognition or renewal of recognition, section 496(n)(3) of the HEA states that the Department is to be “comprehensive” and to consider “all available relevant information concerning the compliance of the accrediting agency . . . including any complaints or legal actions.” Therefore, accreditors must respond in a satisfactory way to allegations initially originating outside the recognition process that the agency has not complied with its statutory and regulatory obligations and how it has corrected any deficiencies in that regard.

b. Key Regulatory Processes

In its June 3, 2013, letter, the Department highlighted some of the processes that it believes are most important for accreditors to follow in demonstrating their effectiveness. These include 34 CFR 602.15, 602.19 and 602.20. In this memorandum we also wish to highlight the informational requirements in 34 CFR 602.26 and 602.27.

34 CFR 602.15, 602.18, 602.19: Agencies must pay particular attention to the staffing requirements in §602.15(a) and the requirement in §602.19(b) that they effectively apply a set of monitoring and evaluation approaches that enable them to identify problems with an institution’s or program’s continued compliance with agency standards. This means assuring that the processes and personnel involved in policymaking, comprehensive reviews, and monitoring can accomplish the task. The agency needs to assure that persons with the appropriate credentials and background are involved. This will often mean that in setting policy, performing site reviews, and monitoring, the agency must involve individuals with expertise in assessing whether an institution or program has appropriately categorized and accurately documented students for retention rates, completion rates, licensure pass rates, and employment status. Under §602.18(d), agencies must have a reasonable basis for determining that the information upon which their accrediting decisions are made is accurate, which would require the skill to audit or verify claims of the institution or program.

34 CFR 602.20: In §602.20(a)(2), agencies must, at a minimum, require a noncompliant institution or program to come into compliance with agency standards within maximum timeframes established by the regulation. If the institution or program does not do so, §602.20(b) requires that the agency must take immediate adverse action, unless the period for compliance is extended “for good cause.” Thus, the standard is that ordinarily, periods of time to achieve compliance will not be extended. Some agencies more routinely provide extensions. Agencies must scrutinize the reasons for an institution’s or program’s noncompliance within the provided regulatory periods to assess whether there is a good
basis for believing that compliance will be forthcoming in light of the applicable regulatory requirement and the gravity of the issue. This is especially the case for violations of major standards, such as those related to student achievement and financial responsibility, for which extensions of time may put students or Department financial aid funds at particular risk.

34 CFR 602.26: Section 602.26 requires agencies to provide to the Department written notification when an agency has terminated the accreditation of an institution or program or placed an institution or program on probation or equivalent status, with specific timeframes described in that section. Agencies must provide decision letters for those actions to the Department to provide necessary information for the Department’s oversight activities.

34 CFR 602.27: Section 602.27(a)(6) requires that the agency provide to the Department the name of any institution or program it accredits that it “has reason to believe is failing to meet its title IV, HEA program responsibilities or is engaged in fraud or abuse, along with the agency’s reasons for concern about the institution or program.” The number of reports of such issues from accreditors is far smaller than the number of such issues identified through other Department processes or by other sources outside the Department. This is remarkable for at least two reasons. First, many of the monitoring activities of accreditors focus on areas that overlap with or that are corollaries to information gathered directly by the Department, so it would be expected that accreditors would find many of the same indicators as the Department. Second, the reporting standard is only that the agency “has reason to believe,” which only requires a rational basis for the belief, rather than requiring any level of probability beyond reasonability. The intent of the regulatory requirement is to provide early warning to the Department of issues that it must investigate. Such early warning is vital for the protection of students and the safeguarding of taxpayer funds. Agencies themselves need to be attentive to these issues in order to ensure quality education and be prepared to work with institutions to prepare teach-out plans, as well as to fulfill their role as gatekeepers for federal financial aid funds. The Department views prompt reporting by an accrediting agency as a factor in evaluating the agency’s reliability.

C. Examples of How This Flexibility May Be Applied

The information provided above outlines the flexibility that agencies have in reviewing individual institutions or programs and standards. While agencies have the authority to determine how to implement that flexibility, we offer a few examples here.

- Differentiation of institutional or program review: Based on previous reviews and ongoing monitoring of institutional or programmatic information, risk factors, and other information, an accreditor may ask that the self-study and on-site visit for a particular institution or program coming up for review emphasize a subset of standards, along with certification of continued compliance and no change in practices with regard to the rest of the standards. Similarly, a site visit for one institution or program may be shorter or longer than that for another on the basis of those reviews and monitoring. Or an accreditor may require more evidence on particular standards for one institution or program than it does for another. Regardless, agencies must comply with all the standards in the regulations, as noted in
Section A.

- Differentiation of terms of recognition: An agency may provide a shorter period of recognition (i.e., fewer years) for an institution or program that has met the threshold standards but for which the agency continues to have concerns, and a longer period of recognition for an institution or program that has regularly exceeded the standards with no ongoing concerns. More frequent monitoring or unannounced visits can be applied for institutions or programs with less satisfactory reviews. Accreditors may also develop tiers of recognition, with some institutions or programs denoted as achieving the standards at higher or lower levels than others.

The Department looks forward to continuing to work with accrediting agencies to assure the quality of our institutions and programs of higher education.

Sincerely,

Ted Mitchell
Under Secretary
US Department of Education
Item 8:
CEP
Recommendations
Students considering sharing personal information in email, in person, or within assignments or exams should be aware that faculty members and teaching/research assistants are required by UT Dallas policy to report information about sexual misconduct and may identify the complainant student to the UT Dallas Title IX Coordinator. Students who wish to have confidential discussions of incidents related to sexual harassment or sexual misconduct should contact the Student Counseling Center (972.883.2527 or after hours 972-UTD-TALK or 972.883.8255), the Women’s Center (972.883.8255), a health care provider in the Student Health Center (972.883.2747), the clergyperson of their choice, or an off-campus resource (i.e. rape crisis center, doctor, psychologist). Students who are sexually assaulted, harassed, or victims of sexual misconduct, domestic violence, or stalking, are encouraged to directly report these incidents to UT Dallas Police Department at 972-883-2222 or to the Title IX Coordinator at 972-883-2218. Additional information and resources may be found at: http://www.utdallas.edu/oiec/title-ix/resources/
General/Endowment Scholarship Programs

The University of Texas at Dallas offers a number of endowed scholarships that are administered by a school, department, or program. Students are encouraged to contact their school dean or program office to obtain information about scholarship opportunities via the centralized listing managed by the Office of Financial Aid awarded in the student's area of study.

In accord with Chapter 54 of the Texas Education Code provided below, all applications for competitive academic scholarships for undergraduate study are reviewed by the Committee on Student Scholarships and/or the Undergraduate Scholarship Committee in the appropriate academic unit.

The Texas Education Code contains specific requirements for a scholarship to be considered competitive:

Texas Education Code Competitive Scholarship
Sec. 54.213. SCHOLARSHIP STUDENT

(a) An institution of higher education may charge a nonresident student who holds a competitive scholarship of at least $1,000 for the academic year or summer term for which the student is enrolled resident tuition and fees without regard to the length of time the student has resided in Texas. The student must compete with other students, including Texas residents, for the scholarship and the scholarship must be awarded by a scholarship committee officially recognized by the administration and be approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under criteria developed by the coordinating board.

(b) The total number of students at an institution paying resident tuition under this section for a particular semester may not exceed five percent of the total number of students registered at the institution for the same semester of the preceding academic year.

(c) The difference between tuition charged to the student under this section and the tuition the student would be charged if this section did not apply to the student shall not be accounted for in such a way as to reduce the general revenue appropriation to an institution of higher education that charges a nonresident student resident tuition and fees under this section.

Transferred and redesignated from Texas Education Code, Section 54.064 by Acts 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., Ch. 359, Sec. 1, eff. January 1, 2012.

Scholarships are awarded in accordance with the published eligibility criteria and award factors set forth by each respective program. Factors that may influence scholarship...
awarding include donor or program specifications, financial need for need-based scholarships, and availability of funding. Committees responsible for awarding a competitive scholarship may consider and give positive weight to such factors as the following:

In addition to any specific criteria governing awards of competitive scholarships (e.g., major field of study), the committee responsible for such awards will give primary consideration to the applicant's academic records, both evaluating the type and nature of courses taken and the grades achieved in specific courses. The committee may also consider and give positive weight to such factors as the following in designating recipients:

- SAT or ACT scores
- Class rank, academic record
- Success in advanced courses
- National recognition
- Achievements in work experiences
- Community service
- Extracurricular activities and leadership activities
- Surmounting obstacles to the further pursuit of higher education
- Socioeconomic background
- Educational level
- Status as a first generation college student

The criteria cited above is not an exhaustive list and some factors are only applicable to incoming freshman applicants.

Scholarships typically are awarded in the spring semester for disbursement during the following academic year. Please visit UT Dallas Scholarships for more information.
Scholarship Programs

Information about a variety of scholarships awarded on the basis of academic merit and achievement is available from the Office of Financial Aid. The University of Texas at Dallas also offers a number of endowed scholarships that are administered by a school, department, or program. Students are encouraged to contact their school dean or program office to obtain information about eligibility criteria and scholarship opportunities via the centralized listing managed by the Office of Financial Aid awarded in the student's area of study.

In accord with Chapter 54 of the Texas Education Code provided below, all applications for competitive academic scholarships for graduate study are reviewed by the Committee on Student Scholarships and/or the Graduate Scholarship Committee in the appropriate academic unit.

Texas Education Code Competitive Scholarship
Sec. 54.213. SCHOLARSHIP STUDENT

- (a) An institution of higher education may charge a nonresident student who holds a competitive scholarship of at least $1,000 for the academic year or summer term for which the student is enrolled resident tuition and fees without regard to the length of time the student has resided in Texas. The student must compete with other students, including Texas residents, for the scholarship and the scholarship must be awarded by a scholarship committee officially recognized by the administration and be approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under criteria developed by the coordinating board.

- (b) The total number of students at an institution paying resident tuition under this section for a particular semester may not exceed five percent of the total number of students registered at the institution for the same semester of the preceding academic year.

- (c) The difference between tuition charged to the student under this section and the tuition the student would be charged if this section did not apply to the student shall not be accounted for in such a way as to reduce the general revenue appropriation to an institution of higher education that charges a nonresident student resident tuition and fees under this section.

Transferred and redesignated from Texas Education Code, Section 54.064 by Acts 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., Ch. 359, Sec. 1, eff. January 1, 2012.

Please visit UT Dallas Scholarships for more information.

Scholarships are awarded in accordance with the published eligibility criteria and award factors set forth by each respective program. Factors that may influence scholarship awarding include donor or program specifications, financial need for need-based scholarships, and availability of funding. Committees responsible for awarding a
competitive scholarship may consider and give positive weight to such factors as the following:

Graduate Scholarships General Selection Criteria:

- Courses taken
- Grades received in specific courses
- Good academic standing
- Demonstrate academic promise
- Full or part-time enrollment
- Degree seeking
- Financial need may be considered but is not required

*The criteria cited above is not an exhaustive list. Please visit UT Dallas Scholarships for more information.*
Graduate Courses for Possible Future Use as Graduate Credit

Undergraduates may take up to 12 semester credit hours of graduate courses to reserve for possible application toward a graduate degree. To register, undergraduate students must obtain permission from the course instructor and from the graduate advisor of the program in which the course is offered. Such courses with an earned grade of 'B' or better will be eligible for application to the student's graduate record when the student is admitted to a graduate program. These courses will not apply to the student's undergraduate degree and will not affect the student's undergraduate GPA.
Graduate Courses for Possible Future Use as Graduate Credit

Undergraduates may take up to 12 semester credit hours of graduate courses to reserve for possible application toward a graduate degree. To register, undergraduate students must obtain permission from the course instructor and from the graduate advisor of the program in which the course is offered. Such courses with an earned grade of 'B' or better may be eligible for application to the student’s graduate record when the student is admitted to a graduate program. These courses will not apply to the student’s undergraduate degree and will not affect the student’s undergraduate GPA.
Policy Statement

1. PROGRAM OF STUDIES: Each student admitted to a Graduate Program will have a specific program of studies, outlined in the current graduate catalog that is agreed to in consultation with the appropriate committee, graduate advisor or administrator for that degree program. Students enrolled in master's degree programs must have a completed "Program of Studies/Degree Plan" filed in and approved by the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies prior to the student's registration for his or her 19th semester credit hour in the degree program. The form will be completed and revised, if necessary, each semester under the guidance of the student's graduate advisor. For each student enrolled in a doctoral degree program, the academic advisor in consultation with the student, will prepare and submit a completed and updated "Milestones Agreement Form" annually to the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. The completed form will define academic milestones and timeline required to earn the doctoral degree and the progress being made by the student in meeting each requirement.

   1. Exception: Common Master's Program: In those Graduate Programs where a common program of studies is prescribed for all Master's students, differing only in elective courses comprising less than one-third of the total required degree semester credit hours, the Graduate Program can file a model "Program of Studies" with the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. Any student wishing to deviate from that approved model Program of Studies must file an Individual Program of Studies developed and approved by the appropriate committee or administrator for that program prior to the student's registration for his or her 19th degree semester hour taken at U. T. Dallas.

   2. Exception: Common Doctoral Core: In those Graduate Programs where a common doctoral core is prescribed for all students, differing only by the area of specialization chosen, the Graduate Program can file a model "Program of Studies" with the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. Any student wishing to deviate from that approved model Program of Studies must file an Individual Program of Studies developed and approved by the appropriate committee or administrator for that program prior to the student's registration for his or her 50th degree semester hour taken at U. T. Dallas.

   3. Additional Master's Degrees: Students wishing to earn additional Master's degrees at U. T. Dallas must develop an approved Program of Studies through the Program offering that degree prior to enrolling in additional courses. The program can allow up to 15 semester credit hours earned in a previous degree program toward the additional degree. Additional credits may be accepted from the previous degree upon the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies. In no case will credits counted for a previous degree be allowed to exceed one-half the total hours required for the additional master's degree program.
4. Graduation Under a Particular Catalog: Provided the requisite courses continue to be offered, the student is bound by the course work requirements of the catalog in effect at the time of admission, within a six-year limit for the completion of the master's degree and ten years for the doctoral degree. With the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies the student may elect to be bound by the catalog in effect at the time the student applies for graduation. This regulation applies to specific course work and the number of semester credit hours for the academic degrees set forth in the catalog. All other requirements will change or be continued with the issuance of new graduate catalogs.

5. TRANSFER CREDIT: To qualify for transfer credit, the grade earned in the course must be a B or better and the course must not be a correspondence, extension or pass/fail course. Courses delivered in a distance learning format will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Petitions for transfer of credit must be prepared by the Graduate Program and submitted for approval by the Dean of Graduate Studies. Petitions may be approved at the time of the student's first enrollment; however, no actual acceptance of transfer credit will occur until after the student has completed 9 semester credit hours of courses at U. T. Dallas with a grade point average of at least 3.0. Petitions for transferring courses taken before enrolling as a graduate student at U. T. Dallas must be submitted prior to filing the Program of Studies. Petitions for transfer credit must be accompanied by a copy of the student's transcript showing the course(s) in question.
   1. No more than 25% of the total requirement of a master's degree may be transfer credits. Some degree programs have more restrictive transfer of credit requirements.
   2. Doctoral Degree: A master's degree or its equivalent may be transferred from another university for up to 36 semester hours of credit towards a doctoral degree.
   3. Non-Degree Students: No more than 15 semester credit hours taken as a Non-Degree Student may be subsequently transferred to a degree program at U. T. Dallas. No petition is necessary for any of this coursework to be included in a student's Program of Studies.
   4. Exceptions: Exceptions to these transfer policies may be granted only on petition to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Such a petition could be for the program of an individual student or for the model Program of Studies (See "Exceptions" on page 1 of this policy).

5. DEGREE REQUIREMENTS: The student will complete the course work degree requirements when he or she completes the previously filed program of studies with acceptable grades.
   1. Required Semester Credit Hours: The minimum required semester credit hours in a Program of Studies required for the degree will be those shown in the catalog applicable to the student at the time of his or her admission or readmission to the program. In no case will a student be allowed to graduate with less than 30 approved graduate semester credit hours (including approved graduate transfer credit hours) for the master's degree.
   2. Required Grade Point Average: In order to qualify for graduation, students must maintain a 3.0 grade point average in their degree program's core
courses. However, individual programs may have more stringent grade point requirements in selected courses, which must be satisfied for graduation. The minimum acceptable University grade point average for graduation is 3.0 for all graduate courses taken in the student’s degree program at U. T. Dallas.

3. Research Involving Animal or Human Subjects
   1. Research Involving the Use of Animals (Policy Memorandum 79-I.2-30): Any student who intends to conduct research, (whether funded or not funded) which would involve animals must obtain permission from the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). Permission to use an animal in research must be obtained prior to ordering, bringing to campus or housing on campus an animal. The required form to request approval may be obtained from the Office of Research Compliance.
   2. Research Involving Human Subjects (Policy Memorandum 79-I.2-31): Any student who intends to conduct research, on or off campus, in partial or complete fulfillment of a course requirement, thesis or dissertation, which would involve human beings as subjects must obtain permission, prior to undertaking the research, from the University's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB). Any research activity, including but not limited to surveys, questionnaires, interviews, standardized and non standardized tests, and/or simple research experiments, which include the participation of human beings, regardless of age of participant, must have approval from the IRB. The required forms to request approval may be obtained from the Office of Research Compliance.

3. Admission to Doctoral Candidacy: The research potential and ability of each doctoral student to both understand and integrate previous coursework will be evaluated before a student can be admitted formally to doctoral candidacy. The format of this evaluation, hereafter referred to as a qualifying examination, varies amongst the degree programs, and can be obtained from the student's Graduate Program Office. A student failing the Qualifying Examination is terminated as a doctoral student in that program unless a two-thirds majority of the examining committee vote that a second examination be permitted. All committee members should have all the evidence of the student's academic record and Qualifying Examination performance prior to this vote. The second examination typically would be taken no sooner than three months after the first examination, and no later than one year after the first examination. Students failing the second examination will not be allowed to pursue a doctoral degree in that program. Under no circumstances will a third examination be allowed. The student will have advanced to candidacy when the student has
   1. passed the qualifying examination,
   2. been assigned an approved Supervising Committee, and
   3. satisfied any other Program or School candidacy requirements.

Candidacy must be achieved before a student is eligible to enroll in dissertation courses.

4. THESIS AND DISSERTATION REQUIREMENT
1. **Dissertation Proposal: Content:** The Dissertation Proposal should be prepared by the student in consultation with the student’s Supervising Committee. The proposal should include:
   1. A tentative title of the dissertation describing the topic as accurately and briefly as possible.
   2. The background of the research, the hypotheses to be tested or concepts to be explored, and the methodology to be employed. It should also address the relationship of the proposed work to existing work in the field, at U. T. Dallas or elsewhere, its intended outcome, and its contribution to the field.
   3. A schedule of the remaining research activities, including major completion milestones.
   4. A set of up to five "key words" to assist in establishing the Data Base on Theses and Dissertations.

5. **Dissertation Proposal: Approval:** The proposal should be prepared by the student in consultation with the student's Supervising Professor, who will approve the document before its submission to the appropriate committee or administrator for that Department or Program. After its approval at the Department, Program, School, or Interdisciplinary Degree Committee level, the proposal will then be forwarded to the Dean of Graduate Studies, together with the Department's or Program's nominations for Supervising Professor and members of the Supervising Committee and the anticipated time of completion.

6. **Supervising Committee: General:** The recommended Supervising Committee for the student is submitted by the appropriate committee or administrator for that Department or Program to the Dean of Graduate Studies for approval. Subsequent changes in membership must also be subject to approval by the appropriate committee or administrator for that Department or Program, and in turn the Dean of Graduate Studies. Individuals qualified for service on the Supervising Committee will be voting members of the General Faculty (as defined by The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures), Adjunct Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Distinguished Scholars in Residence, Emeritus Faculty, Research Professors, Research Scientists, Senior Lecturers, or Visiting Faculty who hold the highest earned degree in the field or fields concerned or exhibit an equivalent record of accomplishment. In addition to the master's and doctoral degree membership composition as defined in sections D and E below, additional members outside the General Faculty may serve with the special approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies. Members of the Supervising Committee will also be members of the Examining Committee. (*In the case of Adjunct Faculty, a General Faculty member will be appointed to co-chair the Supervising Committee).

7. **Supervising Committee: Master's Degree with Thesis:** Appointment of a Master's thesis Supervising Committee consisting of at least three members is a function of the degree program expected to confer the student's degree. Additional members may be appointed. All appointments must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies. The appropriate committee or administrator of
the program in consultation with the student, will nominate:
1. the Chair, who serves as the supervisor of the research, will ordinarily be a voting member of the General Faculty holding the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor. Adjunct Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Distinguished Scholars in Residence, Emeritus Faculty, Research Professors, Research Scientists, Senior Lecturers, or Visiting Faculty who hold the highest earned degree or exhibit an equivalent record of accomplishment in the field or fields of the research or aesthetics may be appointed as Chair if he/she receives a 2/3 majority recommendation of the Professors of the academic discipline and approval of the Academic Dean of the School offering the degree.

2. not less than two voting members of the General Faculty from the graduate degree program expected to confer the student's degree; and

3. if necessary, a third representative appointed by the appropriate committee or administrator for that discipline.

Any school varying from the above procedures in constituting Supervising Committees must have had prior approval from the Dean of Graduate Studies.

8. Supervising Committee: Doctoral Degree: Appointment of a Doctoral dissertation Supervising Committee consisting of at least four members is a function of the degree program expected to confer the student's degree. Additional members may be appointed. All appointments must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies. The appropriate committee or administrator of the program, in consultation with the student, will nominate:

1. the Chair, who serves as the supervisor of the research, will ordinarily be a voting member of the General Faculty holding the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor. Adjunct Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Distinguished Scholars in Residence, Emeritus Faculty, Research Professors, Research Scientists, Senior Lecturers, or Visiting Faculty who hold the highest earned degree or exhibit an equivalent record of accomplishment in the field or fields of the research or aesthetics may be appointed as Chair if he/she receives a 2/3 majority recommendation of the Professors of the academic discipline and approval of the Academic Dean of the School offering the degree.

2. not less than three voting members of the General Faculty, from the graduate degree program expected to confer the student's degree; and

3. if necessary, a fourth representative appointed by the appropriate committee or administrator for that discipline.

Schools varying from the above procedures in constituting Supervising Committees must have had prior approval from the Dean of Graduate Studies.

2. SUPERVISION: The Supervising Committee will meet with the candidate soon after the Dean of Graduate Studies has approved membership of the Committee. The intention of this initial meeting should be to discuss potential problem areas in the proposal and to establish a procedure that the Committee wishes to adopt to follow the research to a successful conclusion, e.g., the frequency and format of contact between candidate and Committee. The Supervising Committee must meet at least once annually, assess the student's progress, and send a report on that progress to the
appropriate committee or administrator for that program and to the Dean of Graduate Studies. This report should describe any problems which have the potential to delay the research beyond its anticipated completion date. A copy of this report must also be sent to the student. The student can request a meeting of the Supervising Committee through a written request to the appropriate committee or administrator for that program. The appropriate committee or administrator for that program will be responsible for convening such a meeting, generally within two weeks of the student's request, unless this timing is impossible owing to the absence of the Supervising Professor. No more than one student-initiated meeting can be called within an academic year. Provision for coverage of leaves of absence of either students or committee members will have been discussed at the initial meeting of the Supervising Committee. Any arrangements for surrogate supervision or changes in the student's plans will be communicated to the appropriate committee or administrator for that program, in writing, with a copy to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Because of the relationship between the student and the Supervising Committee, committee members on leave of absence or who have left their positions with the university may be given permission to remain on the committee by the Dean of Graduate Studies. However, they must agree to be active participants in supervisory activities and to be present for the final examination. If this is not possible, the committee member must be replaced and a new member of the General Faculty must be submitted for approval.

1. Manuscript Preparation: Style and format requirements have been established for theses and dissertations prepared at U. T. Dallas. Prior to submitting manuscripts, candidates should consult the Guide for the Preparation of Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations which can be obtained from http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/dgIndex.htm.

2. Committee Approval of the Manuscript: Approval of the thesis or dissertation to go forward for examination can only be given after the members have considered the entire manuscript. Members of the committee who do NOT agree that the manuscript is examinable, whether in the majority or not, should inform the Department Head or program administrator immediately, and in writing, so that such objections may be discussed with the Supervising Professor and the candidate.

3. Independent Research Competence: The dissertation must demonstrate an independent research competence on the part of the candidate that substantially adds to knowledge in the candidate's field with respect either to its intellectual substance or professional practice. The dissertation should be of such standard as to warrant publication in peer reviewed journals or scholarly books or monographs or equivalent.

4. Submission of the Final Draft of the Thesis or Dissertation: Once the candidate has, in the judgment of the Supervising Professor, prepared an examinable thesis/dissertation manuscript, it should be distributed to the other members of the Supervising Committee, allowing them a minimum of two weeks to review the document. After reading the document, a majority of the Supervising Committee members must agree that the document is ready to be defended before a request for a Final Oral Examination may be submitted and an examination date scheduled. Committee members should ensure that the manuscript is complete, has been rigorously proofread (preferably by a
professional proofreader), and meets scholarship standards for theses or dissertations. The **Supervising Professor** then submits a copy of the dissertation and the Request for Final Oral Examination form, signed with no more than one dissenting vote by the Supervising Committee members to the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, which shall approve the scheduling of the Final Oral Examination. Members of the committee who do NOT agree that the manuscript is examinable should inform the appropriate committee or administrator for that program immediately, and in writing, so that such objections may be discussed with the Supervising Professor and the candidate. The Final Oral Examination cannot be scheduled until a resolution has been reached with, at most, one dissenting vote.

5. **Required Copies Submission of Final Approved Thesis or Dissertation**

1. Students must submit a final approved, electronic version of their dissertation/thesis to the Office of Graduate Studies. An electronic version of the dissertation/thesis will be held by the library and available to the public. An electronic copy must also be submitted to UMI/ProQuest who will make it publically available in hard copy and on the web. Information about required format and the submission process can be found at [http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/dgIndex.htm](http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/dgIndex.htm).

   1. **Thesis Copies**: Three official hard copies of thesis are required. After final approved copies have been bound, one hard copy shall be available to the public in the university library; one copy will be sent to the supervising professor and one copy will be sent to the department/program office. One disk with the thesis in a PDF file is required. This electronic copy will be sent to UMI who will make it available in hard copy and on the web.

   2. **Dissertation Copies**: Three final approved copies are to be bound; one hard copy shall be available to the public in the university library; one copy will be sent to the supervising professor and one copy will be sent to the department/program. One disk with the dissertation in a PDF file is required. This electronic copy will be sent to UMI who will make it available in hard copy and on the web.

6. **FINAL ORAL EXAMINATION**

1. **Examine Committee**: Upon the submission of the dissertation to the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean will appoint the Examining Committee. The membership of the Examining Committee will include all members of the Supervisory Committee plus a non-voting representative appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies. The representative serves as the Chair of the Examining Committee. An examiner external to the University may also be appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies on the recommendation of a member of the Supervising Committee or the candidate.

2. **Conducting the Examination**: Formal arrangements, such as time and place for the Final Oral Examination, are made by the appropriate committee or administrator for that program, in consultation with the candidate and the Examining Committee, and with the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies. All members of the Examining Committee must be present for the examination to be valid, unless a prior written exemption has been granted by the Dean of Graduate Studies. If a member of the Examining Committee is absent without
the approval of the Dean, then the Chair of the Examining Committee shall not hold the defense. The defense shall be rescheduled by the Dean of Graduate Studies. In any case, only one member may be absent without requiring a substitute. The examination will be conducted by the Chair in a manner appropriate to the material presented, and in accordance with current University regulations. The discussion will primarily focus on the candidate's
research, although aspects of the general field in which it was conducted may also be covered.

1. The final oral examination shall be conducted in three phases.
   1. Phase I. The candidate will make a formal public presentation of the research. That presentation is open to the public, and members of the audience may ask questions. The Supervising Professor will chair this phase and supervise the questioning.
   2. Phase II. Following the public presentation, the candidate will be examined by the members of the Examining Committee. This part of the examination is not open to the public. Depending upon the school’s policy, other members of the faculty may also attend that part of the examination. This portion of the examination will be chaired by the representative of the Dean of Graduate Studies.
   3. Phase III. After the completion of the oral examination, the Examining Committee will vote on the results of the Final Oral Examination The committee will reach agreement on one of the five possible outcomes listed below with no more than one dissenting vote. If the committee cannot reach agreement on one of the options, then the candidate will have failed the oral examination and the manuscript will not be accepted.
      1. Passed the oral examination and manuscript accepted,
      2. Passed the oral examination and manuscript accepted pending specified revisions,
      3. Second oral examination required, but manuscript accepted or accepted with specified revisions,
      4. Major revisions of the manuscript and a second final oral examination required,
      5. Oral examination failed, manuscript not accepted and the committee recommends dismissal from the program.

4. Procedures concerning Acceptance, Specified and Major revisions, and Failure are as follows:
   1. Accepted - The committee agrees that the dissertation is acceptable either without any revisions, or with minor revisions such as corrections of typographical errors or changes of a minor editorial nature. It is the Supervising Professor’s responsibility to ensure that such corrections are made. The final corrected and approved copies of the dissertation must be submitted to the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies within the same semester. If the final approved copy is not submitted within the semester, the results of the examination will be changed to Accepted Pending Specified Revisions and will be dealt with as specified under that result.
2. Accepted Pending Specified Revisions - The Committee agrees that the dissertation is acceptable pending changes, which may include insertions or deletions. Such changes would be of the kind which do not radically modify the development/argument of the dissertation but which go beyond minor revisions. The practical criterion will be that the committee is able to specify such changes with precision. It is the responsibility of the Supervising committee to certify that all such changes have been made. If the final approved copy is not submitted by the end of the semester following the examination, the results of the examination will be changed to Referred Pending Major Revisions and will be dealt with as specified under that result.

3. Referred Pending Major Revisions - The Committee agrees that the dissertation requires substantive changes in order for the dissertation to be acceptable. Detailed reasons for this decision must be supplied by the Chair of the Examining committee to the Dean of Graduate Studies, the appropriate committee or administrator for that program, and the candidate concerned. These recommendations on required changes must be approved by all members of the Committee. The committee reconvenes within a period not to exceed twelve months to conduct a second Final Oral Examination. This second attempt on the Final Oral Examination will be the final attempt by the student. If the Final Oral Examination and the written manuscript are not graded within the Accepted category, the student is dismissed from the program.

4. Failure - If the majority of the Examining Committee votes for failure of the oral and the non-acceptance of the manuscript, the student will be dismissed from the program. In no case will a third oral be given.

5. Registration During Manuscript Revision: Regardless of the revisions to be made, the student will be required to register for three credit hours and pay fees until the revisions are accepted by the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

6. Impact of revisions upon time limit for degree completion: The ten-year time limit for completion of the degree is still in effect while these revisions are being completed.

7. Intellectual property right protection: In order to protect patent or other intellectual property rights, the Dean of Graduate Studies may, upon request, delay for a period of one year the binding, distribution, and/or publication in microfilm of the dissertation.

3. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS
   1. Examinations or Proposal Presentation: A student must be registered for at least three semester credit hours of graduate course work during the semester in which any major degree examination, such as the Qualifying Examination, Final Written Examination, or Final Oral Examination, is taken, or during the semester in which the proposal is submitted for approval
2. Procedures are outlined in the Graduate Catalog - Continuous Enrollment for Thesis or Dissertation: Once a student has enrolled in thesis or dissertation unless a leave of absence has been granted, that student must maintain continuous enrollment (not necessarily for thesis or dissertation) of at least three semester hours during consecutive long semesters until the final approved copy of the manuscript has been deposited in the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. If the approved copy of the manuscript has been deposited in the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies too late to permit graduation during that semester, but before the Census day of the Full-Term session (as defined in the academic calendar) of the subsequent semester, the student may register in absentia for his/her final semester of graduation.

3. Enrollment During the Semester of Graduation: With the exception of in absentia registration, doctoral students must be enrolled in at least 1 credit hour in the semester in which they graduate. Enrollment for 1 semester credit hour in the final semester is only allowed once. However, the individual degree program may require more than 1 credit hour be taken during the graduation semester.

4. TIME LIMITS: All requirements for a graduate degree, including transfer of credit must be completed within the specified time period. Students exceeding the specified time limit will not be eligible for their degree and will be dismissed from that graduate program. An approved leave of absence will not alter the time limits placed on graduate degrees.

   1. Master's Degree: All requirements for the Master's degree must be completed within one six-year period. Work over six years old, whether done at this University or elsewhere, will not count towards the Master's degree except through the petition process described in the "Time Limit: Exceptions" section.

   2. Doctoral Degree: All requirements for the Doctoral degree must be completed within one ten-year period. Work over ten years old, whether done at this University or elsewhere, will not count towards the Doctoral degree except through the petition process described in the "Time Limit: Exceptions" section. Students whose master's degrees are accepted for full credit toward a Ph.D. must complete all requirements for the doctoral degree within one eight-year period. Work exceeding these limits, whether done at this university or elsewhere, will not count towards the degree.

   3. Exceptions — Course Work: The time limits affecting course work taken early in a graduate program can be waived only when a student can demonstrate to the appropriate committee or administrator for that program that:

      1. the substantive material in the course is still relevant to the curriculum and,

      2. the student still retains a substantial grasp of the material taught in the course.

   In such case, the acceptability of the course work in the student's Program of Studies must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies upon the recommendation of the appropriate committee or administrator for that program.

   4. Exceptions — Research: The time limits can be waived only for research extending beyond the prescribed limits and only in exceptional cases where the
student, Supervising Professor, and the appropriate committee or administrator for that program can demonstrate that:

1. substantial progress has been made in the research effort and the student can successfully complete the thesis or dissertation within a two term extension, including the summer term, and
2. a schedule to complete the research has been developed including major milestones of accomplishments. In such a case, the acceptability of the plan to finish the research must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies upon the recommendation of the appropriate committee or administrator for that program.

3. Procedures Prior to Graduation: An Application for Graduation must be filed during the semester of graduation on or before the date stipulated in the Academic Calendar.
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• Revised: November 1, 1992
• Revised: June 24, 1997
• Editorial Amendments: February 2, 1998
• Editorial Amendments: September 1, 2000
• Revised: December 15, 2000
• Revised: December 13, 2006
• Revised: December 2, 2008
• Revised: December 17, 2010
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Policy Links

• Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1052
• Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1052
• Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1052
“Required Copies of Dissertation and Thesis

A final, approved electronic version of the dissertation/thesis is required by Office of Graduate Studies. An electronic copy of the dissertation/thesis will be held by the library and available to the public.

An electronic copy must be submitted to UMI/ProQuest. UMI will publish and make the dissertation/thesis available to the public for purchase both on the web and in hard copy.

For more information on this policy please review UTDPP1052 - Policy on Procedures for Completing a Graduate Degree: Thesis and Dissertation Requirement”
Item 9: Appointment of Academic Dishonesty Pool
2016-2017

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><strong>Faculty:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fonseka (ECS)</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murat Kantarcioglu (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>
Item 10:
Amendments to
UTS 180
1. Title

Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment

2. Policy

Sec. 1 Applicability. This policy applies to all UT Dallas employees.

Sec. 2 Purpose. This policy is intended to protect the credibility and reputation of UT Dallas and its employees.

Sec. 3 Primary Responsibility. The primary responsibility of employees of UT Dallas is the accomplishment of the duties and responsibilities assigned to one’s position of appointment.

Sec. 4 Un-Managed Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment Prohibited. UT Dallas employees may not have a direct or indirect interest, including financial and other interests, or engage in a business transaction or professional activity, or incur any obligation of any nature that is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of the employees’ duties to their institution.

Activities on behalf of outside entities or individuals must not interfere with an employee’s fulfillment of his/her duties and responsibilities to UT Dallas. Such conflicts of commitment may arise regardless of the location of these activities, the type of outside entity, or the level of compensation.

Sec. 5 Use of Property. UT Dallas property may only be used for State purposes appropriate to UT Dallas’s mission. Use of UT Dallas property for any outside activity must be approved in accordance with applicable rules and policies.

Sec. 6 Noncompliance. Noncompliance with this policy may subject one to discipline in accordance with applicable procedures up to and including termination of employment.

Sec. 7 Education and Training. This policy and other related policies will be distributed to those responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests on an annual basis. Individuals responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests will be subject to training on an annual basis.

Sec. 8 Definitions.

**Conflict of Commitment** - A state in which the time or effort that a UT Dallas employee devotes to an outside activity directly or significantly interferes with the employee’s fulfillment of their institutional responsibilities or when the employee uses State property without authority in connection with the employee’s outside employment, board service, or other activity (See Sec. 8, RR 30104). Exceeding the amount of total time permitted by institution policy for outside activities creates the appearance of a conflict of commitment.
Conflict of Interest - A significant outside interest of a UT Dallas employee or one of the employee’s immediate family members that could directly or significantly affect the employee’s performance of the employee’s institutional responsibilities. The proper discharge of an employee’s institutional responsibilities could be directly or significantly affected if the employment, service, activity or interest: (1) might tend to influence the way the employee performs his or her institutional responsibilities, or the employee knows or should know the interest is or has been offered with the intent to influence the employee’s conduct or decisions; (2) could reasonably be expected to impair the employee’s judgment in performing his or her institutional responsibilities; or (3) might require or induce the employee to disclose confidential or proprietary information acquired through the performance of institutional responsibilities.

Immediate Family Members - include:

a) a spouse;

b) a dependent child or stepchild or other dependent, for purposes of determining federal income tax liability during the period covered by the disclosure statement; and

c) a related or non-related, unmarried adult who resides in the same household as the individual and with whom the individual is financially interdependent as evidenced, for example, by the maintenance of a joint bank account, mortgage, or investments.
Title

Outside Activity Policy: Executive Officers and Employees Involved in Procurement Activities or Contract Management

Policy

Sec. 1 Applicability. This policy applies to all UT Dallas Executive Officers, Employees Involved in Procurement Activities, and employees involved in contract management.

Sec. 2 Purpose. This policy is intended to protect the credibility and reputation of UT Dallas and its employees, by providing a framework to address conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment, and outside activities.

Sec. 3 Value in Certain Outside Activities. Regents’ Rule 30104 permits UT Dallas employees to engage in outside work or activities, subject to State laws, UT System and UT Dallas rules or policies. UT Dallas encourages outside activities that clearly contribute to the mission of the institution and/or provide important elements of professional development related to their institution responsibilities.

Sec. 4 Approval for Outside Activities Required.

All Executive Officers, Employees Involved in Procurement Activities, and employees involved in contract management must electronically request and receive prior approval for the following activities:

(i) all outside employment or other compensated activity;

(ii) any outside activity, regardless of compensation, that reasonably appears to create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment; and

(iii) outside board service as described in Section 7.4 below.

Sec. 5 Disclosure of Outside Activities and Interests.

5.1 With the exception of the President and the minimum purchasing threshold discussed below, all Executive Officers, Employees Involved in Procurement Activities, and employees involved in contract management shall electronically disclose for themselves and for immediate family members:

(i) a description of the nature and extent of all outside employment or other compensated activity;

(ii) a description of the nature and extent of any outside activity, regardless of compensation, that reasonably appears to create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment;

(iii) a description of the nature and extent of outside board service as described in Section 7.4 below,
(Outside Activities for Executive Officers and Procurement Officials)

(iv) a description, including the amount of compensation or interest, of any substantial interest in a business entity which should be provided no later than 30 days after acquiring the interest;

(v) a description of gifts over $250. Do not include gifts received from: one’s parent, child, sibling, grandparent, or grandchild; one’s spouse or the spouse of anyone mentioned above; or the parent, child, sibling, grandparent, or grandchild of one’s spouse;

5.2 The President is required by state law to file Personal Financial Statements with the Texas Ethics Commission. In lieu of filing the information listed in Section 5.1, the President shall file a duplicate copy of their Personal Financial Statement with the Office of the Chancellor at the time that it is filed with the Ethics Commission. If the President seeks an extension of the time to file a Personal Financial Statement with the Texas Ethics Commission, the President must also notify the Chancellor’s Office of the extension.

5.3 Outside activity disclosed under institutional policy developed pursuant to UTS 175, “Disclosure of Significant Financial Interests and Management and report of Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research,” need not be re-disclosed.

5.4 Minimum Purchasing Threshold: Employees Involved in Procurement Activities who are not authorized to make purchases of $15,000 or more, and who make no decisions or recommendations regarding purchases of $15,000 or more, are not required to disclose their outside activities and interests in the U.T System electronic disclosure database.

5.5 In determining whether activity should be disclosed, the individual should resolve the doubt in favor of disclosure.

5.6 Officers and employees covered by this policy with nothing to disclose must affirmatively indicate that fact in the electronic database.

Sec. 6 Electronic Database.

UT System Administration shall develop a shared service electronic reporting system that is consistent with this policy. Institutions may choose to utilize this system to meet the reporting guidelines outlined below or they may choose to electronically collect and transfer equivalent data to UT System Administration using their own electronic systems. Data transfers to UT System Administration shall occur on at least a bi-annual basis. All data locally collected and transferred to UT System Administration must comport with the data definitions, template, and format provided by UT System Administration.

Sec. 7 Outside Activity Guidelines.
7.1 Approval Authorities. The President has appointed the following individuals as the approval authorities under this policy:

(a) For Executive Officers: the President; or for the President, the Executive Vice Chancellor
(b) For Employees Involved in Procurement Activities: their supervisor
(c) For employees involved in contract management: their supervisor

7.2 Time Commitment

No outside activity may be approved if it creates a conflict of commitment. The time commitment of outside activities must not interfere with an employee’s primary responsibility to UT Dallas. While the permissible level of time commitment to outside activities can vary depending upon the positions involved, under no circumstances may it exceed an average of one day (8 hours) per week, during the term of an appointment, without the express approval of the President.

7.3 Categories of Outside Activity

(a) Activity that clearly contributes to the mission of UT Dallas. Some outside activities clearly contribute to the mission of UT Dallas or UT System and/or provide important elements of professional development related to the employee’s institutional duties and responsibilities. These activities, when disclosed and approved, are permitted, can be encouraged, and may be performed during normal operating hours. Examples of these activities include:

   Engaging in professional activity such as providing expert testimony, providing consulting services, professional/clinical practice, and serving on a board of directors

(b) UT Dallas employees may also engage in activity that does not necessarily contribute to the mission of UT Dallas or provide elements of professional development related to their institutional duties and responsibilities, so long as it does not reasonably appear to create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment with the employee's institutional duties and responsibilities. Any such activity must take place only outside of normal operating hours, without use of institutional resources, and must be disclosed and approved as required by this policy.

7.4 Accounting for Outside Board Service

(a) Recognizing the benefit to be derived by UT Dallas from outside board service, and after thorough consideration of the time commitment that might be involved, time spent on uncompensated service on nonreligious boards, other
than for reimbursement of usual and customary expenses, may be deemed to be of service to the UT Dallas and may not require the use of a person’s own time, with prior disclosure and approval before engaging in such service.

(b) Service on an outside board for which the employee is compensated, and any service to a religious organization whether or not compensated, must be on the person’s own time. If the service occurs during normal office hours, the person must use vacation time, compensatory time, or other appropriate leave while providing the service. The service should be without cost to UT Dallas; and, except for service to religious organizations, must be disclosed and approved prior to engaging in such service.

(c) Participation on the board of a municipality; local religious congregation; neighborhood association; public, private or parochial school; political organization; youth sports or recreation league; affinity group such as the local orchid society or model train collectors club; and other similar outside boards on which the service is primarily personal rather than professional in nature and does not require time away from UT Dallas responsibilities, is permitted without the requirement of disclosure and advance approval if it does not create a conflict of interest or conflict of commitment or the appearance of a conflict of interest or conflict of commitment.

Sec. 8 Additional Process Requirements.

8.1 Management Plans. Management plans must be in place for all employees covered by this policy for outside activities that may create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment before activity begins. Management plans will be developed by [Designated Official] and approved by [Next Senior Official].

8.2 Appeals. Individuals whose request for approval of outside activity is denied may request that the denying authority reconsider the decision and provide an explanation in writing. If the individual remains unsatisfied with the decision, he or she may access standard grievance procedures to the extent that they are otherwise applicable.

8.3 Prospect and Retrospective Approval. In rare instance, outside activity may be approved retrospectively when the individual is called upon to assist in an emergency or urgent situation where it would be impossible or unreasonable to obtain advance approval. In such cases, the activity must be fully disclosed and approval sought from the appropriate authority as soon as reasonably possible.

Some activity may also be prospectively approved, for up to one year, when an individual describes to the approving authority as fully as reasonably possible the general nature and extent of anticipated, but not confirmed, outside opportunities.

8.4 Confidential Outside Activity. If an individual wishes to engage in an activity for which some or all of the relevant information is confidential, the approving
authority may nonetheless approve the activity without requiring full written disclosure upon satisfaction that there is a compelling reason to treat the information confidentially and the activity is otherwise fully compliant with this policy and all other applicable laws and UT Dallas and UT System policies.

8.5 Rescinding Approvals. An approving authority may rescind an approved outside activity upon receipt of information indicating that the activity is not consistent with this policy or any applicable law or UT Dallas or UT System policy. The individual for whom the activity may be rescinded shall be given notice of the information and an opportunity to respond.

Sec. 9 Noncompliance. Noncompliance with this policy may subject one to discipline in accordance with applicable procedures up to and including termination of employment.

Sec. 10 Annual Report. Employees shall review and finalize all disclosures after the end of the calendar year during the annual reporting period (January through March of the following year).

Sec. 11 Education and Training. This policy and other related policies will be distributed to those responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests on an annual basis. Individuals responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests will be subject to training on an annual basis.

Sec. 12 Definitions.

**Business Entity** - Any entity recognized by law through which business is conducted, including a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint stock company, receivership, or trust.

**Compensation** - Any form of benefit including but not limited to salary, retainer, honoraria, intellectual property rights or royalties, or promised, deferred, or contingent interest. It also includes sponsored travel or reimbursement.

**Conflict of Commitment** - A state in which the time or effort that a UT Dallas employee devotes to an outside activity directly or significantly interferes with the employee’s fulfillment of their institutional responsibilities or when the employee uses State property without authority in connection with the employee’s outside employment, board service, or other activity (See Sec. 8, RR 30104). Exceeding the amount of total time permitted by institutional policy for outside activities creates the appearance of a conflict of commitment.

**Conflict of Interest** - A significant outside interest of a UT Dallas employee or one of the employee’s immediate family members that could directly or significantly affect the employee’s performance of the employee’s institutional responsibilities. The proper discharge of an employee’s institutional responsibilities could be directly or significantly affected if the employment, service, activity or interest: (1) might tend to influence the way the employee performs his or her institutional responsibilities, or the employee
knows or should know the interest is or has been offered with the intent to influence the employee’s conduct or decisions; (2) could reasonably be expected to impair the employee’s judgment in performing his or her institutional responsibilities; or (3) might require or induce the employee to disclose confidential or proprietary information acquired through the performance of institutional responsibilities.

Employees Involved in Procurement Activities - An employee who makes decisions or recommendations regarding:

a) contract terms or conditions on a contract;
b) who is to be awarded a contract;
c) preparation of a solicitation for a contract; or
d) evaluation of a bid or proposal.

Executive Officer - includes, but is not limited to, the President, all individuals who report directly to the President (other than administrative support positions), and any employee who exercises broad and significant discretion over key institution functions. The following positions are hereby designated as Executive Officers:

[List positions]

Immediate Family Members - include:

a) a spouse;
b) a dependent child or stepchild or other dependent, for purposes of determining federal income tax liability during the period covered by the disclosure statement; and
c) a related or non-related, unmarried adult who resides in the same household as the individual and with whom the individual is financially interdependent as evidenced, for example, by the maintenance of a joint bank account, mortgage, or investments.

Nature and Extent - Shall include a description of the activity, the time commitment, the amount of compensation, if any, and the anticipated length of time the commitment is expected to continue.

Outside Board - The board, council, or other governing or advisory body of a business, civic, professional social, or religious organization, whether for profit or nonprofit.

Outside Employment - Any activity performed by an employee, other than fulfilling employment obligations at UT Dallas, for which remuneration is received, including distance teaching.

Substantial Interest in a Business Entity - For purposes of this policy, means:
(Outside Activities for Executive Officers and Procurement Officials)

(1) a controlling interest;

(2) ownership of more than 1 percent of the voting interest;

(3) ownership of more than $5,000 of the fair market value;

(4) a direct or indirect participating interest by shares, stock, or otherwise, regardless of whether voting rights are included, in more than 1 percent of the profits, proceeds, or capital gains; or

(5) service as an officer.

Not to include investments in mutual funds or retirement accounts, so long as the individual does not directly control the investment decisions made in those vehicles.
1. Title

Outside Activity Policy for All Employees, Excluding Executive Officers and Employees Involved in Procurement Activities or Contract Management

2. Policy

Sec. 1 Applicability. This policy applies to all UT Dallas employees, excluding Executive Officers, Employees Involved in Procurement Activities, or employees involved in contract management who are governed by [policy name and number].

Sec. 2 Purpose. This policy is intended to protect the credibility and reputation of UT Dallas and its employees, by providing a framework to address conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment, and outside activities.

Sec. 3 Value in Certain Outside Activities. Regents’ Rule 30104 permits UT Dallas employees to engage in outside work or activities, subject to State laws, UT System and UT Dallas rules or policies. UT Dallas encourages outside activities that clearly contribute to the mission of the institution and/or provide important elements of professional development related to their institution responsibilities.

Sec. 4 Approval for Outside Activities Required.

All employees must electronically request and receive prior approval for the following activities:

(i) all outside employment or other compensated activity;
(ii) any outside activity, regardless of compensation, that reasonably appears to create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment;
(iii) outside board service as described in Section 5.4 below.

Sec. 5 Outside Activity Guidelines.

5.1 Approval Authorities. The President has appointed the following individuals as the approval authorities under this policy:

(a) For members of the faculty: [e.g. the Dean or Department Chair (in large units)]
(b) For deans and department chairs: [e.g. the Provost or President]
(c) For administrative and professional staff: [their supervisor]
(d) For other employees: [their supervisor]

5.2 Time Commitment
No outside activity may be approved if it creates a conflict of commitment. The time commitment of outside activities must not interfere with an employee’s primary responsibility to UT Dallas. While the permissible level of time commitment to outside activities can vary depending upon the positions involved, under no circumstances may it exceed an average of one day (8 hours) per week, during the term of an appointment, without the express approval of the President.

5.3 Categories of Outside Activity

(a) Some activity is so integral to the mission of UT Dallas that it is encouraged and may be performed during normal operating hours and may be considered pre-approved, so long as the activity does not reasonably appear to create a conflict of interest and the amount of time committed does not interfere with employee’s institutional duties and responsibilities. These activities include the following:

Serving on a federal, state, or local government agency committee, panel, or commission. Acting in an editorial capacity for a professional journal. Reviewing journal manuscripts, book manuscripts, or grant or contract proposals. Attending and presenting talks at scholarly colloquia and conferences. Developing scholarly communications in the form of books or journal articles, movies, television productions, and similar works, even when such activities result in financial gain, consistent with intellectual property and other applicable U. T. System and institution policies and guidelines. Serving as a committee member, an officer, or a board member of a professional or scholarly society.

(b) Activity that clearly contributes to the mission of UT Dallas. Some outside activities clearly contribute to the mission of UT Dallas and/or provide important elements of professional development related to the employee’s institutional duties and responsibilities. These activities, when approved, are permitted, can be encouraged, and may be performed during normal operating hours. Examples of these activities include:

Engaging in professional activity such as providing expert testimony, providing consulting services, professional/clinical practice, and serving on a board of directors.

(c) UT Dallas employees may also engage in activity that does not necessarily contribute to the mission of UT Dallas or provide elements of professional development related to their institutional duties and responsibilities, so long as it does not reasonably appear to create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment with the employee's institutional duties and responsibilities. Any such activity must take place only outside of normal operating hours, without use of institutional resources, and must be approved as required by this policy.
5.4 Accounting for Outside Board Service

(a) Recognizing the benefit to be derived by UT Dallas from outside board service, and after thorough consideration of the time commitment that might be involved, time spent on uncompensated service on nonreligious boards, other than for reimbursement of usual and customary expenses, may be deemed to be of service to the UT Dallas and may not require the use of a person’s own time, with prior approval before engaging in such service.

(b) Service on an outside board for which the employee is compensated, and any service to a religious organization whether or not compensated, must be on the person’s own time. If the service occurs during normal office hours, the person must use vacation time, compensatory time, or other appropriate leave while providing the service. The service should be without cost to UT Dallas; and, except for service to religious organizations, must be approved prior to engaging in such service.

(c) Participation on the board of a municipality; local religious congregation; neighborhood association; public, private or parochial school; political organization; youth sports or recreation league; affinity group such as the local orchid society or model train collectors club; and other similar outside boards on which the service is primarily personal rather than professional in nature and does not require time away from UT Dallas responsibilities, is permitted without the requirement of approval if it does not create a conflict of interest or conflict of commitment or the appearance of a conflict of interest or conflict of commitment.

5.5 In determining whether activity should be disclosed, the individual should resolve the doubt in favor of disclosure.

Sec. 6 Additional Process Requirements.

6.1 Management Plans. Management plans must be in place for all employees for outside activities that may create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment before activity begins. Management plans will be developed by [Designated Official] and approved by [Next Senior Official].

6.2 Appeals. Individuals whose request for approval of outside activity is denied may request that the denying authority reconsider the decision and provide an explanation in writing. If the individual remains unsatisfied with the decision, he or she may access standard grievance procedures to the extent that they are otherwise applicable.

6.3 Prospect and Retrospective Approval. In rare instance, outside activity may be approved retrospectively when the individual is called upon to assist in an emergency or urgent situation where it would be impossible or unreasonable to
obtain advance approval. In such cases, the activity must be fully disclosed and approval sought from the appropriate authority as soon as reasonably possible.

Some activity may also be prospectively approved, for up to one year, when an individual describes to the approving authority as fully as reasonably possible the general nature and extent of anticipated, but not confirmed, outside opportunities.

6.4 Confidential Outside Activity. If an individual wishes to engage in an activity for which some or all of the relevant information is confidential, the approving authority may nonetheless approve the activity without requiring full written disclosure upon satisfaction that there is a compelling reason to treat the information confidentially and the activity is otherwise fully compliant with this policy and all other applicable laws and UT Dallas and UT System policies.

6.5 Rescinding Approvals. An approving authority may rescind an approved outside activity upon receipt of information indicating that the activity is not consistent with this policy or any applicable law or UT Dallas or UT System policy. The individual for whom the activity may be rescinded shall be given notice of the information and an opportunity to respond.

Sec. 7 Noncompliance. Noncompliance with this policy may subject one to discipline in accordance with applicable procedures up to and including termination of employment.

Sec. 8 Education and Training. This policy and other related policies will be distributed to those responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests on an annual basis. Individuals responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests will be subject to training on an annual basis.

Sec. 9 Definitions.

**Business Entity** - Any entity recognized by law through which business is conducted, including a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint stock company, receivership, or trust.

**Compensation** - Any form of benefit including but not limited to salary, retainer, honoraria, intellectual property rights or royalties, or promised, deferred, or contingent interest. It also includes sponsored travel or reimbursement.

**Conflict of Commitment** - A state in which the time or effort that a UT Dallas devotes to an outside activity directly or significantly interferes with the employee’s fulfillment of their institutional responsibilities or when the employee uses State property without authority in connection with the employee’s outside employment, board service, or other activity (See Sec. 8, RR 30104). Exceeding the amount of total time permitted by institutional policy for outside activities creates the appearance of a conflict of commitment.
**Conflict of Interest** - A significant outside interest of a UT Dallas employee or one of the employee’s immediate family members that could directly or significantly affect the employee’s performance of the employee’s institutional responsibilities. The proper discharge of an employee’s institutional responsibilities could be directly or significantly affected if the employment, service, activity or interest: (1) might tend to influence the way the employee performs his or her institutional responsibilities, or the employee knows or should know the interest is or has been offered with the intent to influence the employee’s conduct or decisions; (2) could reasonably be expected to impair the employee’s judgment in performing his or her institutional responsibilities; or (3) might require or induce the employee to disclose confidential or proprietary information acquired through the performance of institutional responsibilities.

**Employees Involved in Procurement Activities** - An employee who makes decisions or recommendations regarding:

a) contract terms or conditions on a contract;

b) who is to be awarded a contract;

c) preparation of a solicitation for a contract; or

d) evaluation of a bid or proposal.

**Executive Officer** - includes, but is not limited to, the president, all individuals who report directly to the president (other than administrative support positions), and any employee who exercises broad and significant discretion over key institution functions. The following positions are hereby designated as Executive Officers:

[List positions]

**Immediate Family Members** - includes:

a) a spouse;

b) a dependent child or stepchild or other dependent, for purposes of determining federal income tax liability during the period covered; and

c) a related or non-related, unmarried adult who resides in the same household as the individual and with whom the individual is financially interdependent as evidenced, for example, by the maintenance of a joint bank account, mortgage, or investments.

**Nature and Extent** - Shall include a description of the activity, the time commitment, the amount of compensation, if any, and the anticipated length of time the commitment is expected to continue.

**Outside Board** - The board, council, or other governing or advisory body of a business, civic, professional social, or religious organization, whether for profit or nonprofit.
Outside Employment - Any activity performed by an employee, other than fulfilling employment obligations at UT Dallas, for which remuneration is received, including distance teaching.

Substantial Interest in a Business Entity - For purposes of this policy, means:

1. a controlling interest;
2. ownership of more than 1 percent of the voting interest;
3. ownership of more than $5,000 of the fair market value;
4. a direct or indirect participating interest by shares, stock, or otherwise, regardless of whether voting rights are included, in more than 1 percent of the profits, proceeds, or capital gains; or
5. service as an officer.

Not to include investments in mutual funds or retirement accounts, so long as the individual does not directly control the investment decisions made in those vehicles.
Item 10: Amendments to UDPP1013-Academic Program Review
Academic Program Review - UTDPP1013

Policy Charge

Academic Program Review PRC

Policy Statement

Degree programs, as defined by the Classification of Instructional Program Code, are reviewed regularly to evaluate their quality and their effectiveness in supporting the university's mission. As described by this policy, the Program Review Committee, a standing committee composed of members of The University of Texas at Dallas faculty and academic administration, oversees the review process. The Committee functions in cooperation with the Provost, under whose auspices Academic Program Reviews are conducted.

Program Review Committee (PRC)

This university committee maintains general oversight of the review process to assure its efficacy and uniformity. During each program review, one member of the Program Review Committee, designated the Program Review Committee Monitor, participates directly in the process. The entire Program Review Committee evaluates the operation of the review process on a continuing basis and makes an annual report to the Provost and Academic Senate. In this report, it recommends any modifications of policies or procedures regarding reviews it considers advisable. In addition, it consults with and advises the Provost on other aspects of reviews as requested.

The membership of the Program Review Committee is comprised of six faculty members and four deans who are appointed by the President to one-two-year renewable terms. Members from the faculty are recommended by the Academic Senate after consultation with the Committee on Committees; deans are recommended by the Provost. Faculty should be drawn from the schools in which reviews will be conducted during the year of their service, or from the library if the library is to be reviewed.

The Responsible University Official is the Chief Academic Officer.

Frequency of Review and Criteria for Selection

In accord with Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.52, degree programs shall be reviewed in intervals not to exceed seven years. Reviews may occur more frequently if the Provost, in consultation with the appropriate dean, finds that the
circumstances of a particular program warrant an earlier date. However, a program may not need to be reviewed under the procedures of this policy if mandated external accreditation reviews occur regularly and substantially meet the criteria outlined under The Review Procedure below. According to Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part ,1 Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.52 (c)(11) and (d)(11), institutions may submit reviews performed for programmatic licensure or accreditation in satisfaction of the states review and reporting requirements.

Master's programs classified with the same 6-digit Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) as doctoral programs are reviewed simultaneously with their related doctoral programs. UT Dallas reviews bachelors programs in the same discipline as masters and doctoral programs simultaneously with those programs.

Selection of programs to be reviewed in a given year will be made by the Provost after consultation with the Program Review Committee and the appropriate dean(s). The review schedule will be submitted to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) staff. The factors (not in priority order) to be considered when creating the review schedule include:

1. Planned program changes;
2. Elapsed time since last major review of budget, staff and degree programs;
3. University or program accreditation cycles;
4. Significant changes in student demand; and
5. Overlap or shared responsibilities with other programs being reviewed.

The Review Team

The Program Review Committee oversees the evaluation conducted by a Review Team that is appointed and charged by the Provost. The Provost consults with the degree program undergoing review and/or the Program Review Committee, as appropriate, regarding selection of Review Team members. The Review Team's composition may vary from program to program, but will incorporate both internal and external members. Typically, it will include:

1. At least two members from the UT Dallas faculty and academic administration who are not affiliated with the program to be reviewed, appointed by the Provost after soliciting recommendations from the Program Review Committee.
2. One member of the Program Review Committee, appointed by the Provost after consultation with the Program Review Committee, to act as the Program Review Committee Monitor. In addition to responsibilities as a regular member of the Review Team, the Program Review Committee Monitor will have the duty of conferring with and reporting to the Program Review Committee and, on the basis of knowledge acquired as a member of the Program Review Committee, of helping each Review Team ensure consistency of its individual review within the overall review process. This individual will not be affiliated with the program under review.
3. For doctoral programs, at least two external reviewers with subject-matter expertise who are employed by institutions outside of Texas will be appointed by the Provost after consultation with the unit under review and brought to campus for an on-site review. The
reviewers must affirm that they have no conflict of interest and must be part of programs that are nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline.

4. For masters programs, at least one external reviewer with subject-matter expertise who is employed by an institution outside of Texas will be appointed by the Provost after consultation with the unit under review and will be provided the self-study materials. UT Dallas can invite the reviewer(s) to campus or request that they conduct a remote desk review. Each reviewer must affirm that he or she has no conflict of interest and must be part of a program that is nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline.

The Provost may add additional members as appropriate. One member of the Review Team, usually a member not affiliated with UT Dallas, will be designated Chair of the Review Team by the Provost at the time the Team is constituted. The Review Team will evaluate the degree program as requested by a written charge prepared by the Provost after consultation with the Program Review Committee.

The Review Procedure

Reviews will be conducted as follows:

The degree program undergoing review will consult with the Provost regarding suitable dates for the Review Team's campus visit, and the detailed schedule of events during the visit. It will prepare a comprehensive self-study document (an internal planning document, not intended for general distribution) in accordance with guidelines and instructions issued by the Provost. These guidelines include criteria outlined in Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.52, Review of Existing Degree Programs. The Review Team also will collaborate with the Provost in ensuring that the Review Team's on-campus needs are met. The Provost will designate a Review Coordinator (the Dean, Head, Director, or suitable substitute) from the degree program under review to ensure that the duties assigned to the program in connection with the Review Team are carried out.

The Provost will provide the Review Team a written charge, along with the unit's self-study document. The Office of the Provost will issue the visit schedule, oversee the visit arrangements for the Review Team (transportation, housing, meals, reimbursement, etc.) and serve as liaison between the Review Team and the program being reviewed).

Before the campus visit, the Review Team will familiarize itself with the degree program's self-study, and with the Provost's charge. During the visit, it will consult with members of the degree program's faculty, students, and staff and inspect facilities. It may request additional information beyond that provided in the self-study. Adequate time will be allowed in the latter part of the visit for the Review Team to deliberate in private and reach its conclusions.

At the beginning of the visit, the Review Team will have an introductory meeting and orientation hosted by the Provost's Office. Before leaving the campus, the Review Team will hold two exit interviews. In the first, held with the Program Review Committee and the degree program's faculty and administration, the Review Team will provide its preliminary assessment of the
goals, plans, staffing, resources, existing and potential strengths, etc., of the degree program, and those areas needing improvement. In the second, held with the Provost, and other appropriate central administrators, the Review Team will summarize its immediate impressions and provide a forecast of its eventual written report. Then, within one month of the campus visit, the Chair of the Review Team will provide a complete written report on the Review Team's conclusions to the Provost.

Along with addressing any unique aspects of its charge, the Review Team's report will assess the degree program's overall performance and its specific strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for any changes the Review Team thinks are advisable. The evaluation should refer to the program's self-study and note items of agreement and disagreement between the Review Team's assessments and those of the self-study. The Review Team will share its final report with the faculty and administration of the degree program. The program's chief administrative officer, in cooperation with faculty and staff, will provide a written response to the report to the Provost's Office within one month of receiving the report, giving specific actions planned in light of the Review Team's recommendations. Where the program disagrees with findings and/or recommendations of the Review Team, it will state its reasons for such disagreements. The program's faculty will have access to this document as well as to the Review Team's report. The Provost will discuss the Review Team's report and program's response with the program's administration and faculty. Finally, the Provost will prepare recommendations to the President. The university administration will submit a report of the outcomes of each review, including: the Executive Summary from the self-study, the Review Team's report and a summary of actions the institution has taken or will take to improve the program, to the THECB no later than 180 days after the Review Team has submitted its findings to the institution.

In the years between reviews of the degree program, this record of the Program Review will be pertinent to decisions on budget, staffing, curricular and degree changes, and allocation of special resources.

**Policy History**

- Editorial Amendments: February 2, 1998
- Editorial Amendments: September 1, 2000
- Revised: July 11, 2005
- Editorial Amendments: August 3, 2006
- Editorial Amendments: March 26, 2007
- Revised: June 1, 2012
- Revised: October 25, 2013
- Revised: January 5, 2016

**Policy Links**

- Permalink for this policy: [http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1013](http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1013)
- Link to PDF version: [http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1013](http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1013)
- Link to printable version: [http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1013](http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1013)
Item 12: Amendments to Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee – UTDPP1003
Information Resources Security Technology Planning and Policy Committee - UTDPP1003

Policy Charge

IR IT Security Planning and Policy Committee

Policy Statement

The Information Resources Security Technology Planning and Policy Committee is a University-wide Standing Committee.

The Committee will advise and assist the Vice President, Chief Information Officer in long range planning for development and use of the university's information resources in such a way as to strike the best possible balance between outreach for education, support of research, and the maintenance and operations of information security technology on campus. With respect to long-range planning, the Committee will deal with all aspects of information resources technology including existing and emerging requirements, current and anticipated technologies and preferred policies and practices. The committee is expected to maintain liaisons with the Committee on Distance Learning, the Committee on Effective Teaching, the Information Security Advisory Committee, and all other university and administrative committees whose work bears on issues of information resources technology. With respect to security, the committee will have a permanent subcommittee on security compliance to oversee the University's compliance with U. T. System system-wide policy UTS165, U. T. System Information Security Action Plan, and Texas Administrative Code 202. Responsibilities of the full committee include but are not limited to:

1. Participation in the creation and implementation of long-range plans for Information Resources Technology development and utilization. Within that process, the committee will assist in the identification and prioritization of goals, objectives and action items. Completed planning efforts will be documented by the Office of the Vice President, Chief Information Officer and submitted to the Academic Senate before being submitted to the President's Cabinet or concerned State of Texas agencies in a timely manner.

2. Monitoring, Review and monitor of the implementation of the UTD policies related to information technology.
The Committee shall be composed of at least thirteen voting members. Seven shall be tenure-track faculty, including at least two holding administrative positions of Dean or above, appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in UTDPP1088: Faculty Governance, Section 1.B.1 Title III, Chapter 21, Section 1.B.1 of The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures). In addition, there shall be one representative each from the Office of Institutional Compliance Audit and Compliance, Academic Affairs, the University Staff Council, the Office of the Vice President for Research, and the Office of the Vice President for Administration, one graduate student and one undergraduate student. The students are appointed by Student Government to one-year renewable terms. The University Chief Information Security Officer shall be a member ex officio, with vote. The Vice President, Chief Information Officer (under the terms of U. T. System system-wide policy UTS165) is the Responsible University Official (RUO).

The security compliance subcommittee shall consist of the Chief Information Security Officer and at least one committee member from Audit and Compliance, one from Academic Affairs, one from the Office of the Vice President for Research, one from the General Faculty, and one each of the University staff and Information Resources staff. Membership of the subcommittee shall be determined by majority vote of the full committee.

In consultation with the full committee, pursuant to system-wide policy UTS165, the task of the subcommittee on security compliance shall be to advise the Vice President, Chief Information Officer on ways to carry out the tasks assigned in system-wide policy UTS165, namely to:

• Analyze information to determine whether it is confidential, sensitive, both or neither.
• Prepare a security plan to protect information identified as confidential, sensitive or both.
• Assign management responsibility for implementing the security plan.
• Train personnel to treat information resources properly.
• Monitor the treatment of information resources to ensure compliance with the security plan.
• Submit planning documents and reports to state agencies as required.

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

The Committee will meet annually in October to organize subcommittees or other working units for fulfilling its responsibilities and to determine a schedule of meetings that includes at least one per quarter/two per semester at a time and place designated by the Chair. Additional meetings will be called by the Chair or RUO as may be necessary. The Chair and Vice Chair are appointed annually by the President.
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Scholarships, Fellowships and Other Appointments and Monetary Awards to Students

Awards for scholarships, fellowships, stipends, etc., are granted at the undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate academic levels. Funding emanates from a variety of sources including federal and state funds, gifts from individuals, and private foundations.

Administration

Need Based Programs: The Office of Financial Aid administers those programs which are supported by federal and state funds and those which specify financial need as a primary requirement for eligibility. In the latter category, for scholarships funded by private gifts and grants that are administered by Financial Aid, applicants are screened for eligibility requirements in that office and recipients are selected by the University Committee on Student Fellowships and Scholarships. This Committee is appointed by the President with the advice of the Academic Council.

Merit Based Programs: Programs based solely on academic merit are administered by various university departments, schools, and other units including the offices of cabinet-level officers as well as the Deans of the Schools, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean of Undergraduate Education and the University Committee on Student Fellowships and Scholarships.

Scholarship and fellowship awards are determined by selection committees appointed by the university officials responsible for the scholarship programs. The University Committee on Student Fellowships and Scholarships is appointed by the President with the advice of the Academic Council. In the case of programs within the Schools, selection committees are appointed by the Deans of the Schools annually with the approval of the appropriate Graduate or Undergraduate Dean. University-wide programs based on academic merit are administered by the Dean of Graduate Studies or Undergraduate Education, who may appoint a selection committee with approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost for Academic Affairs. In the case of programs within the Schools, selection committees are appointed by the Deans of the Schools annually.

Coordination: The Office of Financial Aid, as the University's central location for information on all scholarships, fellowships, and other monetary awards awarded, is advised of awards made by the Schools or the Graduate or Undergraduate Deans through the University’s "Appointment Form for School Scholarships, Fellowships and Other Awards" (see Exhibit D11). processes all awards once the appropriate approval and notification has been made by the applicable account manager and awarding authority.

Establishment of Scholarships and Fellowships
**University Affairs:** The Office of Development is responsible for University fund raising and communications with donors. Establishing scholarship selection criteria is a negotiation process that takes place between the donor and the Office of Development, in cooperation with the Office of Institutional Scholarship Administration and any involved university unit, at the time a gift is made to establish a scholarship, fellowship, or other monetary student award. The criteria must be carefully developed to ensure that both university and donor objectives are met in accordance with institutional, state, and federal policy. Criteria may include, but are not limited to, GPA requirements, standardized test score minimums, financial need, major or area of study, enrollment hours, and extracurricular activities not related to athletics. The donor may also elect to make the award renewable and define conditions under which renewal may occur. The donor may not name a specific student to receive a scholarship.

All contributions, including those accepted by colleges, schools, and departments, will be processed through the Office of Development. Full reporting and approval procedures for acceptance of private gifts from all sources, including individuals, foundations, and corporations, must be followed in accordance with The University of Texas System Systemwide Policy UTS 138. All scholarship/fellowship accounts are established by and through the Office of Development. Any University office receiving a check to support a scholarship/fellowship should forward the check and any stipulations by the donor to the Office of Development.

**Awarding Scholarships**

All scholarship/fellowship accounts are established by and through the Office of Development. Prior to establishing a new account, the Office of Development determines from the Executive Vice President and Provost the appropriate administrative unit to serve as account manager.

The availability of each scholarship and fellowship must be advertised through the Office of Financial Aid and through the appropriate area(s) for which the award is designated. Prior to advertising any scholarships or fellowships, the awarding unit is responsible for checking account balances to verify the availability of funds. The awarding unit should maintain the account and is responsible for the account balances.

All awards to or on behalf of a student must be approved by the appropriate account manager and awarding authority before submittal to the Office of Financial Aid in order for payments of scholarship funds to authorize to students. The chair of the scholarship committee is responsible for assuring that all awards approved by the account manager and awarding authority are true and accurate.

Scholarships from annual gifts should not be awarded if funds have not been received prior to the year of award. For endowments, awards can only be made based on the projected income to be earned by September 1 of the academic year of the award. Due to funding limitations, not all students meeting the minimum requirements will be awarded a scholarship.
Account Manager: Prior to establishing a new account, the Office of Development determines from the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs the appropriate administrative unit to serve as account manager.

Processing Award Checks
Scholarship and fellowship awards initiated by University offices other than the Office of Financial Aid are made by completing the "Appointment Form for School Scholarships, Fellowships and Other Awards" (see Exhibit D11). Prior to approving the appointment form, the account manager must verify that the account has sufficient funds budgeted for scholarship expenditures.

A. Continuing accounts (e.g., endowed accounts) should be budgeted during the regular budget cycle.

B. The Development Office will provide the account manager with a copy of the gift receipt form which creates the fund account number for new and/or annual gifts for scholarships and fellowships. Upon receipt of this form, the account manager must process a Budget Adjustment Form (BAF) and a Signature Authority Form to create the appropriate budget for the funds and to allow the account manager to process Purchase Vouchers for award checks.

A separate appointment form must be completed for each account to be charged. Multiple recipients and/or multiple payments for each recipient may be scheduled on a single appointment form, provided only one account is being charged.

A Purchase Voucher (see Exhibit D12) for each recipient should be prepared by the account manager for each issue date for which a recipient is scheduled on the appointment form. The account manager is responsible for submitting the Purchase Voucher to Accounts Payable at least two weeks prior to the date a recipient is scheduled to receive an award check. In the case of a single payment to a recipient, the appointment form will be forwarded to Accounts Payable with the Purchase Voucher. When multiple payments to a recipient are scheduled on the appointment form, Accounts Payable will maintain a file copy of the appointment form and voucher and issue payments as directed by the form and voucher. Accounts Payable will verify that the student/employee is still with the University before each subsequent payment is made. If there is a change in status of the appointment, it is the responsibility of the account manager to notify Accounts Payable in writing.

All award checks are forwarded to the Bursar’s Office for distribution to recipients. If an exception to this procedure is necessary, written instructions regarding the disposition of the check(s) should be attached to the Purchase Voucher(s). Such exceptions will be subject to approval by the Director of Financial Services.

Upon receipt of the appointment form, Accounts Payable will indicate the date of receipt and distribute copies as indicated on the form. In the case of multiple payments to a recipient scheduled on a single appointment form, Accounts Payable will provide the Office of Financial Aid with a copy of the authorizing appointment form as each Purchase Voucher is processed.
The Office of Financial Aid will notify the Registrar of out-of-state and foreign students who receive competitive academic scholarships or fellowships that qualify the recipient to pay the same tuition as a Texas resident.

Appointments conditioned upon a service being rendered by the recipient should be routed through the Payroll Office prior to Accounts Payable to ensure proper deductions are calculated.

**Awards Qualifying for Tuition Waivers**

**Competitive Scholarship Waivers, under section 54.213 of the Texas Education Code:**

“An institution of higher education may charge a nonresident student who holds a competitive scholarship of at least $1,000 for the academic year or summer term for which the student is enrolled resident tuition and fees without regard to the length of time the student has resided in Texas. The student must compete with other students, including Texas residents, for the scholarship and the scholarship must be awarded by a scholarship committee officially recognized by the administration and be approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under criteria developed by the coordinating board.

The total number of students at an institution paying resident tuition under this section for a particular semester may not exceed five percent of the total number of students registered at the institution for the same semester of the preceding academic year."

In accordance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC), RULE §21.2263 to be considered competitive, a scholarship must:

1. Total at least $1,000 for the period of time covered by the scholarship, not to exceed 12 months;
2. Be awarded by a scholarship committee authorized in writing by the institution's administration to grant scholarships that permit this waiver of nonresident tuition;
3. Be awarded according to criteria published in the institution's paper or electronic catalog, available to the public in advance of any application deadline;
4. Be awarded under circumstances that cause both the funds and the selection process to be under the control of the institution; and
5. Permit awards to both resident and nonresident persons.

Under this Rule, a waiver based on a competitive scholarship lasts for the period of the scholarship (up to a 12-month period). The scholarship award must specify the term or terms in which the scholarship will be in effect. If the scholarship is terminated, so is the waiver. If the scholarship is to be issued in multiple disbursements and less than $1,000 is issued when a scholarship is terminated, the student does not owe a refund for the tuition that has been waived, since the waiver
was originally made in a good faith expectation of a scholarship for at least $1,000, but the waiver is canceled for the terms for which the scholarship is canceled.

The Office of Financial Aid applies the in-state tuition waiver for nonresident students who receive competitive academic scholarships or fellowships that qualify the recipient to pay the same tuition as a Texas resident.

The chairperson of the selection committee certifies that the criteria used by the committee does or does not meet the definition of a "competitive academic scholarship" cited above. The form also indicates the appointment period for the award which stipulates the academic year in which a competitive academic scholarship is in effect.

The Office of Institutional Scholarship Administration will maintain a list of all approved competitive scholarships/fellowships and ensure awards are disbursed to students in accordance with federal, state and institutional regulations.

A nonresident student who is awarded a competitive academic scholarship in the amount of $1,000 or more may pay the same tuition as a resident of Texas during the registration period in which the competitive academic scholarship is in effect.

A competitive academic scholarship is defined as an award made in competition with other students, including Texas residents, to encourage academic excellence in the academic program in which the recipient is enrolled.

The chairperson of the appropriate selection committee certifies on the "Appointment Form for School Scholarships, Fellowships, and Other Awards" that the criteria used by the committee does or does not meet the definition of a "competitive academic scholarship" cited above. The form also indicates the appointment period for the award which stipulates the registration period(s) in which a competitive academic scholarship is in effect.

**Third Party Awards**

Third party awards are defined as those scholarships, fellowships, or other awards which are awarded to a student enrolled for course work at U.T. Dallas by a funding agency which is not part of the U.T. Dallas administration. Normally, students apply directly to such agencies and award checks may or may not be transmitted to the student via the University.

All third party award checks when received by any university office should be forwarded to the Office of Financial Aid for processing through Accounts Payable, including distribution to the student via the Bursar's Office.
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