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AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
October 15, 2014

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions  Dr. Daniel
2. Approval of the Agenda  Dr. Redman
3. Approval of Minutes
   September 17, 2014 Meeting  Dr. Redman
4. Presentation by Nate Howe  Nate Howe
5. Speaker’s Report  Dr. Redman
6. FAC Report  Dr. Leaf
7. Student Government Liaison Report
8. CEP Proposals  Dr. Radhakrishnan
   A. Cotutelle dual degree program agreement
   B. MS in Energy Management
   C. Informational: Repeatable courses
9. Regent Request: Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching –
   (Pending Approval of Agenda)  Dr. Redman
10. Recommendations for Committee Replacements  Dr. Redman
11. Adjournment  Dr. Daniel
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
September 17, 2014

Present:  David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Robert Ackerman, Frank Anderson, Zalman Balanov, Poras Balsara, Karen Baynham, Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Matthew Brown, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, George Decourcy, Eugene Deluke, Gregg Dieckmann, Vladimir Dragovic, John Ferguson, Andrea Fumagalli, Yulia Gel, Lev Gelb, M. Ali Hooshyari, Mustapha Ishak-Bounshaki, Joe Izen, Wieslaw Krawcewicz, Michele Lockhart, Murray Leaf, Vance Lewis, Jason McAfee, Jessica Murphy, Jinkyong Na, Jared Pickens, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Christopher Ryan, Mark Salamisick, Liz Salter, Betsy Schlobohm, Richard Scotch, Scott Rippel, Michael Tiefeldorf, Murat Torlak, Tonia Wissinger, Alejandro Zentner

Absent:  Naofal Al-Dhair, Adam Brackin, Gail Breen, John Burr, Nicholas Gans, Jennifer Holmes, Carie Lambret, Dongsheng Ma, Dennis Miller, Emire Muslu, Matthew Polze, Tim Redman, Tres Thompson,

Visitors:  Andrew Blanchard, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Inga Musselman, Vicki Carsile, Suresh Radhankrishnan, Cristen Casey,

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions

President Daniel called the meeting to order at 2:20. There were no announcements. The President opened the floor to questions. A Senator asked how responsive the legislature will be to the university’s growth. President Daniel is working to make our case. When growth over the last three years of all public universities in the State of Texas is compared, our university has grown 23%, the second highest in the state was 11%, and the third highest is 7%. After that all other universities are in the 2% range. Our graduation rate continues to improve, and our institution continues to add value to the state of Texas. Our university has two urgent requests to the legislature. 1) A new Engineering building which should have happened the previous session. 2) A matching gifts program which has been hugely successful, i.e. $35 million. We are currently waiting for the state to pay the university in matching gifts. $35 million is roughly the annual budget of the School of Management.

David Cordell requested a summery on how well the university is doing on the Tier 1 metrics. On research the university is at 99.3 million of total research, but our goal is over 100 million. This is an opportunity for growth of the university. The expenditures toward research have not grown with the pace of enrollment. There are two reasons for this. Faculty must be hired to write proposals for research, these causes a lag time between hiring and producing research. The second concern is the space limitations on campus. The university has been limited due to space more than anything else. NRUF requires $45 million in restricted research for two consecutive years. The university was just below 45 million last
year. The university should be just above 45 million this year. Then the university has to meet four of six parameters: 1) Student Quality, which the university meets. 2) Faculty Quality, which the university meets, 3) Phi Kappa Phi Chapter qualifies the university. The university must be able to obtain one of the remaining three. The two that is possible for the university to complete are 1) an endowment of at least $400, but the university is currently at $387 million. 2) 200 PhD’s must be produced each year. Currently the University is at 179-183 per year. It may take a few years to reach that particular qualification. All in all, the university is doing well.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   The agenda was amended to add the proposal for an International Oversight Committee charge to the agenda as item 8. Joe Izen made the motion to approve the amended agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
   Liz Salter moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.

4. Speaker’s Report – Murray Leaf
   1. Tim Redman expects to return on October 1, 2014.
   2. Everything else is on the agenda.

5. FAC Report
   FAC will be meeting in Austin on September 25-26 2014. Both Murray Leaf and David Cordell will be attending.

6. Student Government Liaison Report
   No report was given.

7. CEP Proposals
   A. Arts and Humanities EMAC Master’s degree program
      The degree program was presented at this time due to an accidentally missed deadline. The program has been streamlined, with minor changes to courses. CEP moved to approve. Jessica Murphy seconded. The motion carried.

   B. Repeatable Course Policy
      This policy clarifies previous practices in response to requirements from SACS. I will be listed in both the Undergraduate and Graduate catalogs. This policy details what courses are repeatable, and what courses have limited repeatability. The policy will be executed through Catbook. The courses that will have limited repeatability will require a rational entered for the course. In the next few months Faculty will be required to enter the rationales. CEP moved to approve.
      Vice Speaker Leaf raised the question of how special topics and individual studies courses would be handled with in this policy. The special topics and dissertation courses will require a rationale. Every special topics courses will also have a ‘sub-title’ listed with the course indicating specific content. Each instructor will fill out a form
listing the sub-title which will then be submitted to the registrar. This will allow the course sub-title to appear on transcripts. They are working to have it also appear in Catbook. The forms will be policed to make sure that no courses are entered without the forms being completed. CEP moved to approve. The motion carried. See appendix A for approved policy.

C. Substantive Change Policy
SACS has had a substantive change policy since the 1970's, which the university has been following; however given the rate the university has been growing a local policy was created. The only differences between the local policy and the SACS policy, is the annual certification from the deans that states that their schools are compliant with the policy. The policy contains a request that each school’s bylaws include reference to substantive changes. She did not list all substantive changes but did give examples of the most common substantive changes. She again reiterated that certificate programs cannot be closed without prior SACS approval. SACS considers certificates programs just like degree programs. CEP moved to approve. The motion carried. See appendix B for approved policy.

D. Schedule for Catalog Changes
A proposal listing when new courses can be added to the catalog was presented by CEP. The process will be separate from the catalog cycle. This will allow faculty to add courses 1 semester ahead when new programs are added. They do not have to wait until the next catalog. This will be keep courses separate from policy. Faculty cannot change degree programs during the year but courses for new programs can be added. The calendar for the 2015-2016 and the 2016-2017 calendars was distributed. If faculty needs to make changes, the calendars will give them the proper deadline dates. It was noted that the repeatable courses are due at a different time than the non-repeatable to allow for justifications to be written. The first rounds are due to December 2014. This will allow CEP to return them to faculty for review. An error was found regarding the year on two of the due dates. See Appendix C for corrections. Richard Scotch moved to approve the corrected deadlines as announced. Jessica Murphy seconded. The motion carried.

8. Proposed International Oversight Committee charge
In 2011 UT system sent a letter to the president requiring the creation of an International Oversight Committee. The university did not formally do so. The Office of International Education Advisory Council was repurposed to fill this role. Due to the recent reorganization of the Office of International Education into the International Center in Student Affairs a new University committee was created. Three of the eight members will be faculty. Jason McAfee moved to approve. Viswanath Ramakrishna seconded. The motion carried.

9. Committee on Committee Recommendations
Brian Berry has declined his appointment to the Effective Teaching Committee. The Committee on Committees recommended Denise Boots as his replacement. Richard Scotch moved to approve the recommendation. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried.

In the caucus meeting a lot of time was spent on the election, but not about priorities for the upcoming year. The two main concerns from the Caucus were to update UTDPP 1062 – Non-tenure System Faculty and clarifying policies concerning Intellectual property.

Two years ago the Senate was concerned about the STARS program, and if you give up the UT system. We appear to be recruiting professors who thought they were "stars" in in the sense of being exempt from the service and collegial responsibilities of full professors. There was considerable concern about this at that time. It was a general consensus that all faculty should share all the work. Vice-Speaker Leaf has not heard these types of complaints recently. It is unclear if the problem has been resolved, but equity and fairness in distributing the work is always a problem. President Daniel noted that the Stars who have spoken to him on this topic typically are saying that they would like to do more, not less. The Senate concluded that the problem could be considered resolved for the moment.

11. New Business:
    Judd Bradbury suggested that the Senate distribute a report to the faculty listing what the Senate had accomplished during the year. Vice Speaker Leaf noted that the possibility of a Senate annual report would be brought up before the Academic Council at their next meeting.

12. Adjournment
    There being no further business, President Daniel adjourned the meeting at 3:10 pm.

APPROVED: ___________________________       DATE: ______________
Murray Leaf
Vice Speaker of the Academic Senate
in lieu of Tim Redman
Speaker of the Academic Senate
UT Dallas Substantive Change Policy

Policy Statement

A substantive change is a significant modification or expansion in the nature and scope of an accredited institution. The federal government requires regional accrediting agencies to have a substantive change policy and to monitor the compliance of its member colleges and universities with the substantive change policy. UT Dallas’ regional accrediting agency, the Southern Association Schools and Colleges Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), Board of Trustees requires as a condition of accreditation member institutions to notify the SACSCOC of substantive changes, and, in some cases, seek SACSCOC approval prior to implementation of such changes.

Policy Rationale

The purpose of this policy is to establish the UT Dallas responsibilities and required procedures for timely notification of substantive changes to SACSCOC. The policy complies with the SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation: Foundation for Quality Enhancement and the SACSCOC Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions Policy in adherence with United States Department of Education Regulations 34 CFR 602.22 Substantive Change.

Scope

This policy applies to any university employee who can initiate, review, or approve changes that are considered substantive according to the current version of the SACSCOC Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions Policy. In academic affairs, this includes faculty, assistant and associate deans, deans, vice provosts, and the provost. Other university officials in the Office of Research, Procurement Management, or the International Center might be asked to review or approve a substantive change initiative. Further, a substantive change may come directly to the attention of the president, vice presidents, or the university attorney. These individuals are responsible for timely notification of substantive changes to the Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination, who is responsible for notifying or seeking approval from SACSCOC as appropriate for the substantive change.

Types of Substantive Changes

The most common UT Dallas reported substantive changes include:

- The establishment of an additional location geographically apart from the main campus at which the institution offers at least 50 percent of an educational program
- Closing a degree or academic certificate program, off-campus site, or branch campus
- Entering into a collaborative academic arrangement that includes the initiation of a dual or joint academic program with another institution
- Entering into a contract by which an entity not eligible for Title IV funding offers 25% or more of at least one of our degree or academic certificate programs
- Initiating certificate programs at an off-site location
- Initiating distance learning programs

Several additional types of substantive changes, such as initiating dual credit or initiating degree completion programs, are included in the SACSCOC policy. Some types of substantive change require only prior notification to SACSCOC whereas others required prior SACSCOC approval prior to implementation. A matrix for each type of substantive change, its permission requirements, and its timeline to obtain permission is available via a matrix on the Provost Office’s webpage at http://provost.utdallas.edu/home/academic-program-proposals/reporting-substantive-change.

Responsibilities

Each individual, position, or entity designated as within the scope of this policy is required to be familiar with and comply with this policy.

Each school, program, or department is recommended to incorporate this policy into its bylaws.

Each dean is required to produce an annual report that confirms his school is in compliance with this policy.

The Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination is responsible for ensuring the university policy is in compliance with the current version of the SACSCOC policy. The Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination is also responsible for communicating policy updates to university stakeholders. The Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination will remind university stakeholders about the policy each long semester.

Procedures for Notification

At the earliest stage of consideration, any potential substantive change must be submitted in writing via the appropriate dean or vice president to the Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination, who will coordinate any additional paperwork, such as a prospectus, and internal and external approvals. Once all appropriate documentation and internal approvals have been completed, the Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination will submit to the President’s Office a cover letter addressed to SACSCOC. Upon president’s review, approval, and signature, the Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination will submit the request to SACSCOC. The Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination will update the appropriate dean or vice president about the status of the request.
Responsible University Official

Executive Vice President and Provost (policy@utdallas.edu)

Effective Date: TBD, 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC / RO</td>
<td>Send <strong>2015-16 catalog documents</strong> (courses* &amp; existing degree programs**) to Associate Deans.</td>
<td>September 5, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans / Schools</td>
<td>Initiate changes and start internal process review and approval in each school for non-repeatable courses, repeatable courses, and degree programs.</td>
<td>September 5, 2014 to December 4, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans / Schools</td>
<td>Enter <strong>non-repeatable course revisions</strong> into CatBook from September 5, 2014 to October 31, 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans / Schools</td>
<td>Last day to submit <strong>non-repeatable course revisions</strong> in CatBook.</td>
<td>October 31, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC / RO</td>
<td>Complete review of <strong>non-repeatable course revisions</strong> in CatBook.</td>
<td>November 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall / Thanksgiving Break: November 24-29, 2014</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Approve changes made to <strong>non-repeatable/core course revisions</strong> on undergraduate level.</td>
<td>December 2, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans / Schools</td>
<td>Last day to enter <strong>repeatable course revisions</strong> into CatBook AND degree programs via Word documents.</td>
<td>December 4, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans / Schools</td>
<td><strong>NOTE: repeatable course revisions</strong> can be entered into CatBook from September 5, 2014 to December 4, 2015.</td>
<td>December 4, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs can be submitted by email anytime during the same time period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE / GC</td>
<td>Review and approve <strong>non-repeatable course revisions</strong> between December 2, 2014 and December 9, 2014.</td>
<td>December 9, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC / RO</td>
<td>Complete review of <strong>repeatable course revisions</strong> in CatBook.</td>
<td>December 18, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC / RO</td>
<td>Submit <strong>non-repeatable course revisions</strong> report to CEP.</td>
<td>December 18, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Holiday Break: December 22, 2014 - January 2, 2015</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Review and approve <strong>non-repeatable course revisions</strong> only.</td>
<td>January 6, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE/GC/CEP</td>
<td>Receive first round of <strong>repeatable course revisions</strong> report as an informational item only.</td>
<td>January 6, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO / Schools</td>
<td>Fall 2015 first schedule draft.</td>
<td>January 9, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by Venetis, revised August 28, 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLK Day January 19, 2015</td>
<td>Receive consolidated 1st 40 policies for review and provide DAC revisions between January 27, 2015 and February 20, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2015</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 28, 2015</td>
<td>Associate Deans / Schools / DAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30, 2015</td>
<td>DAC / RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30, 2015</td>
<td>RO / Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2015</td>
<td>CUE/GC/CEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 2015</td>
<td>DAC / RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 2015</td>
<td>Associate Deans / Schools / DAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 2015</td>
<td>CUE / GC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 2015</td>
<td>CEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 2015</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 2015</td>
<td>PTG / RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC ***</td>
<td>Prepare, review, and submit OGC files at end of March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost’s Office</td>
<td>Prepares and submits SACS report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools / Advisors</td>
<td>Registration begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Prepare, review, and submit THECB course inventory CBM003 report before end of May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC ***</td>
<td>Receive OGC revisions; review them and notify appropriate departments for any additional updates. Resubmit them until approval is received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTG / RO</td>
<td>Tentative -- Course / degree program component in catalogs to go live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTG / RO</td>
<td>Policy component / catalog to go live.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

- DAC = Director of Academic Catalogs in conjunction with RO team
- RO = Registrar’s Office
- CCC = Core Curriculum Committee
- CUE = Council of Undergraduate Council
- GC = Graduate Council
- CEP = Committee of Educational Policy
- PTG = Provost’s Technology Group
- OGC = Office of General Counsel

*NOTE: Repeatable courses* should be reviewed and assessed starting September 2014. Revisions should be entered into CatBook anytime between September 2014 and December 4, 2014 for the 2015-16 course catalog.

CUE/GC/CEP receives the first round of repeatable course reports on January 6, 2015 as informational item. The repeatable course rationale will be reviewed for approval only by CUE or Graduate Council as appropriate, CEP, and Senate. The revisions should be sent back to faculty members and/or Associate Deans appropriate, with the DAC copied on revisions between January 6, 2015 and January 28, 2015.

CUE/GC/CEP receives the second round of repeatable reports on February 3, 2015. Additional revisions should be made between February 3 and February 24, 2015.

Prepared by Venetis, revised August 28, 2014
CUE/GC/CEP receives the final round of repeatable course reports along with degree programs, and 1st 40 policies prior to the CEP meeting on March 3, 2015.

CEP approval: March 3, 2015

Senate approval: March 18, 2015

SACS report: April 1, 2015 through Provost’s office through Serenity King, Assistant Provost of Policy and Program Coordination.

** NOTE: new degree programs go directly to Provost’s Office through Assistant Provost of Policy and Program Coordination. Upon approval, catalog copy needs to be sent to RO/DAC.

*** NOTE: OGC preparation is in consultation with Assistant Provost of Policy and Program Coordination in Provost’s Office and University Registrar.
Repeating Coursework

There are certain courses in which students may repeat the course(s) for credit and may satisfy degree requirements. In other instances, students may repeat the course to improve their grades.

Courses transferred for credit to UT Dallas from another institution of higher education may not be repeated for additional credit.

Before repeating any course, students should contact their academic advisor to determine the application of such course credit toward graduation. Students are also advised to check with the Office of Financial Aid to determine how and if grades earned in repeated coursework impact their financial aid eligibility status.

The University of Texas at Dallas’s policy for repeating coursework is stated below.

Taking Repeatable Courses

Unlimited Repeatable Courses

There are certain courses in which students may repeat the course(s) for credit. These courses in the catalog will have the statement of “may be repeated for credit” and are considered non-duplicated courses. All semester credit hours and grade points earned from each of these courses count towards degree completion, count in a student’s earned hours and cumulative GPA. Students should review their degree program for application towards degree requirements.

Limited Repeatable Courses

There are certain courses in which students may repeat the course(s) for credit with a limit of repeatability. For example, courses with the course description that states, “May be repeated for credit (9 semester credit hours maximum).” For limited repeatable courses, a student is limited to repeating the course to the maximum hours stated in the course description. Registrations are not allowed beyond the repeatable limit of the class. The limited semester credit hours and grade points earned from each of these courses count in a student’s earned hours and cumulative GPA. Students should review their degree program for application towards degree requirements. NOTE: Registrations beyond the repeatable limit of the class will not count in a student's earned hours, cumulative GPA, and degree requirements.
Each course designated as repeatable for credit requires departmental approval and registration. Prior to registration, a student and the student's departmental advisor complete the appropriate repeatable course approval and registration form. The form requires approval from the instructor of the class and the appropriate program head. A copy of the form is submitted to both the Undergraduate or Graduate Dean and the Office of the Registrar for review, transcription, approval, and filing. The form must be completed and approved before the registration of the course and submitted to the Undergraduate or Graduate Dean and the Office of the Registrar no later than the first day of class of the current term. Students without appropriate forms on record may be administratively dropped from the course.

Repeating Courses to Improve Grades

Regardless of the number of times a course is repeated, any single course can contribute only once to the number of semester credit hours required for graduation. A limited number of courses, such as independent study courses, may be repeated for credit – see “Taking Repeatable Courses – General Policy for All Students.”

Students may repeat the course to improve their grades, however, if the course is not designated as a repeatable course, then any single course can contribute only once to the number of semester credit hours required for graduation.

Undergraduate Students

An undergraduate student may repeat the same course to improve his/her grades based on following:

- An undergraduate student is limited to three grade-bearing enrollment attempts for any specific class. The student cannot repeat the same course for a fourth time regardless of the grade earned.
- According to Texas Education Code 54.014, a student attempting the same class, excluding designated repeatable courses, for the third time will be charged a penalty fee equivalent to the out-of-state tuition for the same number of semester credit hours.
- Courses cross-listed under more than one course prefix are considered the same course for repeat counting.
- All withdrawals (academic and non-academic withdrawals) are counted as grade-bearing enrollment attempts.
- Undergraduate students who are Texas residents should be aware that state law limits the number of semester credit hours an undergraduate Texas resident may attempt while paying tuition at the rate provided for Texas residents. See Excessive Undergraduate Hours.

The grade from the first attempt will not be used in computing a student's grade point average. All further repeats will be used in computing the student's cumulative grade point average (GPA). See Grade Point Average and Transfer Credit. All grades will appear on the student's transcript. A notation beside the first grade will indicate that the course has been repeated.

Courses that were originally taken for a letter grade may not be repeated for credit/no credit or pass/fail in lieu of a letter grade.

Undergraduate Coursework from Other Institutions of Higher Education
Undergraduate students who fail a course in residence at UT Dallas may repeat the course at another institution of higher education. An undergraduate student may not transfer an equivalent course if that course was taken at UT Dallas with a passing grade (D's included). Upon successful completion of the repeated course with a grade of at least C (2.000 on a 4.000 scale), the course may be transferred to UT Dallas where it will meet the content requirements of the course failed in residence and contribute semester credit hours toward graduation. However, the grade of F earned at UT Dallas will remain a part of the student’s academic record and will be computed as a part of the cumulative GPA.

**Graduate Students**

A graduate student who wishes to repeat a course must submit a Repeated Course Adjustment form to the Graduate Dean.

Up to three graduate courses may be repeated. However, no graduate course may be repeated more than once. When a course is repeated, both grades will remain in the graduate student’s record and will be included in the graduate student’s transcript. The higher grade will be used in computing the GPA for purposes of graduation.

From the University Resources list:


**3-peat Fee:** Three Course Repeat Fee: As outlined in section 54.014 of the Texas Education Code, an institution may charge a resident undergraduate student a higher rate when enrolling in a course, excluding designated repeatable courses, that the student has previously completed. An undergraduate student who registers for a course three or more times will be charged the non-resident tuition rate.
International Oversight Committee- Proposed charge.

The International Oversight Committee (IOC) is a university-wide standing committee appointed by the President. The IOC does not report to the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas (UT Dallas).

The IOC is dedicated to preserving academic freedom and the University's robust research agenda, while remaining committed to the safety and security of UT Dallas students, faculty, and staff during international travel as well as to the safety and security of UT Dallas international students in the United States. Committee members include representatives from across campus, including faculty members, administrative leaders, and international travel and risk specialists. The committee meets each semester as required to review and discuss policies.

The Committee is charged with evaluating any UT Dallas activity or travel to high risk regions; coordinating University emergency responses to assist both UT Dallas travelers abroad and UT Dallas international students in the United States; and developing guidelines and formulating policies to maintain the well-being and safety of UT Dallas travelers to international regions.

1. Evaluation of UT Dallas programs and travel in high risk countries or regions: High risk countries or regions are those in which warnings or alerts have been issued by the U.S. Department of State, or where significant health or safety concerns are present. The Committee will evaluate proposed programs and travel requests to high-risk regions according to well-defined criteria, to determine adequate safeguards are in place before an approval to travel is granted. Such criteria may include, but will not be limited to, the following: the nature and scope of the travel alert / warning and/or health or safety concern; the experience of the faculty program leaders and in-country staff; the strength of the in-country infrastructure; the specific steps taken to inform all travelers about known risks; the specific steps taken to mitigate known risks and their likely effectiveness; the academic or university related purpose for which the authorization is being sought; whether the opportunity is for undergraduate, graduate or professional training; the education, research, or professional training importance of the opportunity in relation to the student's academic program; the political and physical conditions in-country; travel conditions and the ability to evacuate all travelers, if necessary; and the manageability of legal risk to the institution.

2. Coordination of the University’s emergency response: The Committee will develop and initiate a coordinated UT Dallas emergency response strategy by taking into account specific issues, including but not limited to: identifying the context of emergency or crisis; assessing potential risk to the faculty, staff, or students involved including the nature, duration and severity of any risk; and identifying appropriate resources and activation of appropriate emergency response plans to assist in addressing a situation.

3. Development of guidelines and formulation of policies: The IOC will develop guidelines and formulate policies on international travel pertaining to: oversight, prevention-mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery.

The Committee will be composed of the following eight voting members appointed by the President: three faculty members, the Dean of Students, an Associate Provost, the Assistant Vice President for Procurement, the Vice President for Communications, and the Vice President for Research or their designees. The Committee will be chaired by a representative from the International Center Risk and Safety Office. The term of office for Committee members will be for two years, and the President can reappoint members for additional terms. The Assistant Vice President for International Programs will serve as the Responsible University Official for this committee.
The University Paul Sabatier Toulouse III
118 Route de Narbonne, 31062, Toulouse Cedex (France)
Represented by Bertrand MONTHUBERT, President

And

The University of Texas at Dallas (UT Dallas)
800 West Campbell Road, Richardson, TX USA 75080-302

Represented by David E. DANIEL, President

Have entered into the following agreement regarding the enrollment of Ms Yingzhen Lu in doctoral studies and research at both institutions.

(UT Dallas will be designated below as the contracting institution)
ARTICLE 1

That Ms Yingzhen Lu can be concurrently enrolled as a Ph.D. student at both U of TOULOUSE and UT Dallas working under the joint supervision of Prof. Yves Chabal, Head of the Materials Science and Engineering department at UT Dallas, Dr. Carole Rossi, and Dr. Alain Estève of the Université Paul Sabatier.

ARTICLE 2

That his research topic is entitled: “Control of interfacial chemistry in reactive nanolaminates.”

ARTICLE 3

That Intellectual Property rights relative to the results obtained during the common research programs, will be protected according to the laws in force in each country.

ARTICLE 4

That the results obtained in the course of research programs do not allow registration of a patent or commercial exploitation by one University without written permission given by the other. As far as it is possible, eventual patents must be registered jointly. If one party is unresponsive after 90 (ninety) days, the other party is entitled to register them under its own name. The publication or free exchange of scientific results will neither give rise to any preliminary permission nor any financial compensation, except if non disclosure statement is attached to the program.
Administrative modalities

ARTICLE 5
That the concurrent enrolment of Ms Yingzhen Lu is effective from XXXXXX and the duration of program is fixed at 3 years. An extension to this timeline will only be considered in exceptional circumstances, after approval by the two institutions upon recommendation by the Ph.D. advisors. Furthermore an application for extension must be submitted 6 months before the termination of the agreement.

ARTICLE 6
That the sequencing of the research to be conducted at both institutions will be developed and agreed upon by the faculty advisors. A calendar shown in the appendix reflects the first phase of the project. It will be reviewed and updated based on findings and progress. Any modification of this calendar must be submitted to the two institutions by the Ph.D. advisors at least 1 month in advance.

ARTICLE 7
That Ms Yingzhen Lu must be registered at both institutions. The registration fees will be paid to the contracting University. The Université Paul Sabatier will not collect any registration fees.

ARTICLE 8
Ms Yingzhen Lu must have all necessary personal and health insurance coverage at both Université Paul Sabatier and UT Dallas.

ARTICLE 9
That Prof. Yves Chabal, Head of the Materials Science and Engineering department at UT Dallas, and Dr. Carole Rossi, and Dr. Alain Estève of the University of Toulouse will serve as Ph.D. advisors for Ms Yingzhen Lu for the duration of this agreement.

TITLE III
Pedagogical modalities

ARTICLE 10
That each institution will appoint a dissertation (thesis) committee to review the results and findings of the research conducted by Ms Yingzhen Lu. The composition of each committee will be designated by the legal authorities of the institution where the dissertation (thesis) is submitted, after agreement from the cosignatory institution. It will be composed on a proportional balanced basis by academic representatives from both universities. Moreover, the dissertation (thesis) committee will (may?) include appointees with relevant research expertise that are external to both universities. The number of the members of the dissertation (thesis) committee cannot exceed eight.

The results and findings of the research study will be summarized in a dissertation (thesis) submission in conformity with their regulations of both institutions.

ARTICLE 11
That the approved dissertation (thesis) presented at UT Dallas will be written in English. A written summary will be written in French and English.

ARTICLE 12
That a short report of the dissertation (thesis) submission will be prepared in English and translated into French. This report will allow the faculty at University
of Toulouse to evaluate the contribution by and the capability of Ms Yingzhen Lu to present his work and show that her mastery of her research subject.

Upon approval by Université Paul Sabatier Ms Yingzhen Lu will qualify conferral of the Ph.D. degrees by both Université Paul Sabatier and UT Dallas.

Université Paul Sabatier

ARTICLE 13

That Ms Yingzhen Lu must follow the rules of both institutions concerning the registration for, formatting of and reproduction of the approved dissertation (thesis) copy.

ARTICLE 14

That the present convention will hold for 3 years. It can only be extended following conditions described in article 5.
Dallas,

President of University of Texas at Dallas

David E. DANIEL

Dean of Graduate Studies

Dr. Austin Cunningham

PhD advisor

University of Texas at Dallas

Pr. Yves J. Chabal

Carole Rossi, Alain Estève

PhD student

Toulouse,

President of Université Paul Sabatier

Bertrand MONT'HUBERT

The Director of the Doctoral School

Alain CAZARE

PhD advisor

Université Paul Sabatier

PhD advisor

University of Texas at Dallas

Pr. Yves J. Chabal

PhD student
Cotutelles France-USA  2000-2011
80 signed agreements (36 US → Fr, 44 Fr → US)

25% Humanities and Social Sciences
75% Sciences, Engineering, Health
80 « cotutelles » PhD’s : American universities
80 « cotutelles » PhD’s: French universities
Obstacles to double or joint PhD Degree

• American universities hesitate to “share” their degrees
• **Duration:**
  - Graduate school 5 years (min.)
  - Master 2 years + Thèse 3 years (min.)
• Problem of Tuition fees: *home university?*
### Question

The Cotutelle program allows approved PhD students to be supervised jointly by academics from The University of Melbourne and a nominated French university. A Cotutelle agreement sets out in detail the terms and conditions of candidature. The agreement would give approval to be enrolled concurrently in two institutions, spending at least 30% of the total maximum time limit (or one year) in each university.

The Cotutelle program takes place under a reciprocal agreement that needs to be drawn up between the two institutions, setting out in detail the terms and conditions for joint supervision and examination. Fees are only paid at one institution.

If successful, you would be awarded a doctoral degree jointly-badged by the two institutions, and stating that the award was made as a consequence of a Cotutelle agreement with the partner institution.

The objective of the Cotutelle program is to strengthen collaborative links between French and Australian research teams via the joint supervision of PhD students.

### Answer

The Cotutelle program allows approved PhD students to be supervised jointly by academics from The University of Melbourne and a nominated French university. A Cotutelle agreement sets out in detail the terms and conditions of candidature. The agreement would give approval to be enrolled concurrently in two institutions, spending at least 30% of the total maximum time limit (or one year) in each university.

The Cotutelle program takes place under a reciprocal agreement that needs to be drawn up between the two institutions, setting out in detail the terms and conditions for joint supervision and examination. Fees are only paid at one institution.

If successful, you would be awarded a doctoral degree jointly-badged by the two institutions, and stating that the award was made as a consequence of a Cotutelle agreement with the partner institution.

The objective of the Cotutelle program is to strengthen collaborative links between French and Australian research teams via the joint supervision of PhD students.


"Discussion points" from Graduate Council

From: Cunningham, Austin  
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2014 2:56 PM  
To: Jacob, Varghese; STILLMAN, ROBERT; King, Serenity; Balsara, Poras; Gonzalez, Juan; Wilson, Michael; Fair, George; Piquero, Nicole  
Subject: RE: For Grad Council review: Dual Degree Agreement  
All PhD requirements (qualifiers etc, coursework, oral examinations ) are satisfied independently at both institutions—researchers from both institutions serve on the PhD committees…. Absolutely no different than one of our own doctoral students… the student benefits from joining a vibrant supported common research activity at both institutions and gains invaluable international research exposure—
Cotutelles started in France (every university there is authorized to engage in cotutelles ). Initially the partnership universities and researchers were in Australia. Do a search on the internet – global agenda now—all EU countries, Canada , US institutions

---------------------------------
From: Jacob, Varghese  
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2014 11:36 AM  
To: STILLMAN, ROBERT; King, Serenity; Balsara, Poras; Gonzalez, Juan; Wilson, Michael; Fair, George; Piquero, Nicole  
Cc: Cunningham, Austin  
Subject: RE: For Grad Council review: Dual Degree Agreement  
Since it is a single student I am ok with it. But here are some food for thought if it was going to become general policy, how are things like qualifiers and course work requirements going to work. Also I am curious does anybody know how common is it to have dual PhDs like in this case. VSJ

From: Gonzalez, Juan  
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2014 9:22 AM  
To: King, Serenity  
Cc: Balsara, Poras; STILLMAN, ROBERT; Piquero, Nicole; Wilson, Michael; Jacob, Varghese; Fair, George; Cunningham, Austin  
Subject: RE: For Grad Council review: Dual Degree Agreement  
Thanks Serenity.

These Cotutelle agreements are very common in Europe and even in Canada. They are, in my opinion, a great way to tie researchers from two different institutions and provide the students with an experience that is hard to get; the inner workings of the educational system in two different countries.

It fosters collaborations and academic interactions. If done correctly, I am a strong supporter.

I have no objection to this agreement.
Dear Graduate Council,

The Provost requests your review of the below memorandum and attached Cotutelle agreement. In addition to internal approvals, the Cotutelle agreement requires SACS notification as it is a dual degree in which both UT Dallas and the University Paul Sabatier Toulouse III award diplomas.

Questions/comments/concerns can be directed either to Dean Spong, Dean Cunningham, me, or all of us. If you approve, the documentation will be forwarded to the Committee on Educational Policy for their review.

Thank you,

Serenity

From: Cunningham, Austin
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2014 2:00 PM
To: Wildenthal, Bryan
Cc: MARQUART, JAMES; Shaw, Timothy; King, Serenity; Hernandez, Rodolfo
Subject: Memorandum_for_International_Collaboration_Endorsement-1 (3)
Memo

Date: May 23, 2014

To: B. Hobson Wildenthal, Executive Vice President and Provost
    Office of Academic Affairs and Provost.

From: Austin Cunningham, Dean of Graduate Studies
CC: James Marquart, Vice Provost.
    Timothy Shaw, UT Dallas Attorney.
    Serenity King, Assistant Provost.
    Rodolfo Hernández Guerrero, International Education Director.

Re: Endorsement: International Collaboration

I endorse the attached proposal that will establish a Cotutelle research and academic exchange collaboration between the University Paul Sabatier Toulouse III and the University of Texas at Dallas (UTD). The initiative has been submitted for institutional consideration by Dr. Yves J. Chabal, Director of Material Science Engineering Program, with the following objectives:

To forge, promote and strengthen research collaboration between the two universities;
To enrich the training experiences for a selected doctoral student and expose the student to different educational environments and
Help the student develop personal and professional links that will increase her career prospects internationally.
In addition the faculty, students and staff from both partners in the collaboration will benefit from the resulting international and cultural exchanges.

The initiative has been reviewed and approved by Dr. Mark Spong, Dean of the Erik Jonsson School of Engineering and Computer Science.

I am submitting a preliminary draft of the agreement for institutional and legal review (attached). If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.
New Program Request Form for Bachelor’s and Master’s Degrees

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Institution:</strong> The University of Texas at Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Program Name</strong> – Show how the program would appear on the Coordinating Board’s program inventory (e.g., Bachelor of Business Administration degree with a major in Accounting):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science in Energy Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Proposed CIP Code:</strong> 52.1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Number of Required Semester Credit Hours (SCHs)</strong> (If the number of SCHs exceeds 120 for a Bachelor’s program, the institution must request a waiver documenting the compelling academic reason for requiring more SCHs): 36 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Brief Program Description</strong> – Describe the program and the educational objectives:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Master of Science in Energy Management will train students in the fundamentals of global energy markets and provide them with skills necessary to make managerial decisions faced by diverse energy companies. The courses in the program will address concepts related to economics, finance, business strategy, risk management, public policy, technology, and energy supply chain with the objective of identifying challenges and opportunities. The ultimate goal of the program is to prepare students to use analytical skills to evaluate industry operations, detect important trends, and devise strategies that will enhance operational efficiency of energy firms and steer them toward areas of growth. The program will ensure that students will not only acquire fundamental knowledge on the interaction between industry players, but also that the skills they will obtain will closely represent and continually evolve with current needs of energy companies in Dallas/Fort Worth and beyond, maximizing graduates’ competitiveness on the job market.

The MS in Energy Management is designed to give students three critical components: 1) a significant depth in understanding of energy markets across the entire spectrum of the industry, 2) sufficient breadth in analytical and quantitative skills that will allow graduates to effectively apply such skills to any segment of the industry, preparing them for a wide range of careers in the energy industry, and 3) critical exposure to real industry problems through an
industry-facilitated capstone experience designed to facilitate job entry and ensure that graduates of the program will become value-adding employees without delay. A student finishing the proposed program will have mastered a wide variety of analysis and decision making techniques that include statistical, econometric, and decision theoretical methods. With a distinguished faculty and the Naveen Jindal School of Management’s (JSOM) close partnership with local industry leaders, JSOM aims to develop a program that will be able to compete with other energy-focused offerings provided by Universities in North Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Arkansas.

The student learning outcomes for the program are as follows:

- Students will develop a strategic level of understanding of global energy markets;
- Students will be prepared to dissect and critique industry operations;
- Students will synthesize latest energy news headlines and formulate potential effects on industry outcomes;
- Students will develop research skills to analyze data and interpret important trends;
- Students will design methods and strategies to help with growth and enhance operational efficiency of energy firms; and
- Students will be prepared to clearly communicate the outcomes of their research through written and oral means.

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

   Naveen Jindal School of Management

7. **Proposed Implementation Date** – Report the date that students would enter the program (MM/DD/YY): Spring 2015

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

   Name: Hasan Pirkul
   
   Title: Dean, Naveen Jindal School of Management, The University of Texas at Dallas
   
   E-mail: hpirkul@utdallas.edu
   
   Phone: 972-883-2705
Program Information

I. Need

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

Employment prospects in the energy industry in the DFW area and beyond are bright. The high pace of industry growth and an aging employee base continue to lead to many new job openings. Because of the generation gap that has plagued the energy industry, the National Research Council—the policy arm of the National Academy of Sciences—estimates that as much as a third of the current energy workforce will be retiring by the end of the current decade. In addition to retirement-based openings, the rapid process of technological change in the industry has led to many new developments including horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, emergence of new oil and gas fields and associated logistics challenges, oil and gas price decoupling, smart grids, renewable energy resources and tightening environmental regulations. These developments have in turn created many new roles for managers, researchers, analysts, financiers, and policy makers in both conventional and non-conventional segments of the energy industry, and the associated demand for energy-related training.

Independent analysts estimate that the total number of energy and mineral extraction jobs created over 3.5 years since 2010 amounted to nearly 600,000 or 15% of all new jobs. At the same time, earnings in the energy and mining industry rose by 53%.

Last year, McKinsey & Company released a report analyzing important economic drivers in the U.S. One of five industries that were highlighted was shale oil and gas, which has strong presence in North Texas. Combined with projections by the International Energy Administration that put the U.S. ahead of Saudi Arabia in oil production by 2020, the McKinsey & Co. report points to strong potential for job growth in the oil and gas sector, much of which is contained in Texas.

In 2013, Texas had the third fastest rate of job growth in the U.S. and the state was a significant contributor of jobs paying above-average wages, and leading indicators suggest that Texas will remain a top job producer beyond 2014, with energy (and especially midstream and downstream activities) remaining one of the strongest sectors. A report by IHS Global Insight estimates that just the upstream segment of unconventional oil and gas industry will add a quarter of a million jobs by the end of this decade, and another quarter of a million jobs between 2020 and 2035. For every job created within the industry, demand for additional goods (such as inputs and equipment) and services (including accounting, financial and economic analysis, and strategic consulting services), the so called “multiplier effect”, leads to creation of between 1.68 and 20.8 indirect jobs in the state. These multiplier statistics further reinforce the importance of the energy industry to the Texas and U.S. job creation process.


2 Gene Hayward (http://haywardeconblog.blogspot.com/2013/06/drill-dig-baby-drill-dignot-what-many.html) and New Geography


4 In 2013, Texas accounted for 35% of total U.S. shale gas production, and just one field in South Texas (Eagle Ford) produced 14% of all shale oil recovered in the nation that year. If conventional production is included in the statistics, in June 2013 Texas accounted for 48% of all oil and gas rigs operating in the United States, 26% of all rigs operating around the world, and 30% of total oil and gas output of the U.S. (U.S. Energy Information Administration)


8 The multiplier is calculated based on production complexity, capital requirements and the extent of vertical integration within an industry.
A quick scan of various internet job boards for the Dallas-Fort Worth oil and natural gas industry reveals a strong need for management and finance-based roles, with many advertisements for positions in oil and gas accounting, tax and audit services, financial analysis, business development, land management, procurement management, supply chain management, data analysis, market research, consulting, strategic planning, and valuation. Companies like Schlumberger and Halliburton have opened offices in the Dallas area, and young entrepreneurs and investors are increasingly favoring the Dallas energy industry over Silicon Valley’s technology ventures, emphasizing the growing importance of North Texas in the state’s energy presence. With so much money flowing to North Texas energy, the industry will need skilled energy managers to continue its successful development.

Locally, a query of the Capital IQ database revealed over 500 energy companies operating in the DFW area, representing all types of energy resources and all segments of the energy supply chain. Some of these companies are among the world’s most dynamic. For example, the 2013 edition of Fortune’s global “100 Fastest Growing Companies” ranking lists HollyFrontier—a Dallas refiner—in second place and Denbury Resources—an upstream oil and gas company headquartered in Plano—in 75th place. These companies will need skilled managers to direct and improve their operations as the industry continues to grow. The local need for qualified individuals is already so high that Cholla Petroleum, a Dallas-based exploration and production company, recently reached out to JSOM faculty in search of a suitable intern for Cholla’s mergers and acquisitions department, even though the school does not yet offer an energy curriculum. The Vice President of Human Resources at Pioneer Natural Resources—a large, publically traded, U.S. upstream oil and gas producer headquartered in Irving, Texas—revealed that the company has been unable to fill a significant need for skilled oil and gas accountants, energy marketers, and procurement managers. This recent evidence amounts to a wide range of opportunities for individuals with a fundamental understanding of the energy industry and strong quantitative, data analysis, and management skills.

Opportunities for individuals with good analytical skills also abound in Texas’ power industry. Texas has a unique independent electricity grid and liberal wholesale and retail markets, and is currently seeking to devise a wholesale market structure that will provide sufficient incentives to generators to invest in additional capacity to meet growing demand while reducing system costs. Analysis of the appropriateness of any given market structure requires understanding of reserve margins, blackout risks, determinants of generation costs, opportunities and challenges of demand side management, effect of renewable integration on system costs and environmental outcomes, and the implications of rapid smart meter deployment and construction of new transition lines. As more data becomes available on generation and consumption side, ability to analyze this data is critical to improving power flows through local grid controls. The implied outcomes are relevant not only for Texas, but for other states as well, so these skills translate well geographically.

In addition to oil, gas, and electricity, Texas has the nation’s largest installed capacity for wind power generation, with companies like Google having contributed to the large number of wind projects in the state. In addition to renewable integration considerations mentioned in the previous paragraphs, the wind energy industry needs data analysts who can use spatial wind patterns to determine optimal turbine placement, and finance experts who will be able to determine the appropriate timing for wind investment given uncertainty in future energy prices and the potential value inherent in a company’s ability to wait for more information. The

---

10 Future growth rates can also be estimated by looking at current investment patterns. Occidental Petroleum (Oxy)—one of the top producers of oil in Texas’ Permian Basin—has been selling its overseas assets and reinvesting in places like Texas’ Eagle Ford shale field. In one particular deal, Oxy sold its Argentinian assets to China for roughly $3 billion and reinvested all of the proceeds in U.S. unconventional plays.
proposed curriculum will address all of the managerial, financial, economic, policy, and analytical skills mentioned here.

In April, the program’s development committee consulted with industry Advisory Board members on the draft curriculum outlined in this proposal. The Board members confirmed a strong market need for energy-focused business and economics skills, and expressed strong optimism toward the success of the proposed program. Several universities across the U.S. began to fill the industry’s employment need by launching energy-focused initiatives (e.g. a new undergraduate program is in the works at the University of Texas at Austin), buoyed by optimism surrounding the above job and industry growth statistics. In many cases these programs are rolled out at the request of (and with help from) alumni. JSOM faculty’s correspondence with UT Dallas alums employed in the energy industry and their highly-placed industry peers revealed strong interest in and support for a program of this kind, which is substantiated in the accompanying letters of support.

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

The Dallas-Fort Worth area is growing rapidly, with nearly 300 people relocating to Dallas every day. According to data supplied by Forbes, Dallas population has grown at an annual rate of 2.1% during 2012 and 2013, with job growth keeping the same pace. Economic growth and availability of jobs has largely contributed to this influx of residents.

The University of Texas at Dallas has also seen significant growth rates in recent years. The Fall 2013 student population stood at 21,193 – an increase of more than 7% since Fall 2012. The student body is expected to expand further in the coming years.

JSOM is UTD’s largest school with an enrollment of almost 7,000 students; half of them graduate students. JSOM is growing rapidly, with a total enrollment that has more than doubled over the last decade. This exponential growth requires the school to enrich its offerings at the MS level to better serve the needs of an increasingly diverse student body and compete with other educational institutions in the area. Five of the Fall 2013’s seven most popular graduate programs at UT Dallas are offered by JSOM, and the proposed degree in Energy Management will take the school a step further in securing student interest and continued enrollments.

With such strong growth in population and student body, and surging activity in the energy industry, JSOM has been seeing active demand from students for energy-focused academic offerings. The 2012 MBA cohort founded The Energy Association, UT Dallas—a student organization focused on energy industry knowledge and activities. Current graduate students have also provided JSOM faculty with direct feedback expressing their interest in energy courses. Such feedback included indications that students would have chosen the Energy curriculum over their current program of study if it existed at the time of their enrollment at UT Dallas, requests for additional energy-focused courses, and requests for course materials related to specific energy sector topics. This academic year, 45 students enrolled in the two energy courses presently offered by JSOM faculty, even though these courses did not satisfy any requirements of degree completion. In addition to students who took energy courses for credit, a number of other MBA, engineering, and economics students participated in them by auditing the courses.

Four universities in Texas are presently involved in energy-focused education: Southern Methodist University in Dallas offers a Finance Concentration within its MBA program, which students can further tailor to receive a specialization in Energy Finance; Texas Christian University in Fort Worth launched an MBA for Energy Professionals last year; Rice University in Houston offers an MBA concentration in Energy; and the University of Houston offers a Global Energy Executive MBA, in addition to energy-related certificates within its regular MBA program. However, all of these graduate programs are general MBA degrees, in which students can choose to gain some knowledge of the energy industry. By contrast, the program outlined in this proposal would immerse students in all energy industry segments and prepare them to enter
managerial roles with a focused set of skills prized by the industry. No other Universities in the state of Texas offer graduate-level programs imparting a comprehensive set of energy skills, and only one (Texas Tech) offers an analogous program at the Bachelor’s level (Bachelor of Science in Energy Commerce).\(^\text{11}\) Furthermore, only one of the above options is located in North Texas, where the demand for skilled energy employees continues to grow quickly, as outlined in the previous section. The state’s existing programs and programs offered by universities in neighboring states, like the University of Oklahoma and Tulane University, enjoy high demand\(^\text{12}\) and spend resources to host recruitment seminars in Dallas.

A recent survey\(^\text{13}\) of Texas energy companies, conducted by Manpower Group, revealed that Texas universities fail to adequately prepare students for high paying jobs in the energy industry. Energy companies continue to express concerns about availability of qualified employees, expecting the problem to worsen over the next five years. These survey results, combined with the present success of existing energy programs and the cross-border recruitment efforts of neighboring universities provide compelling evidence that existing energy educational initiatives in Texas are insufficient for the state’s current rate of growth in demand for skilled energy employees, and that local demand for such educational opportunities is not being met.

Although, based on program faculty’s conversations with current JSOM graduate students, it is expected that a share of all students enrolling in the MS in Energy Management will be diverted from other degree programs offered by the JSOM (such as an MBA or an MS in Finance or Supply Chain Management), the impact of such diversions is expected to be modest, given total JSOM enrollment figures.

C. **Enrollment Projections** – Use this table to show the estimated cumulative headcount and full-time student equivalent (FTSE) enrollment for the first five years of the program. (*Include majors only and consider attrition and graduation.*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTSE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five-year enrollment projections are informed by total enrollments in comparable programs at other U.S. Universities and are based on the following assumptions:

1. Headcount enrollments are based on program faculty’s analyses of the job market needs and student demand presented above.
2. FTSE = 80% of Headcount.
3. Roughly 65% of students enrolled in the program are expected to be full-time, taking 30 SCH per academic year, and the other 35% are part-time, taking 15 SCH per academic year.

---

11 Branches of the for-profit University of Phoenix in Fort Worth and Arlington offer a Master’s level degree in Energy Management, but UT Dallas does not compete with the University of Phoenix for students.

12 For example, Tulane’s Master of Management in Energy program had 40 students in 2014.

13 Press coverage of the study can be found here: http://www.woai.com/articles/woai-local-news-sponsored-by-five-star-cleaners-119078/new-programs-in-works-to-create-12321093
A. **Degree Requirements** – Use this table to show the degree requirements of the program. *(Modify the table as needed; if necessary, replicate the table for more than one option.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Semester Credit Hours</th>
<th>Clock Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education Core Curriculum <em>(bachelor’s degree only)</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Courses</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Electives</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Electives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other <em>(Specify, e.g., internships, clinical work)</em></td>
<td>(if not included above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A Bachelor’s degree should not exceed 120 Semester Credit Hours (SCH) per Board rule 5.44 (a) (3). Those that exceed 120 SCH must provide detailed documentation describing the compelling academic reason for the number of required hours, such as programmatic accreditation requirements, statutory requirements, or licensure/certification requirements that cannot be met without exceeding the 120-hour limit.

B. **Curriculum** – Use these tables to identify the required courses and prescribed electives of the program. Note with an asterisk (*) courses that would be added if the program is approved. *(Add and delete rows as needed. If applicable, replicate the tables for different tracks/options.)*

The proposed curriculum below has been developed with the input of existing energy industry advisory board members. These individuals are 1) recognized professionals in the energy industry; 2) hold important managerial positions (C-level or VP) in their firms; and 3) have significant influence on training and hiring energy professionals. The program’s advisory board presently consists of the following individuals:

- Anas Alhajji (Chief Economist, NGP Energy Capital Management)
- Tina Castillo (CFO, Compass Well Services)
- J. Patrick Collins (CEO, Cortez Resources)
- Daniel Kimes (CFO, Brigadier Oil and Gas)
- Jill Lampert (CFO, NGP Energy Capital Management)
- David Malkowski (Vice President, Energy Capital Solutions)
- Eddie Rhea (CEO, Foundation Energy Management)
- Kevin Ryan (CFO, Merit Energy)
- Yessica Tavera (International Negotiator, Hunt Oil)
- Brian Tulloh (VP Public Policy, Energy Future Holdings)

During the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 semesters, the internal program development committee worked closely with industry leaders identified above to create a comprehensive set of skills and a broad knowledge base that are essential for energy professionals, as well as develop opportunities for real industry exposure for students through business cases and capstone projects.
The committee also consulted curricula of similar programs at other universities and the Energy Risk Professional (ERP) certification requirements developed by the Global Association of Risk Professionals (GARP) to identify key components of the proposed curriculum. The committee carefully mapped identified skills and knowledge base into individual courses proposed here, and believes this curriculum will generate some of the strongest graduates among existing energy-based graduate programs in the nation.

The curriculum has a set of core courses and a set of electives that can be organized into focused tracks. The core courses cover energy finance, accounting, economics, risk management, and operations, and provide a solid foundation of the inner workings of energy markets. Elective courses provide students an opportunity to obtain in-depth knowledge in a specific domain of the energy industry. While not presently organized into formal specialization tracks, students can tailor their curriculum to acquire skills in finance and risk management, supply chain and logistics, land contracting and management, or global management and strategy.

The curriculum for the program is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPRE 6301</td>
<td>Quantitative Introduction to Risk &amp; Uncertainty in Business*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Core</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPRE 6302</td>
<td>Operations Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECO 6303</td>
<td>Business Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 6301</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy Core</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECO 6318</td>
<td>Energy Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPRE 6389</td>
<td>Managing Energy: Risk, Investment, and Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 6335</td>
<td>Energy Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 6336</td>
<td>Energy Accounting and Tax Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS xxx1#</td>
<td>Energy Law &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To effectively follow the curriculum, students must be familiar with the concepts of probability and statistics. Students must either take OPRE 6301 or waive it through the JSOM’s formal waiver request process. A student choosing to take OPRE 6301 can count 3 credits of this course towards meeting the program’s elective requirements.

# Denotes new course to be developed.
Number
MECO 6352 Financial Negotiation and Dispute Resolution 3
OPRE 6335 Risk and Decision Analysis 3
FIN 6341 Energy Risk Management 3
FIN 6360 Options and Futures Markets 3
MECO 6312 Applied Econometrics and Time Series Analysis 3
OPRE 6371 Purchasing, Sourcing and Contract Management 3
OPRE 6370 Logistics, Distribution and Warehousing 3
OPRE 6332 Spreadsheet Modeling and Analytics 3
OPRE 6362 Project Management in Engineering and Operations 3
OPRE 6366 (or) OPRE 6378 Global Supply Chain Management 3
OPRE 6362 Supply Chain Strategy 3
GISC 6381 Geographic Information Systems Fundamentals 3
MAS xxx2# Capstone course ** 3

# Denotes new course to be developed.
** At this time the capstone course is listed as an elective. Program faculty will work with industry members to develop a steady stream of projects to which our students can contribute their efforts.

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

The program will be managed by Anastasia Shcherbakova under direction of Robert Kieschnick. Core faculty members are those who teach the core courses in the program. All listed core courses except one (MAS xxx1) already exist in the school’s catalog and are offered regularly or will be offered starting in the Fall 2014. For these courses, the proposed program will not add additional teaching load or requirement for additional faculty members, except for increased enrollments in existing classes. MAS xxx1 will be taught by an existing faculty member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Core Faculty and Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree and Awarding Institution</th>
<th>Courses Assigned in Program</th>
<th>% Time Assigned To Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.: Robertson, David Asst. Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Molecular Genetics Univ. of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>MG200, MG285 MG824 (Lab Only)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasia Shcherbakova Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Public Policy, University of Chicago</td>
<td>MECO 6318, FIN 6335, MAS xxx2</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kieschnick Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Finance, The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>FIN 6301, MECO 6312</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metin Cakanyildirim Full Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Operations Research, Cornell University</td>
<td>OPRE 6389, OPRE 6366</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milind Dawande Ashbel Smith Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Operations Management, Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>OPRE 6302</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernhard Ganglmair Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Economics, University of Zurich</td>
<td>MECO 6303</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Time allocated includes 25% for administering the program (reallocated faculty cost) and 50% for increased enrollments in existing classes.
Support faculty members are those who teach energy elective courses and those core courses for which numerous sections are offered. All elective courses except the capstone experience already exist in the school’s catalog and are offered regularly for other programs in the school. For these courses, the proposed program will not add additional teaching load or requirement for new faculty members, except for increased enrollments in existing classes. The capstone course will be led by the program director.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Support Faculty and Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree and Awarding Institution</th>
<th>Courses Assigned in Program</th>
<th>% Time Assigned To Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Bolton Full Professor, O.P. Jindal Chair of Managerial Economics</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Economics, Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>MECO 6352</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Selender Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>PhD in Finance, University of Chicago</td>
<td>FIN 6301</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alain Bensoussan Ashbel Smith Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Mathematics, University of Paris</td>
<td>OPRE 6335</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessio Saretto Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Finance, University of California, Los Angeles PhD in Mathematical Finance, University of Brescia</td>
<td>FIN 6341, FIN 6360</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Wardlaw Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Finance, The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>FIN 6341</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hazzard Clinical Professor</td>
<td>MBA, University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>MAS xxx1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Smith Clinical Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Economics, University of California, Riverside</td>
<td>FIN 6306</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozalp Ozer Full Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, Columbia University</td>
<td>OPRE 6378</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Katok Ashbel Smith Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Management Science and Information Systems, Penn State University</td>
<td>OPRE 6372</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng Zhao Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Economics, Cornell University</td>
<td>FIN 6360</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannan Ramanathan Senior Lecturer II</td>
<td>PhD in Business Administration, University of Illinois</td>
<td>OPRE 6332</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yongwan Chun Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Geography, Ohio State University</td>
<td>GISC 6381</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Alborz Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Management Information Systems, University of Melbourne</td>
<td>OPRE 6362</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran Blueshtein Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Economics, University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>MECO 6303, MECO 6312</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Stecke Ashbel Smith Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Industrial Engineering, Purdue University</td>
<td>OPRE 6302</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Guttery Clinical Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Finance, University of Connecticut</td>
<td>REAL 6321</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Please note that the 25% of time assigned to the proposed program reflects increased enrollments in existing classes.
D. **Students** – Describe general recruitment efforts and admission requirements. In accordance with the institution’s Uniform Recruitment and Retention Strategy, describe plans to recruit, retain, and graduate students from underrepresented groups for the program.

The School of Management at UTD will make every effort to recruit and retain underrepresented students into this program. Such efforts will include, but are not limited to, advertising the program widely to communities and organizations with underrepresented populations; providing needed advising to such students on their academic work; and helping them on their career path. JSOM’s coordinator of student recruitment is a member of The National MBA Association, Texas Association of Black Personnel in Higher Education, and The North Texas Collegiate Consortium. Furthermore, she routinely attends various events that are targeted to recruiting underrepresented students such as, A&M Diversity Fair, The National Black MBA conference, Huston-Tillotson Graduate Fair, The National Society of Hispanic MBA conference, Diversity Leadership Conference, Paul Quinn College Graduate Fair amongst others.

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

Ellen Safley, Dean of Libraries at UT Dallas, provides the following assessment of library resources:

Overall, the collection available at the Eugene McDermott Library is adequate to begin the program in Energy Management.” The Library will increase acquisition of monographic materials by adding 25 new titles per year (with the average title costing $130 or $3,250/year) and will spend approximately $16,250 over the first 5 years of the degree.

Three titles will be added to improve journal access to the subject. These titles currently cost $2,250 per year or $11,250 for the first 5 years of the degree. The addition of other journal titles will be considered if Interlibrary Loan statistics show a demand. The total costs will be $27,500 plus inflation for the first five years of the degree.

UTD’s business/management databases are adequate.

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

The School of Management Building was constructed in 2002, with cutting-edge computing and other teaching facilities and technologies. A new building is being added to the school and is expected to be ready by Fall 2014. The new building will house a state-of-the-art finance and trading lab, which will be a great asset to the energy trading and energy risk management courses. The two buildings offer adequate facilities and equipment, in terms of office and classroom spaces, computing and research and teaching resources, to accommodate the proposed program, and JSOM does not expect the need for additional facility or equipment requirements.
G. **Accreditation** – If the discipline has a national accrediting body, describe plans to obtain accreditation or provide a rationale for not pursuing accreditation.

Currently, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) is the accreditation body that accredits business school programs, their standards for a business school can be found at http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards.asp. The School of Management was accredited by AACSB in 2002 and was reviewed and re-affirmed in 2012. The review cycle for the maintenance of accreditation is now every five years by AACSB and this program if approved along with the existing programs will be reviewed again in 2017. If approved, the proposed degree (being a part of JSOM’s current MS degree programs) is considered to meet the stated standards until the next review in 2017.

H. **Evaluation** – Describe the evaluation process that will be used to assess the quality and effectiveness of the new degree program.

To gauge the success and progress of the MS in Energy Management, the program committee will take the following steps:

1. Hold an annual advisory board meeting to present summary of the program’s state and seek guidance about the appropriateness of the curriculum;
2. Survey a random sample of students following their first semester in the program and prior to graduation; surveys will inquire about student performance, satisfaction with the program, and post-graduation plans and arrangements;
3. Maintain and evaluate proper records of applicants, admission and retention rates, and job placements;
4. Survey local employers and industry participants regularly, noting main industry trends pertaining to curriculum development and employment prospects;
5. Complete an annual program assessment based on student performance on specific evaluation questions on exams, teaching evaluations and placement data. Adopt any suggestions and implement changes recommended by the Masters Committee based on the results of these assessments;
6. Carry out any additional program assessments required by the University.
### III. Costs and Funding

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Year Costs</th>
<th>Five-Year Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel $1</td>
<td>$7,440,724 Reallocated Funds $7,440,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>$0 Anticipated New Formula Funding $952,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library, Supplies, and Materials</td>
<td>$27,500 Special Item Funding $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other $2</td>
<td>$0 Other $4 $380,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reallocated Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Reallocated</strong> $7,440,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total New</strong> $27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong> $7,468,224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2. Specify other costs here (e.g., administrative costs, travel).

3. Indicate formula funding for students new to the institution because of the program; formula funding should be included only for years three through five of the program and should reflect enrollment projections for years three through five.

4. Report other sources of funding here. In-hand grants, “likely” future grants, and designated tuition and fees can be included.

---

14 Please use the “Program Funding Estimation Tool” found on the CB website to correctly estimate state funding.
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1. **Adequacy of Funding and Notification of Other Institutions** – The chief executive or chief academic officer shall sign the following statements:

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

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

   __________________________________________________________________________

   Chief Executive Officer/Chief Academic Officer        Date

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

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

   __________________________________________________________________________

   Board of Regents (Designee)        Date of Approval
Consolidated repeatable course policy for UG and Grad (from scratch)

http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2014/undergraduate/policies/course-policies#repeat

http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2014/graduate/admission/registration-and-enrollment-requirements#repeated-course-work

Repeating Coursework

There are certain courses in which students may repeat the course(s) for credit and may satisfy degree requirements. In other instances, students may repeat the course to improve their grades.

Courses transferred for credit to UT Dallas from another institution of higher education may not be repeated for additional credit.

Before repeating any course, students should contact their academic advisor to determine the application of such course credit toward graduation. Students are also advised to check with the Office of Financial Aid to determine how and if grades earned in repeated coursework impact their financial aid eligibility status.

The University of Texas at Dallas’s policy for repeating coursework is stated below.

Taking Repeatable Courses

Unlimited Repeatable Courses

There are certain courses in which students may repeat the course(s) for credit. These courses in the catalog will have the statement of “may be repeated for credit” and considered non-duplicated courses. All semester credit hours and grade points earned from each of these courses taken count in a student’s earned hours and cumulative GPA. Students should review their degree program for application towards degree requirements.

Limited Repeatable Courses

There are certain courses that students may repeat for credit with a limit on repeatability. For example, courses with the course description that states, “May be repeated for credit (9 semester credit hours maximum).” For limited repeatable courses, a student is limited to repeating the course to the maximum hours stated in the course description. The limited semester credit hours and grade points earned from each of these courses taken count in a student’s earned hours and cumulative GPA. Students should review their degree program for application towards degree requirements. NOTE: Registrations beyond the repeatable limit of the class will not count in a student’s earned hours, cumulative GPA, and degree requirements.
Repeating Courses to Improve Grades

Regardless of the number of times a course is repeated, any single course can contribute only once to the number of semester credit hours required for graduation. A limited number of courses, such as independent study courses, may be repeated for credit—see “Taking Repeatable Courses—General Policy for All Students.”

Students may repeat the course to improve their grades, however, if the course is not designated as a repeatable course, then any single course can contribute only once to the number of semester credit hours required for graduation.

Undergraduate Students

An undergraduate student may repeat the same course to improve his/her grades based on following:

- An undergraduate student is limited to three grade-bearing enrollment attempts for any specific class. The student cannot repeat the same course for a fourth time regardless of the grade earned.
- According to Texas Education Code 54.014, a resident undergraduate student attempting the same class, excluding designated repeatable courses, for the third time will be charged tuition at the nonresident undergraduate student rate for the same number of semester credit hours.
- Courses cross-listed under more than one course prefix are considered the same course for repeat counting.
- All withdrawals (academic and non-academic withdrawals) are counted as grade-bearing enrollment attempts.
- Undergraduate students who are Texas residents should be aware that state law limits the number of semester credit hours an undergraduate Texas resident may attempt while paying tuition at the rate provided for Texas residents. See Excessive Undergraduate Hours.

The grade from the first attempt will not be used in computing a student's grade point average. All further repeats will be used in computing the student's cumulative grade point average (GPA). See Grade Point Average and Transfer Credit. All grades will appear on the student's transcript. A notation beside the first grade will indicate that the course has been repeated. Courses that were originally taken for a letter grade may not be repeated for credit/no credit or pass/fail in lieu of a letter grade.

Undergraduate Coursework from Other Institutions of Higher Education

Undergraduate students who fail a course in residence at UT Dallas may repeat the course at another institution of higher education. An undergraduate student may not transfer an equivalent course if that course was taken at UT Dallas with a passing grade (D's included). Upon successful completion of the repeated course with a grade of at least C (2.000 on a 4.000 scale), the course may be transferred to UT Dallas where it will meet the content requirements of the course failed in residence and contribute semester credit hours toward graduation. However, the grade of F earned at UT Dallas will remain a part of the student's academic record and will be computed as a part of the cumulative GPA.
Graduate Students

A graduate student who wishes to repeat a course must submit a Repeated Course Adjustment form to the Graduate Dean.

Up to three graduate courses may be repeated. However, no graduate course may be repeated more than once. When a course is repeated, both grades will remain in the graduate student's record and will be included in the graduate student's transcript. The higher grade will be used in computing the GPA for purposes of graduation.

From the University Resources list:


**Three Course Repeat Fee:** As outlined in section 54.014 of the *Texas Education Code*, an institution may charge a resident undergraduate student a higher rate when enrolling in a course, excluding designated repeatable courses, that the student has previously completed. An undergraduate student who registers for a course three or more times will be charged the non-resident tuition rate.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Pedro Reyes  
    Alan Marks

FROM: Barbara M. Holthaus

THROUGH: Dan Sharphorn

SUBJECT: FERPA and Publication of Individualized Student Comments Provided as Part of the Class Evaluation Process

QUESTION PRESENTED

How does FERPA affect the ability of System institutions to make individualized comments provided by students as part of the class evaluation process available to the public?

SHORT ANSWER

Class evaluations provided by students to the institution are records that are maintained about those students by the institution and therefore Education Records that are subject to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). FERPA is a federal law that prohibits the release of personally identifiable Education Records unless the student gives a voluntary FERPA compliant consent or a specific exception permits such records to be released. FERPA specifically pre-empts application of any state law that would otherwise require the release of an Education Record contrary to the requirements of FERPA. Under FERPA, the public release of individual evaluation comments that contain sufficient information that is reasonably likely to allow the student to be identified would be a FERPA violation. Therefore, an institution may release individual student comments only 1) if the student has provided a written voluntary FERPA compliant consent prior to the release of the comment; or, 2) comments that
have been determined by the institution upon review not to contain any information that the institution reasonably believes could be used to identify a particular student.

ANALYSIS

Texas Education Code Section 51.974(h) requires Texas institutions of higher education “to conduct end-of-course student evaluations of faculty and develop a plan to make evaluations available on the institution’s website.”

The question has arisen about whether such postings may contain comments provided by individual student in addition to or as part of the evaluation process. Although the plain language of Section 51.974(h) appears to authorize an institution to post such comments as part of its plan to comply with the statute, UT System institutions must also comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)(20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99), which may limit an institution’s ability to post certain comments.

FERPA is a federal law that protects the privacy of student education records. The law applies to all schools that receive funds under an applicable program of the U.S. Department of Education. To the extent that a state law conflicts with FERPA, the doctrine of federal preemption provides that FERPA, not the conflicting state law, prevails.

FERPA defines Education Records at 34 CFR §99.3 very broadly to include, with few exceptions, all records that are:

1. Directly related to a student; and
2. Maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a party acting for the agency or institution.

FERPA provides students enrolled in institution of higher education with certain rights with respect to their Education Records. This includes the requirement that institutions must have written permission from student in order to use or release any information from a student’s Education Record that can be used to identify the student unless a specific exception under FERPA permits the use or disclosure.¹ Records of evaluations of classes or teachers obtained from students pursuant to applicable law or policy and maintained by or for the institution fall squarely under the definition of Education Records that are subject to FERPA.

There is no question that one primary exception, the “school official exception,” permits a System institution, and/or System to access students’ individual comments provided as part of an evaluation for any and all legitimate educational purposes; and in the case of the Board of

¹ FERPA allows schools to disclose those records, without consent, only to certain parties or under certain conditions. Examples include disclosures to: school officials with legitimate educational interest; other schools to which a student is transferring; specified officials for audit or evaluation purposes; appropriate parties in connection with financial aid to a student; organizations conducting certain studies for or on behalf of the school; accrediting organizations; to comply with a judicial order or lawfully issued subpoena; appropriate officials in cases of health and safety emergencies; and, State and local authorities, within a juvenile justice system, pursuant to specific State law. See 34 CFR §99.31. None of these exceptions would authorize an institution to release a student’s evaluative comment to the public, unless the comment was de-identified as required by FERPA or the student expressly consented to the release.
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Regents and/or System Administration, as part of an evaluation or assessment of a System institution’s educational programs.

In addition, generalized evaluations that require the student to complete a printed form and answer question objectively, such a rating an aspect of the class on a scale, or providing “yes” or “no” answer to question would not permit a reader to glean information from such comments, and could be released publically in individual or aggregate format without running afool of FERPA.

However, there are no FERPA exceptions that would permit the institution or System to post records consisting of student evaluation comments that contain information that can be used alone or in combination with other information known to the reader sufficient to permit the reader to identify a student on a site available publically. Therefore, unless the student has given his or her voluntary written consent, the records must be reviewed to ensure they do not identify the student who submitted the comment that constitute the record before they could be posted on a public website.

A. CONSENT

In order to release an Education Record pursuant to the consent requirement, FERPA requires that a consent form be signed and dated by the student and: (1) specify the records that may be disclosed; (2) state the purpose of the disclosure; and (3) identify the party or class of parties to whom the disclosure may be made. 34 CFR § 99.30(b).

A student cannot be denied any educational services based on the student’s refusal to provide a FERPA consent. In addition, the student must also be given the opportunity revoke the consent and the institution would have to honor the revocation once it is given as to any future disclosures.

Therefore, if an institution decides to request students to give their consent to waive their right to confidentiality as to any Education Record, the institution should be careful that any process the institution adopts to obtain and utilize such waivers is designed to allow the institution to establish that all consents obtained and relied upon by the institution are the product of a knowing and voluntary waiver, and meet the requirements of FERPA.

One important aspect is the timing of the request for the consent. FERPA is silent as to how far in advance a student can be requested to provide written consent evidencing the waiver of a FERPA right. Obviously, a student would need to understand the nature of the remarks she or he may make in the future in order to knowingly consent to their public revelation, and presumably, the nature of the comments will depend on the type of experience the student will be evaluating. Additionally, a process where the students is required to give consent before the student understands the actual nature of what they are consenting to have revealed may be seen as a way to chill the student’s willingness to give a candid evaluation in the future. Therefore, to be able to demonstrate that consents are knowing and voluntary, the best practice would be to seek the consents in close proximity to time the student’s evaluation is requested.
If an institution nonetheless decides to initiate a practice of requesting that students agree to consent to the release of individual evaluation remarks in advance of the evaluation process, the institution would need to implement a consistent, failsafe process that would ensure that students, at the time they are asked to provide evaluations, are reminded that they may have previously consented to the release of their evaluation remarks; and if they provided prior consent, or if they are not sure if consent has been provided, be given the opportunity to revoke that consents before they submit their comments.

Regardless of when the consent is sought, the institution will need to ensure that all students understand that their ability to provide an individual comment as part of an evaluation is not conditioned on their willingness to consent to publication of the comments. And of course, any process adopted by an institution to obtain such consents must ensure that it provides for efficiently and consistently explaining the purpose and nature of the consent requested; collecting all waivers using a FERPA compliant consent form; tracking all waivers and revocations of waivers; and, once evaluations are collected, ensuring that it correctly verifies which students have provided waiver consents and that only comments made by students who have a valid waiver in place at the time the evaluation was provided are made public.

B. DE-IDENTIFICATION

Absent consent or the availability of a specific exception, an institution cannot release information from an Education Record that, alone or in combination, is linked or linkable to a specific student such that would allow a reasonable person in the school community who does not have personal knowledge of the relevant circumstances, to identify the student with reasonable certainty. 34 CFR §99.3(e), “Personally identifiable information.”

As explained by the DOE:

The purpose of FERPA is two-fold: to assure that parents and eligible students[2] can access the student’s education records, and to protect their right to privacy by limiting the transferability of their education records without their consent. 120 Cong. Rec. 39862. As such, FERPA is not an open records statute or part of an open records system. The only parties who have a right to obtain access to education records under FERPA are parents and eligible students. Journalists, researchers, and other members of the public have no right under FERPA to gain access to education records for school accountability or other matters of public interest, including misconduct by those running for public office. … [T]he regulatory standard for defining and removing personally identifiable information from education records establishes an appropriate balance that facilitates school accountability and educational research while preserving the statutory privacy protections in FERPA. The simple removal of nominal or direct identifiers, such as name and SSN (or other ID number), does not necessarily avoid the release of personally identifiable information. and place of birth, race, ethnicity, gender, physical description, disability, activities and accomplishments, disciplinary actions, and so forth, can indirectly identify someone depending on the combination of factors and level of detail released. Similarly, and as noted in the preamble to the NPRM, 73 FR

---

[2] At the K-12 level, FERPA rights are exercised by the parent. At the post-secondary level, only the student may consent to the release of his or her education records, even if the student is a minor.
15584, the existing professional literature makes clear that public directories and previously released information, including local publicity and even information that has been de-identified, is sometimes linked or linkable to an otherwise de-identified record or data set and renders the information personally identifiable. The regulations properly require parties that release information from education records to address these situations.

Federal Register, Vol. 73, No. 237, p. 74831.

Therefore, in order to release individual student comments publically without violating FERPA, the institution must devise a system under which to review each comment to ensure whether there is other information already in the public domain that would allow a person of average knowledge within the campus community to identity of the student. In the case of a very small class, this could also require redaction of information about a person’s sex, ethnicity or other factors. Since handwriting is considered by the Department of Education to be an identifier under FERPA, handwritten comments could not be released. Handwritten comments would have to be re-typed as part of the review process. If de-identification of any comment under the FERPA standard cannot be ensured, the institution’s responsibility under FERPA is to err on the side of caution and refrain from releasing the information.

Ideally, the analysis of each comment would retained so that the institution, if challenged by a student or audited by the Department of Education could establish that the institution did not have a pattern or practice of releasing education records in violation of FERPA.

**CONCLUSION**

A student’s comments provided as part of a class evaluation and maintained by or for an institution of higher education are Education Records that are subject to FERPA. System and System institutions are required to comply with FERPA.

In the absence of a specific exception, FERPA permits the release of Education Record, or personally identifiable information from an education record, to the public only upon express written consent of the student as required by FERPA.

There is no FERPA exception that would permit the release of student evaluation comments to the public in identifiable form.

Therefore, individual student comments provided to the institution pursuant to an evaluation could be publically released only 1) if the student has provided a written voluntary FERPA compliant consent pursuant to a policy that complies with the conditions explained in this memo; or, 2) upon a determination by the institution, pursuant to a consistently applied policy, that the institution believes the individual comment is not linked or linkable to a specific student that would allow a reasonable person in the school community who does not have personal knowledge of the relevant circumstances, to identify the student with reasonable certainty as required by FERPA.
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Given the efforts that would have to be made to avoid posting an individual student comment in violation of FERPA, System should carefully evaluate whether the benefits of making individual comments publically available would be worth the institutional resources that would have to be required to develop, implement and monitor a process for doing so that is FERPA compliant.

I hope this information is useful to you. If you have any questions or comments about this memo or any other matter, please do not hesitate to contact me. My direct line is 512 499 4617.
Recommendations for Committee Replacements

- Committee on Academic Integrity:
  - Replace Robert Glosser with Dingsheng Ma.
  - Replace Robert Glosser as chair with ____________________________.
  - Replace Judd Bradbury with Vance Johnson Lewis.

- Committee on Learning Management Systems:
  - Replace Matt Brown with John McCaskill (EPPS).

- Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel:
  - Replace Ivan Sudbourough with Jason Jue.

- Library Committee:
  - Replace Pankaj Choudhary with Mieczyslaw Dabkowski.

- Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity:
  - Replace Peter Park with ________________.
  - Replace Peter Park as chair with Rashaunda Henderson.

- Committee on Institutional Animal Care and Use:
  - Replace Christa McIntyre Rodriguez with Theodore Price.

- Institutional Biosafety & Chemical Safety Committee:
  - Replace Marco Atzori, who is no longer with the University, with Michael Biewer.

(Added 09/29/14)

- Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects: Replace John Hansen (ECS) with Michael Rugg.