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AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
September 13, 2016

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS
   Dr. Benson

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   Dr. Redman

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Dr. Redman
   August 17, 2016 Meeting

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT
   Dr. Redman

5. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates
   Serenity King

6. Student Government Report
   Akshitha Padigela

7. CEP Recommendations
   Dr. Peinhardt
   A. English Language Proficiency Requirements
   B. Three Year International Degree
   C. New Degree: Social Data Analytics and Research Degree

8. LEAP (LGBT Education, Advocacy, and Programming) Committee
   Matt Johns

9. Amendments to UTDPP1019- Committee on Committees Charge
   Dr. Redman

10. Resolution on Salary Compression and Inversion
    Dr. Scotch

11. Replacement for Committee Appointments
    Dr. Redman

12. Discussion: School By-laws
    Dr. Redman

13. Approval of A&H School By-laws
    Dr. Redman

14. Faculty Handbook
    Dr. Redman

15. ADJOURNMENT
    Dr. Benson
Item 3: Previous Meeting Minutes
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
August 17, 2016


Absent: Naofal Al-Dhair, Elizabeth Bell, Thomas Brikowski, Gregg Dieckmann, Kimberly Hill, D.T. Huynh, Syam Menon, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Shilyh Warren, Alejandro Zentner

Visitors: Andrew Blanchard, Cristen Casey, Joanna Gentsch, Sheila Hayes, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Michelle Lockhart, Jennifer McDowell, Dennis Miller, Inga Musselman, Akshitha Padigela, Clint Peinhardt, Alex Piquero, Elizabeth L. Rugg, Marion Underwood, Eric Van Leeuwen

1. Call to Order
Speaker Tim Redman called the meeting to order at 2:31 PM and announced that President Benson was delayed but would share his announcements once he arrived.

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

3. Approval of the May 18, 2016 Minutes
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes with minor grammatical revisions. Betsy Schlobohm seconded. The motion carried.

4. Speaker’s Report – Tim Redman
1. On July 28, 2016 the Committee on Committees met. Speaker Redman felt that the school of Interdisciplinary Studies should have a representative and recommended that the charge be updated. It was also noted that the school of Interdisciplinary Studies does not have a representative on the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel (CQ). Also, he noted that CQ is made up of thirteen men and only one woman. Speaker Redman indicated that this situation is unacceptable and that one way of adding a woman to the pool is to add an Interdisciplinary Studies representative.
2. Speaker Redman noted that it was recently reported that the schedule for the proposed “Cotton Belt”, a planned 67.7-mile (109 km) commuter rail line in Tarrant, Dallas, Collin, and Rockwall Counties, may have its construction date moved up from 2035 to 2023. The Cotton Belt will provide service from Dallas's northeast suburbs to Southwest Fort Worth with a major terminal at the north end of Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport. This project is very important to the University as a station is planned to be on our campus. This will provide greater transportation opportunities for our students to come to campus, and it will improve UTD’s ability to recruit bright students from all over the Metroplex.

3. Speaker Redman reminded the Senate that all committee reports to the Senate were due August 31, 2016.

4. All other items are on the agenda.

5. **UT Dallas’s SACSCOC Reaffirmation Project – Serenity King**
Serenity King gave a brief update on the SACSCOC Reaffirmation Project. Each Reaffirmation Committee's webpage now includes agenda packets and minutes. The Leadership Team resumed its meeting schedule on August 4, 2016. Some committees have met during the summer to get started on their assignments. The Provost’s Technology Group (PTG) created working folders for each committee on the Degas server. Each principle has a “seed document” or a baseline document to be updated for the 2017 Compliance Certification Report (CCR). PTG has completed a new web version of the 2007 narratives along with other reports, such as the Fifth-Year Interim Report.

Lisa Berry, Assistant Director for Library Planning and Assessment at the University of Houston, Downtown (UH-D), visited UTD to share her expertise and advice on reaffirmation processes.

Dr. Gloria Shenoy, the Director of Assessment in the Provost’s Office conducted the inaugural 2-day Assessment Seminar (August 11-12, 2016) which was held in conjunction with JSOM’s Project Management Institute. There were 70 participants, including 30 UT Dallas program heads, assessment coordinators, and instructors with representation from all of the schools. During this seminar, participants learned about learning outcomes assessment. This summer, the Office of Assessment and the Center for Teaching and Learning launched its first desktop development, called “10-in-10” – 10 teaching tips in 10 minutes or less. Dr. Shenoy will be presenting at both the New Faculty Orientation and Graduate Assistants Orientation on the importance of learning outcomes.

6. **Announcements and Questions – President Benson**
The semester has started and he eagerly awaited the new students on campus, and faculty. He hopes to visit the various schools as time permits. With no other announcements, he opened the floor to questions. There were none.

7. **Monitoring Recap Presentation- Serenity King**
Serenity King presented a detailed timeline of the July 2013-December 2015 SACSCOC Monitoring.

**July 2013: SACSCOC Notification of Complaint: July 2013**
President Daniel and Dr. Blanchard, then SACSCOC Liaison, received notification from SACSCOC that a student complaint had been forwarded to them from the THECB. UT Dallas was not notified by the THECB that they had received and referred the complaint.

- UT Dallas received the letter from SACSCOC on July 22. Our response was due August 16.
- Complainant cited some of the SACSCOC principles, but SACSCOC requested evidence of compliance with eight Principles of Accreditation ([http://dox.utdallas.edu/publication1209](http://dox.utdallas.edu/publication1209)).

### Fall 2013: UT Dallas Response to address eight Principles of Accreditation (due August 16, 2013)

UT Dallas response needed to show evidence of compliance in addressing complaint:

- Whether undergraduate and graduate programs, specifically the Arts and Technology BA, MA, MFA, and PhD programs adhered to institutional processes;
- When requested, whether institutional processes were appropriate, published and followed.

1. **CR 2.8 (Faculty)** – The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs. Upon application for candidacy, an applicant institution demonstrates that it meets the comprehensive standard for faculty qualifications.
   - Provide evidence that a sufficient number of faculty teaching in the ATEC suite of programs. Data was to include full-time and part-time faculty coverage and load during a specific timeframe (spring 2012-spring 2013). A master list of courses, including independent study, with instructor name (including TA’s and co-instructors), and enrollment for each course in each term needed to be included.

2. **CS 3.3.1.1 (Institutional effectiveness, education programs, to include student learning outcomes)** – The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: educational programs, to include student learning outcomes.
   - Demonstrate that the ATEC suite of programs had identified expected outcomes and the extent of achievement for these outcomes. Evidence should include an analysis of the results and support the resulting improvements.

3. **CS 3.4.3 (Admissions policies)** – The institution publishes admissions policies consistent with its mission.
   - Summarize published admission policies that have been approved through institutional processes. Demonstrate evidence of consistent adherence to these policies by the ATEC suite of programs.

4. **CS 3.4.6 (Practices for awarding credit)** - The institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery.
• Provide an overview of institutional practices in awarding credit for all programs, and then focus on consistent adherence by the ATEC suite of programs.

5. CS 3.6.1 (Post-baccalaureate program rigor) - The institution’s post-baccalaureate professional degree programs, master’s and doctoral degree programs, are progressively more advanced in academic content than undergraduate programs.

• Demonstrate how the ATEC doctoral program consists of progressively more advanced academic content than that of the ATEC MA and MFA programs, and how the MA/MFA programs consist of progressively more advanced academic content than that of the BA program.

6. CS 3.6.2 (Graduate curriculum) - The institution structures its graduate curricula (1) to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (2) to ensure ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences.

• Address whether the ATEC graduate programs adhered to the standard to structure its graduate curriculum.

7. CS 3.6.4 (Post-baccalaureate program requirements) – The institution defines and publishes requirements for its graduate and post-baccalaureate professional programs. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs.

• Address whether there was an insufficient number of ATEC doctoral courses and the program’s course sequencing.

8. CS 3.7.1 (Faculty competence) – The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (See Commission guidelines “Faculty Credentials.”)

• Supply a roster for all faculty teaching all courses within the ATEC suite of programs during spring 2012-spring 2013.

Met the August 16, 2013 deadline by submitting a report with over 250 pages.

SACSCOC requested follow up supporting documentation throughout fall 2013 such as incomplete assessment reports, questions on faculty credentialing, discrepancy between the ATEC PhD assessment report and progress report to THECB, transcript concerns, and evidence of adherence to policy.
January – April 2014: Monitoring Report Begins

- The Monitoring Period began on January 22, 2014 when Drs. Daniel and Blanchard received notice that SACSCOC had ruled at its December 9, 2013 meeting to request a First Monitoring Report for questionable compliance with six principles.
- SACSCOC cleared the institution on 2.8 Faculty and 3.6.2 Graduate Curriculum.
- The letter stated that a Special Visiting Committee would visit the UT Dallas campus for two days at the end of April 2014, and that the First Monitoring Report would be due to that committee no later than two weeks prior to the visit.

First Monitoring Report to address six *Principles of Accreditation* (due April 15, 2014)

1. CS 3.3.1.1 (Institutional effectiveness, educational programs, to include student learning outcomes) - address a gap in assessment activities with little to no supporting documentation within the ATEC suite of programs. Explain the discrepancy between the doctoral assessment report and the president’s letter as whether there were ATEC doctoral graduates.
2. CS 3.4.3 (Admissions policies) - address remaining questions as whether the ATEC graduate programs adhered to institutional admission requirements and produce documentation showing consistent adherence to these policies.
3. CS 3.4.6 (Practices for awarding credit) - address why credit awarded practices did not adhere to the graduate catalog policy. Also address how credit for repeatable courses is awarded.
4. CS 3.6.1 (Post-baccalaureate program rigor) - address how concurrent courses and courses for master’s and doctoral students reflect progressively more advanced academic content beyond the baccalaureate.
5. CS 3.6.4 (Post-baccalaureate program requirements) – explain why specific UT Dallas faculty transcripts show the conferral of MFA degrees with fewer credits than the stated required credits. Demonstrate that the institution and the ATEC suite of programs adhered to the published graduate catalog requirements.
6. CS 3.7.1 (Faculty competence) - address remaining questions about qualifications for specific faculty members in teaching assigned courses.

Submitted the First Monitoring Report (640+ pages) two weeks prior to the site visit.

Additional documentation was requested prior to the visit.

April 2014: Site Visit
• The Visiting Committee (chaired by Virginia-Commonwealth University) interviewed people in a variety of groups, including one-on-one discussions with ATEC administrators, ATEC faculty, ATEC students, Assessment Office staff, Graduate Dean, Undergraduate Dean, University Registrar, CEP faculty members, and Graduate Council representative and CUE representative.

Sample Questions Grouped by Common Themes during Site Visit

Adherence to Policy
• Why do you have such a robust faculty governance process only to have one person (Graduate Dean) override the entire process?
• Are you making more exceptions to graduate catalog policy than following the policy?
• What rationale is there for overriding admissions standards and what assessment data is provided to evaluate how those students who have certain criteria waived perform?
• How are any of the exceptions to policy documented?
• A lot of responsibility with adherence to awarding credit and related compliance with SACSCOC principles falls on the Registrar’s Office, so why are so many Registrar Office functions performed by the Graduate Dean here?
• Is your fast track program policy consistently applied?
• Do you all inherently trust one another; do you not agree that it is unusual that so little documentation exists?

Courses / Academic Content
• Why are you allowing so many exceptions to the repeatable course restrictions listed in their catalog course descriptions?
• Why do you use topics courses to introduce new courses instead of new course numbers?
• How do you document what students do each time they take a repeatable course?
• Why are the syllabi for these courses not posted?
• How do you know students in concurrent undergrad/grad courses are receiving appropriate level of rigor?

Transcripts
• Why are you not transcripting different sub-topics for independent study courses on student’s transcripts?
• Why are you not transcripting fast track hours on graduate transcripts?

Assessment Activities
• Tell me about assessment in the other degree programs…
• Why did one of the faculty say they have never seen their program’s student learning outcomes? Does the sharing/use of assessment data not get broadly dispersed by program heads to their faculty?

April 2014: Site Visit Outcomes

The Visiting Committee held an exit meeting the following day with President Daniel, Provost Wildenthal, SACSCOC Liaison and Dean of Undergraduate Education Andy Blanchard, and Assistant Provost Serenity King to preview their report.

• The Committee cleared the ATEC programs and closed the complaint.

Based on what they heard during the visit, the Committee cited the university’s processes on 3.3.1.1 (Institutional effectiveness, educational programs, to include student learning outcomes) and [a principle to which we had not yet been asked to respond], 3.4.5 (Academic policies).

• 3.4.5 Academic policies: The institution publishes academic policies that adhere to principles of good educational practice. These policies are disseminated to students, faculty, and other interested parties through publications that accurately represent the programs and services of the institution.

Assessment Office

• In 2011, four individuals (complete staff) left the university.
• Two new hires (Assistant Provost for Assessment and Assessment Specialist) made in summer 2011 to begin September 1.
• Assistant Provost for Assessment left the university in spring 2012.
• Assessment Office supervision transferred to Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination (King)
  – Part of assessment team in 2006-2008
  – “Discovered” three-year reporting cycle and no online tool
• Director of Assessment hired June 2012; had a part-time faculty role.
• Assessment and Accreditation Coordinator Dr. Michael Carriaga hired February 2013 to replace Assessment Specialist.
• Assessment Coordinator Dr. Gloria Shenoy hired April 2014.

Second Monitoring Report to address two Principles of Accreditation (due April 1, 2015)

1. CS 3.3.1.1 (Institutional effectiveness, educational programs, to include student learning outcomes) – asked the institution to demonstrate that other educational programs engage in
assessment activities and indicate how they implement changes to their programs based on analyses of assessment results.

2. CS 3.4.5 (Academic Policies) – asked the institution to address numerous exceptions to various policies and to address repeated coursework and how these courses may be applied towards total academic credit, and also address how academic credit earned through Fast Track may be applied.

April 1, 2015: UT Dallas submitted its Second Monitoring Report (2130+ pages) with CS 3.4.5 commitments.

3.4.5 Commitments

- No exceptions to repeatable course limit
- Rationale for repeatable courses included in catalog review process
- Specify sub-topics for independent study and/or Topics courses; course sub-titles recorded on transcripts
- Documentation of new student work in repeatable courses
- Student information system changes for repeatable courses
- Documentation of exceptions to policy beyond school
- Fast track language clearer, consistent with departmental website and/or marketing brochures
- Use stand-alone new course numbers for new courses instead of existing Topics courses
- Allow new courses three times/year

Changes at UT Dallas and Third Monitoring Report (April – December 2015)

- April 22, 2015: Assistant Provost King became SACSCOC Liaison.
- May 1, 2015: Gloria Shenoy became Director of Assessment; she began meeting with programs to which she had not previously been assigned.
- June 11, 2015: President Daniel received a phone call that UT Dallas would be required to submit a Third Monitoring Report for only 3.3.1.1 due September 7, 2015 (and extended to October 9, 2015).
- Cleared on 3.4.5 Academic Policies due to changes and commitments
- June 30, 2015: President Daniel departed UT Dallas to assume the position of Deputy Chancellor at UT System.
- July - August 2015: Upon the recommendation of Deputy Chancellor Daniel and President ad interim Wildenthal, King met with experienced SACSCOC institutional effectiveness reviewer Dr. Neal Armstrong. Dr. Crystal Baird, SACSCOC Vice President, visited the campus. Both agreed to review the Third Monitoring Report before submission. They both had the same advice: Be completely candid. Neal also suggested that the Assessment Office
create a maturity matrix to document progress to date while Baird suggested the report focus on commitment to improve.

October 2015: UT Dallas Submitted Third Monitoring Report (3140+ pages) with CS 3.3.1.1 commitments.

December 2015: UT Dallas cleared based not only on progress made but also on commitments to sustain progress

3.3.1.1 Commitments

• Improved communications from Assessment Office
  – Informative website, more face-to-face discussion, assessment office plan/report, service survey, timely sharing of information with schools
• Annual assessment cycle university-wide. Plans for upcoming year/reports for last year due each October
• Online tool (Hyoka) for annual assessment reporting
• University-wide assessment committee (including administrators in schools)
• Workshops and training by assessment office (including TA training, adjunct training, new faculty orientation, CTL partnerships)
  – 7 workshops, 276 participants. Thank you!
• Increase maturity matrix score by better sharing/use of data in schools
• Catalog updates consistent with assessment reports

Moving Forward

Continue consistent adherence to institutional processes:

• Track exceptions in undergraduate and graduate deans’ offices
• Report annually exceptions to CEP by Undergraduate and Graduate Deans
• CEP review frequency of exception versus policy itself
• CUE, Graduate Council, and CEP review authority of Undergraduate or Graduate Dean to waive/exempt faculty policy
• Document exceptions/waivers
• Share documentation. Remember Graduate Dean’s office conducts functions of Registrar’s Office
• Determine appropriate document storage location
• Produce evidence of consistent adherence/compliance to institutional policies at all levels: university-wide, school, and program
• Balance “SACSCOC makes us” with “general best practices” and what makes sense for us. Shared responsibility, not micro-managing
• Assessment Office provide up-to-date assessment training of new faculty, new program heads
• Provost’s Office continue to sponsor faculty at assessment and/or SACSCOC conferences
• Provost’s Office provide timely information on changes to SACSCOC expectations

Takeaways

• Could be “blindsided” by a request for compliance documentation.
• All Principles are fair game any given day.
• Not much time to gather documentation, so multiple people need to be aware of where documents reside, particularly in summer months.
• Communicate, particularly during personnel transitions.
• Be prepared. Any student in any program could complain on any given day.
• Inform SACSCOC Liaison if you know a student has complained beyond the university, even if it has not yet reached SACSCOC.
• Do not focus on individual making complaint. SACSCOC can follow through on complaints from individuals not affiliated with us.
• Do not panic.
• Remember SACSCOC accredits institutions, not programs, not offices. We all pass/fail together.
• Be patient.

8. FAC Report- Murray Leaf
   There was nothing to report, but the FAC Executive Council will be meeting later in the month.

   Mr. Campain shared Student Government’s (SG) goals and projects for the 2016-2017 academic year. SG is focusing on how students can interconnect with each other, and communicate more effectively. The Comet discount program has been transferred from Human Resources to SG. They have been contacting over one hundred vendors to confirm proposed discounts. He requested that, should faculty have any suggestions for locations for Comet discounts, to let SG know. SG is working to display signage of the Comet Creed throughout campus with the help of the facilities department. He opened the floor to questions, but there were none.

10. CEP Proposals- Clint Peinhardt

Professor Peinhardt presented the following Committee report.

A. Amendments to UTDPP1075- University Policies related to Graduate Student Teaching Assistants, Research Assistants, and Graduate Assistants
The amendments would create a new category, Graduate Assistant. This will be in addition to Research Assistant and Teaching Assistant. This will allow students who provide administrative assistance to specific departments and staff not be tied to a specific faculty member. Each department would pay for the students out of their departmental funds. The Graduate Assistants will be recruited through Human Resources. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the amendments to UTDPP1075. The motion carried.

B. JSOM New degree: MS in Financial Engineering and Risk Management
The new program reflects the additional mathematics that is required to work in the risk management field. There is a growing demand for this type of program, especially from the large insurance companies moving into the Metroplex. Only one new professional development class would be required for this new degree. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the MS in Financial Engineering and Risk Management. The motion carried.

C. JSOM Degree Name Change: MS in Healthcare Management to MS in Healthcare Leadership and Management
The program was originally created in 1998. It was initially open only to typical graduate students, but in the past few years, it has been open to physicians and medical administrators. The program currently has 300 students, and there is a very long wait-list for admission into the program. Leadership is key in the field as it continues to change in today's market. In order to reflect the students they are serving, the school recommended changing the degree name, but none of the courses would require changing. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to the degree name change from MS in Healthcare Management to MS in Healthcare Leadership and Management. The motion carried.

D. Graduate Supplemental Course - MAS 6102
This supplemental course was approved by the Graduate Council in May. It is a 1 credit hour course, which should be taken in the first semester of the degree. It is a professional development course that will prepare the students to be competitive in the global economic environment. The course would be offered on pass/fail basis. Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve MAS 6102. The motion carried.

E. Syllabi Language for Concealed Handgun Policy
The following statement was recommended to be added to the syllabus template.

"The University's concealed handgun policy is posted on the campus carry website: https://www.utdallas.edu/campuscarry/".

This statement would be added under a heading "Campus Carry" on the syllabi policies and procedures page (https://coursebook.utdallas.edu/syllabus-policies) between the headings "Sharing Confidential Information" and "Technical Support."

Clint Peinhardt made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the addition of the statement to the syllabus template. The motion carried.

11. Discussion: One Card System Concerns – Tim Redman
Murray Leaf has suggested that an ad hoc committee to discuss concerns brought to the committee. The ad hoc committee will be chaired by Murray Leaf. The other members will be: William Hefley,
Joe Izen, Jennifer Holmes, Nicole Smith, Tres Thompson, Terry Pankratz, and Debbie Reynolds. Redman will contact Terry Pankratz to nominate a staff member from the procurement office to be a member as well. Joe Izen moved to appoint the committee. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

12. Committee on Committees Appointment Recommendations - Tim Redman
A set of nominees for committees is in the agenda packet. Additionally, Shayla Holub was nominated to chair the Assessment Committee. Joe Izen moved to approve the amended appointments. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried. Speaker Redman noted that the committee worksheets for committees with Staff appointments be sent to Staff Council.

13. Approval of the April 2016 Caucus Minutes – Tim Redman
Richard Scotch moved to approve the Caucus Minutes. Betsy Schlobohm seconded. The motion carried.

14. Discussion: Campus Carry – Alex Piquero
Speaker Redman reminded Senate members that only questions not addressed in the FAQ section of the UT Dallas Campus Carry website would be answered during the discussion. The new Campus Carry Policy went into effect on August 1, 2016. Dr. Piquero has been fielding media requests on this topic for the university. All UT System campus representatives are in contact with each other, which helps campus representatives not to feel alone when dealing with this highly debated issue. The Campus Carry Work Group (CCWG) will continue to meet and work on the campus carry issue as it evolves.

Joe Izen requested additional clarification on what “oral notice” means. Dr. Piquero responded that a faculty/staff occupant of an individual office should say to each person entering the office, either:

> “Pursuant to Section 30.06, Penal Code (trespass by license holder with a concealed handgun), a person licensed under Subchapter H, Chapter 411, Government Code (handgun licensing law), may not enter this property with a concealed handgun,” or “The carrying of a concealed handgun is prohibited in this office.”

Posting a sign is not sufficient notice since it is not oral. A faculty/staff occupant of an individual office who chooses to designate the office as an exclusion zone is responsible for ensuring that all persons who enter the office receive oral notification that the carrying of concealed handguns is prohibited in that office. The faculty/staff occupant should determine how frequently oral notice must be given in order to ensure that all persons entering an office have received it. Faculty should be mindful that announcements made in class at the beginning of a semester may not effectively reach all students due to absences or add/drops. To err on the side of caution, it is recommended that oral notice be provided each time a person enters the office. Chief Zacharias noted that should a student be hearing impaired a written card may be given, this is the only time that written notice can be given. This is to accommodate the students with hearing difficulties ONLY. If faculty choose to put something on their door, they can, but that is not considered legal notification.

Chief Zacharias noted that he spoke at every freshman, transfer, staff, and faculty orientation. Following the FY16 orientations he was inundated with questions. This year only a handful of questions were asked. It is his opinion that the incoming freshman/ transfer do not appear to be
seriously concerned about the issue. Student Government has compiled a list of feedback for the Campus Carry Workgroup, and will be submitting them via Campus Carry email.

Faculty raised a concern of what they should do if they had a reasonable apprehension of bodily harm, i.e. the legal definition of an assault. Faculty should call x2222 for help from the campus police force. An example of such a situation is a disgruntled student whose emotions are greatly heightened.

Inga Musselman is organizing emergency situation training for faculty. Training topics will include weather related emergencies, medical related emergencies, and conflict related emergencies. In the past twenty years there has been no training for faculty on these topics. Dr. Musselman expressed her opinion that faculty will be pleased that this type of training is available, and she anticipates a roll-out in fall 2016.

15. **Resolution on Salary Compression and Inversion – Richard Scotch**
   Betsy Schlobohm moved to defer the resolution until the September Senate meeting. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

16. **Discussion: Parking Sticker Policy – Tim Redman**
   The parking and transportation committee is addressing this issue. Some faculty have expressed concern that the new policy of issuing orange parking tickets to students has forced faculty to buy high-priced purple stickers. Judd Bradbury, a new member of this committee will keep the Senate informed.

17. **Adjournment**

   There being no further business, Joe Izen moved to adjourn. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 4:04 PM.

   APPROVED: ___________________________           DATE: ____________

   Tim Redman
   Speaker of the Faculty
Item 5:
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Committee on Educational Policy
September 2016 Updates
English Proficiency Requirements for International Applicants

International applicants must demonstrate English proficiency.

English proficiency requirements can be met by:

- Achieving a minimum score of 550 on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) PBT (paper-based test),
- Achieving a minimum score of 80 on the TOEFL IBT (Internet-based test),
- A minimum score of 6.5 on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) test,
- A minimum score of 67 on the Pearson's Test of English Academic (PTE), or
- A successful completion in level 112 of English from the ELS Language Centers, [http://www.els.edu](http://www.els.edu).

This requirement should be met at the time the admission application is submitted. Applicants with lower scores will be considered but are advised to improve their test scores and reapply.

Applicants native to a country where the primary language is English and-or who have earned a baccalaureate degree or a masters degree in a country where the primary language is English may be considered to have met the English proficiency requirement.

Scores must not be more than two years old, and an official copy must be sent from the testing agency to:

Office of Admission and Enrollment
The University of Texas at Dallas
800 West Campbell Road
Richardson, Texas 75080-3021

Higher scores may be required if the applicant is to succeed in the competition for Teaching Assistant openings.

English Requirements for Teaching Assistants

Students are required to be able to speak and write English clearly and well. Texas state law and regulations, [Texas Education Code](https://www.texaslegis.gov/), Section 51.917, require that international students appointed as Teaching Assistants (TA's) be proficient in the use of the English language. An English Proficiency Interview conducted under the auspices of the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies will be used to screen for students requiring remedial help in the form of English as a Second Language (ESL) course. International students must satisfy the proficiency requirement upon appointment or pass the ESL course within two semesters to be eligible for consideration of continued appointment as a TA. Regardless of test scores, students must meet the language requirements of their programs.
Three Year International Degrees in International Admissions

Working Group Attendees: Avery Ausborne, Cristen Casey, Dr. Frank Dufour, Dr. John Gooch, Dr. Varghese Jacob, Serenity King, Wray Weldon.

Invited: Dr. Poras Balsara, Dr. Juan Gonzalez.

Working group recommendations:

- Graduate departments establish departmental-level admission criteria that may incorporate 3 year degree applicants.
- OES continue to vet international degrees including accreditation, coding degrees appropriately in PeopleSoft, transferring graduate application materials to graduate admission committees as documents arrive.
- OES add resources for graduate admission committees on evaluation of international degrees.
- OES provide a regular report for admission committees that identifies international graduate applicants who will not have earned a UT Dallas baccalaureate degree or its equivalent by the semester of requested admission.

If implemented:

- Strengthen transparency of admission standards for university administration and external agencies. Graduate departments will provide information to the Provost's Office for appropriate dissemination and documentation. Examples: country lists, degree lists, other departmental level standards.

Potential catalog language:

Admission Requirements

Each program has specific admission requirements listed at [www.utdallas.edu/admissions/graduate/degrees](http://www.utdallas.edu/admissions/graduate/degrees).

At a minimum, all applicants must meet the following admissions requirements:

**Master's Programs**

The minimum requirement for admission to any master's degree program at UT Dallas is an earned UT Dallas baccalaureate degree or its equivalent with a grade average of B or better in upper-division (junior and senior level) work in the student's major field and related fields. Applicants who have earned a three year baccalaureate degree are eligible to apply for admission to UT Dallas graduate programs. Admission decisions are based on each program's admission committee's holistic review of the applicant's credentials.

Applicants in their final year of undergraduate study may be admitted to a master's degree program at UT Dallas. Evidence for the conferral of the baccalaureate degree must be presented before enrollment in the master's degree program is permitted.

Students who have completed a relevant and acceptable master's degree and have submitted official degree conferral documentation are only required to submit unofficial copies of their baccalaureate degree transcripts and degree conferral. Electronic copies of official documents may be uploaded via the online graduate application system in PDF format.
July 28, 2016

Serenity King
Assistant Provost for Program and Policy Coordination

Dear Dr. King:

I write this letter to endorse the proposed Master of Science in Social Data Analytics and Research degree. This proposed degree program has the support of all of the EPPS faculty identified in the proposal, as well as other faculty throughout the school. I can also attest that implementing this new degree and the new courses it will require will not result in any faculty workload issues; a handful of faculty will have their teaching portfolios altered, but no faculty member will be placed in a position where they are required to teach more courses than the number they are normally expected to teach.

Sincerely,

Denis J. Dean, Ph.D.
Dean of the School of Economic, Political and Policy Science
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.

Administrative Information

1. Institution: The University of Texas at Dallas

2. Program Name – 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):

   Master of Science (MS) in Social Data Analytics and Research

3. Proposed CIP Code: 45.0102 Research Methodology and Quantitative Methods

4. Number of Required Semester Credit Hours (SCHs) (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

5. Brief Program Description – Describe the program and the educational objectives:

   The MS in Social Data Analytics and Research is an interdisciplinary graduate program that builds on the expertise of diverse faculty and course offerings in the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences (EPPS). The faculty, among whom many have earned international acclaim for their groundbreaking efforts in econometrics, geospatial science, political methodology and survey technology, are actively engaged in teaching both introductory and advanced analytical methods and research courses across the full spectrum the School's disciplinary degree programs, including criminology, economics, geospatial sciences, political science, public policy, political economy, sociology and public affairs.

   Concurrently, these faculty members engage in extensive research in data modelling, analytics and related domains through collaborative relationships with international, national and local partners. These include the University of Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Analysis; Academic Sinica and Soochow University in Taiwan; Beijing Jiaotong University; Hong Kong Polytechnic University; the University of Michigan Ann Arbor ICPSR Summer Program in Quantitative Methods of Social Research; Qualtrics (a leader in survey platforms), YouGov (a leader in the survey industry), ESRI (a major GIS solution provider); the Institute for Data Analytics and Marketing Brainology.

   Through this faculty, the MS program will provide rigorous preparation in methods of data collection and analysis for which there is strong and increasing demand by
the public, nonprofit and private sectors, and by doctoral and other advanced research programs, as highlighted further below in the section on job market demand. The MS will endow students with a clear understanding of the contributions that rigor makes to collection, interpretation and analysis of social science data. It will encourage reflection on core methods, theories and philosophical dimensions of social sciences practice. It will foster appreciation of the importance of applied social science in helping to shape public policy and action, be it through participation in formation of new policies and programs or evaluation of policies and interventions in progress.

The MS in Social Data Analytics and Research targets students interested in applying social science concepts and principles to a broad range of questions in research-related and other professional activities in nonprofit, government and private sector settings that rely on social data for answers.

For these students, the MS program will realize five measurable learning outcomes:

1. Students will understand and apply methods of social science research design and evaluation, including quantitative (e.g., experimental, quasi-experimental and naturalistic) and qualitative approaches in varied public, non-profit and private sector settings, and where appropriate understand and utilize large data sets and their analysis.

2. Students will understand and utilize appropriate quantitative analysis methods for social science data used in research by different types of public, non-profit and private sector organizations.

3. Students will be able to interpret core methods, theories and philosophical dimensions of social sciences practice.

4. Students will justify the importance of applied social science in helping to shape public policy and action.

5. Students will proficiently and ethically execute research methods and draw appropriate conclusions.

The MS in Social Data Analytics and Research, building largely on current course offerings, is a natural response to recent trends in the state and national economy, notably a rise in demand for graduates highly skilled in social science methods of analysis and research. A fundamental mission of the School of EPPS is to equip students with vital skills needed to thrive in an evolving, competitive job market, to prepare them for careers in government, non-profits and the private sector where they can make positive differences in the world. Methodological depth and proficiency provided by the MS in Social Data Analytics and Research will help them accomplish this.

In so doing the MS in Social Data Analytics and Research will complement two other new programs at the University of Texas at Dallas. One is the Graduate Certificate in Data Science jointly offered by the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM) and the School of Engineering and Computer Science (ECS),
which focuses on the mathematical and methodological underpinnings of machine learning and "big data" mining tools. The other program is the MS in Business Analytics (MS BA) in the Naveen Jindal School of Management (JSOM), which concentrates on business applications of machine learning and "big data" mining tools, such as marketing analytics, decision and operations analytics, financial analytics, healthcare analytics and IT for analytics. A few courses in the MS in Social Data Analytics and Research program are similar to offerings in the other programs, such as econometrics and knowledge extraction (i.e., data mining). However, the MS in Social Data Analytics and Research covers but does not focus only on machine learning and data mining, emphasizes social science data and applications rather than business data, and has a broader analysis and research agenda.

Recent articles underscore the importance of analysts trained in the broader range of social science concepts, applications and research agendas in an era of "big data" and, by extension, the benefit of adding such training to the roster of graduate programs at UT Dallas. One, in *Science Magazine*, the "Parable of Google Flu: Traps in Big Data Analysis" points to the pitfalls of drawing conclusions from "big data" without social science concepts and methods to make meaningful extraction of knowledge (http://gking.harvard.edu/files/gking/files/0314policyforumff.pdf). Similarly, "We Are All Social Scientists Now" argues forcefully that data scientists are too often hampered by lack of social science training in how to infer causal effects (http://stanford.edu/~jgrimmer/bd_2.pdf). And another *Science Magazine* article, "Economics in the Age of Big Data" notes that a major challenge in working with "big data" is design of creative approaches to describe and analyze large and unstructured data sets in coherent ways, a challenge that could be productively addressed by individuals, such as those emerging from the MS program, who are trained in geospatial science, survey methods or any of the other social science disciplines housed in EPPS (http://science.sciencemag.org/content/346/6210/1243089).

Accordingly, in tandem with the two other programs in NSM/ECS and JSOM, the MS in Social Data Analytics and Research program at EPPS will contribute to fulfilling a vital mission of the University of Texas at Dallas: graduating well-rounded citizens prepared for rewarding lives and productive careers in a constantly changing world, and continually improving educational and research programs.

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*):

**School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences**

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

08/21/2017

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

**Name:** Denis J. Dean

**Title:** Dean, School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences
Program Information

I. Need

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

There are two indicators of job market need for program graduates, indirect and direct. Both are relatively short term in nature because expansion in the volume and diversity of data of all kinds, and the corresponding growth in demand for trained graduates to manage and analyze them, are of very recent origin.

Indirect evidence comes from the recent emergence and spread of comparable programs at other universities. The noticeable rise in marketing of online courses on “big data” and of Certificate, Bachelor and Master’s diplomas in data science, data analytics and the like in business, mathematics and computer science programs in Texas (including UT Dallas, as noted), the US and globally are evidence of this.

The expansion process has only just begun in relation to the social sciences. Europe has taken the lead here. Building on a Masters’ program at the University of Surrey since 1974, recent additions include the London School of Economics, University of Manchester, University of Amsterdam and Universitate Babeş-Bolyai in Romania. These institutions emphasize quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis in the social sciences, and training for subsequent doctoral study and careers in the public and private sectors:

MSc Social Research Methods, University of Surrey, Department of Sociology
http://www.surrey.ac.uk/postgraduate/social-research-methods
The program provides training across a range of technical and practical social research skills. It equips students with good understanding of contributions that quantitative and qualitative approaches make to collection, interpretation and analysis of data. The program encourages critical reflection on methodological, theoretical, philosophical and ethical aspects of social research practice. It fosters understanding of the contribution that social research makes to social policy formation and the evaluation of social interventions.
Courses: data analysis, field methods, theory and methodology, statistical modeling, principles of survey design, documentary analysis and online research, research design and implementation, evaluation research and advanced research methods

MSc Social Research Methods, London School of Economics/Political Science, Dept. of Methodology
http://www.lse.ac.uk/study/graduate/taughtProgrammes2016/mscsocialresearchmethods.aspx
Provides advanced training in quantitative and qualitative social research methods, in the context of a disciplinary specialization. The MSc is designed as a training for doctoral research and as a pre-professional training for careers in social research in the public and private sectors. The LSE Department of Methodology is a base for cross-disciplinary research and teaching in the broad area of social science methodology. Students take courses in research design, quantitative analysis and qualitative research methods, submit research report, and have opportunities to take workshops on computer packages for quantitative and qualitative analysis.
MSc Social Research Methods and Statistics, University of Manchester, School of Social Science
http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/study/masters/courses/list/social-research-methods-and-statistics-msc/

The program is designed to be accessible to non-statisticians, yet remains focused on social research methods. Student builds on a base level of knowledge in undergraduate research methods to gain comprehensive statistical and analytical skills. The program aims to develop future social scientists who will have a thorough grounding in research, and are equipped with the tools for collecting and analyzing statistical data.

MSc Social Sciences (Research), University of Amsterdam, Graduate School of Social Sciences
http://gsss.uva.nl/programmes/programmes/programmes/programmes/content/folder/social-sciences-research/social-sciences-research-msc.html

The Research Master Social Sciences is designed for students with interest in research from various social scientific perspectives. Because of its extensive focus on advanced quantitative and qualitative research skills, students who complete the program will be able to carry out high quality scientific research independently. The MSc offers advanced training in contemporary social science research. The program combines advanced social theory with innovative methodologies in a rigorous and multidisciplinary social science research environment.

MA Research Design and Data Analysis in Social Sciences, Universitate Babeş-Bolyai, Romania

The program aims to strengthen the ability to develop quality empirical analyses as well as to contribute to applied research, particularly in the economic and administrative environment. The program addresses sociologists and marketing experts who work in survey and marketing institutes, specialists in human resources, specialists in social analysis and diagnosis in public administration, statisticians and staff of non-governmental organizations involved in community development programs. Coursework: analysis, representation and interpretation of social data; advanced quantitative methods, advanced qualitative methods, social statistics, polls and statistical modeling, structure of social research, document analysis, game theory and complex analysis of preferences.

The only US institution that has established a similar Master's program thus far is Brown University. Its recently initiated Master's in Social Analysis and Research, centered in the Sociology Department, links with other units including the business school to focus on data collection and analysis associated with careers in market research, evaluation, policy analysis and advanced study in the social sciences.

ScM Master's in Social Analysis and Research, Brown University, Sociology Department
https://www.brown.edu/academics/sociology/masters

Focuses on ability to collect, process, analyze, and interpret large-scale data on human attributes, preferences, attitudes, and behaviors and complex systems of human interactions associated with careers in market research, program evaluation, policy work, advanced study in the social sciences and financial analysis. Hallmarks of the program are focused methodological training in both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis, with cores in spatial analysis and market research. Main program courses include: multivariate statistical methods, qualitative methods, social research methods, focus groups for social research, market and social surveys, spatial analysis, geographic information systems, spatial data analysis, advanced methods for population analysis and behavioral modeling, event history analysis and statistical methods for hierarchical and panel data.

As noted earlier, the proposed MS in Social Data Analytics and Research has a broader analysis and research agenda by emphasizing social science data and applications to address societal issues, rather than business data which is handled by JSOM's MS Business Analytics. The School of EPPS is uniquely
positioned to provide students a solid reflection on core methods, theories and philosophical dimensions of social sciences practice due to its strong disciplinary programs, ranging from criminology to sociology. The proposed degree program will foster appreciation of the importance of applied social science in helping to shape public policy and action through rigorous preparation in methods of data collection and analysis, using and interpreting data derived from machine learning algorithms, big data sets, and social data analytics.

Direct evidence of the need for the MS program takes the form of job postings. Analysis of announcements on Indeed.com during May 28-29, 2016 yielded almost 50 openings in government, non-profit and private organizations across the Dallas-Fort Worth region for individuals with skill sets of kinds taught in the MS program. Many of these postings went unfilled for 60 days or more, implying a shortage of qualified candidates:

**Addison**
- Data Analyst, Metrocare Services: Ensure data errors are addressed. Monitor integrity and completeness of data. Support leadership in obtaining missing or additional data....

**Dallas**
- Big Data Analytics, KPMG: Degree in a technical or quantitative field from an accredited college or university; Strong communication skills with the ability to explain clearly.
- Content Manager, Highland Park United Methodist: Data analytics background a plus. Church or nonprofit experience a plus.
- Data Analyst - Customer Analytics, HKS Inc.: Experience with data analysis and mapping tools such as ArcGIS, Hadoop, etc.
- Data Analytics, KPMG: Degree in a technical or quantitative field from an accredited university; Strong communication skills.
- Data Manager, Education Pioneers Fellowship: Serve as a school department's data manager. Visualizing student achievement data to better inform school curriculum.
- Data Mining Auditor, United Health Group: Analyze data and identify cost saving opportunities. Examine, assess, and document operations and procedures to ensure data integrity, data security.
- Data Scientist, Pieces Technologies: Strong quantitative and qualitative communication skills. Word processing, spreadsheet, data management, and statistical analysis software.
- Development Officer, Catholic Charities: Data collection and analysis as related to fundraising needs.
- Director of Analytics, Dallas Morning News: Economics or other quantitative discipline required. Fluent in data manipulation, analysis and charting. Reporting and analysis, testing and dashboard.
- Economic Research, Federal Reserve Bank: Excellent quantitative skills. Responsibilities include providing support services and research assistance at a high level.
- Education and Implementation Manager, American Heart Assoc.: Ability to extract data from various data systems, analyze data/results, and prepare information.
- Forensic Litigation and Valuation Services, Whitley Penn LLP: Candidate must be able to utilize analytical and quantitative skills.
- Major Gift Practice Lead, The Pursuant Group: Experience in data analytics and business intelligence, specifically understanding how to interpret, enhance and construct a compelling narrative for key issues.
- Mobile Marketing Manager, 5Miles LLC: Strong quantitative, analytical and problem solving skills. Comfortable with data analysis and able to use data to make recommendations and drive decisions.
- Program Evaluation Analyst, American Heart Association: GEE or random effects models for longitudinal or multilevel analysis, latent class group-based analyses, analysis of missing data.
• Research Specialist, Susan G. Komen for the Cure: Collect and synthesize information, conduct research, analyze and interpret data to create the most compelling case for support.

Denton
• Program Analyst, Dept. of Homeland Security: Managing data collection projects; One year of specialized experience in the federal government, a state or local government, a non-profit organization.
• Program Analyst, Dept of Homeland Security: Design methodologically sound quantitative collection plans, ensuring precision and confidence, questionnaire design, and reporting process.
• Program Analyst, FEMA: Managing data collection projects; One year of specialized experience in the federal government, a state or local government, a non-profit organization.

Farmers Branch
• GIS Technician, BIS Consulting Inc.: Creation and maintenance of spatial data (mainly surface property parcels), map production and design, printing, and light analysis.

Fort Worth
• Area Director Family Services, Upbring: Track and report accurate data as related to the Performance Management Evaluation Tool.
• Data and Research Specialist, Catholic Charities Diocese: Ensure that the quality of data entered by direct service professionals meets agency standards by performing regular case record reviews and executing data.
• Decision Analytics, GM Financial: Advanced knowledge of applied statistical methodologies including least squares regression, logistic regression, sampling methodologies, time series, survival analysis.
• Economist, GM Financial: Economic Analysis. Support the used vehicle market monitoring process, including detailed analysis of residual value projections, monthly reporting
• Government Compliance Analyst, Elbit Systems of America: Perform statistical sampling analysis for testing of unallowable costs. Develop effective and constructive relationships with customers
• Institutional Research Analyst, UNT Health Science Center: Manage the administration, data analysis, and reporting of institutional surveys. Strong analytical and quantitative skills plus attention to detail.
• NCS Data Editor, Spero Solutions: Perform editing and analysis activities involving heads up digitizing, LiDAR Point Cloud feature extraction, Trimble SSF and ESRI GIS data formats.

Irving
• Analyst, Boy Scouts of America: Advanced analytical skills, proficiency in Microsoft Excel - deep interest and aptitude in data, metrics.
• Data Analyst, Apex Systems: Perform extensive and detailed data analysis necessary to ensure strict adherence to data quality guidelines.
• Data Governance Specialist, Pioneer Nat. Resources: Strong written and verbal communication skills, listening skills, quantitative and analytical skills.
• Manager of Analytics, Alliance Data: Advanced degree in Statistics, Economics or other quantitative discipline.
• Project Analyst, 7-Eleven: Strong quantitative analysis skills. Engage soft skills and ability to influence others on tasks associated with assumptions analysis.
• Quantitative Analytics, BurnsSearch Inc.: Strong quantitative skills with a proven ability to translate analysis into meaningful insights, and help drive execution strategy.
• Reporting Analyst, INT Technologies: Quantitative based methodologies for analyzing data. Strong data analysis and problem solving skills.

Plano
• Community Development Officer, LegacyTexas: Strong computer skills and knowledge required in areas of spreadsheet analysis, word processing, data management and programming and other software.
• Data Analyst, Capital One: Quantitative and qualitative data analysis; Perform quantitative and qualitative analysis of econometric data, relating constants and variables, restrictions.
• Data Scientist, Hewlett Packard Ent.: R, SAS, Enterprise Miner or SPSS.
• Principal Associate Community Affairs, Capital One: Substantial analytical skills with a keen instinct on how to gather and interpret meaningful data. Deep knowledge and understanding of trends in economic development
• Sourcing Specialists, Rent-A-Center: Analysis and reporting. Quantitative and qualitative analytical skills.
• Workforce Insights Analyst, Hewlett Packard Ent.: Advanced analytical and quantitative skills, including developed expertise in data analysis and basic interpretation.

Richardson
• Analyst, Development Rotational Program, UnitedHealth Group: Perform quantitative and qualitative data analysis.
• Crime Analyst, CargoNet: Degree in business, crime analysis, intelligence analysis, criminal justice, or other related field.
• Model Validation Officer, Texas Capital Bank: Time series analysis, data analytics, and forecasting models. Master's degree required in a quantitative field

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

A questionnaire administered to undergraduate and graduate students already enrolled in the School of EPPS in March 2016 suggested broad interest in the MS program. There were 81 responses to the questionnaire, approximately 40-41 undergraduates, mostly juniors and seniors, while the remaining respondents were graduate students. Undergraduate student respondents reported their main career aspirations as government analyst, private sector data analyst and university researcher. Among the undergrads, 60% expressed interest in the program, in some cases looking to enroll in the MS in Social Data Analytics and Research rather than another EPPS Master's program, and in other instances enrolling in the MS program rather than another non-EPPS Master’s at UT Dallas or at another university. Out of graduate student respondents, 74% reported interest in the MS program, implying that they might return for a second Master’s before seeking new employment or applying to doctoral programs. These observations suggest that the program seems likely to produce a net increase in EPPS enrollment.

The foregoing indirect and direct indicators suggest that the global rise in demand for and interest by graduates such as those anticipated from the MS in Social Data Analytics and Research program is already present in Texas and likely to expand substantially in the future. Recent articles underscore this. For example, the McKinsey Global Institute (MGI) projects that by 2018 the United States may face a 50 to 60 percent gap between supply and demand of people with deep analytic talent, people with advanced training in statistics or machine learning. This applies as much to social science applications as to business and other applications. The Federal government, for instance, is investing hugely in "Smart Cities" concepts that ask social science analysts to design, implement and administer technology-intensive government services (Information Week Sept 15, 2015 http://goo.gl/MCXjRQ). Similarly, economists, sociologists, criminologists and others with advanced training in statistics or machine learning are much needed in wide variety of public sector efforts to lower suicide (Todd Essig. 2015. "How 'Big Data' Can, And Can't, Prevent Suicide,"
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.)

This is based upon ancillary expressions of interest by domestic and overseas audiences, in addition to our own formal Qualtrics survey.

<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>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTSE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Quality

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Semester Credit Hours</th>
<th>Clock Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Courses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Module (select 1 of 6)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Module (select 1 of 5)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Electives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Six organized courses will be added to the course inventory if the proposed degree program is approved (see Appendix A for descriptions of new EPPS courses to be added and current courses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Core (Total 15 SCH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* EPPS 6xx1</td>
<td>Research Practice in the Social Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* EPPS 6xx2</td>
<td>Methods of Data Collection and Production</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPPE 6310</td>
<td>Research Design 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefix and Number</td>
<td>Prescribed Elective Courses</td>
<td>SCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPS 6313 or EPPS 7313</td>
<td>Introduction to Quantitative Methods or Descriptive and Inferential Statistics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPS 6316 or EPPS 7316</td>
<td>Applied Regression or Regression and Multivariate Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Prescribed Elective Courses - continued</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Analytical Module (1 of 6)</td>
<td><strong>Module 1: Data Collection, Production and Management (Total 12 SCH)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* EPPS 6xx3</td>
<td>Knowledge Extraction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 6364</td>
<td>Public Opinion and Survey Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISC 5322</td>
<td>GPS Satellite Surveying Techniques</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISC 6381</td>
<td>GIS Fundamentals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISC 6325</td>
<td>Remote Sensing Fundamentals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISC 7365</td>
<td>Advanced Remote Sensing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPS 7386</td>
<td>Survey Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISC 6384</td>
<td>Advanced Geographic Information Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* EPPS 6xx4</td>
<td>Information Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPS 6324</td>
<td>Data Management for Social Science Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B. Analytical Module (1 of 6) | **Module 2: Quantitative Methods (Total 12 SCH)** | |
| EPPS 7370 | Time Series Analysis I | 3 |
| EPPS 7371 | Time Series Analysis II | 3 |
| EPPS 7344 | Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables | 3 |
| EPPS 7318 | Structural Equation and Multilevel/Hierarchical Modeling | 3 |
| EPPS 7390 | Bayesian Analysis for Social and Behavioral Analysis | 3 |
| CRIM 7310 | Advanced Quantitative Methods in Criminology | 3 |
| ECON 6305 | Mathematical Economics | 3 |
| ECON 6306 | Applied Econometrics | 3 |
| ECON 6309 | Econometrics | 3 |
| ECON 7309 | Econometrics II | 3 |
| ECON 7315 | Econometrics III | 3 |

| B. Analytical Module (1 of 6) | **Module 3: Qualitative Methods (Total 12 SCH)** | |
| * EPPS 6xx5 | Qualitative Data Analysis | 3 |
| EPPS 6346 | Qualitative Research Methods. | 3 |
| CRIM 7342 | Qualitative Criminology | 3 |
| * EPPS 6xx6 | Data Visualization | 3 |

| B. Analytical Module (1 of 6) | **Module 4: Design and Evaluation (Total 12 SCH)** | |
| PPPE 6342 | Research Design II | 3 |
| CRIM 6301 | Research Design I | 3 |
| GISC 7387 | GIS Research Design | 3 |
| PA 7330 | Research Design in Public Affairs | 3 |
| EPPS 6352 | Evaluation Research Methods in the Social Sciences | 3 |
| PA 6315 | Evaluating Program and Organizational Performance | 3 |
C. Faculty – Use these tables to provide information about Core and Support faculty. Add asterisk (*) before the name of the individual who will have direct administrative responsibilities for the program. (Add and delete rows as needed.)

The program, in the first year of operation, will be administered from the Dean’s office under the immediate supervision of Euel Elliott, Professor of Public Policy and Political Economy, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and one of the individuals involved in development of this proposal.

The six new courses are highlighted below with five assigned to core faculty and one to supporting faculty.

Tentative Faculty (subject to change)

<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>Patrick T. Brandt</td>
<td>Ph.D. Political Science Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana</td>
<td>EPPS 7316, EPPS 7390,</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yongwan Chun</td>
<td>Ph.D. Geography, Ohio State University</td>
<td>GISC 6384, GISC 7310, GISC 7360, GISC 6381</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold D. Clarke</td>
<td>Ph.D. Political Science Duke University</td>
<td>EPPS 7318, EPPS 6324, EPPS 7386</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Euel Elliott</td>
<td>Ph.D. Political Science Duke University</td>
<td>PSCI 6364</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon M. Fass</td>
<td>Ph.D. Urban Planning University of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td>EPPS 6xx1, EPPS 6xx2, EPPS 6352, EPPS 7304</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. **Students** – Describe general recruitment efforts and admission requirements. In accordance with the institution’s Uniform Recruitment and Retention Strategy, describe plans to recruit, retain, and graduate students from underrepresented groups for the program.
Applicants will be recruited during campus events aimed at prospective students. We will also recruit existing “undeclared” students by disseminating degree availability to academic advisors responsible for these students. The fast track program will play an important role in recruitment efforts as it has proven to be an excellent source of highly qualified undergraduate students.

External recruitment efforts will involve participation at college and graduate school fairs held at local community colleges and other post-secondary institutions in the region. Social media (LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook) and the UT Dallas website will be used to disseminate program information. Faculty and advising staff will be made available to answer program and admission questions from prospective applicants. Recruitment efforts will highlight the practical benefits of the program – highly marketable quantitative skill sets and job placement assistance through the Career Center, and robust preparation for doctoral studies. Outreach efforts will be made to establish partnerships with public agencies, nonprofit organizations and private sector firms to promote internships for students.

Special efforts to recruit historically underrepresented groups will be made by attending graduate school fairs and related events hosted by historically minority and other institutions with large enrollments of students from underrepresented groups. Efforts to retain and graduate students from underrepresented groups will be conducted in collaboration with Enrollment Services, the Office of Diversity and Community Engagement, and the Multicultural Center.

Graduate applicants must meet the University admission requirements, including an undergraduate GPA of at least 3.0 from a higher education institution, and test scores of at least 150 on the verbal section and 150 on the quantitative section of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE).

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.

Dr. Ellen Safley, Dean of McDermott Library at UT Dallas, provides the following assessment of library resources:

Collection Review

To compare the book resources available for data analytics in the social sciences, the librarian searched across the library catalog systems in Brown (a university already providing a similar degree as the one proposed) and at the University of Texas at Dallas. “Social sciences – mathematical models” and “data mining” were used as search phrases.
For journals, the search terms “data mining” and “periodicals” were used.

Comparing the collections between Brown University and the University of Texas at Dallas indicates that the rate of acquisitions available locally surpasses the items available at Brown University. The Library would continue to monitor the acquisition rates at both institutions in this subject area to be sure that adequate and appropriate resources are purchased.

### School selected for comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Books (2000-2016)</th>
<th>Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT Dallas</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences – mathematical models</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data mining</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences – mathematical models</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data mining</td>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed curriculum includes 6 new courses that will require additional acquisitions. The new courses include research design, methods of data collection, qualitative data analysis, data optimization, and knowledge extraction. According to the 2015 *Library and Book Trade Almanac* (formerly *The Bowker Annual*), the average cost per book in the subject area of social sciences is $114.34 for print books. The library will increase book/eBook purchases by 20 books or approximately $2,300 per year.

In addition to a rich book collection, graduate level courses demand access to current periodical literature. Several journals will be considered for purchase including the *International Journal of data warehousing and mining* ($730) and the *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* ($992).

### Summary

The collection available at the McDermott Library is adequate to begin the program.

Approximately 20 additional book titles would be purchased each year. The total cost of the graduate degree plan for social data analysis and research is approximately $15,110 plus inflation over the initial 5 years of the degree program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional book costs</th>
<th>$2,300 per year</th>
<th>$11,500 (5 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional journal costs</td>
<td>$1,722 per year</td>
<td>$8,610 (5 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,022 per year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,110 (5 years)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facilities and Equipment

Describe the availability and adequacy of facilities and equipment to support the program. Describe plans for facility and equipment improvements/additions.
Existing facilities are adequate for faculty and students. Program courses are currently staffed by EPPS faculty or by faculty in cooperating programs in cross-listed courses. The School has four computer labs equipped with multimedia systems and full suites of statistical and GIS software for teaching and research. UT Dallas has acquired software licenses for teaching and conducting online surveys.

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

NA

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

An assessment process will be developed with program goals and learning objectives defined and data collected in order to assess the effectiveness of the program’s pedagogical objectives. Details of the student learning outcomes process will be presented in the assessment plan, based on the template given by the University. The courses, curriculum sequence, and degree requirements will be assessed on a yearly basis. The program process will include, inter alia, an assessment the extent to which the program meets its teaching quality and its enrollment and job placement targets. This process will have three components. First is analysis of student online evaluations for required courses. Second is an exit survey of graduating students that solicits their perspectives on the overall program, asks them to identify strong points to be strengthened further and weak points that require attention. If they have new jobs at that time, the survey will also ask about the type of job acquired. Third is a one-year follow-up survey that contacts graduates to ask about their job market experiences since graduation and solicits their retrospective ideas on how the MS program might be further improved.

A joint faculty-student review team established by EPPS for this purpose will analyze information produced by the processes described above at least once per academic year. The committee will submit specific recommendations to the Dean of EPPS for actions it deems necessary and worthwhile. The Dean will then provide appropriate implementation guidance to the MS Program Head.

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.

The proposed MS degree program will use existing UT Dallas faculty members and, therefore, will not necessitate additional funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Year Costs</th>
<th>Five-Year Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel¹</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocated Funds</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Please use the “Program Funding Estimation Tool” found on the CB website to correctly estimate state funding.
Facilities and Equipment | $0 | Anticipated New Formula Funding | $249,255  
Library, Supplies, and Materials | $20,110 | Special Item Funding | $0  
Other² | $0 | Other⁴ | $0  
**Total Costs** | **$20,110** | **Total Funding** | **$249,255**

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.
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
Appendix A: New and Existing EPPS Methods Courses

1. New EPPS Courses

EPPS 6xx1: Research Practice the Social Sciences. Required core course that introduces students to the different applied social science disciplines. Reviews how data are commonly produced and analyzed within each, identifies recent methodological trends and areas of application, describes the current job market for graduates and indicates paths to more advanced doctoral study.

EPPS 6xx2 Methods of Data Collection and Production. Course examines interview-based and self-administered data collection methods, including mobile web and SMS interviews, and newer data sources such as social media. Concentrates on the effects of different techniques on data quality, including error from measurement, nonresponse and coverage, and assesses tradeoffs between these error sources when selecting a particular mode or survey design.

EPPS 6xx3 Knowledge Extraction. Introduces techniques to discover patterns and relationships in large and complex data sets, including web mining. Examines ways to explore, analyze and leverage data and transform them into useful and useable information, including decision trees, association rules, clustering, case-based methods and data visualization.

EPPS 6xx4 Information Management: Focus on design of database applications for commercial, public and nonprofit organizations. Covers user requirement's analysis, logical database design, physical database design, database query languages, and distributed and client-server databases. Course emphasizes data definition and data manipulation languages for relational data modeling. (To be cross-listed/developed with other Schools. Exists now as MIS 6326)

EPPS 6xx5 Qualitative Data Analysis. Course focuses on analysis of qualitative data with support of Qualitative Data Analysis software (ATLAS.ti, NVivo, Provalis, etc.). Introduces alternative interpretive analytic approaches, explores their use and guides users in applying them to data.

EPPS 6xx6 Data Visualization: Presents technologies, techniques and algorithms for creation of effective visualizations of social science data. Examines data wrangling, insight modeling, cognitive science and graphical communication using SAP Lumira, Tableau, Excel Powerview and D3. (To be cross-listed/developed with other Schools. Exists now as MIS 6380)

2. Current EPPS Courses

EPPS 6313 Introduction to Quantitative Methods. This introductory graduate-level statistics course is geared to the consumption of statistical methods commonly used in social science research. Topics include creating and interpreting graphical and tabular summaries of data, descriptive statistics, basic probability theory, sampling distributions, basic hypothesis testing (t-tests, chi-square tests, and analysis of variance), estimation of population parameters, confidence intervals and correlation. An introduction to regression analysis will also be provided. Topics are supported by computer-supported data analyses.

EPPS 6316 Applied Regression. This course provides a survey of the bivariate and multiple regression models estimated using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS), with an emphasis on using regression models to test social and economic hypotheses. This application-focused course presents examples drawn from economics, political science, public policy and sociology, introduces the basic concepts and interpretation of regression models, and basic methods of inference. Topics are supported by computer-supported data analyses.

EPPS 6324 Data Management for Social Science Research. Covers the principles and practical techniques of data cleaning, data organization, quality control, and automation of research tasks. Topics covered will include data types, useful text and math functions, labeling, recoding, data documentation, merging datasets, reshaping, and programming structures such as macros, loops, and branching using Stata and R. The course will also discuss using LaTeX to automate outputting of results and graphics in publishable formats.

EPPS 6342 Research Design II. This course is the second in a two-course sequence devoted to the study of data development strategies and techniques to facilitate effective statistical analysis. Topics generally covered include: the logic of causal inquiry and inference in the Economic, Political and Policy Sciences, the elaboration paradigm and model specification, anticipating and handling threats to internal validity, hierarchies of design structure (experimental, quasi-experimental and non-experimental): linking design structure to effect estimation strategies and analyzing design elements in published literature. Students will be required to select a research topic in consultation with the instructor and prepare a written comparative design analysis.
EPPS 6346 Qualitative Research Methods. This course provides an overview of qualitative research in the Economic, Political and Policy Sciences. Students will investigate the assumptions underlying qualitative research approaches and critically assess the strengths and weaknesses of such approaches. Possible topics may include participant observation, ethnographic interviewing, ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, case study, and the analysis of historical documents.

EPPS 6352 Evaluation Research Methods in the Economic, Political and Policy Sciences. A review of research methods used in program evaluation, with an emphasis on public and nonprofit social programs. Issues to be addressed include research design, appropriate performance standards, measurement and selection of individuals, sampling, data collection, and data analysis.

EPPS 7304 Cost-Benefit Analysis. Examines methods for measuring costs and benefits of public projects and policies, and the application of cost-benefit analysis to areas such as economic development, water resources, recreation, transportation, regulation, and the environment.

EPPS 7313 Descriptive and Inferential Statistics. The course provides a thorough introduction to probability and statistics. Probability topics covered include random variables, expectations, and probability distributions. The heart of the course is a rigorous introduction to statistical inference: sampling theory, confidence intervals, and hypothesis tests. The final section of the course is an introduction to regression analysis, with an emphasis on interpretation of regression results, using examples from recent research.

EPPS 7316 Regression and Multivariate Analysis. This course provides a detailed examination of the multiple regression models estimated using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS), with an emphasis on using regression models to test social and economic hypotheses. Also covered are several special topics in regression analysis, including violations of OLS assumptions, the use of dummy variables, and fixed effects models. The course ends with an introduction to advanced topics in regression analysis, qualitative response models, and non-OLS approaches to estimation. Topics are supported by computer-supported data analyses using application-specific software.

EPPS 7318 Structural Equation and Multilevel (Hierarchical) Modeling. An introduction to structural equation modeling (SEM) and multilevel modeling (MLM), sometimes called hierarchical linear or mixed modeling. SEM represents a general approach to the statistical examination of the fit of a theoretical model to empirical data. Topics include observed variable (path) analysis, latent variable models (e.g., confirmatory factor analysis), and latent variable SEM analyses. MLM represents a general approach to handling data that are nested within each other or have random components. Topics include dealing with two-level data that may be cross-sectional, such as students within classes, or longitudinal, such as repeated observations on individuals, firms or countries.

EPPS 7344 Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables. This course examines several types of advanced regression models that are frequently used in policy analysis and social science research. The key similarity of these models is that they involve dependent variables that violate one or more of the assumptions of the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression model. The main models examined in the course are binary logit and probit, multinomial logit, ordinal probit, tobit, and the family of Poisson regression models. All these models are estimated using maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). The Heckman correction for selection is also addressed.

EPPS 7370 Time Series Analysis I. This course considers several important topics for applied time series analyses of social science and public policy data including the specification and testing of Box-Jenkins ARIMA models and dynamic regressions. Other topics include stationarity and unit root tests, cointegration and error correction models, autoregressive conditional heterogeneity (GARCH) models and introductions to vector autoregression (VAR) and state space models. Students learn how to use modern software such as Eviews, R, RATS and Stata to do time series analyses.

EPPS 7371 Time Series Analysis II. This course introduces intermediate and advanced methods for the analysis of social science time series data. After reviewing core time series concepts such as stationarity and cointegration, the course considers topics such as vector autoregression and vector error correction models, simultaneous equation and structural time series models, regime switching models, non-Gaussian and nonlinear models, and state space representations. Both frequentist and Bayesian approaches to modeling time series processes are employed. Data analyses are implemented using widely available software packages such as R, RATS and Stata.

EPPS 7386 Survey Research. This course exposes students to the use of survey methods in social science research. Emphasis is placed on interview and questionnaire techniques and the construction and sequencing of survey questions. Attention is also devoted to sampling theory, sampling and non-sampling errors, and the use of recent advances in fieldwork to reduce measurement error in surveys.
EPPS 7390 Bayesian Analysis for Social and Behavioral Sciences. This course covers the theory and application of Bayesian statistics for economic, political, and other social science data. Students will learn how maximum likelihood and Bayesian estimation are related and how the latter is used to develop decision based inference. Topics include subjective probability, general linear models, posterior simulation methods, model specification and averaging, and sensitivity analysis.

CRIM 6301 Research Design I. This course provides an overview of the research enterprise and the study of data development strategies and techniques to facilitate effective statistical analysis, using practical criminological applications. Topics generally covered include: (1) issues and techniques in social science research with emphasis on philosophy of science, theory testing, and hypothesis formulation; (2) measurement and data collection strategies, reliability and validity of measures and results, sampling, surveys; and (3) examination of qualitative versus quantitative research techniques, working with observational data, field research issues, and triangulation.

CRIM 6332 (GIS 6331) Applications in Criminology. Examines spatial distributions of crime, criminals, and criminal justice interventions. Students conduct spatial analysis of point patterns and area-based data in studies of the locations of crime events and rates, offenders, police patrolling practices, judicial districts and community corrections and how they relate to physical and social characteristics of neighborhoods.

CRIM 7310 Advanced Quantitative Methods in Criminology. This course is designed to be an extension to CRIM 7301. Quantitative research techniques not covered in 7301 will be addressed in depth as they apply to longitudinal and multilevel criminological research. Topics may include, but are not limited to, structural equation modeling (SEM), multilevel growth curve modeling, growth mixture models, panel regression, propensity score matching, and latent class analysis. Topics may vary by semester and may be tailored to fit students' research needs. Recommended prerequisite: Students should have a firm understanding of varying regression techniques, etc., prior to enrolling.

CRIM 7342 Qualitative Criminology. Examines ethnography and other qualitative approaches to studying crime, criminals, and criminal justice, particularly participant observation and informant and respondent interviewing. Topics include phenomenology, case study, in-depth interviewing, ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, historical methods, gaining access, sampling, data collection and analysis, and legal and ethical concerns.

ECON 6305 Mathematical Economics. Mathematical tools used in advanced topics model building and in the social and economic analysis of public policy.

ECON 6306 Applied Econometrics. This course investigates the consequences of relaxing the classical linear regression model assumptions and explores solutions when the assumptions do not hold. Topics include a review of the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) basics (including the assumptions, hypothesis testing, multicollinearity, dummy variables and heteroskedasticity), model specification and selection, Generalized Least Squares (GLS), maximum likelihood estimation, binary choice models, simultaneous equation models, instrumental variables, time series and fixed and random effects models.

ECON 6309 Econometrics I. An introduction to econometrics, with a development of background concepts in linear algebra and statistics. The course focuses on estimation, hypothesis testing, and prediction in the classical linear regression model. Corresponding large sample issues are considered. General testing principles, such as likelihood ratio, Wald, Lagrange multiplier, and Hausman-type tests are also discussed. Other topics include model specification and nonlinear estimation issues.

ECON 6316 Spatial Econometrics. The application of econometric techniques to the explicit treatment of space (geography) in social science models. Covers the specification of spatial regression models, estimation and specification testing. The emphasis is on the application of spatial econometric methods to an empirical data analysis project.

ECON 7309 Econometrics II. This is the second core course in the econometrics sequence of the economics PhD program. The course extends the topics covered in the first course and covers topics such as serial correlation, unit roots, cointegration, and dynamic models; panel data; simultaneous equation models, maximum likelihood and GMM estimations methods.

ECON 7315 Econometrics III. This is the third core course in the econometrics sequence of the economics PhD program. The course extends the topics covered in the first two courses and covers topics such as Bayesian, semiparametric and nonparametric estimation approaches; discrete choice models, limited dependent variable models and duration models; and bootstrap and jackknife methods.

GISC 5322 GPS (Global Positioning System) Satellite Surveying Techniques. The theory and application of satellite positioning utilizing the Global Positioning System Code and phase methodology in field
observations, data processing and analysis of Differential GPS, high accuracy static and other rapid measurements, in real time and with post-processing.

GISC 6301 GIS Data Analysis Fundamentals. Statistical techniques are examined with a focus on fundamental geospatial data handling techniques and algorithms as well as applied geospatial data analysis. The underlying concepts of descriptive statistics, data visualization, and exploratory methods; probability theory, study design and sampling theory; statistical inference and simulation experiments; basic correlation and regression analyses; as well as methods of pattern analysis are discussed from a Geoinformation Sciences perspective.

GISC 6311 Statistics for Geospatial Science. The course introduces calculus-based statistical analysis and probability theory, providing background for econometrics and economic modeling of simple stochastic processes. Standard probability distributions are covered, including Bernoulli, binomial, negative binomial, hypergeometric, Poisson, normal, gamma, beta, t and F distributions. Estimation and hypothesis testing are discussed. Introductory asymptomatic theory, including the Law(s) of Large Numbers and the Central Limit Theorem, will be covered as well as real-world applications of probability theory as time permits.

GISC 6381 Geographic Information Systems Fundamentals. Examines the fundamentals of Geographic Information Systems and their applications. It emphasizes the concepts needed to use GIS effectively for manipulating, querying, analyzing, and visualizing spatial-based data. Lab exercises, which use industry-standard GIS software packages, provide GIS experience to investigate real world problems including social, economic and environmental issues.

GISC 6384 Advanced Geographic Information Systems. Treatment of more advanced GIS topics with real world applications. Topics covered include raster and vector data models, Geodatabase, map algebra, 3-D surface analysis, spatial interpolation and network analysis. Student will be acquainted with state-of-the-art software through hands-on laboratory experiences.

GISC 7310 Advanced GIS Data Analysis. The specification, interpretation and properties of the multiple linear regression model including spatial and aspatial regression diagnostics are examined. A detailed review of the key concepts of matrix algebra, optimization techniques and simulation experiments is given. GIS and GPS data handling procedures are discussed from a regression and linear transformation perspective. Extensions to principal component analysis, ridge regression, weighted regression, logistic and Poisson regression are provided. Practical data analysis for large Geo-referenced data sets are exercised.

GISC 7360 GIS Pattern Analysis. Examines transformations among geospatial object classes, topological measures, edge effects, univariate and multivariate methods for point pattern analysis, directional data, geo-statistical surface interpolations, and spatial regression models. Underlying models and data generating processes leading to spatial heterogeneity and spatially clustered/dispersed patterns are discussed and simulated. examples of local and global spatial analyses of crime, disease, real estate or environmental patterns are discussed.

GISC 7361 Spatial Statistics. The application of statistical techniques to the explicit treatment of space (geography) in social science models. Covers indices of spatial autocorrelation, the specification of autoregressive models (Gaussian, Poisson, binomial/logistic), geostatistical modeling, spatial filtering, Bayesian map analysis, random effects in models, and imputation of missing geocoded data.

GISC 7365 Advanced Remote Sensing. Examines advanced remote sensing technologies, data processing techniques and applications. The latest remote sensors are introduced. The class will discuss how remote sensing data can be processed to extract information in support of important urban and environmental decision making. The current generation, industry standard software is used for labs and applications development.

GISC 7387 GIS Research Design. Examines issues relative to the conduct of effective and valid research in geospatial information sciences and related fields.

PA 6315 Evaluating Program and Organizational Performance. Techniques and analytical methods of assessing governmental and nonprofit program and policy success. Emphasis is placed on strategies for impact assessment, measuring efficiency, examining short-term and long-term consequences, identifying both intended and unintended impacts, and the social, political and ethical context of evaluation.

PA 7330 Research Design in Public Affairs. Includes a variety of applied research techniques aimed at enhancing analysis of intra-organizational and extra-organizational settings. Both qualitative and quantitative techniques will be explored and applied. Techniques range from ethnographic analysis of
organizational and social cultures to development of survey research methods for needs assessment, environmental sensing and marketing.

PPPE 6310 Research Design I. This course is the first in a two-course sequence devoted to the research enterprise and the study of data development strategies and techniques to facilitate effective statistical analysis. Topics generally covered include: (1) issues and techniques in social science research with emphasis on philosophy of sciences, theory testing, and hypothesis formulation; (2) measurement and data collection strategies, reliability and validity of measures and results, sampling, surveys; and (3) examination of qualitative versus quantitative research techniques, working with observational data, field research issues, and triangulation.

PPPE 6342 Research Design II. This course is the second in a two-course sequence devoted to the study of data development strategies and techniques to facilitate effective statistical analysis. Topics generally covered include: the logic of causal inquiry and inference in the social sciences, the elaboration paradigm and model specification, anticipating and handling threats to internal validity, hierarchies of design structure (experimental, quasi-experimental and non-experimental); linking design structure to effect estimation strategies and analyzing design elements in published literature. Students will be required to select a research topic in consultation with the instructor and prepare a written comparative design analysis.

PSCI 6364 Public Opinion and Survey Research. This course describes, explains and evaluates the conduct of survey research for the study of public opinion. Major topics include the guidelines, design, implementation and precision of survey projects, questions, interviews and data about the development, distributions and dynamics of public opinion, together with public attitudes, beliefs and values, about politics and society. Also considered are recent examples of how survey research on public opinion has informed governments’ making of public policy.
Item 8:
LEAP (LGBT Education, Advocacy, and Programming) Committee
Mini-Workshops: LGBT+ and Women’s Equity

The Galerstein Women’s Center offers a series of 30 minute and 1-hour mini-workshops open to faculty, staff, students, community members, and industry, upon request. These mini-workshops use an intersectional approach to educate and provide practical tools to foster allyship practices that promote equitable, and affirming climates across overlapping identities and communities of both women and LGBT+ communities.

Mini Workshop Menu

LGBT+ 101
In this workshop, we will provide a brief overview of all LGBT+ identities, carefully researched and closely analyzed from theoretical and practical perspectives for cultural sensitivity, common usage, and general appropriateness. This workshop is aimed to help participants understand the terminology, the coming out process, the challenges of LGBT+ people, and an opportunity to gain more knowledge about the LGBT+ community.

Transgender 101
In this workshop, we will talk about transgender identities, an umbrella term used by people of many different identities whose gender identity and/or expression is different from their sex assigned at birth. Participants will learn about the history and work of transgender advocates, and will build participant’s understanding of and practice strategies for interrupting transphobia and creating a welcoming environment. Our mission is to provide practical ways to help each participant make UT Dallas more transgender friendly.

Supporting LGBT+ Students in the Classroom (faculty only)
In this workshop, we aim to help aid UT Dallas professors, adjuncts, and instructors in the classroom. Participants will discuss how LGBT+ people have made significant contributions in the past, LGBT+ current events, addressing homophobic and heterosexist comments and actions that are not acceptable, as well as how to address this in an educational, informative, and non-threatening manner.

LGBT+ History (October only)
In this workshop, we will discuss the astonishing past and future of LGBTQ activism. October is LGBT+ History Month and we aim to educate the campus on the accomplishments, struggles, and hardships of the LGBT+ community. LGBT History, though seldom spoken about, has been very visible. Thousands of years of persecution and victimization have left a rich trail of evidence of a history hidden in plain sight.
**Everyday Sexism**
In this workshop, participants will learn about and practice identifying how sexism affects each of us. The two main topics we aim to explore are social theory in local context and possibilities for further action. We will talk about how sexism affects people of all genders through social expectations about gender roles and gender expression. We also aim to cover such topics as racism, homophobia, and transphobia and how they each intersect with sexism.

**Women in STEAM**
The vision of this workshop is to give women a ready-made community of people with the resources and experience to help them on the road to pursuing their own studies and careers in STEAM (science, technology, engineering, and math). Participants will have the opportunity to learn more about the struggles and hardships of women in these fields of study. Participants will also have the chance to take away pointers on how to succeed in these fields of study.
Item 9: Amendments to UTDPP1019: Committee on Committees Charge
Amendments previously submitted to OGC in September of 2015

Committee on Committees - UTDPP1019

Policy Statement

The Committee on Committees is a Standing, Concurrent Committee of the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas. Members of the Committee are appointed by the President upon nomination by the Academic Council.

The Committee is charged to advise the Academic Council on faculty membership for the standing and ad hoc committees of the Academic Senate; to study the organization and operation of Senate committees, making recommendations with respect to improvements in the structure and effectiveness; and to advise the President on faculty membership for University-wide standing committees.

Annually, but no later than August 31, the Chair of the Committee provides the Academic Senate with a written report for the Academic Senate of the Committee's activities for the prior academic year.

The Committee is composed of seven members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in UTDPP 1080/Title III, Chapter 21, Subchapter B, Section 1.01 of The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures), consisting of one person appointed to represent each of the six Schools, excluding the School of Interdisciplinary Studies, and the Speaker of the Faculty and President of Student Government as ex officio (with vote). The Executive Vice President and Provost serves as the Responsible University Official.

The term of office for appointed committee members shall be effective June 1 to May 31, and members may be reappointed by the President for additional terms upon nomination of the Academic Council. The terms for appointed members shall be staggered so that no more than one-half of the terms expire in any one year. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President, upon nomination of the Academic Council, shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

The Speaker of the Faculty serves as the Chair of the Committee. The term of office for the Speaker shall expire upon the selection of the Speaker-Elect, who serves until the next election.

Policy History

- Issued: May 31, 1984
- Revised: May 13, 1985
- Revised: May 1, 1988
- Revised: November 1, 1990
- Revised: October 15, 1993
- Revised: September 1, 1998
- Editorial Amendments: September 1, 2000
- Editorial Amendments: April 18, 2006

Policy Links

- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1019
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1019
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1019
Draft Academic Senate Resolution on Salary Compression and Inversion

Whereas the Senate Budget Advisory Committee has conducted an analysis of salaries of tenured/tenure-track faculty at the University of Texas at Dallas, the results of which suggest the persistence of faculty salary compression and inversion across ranks in much of the University; and

Whereas salary compression and inversion may have adverse effects on faculty morale and retention;

The Academic Senate hereby urges the school deans and the senior university leadership to take steps to reduce salary compression and inversion by allocating significant funds in the coming years to enhance faculty salary equity.
Item 14:
Academic Senate
Resolution on Salary
Compression and
Inversion

I. Procedures:

Using the salary analysis from 2012, we update the findings from the original analysis with data from 2016. The data set provided by the Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis includes the names of all professors at UTD, their nine-month academic salaries, tenure status, school in which they teach, and the date of their initial hire.

The key question we answer is whether compression and/or inversion of tenure/tenure-track faculty salaries is present at UTD and, if so, to what extent this exists and which units are involved. Salary compression and inversion arise due to external market conditions in hiring, combined with internal decisions and other exacerbating conditions. Salary compression occurs when the differential between junior and more senior faculty salaries is relatively small when still positive or alternatively is actually negative with any magnitude. The latter extreme is called salary inversion. The possibility of compression or inversion is investigated by comparing salaries both across ranks and within ranks. Because salary scales differ across disciplines, it is important to look at this separately within UTD schools and, if possible, separately within departments or programs.

We explore the issue of compression/inversion by addressing the following question: Is there substantial overlap among Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor salaries? We address this question by comparing salaries across ranks. For example, are the middle halves of these groups separated and following an increasing order?

If there is no compression or inversion, average salary should increase with years at UTD to keep apace with inflation and market levels, and also average salary should increase with rank. If, on the other hand, average salary versus years remains constant or decreases, or if there is substantial overlap among ranks, or if average salary follows a decreasing order as rank increases, then compression is present. In extreme cases, there is inversion.
## Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Compression/Inversion 2016 Across Ranks</th>
<th>Compression/Inversion 2016 Within Assistant Professor Rank</th>
<th>Compression/Inversion 2016 Within Associate Professor Rank</th>
<th>Compression/Inversion 2016 Within Full Professor Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATEC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Compression/Inversion 2012 Across Ranks</th>
<th>Compression/Inversion 2012 Within Assistant Professor Rank</th>
<th>Compression/Inversion 2012 Within Associate Professor Rank</th>
<th>Compression/Inversion 2012 Within Full Professor Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. **Comments:**

In the 2012 analysis, three schools *did not* exhibit compression/inversion: A&H, ECS, and EPPS. In A&H, there was no compression/inversion across ranks and within the Assistant Professor rank; within the Associate and Full Professor ranks, there was evidence of compression/inversion. Likewise, in ECS, across ranks and within the Assistant Professor rank, there was no evidence of compression/inversion, but there was compression/inversion within Associate and Full Professor ranks. The Associate Professor rank in EPPS was the only rank in which there was no compression/inversion.

Comparing the results of the 2016 analysis with the 2012 analysis, it can be seen that A&H still shows no compression/inversion across ranks, but there is not enough data to determine if there is no compression/inversion within the Assistant Professor rank, as was the case in the 2012 analysis. Within EPPS, there is now an *absence* of compression/inversion within the Assistant Professor and Associate Professor ranks, whereas only the Associate Professor rank in EPPS exhibited an absence of compression/inversion in the 2012 analysis.

There is no change within BBS, ECS, NSM and JSOM (compared to SOM in 2016). Looking at ATEC alone, a recent addition to UTD, we only see a lack of compression/inversion across ranks, but not within the Associate and Full Professor ranks (there is not enough data to assess the Assistant Professor rank).
I. Overview:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>A&amp;H</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>NSM</th>
<th>SOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. A&H:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The boxplots show the distribution of salaries within each group, indicating the median, quartiles, and outliers.
### BBS:

**Boxplot of salary, BBS, by rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBS Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in BBS, by range of years at UTD
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IV. ECS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECS Count</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in ECS, by range of years at UTD

Panel variable: group_Associate
Scatterplot of salary, Full Professors in ECS, by range of years at UTD

1 to 7 years

8 to 14 years

15+ years

Panel variable: group_Full
Boxplot of salary_Assistant, ECS, by range of years at UTD

salary_Assistant

1 to 3 years

4 to 9 years

group_Assistant
Boxplot of salary_Full, ECS, by range of years at UTD
V. EPPS:

Boxplot of salary, EPPS, by rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPPS Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in EPPS, by range of years at UTD
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Fitted line plot, EPPS Full Professors, salary vs years at UTD

![Graph showing the relationship between salary and years of employment for full professors. The graph includes a fitted line, a 95% confidence interval, and individual data points.](image)
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VI. SOM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOM Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fitted line plot, SOM Associate Professors, salary vs years at UTD
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>[Data Points]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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VII. NSM:

**Boxplot of salary, NSM, by rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSM Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in NSM, by range of years at UTD
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VIII. ATEC:

![Boxplot of salary, ATEC, by rank](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATEC Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in ATEC, by range of years at UTD
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>years</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 7 years</td>
<td>90,000 - 120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 14 years</td>
<td>90,000 - 120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salary Compression and Inversion at UTD

(by Robert Serfling, December 2012)

This analysis is based on the spreadsheet provided to the UTD Senate Budget Advisory Committee by Dr. Redlinger, October 2012. The spreadsheet provides for each t/tt faculty at UTD the school, the rank, the AY 2012-2013 salary, and the year of appointment.

The key issue is whether compression and/or inversion of t/tt faculty salaries is present at UTD and, if so, to what extent this exists and which units are involved.

Salary compression and inversion arise due to external market conditions in hiring, combined with internal decisions and other exacerbating conditions. Salary compression occurs when the differential between junior and more senior faculty salaries is relatively small when still positive or alternatively is actually negative with any magnitude. The latter extreme is called salary inversion. The possibility of compression or inversion is investigated by comparing salaries both across ranks and within ranks. Because salary scales differ across disciplines, it is important to look at this separately within UTD schools and, if possible, separately within departments or programs.

With the given data set, one can look at this globally over UTD and separately within schools. To look at it at department or program levels, one would need to augment the given data set with the department or program information for each faculty member. This is highly desirable but is deferred to a later study.

We may explore the issue of compression/inversion by addressing two questions:

- *Is there substantial overlap among Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor salaries?*
  - Method: compare salaries across ranks. For example, are the middle halves of these groups separated and following an increasing order?
- *Does salary, on the average, decrease with years at UTD?* That is, are the salaries of new (1-3 years) Assistant Professors higher on average than for the less recent (4-6 years) Assistant Professors? How do the salaries of Associate Professors with 1-6 years at UTD, 7-14 years at UTD, and 15+ years at UTD compare on average? How do the salaries of Full Professors with 1-6 years at UTD, 7-14 years at UTD, and 15+ years at UTD compare on average?
  - Method: examine linear regressions of salary versus years at UTD. Is the slope of this line positive, constant, or negative?

If there is no compression or inversion, average salary should increase with years at UTD to keep apace with inflation and market levels, and also average salary should increase with rank. If, on the other hand, average salary versus years remains constant or decreases, or if there is substantial overlap among ranks, or if average salary follows a decreasing order as rank increases, then compression is present. In extreme cases, there is inversion.
With these perspectives in mind, the given data set was explored. For purposes of analysis, a few cases with incomplete information were eliminated. Also eliminated were 2 Assistant Professors with 15 and 22 years at UTD, whose roles at UTD are different from the usual t tt Assistant Professors, who leave this rank after 6 or so years.

This report provides:
- An overview of salary compression at UTD looking at all faculty combined,
- Separate studies of salary compression in each of the schools A&H, BBS, ECS, EPPS, JSOM, and NSM, and
- A concluding summary of the findings, with comments.

The findings are provided objectively without opinions about causes, without evaluative characterizations, and without recommendations for policy actions. All of that is for others to pursue.

Methods of the data analysis consist primarily of 1) regressions of salary versus years at UTD, by school and rank, and 2) boxplot comparisons of salary, by school, by rank, and within ranks by years at UTD. We note that regression methods are sensitive to outliers, while boxplots by design are not. It is advantageous to use both approaches together.

OVERVIEW

A first look at the entire data set (after these eliminations) shows lots of scatter but nevertheless clear indication that average salary is not increasing as years at UTD increase.
The next plot repeats the preceding plot with the addition of the fitted linear regression equation and 95% confidence bands for the “true” linear regression line.

This plot indicates that overall, on the average, salaries do not increase with years, a clear indication of the presence of compression. However, there is a great deal of scatter due to differences across ranks and across schools. To eliminate this source of variation and obtain a more useful perception regarding compression, we look at salary versus years by ranks, by schools, and, in finer detail, by schools and ranks.

Interpreting the negative slope in the above regression line. Given that individual salaries invariably increase with years at UTD, it is at first counterintuitive that the slope of the line in the above plot can be negative. Indeed, this is symptomatic of the presence of compression/inversion. If there were no compression or inversion, and if all salaries for a given rank started at the same baseline, then we would see a positive slope in the above line. The negative slope results when, in fact, the baselines for a given rank are increasing with new hires and there is no adjustment of baselines for existing faculty.
Another way to view the compression across and within ranks is via a plot of the average salary by rank and years at UTD:

![Mean salary of UTD faculty, by rank and years at UTD](image)

For Associate Professors and Full Professors, average salary is generally decreasing with years at UTD. For Assistant Professors, the same pattern holds except for an anomalous group in the range 7-9 years at UTD.

The above plot clearly shows compression of average salary within ranks at UTD. Further, the proximity of the three line plots of averages suggests that there is considerable overlap of the distributions of salary within the ranks, which corresponds to salary compression across ranks. The latter will be shown in other ways in what follows in this report.

The next display employs “boxplots” for visual comparisons across ranks and across schools.

**Interpreting boxplots.** For a given boxplot, the top of the box marks the 3rd quartile, the horizontal line inside the box marks the median (2nd quartile), and the bottom of the box marks the 1st quartile. The vertical distance between the top and bottom of the box is the interquartile range (IQR). In short, the box tells the location (median) and spread (IQR) of the middle half of the given data set. Lines above and below the box extend to the farthest points that may be regarded as nonoutliers. Asterisks mark data points regarded as outliers lying relatively far afield of the main body of the data.
The above display shows that the middle halves of the Assistant and Associate Professor ranks at UTD virtually coincide. *This represents substantial compression with also presence of inversion.* However, the apparent differences are confounded with the variation in salary scales across schools. Hence later we look at this separately by school.

The following display shows the aforementioned variation of salary scales across schools. *We later eliminate this factor by making comparisons separately within schools.*
Next we provide two quick overviews of salary by school and rank. The first shows *scatterplots for salary versus years*, the second *boxplots of salary*.

Before commenting on these two overview plots, we first create more suitable versions by *dropping the IS and UGE schools*, whose combined total of 5 faculty is insufficient data for analyses by schools. The above plots then become replaced as follows.
It is roughly clear from the above scatterplot panels that the decreasing slope in the fitted line plot for salary versus years at UTD seen earlier for all schools and ranks combined is also a pattern within schools and ranks. We examine these panels separately later.
The above display shows for each school the interplay among the middle halves of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor salaries. Findings:

- **A&H.** The Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor middle halves are all separated and follow increasing order, as desired.

- **BBS.** The Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves lie below the Full Professor middle half but themselves overlap substantially. *This indicates substantial compression and inversion, the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.*

- **ECS.** The Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor middle halves are all separated and follow increasing order, as desired.

- **EPPS.** The Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves both fall below the Full Professor middle half but themselves overlap substantially, with the Associate Professor middle half falling completely within the upper part of the Assistant Professor middle half. *This indicates substantial compression and inversion, the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.*

- **JSOM.** The Associate Professor middle half falls below the Full Professor middle half but falls completely within the Assistant Professor middle half. Further, the Assistant Professor middle half overlaps with the Full Professor middle half, even when the Associate Professor group does not. *This indicates striking compression and inversion, with both the Associate and Full Professor ranks being seriously impacted.*

- **NSM.** Although the Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves both fall below the Full Professor middle half, the Assistant Professor middle half falls in the middle of the Associate Professor middle half. *This indicates striking compression and inversion, with the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.*
Apart from the above findings based on comparisons across ranks, we also look within ranks. The following two scatterplots show, for all three ranks at UTD, that average salary decreases as years at UTD increases, indicating compression and inversion within each rank.

For the Associate and Full Professor ranks, we examine these panels more closely, with 95% confidence bands included, as follows.
The overall findings of compression and inversion within the Associate and Full Professor ranks indicated by the preceding two plots are confounded by school-to-school variation. Later we look at similar plots within schools.

For investigation of compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank, with years at UTD of relatively short duration (see dotplot below), it is more effective to compare the two subgroups for years 1-3 and 4-9 using boxplots. This will be carried out later.
Next we use boxplots for comparisons *within ranks*, starting with all *Assistant Professors* at UTD.

![Boxplot of salary, Assistant Professors, by range of years](image)

It is evident that the median salary for Assistant Professors in years at UTD 1 to 3 is considerably higher than for those in years 4 to 9. Also, the 1st quartile for the recently hired group is substantially higher for the recently hired group, although the reverse is true for the 3rd quartiles.

*This indicates serious salary compression within the Assistant Professor rank at UTD.*

Of course, later this also will be examined separately within schools.
Next we compare *Associate Professors* across the three subgroups of years at UTD 1 to 7, 8-14, and 15+, and likewise we compare Full Professors across the same subgroups.

It is seen from the above display that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is a bit higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is considerably greater than the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The same statement holds for the 1st quartiles. Particularly relevant is the comparison between the first and second subgroups, since the third group is unlikely to be promoted to Full Professor and plays a different type of role at UTD.

*Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank at UTD.*

Of course, later this also will be examined separately within schools.
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is somewhat higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is considerably greater than the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The same statement holds for the 1st quartiles and for 3rd quartiles. Strikingly, even the 3rd quartile for the years at UTD 15+ group is below the medians for the other groups. We note that there is almost no difference between middle halves of the years at UTD 1 to 7 and the years at UTD 8 to 14 Full Professors. Further, the middle half of the years at UTD 15+ group falls way behind the other two middle halves.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank at UTD.*

Of course, later this also will be examined separately within schools.

The foregoing treatment has provided an overview of salary compression and inversion at UTD as a whole. We now proceed to look within each school.

Note that, in this analysis, the numbers of faculty for the schools are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>A&amp;H</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SALARY COMPRESSION AND INVERSION IN THE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES (A&H)

We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

![Boxplot of salary, A&H, by rank](image)

The Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor middle halves are all separated and follow increasing order, as desired. This suggests an absence of compression across ranks in A&H.

In using boxplots, the comparative sizes of the boxes do not correspond to the actual counts. For the above plot, the corresponding numbers of faculty in the three ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next we examine scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands, for salary versus years at UTD, for Associate and Full Professors in A&H. These are diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in A&H. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
Fitted Line Plot, A&H Associate Professors, salary versus years at UTD

salary_Associate = 83593 - 481.3 years_Associate

Regression
95% CI

S 12928.0
R-Sq 4.9%
R-Sq(adj) 0.0%

Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in A&H, by range of years at UTD

Panel variable: group_Associate
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
It is evident that the middle half (1st quartile to 3rd quartile) of salaries for Assistant Professors in years at UTD 1 to 3 is concentrated around the median level for those in years 4 to 9. These groups number 3 and 17, respectively.

This indicates an absence of salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in A&H.
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is considerably higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which on the other hand is considerably less than the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The 1st quartiles are all about the same for these three groups. However, the 3rd quartile for the recently hired is substantially higher than the others. The groups number 5, 5, and 3, respectively.

Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in A&H. This is supported by the fitted line plots.
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is a bit higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is considerably greater than the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The same statement holds for the 3rd quartiles, indicating that the years at UTD 15+ group falls way behind the other two. The groups number 6, 5, and 17, respectively.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in A&H. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
SALARY COMPRESSION AND INVERSION IN THE SCHOOL OF BRAIN AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES (BBS)

We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

The Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves lie below the Full Professor middle half but themselves overlap substantially. This indicates some compression across ranks in BBS, the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.

The actual counts of faculty in these ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBS Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next we examine scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands, for salary versus years at UTD for Associate and Full Professors in BBS. These are diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in BBS. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
**Fitted Line Plot, BBS Associate Professors, salary by years at UTD**

salary\_Associate = 94476 - 1345 years\_Associate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>9027.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Sq</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Sq(adj)</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in BBS, by range of years at UTD

Panel variable: group\_Associate
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
The entire middle half of Assistant Professors in years 4-9 at UTD lies below the median for the group in years 1-3. Further, the 3rd quartile for the recently hired is about 25% higher than that for the 4-9 year group. The groups number 12 and 3, respectively.

It is evident that there is substantial salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in BBS.
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the middle halves of the three subgroups are completely separated but ordered in the reverse of the desired order. The numbers in the three subgroups are small (3, 4, and 2, respectively), but even so this is a striking departure from the desired norm.

*Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in BBS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is higher than the median salary for years at UTD 15+, although it is lower than that for the years at UTD 8 to 14 group. The 3rd quartiles follow a decreasing order across the three groups. Thus the years at UTD 15+ group falls way behind the other two. The three groups number 5, 4, and 19, respectively.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in BBS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
SALARY COMPRESSION AND INVERSION IN THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE (ECS)

We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

![Boxplot of salary, ECS, by rank](image)

The Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor middle halves are all separated and follow increasing order, as desired. This suggests an absence of compression across ranks in ECS.

The actual counts of faculty in these ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECS Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we examine scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands, for salary versus years at UTD for Associate and Full Professors in ECS. These are diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in ECS. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
Fitted Line Plot, ECS Associate Professors, salary versus years at UTD

\[ \text{salary}_{\text{Associate}} = 116434 - 712.9 \times \text{years}_{\text{Associate}} \]

- **Regression**: $S = 11860.3$
- **$R$-S$^2$**: 14.2%
- **$R$-S$^2$(adj)**: 11.7%

Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in ECS, by range of years at UTD

Panel variable: group_Associate
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
The entire middle halves of Assistant Professors in years 1-3 at UTD and in years 4-9 are very comparable, with the 3rd quartile slightly higher for the years 4-9 group. These groups number 13 and 9, respectively.

*There appears to be an absence of salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in ECS.*
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is somewhat higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is somewhat higher than the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The 3rd quartiles are all about the same for these three groups. The groups number 13, 17, and 6, respectively.

**Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in ECS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.**
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is higher than the median salaries for the years at UTD 8 to 14 and years at UTD 15+ groups, which are about equal. The 3rd quartiles follow a decreasing order across the three groups. Thus the years at UTD 15+ group falls behind the other two. The three groups number 16, 26, and 21, respectively.

It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in ECS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.
SALARY COMPRESSION AND INVERSION IN THE SCHOOL OF ECONOMIC, POLITICAL AND POLICY SCIENCES (EPPS)

We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

The Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves both fall below the Full Professor middle half but themselves overlap substantially, with the Associate Professor middle half falling completely within the upper part of the Assistant Professor middle half. This indicates some compression and inversion across ranks, the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.

The actual counts of faculty in these ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPPS Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we examine scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands, for salary versus years at UTD for Associate and Full Professors in EPPS. These are diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in EPPS. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
Fitted Line Plot, EPPS Associate Professors, salary versus years at UTD

salary_Associate = 91825 - 390.8 years_Associate

Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in EPPS, by range of years at UTD

Panel variable: group_Associate
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
The entire middle half of Assistant Professors in years 4-9 at UTD lies below the median for the group in years 1-3, with the 3rd quartile for the recently hired is considerably higher than that for the 4-9 year group. The counts in these groups are 4 and 7, respectively.

*There is substantial salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in EPPS.*
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is considerably lower than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, although these are both considerably higher than the median salary for years at UTD 15+ (which numbers only 2, however, in comparison with counts of 9 and 8 for the first two subgroups, respectively).

Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is no salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in EPPS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is just below the median salary for the years at UTD 8 to 14 group and much higher than that for the years at UTD 15+ groups. The 3rd quartiles follow a decreasing order across the three groups. Thus the years at UTD 15+ group falls behind the other two. The three groups number 1, 6, and 11, respectively.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in EPPS. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
SALARY COMPRESSION AND INVERSION IN THE NAVEEN JINDAL
SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT (JSOM)

We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

The Associate Professor middle half falls below the Full Professor middle half but falls completely within the Assistant Professor middle half. Further, the Assistant Professor middle half overlaps with the Full Professor middle half, although the Associate Professor group does not.

This indicates striking compression and inversion across ranks, with both the Associate and Full Professor ranks being seriously impacted.

The actual counts of faculty in these ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSOM Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we examine scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands, for salary versus years at UTD for Associate and Full Professors in JSOM. These are diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in JSOM. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
Fitted Line Plot, J SOM Associate Professors, salary versus years at UTD

salary\_Associate = 183567 - 2116 years\_Associate

Regression

95% CI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>20720.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-Sq</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Sq(adj)</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in J SOM, by range of years at UTD

Panel variable: group\_Associate
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
The median salary for Assistant Professors in years 4-9 at UTD compares with the 1st quartile for the group in years 1-3, and the 3rd quartile for the 4-9 year group is considerably lower than even the median for recently hired. The counts in the years 1-3 and 4-9 groups are 12 and 17, respectively.

*There is substantial salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in JSOM.*
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is slightly higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is higher the median salary for years at UTD 15+. The 1st quartiles also decrease sharply in the same fashion. The 3rd quartile for the recently hired is very much higher than that for the second subgroup. The counts for the three groups are 9, 14, and 6, respectively.

Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in JSOM. This is supported by the fitted line plots.
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is slightly higher than the median salary for the years at UTD 15+ group, although quite lower than that for the years at UTD 8 to 14 group. The 1st quartiles follow a similar pattern. The 3rd quartiles are about equal for all three groups. Thus the years at UTD 15+ group largely falls behind the other two. The three groups number 11, 11, and 13, respectively.

*It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in JSOM. This is supported by the fitted line plots.*
SALARY COMPRESSION AND INVERSION IN THE SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS (NSM)

We first reexamine the plot seen earlier in the overview plot.

![Boxplot of salary, NSM, by rank](image)

Although the Assistant and Associate Professor middle halves both fall below the Full Professor middle half, the Assistant Professor middle half falls in the middle of the Associate Professor middle half. *This indicates some compression and inversion, with the Associate Professor rank being seriously impacted.*

The actual counts of faculty in these ranks are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSM Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we examine *scatterplots with fitted lines and 95% confidence bands*, for salary versus years at UTD for Associate and Full Professors in NSM. These are *diagnostics regarding the presence or absence of compression within ranks in NSM. In both cases, the slope of the regression line is decreasing, which indicates compression.*

Accompanying these fitted lines are plots showing regressions separately within ranges of years at UTD: I. 1-6 years, II. 7-14 years, and III. 15+ years. Although the counts within these ranges are smaller, these plots nevertheless give some information about the dynamics of the compression (presence or absence) within these ranges.
**Fitted Line Plot, NSM Associate Professors, salary versus years at UTD**

\[
salary_{\text{Associate}} = 95549 - 778.3 \times years_{\text{Associate}}
\]

**Regression**

- $S = 12759.2$
- $R^2 = 25.7\%$
- $R^2(\text{adj}) = 22.7\%$

**95\% CI**

---

**Scatterplot of salary, Associate Professors in NSM, by range of years at UTD**

- Panel variable: group_{Associate}

- Group I: 1 to 7 years
- Group II: 8 to 14 years
- Group III: 15+ years
Next we use boxplots for comparisons within ranks, separately by ranks.
The 3rd quartile for Assistant Professors in years 4-9 at UTD is below the median for the group in years 1-3, and the 1st quartile for the 4-9 year group is considerably lower than that for the recently hired. The counts in the years 1-3 and 4-9 groups are 11 and 14, respectively.

*There is substantial salary compression and inversion within the Assistant Professor rank in NSM.*
The above display shows that, for Associate Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is considerably higher than the median salary for years at UTD 8 to 14, which in turn is considerably higher than that for years at UTD 15+. The 1st and 3rd quartiles also follow this pattern.

Focusing on the comparison between the years at UTD 1 to 7 and years at UTD 8 to 14 subgroups, it is evident that there is serious salary compression within the Associate Professor rank in NSM. This is supported by the fitted line plots.
The above display shows that, for Full Professors, the median salary for years at UTD 1 to 7 is substantially higher than the median salary for the years at UTD 15+ group, although a bit lower than that for the years at UTD 8 to 14 group. The 3rd quartiles follow a similar pattern. The 1st quartiles decrease across the three groups. Thus the years at UTD 15+ group largely falls behind the other two. The three groups number 15, 4, and 30, respectively.

It is evident that there is serious salary compression and inversion within the Full Professor rank in NSM. This is supported by the fitted line plots.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, WITH COMMENTS

1. It is evident that there does exist substantial salary compression and inversion at UTD, within each of the schools A&H, BBS, ECS, EPPS, JSOM, and NSM.

2. It is present both across ranks and within ranks.

3. The patterns and extents of the salary compression vary across schools.

The following table summarizes the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Across Ranks</th>
<th>Within Assistant Professor Rank</th>
<th>Within Associate Professor Rank</th>
<th>Within Full Professor Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Just as the pattern and extent of salary compression varies across schools, undoubtedly it also varies across programs within schools. Actions taken on the basis of the above findings would be carried out by extension of this study to the program level.

5. The variable “years at UTD” is somewhat indeterminate in the Associate and, especially, the Full Professor ranks. Some faculty come to UTD with previous years elsewhere in these ranks. We could also look informatively at “years since PhD” and “years in current rank”. In fact, after this report was finished, we did acquire data on these variables. However, a preliminary inspection indicates that the message presented in this report will not change in substance when these additional variables are incorporated into the analysis, but the report would double in length. We deem it not worth the effort to bother with an extended analysis. For purposes of policy decisions, the present report suffices. If any actions were to be decided upon, then detailed analyses within programs and units would be required, the present report having served its purpose in bringing attention and documentation to the existence and magnitude of salary compression and inversion at UTD.
Item 14: Replacement for Committee Appointees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replace Mike Kesden from Natural Sciences on the Advisory Committee on Research as Chair.  Dr. Kesden would feel more comfortable if a more experienced tenured faculty member was appointed to serve as chair. Recommended replacement would be <strong>Midori Kitagawa</strong>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace Erin Smith from Interdisciplinary Studies on the Academic Integrity Committee as Chair. Dr. Smith is on SFDA for Fall 2016 and cannot be chair. She still wishes to be a member starting January 17/2017. Recommended replacement would be <strong>Yvo Desmedt</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Kenneth Smith from JSMO on the Academic Integrity Committee as a Member. Dr. Smith is no longer with the university. His appointment was through 8/31/2017. Recommended replacement would be <strong>Matt Polze</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Fabiano Rodrigues from Natural Sciences on the Core Curriculum Committee as chair. Dr. Rodrigues agreed to serve as a member, but cannot be chair. Recommended replacement as chair would be <strong>Marilyn Kaplan</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Denise Boots from EPPS on the Core Curriculum Committee as Member. Dr. Boots declined the appointment letter with no reason given. Recommended replacement as Member would be <strong>Banks Miller</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Karen J. Prager from IS on the Committee on Educational Policy as a Member. Dr. Prager has office hours during the meeting times for CEP. Recommended replacement would be __________________.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace John Zweck from NSM on the Committee on Educational Policy as a Member. Dr. Zweck is teaching classes from 11:30-12:45 every Tuesday. Recommended replacement would be <strong>Swati Biswas</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Yuri Garstein from NSM on the Committee on Educational Policy as a Member. Dr. Garstein is teaching classes from 11:30-12:45 every Tuesday. Recommended replacement would be <strong>Michael Kesden</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Peter Park from AH on the Committee on Educational Policy as a <strong>Member</strong>. Dr. Park is teaching classes from 11:30-12:45 every Tuesday. Recommended replacement would be <strong>Natalie Ring</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace <strong>Adrienne McLean</strong> on the <strong>Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee</strong> as a <strong>Member</strong>. Dr. McLean has declined the appointment. Recommended replacement would be <strong>Douglas Dow</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace <strong>Ozalp Ozer</strong> on the <strong>Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel</strong> as a Member. Dr. Ozer has declined the appointment. Recommended replacement would be <strong>Ashiq Ali</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 12:

School By-laws
November 18, 2013

Dear Colleagues:

Attached are the revised guidelines for school bylaws approved by the Academic Senate at its meeting of September 18, 2013.

Our first guidelines for school bylaws were developed in 2002, at Senate initiative. The problem at the time was that we had a well-defined faculty governance system at the university level, but had nothing comparable for the schools, and hence no clear way to connect policies and organizations at the university to faculty activities in the schools. Since the problem was mainly considered to be a matter of faculty governance, rather than administration, the bylaws guidelines focused mainly on faculty organizations and said as little as possible about school level administration.

Experience since then has shown that we need to say more about administration, and most especially about the interface between administration and faculty. We have also had new procedures and policies introduced, such as post-tenure review and its linkage to annual reviews, that require new or adjusted processes at the school level.

Accordingly, these revised guidelines reflect a more concerted effort to assure that governance is genuinely shared and to find a more satisfactory balance between transparency and accountability, openness and the ability to act efficiently and decisively.

Please reconsider your current bylaws and revise them in this general spirit.

When the original guidelines were issued, they were accompanied by guidelines for departmental bylaws as well. These should still be largely applicable, but we will now begin a review at the university level to see if any adjustments are needed.

Hobson Wildenthal
Executive Vice President and Provost

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Faculty
PREFACE

This document contains guidelines to assist individual Schools within UTD to draft or modify their respective bylaws. The purpose of such bylaws is to assure clear, transparent, and appropriate faculty and administrative processes for carrying out the major recurrent activities in each of the several schools of the university.

This is a template, not a rigid prescription. Uniformity is desirable because it can assure that the same general principles are being applied in the same way, but it should not come at the cost of recognizing real differences in the situations to which our several schools must respond.

The School of Interdisciplinary Studies will not be able to adopt many of these provisions directly because of the small size of its faculty and the nature of its programs. Faculty and administration of the school should adjust the provisions to their resources and curricula in whatever way best allows them to implement the academic standards and policies of the university.

Bylaws should be clear, concise, and constructive. They should be process-oriented rather than legalistic, representing a joint effort on the part of administration and faculty to arrive at mutually satisfactory ways to discuss and resolve common problems.
Academic tradition and Regents’ rules recognize a number of areas of policy that are primarily the responsibility of faculty. Rule 40101, section 3, articulates them this way:

3 General Authority
Subject to the authority of the Board of Regents and subject further to the authority that the Board has vested in the various administrative officers and subdivisions of the System, the faculties of the component institutions regularly offering instruction shall have a major role in the governance of their respective institutions in the following areas:
3.1 General academic policies and welfare.
3.2 Student life and activities.
3.3 Requirements of admission and graduation.
3.4 Honors and scholastic performance generally.
3.5 Approval of candidates for degrees.
3.6 Faculty rules of procedure. (Series: 40101)

The Board of Regents itself is responsible for other areas where the faculty has little voice, such as financial and fiscal security for the university as a whole, provision of physical facilities, and compliance with general law. The administration is in between, being delegated powers by the Regents but also responsible for carrying out academic policies established by the faculty. At the campus level, the division of responsibility between administration and faculty is represented by the rules and policies establishing the distinction between the faculty governance organization and the administration. Bylaws should establish how this division is implemented in schools and departments.

At the University of Texas at Dallas, the primary administrative unit is the school. The chief academic officer in a school is the dean. Deans are appointed by the President and report to the Provost; all the deans together make up the Council of Deans.

In Texas generally, by Coordinating Board convention, the degree-granting unit of the university is the program. Faculty must therefore be assigned to programs to carry out their teaching obligations. Every program must be assigned to at least one school for administrative purposes. Most programs are assigned to only one school. However, programs may utilize courses offered by other programs and other schools. UT Dallas has always sought to encourage interdisciplinary cooperation in program design, content, and implementation.

All of the faculty members assigned to the programs of a school make up the faculty of the school. The faculty of the school is responsible for academic policy in the school as a whole, and for exercising oversight over the individual programs. University policy requires schools to establish faculty committees for some of these purposes. Schools may develop additional committees or bodies on their own as long as they do not conflict with established university policy. The school bylaws are the primary document for describing what bodies will be responsible for such oversight and how it is to be carried out.
If a school has departments, the school bylaws should say what these departments are, and what their powers and responsibilities are compared to the powers and responsibilities of the faculty of the school as whole.

School bylaws must be drafted by a committee of faculty of the school, elected by the faculty of the school by secret ballot. Before adoption they must be available for consideration by all the faculty of the school. To be adopted, they must be approved by at least a majority of the faculty of the school in an open meeting with full prior written notice and debate.

For schools that have departments, the departments shall have bylaws. Departmental bylaws should be consistent with school bylaws, which in turn should be consistent with UT rules and policies. If there are departmental bylaws, the departmental bylaws and the school bylaws together should be clear about which decisions are to be made at each level. At UT Dallas, meetings are conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order. Quorum requirements must be specified.

According to the Handbook of Operating Procedures, after the bylaws are approved by the school, they are to be approved by the Senate, Provost and the President. In reporting bylaw amendments to the Senate for approval, schools should describe the vote they received in the school.

Wherever these guidelines use the word “chair” for the head of a department or program, they should be understood as meaning “chair or head.”

The general elements that school bylaws should contain or should address are:

**PREAMBLE**

School bylaws should begin with a Preamble. The Preamble should name the school, the programs, the centers, and any other such features of the school organization that will be described in the bylaws. If there is an overall strategy that the school has agreed on in arriving at its policies and providing oversight to its operations, this could be usefully mentioned or described. For example, will the school rely heavily on meetings of the entire faculty, or will it delegate major functions to groupings of programs? If the latter, the groupings should be named here and included in the body of the description. For schools with departments, the departments should be named and the program(s) for which each is responsible. The preamble should also indicate whether there are features or aims in the school mission statement that should be referred to in its internal procedures.

The Preamble should also state that all faculty meetings will be conducted according to Robert’s Rules of Order.
FACULTY

VOTING FACULTY

UT Dallas policy defining faculty governance distinguishes Voting Faculty from the General Faculty. See UTDPP1088 Section I.B.1. for the titles of appointments in each class. The voting faculty consists only of tenured or tenure-track faculty. The General Faculty also includes non-tenure-track faculty, usually titled Senior Lecturer or Clinical Professor. The voting faculty of the university are described in The Handbook of Operating Procedures, Chapter 21, Section I.B as follows:

Voting members of the General Faculty shall consist of the following:
(1) Faculty appointed half-time or more to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Regental Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor.
(2) Faculty appointed to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Instructor and who hold appointments of half-time or more.

The title “instructor” at UT Dallas has been used only for faculty newly hired to serve as Assistant Professors, but who failed to have their dissertations completed as promised. As such, the title is now substantially obsolete. Non-tenure-track faculty are not titled “instructor.”

The members of the voting faculty in the school may accord voting rights to members of the general faculty in the school on matters other than personnel actions for tenure-track faculty.

Since in principle all faculty meetings except those involving personnel decisions are open meetings, non-voting members of the general faculty must be able to attend meetings. Bylaws may say whether they have privilege of the floor. In the absence of a specification it should be assumed that they do have the privilege, since they would have it in a meeting of the Academic Senate.

The method of assigning faculty to programs should be described. This need not be overly formal. Self-selection and consensus are possible, as is assignment by the Dean. Catalogs list faculty associated with programs; this should describe how those associations are created. There is no numerical limit on the number of programs a faculty member can be assigned to for academic purposes, although for administrative purposes a school may assign one program or department as an administrative “home.”

If there are groupings of programs that faculty are assigned to apart from their associations with programs, this should be described.

If faculty are assigned to or associated with centers or institutes that are funded as part of the school activities, the method of making this assignment should be described.

A method for resolving disputes regarding the assignment of faculty to programs, program groupings, or centers, should be described.
MEETINGS AND VOTING OF THE SCHOOL FACULTY.

Bylaws should provide for two kinds of meetings: regular meetings and caucus meetings.

Regular meetings:

The bylaws should require at least two regular meetings per year on a fixed schedule. One meeting should be early in the fall term, the second near the end of the spring term.

If only two regular meetings are scheduled, provision must be made for calling additional meetings if faculty request them.

Regular meetings should be chaired by the Dean or the Dean’s Designee.

The quorum must be specified. In the absence of a different specification, a quorum is a majority of the voting faculty who are in residence that term.

Bylaws should specify the actions for which a vote of a quorum of the full faculty is required.

Bylaws should specify how minutes will be kept and how they will be made available.

Bylaws should specify minimum notice for a meeting and for agenda items. They may also specify a requirement for accepting agenda items proposed during the meeting that were not on published agenda, such as by majority vote or two-thirds.

It should also be easy for faculty to call a regularly scheduled meeting, such as one of the annual meetings, if the dean fails to do so. The faculty might, for example, empower the chair of one of the faculty committees to call such a meeting.

Major decisions should be confined to meetings held in a period that corresponds to the nine-month terms for which most faculty are appointed.

Caucus Meetings.

Bylaws should provide for caucus meetings of the faculty without the dean being present. Rules for the caucus may also exclude associate deans. Caucus meetings cannot make policies for the school that require assent of the dean.

Caucus meetings can formulate positions to be considered with the dean at regular meetings. There should be a simple procedure for a small number of faculty to call a caucus meeting of the faculty. Requirements for notice and for an agenda need not be the same as for a meeting called by the dean.
A caucus meeting may also be provided as a regular occurrence, as it is for the newly elected Senate.

**CONDUCT OF BUSINESS.**

There should be a statement that the school follows *Robert’s Rules of Order*. Bylaws may provide for for exceptions. Examples of exceptions could include a procedure for the use of email ballots or alternative requirements for a quorum.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS**

**DEAN.** The duties and responsibilities of the Dean with regard to academic policy should be indicated. In general, the Dean is responsible for the finances and physical resources of the school, representing the school to the Provost and President. The faculty, not the dean, has primary responsibility and the primary voice in setting academic policy in a strict sense, meaning setting intellectual standards and goals, setting the curriculum and standards for student evaluation, and setting standards for and participating in peer review.

The section on the Dean should address, explicitly or implicitly, the way the balance between these two sets of responsibilities is maintained, respecting the integrity of each. The general duties of the Dean with regard to financial and other administrative policies should be indicated. The common practice at UTD has been that the deans appoint the members of the school faculty committees in consultation with the Executive Committee or the Academic Advisory Committee. These appointive powers and the procedures for appointment should be indicated—who is appointed and by what process.

Schools may also have elected committees with elected chairs in addition to committees that must be elected under UT Dallas policies.

The role of the Dean in hiring should be described, distinguishing the positions that should be filled with faculty consultation and involvement from positions that the Dean can fill at his/her discretion.

**ASSOCIATE DEANS FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION.** The Associate Deans have clearly defined roles in university policy as members of the Council on Undergraduate Education, in preparing catalog copy, and usually in communicating with the scheduling office on course scheduling. These responsibilities should be delineated. In addition, the bylaws should specify how they are appointed (for example by the Dean or by the Dean with approval or confirmation of the faculty) and their qualifications, powers and duties. For example, must they be tenured? A persistent weak spot in the administration of our undergraduate programs has been supervision of contingent faculty, meaning faculty hired on a course-by-course or term-by-term basis. Is this part of their responsibilities? (If not, someone else should be responsible for them).
ASSOCIATE OR ASSISTANT DEAN FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION. This is an ex-officio member of the Graduate Council. They have established roles in coordinating the graduate programs, preparing catalog copy, and communicating with the scheduling office on course scheduling. Where these functions have devolved onto programs, as in NS&M, the relation of the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies for graduate studies to whoever does it in the programs should be indicated. Does the Associate Dean for Graduate Education have no responsibility at all (does copy go right from programs to the Dean?) or is there some limited responsibility?

The bylaws should specify how the Associate Dean for Graduate Education is appointed (for example by the Dean or by the Dean with approval or confirmation of the faculty), their qualifications (tenured only?), powers and duties. Is the Associate Dean for Graduate Education responsible for assigning TAs? Is the Associate Dean for Graduate Education responsible for hiring and supervising lecturers? (If not, the bylaws should say who is.) What is the role of the Associate Dean for Graduate Education in setting up ad hoc committees for dissertations?

PROGRAM HEAD.
Program heads are appointed by the school dean in consultation with the faculty.

DEPARTMENT AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRS OR HEADS. At present, only the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics and the School of Engineering and Computer Science have departments. The chief administrative officer of a department is a “head” or “chair.” Departments are usually responsible for one or more academic programs. Department heads or chairs are appointed by the dean in consultation with the faculty.

The Chair position may also be a program head position for one or more programs, or the program head or heads may be separate.

Departments normally have an annual budget that includes faculty salaries. Chairs may have responsibilities in hiring. Chairs may also have responsibility for preparing annual review assessments and for preparing evaluations of faculty in the Period Performance Evaluations. They may also have responsibilities in setting course schedules, room assignments, and the like. A department should have an Executive Committee unless there are so few faculty that it is more efficient to have the entire faculty meet regularly with the Chair.

In schools with departments, bylaws should specify the term of appointment of the chair and whether it shall be renewable.

Each school should also specify the process by which the department chairs are appointed. Chairs appointed through an external search will be subject to the usual review process for faculty appointments and appointed by the President on recommendation of the Provost and Dean in the usual manner.
Departmental bylaws are probably better kept separate from school bylaws, but if schools have departments the school bylaws should indicate in general what part of school functions are delegated to departments and whether the departments should have further bylaws of their own.

OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN THE SCHOOL. Some schools have groupings of programs that are not departments in the sense that they do not have budgetary autonomy and the main fiscal responsibilities of the school dean are not delegated to the faculty member who represents or heads these units. We have no established term for this kind of organization. Henceforth, bylaws should use either the term “program group” or “program area.” The faculty member designated to represent or coordinate them should be designated “program group coordinator” or “area coordinator.” The choice between the two terms should be based on which provides the more accurate description. If they are in fact a grouping of programs, brought together because their courses or other activities are related or in order to share common resources, such as a secretary, they should be described as a program group. If they are rather a set of faculty brought together around a common interest that cross-cuts several programs, the idea of a “program area” and “area coordinator” is more appropriate. If they are significant in the teaching program of the school, the bylaws should describe such groups and the responsibility delegated to them.

CENTERS AND INSTITUTES. Our present Policy on University Research Units and Organized Research Units - UTDPP1010 assumes that centers or institutes are groupings of faculty concerned with common or interrelated research problems and are in principle independent of schools. Originally, they were conceived of as self-funding. As we have evolved, we have developed important centers with other kinds of functions and other kinds of funding. If a school has centers as an integral part of its functioning, and if faculty positions in the center are part of normal faculty assignments over which Deans, Associate Deans, or Department Heads have authority, their governance arrangements should also be included in the school bylaws. This should, again, indicate the arrangements for shared governance—are there faculty bodies to work with the directors and how are they constituted?

EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS. Bylaws should note that Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and Program Heads are subject to upward evaluation under the UTD policy on Evaluation of Academic Administrators - UTDPP1047.

STANDING COMMITTEES

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OR ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE. The previous Senate guidelines did not require school executive committees. School bylaws should now specify either an Executive Committee or an Academic Advisory Committee.

An Executive Committee is elected by the voting faculty of the school. The minimum size of such an Executive Committee should be seven, with exception of Interdisciplinary Studies. The bylaws may also provide for student representation on the Executive Committee. The election will be conducted with an open nominating procedure and a secret ballot. The method should be
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specified in the bylaws. Schools may decide not to elect members at large; they could also be elected from specified subdivisions of the school faculty.

Faculty eligible for election to the Executive Committee shall not include the Dean, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, or department Chairs or Heads.

Schools may choose to have an Academic Advisory Committee in place of an Executive Committee. An Academic Advisory Committee will consist of the department heads or chairs of other such units together with at least three faculty who do not hold such appointments and who are elected by secret ballot from the school as whole. For an Academic Advisory Committee, it is important that the procedures for appointing chairs or program heads involves sufficient faculty consultation that the chairs or program heads can properly be considered to represent faculty views and interests.

The Executive Committee or Academic Advisory Committee should meet with the dean regularly. Their scope of concern shall include academic policy and personnel matters that affect academic performance and faculty working conditions.

School bylaws may specify whether there should be formal faculty approval to authorize searches for new hires, and if so whether this approval should be by the school faculty, department faculty, program faculty, Executive Committee or Academic Advisory Committee. Non-tenure system faculty shall not vote on personnel matters involving tenure-system faculty. Student members shall not vote on personnel matters involving faculty.

While members of the Executive Committee may properly expect details of their views on delicate matters to be held confidential within the committee, the votes of the committee recorded in minutes should be readily available to the faculty as a whole.

**FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEW COMMITTEE.** This is a standing committee in each school mandated by three UT Dallas policies: the policy on annual reviews of faculty, on periodic performance evaluations, and on promotion and tenure. The Committee has a university charge that describes the general method of election. Bylaws may add further specifications. For example, in a school like ECS it might be advisable to specify representation by discipline. Since only equal or above-rank faculty can participate in these reviews, it is recommended that this committee should consist of tenured full professors.

**COMMITTEE ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING.** A school Committee on Effective Teaching is mandated by POLICY MEMORANDUM 96-III.21-70, which requires in part:

- A. A teaching evaluation procedure developed and administered by an independent faculty committee.

- B. Written objective standards for evaluating teaching performance. These standards must include student course evaluations, teaching load
contributions, diversity of courses covered, course development and administration, and thesis and dissertation supervision.

C. Procedures for periodic collection of reliable and verifiable information related to teaching performance including periodic classroom visits by designated faculty to gather direct observational information that supplements information taken from sources such as course syllabi and student course evaluations.

D. Some mechanism for faculty to comment on their evaluations and provide information they feel is pertinent to the teaching evaluation process.

E. The bylaws should specify how the membership is constituted, the terms for which they serve, how they report their results and to whom, and how their procedures are established, whether by the committee, the school, or both in some combined process.

COMMITTEE FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES. In general, the bylaws should indicate who is responsible for planning, preparation of catalog copy, and scheduling courses in the undergraduate program. If this is done by an undergraduate program committee, then the bylaws should specify who the members are and how they are appointed or selected. If there is no school committee, then the bylaws should indicate who is responsible instead.

COMMITTEE FOR GRADUATE STUDIES. In general, the bylaws should indicate the process by which the graduate program is developed and implemented, specifically describing who is responsible for planning, preparation of catalog copy, and scheduling courses. If this is done by a graduate program committee, then the bylaws should describe it. If this is done by departments or programs, the bylaws should say how the information is aggregated and coordinated at the school level.

PROGRAM COMMITTEES. The bylaws may provide either for program committees associated with the various degree programs in the schools or combinations thereof, or they may provide a general pattern for all program committees. In either case, however, there should be clear provisions for who is to be on such committees, how disputes about who is to be on them are to be resolved, who chairs them, and what their relation is to the school committees. In schools with departments, program committees may be unnecessary; the decision should be up to the school or department.

OTHER COMMITTEES. Each school should specify their standing committees and when necessary should create temporary committees to meet their administrative and academic needs.

The bylaws should provide a way to form them, establish their operating rules, and dissolve them.
KEY ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES.

STATE OF THE SCHOOL REPORT AND CONSULTATION. The dean should present a “state of the school” report to the faculty at the beginning of each year at a meeting of the school faculty. This should include plans for searches and other program initiatives. The meeting should provide opportunity for discussion. Resolutions from the faculty in relation to the plan should be in order.

At the end of each spring term, the dean should report what was actually done and the faculty should again have the opportunity to offer advice and resolutions.

APPOINTMENTS OF TENURE-SYSTEM FACULTY.

All appointments of tenure-system faculty in the University of Texas at Dallas shall be made in accordance with the General Standards and Procedures: Initial Appointments to the Ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor - UTDPP1057. Appointments to named chairs and appointments under the U T STARS program are not exceptions. A chaired professor is still a professor. Appointments must go through the same approval process within the school as any other tenured appointment (assuming that it would be a tenured appointment).

University policy requires votes on all tenure and promotion reviews by “the faculty of the school or department in which the person under review has teaching and/or administrative responsibilities.” School bylaws should specify whether this vote is to be by department, school, or both. Bylaws must also specify the quorum requirements. The university policy specifies the procedure.

Ordinary searches. School bylaws may provide for faculty involvement in making up appropriate ad hoc committees for approved hires. The composition of such committees should require approval by either the Executive Committee or the full school faculty. If approval is to be by the full school faculty, bylaws should specify how the necessary meeting is to be called.

Opportunity Searches. The bylaws may provide for faculty involvement in making up appropriate ad hoc committees. The default rule is that composition of ad hoc committees requires approval by the Executive Committee or Academic Advisory Committee. School bylaws may require approval by the full school faculty instead.

APPOINTMENTS OF NON-TENURE-SYSTEM FACULTY.

Bylaws should specify the approval process for hiring and reappointing non-tenure track faculty. This should include consultation with, or a recommendation from, the program faculty or program head.
Responsibility should be assigned for hiring part-time faculty, adjunct or associate faculty, and for making non-tenure-track special appointments. There should also be provisions for the evaluation and reappointment of part-time faculty, since these are not covered in the general University policies on promotion and tenure.

**Criteria for promotion and tenure.** University policy requires that faculty of the several schools develop their own supplementary guidelines to implement the general university criteria for promotion and tenure. The policy does not say what body represents “the faculty” for this purpose but it assumes that policies for the school will be made by the faculty of the school. This means that they should be approved by the faculty of the school as a whole, in assembly. School bylaws may delegate this to departments or other subordinate units.

**CREATING NEW DEGREE PROGRAMS.** School faculty should vote to approve new degree programs in the school. Bylaws should provide the procedure.

If there are departments, department faculty should vote to approve new degree programs in the department.

If the program involves faculty or disciplines from several departments, school bylaws should provide for votes in all the concerned departments.

Results of the votes should be reported to the Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate in requests for Senate approval of the new programs.

**CLOSING EXISTING DEGREE PROGRAMS.** Combining or eliminating degree programs and transferring their faculty to other programs in the school should require votes by the program faculty and school faculty. Voting procedures should be specified. Votes in programs should be taken before votes in departments (if any) or schools. Votes in programs should be made available to department faculty (if any) before they vote; results of the vote in programs and departments should be made available to school faculty before they vote.

Elimination of programs that would result in termination of tenured faculty requires conformance to Regents Rule 31003, Section 2, Elimination of Academic Positions of Programs: Elimination for Academic Reasons as implemented in the UTD Academic Program Abandonment Policy - UTDPP1000.

**AUTHORITY**

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

**PROVISIONS FOR AMENDING THE BYLAWS**
All bylaws should include a provision for amending the bylaws. Requirements now vary. Amendment should require at least a majority of the faculty present.
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7.0 Amendments to the Bylaws
1.0 THE SCHOOL OF ECONOMIC, POLITICAL AND POLICY SCIENCES

The School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences (hereafter "The School") is an academic and administrative unit of The University of Texas at Dallas (hereafter "The University"). The mission of the School is the development and delivery of innovative programs with widespread recognition for multidisciplinary approaches to research and to top-tier graduate education as well as for outstanding undergraduate instruction and public service.

The School offers undergraduate degree programs in Criminology (BA), Economics (BA, BS), Geospatial Information Sciences (BS), International Political Economy (BA, BS), Political Science (BA), Public Affairs (BS), and Sociology (BA).

The School also offers Master's degrees in Applied Sociology (MS), Criminology (MS), Economics (MS), Geospatial Information Sciences (MS), International Political Economy (MS), Justice Administration and Leadership (MS), Political Science (MA), Political Science--Constitutional Law Studies (MA), Political Science--Legislative Studies (MA), Public Affairs (MPA), and Public Policy (MPP).

The School is further authorized to offer the Doctor of Philosophy in Criminology, Economics, Geospatial Information Sciences, Political Science, Public Affairs, and Public Policy & Political Economy. This set of degree programs may be amended or extended through proposals made by the School's faculty in the manner described by these By-Laws and on approval by the University, the University of Texas System, and the State of Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.
2.0 THE FACULTY

The faculty of the School is composed of Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track members. Tenure-Track faculty hold the ranks of Regental Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor or Instructor. They are voting members of the General Faculty of the School if they are appointed half-time or more. Non-Tenure-Track faculty hold the titles of Clinical or Visiting Professor, Clinical or Visiting Associate Professor, and Clinical or Visiting Assistant Professor; Clinical Instructor, and Instructor (less than half-time appointments, including Teaching Associates); Lecturer and Senior Lecturer; Adjunct or Adjoint Professor, Adjunct or Adjoint Associate Professor, and Adjunct or Adjoint Assistant Professor; Professor Emeritus and Associate Professor Emeritus; and Research Scientists and Research Associates holding appointments outside the classified pay plan of the University.

The faculty are appointed to the School with specific responsibilities, rights, and duties as specified by the University’s Faculty Handbook and these By-Laws. Tenure is held in the School. Tenure-Track faculty are appointed to programs consistent with their research interests and course delivery. One of the programs must be their primary program, but faculty may affiliate with multiple programs. They may petition in writing to change their affiliation(s) at the end of an academic year with the approval of the School’s Academic Advisory Committee, the approval of the receiving program faculty, and the approval of the Dean.

Non-Tenure-Track and newly appointed faculty are assigned to programs by the Dean upon the advice of the School’s Academic Advisory Committee as the final step in the appointment process detailed below.

The School expects faculty to work collaboratively. Collaboration among programs is necessary because each program in the School, by design, regularly incorporates courses from other programs and other disciplines.

2.1 Responsibilities of the Faculty

The faculty collectively, and each individual member thereof, is responsible for the maintenance of high standards of scholarship and teaching, for the conscientious performance of their assigned duties, and for their observance of the regulations and policies established by the Regents of the University of Texas System in accordance with law and accepted academic practices. Each member of the faculty accepts the obligation to treat students and colleagues with courtesy and dignity. Each member of the faculty is obligated to accept a fair share of responsibility for the conduct of the affairs of the School and the University by service to the institution, to their discipline or profession, and to the public.

Consistent with the policies of the University, the faculty meeting as a body shall establish and/or approve: (a) educational policy for the School, including approval of academic programs, curricula and requirements for degrees or certificates offered by the School; (b) standards and procedures for the appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty; (c) the strategic plan of the School; and (d) other procedures and policies as may be necessary or desirable for School
2.2 Meetings of the General Faculty

A meeting of the General Faculty means a meeting at which the General Faculty deliberates and votes upon matters of academic policy within its purview.

All members of the faculty may participate in discussion at faculty meetings. Members of the Tenure-Track faculty may vote on all matters within the cognizance of the faculty of the School or the University, except as provided in the procedures for voting on recommendations for hiring, reappointment and promotion in Section 2.3. After one year of service, full time members of the faculty with Non-Tenure-Track appointments may vote on all matters within the cognizance of the Faculty of the School or University, except recommendations to hire, retain, or promote tenure track faculty. Faculty of the school shall vote on all substantive changes in school programs as defined in the U T Dallas Substantive Change Policy.

The General Faculty of the School shall meet in general session at least once each semester on a date and time that is fixed as far as this is practicable. The Dean shall chair the meeting. The Dean also shall also call a meeting of the faculty at such other times as may seem necessary, or if petitioned to do so by fifteen members of the voting faculty.

All meetings of the General Faculty shall be open except in cases involving personnel or other matters authorized by law to be discussed in executive session. The Dean may convene, in executive session, a sub-unit of the faculty consisting solely of tenured professors and associate professors or tenured professors, respectively, for the purpose of reviewing and voting on a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion of a member of the faculty following the procedures detailed below.

The agenda for a General Faculty meeting shall be published at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, except in cases when notice and publication of an agenda are not feasible due to the urgency of the occasion or the purpose is solely to provide information as quickly as possible. All meetings of the General Faculty shall be meetings of record.

At the first meeting of the School’s General Faculty each academic year the faculty shall elect a Recorder who shall be charged with preparing the Minutes of each General Faculty meeting during that academic year, including the agenda and the actions taken. Should the Recorder be unavailable for a faculty meeting, the recorder shall appoint a substitute to act in the Recorder’s absence. The Minutes shall be maintained as an open record in the Office of the Dean.

2.3 Caucus Meetings of the General Faculty

Either the Dean or any fifteen members of the General Faculty of the School may call a Caucus Meeting of the Faculty. A Caucus meeting is a meeting without the Dean or Associate Deans. The Caucus meeting will elect its chair and secretary. A Caucus Meeting may consider and formulate any matters to be brought before a regular meeting of the General Faculty, but its
actions cannot establish policy for the school without approval in a meeting of the General Faculty. A quorum for a Caucus Meeting is one half of the faculty in residence.

If the Dean does not call a meeting of the faculty of the school when petitioned to do so as in section 2.2 or when asked to do so by a caucus meeting, a Caucus Meeting may vote no confidence. If it does so, it should also elect at least four representatives to advise the Provost of their action.

2.4 Appointments to the Tenure-Track Faculty

Upon the request of a Program and the approval of the Dean and the Provost, a search may be initiated to select a new appointee to the Tenure-Track Faculty. Upon the recommendation of the Program Head and the approval of the Dean, an ad hoc Search Committee is appointed and the position is advertised in the appropriate media. It is the responsibility of the Search Committee to review applications, interview candidates, and to prepare a report that details the recommended candidate’s qualifications. This report is added to the candidate’s application folder, which is transferred to the Program. The Program Head then promptly convenes a meeting of the voting faculty of the Program to review the Search Committee’s recommendations and to vote by secret ballot on whether they agree or disagree that an offer of employment should be made. Prior to the vote on the Search Committee recommendations, the faculty shall sign a statement that they have read the Candidate’s file. A report is prepared by a member of the Program’s voting faculty selected by his/her peers that summarizes the faculty’s discussion and the results of the ballot. Faculty who have voted shall approve the summary of the faculty discussion and sign the approved minutes. These documents shall be added to the candidate’s file.

A School-wide vote on all tenure-track faculty appointments shall be in accordance with the School-wide vote procedure detailed in Section 2.5 below.

2.5 Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty

The University recognizes three categories of performance in matters of promotion, reappointment and tenure. They are (a) creative productivity and professional achievement; (b) teaching effectiveness; and (c) University citizenship. All members of the Tenure-Track Faculty are expected to perform well in categories (a), (b), and (c) and to demonstrate excellence in at least (a) or (b). If they are assistant professors at their third-year review, this means that they must demonstrate the potential for excellence in at least (a) or (b) when the tenure decision is made.

The School requires that the ad hoc Committee address the following questions when considering a candidate’s prospects for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure:

1. Has the individual initiated and sustained a research program which has and will continue to lead to significant results in his/her research area?
2. To what degree has the individual’s research made an impact upon his/her field or to the design of public policies.

3. At what institutions would the individual’s performance to date justify promotion and tenure?

For promotion to Professor, the following questions relating to creative productivity and professional achievement must be addressed.

1. Has the candidate continued to initiate and sustain a research program leading to significant results in his/her research area?

2. Must fellow professionals consider the candidate’s contributions as they pursue their own work? Has the candidate’s work enlightened issues of public policy?

3. At what institutions would the individual’s performance to date justify promotion and tenure?

The review process begins with the preparation of a review file by the faculty member and the appointment of an ad hoc Committee. Members of ad hoc Committees are nominated by the Dean with the advice of the School’s Personnel Review Committee, and appointed by the Provost. When the members of an ad hoc Committee have completed their work, their signed report is added to the candidate’s review file. The file is forwarded to the Program that is the faculty member’s primary affiliation. The above-rank faculty members of the Program have the responsibility to review the file, sign a statement saying that they have reviewed the file, discuss the ad hoc Committee’s recommendation, vote by secret ballot on the recommendation of the ad hoc Committee, approve the report that summarizes their discussions, and sign the report that summarizes their discussions and the results of the ballot. This report is to be prepared by a member of the Program’s voting faculty selected by those present.

Once the ballot has been taken, the statement of the faculty that they have reviewed the file, the report that summarizes the faculty’s discussion and the results of the ballot shall be added to the candidate’s review file. Upon notification by the Program Head that the Program review is complete, the Dean shall convene a meeting of the above-rank Tenure-Track Faculty of the School. The Dean does not attend the meeting.

While votes on the hiring of external faculty candidates shall be held as needed, with the exception of unusual circumstances which shall be explained by the Dean to the faculty, faculty meetings on internal reappointments, promotions and/or tenure shall be on the following dates:

1. The meeting on the reappointment of faculty and on the promotion of faculty to full professor shall occur on November 4, if a business day; otherwise the meeting shall occur on the next business day.

2. The meeting on the tenure review of faculty shall occur on December 18, if a business
day; otherwise the meeting shall occur on the next business day.

This meeting shall occur after the candidate’s review file has been available in the Dean’s office for review by the School’s above-rank faculty for not less than three business days.

At the faculty meeting the faculty shall first elect a Chair to preside over the proceedings and a Recorder whose responsibility is to prepare minutes summarizing the discussion and reporting on the votes that are taken by secret ballot. Neither the Chair nor the Recorder shall be members of the ad hoc committee or voting members of the candidate’s primary Program. Prior to any discussion each faculty member participating in the meeting must sign a form attesting to the fact that they have read the review file. This form becomes part of the record of the meeting. The meeting begins with a presentation by the ad hoc Committee of its report and recommendation. This is followed by a report on the Program faculty’s review and recommendation, followed by discussion among the above rank members of the Tenure-Track Faculty who are participating. Upon conclusion of the discussion the faculty shall vote on the recommendation of the ad hoc Committee. Only those faculty who attend the meeting may vote. No proxy or absentee votes will be recognized. If non-participants wish their opinions to be known they should submit, prior to the preparation of the ad hoc Committee report, signed letters to be added to the candidate’s review file. The votes are counted and the results reported to the meeting. Before the meeting adjourns, the faculty attending shall approve the report and the Recorder shall make the report available for the signature of each faculty member who voted at the meeting. At the end of the meeting, the Chair of the meeting shall add the Recorder’s signed report, which shall include the ballot results, to the candidate’s review file. The file will then be transferred to the Dean. The Dean then adds his/her assessment and recommendation in a letter to the Provost that is transmitted via the Committee on Qualifications.

2.6 Annual Reviews of Tenure-Track Faculty

All Tenure-Track Faculty are subject to annual review in accordance with UTDPP1089. Information for the review is submitted on-line, using the form provided by the University Provost. The annual review is conducted by the Program Head. The program head provides his or her assessment in a letter, which is made available to the faculty member. The program head and the faculty member meet to discuss the letter. The letter can be amended after the meeting. After any necessary amendments, the faculty member countersigns the letter. This attests that he or she has seen the letter and discussed it with the program head. The program head then sends the letter to the Dean, who adds his or her recommendation. Faculty who believe that the annual review by their program head or dean is based on factual errors or is not in accord with university policy should direct their concerns by letter to the Faculty Personnel Review Committee within two weeks of countersigning the letter of the program head. The response of the Faculty Personnel Review Committee will be included in their review file. The primary focus of annual reviews for tenured faculty is their merit for annual merit increases. Unsatisfactory annual reviews cannot lead to a recommendation to remove a faculty member with tenure, but two unsatisfactory reviews in a row may lead to an early periodic performance evaluation, which could in turn lead to such consideration as described in UTDPP1064.
2.7 Appointment and Review of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Full time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty are “to be treated as true colleagues in a collective academic enterprise” (University Policy Memorandum). They have the same rights and responsibilities as the School’s Tenure-Track Faculty, except for those explicitly reserved to Tenure-Track appointees. Clinical Professors and Clinical Associate Professors may serve on and chair Ph.D. committees upon the recommendation of the Program Head and the approval of the School’s Academic Advisory Committee and the Dean.

Rank and titles of Non-Tenure-Track faculty are to be awarded in accordance with the Regents’ Rules and Regulations. Hiring begins with the recommendation of a Program Committee serving as the search committee, followed by review and vote by the above-rank Program faculty (including above-rank Non-Tenure-Track Faculty), and the transfer to the Dean of the candidate’s review file by the Program Head, with all reports, ballot results, and recommendations attached. The Dean, in turn, forwards the file with his/her assessment and recommendation to the Provost for action. Reappointment review follows the same procedure.

2.8 Annual Reviews of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

All Non-Tenure-Track Faculty are subject to annual review in accordance with UTDPP1089. The procedure is the same as for Tenure-Track Faculty. Information is for the review is submitted on-line, using the form provided by the University Provost. The annual review is conducted by the Program Head. The Program Head provides his or her assessment in a letter, which is made available to the faculty member. The program head and the faculty member meet to discuss the letter. The letter can be amended after the meeting. After any necessary amendments, the faculty member countersigns the letter. This attests that he or she has seen the letter and discussed it with the program head. The program head then sends the letter to the Dean, who adds his or her recommendation. Faculty who believe that the annual review by their program head or dean is based on factual errors or is not in accord with university policy should direct their concerns by letter to the Faculty Personnel Review Committee within two weeks of countersigning the letter of the program head. The response of the Faculty Personnel Review Committee will be included in their review file. The primary focus of annual reviews for tenured faculty is their merit for annual merit increases. Unsatisfactory annual reviews cannot lead to a recommendation to remove a faculty member with tenure, but two unsatisfactory reviews in a row may lead to an early periodic performance evaluation, which could in turn lead to such consideration as described in UTDPP1064.

2.9 Research Faculty

Appointments to the positions of Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Assistant Professor require documentation of scholarly credentials comparable to those of Tenure-Track Faculty of equivalent academic rank. The appointment and annual review processes follows the same procedures as for the Tenure-Track Faculty. Research faculty may serve on and chair Ph.D. committees, upon the recommendation of the Program Head and the approval of the School’s Academic Advisory Committee and the Dean.
3.0 THE DEAN AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL

The Dean of the School is appointed by and serves at the pleasure of the President of the University. The Dean reports to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and is a tenured member of the faculty with rank of professor. The Dean is responsible for enhancing the quality of the School's programs of instruction and research, for enriching the School's resources and reputation, and for establishing a stable environment of planning and decision making. The Dean is further responsible for the administration of the School, including preparation and execution of the budget; approval of all personnel actions; scheduling of courses and assignment of duties to members of the faculty; appointment, discipline, and removal of staff and administrators within the school; recommendation to the Vice-President/Provost of ad hoc committees for review of tenure and promotion cases; annual review of the performance of faculty; and representation of the interests of the School both within the university and externally. The Dean may delegate responsibilities to other officers of the school, including the Associate Deans and the Program Heads.

The Dean may appoint additional administrative officers as determined to be useful in the management of the School. These may include directors of centers and various members of the Administrative Services Staff.
4.0 THE PROGRAMS OF THE SCHOOL

The Programs are the academic units of the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences at the University of Texas at Dallas: Criminology, Sociology, Economics, Geospatial Information Sciences, Political Science, Public Affairs, International Political Economy, Public Policy and Political Economy, and Public Policy & Political Economy.

The programs are responsible for developing and implementing instructional and research plans capable of positioning the School at the frontiers of science and delivering coursework and related aspects of education associated with approved degree programs. These responsibilities usually include providing intellectual leadership for program faculty, assisting the Office of the Dean in annual review and periodic performance evaluations of the faculty, administration and oversight of the program budget and accounts of program faculty, graduate and undergraduate program scheduling, and as appropriate, admissions, advising, and monitoring of student performance, especially graduate student performance.

Under the leadership of the Program Head, assisted by a Program Committee established by the procedures outlined in Section 4.1, the academic program faculty is responsible for: (a) maintenance of the academic quality of the program that is consistent with standards of the relevant accrediting body; (b) approval of lecturers employed to teach courses in the program; (c) development and maintenance of an appropriate schedule of courses; (d) recommendations to the Program Head and thereby to the Dean for improvements in the structure, operation, and development of the program; and as appropriate; (e) selection of students in the program for special awards.

4.1 APPOINTMENT OF PROGRAM HEADS

The appointment of the Program Head is made by the Dean after consultation with the Program Faculty Recommendation Committee. The Program Head should have the rank of professor or associate professor. The Program Faculty Recommendation Committee shall be a committee of three to five members of the program faculty who have been elected by the program faculty in a meeting called to consider its recommendations for program head. The program faculty shall elect the committee during this meeting, to advise the dean on the appointment.
5.0 UPWARD EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

The Dean, Associate Deans, and Program Heads shall be subject to upward evaluation of administrators in accordance with UT Dallas policy UTDPP 1047, Evaluation of Academic Administrators. The first evaluation shall be in the third year of service. The second evaluation shall be in the sixth year. Subsequent evaluations shall be every sixth year thereafter. For faculty with both faculty and administrative duties, the administrative evaluations shall be combined with periodic performance evaluations in accord with UTDPP 1064.
6.0 STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY

Standing committees of the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences may be established pursuant to University rules, by action of the faculty, or by action of the Dean, as provided herein. The Standing committees are:

6.1 The School Academic Advisory Committee

The School Academic Advisory Committee is chaired by the Dean and consists of the Associate Deans and Program Heads, plus four faculty members not in administrative positions elected by the faculty of the school at large. The Committee normally meets bimonthly throughout the academic year. Its duties include, but are not limited to: (a) providing advice to the Dean on matters of educational and faculty policy and practice; (b) providing assistance to the Dean in strategic planning for the School; (c) ensuring effective coordination of practices and maintenance of standards among the academic programs, including, but not limited to, those involving cross-program activities; (d) approving the membership of school-wide committees other than those committees provided for in these By-Laws; (e) providing assistance to the Dean on matters pertaining to day-to-day management of the School.

Alternative composition: the Dean chairs and the committee consists of one representative elected by the faculty of each program. This would be an Executive Committee in terms of the current bylaws guidelines. A committee consisting of the dean, associate deans, and program heads can then be considered the administrative committee.

6.2 The School Academic Review and Scholarship Committee

The School Academic Review and Scholarship Committee is co-chaired by the Associate Deans for Graduate and Undergraduate Education and is composed of the Associate Program Heads/Graduate Advisors of each Program. The Committee provides advice on the following: (a) admission of students, the monitoring of their performance, and the appointment and assignment of graduate assistantships; (b) improvements in the structure, operation, courses, and development of the academic programs; (c) coordination of course schedules; and (d) selection of students to receive School-wide awards or student nominees for University or national scholarship competitions.

Suggestions for such awards or such nominations are forwarded to the Committee, in the form of a letter that details the selection process, by relevant program or scholarship committees and/or sub-committees appointed to make recommendations in the case of particular endowed scholarships or fellowships, as required by terms of the endowments and specified selection procedures maintained in an open file by the School Academic Review and Scholarship Committee and in the Offices of the Dean of Graduate and/or Undergraduate Studies, as appropriate.
6.3 The Program Committees

Each program shall have a Program Committee chaired by the Program Head. The Committee shall consist of not less than three program faculty. The number shall be determined by the program faculty. Clinical faculty and Senior Lecturers may be invited to vote and to serve on the program committee by majority vote of the tenured/tenure track faculty.

Program Committee members shall be nominated and elected by the Program faculty. The term of office shall be two years, renewable. The election result shall be forwarded to the Dean, who will appoint the Committee members. The Dean may decline to appoint a faculty member who has been nominated by election, but may not appoint a faculty member who has not been so nominated.

Faculty who hold more than one program affiliation are eligible for committee membership in each program and for voting rights in each program.

Program Committees shall meet at least once each Fall and Spring semester. Program faculty as a whole shall meet at least once per semester with the Program Head and the Program Committee.

A Program Committee, as chaired by the Program Head, is responsible for: (a) matters of educational policy and practice that affect a program's undergraduate and/or graduate instructional responsibilities; (b) matters of graduate program and student career development; (c) improvements in the research activities of the program faculty; (d) other aspects of program development and administration and operations, including, but not limited to, graduate admissions.

6.4 The Faculty Advisory Committee

The membership of the Faculty Advisory Committee shall consist of not fewer than six members. Its size may increase, at the discretion of the Dean, to accommodate growing needs and demands of the School. Two-thirds of its members shall be elected in an at large procedure involving all voting faculty, and one-third shall be appointed by the Dean. Associate Deans and all chaired Professors of the School serve as ex-officio members.

The Committee is chaired by the Dean. It shall meet at least once each Fall and each Spring term to discuss: (a) ways by which the School and the University can construct and maintain a more effective instructional, research and service presence in the North Texas region; (b) activities that may increase the School's instructional and research reputations both nationally and internationally; (c) methods for undertaking highly productive community outreach and resource development projects that enhance the excellence of the School and the University of which it is a part; (d) actions that provide an effective process for the review and equitable resolution of faculty contentions, including informal and formal procedures that shall involve the Program Head, this Committee, Associate Deans, the Dean, and the Provost in a manner consistent with University Policy; (e) such other functions that may be necessary for ensuring the peace, order,
and good governance of the School.

6.5 The Faculty Personnel Review Committee

The Faculty Personnel Review Committee carries out the responsibilities outlined in University Policy. The committee may be chaired by the Dean or an Associate Dean. It consists of six Tenured Faculty. The term of office is two years, and three members rotate each year. Since only full professors can vote on recommendations for positions as full professors, the School's preference is that the members be full professors, but there may be instances when this is impractical. Members shall be elected by a secret ballot by the faculty of the school. Voting shall be by plurality. Nominees shall be elected in order of the number of votes they receive, except that no more than two Associate Professors may serve in any one year. The duties of the Committee include: (a) review of the files of all associate professors annually to determine whether to recommend that ad hoc committees be appointed to consider promotion of any associate professor to professor; (b) advice to the Dean concerning appointments to ad hoc committees for third-year review of assistant professors, promotion and tenure of assistant professors to associate professors, and promotion of associate professors to professors; (c) review the qualifications of opportunity hires nominated by members of the faculty; (d) review of the qualifications of non-tenure-track special appointments and research associate appointments as provided for in procedures adopted by the faculty; (e) advice to the Dean regarding selection of faculty for faculty development leaves; (f) assistance to the Dean in providing advice to faculty on progress toward tenure and promotion, and (g) advising the dean on the periodic performance evaluation of tenured faculty in accordance with UTDPP1064. The Dean may consider such recommendations and advice in consultation with one or more Heads of affected programs.

6.6 The Committee on Effective Teaching

The Committee on Effective Teaching is mandated by the University Teaching Evaluation Policy, UTDPP1006. Its membership shall consist of no more than seven members of the full-time faculty appointed by the Dean in consultation with the School Academic Advisory Committee. This should include an appropriate proportion of non-tenure-track faculty. The Associate Dean of Academic Programs serves as chair of the Committee.

The University Policy requires that the Committee develop and administer a teaching evaluation procedure; that it use written objective standards; and that these should include student course evaluations, teaching load contributions, consideration of the diversity of courses taught along with course development, and thesis and dissertation supervision. The Committee shall also develop procedures for collecting reliable and verifiable information from periodic classroom visits that supplements information taken from sources such as course syllabi and student work. Finally, the Committee shall develop mechanisms for faculty to comment on their evaluations and to provide information they feel is pertinent to the teaching evaluation process.

6.7 Other Faculty and Functional Committees
Such other committees as may be needed to carry out faculty or other functions not assigned to the committees established herein may be established or modified as needed by the Dean with the approval of the Academic Advisory Committee. The Dean will maintain and post a complete list of such committees, their charges, and their membership in the administrative offices. Such committees may include committees to administer graduate examinations, to advise on the renovation and construction of facilities, to manage institutes or centers, or to supervise computer or other infrastructural facilities.
7.0 AMENDMENTS TO THE BYLAWS

Committees to recommend amendments to these bylaws shall be elected by the General Faculty of the School. These By-laws may be amended by two-thirds or more of those present and voting at any regular meeting of the faculty where a quorum is present, provided that full notification of the proposed amendments have been circulated to the entire faculty of the school not less than two weeks in advance of the meeting. These By-Laws will take effect upon a favorable vote by two-thirds or more of those Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty members present and voting at a regular faculty meeting.
1.0 Preamble.

1.1 Purpose. The purpose of the School of Arts and Humanities Bylaws ("Bylaws") is to provide guidance to the faculty regarding their various duties and responsibilities and to provide information to the University Administration on the administration, operation and organization of the School of Arts and Humanities ("A&H") at the University of Texas at Dallas ("UT Dallas").

1.2 Terminology. The following terminology shall be used throughout the Bylaws and is defined as follows:

1.2.1 Faculty. The A&H Faculty shall consist of all persons appointed at least half time for a term of at least nine (9) months during the current academic year to one of the following positions:

1.2.1.1 Full, Associate, or Assistant Professor (tenured/tenure-track)

1.2.1.2 Senior Lecturer I, II, III [Distinguished Senior Lecturer, This term, Distinguished Lecturer, is no longer used] and Part-time Senior Lecturer (non-tenure track)

1.2.1.3 Full, Associate, or Assistant Visiting Professor (non-tenure track)

1.2.1.4 Full, Associate, or Assistant Adjunct Professor (non-tenure track)

1.2.1.5 Full, Associate, or Assistant Clinical Professor (non-tenure track)

These terms are defined more fully in The University of Texas System Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents Rule: 31001 ("Rule 31001"). [If we are to have teaching loads defined, they need to be defined for all faculty. I advise against it. Instead, some statement like "The Dean will define teaching load reductions" should be used in its place.]

1.2.1.5.1 Senior Lecturer. Per the UTDallas Faculty Senate General Standards and Procedures: Peer Review of Non-Tenure Track Faculty ("Faculty Senate") at UTDallas, "Senior Lecturer" will be understood to be a non-tenure track person employed on at least a renewable annual contract with a teaching requirement of 24 workload points in organized courses or a non-tenure track person appointed as a Senior Lecturer at least half-time or with administrative duties. Senior Lecturers may be hired for up to a three (3) year contract term. This policy does not apply to ordinary "Lecturers," who are hired to teach specific courses on a course-by-course basis.

1.2.1.5.1.1 Senior Lecturer I. Term used for teachers who will augment and complement regular teaching faculty and whose teaching experience and qualifications must meet the

---

1. These definitions reflect established usage at UT Dallas. With respect to the Faculty Senate, Senior Lecturer I at UT Dallas corresponds to "Lecturer" in the Rules. Senior Lecturer I and II are divisions of "Senior Lecturer" in the Rules, and "Lecturer" corresponds to a position that would presumably be a subcategory of "Lecturer" in the rules.
SACSCOC requirements for all courses taught. Senior Lecturer is generally an initial appointment.

1.2.1.5.1.2 Senior Lecturer II. Term used for teachers who will augment and complement regular teaching faculty and whose teaching experience and qualifications meet the SACSCOC requirements for all courses taught. Senior Lecturer II signifies a record of excellence relative to their assignments.

1.2.1.5.1.3 Distinguished Senior Lecturer. Term used for teachers who will augment and complement the regular teaching faculty and whose teaching experience and qualifications demonstrate extraordinary service and performance. Senior Lecturer III faculty meet the SACSCOC requirements for all courses taught.

1.2.1.5.1.4 Part-time Senior Lecturer. Term used for teachers with less than a 50% appointment who will augment and complement regular teaching faculty and whose teaching experience and qualifications meet the SACSCOC requirements for all courses taught.

1.2.1.6 Full, Associate or Assistant Visiting Professor. A non-tenure track temporary appointment of persons either visiting from other institutions where they hold similar ranks or who are brought to A&H on a trial basis. Such appointments are limited to two (2) years.

1.2.1.7 Full, Associate, or Assistant Adjunct Professor. A non-tenure track appointment used when a qualified person from business, industry, government, private practice, or another institution of higher education may be teaching a course or participating in the teaching of a course in A&H. Appointment shall not exceed the term of one (1) academic year. If A&H deems the position beneficial, the lecturer faculty member may be offered reappointment to a lecturer faculty position in accordance with the Texas Education Code Section 51.943.

1.2.1.8 Full, Associate, or Assistant Clinical Professor. A non-tenure track position designating full-time or part-time service on the faculty while involved in a professional clinical experience program. Appointment shall not exceed the term of three (3) years and shall terminate upon expiration of the stated period of appointment without notification of nonrenewal. If A&H deems the position beneficial, the clinical faculty member may be offered reappointment in accordance with the Texas Education Code Section 51.943.

4.2.21.2.1 Rules of Order. All meetings within A&H shall be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order.

4.2.31.2.2 Voting Faculty. The voting faculty shall consist of all tenured and tenure track faculty, the Dean, and the Associate Deans. Other members of the voting faculty include: faculty appointed half-time or more who hold the rank of Regental Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Instructor, Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, and Senior Lecturer.

Non-voting faculty include those with the following titles: Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor; Clinical Instructor, and Instructor (less than half-time appointments); Lecturer; Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor; Professor Emeritus and Associate Professor Emeritus; and Research Scientists and Research Associates holding appointments outside the classified pay plan of the University.
The Dean shall only vote in matters where there is a tie of the voting faculty.

All non-voting faculty may attend all A&H faculty meetings and participate in discussions, except when the faculty meets in executive session or when matters subject to privacy protection are under consideration.

2.0 FACULTY

2.1 Faculty. The term faculty is fully defined in Section 1.2.1 above.

2.2 Powers and Responsibilities. Consistent with the policies of UT Dallas, the whole voting faculty shall establish:

- 2.2.1 Procedures for election of faculty representatives to School Committees,
- 2.2.2 Approval of proposed administrative appointments such as Associate Deans in the School,
- 2.2.3 Amendments to Governance documents such as the School By-laws,
- 2.2.4 Such other procedures and policies as may be from time to time necessary or desirable for the governance of A&H.

[2.2.5 is deleted since it is not in accord with UTDPP 1088.]

2.2.5 Recognizing the specific research and creative contributions of the tenure-track faculty, the following areas shall be limited to voting by that portion of the voting faculty in tenure-line faculty positions:

- 2.2.5.1 Educational policy for A&H, including without limitation, approval of academic programs, curricula, and requirements for degrees or certificates offered by the school,
- 2.2.5.2 Standards and procedures for the appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty,
- 2.2.5.3 Strategic plan for A&H.

2.3 Maintenance of High Academic Standards Required. All faculty assume responsibility for the maintenance of high standards of scholarship and teaching, for the conscientious performance of their assigned duties and for observance of the regulations and policies established by the Regents of the University of Texas System. All faculty share the obligation to treat students and colleagues with courtesy and dignity, while individual members of the tenure track faculty accept additional responsibility for the conduct of the affairs of A&H and UT Dallas by service to UT Dallas, the discipline and profession of which they are members.

2.4 Meetings and Voting

2.4.1 Faculty Meetings. The A&H faculty will generally meet on the second Wednesday afternoon in August, October, November, February, March, and April of each school year. All faculty are invited to attend. In the event student associations are formed to represent undergraduate students and graduate students, each such student association may have one (1) representative attend faculty meetings in conformity with Section 1.2.3 above. Faculty meetings will be scheduled at a time that will allow maximum participation by all tenure-system and non-tenure-system faculty.
2.4.2 Faculty Tenure Voting Meetings. In conformity with the policies and procedures in the university policy memorandum 75-III 22-3, the Dean convenes an above-rank subunit of the faculty for the purpose of reviewing and voting on a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion of individual members of the regular faculty.

2.4.3 Extraordinary Faculty Meetings. Extraordinary meetings of the faculty may be called by the Dean, acting on his/her own initiative or in response to a request or requests from a regular faculty member or members.

2.4.4 Quorum. A quorum in all the above meetings consists of a simple majority of the eligible voting faculty.

2.4.5 Agenda. A written agenda for each faculty meeting will be sent to all faculty members from the office of the Dean at least one week in advance of each meeting. The agenda includes but is not limited to approval of the minutes of the previous meeting as submitted and/or amended, reports from the Dean and the Associate Deans, and new business.

Items may be submitted for the agenda in writing to the Dean’s office ten (10) days prior to any faculty meeting by any faculty member. Items so placed on the agenda will be considered under the category of new business.

2.4.6 Faculty Meeting Chair and Parliamentarian. The Dean will chair faculty meetings unless he/she selects a faculty member to chair a meeting in his/her absence. The voting faculty may elect a Parliamentarian to serve as authority on all matters pertaining to meeting conduct under Robert’s Rules of Order at the beginning of each school year. Should any so elected Parliamentarian be absent from a faculty meeting, one of the Associate Deans may serve as Parliamentarian for said faculty meeting.

2.4.7 Faculty Meeting Motions. Motions can be placed before the faculty only by A&H voting faculty. All motions must be seconded by a faculty member, may be discussed by all faculty and any student representatives present, and will be voted upon only by voting faculty. All motions may be proposed for amendment under Robert’s Rules of Order during discussion by faculty.

2.4.8 Voting Methods. All motions, either original or as amended, may be voted upon by voice, show of hands, or secret ballot. If no request is made by faculty, voting shall be by voice vote. No proxy votes are permitted.

Discussion of a motion can be ended, if a call to put the previous question is made and seconded and if two-thirds of the voting faculty so decides.

2.4.9 Faculty Meeting Minutes. Minutes will be kept of all faculty meetings and these minutes will record discussion of issues and action taken by the faculty. These minutes will be distributed to the faculty by the Dean’s office with the agenda for the next meeting.

Minutes of the previous faculty meeting will be approved as submitted and/or amended at the start of the next regular faculty meeting.

The Dean may appoint a secretary (either from the faculty or from the Dean’s staff) to record the minutes of the meetings.

3.0 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

[What is needed here is a definition of the Administrative Committee.]
3.1 Dean

The Dean of the school is appointed by and serves at the pleasure of the president of the university. The Dean is a tenured member of the faculty, with the rank of full professor. The Dean reports directly to the provost of the university.

The Dean has final responsibility for administration of the school, including preparation and execution of the budget; approval of all personnel actions; scheduling of courses and assignment of duties to members of the faculty; leadership of the faculty on issues of educational policy and programs; appointment, discipline, and removal of staff and administrators within the school; recommendation to the provost of ad hoc committees for review of tenure and promotion cases; annual review of the performance of faculty; and representation of the interests of A&H both within UT Dallas and externally.

The Dean may delegate responsibilities to other officers of the school. Initial appointment of the three principal officers, the Associate Deans, requires approval by majority vote at a regular meeting of the faculty before it becomes effective. When these positions become vacant, the Dean notifies the faculty of their pendency, and any member may indicate interest in appointment.

3.2 Associate Dean for Graduate Studies

The Associate Dean for Graduate Studies is a tenured member of the faculty, who reports directly to the Dean and assumes the following special responsibilities:

1. organization of the graduate course schedule each semester, with the assistance of the program coordinators and the administrative committee,
2. preparation of the arts and humanities section of the university’s graduate catalog,
3. representation of the interests of the graduate program both within the university and externally,
4. administration of the graduate program, including admission of students as well as general oversight of advising and student progress through their degree plans,
5. the appointment, assignment, and general training of teaching assistants, and
6. leadership in maintaining high academic standards and in developing the intellectual and artistic quality of the graduate program.

3.3 Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies

The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies is generally a tenured member of the faculty, who reports directly to the Dean and assumes the following special responsibilities:

1. administration of the undergraduate programs, including oversight of both lower- and upper-division advising and instruction as well as student progress through their degree plans, including oversight of evaluation of nontenure-track faculty,
2. preparation of the arts and humanities section of the university’s undergraduate catalog,
3. organization of the undergraduate course schedule each semester, with the assistance of the program coordinators and the administrative committee,
4. representation of the interests of the undergraduate programs both within the university and externally, and
5. leadership in maintaining high academic standards and in developing the intellectual and artistic quality of the undergraduate programs.

3.4 Associate Dean for the Arts

The Associate Dean for the Arts is generally a tenured member of the faculty, who reports directly to the Dean and assumes the following special responsibilities:
(1) serving as program coordinator for Arts and Performance,
(2) organization of the Art and Performance program and courses, including the
Art and Performance undergraduate course schedule each semester,
(3) initial planning and the general coordination of the school’s Art and Performance
events,
(4) initial planning and scheduling of the course schedule each semester with the the
assistance of the program coordinators and the the administrative committee.
(5) representing the interests of the undergraduate Art and Performance programs both
within the university and externally, and
(6) leadership in maintaining high academic standards and in developing the intellectual and
artistic quality of the undergraduate programs in the arts.

3.5 Other Officers

3.5.1 Program Coordinators

With the advice of the faculty in aesthetic studies, historical studies and literary studies, the Dean
shall appoint program coordinators in each field for a three-year, renewable term of service. The
program coordinators are generally tenured or tenure-track faculty and will hold the appropriate
terminal degree. Program coordinators will receive an administrative stipend. Program
coordinator responsibilities include organization of the arts and performance, history and literature
courses, including the course schedules each semester; curricular planning, including attendance
at meetings of the Curriculum Committee, when one is in operation; and preparation of SACSSOC
reports, in collaboration with the Associate Deans, the Dean, and relevant University personnel.
The program coordinator’s decisions on these matters will be supported by the Associate Deans
of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies and the Dean. Program coordinators may not serve on
the Executive Committee during their service as coordinators.

3.5.2 Additional Officers

With the advice and consent of the school’s Executive Committee, the Dean may appoint
additional administrative officers deemed useful to the management of the school.

4.0 STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

4.1 Executive Committee

Committees, with the exception of tenure committees, must be scheduled to allow the
participation of the non-tenure-system faculty. The Executive Committee consists of the Dean, the
Associate Deans, six (6) tenured or tenure-track faculty members, two (2) from each of the three
(3) general sections of the school (Art & Performance / Aesthetic Studies, Literary Studies, and
Historical Studies / History of Ideas), and three non-tenure system faculty

The faculty representatives are chosen by open nomination and paper ballot, with the full
participation of the non-tenure-system faculty (at the first faculty meeting of the year) for two-
year nonrenewable terms, with membership staggered so that three sitting members leave
the committee and three new members join it each year. A person nominated for the
committee must consent to the nomination either orally, if
present, or in writing, if not.

The committee is chaired by the Dean and meets at least monthly during the regular academic
year. It serves as the principal advisory body for both the faculty and the Dean in their educational
mission.
The committee assumes the duties of the school’s previous budget and planning, nominating, and development committees. Thus its responsibilities include:

1. advising the Dean on strategic planning and general budgetary issues for the school,
2. considering proposals from section meetings regarding curricular matters and, when appropriate, assisting in the preparation of motions on academic policy or curricular matters for full deliberation and vote in faculty meetings,
3. considering proposals from section meetings regarding personnel and hiring and, when necessary, recommending priorities among such proposals,
4. proposing the membership of search committees as well as other school committees for which this document does not provide election,
5. developing public-relations and fundraising programs for the school, in particular identifying appropriate programmatic grant proposals,
6. identifying and recommending new members of the school’s advisory board, and
7. developing guidelines for the administration of any school-wide research programs or research awards.

4.2 Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee consists of the Dean and the three (3) Associate Deans.

The committee is chaired by the Dean and meets regularly at his or her discretion to advise and assist the Dean in both long-range planning and the day-to-day administration of the school’s activities. These meetings may include Assistant Deans and other administrative personnel at the discretion of the Associate Deans and Dean.

The committee also assumes the following responsibilities:

1. review of the scheduling of undergraduate and graduate courses to ensure proper balance in curricular offerings and effective course scheduling,
2. oversight of the application of the guidelines for all school-wide core courses,
3. review of and advice concerning the school’s sections in the annual university catalog, and
4. consideration of space, equipment, and facilities in order to establish priorities for the school in each of these areas.

4.3 Faculty Personnel Review Committee

With the advice and consent of the A&H Executive Committee, the Dean appoints six (6) tenured professors, one (1) full and one (1) Associate professor from each of the three (3) sections of the school, to the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. They serve for two-year nonrenewable terms, with membership staggered so that three sitting members leave the committee and three new members join it each year. Members of the executive and administrative committees may not serve simultaneously on this committee.

The Dean chairs the committee, and its tasks are those specified in the university’s policy memorandum UTDPP 1064:

Annually the full professors on the FPRC (or if the Dean prefers, a meeting of all the school’s full professors) will consider the files of all Associate professors to determine whether or not to recommend the appointment of ad hoc committees to review them for promotion to full professorships.

The committee shall not consider the teaching evaluations (organized by the committee on effective teaching) of Non-Tenure Track Faculty (“NTTF”), which review process is addressed in Section 6 below.
The committee proposes the membership for all *ad hoc* committees undertaking reviews for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion of tenured and tenure-track faculty members, including periodic performance evaluation (PPE) of tenured faculty.

Meeting separately from the Dean, the FPRC reviews all applications for Special Faculty Development Assignments ("SFDA") and then makes its recommendations to the Dean. The criteria for the committee’s evaluations and recommendations are in written form and open to the faculty after the decision process is complete.

### 4.4 Graduate Studies Committee

With the advice and consent of the school’s executive committee, the Dean appoints six (6) tenured and tenure-track faculty members, *three non-tenure-system faculty*, two (2) from each of the three (3) sections of the school, to the graduate studies committee (GSC). They serve for three-year terms, with membership staggered so that the three longest-serving members leave the committee and three new members join it each year. In addition, there is one elected student representative from the graduate program.

The Associate Dean for Graduate Studies chairs the committee, which is responsible for:

1. oversight of all graduate programs for conformity with regulations established by the university and by the school faculty,
2. advising the Associate Dean of graduate studies on admission, discipline, and dismissal of graduate students,
3. approval of graduate student portfolio, thesis, and dissertation proposals,
4. advising the Associate Dean on the appointment, assignment, and training of teaching assistants, and
5. recommendations to the faculty for improvements in the structure, operation, courses, and development of the graduate program.

### 4.5 Committee on Effective Teaching

The committee on effective teaching, mandated by the university policy memorandum UTDPP 1006, consists of five (5) tenured faculty members, one (1) from each of the three (3) sections of the school plus the Associate Deans for graduate and undergraduate studies. With the approval of a majority of the executive committee, the Dean appoints the three (3) faculty members for two-year nonrenewable terms, with membership staggered so that one sitting member leaves the committee and one new member joins it each year. Of these three (3) members, the one serving longest will serve as chair.

The committee is to promote excellence in teaching across the school, and in compliance with the policy memorandum and earlier practice, it:

1. gathers comprehensive data on teaching responsibilities and prepares an annual report to the Dean on teaching effectiveness,
2. develops and administers a procedure for evaluation of teaching, one using written objective standards that include course evaluations, teaching load contributions, the diversity of courses taught, course development and administration, as well as graduate supervision and service on honors, portfolio, casebook, and dissertation committees,
3. develops mechanisms for faculty members to comment on their evaluations and to provide information they feel is pertinent to the process of teaching evaluation,
4. consults with graduate and undergraduate students on teaching and classroom issues, and
5. constitutes, along with one representative each from the graduate and undergraduate students, a special committee to consider nominations and make recommendations for the school’s teaching awards to the Dean.
4.6 Special Committees. From time to time there may exist a need for Special Committees. The Dean shall appoint faculty to said special committees which may consist of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty depending on the purpose of each of said special committees. When the service of each of said special committees has been completed, said special committee shall be disbanded unless it is determined by a two-thirds vote of the voting faculty at a regular faculty meeting that said special committee should become a regular standing committee. At that faculty meeting, the continued purposes of said committee shall be determined.

5.0 STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT OF TENURE TRACK FACULTY

According to UTDPP 1057, these are the procedures all Schools must follow to make these appointments (practice specific to A&H has been included where necessary):

(1) Approval of academic positions by the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost) at the request of the School Dean.

(2) Submission of search plan including documentation of compliance with affirmative action procedures to the Provost by the School Dean and formation of search committee, appointed by the Dean with the advice of the Executive Committee, of three (3) to five (5) members, with one (1) of these to be in a program outside of the one in which the hire is proposed. The Chair shall be a tenured faculty member.

(3) Approval of the search plan by the Provost.

(4) Evaluation of applicants and identification of preferred candidates by the Search Committee.

(5) Interviews conducted with preferred candidates.

(6) Vote of the faculty of the concerned school or department(s) on the recommendation of the ad hoc committee.

(7) The vote should follow the same procedures as for promotion and tenure recommendations, and the voting faculty should include all appropriate rank tenure-track in the school or department(s) in which the appointment will be made.

(8) Recommendation for appointment by the Search Committee and summary report of compliance with University affirmative action procedures added to candidate's file and file forwarded to the School Dean.

(9) Recommendation by the School Dean added to the candidate's file and file forwarded to the Committee on Qualifications (CQ).

(10) CQ forwards file including its recommendation to the Provost.

Because of the vicissitudes of the hiring process, alternate candidates may be recommended for appointment through the process outlined above.

If the Provost approves the recommended appointment, the candidate's file and request for appointment will be forwarded to the President.

All applicant files will originate in the Office of the Provost. Applications sent directly to the Search Committee will be forwarded to the Office of the Provost for initial processing although the Search Committee may retain copies of pertinent information. After initial processing, the Office of the Provost will forward the applicant file to the Search Committee.

An applicant file will be created when a letter of interest or a curriculum vita has been received from an applicant. Copies of all correspondence between the Search Committee and the applicant, letters requesting recommendations, and responses must be part of the applicant's file. No one may remove items from the file. Search Committee recommendations regarding the applicant are to be based solely on information in the official file.
6.0 STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT OF NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

6.1 Special Committee. The Dean shall appoint a Special Committee to consider the appointment of any NTTF required for the teaching, administrative, and service needs of A&H.

6.2 Special Committee Composition. The Special Committee so established shall consist of three (3) faculty members as follows: one (1) tenured/tenure-track faculty members in the track the NTTF member will be serving within; one (1) Associate Dean; and one (1) NTSNTTF member of higher rank, if available, already serving within the track. The search committee will recommend a candidate and an initial hiring rank to the Dean; program faculty will be given the opportunity to comment on this recommendation prior to any formal job offer.

6.3 Procedure. The Special Committee shall review all applications according to the needs of A&H and the track. Upon review completion, the Special Committee shall make its recommendations to the Dean; the Dean will call a vote on these recommendations by the program voting faculty; and the Dean shall make his/her recommendations to the Provost for the hire of NTTF. The Dean and/or the Provost shall be responsible for determining whether the SACSCOC requirements have been met for the proposed teaching assignment(s) of all NTTF.

7.0 STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

7.1 Promotion Review Request. Non-tenure track faculty (“NTSNTTF”) may be reviewed for promotion each time their employment contract term is up for renewal at UTDallas.

7.2 Promotion Review Faculty Committee. A Promotion Review Faculty Committee (“PRFC”), appointed by the Dean for each NTTF member requesting review, will review the credentials of said NTTF member.

7.2.1 Committee Composition. The special faculty committee will consist of three (3) faculty members. The composition of each committee shall consist of at least one (1) tenured or tenure-track faculty member and at least one (1) higher-ranked NTTF within the area of study being reviewed, where available.

7.2.2 Committee Selection Process. Each NTSTTF member requesting review will submit five (5) names of possible committee members to the Dean. Within ten (10) days after submission, the Dean will appoint two (2) committee members from the list so submitted in addition to at least one (1) tenured or tenure-track faculty member whose name may or may not be on the list submitted by the NTTF member. Further, at least one (1) committee member must be a NTTF member of higher rank than the NTTF member under promotion review.

7.4 Evaluation Procedure. The evaluation procedure administered by the special faculty committee shall consist of three (3) elements: (a) peer-reviewed research and academic achievement; (b) teaching effectiveness; and (c) university citizenship. Contracts will specify the duties of NTTF in terms of the proportion of effort expected under each of these categories.

7.4.1 Peer-Reviewed Research and Academic Achievement. Peer-reviewed research and academic achievement are not required of NTTF as part of their normal assigned responsibilities at UTDallas. However, NTTF have the same standing to seek funding for, and to pursue, independent funded research as other faculty. Even though this element is not required, if present, it may be noted in peer reviews.

Evidence of research and academic achievements can include publication in peer-reviewed journals; monographs which contribute to advancing knowledge or its utilization in the
resolution of societal problems; development of widely adopted clinical or educational
techniques or programs which advance the quality of life; presentations at professional
gatherings; literary publications, textbooks, performances, and visual and other artistic
contributions in regional and national exhibitions.

The lack of any peer-reviewed research and academic achievement shall not be considered in
preventing any NTTF from receiving promotion as this element is not a required element for
promotion of NTTF under the Academic Faculty Senate.

7.4.2 Teaching Effectiveness. Teaching effectiveness is not to be measured solely in terms of
teaching in organized courses. It also includes the ability and willingness to develop new
courses and to teach a wide variety of courses. The PRFC should consider the importance of
such courses taught to instructional programs and the development of innovative teaching
methods. Teaching also extends to curriculum development and student advisement. To this
end, the PRFC shall review the following in determining teacher effectiveness:

7.4.2.2 Teaching Portfolio consisting of:
- Course syllabi for up to the three (3) most current years
- Examples of teaching materials
- Student evaluations from the three (3) most current years
- Written statements and/or letters by faculty and/or students
- All other materials selected by the NTTF under review

7.4.2.3 Teaching narrative statement by NTTF member between 1-3 pages in length.

7.4.2.4 PRFC reports of classroom observation. Specifically, at least two (2) of the three
(3) PRFC members will conduct independent classroom observations for the
duration of at least thirty (30) minutes and up to one (1) hour in length for each
observation. The proposed classroom observation form is attached to these Bylaws as Appendix 1.

7.4.2.5 Upon completion of the in-class observation, the NTTF member may request and the
observer must provide an oral review of fifteen (15) to thirty (30) minutes in length at the
mutual convenience of the NTTF member and observer, which shall occur in no event more than five (5) days after the classroom observation.

7.4.3 University Citizenship. Administrative duties, service on committees, research, professional service, and clinical or outside professional service that enhances instructional skills may be areas considered by the PRFC.

7.5 Written Recommendation by PRFC. The PRFC shall make its written recommendation to the Dean within 45 days of the committee appointment date, but in no event later than March 31 in the year the NTTF member requests promotion review.

7.6 Faculty Vote. After the special faculty committee recommendation report is submitted to the Dean on or before March 31 in any school year, the above-rank voting faculty shall vote on the written recommendation at the April faculty meeting of the same school year.

7.7 Dean’s Written Recommendation. The Dean shall make his/her written recommendation report to the Provost of UT Dallas based on the teaching portfolio, written recommendation report of the special faculty committee, and the faculty vote.

8.0 REVISION AND AMENDMENT OF GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES
These Bylaws may be revised or amended via motions placed on the agenda of all voting faculty meetings, scheduled to allow the participation of nearly all voting faculty by the procedures outlined above and carried by a simple majority vote of voting faculty members.

Such revisions or amendments shall be approved by the Dean and the academic senate and, if so approved, shall be incorporated into these Bylaws.

Copies of these Bylaws as accepted by the faculty and approved by the Dean and as subsequently revised or amended and approved are made available to the faculty by the Dean’s office.
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I. Welcome to UT Dallas

A. About this handbook
This document is intended to help orient you to the information you need to get started teaching. You’ll find requirements, recommendations, and answers to frequently asked questions, as well as referrals to the many teaching resources that are available. Just about all of this information is available online, but this searchable document pulls together much of what you will need to know right away, and can serve as a handy reference for questions that may arise throughout the semester. Additional information is available in the official Faculty Handbook, available at http://provost.utdallas.edu/faculty-handbook/resources-for-new-faculty-members.

Please note: Web addresses frequently change; if you do not find a link, search the UTD website for the office/procedure.

B. Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)
CTL was launched in January 2016 with the mission to provide campus-wide leadership and coordination of activities aimed at supporting excellence in teaching. Please contact CTL staff when you have questions or concerns related to teaching, by email at CTL@utdallas.edu or by phone at 972-883-2247. Additional information about the center and our programs is available on our web page, utdallas.edu/ctl.

Director: Dr. Paul F. Diehl
Associate Director: Dr. Karen Huxtable
Administrative Assistant II: Beverly Reed

In addition, a Teaching Leader from each school is available to provide school-specific guidance and programming, and can either provide support directly or refer you to an appropriate resource.

A&H  Dr. Sabrina Starnaman
ATEC  Dr. Kristin Drogos
BBS  Dr. Shayla Holub
EPPS  Dr. Paul Battaglio
ECS  Dr. Randy Lehmann
JSOM  Dr. McClain Watson
NCS  Dr. John Sibert

II. New Employees

A. Paperwork & request for NetID
Please complete your new employee paperwork as designated by the Dean’s office of your school. After this paperwork is processed you will receive your UTD ID number.

1. NetID, computer access, and email
As soon as you receive your UTD ID number you can use it to obtain your separate NetID at https://netid.utdallas.edu/. The NetID gives you access to your UTD computer account. This is a unique identifier (username) that also serves as your default UTD email address.
Forwarding emails to a personal email account outside of UT Dallas is dangerous and highly discouraged because the contents are exposed to Internet attackers and a third-party email service that has no contract with UT Dallas. Several better options exist to conduct UTD-related work, including Outlook Web Access (webmail.utdallas.edu), Box.com (utdallas.edu/cometspace), and VPN remote connection to the UT Dallas network.

For more information, contact the Information Security office at infosecurity@utdallas.edu or 972-883-6810. Change of password is required on a regular basis for university computer accounts; unless done in a timely manner the UTD computer account will be locked.

To request computer Tech Support, email assist@utdallas.edu, call the Help Desk at 972-883-2911, or visit http://www.utdallas.edu/ir/helpdesk/.

2. Comet Card photo ID
The UTD photo ID card, called the Comet Card, is used for all identification purposes on campus, as a library card, and is also used as a key for electronic access in many buildings and labs on campus, http://www.utdallas.edu/cometcenter/getcard/, as well as for discounts at some local businesses. A new employee must complete a Faculty/Staff Comet Card Request form and have it approved by the department. The Photo ID is issued at the Student Union.

3. Administrative Assistant support
Administrative assistant (AA) support is provided for all instructors. The provided support includes:

- Requests for office keys and electronic access to labs and selected other rooms on campus
- Requests for photocopying of exams (most require one week advance notice, so please verify in advance)
- Office or classroom supplies

Please contact your program head to identify the designated person in your unit.

4. Teaching Assistant (TA) support
Availability of Graduate TAs varies by school and by course. If you have been assigned a TA, you will be notified by your school or program head, and the TA will be asked to contact you to discuss his or her responsibilities. Please note each TA may have multiple assignments, and the claim of each instructor on a TA’s time is limited to the portion of the TA’s time assigned to that instructor. For example, a 50% TA means that the instructor can give the TA the equivalent of no more than 10 hours of work per week. Consult with your program head to identify the appropriate uses of a TA’s time in your school. Additional considerations for working effectively with TAs are indicated below.

B. Galaxy
The Galaxy online portal is the starting point for working in the Orion system, which is the online application that students use to track their class schedules, grades and more. Galaxy also is the entry page for staff and faculty members seeking access to payroll and benefit information. Log
in to Galaxy from the University’s main web page using the link in the upper right corner. Galaxy provides access to many useful tools, including:

1. **Outlook Webmail**
   Faculty and Staff Email on the Microsoft Exchange Server

2. **New Employee DayOne**
   Employee self-service for New Hires to complete/verify documents.

3. **eLearning**
   This is the university’s BlackBoard course management system. An eLearning webpage will be created automatically for every course offered each semester. This allows the integration of technology into online, hybrid, and classroom-based courses. You can set up your eLearning course to make announcements, post documents, host discussions, and share grades (which may never be shared by unencrypted email) with your students.
   - The eLearning Team provides the university’s faculty, staff and students with resources to facilitate a successful online learning experience. The team’s focus is to assist with the integration of technology into online, hybrid and classroom-based courses. Services for faculty and staff include instructional design, training, and support, [http://www.utdallas.edu/elearning/instructors/](http://www.utdallas.edu/elearning/instructors/).
   - Add TA/Add USER: To add a Graduate Teaching Assistant (TA) or an Undergraduate Teaching Intern (UGTI) to your course in eLearning, please click on the appropriate link at the bottom of the main eLearning login page. Please be sure to specify that your UGTI is not a Teaching Assistant—these are separate roles with different levels of access to protected information.

Additional information about eLearning appears below.

   **a) Required: Faculty Compliance Training in eLearning**
   The Office of Audit and Compliance oversees the training of all new employees in understanding laws and policies appropriate to their positions, such as FERPA and research ethics. More information may be found here [http://www.utdallas.edu/audit-compliance/training/all_about_compliance_training.html](http://www.utdallas.edu/audit-compliance/training/all_about_compliance_training.html). Please be sure to log in to eLearning to complete Compliance Training right away, at least within 30 days of hire. Call 972-883-2233 if you run into any difficulties.

**Special note regarding FERPA**
- The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) is a federal law enacted in 1974 to protect the privacy of student education records. More information is available at [https://www.utdallas.edu/registrar/legislative-policies/ferpa/](https://www.utdallas.edu/registrar/legislative-policies/ferpa/).
- As a course instructor, you must be aware of the regulations regarding information security and protection of confidential student information, [http://provost.utdallas.edu/home/information-security-and-ferpa](http://provost.utdallas.edu/home/information-security-and-ferpa).
- The UT Dallas FERPA violation link is located at [http://www.utdallas.edu/legal/ferpa](http://www.utdallas.edu/legal/ferpa).
- **Students have four primary rights under FERPA:**
  1. To inspect and review their education records
  2. To seek to amend those education records they believe to be inaccurate or misleading
3. To have some control over the disclosure of information from those education records
4. To file a complaint concerning alleged failures by an institution to comply with FERPA regulations within 180 days

b) Epigeum courses for new Lecturers in eLearning
UT Dallas subscribes to Epigeum, a service that provides online teacher-training courses. You are welcome to complete these courses, available in eLearning. After you log in to eLearning, you will see a section called My Organizations. Under that is a link called Epigeum Courses. This organization will provide you with online courses in Avoiding Plagiarism, Lecturing I, Making the Most of Discussion, and Marking and Giving Feedback, and many more. These course modules generally require 1-2 hours to complete. Questions about completing these modules may be directed to CTL.

c) eLearning certification in teaching online courses
Training in best practices for teaching online and hybrid courses is offered by the eLearning support team. For more information or to sign up, email elearning@utdallas.edu. The eLearning Team offers three levels of Online Teaching Certification. Each level will require 13 hours of instruction and will use the blended model, allowing instructors to experience the online tools and educational environment as students prior to teaching. The certificates will focus on pedagogy, University policies and processes, learning management system functionality, multimedia production, and online tools (web conferencing, audience response systems, surveys, etc.). For support, instructors have a 24/7 help desk available for assistance with Blackboard. Additionally, instructors are provided with a 24/7 emergency on-call number that connects them with an instructional designer for issues that go beyond the Learning Management System.

4. CourseBook Lookup
Detailed CourseBook information, including instructions for uploading required documents, is available within Galaxy and at http://coursebook.utdallas.edu/coursebookhelp. CourseBook provides course schedules, locations, syllabi, textbook information, course evaluations, and instructor information to faculty and students. Use your NetID to log in using the “my classes” link in the menu at the top of the page to download a photo roster, send email to the entire class, submit your syllabus, and view a map of your classroom location. You also can use CourseBook to view syllabi for classes similar to yours in previous semesters.

New faculty members should be sure to review the Syllabus Templates and Syllabus Policies available at this link.

Please note that all instructors (i.e., faculty of any rank) are required to upload, no later than one week after classes begin (but at least one week before classes begin is preferred):

1. Course syllabus (syllabus requirements and best practices are described in greater detail below)
2. Public Curriculum Vita or Public Resume
   Course instructors are required to post public CVs (or resume, as appropriate) on the UTD website per the Texas Legislature (Texas HB 2504). Public CVs or resumes should be up-to-date and dated for the current year. The public document may
not include any personal information, including the instructor's home address or home telephone number. Additional information can be found and documents can be uploaded by going to http://provost.utdallas.edu/wp/public-curriculum-vitae/.

Public CVs or Resumes should include
- all institutions of higher education attended, with degrees earned
- all previous teaching positions, including names of the institutions, the positions, beginning and ending dates, and a list of significant professional publications relevant to the academic positions held, including full citation data for each entry

5. My Parking
This link, under “My Menu” in Galaxy, is where you will find information and a link to purchase your permit for the current year. There is no free parking on campus. Visitors may obtain a temporary pass at the Visitors’ Center.

6. Orion Self-Service
This link, under “My Menu” in Galaxy, is where you will find your teaching schedule and class rosters, where you will submit midterm and final grades, and view your final exam schedule.

7. Staff Tools
This is the place to view and update personal information, view paychecks and benefits.

III. Before the Semester Begins

A. Academic Calendar
The official University academic calendar can be found on the UTD homepage by clicking on “Academic Calendar” on the right side of the page. Information regarding semester start and stop dates, drop dates, reading days, final exam week, mid-term and final grade due dates and holidays are provided here.

B. Bookstore requests
Please inform the university bookstore of the textbook you will be using. Typically, they will need the title, author, edition number, and approximate expected number of students in your class. You can submit your requests online at: https://adoptions.efollett.com/OnlineAdoptionsWeb/onlineAdoptions.html?storeNumber=1163
UT Dallas textbook policy is http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1005
Recommended adoption due dates:
- March 15th--Summer Semester
- April 15th--Fall Semester
- October 15th--Spring Semester
Textbook information may be viewed via the students’ online textbook ordering website at www.utd.bkstr.com, which is a good way for faculty to check to see if their textbook information is correct. The bookstore manager recommends that all faculty visit the
bookstores two weeks before the beginning of each semester to check their shelves to make sure their books are correct. All instructors (i.e., faculty of any rank) are responsible for ordering any instructor or "desk" copies they need. A copy of each textbook that you require your students to purchase generally will be provided free to you by the textbook publisher on request. Check with your course coordinator or associate dean for common textbooks. Students also purchase textbooks from Off Campus Books and Stanza Textbooks, located near campus. You can notify them of your textbook requirements using the contact information below.

The bookstore contacts are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bookstore</th>
<th>email</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>location</th>
<th>phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bookadoptions@utdallas.edu">bookadoptions@utdallas.edu</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rachel@offcampusbooks.com">Rachel@offcampusbooks.com</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrissie@stanzatextbooks.com">chrissie@stanzatextbooks.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Holliday, Field Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UT Dallas Bookstore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>561 W. Campbell Road, #201</td>
<td>972-907-8398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>972-883-4664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>888-578-2692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Required: Syllabus

A syllabus is required for each course and should be made available to students on or before the first day of class. Samples are available at CourseBook. Your program head can answer questions about the expected learning outcomes of your course and its place in the school curriculum.

According to State law, all syllabi for organized undergraduate courses must have (1) Brief description of each major course requirement, including each major assignment and examination (2) measurable student learning outcomes (3) a general description of the subject matter of each lecture or discussion and (4) list of any required or recommended readings.

In order to teach a course that gives credit at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, you must complete a Concurrent Course Approval Form, which requires approval by your associate dean or school dean, the Provost’s Office, the Office of Undergraduate Education, and the Office of Graduate Studies. The Concurrent Course Guidelines and Concurrent Course Approval Form are found on the Registrar’s Office intranet page (https://www.utdallas.edu/registrar-intranet/scheduling/scheduling-resources/). The syllabi for these courses must indicate different learning outcomes and assignments that are appropriate for the level of credit awarded to students.

Please use one of the approved templates and follow the guidelines on these pages:

- Syllabus templates: [http://provost.utdallas.edu/home/syllabus-templates](http://provost.utdallas.edu/home/syllabus-templates)
- Syllabus policies: [http://provost.utdallas.edu/syllabus-policies/](http://provost.utdallas.edu/syllabus-policies/)
- Syllabus submission: [http://coursebook.utdallas.edu/syllabussubmit](http://coursebook.utdallas.edu/syllabussubmit)

As stated above, you must upload your syllabus to the University CourseBook website, which requires NetID and password for log-in.
D. **eLearning (Blackboard)**
eLearning (a division of Blackboard) is a University-provided software tool that provides many forms of student-professor communication, interaction and grading tools. Using this platform is not mandatory, but many instructors find it far easier and more functional than maintaining an individual website for each course. UTD students use eLearning for many of their classes and are used to it. In addition to a standard repository for posting course-related information, eLearning allows students to engage in discussion boards or chat rooms, and provides a variety of options for communication of course material, assignments, grades, as well as questions and feedback between students, TA, and instructor. Enabling each feature in eLearning is at the discretion of the instructor. eLearning tutorials are available upon login on eLearning. Some of the recommended items you can post in eLearning include:

- Course syllabus
- Lecture plan or outline, Lab schedule, or Course calendar
- Reading/Homework/Projects/Lab assignments and due dates
- Class notes or reference materials
- Dates of quizzes or exams
- Office hours, with times and location for instructor and TA
- Announcements
- Office hours—times and location (Instructor and TA)
- Grades

eLearning allows the instructor and TA to post grades throughout the semester in a secure environment. Each student has individual access to his or her grades at all times (via permission granted by instructor). eLearning can be accessed and used from any computer or mobile device via the web, from the following URL, using your UTD NetID and password: [http://elearning.utdallas.edu](http://elearning.utdallas.edu), or the eLearning app.

Courses are created automatically several weeks before each semester begins. You will see courses you are assigned to teach appear on your individual eLearning login page. You are responsible for populating the eLearning module for each course in a manner you deem appropriate (examples provided in the list above). The eLearning module for a repeated course has the option to copy material from a previous semester. The various eLearning components can be enabled or disabled by the instructor. The visibility of certain component or data can also be controlled or made time-dependent (e.g. automatic appearance of solutions after a certain date). Students are not able to view their respective eLearning course websites until the first day of the semester, but you may specifically request to allow access sooner.

A phone number to reach the eLearning Helpdesk is listed at the top of every eLearning page. The email address is elearning@utdallas.edu (not to be shared with students).

E. **Media Services**
To reserve classroom equipment, even equipment that is permanently installed, please contact UTD Media Services before the semester begins, media@utdallas.edu or 972-883-4900. Prior arrangement ensures that staff are available on call if you need immediate assistance before or during class. Service personnel typically arrive within 10-15 minutes.
Please be prepared to provide your building and classroom number, your name, and if leaving a message, the information about your request. Media services personnel are available prior to your first class to show you how to operate or log on to the equipment and verify that everything you need is working properly. Some classrooms require access codes to use the computer and related equipment. This access code may be obtained from Media Services.

IV. Communicating with Students

A. Email

Although not required, a good way to let students know you care about their learning and want them to come prepared for the first class is to send a brief “welcome” email introducing yourself and the course before class begins. This can be done via CourseBook or eLearning.

A few items that you may include in this email are:

- Textbook information (many students like to buy their textbooks online)
- Course syllabus
- Start dates of labs, if applicable (which typically are not the first week of class)
- Any room changes that may have occurred
- Any pre-class assignment

B. Student inquiries

It is not unusual for students to contact the course instructor prior to the beginning of the semester with questions about course pre-requisites, permission to enroll in the class if it is full, and so forth. It is important to note that instructors do not have the authority to override prerequisites. The program head may do so under very limited circumstances. Instructors also do not have the authority to allow a student to enroll in a class that is full. In either case, please refer students to an undergraduate or graduate adviser.

V. First Week of Class

A. Check final room location

Occasionally a classroom location is changed before the start of classes. Changes are reflected online. Please check for any such changes and if one occurs, it is a good idea to remind students via email of the change.

B. Recommended practices for the first day of class

1. Review syllabus

It is a good idea to use the first day of class to set the tone for the semester. Discuss important points from the class syllabus, course policies, and expectations, such as:

- Grading
- Specific classroom rules, as appropriate (e.g., your policies regarding use of cell phones, laptops, etc.)
- Expectations regarding collaboration on homework assignments—are group efforts allowed or must all work be completed individually?
• Policies and procedures for missing an exam
• Attendance policy
• General channels of communication—do you prefer email, eLearning, etc.?
• Policies regarding plagiarism and academic integrity
• Office hours

It also is a good idea to cover some substantive aspect of the course, and strongly recommended that you do not dismiss students before the regularly scheduled end time for the course.

2. Take attendance: The Registrar will require participation data
Take attendance during the first weeks of class. This not only is helpful in correcting any errors in registration that may be costly to the students if not caught, but also helps you to learn your students’ names, especially in small and medium-sized classes. You will receive an email from the Registrar asking you to record students’ participation early in the semester. This information is required for federal reporting purposes.

VI. Communicating Effectively with Students

A. What you expect from students

1. General
It is vital to clearly communicate expectations and goals with students and your TA.
• Encourage questions every class period. Begin and end each class period by asking for questions. Keep the class website (eLearning) up to date.
• Remind students of instructor and TA office hours. Notify your availability for questions by email. This is especially important the week before exams.
• Be available for office hours, and post them in eLearning and if possible, outside your office.
• Return emails from students as soon as possible (within reason).
• Periodically remind students of major project or exam due dates.

2. Email policies
All UTD employees are to use UTD email for the purposes of conducting UTD business. All communication with students is to be made to the students’ official UTD account. It is the responsibility of the instructors and students to monitor their UTD-issued email and ensure that the email account is properly maintained and meets any email quotas to allow emails to be delivered.

3. Exam policies
A. Missed exams
• Students in UTD varsity sports or participating in other university-sponsored events may present at the beginning of the year a note from their coach, athletic director, or faculty sponsor; this constitutes an allowable absence. Any midterms on such dates must be made up for these students. Athletic events do not occur during the final exam week.
• At the instructor’s discretion, students may be allowed to make up missed
exams based on allowable excuses. Allowable and documented excuses must be honored according to UTD rules and as indicated in the course syllabus. Instructors must be consistent across all students to avoid any appearance of impropriety and are encouraged not to stray far from the school norms. Please consult with your associate dean or program head when deciding your exam policies.

B. Grading Exams
By UTD policy, grading of exams and other assignments are the responsibility of the Instructor of Record. Any grading completed by TAs requires close supervision and final approval by the instructor.

B. What you expect from your TA
It is a good idea to meet with the TAs serving each of your courses to clarify their responsibilities and weekly schedules. It is recommended that a summary of this meeting is sent by email to the TA as a record of what was said, to avoid ambiguity. Examples of topics to be clarified in the meeting and email are:

- Time commitment
  - Full-time TA = 20 hrs/wk
  - Half-time TA = 10 hrs/wk
  - Quarter-time TA = 5 hrs/wk
- Specific responsibilities (as applicable)
  - Grading homework, quizzes, lab reports, projects
  - Overseeing lab section(s)
  - Other lab work (ordering of parts, milling of boards, inventory, etc.)
  - Holding office hours (establish times and location)
  - Conducting recitation sessions or review sessions
  - Proctoring of quizzes or exams
- Clarify and establish in first meeting
  - Deadlines to complete grading of homework, quizzes, lab reports, etc. (Example: 1 week after submission)
  - Does your TA enter grades directly into eLearning? (Requires giving TA access in eLearning.)
  - Establish TA arrival time for lab sessions. (e.g., 10 minutes before the lab session starts)
  - Clarify division of responsibility between multiple lab TAs.
  - For lab TAs, review the emergency contact information, safety and cleanliness issues of the lab and clarify that these expectations must be passed down to the students.
  - If needed, request lab access (keycard access) for lab TAs through an AA.

VII. Services for Students and Other Student Concerns

A. Office of Student AccessAbility
Following Federal law, UTD makes special allowances for students with documented disabilities. For allowances that involve the instructor, the student will present a form to the instructor from the Office of Student AccessAbility (OSA), which the instructor must
complete and sign and the student will return to the OSA. Student accommodations may include in-class provisions (such as special seating up front, use of a recording device or the ability to have another student take notes for them, etc.) or extra time to take quizzes and exams, which are administered in the OSA. Instructors are not allowed to inquire as to the specific disability or challenge the validity of the request, whose evaluation and approval are in the domain of the Office of Student AccessAbility. In these cases, the instructor may need to supply in advance the dates of quizzes and exams, as well as the allowed material and conditions for each quiz or exam (e.g., calculator, compass, ruler, page of notes or no notes, open or closed book, and the nominal amount of time you would allow students in the classroom to have). Depending on the case, the instructor may need to provide the quizzes and exams to the OSA a day or more prior to each test. For additional information, see http://www.utdallas.edu/studentaccess/.

B. Resource Connection-Academic Outreach
The Office of Undergraduate Education operates the Resource Connection-Academic Outreach program to quickly identify students who are not meeting course expectations, including participation, https://oue.utdallas.edu/special-programs/resource-connections/. Faculty who refer students to Resource Connections remain anonymous. The program is confidential and serves to assist students with organization, life skills, study habits, homesickness, adjustment to college life, and referrals to all campus resources in addition to ongoing support. Resource Connections-Academic Outreach is a one-stop source for students to locate assistance for a variety of academic and non-academic support services. The program is not part of a student’s academic record.

Please contact us for additional information or to confidentially refer a student:
- Angela Scoggins, Academic Project Manager, atscoggins@utdallas.edu
- 972-883-2288
- Sarah Maxwell, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, Sarah.Maxwell@utdallas.edu

C. Student Success Center
The Student Success Center provides a variety of services to enhance student success, including a Math Lab, Writing Center, Peer-Led Team Learning, Success Coaching, and more. Instructors may refer students as appropriate: http://www.utdallas.edu/studentsuccess/.

D. Student Outreach and Academic Retention (SOAR)

E. Testing Center
The Testing Center is available to administer online exams, quizzes, and tests for up to 158 students at a time. The test environment is secure and closely monitored. Instructors may give exams in the classroom, at the testing center, or online. If your exams are not administered in the classroom, specify the method in the syllabus. If exams for the entire class are given at the Testing Center on scheduled exam days, the instructor should attend the exam in order to address student questions. The Testing Center is not able to
administer paper-format exams to whole classes, but paper exams may be used when scheduling make-up exams.

- The Testing Center is located on the bottom floor of McDermott library. The director is Sou Leaney, sfl130030@utdallas.edu or x6734. The link to the Testing Center web site is http://www.utdallas.edu/studentsuccess/faculty/index.html.

### Testing Requests

- Complete the online Request Form at http://www.utdallas.edu/studentsuccess/testingcenter/TC-secure302/save-a-seat.php. Scroll down to Testing Center to access the form.
- When completing the form, please include all of your specifications about exam conditions or restrictions. Be sure to include the students’ names and the deadline that you choose for when they must have completed the exam or make-up exam. You can send the make-up exam or other exam via email to the Director of the Testing Center or deliver it personally. Students are not allowed to bring any personal belongings into the Testing Center and are monitored closely while they complete their exams.
- Testing Center requests should be submitted a minimum of 2 weeks prior to your quiz/exam time.
- See the Testing Center web page for more information about scheduling whole-class exams, makeup exams, information needed by students, policies, and hours of operation, http://www.utdallas.edu/studentsuccess/testingcenter/.
- **eLearning Tutorials** – Training is available via organized sessions and individual requests. Click on the Special Training Request Form to arrange an in-person tutorial on setting up quizzes and exams in eLearning, https://www.utdallas.edu/elearning/training/index.html. For more information about all tutorials, see http://www.utdallas.edu/elearning/instructors/eLearningTutorialsFaculty.html. You may find that the Testing Center is particularly helpful for scheduling and administering make-up exams that can take up so much time each semester. See the web page for more information about policies and procedures.

### Library

- The McDermott Library offers many helpful resources for faculty. The Reference Librarians may be reached at 972-883-2643. The Callier Center in Dallas also has a library and can be reached at callierlibrary@utdallas.edu or 972-883-3165.
- You can put readings on reserve for your course. The Library maintains both traditional print Reserves and electronic Reserves. For faculty resources see: http://www.utdallas.edu/library/faculty/index.html
- Videos and DVDs are available to show in classes. Please see the library catalog for available selections: http://www.utdallas.edu/library/index.html. Most classrooms no longer have VHS players, but VHS tapes may be transferred to a digital format by Media Services on request (media@utdallas.edu). Please allow ample time for processing.
VIII. Addressing Problems That May Arise

A. Student non-attendance
It is common to have students listed on your class roster who have never shown up for a class. If you do not regularly take attendance, you might notice this until the occasion of the first class exam or major assignment. Sometimes there is a mismatch between rosters in Orion (which are the accurate ones) and the rosters available in eLearning. If a student is still enrolled but not attending, the adviser or instructor may email the student and advise the student to withdraw from the course before the next deadline. Sometimes, the student began attending class, but then stopped. The student may have dropped out without notifying the instructor, may have intended to withdraw but neglected to submit the required paperwork, or simply wishes to remain in the course without attending, perhaps even without attending or completing coursework. The instructor should grade such performance accordingly, depending on established course grading policies and procedures as indicated in the course syllabus. Please note that if you plan to impose grade penalties for non-attendance (or anything else), you should explain those penalties very clearly in your syllabus.

B. Faculty absence
Faculty who encounter life events that conflict with their classes may discuss the conflict with the Program Head or appropriate Associate Dean if assistance is needed with decisions about alternate teaching arrangements arising from any absence from a regularly scheduled class session.

C. Disruptive student behavior
For serious and/or immediate, threatening behaviors break the law and/or threaten faculty, staff, or other students, call the UTD Police immediately at 972-883-2331 or you may dial 911 and will be transferred to the UTD Police. The university Guidelines for Managing Difficult Student Behavior may be found at http://www.utdallas.edu/deanofstudents/behavior/. All faculty should understand and follow the guidelines indicated here. The Office of Community Standards and Conduct (OCSC) can help identify appropriate resources for students who have indicated they might harm themselves or others. The OCSC may be reached at x6391, Counseling Center at x2575.

D. Troubled student behavior
Refer troubled students to the Counseling Center for behavior changes such as distinct changes in academic performance, withdrawal from others, changes in class participation, crying, outbursts of anger, increased or decreased activity, and poor attendance. More information is available at http://www.utdallas.edu/counseling/faculty/. You also may refer students to the Health center, http://www.utdallas.edu/healthcenter/.

IX. Instructional and Grading Policies

A. Academic policies for undergraduate courses
Important information regarding Academic Advising, Academic Grievances, Final Exams, Grade Changes, Grading Scale, Incomplete Grades, and more is available at
Academic Advisors assist undergraduate students with degree planning, class registration, various approval forms, and graduation applications. Advisors have regularly scheduled hours for drop-in advising. Students are encouraged to meet with an advisor regularly and to seek advice on degree and career planning during non-registration periods.

B. Extra credit policies

Many students ask for opportunities to complete extra credit, and there are some general considerations and gain faculty consensus regarding these requests. This is not intended to limit faculty autonomy, but rather to offset students’ erroneous assertions that granting extra credit is common and expected practice. The question of extra credit may be considered from both an ethical and a pedagogical perspective.

- With regard to ethics, there is a danger of treating some students unfairly if students who are unhappy with their progress in a course are able to earn extra credit on request. It seems reasonable to recommend that \textit{if extra credit opportunities are made available in a course, they must be available to all of the students}, not just to those who specifically request them.
- With regard to how extra credit policies can practices affect students’ learning, it is necessary to consider the relationship between course grades and students’ achievement of course objectives. Over-use of extra credit can result in students passing or earning higher grades in a course even if they have not achieved course objectives. The grade assigned therefore becomes invalid. A small amount of extra credit may be useful for motivating students to complete some work above and beyond course expectations, but \textit{extra credit used to bring up the grades of otherwise low-performing students may be unwise}.

C. Meaning of letter grades

Grade levels are described as follows:

- \textbf{A} = \textit{exceptional achievement, superb command of the subject matter, and can apply, analyze, evaluate, and create with the topics of the course}

- \textbf{B} = \textit{good but not outstanding grasp of the subject matter, able to engage in some higher-order thinking with regard to the course material}

- \textbf{C} = \textit{fair level of achievement with some mastery of most of the course material, with some ability to use the subject matter}

- \textbf{D} = \textit{below average understanding of the subject matter, minimally acceptable performance in demonstrating achievement of course objectives}

- \textbf{F} = \textit{insufficient understanding of the subject matter, unacceptable performance in demonstrating achievement of course objectives}

Plus/Minus grades may be used. A list of administrative grades is included below under “Final Grading Instructions in Orion.”

D. Storage and dissemination of grades

- Grades must be kept in a secure location (e.g., password protected encrypted computer, password protected encrypted flash drive, etc.).
- A student’s grades may not be released or discussed with the student’s parents, friends, family, or classmates. Grades may not be sent by unencrypted email even with written permission from the student.
- It is recommended to put all grades on eLearning as a single point of reference for
students. Some benefits of doing so are:

- Fully encrypted (satisfies UTD security policy and FERPA requirements)
- Professor can grant access to TA for online recording of grades
- Grades are visible to students throughout the semester, reducing surprises and related complaints
- eLearning allows various notes to be added to grade entries that have been changed by the instructor so that there is an electronic documentation of what was done.

E. Managing exams and quizzes

Details and policies regarding the timing of exams, quizzes, and other assessments should be listed in the syllabus. Some instructors send a reminder to students one week prior to each announced exam or quiz. Suggestions for the content of the exam reminder:

- Date and location (a larger room for an exam can be requested from the Administrative Assistant assigned to you well in advance, which will be processed based on availability. The UTD Testing Center is another good option (http://www.utdallas.edu/studentsuccess/testingcenter/).
- Material to be covered (chapters, topics, etc.)
- Open/closed book, notes allowed or not, equation sheet provided or not, etc.
- Requirements or restrictions regarding electronic or communication devices (e.g., cell phones, laptops, smart watches, etc. must be turned off and put away during the exam).

F. Academic dishonesty

- The Office of Community Standards and Conduct guidelines for managing academic dishonesty may be seen at https://www.utdallas.edu/conduct/manage-dishonesty/.
- UTD policy indicates that “Academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to plagiarism, collusion, cheating, fabrication, facilitating academic dishonesty, failure to contribute to a collaborative project, and sabotage” (https://www.utdallas.edu/conduct/dishonesty/).
- Instructors are to collect evidence carefully and then refer the case to UTD Judicial Affairs via an Academic Dishonesty Referral Form (see link below). Instructors are NOT to administer any punitive measure without referring the case to Judicial Affairs. If you suspect students of cheating during a test, you may remove any unauthorized material and discreetly ask the student to move to another seat, but the student must be allowed to finish the test.
- The most important aspect of managing academic dishonesty is prevention. The link above has useful information that instructors are expected to know and follow.
- Ideas to discourage cheating include:
  - Reserve a room large enough to allow an empty seat between all students.
  - If space is insufficient for students to adequately spread out, consider giving two or more equivalent but different exams (A and B) to students sitting side-by-side.
  - All backpacks, purses, bags, notebooks, books, etc. off of desks.
  - All electronic devices (especially smartphones) are to be turned off and put away.
  - No hats allowed.
  - Have the TA in the classroom walk around and help proctor the exam.
  - Count exam papers when completed (or number them ahead of time)
• To ensure you have received all exams from the students present
• To document any absences from the exam

G. Midterm grades
Mid-term grades are required for all undergraduate classes. Plan to have at least one exam or major assignment prior to the midpoint of the semester to provide one or more significant grades upon which to base the students’ midterm grades. The Registrar’s office will email all faculty a reminder about midterm grades shortly before they are due. The date is indicated in the Academic Calendar.

Please remember that midterm grades will be most helpful to students if they are meaningfully tied to students’ progress in achieving course objectives by the mid-point of the semester. The deadline for submitting midterm grades via Orion may be found in the Academic Calendar. Step by step instructions may be found in the “End of semester” section of this document.

H. Withdrawal from courses
The course withdrawal deadlines are listed in the Academic Calendar, http://www.utdallas.edu/academiccalendar/. Types of course withdrawal vary depending on the date in the semester. Some require instructor approval, while others require you to assign a pass or fail grade to the withdrawal, http://www.utdallas.edu/student/catalog/undergrad10/policies/registration.html#dropadd.

X. End of Semester

A. Student feedback about the course experience
Students are invited to complete Course Evaluations online shortly before or during the last week of each semester. All Instructors will receive an email informing them of the evaluation dates. Please set aside 10-15 minutes of class time to encourage students to complete course evaluations using their mobile devices and to inform students that evaluations are important for improving the university, and that student opinion is valuable and has impact on the university.

B. General standards and procedures for review of non-tenure system faculty
Student feedback is just one source of information that is used to evaluate instructor performance. Official policies regarding evaluation procedures, UTDPP1062, are available at https://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1062.

C. Final exams and Reading Days

1. Final exam schedule
The final exam schedule can be found at https://www.utdallas.edu/registrar/final-exam-assignments/. Final exam dates are scheduled by the University. These dates can be found by logging in to Orion (via Galaxy) and are determined shortly after Census Day, which occurs approximately two weeks after the start of the semester. According to UTD rules, a student can be required to take up to 3 final exams on the
same day, but no more. If a student has more than 3 final exams scheduled on the same day, he/she has the right to ask one of the instructors to give him/her a separate exam. A student having 2 or 3 exams on the same day does not have a right to a separate exam, but you may allow a separate exam in these cases if you wish to do so provided you offer the same accommodation to all students in similar circumstances.

All final exams must take place during the final exam week. You may plan and conduct an examination in any regular class period as part of your overall evaluation of the students, including the last class period. Any exam conducted outside the final exam week, however, cannot be treated as or announced under the title of “final exam.” If an instructor does not wish to take advantage of the time allocated in the final exam week, for official purposes this means the course does not have a final exam.

Please note that you can NOT change the time of your final exam even if all of your students agree. Changes can only be made with a request to schedule-pub@utdallas.edu. Faculty should NOT:

- Re-schedule a final exam outside the approved meeting times—even if all students agree—without approval. This also means there can be NO cumulative final exams on the last day of class.
- Give a final exam after the final exam period has ended.
- Ask students to stay longer than the 2 hours and 45 minutes allotted for a final exam.
- Schedule final exams during reading days (see below). Reading days are scheduled between the last day of classes and the first day of the final exam period for the semester.

2. **Reading Days**

Designated **Reading Days** are indicated in the Academic Calendar. Reading days are designed to provide students with a day void of university activities and/or courses to prepare for final exams.

- Activities allowed on reading days:
  - Optional student and class review sessions
- Activities NOT allowed on reading days:
  - Required class review session
  - Early final examinations
  - Required presentation session
  - Student club or group meetings/activities
  - Any gatherings not specifically for review or study of the semester’s academic work.

D. **Submitting final course grades**

Final grades can be posted on eLearning for students to review, but these are not official. You will post your official course grades in Orion via Galaxy. Once grades are posted as final in Orion, the only way to change them is through a multi-signature electronic procedure. Please be sure to check the Academic Calendar for grade submission deadlines.
Submitting grades in Orion via Galaxy using your NetID and password.

A quick overview of the Galaxy grade submission process follows:

- Log in to Galaxy
- Click on Faculty Center listed below Orion Self-Service
- Click on My Schedule under Faculty Center
- On the course you want to grade, click on the Grade Roster icon
- Input grades for each student using the drop down menu
- SAVE
- Change Approval Status to “Approved”
- You have completed grading for this course

Please enter a grade for all students; failing to submit a grade results in complications for staff, students, and registrar’s office.

If you experience any problems submitting grades online, please email schedule-pub@utdallas.edu or call the Office of the Registrar at 972-883-2342.

Final Grading Instructions in Orion

Very Important Items to Know BEFORE Final Grading:

- Orion will attempt to log you off after a period of inactivity (about 20 minutes). This is a security action. The amount of time cannot be changed.

- You MUST ENTER ALL GRADES on a Final Grade Roster before approving the grade roster.

- You MUST SAVE after entering grades BEFORE performing any additional actions like “notification to all or selected students” or exiting the grade roster or while entering grades for large rosters (periodically save to avoid loss of work).

- There are two Grade Roster Actions you can take to indicate Approval Status:
  - Not Approved – Initial step when grades are entered
  - Approved – Final step once ALL grades are entered

- Orion provides the appropriate grade options for the student in the drop down menu. For example, if your course is taught as an undergraduate course, but you have a student in your course taking the course Credit/No Credit, the drop down menu will contain the grades for Credit/No Credit (CR, NC, X, I, NR).

- Explanation of administrative grades follows (http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2016/undergraduate/policies/academic#grading-scale):
  - I = Incomplete, which may be used when a student has completed at least 70% of the required course material but cannot complete all requirements by the end of the semester. Course work must be completed within the time period set by the instructor, not to exceed eight weeks from the first day of the subsequent long semester.
  - NR = Non-recorded, used for ONLY grades that indicate the student grade awaits review from the Office of Judicial Affairs. Instructors may assign this grade if a case is or will be with the Office of Judicial Affairs. Please consult with that office for guidance.
- **NF** = Failing for non-attendance (Undergraduate only, to indicate that a student has NEVER attended any classes or completed any course-related activity)
- **MN** = Mid-term Grade: only used if there is not enough information to provide a grade. Do not use for final grade. (Undergraduate only)
- If you do not know which grade to record for a student due to a missed final exam or other missing information, please follow the guidelines in the appropriate undergraduate or graduate course catalog for an incomplete OR consult your program head or associate dean. You MUST assign a grade to every student on your roster.

- The Office of the Registrar updates posting of final grades twice daily after all final exams are completed for the term. Students will be able to see the final grade online after the grades are posted.

- If you need instructions on how to upload grades, please email grading@utdallas.edu on how to complete this procedure.

- Questions, comments, concerns, feedback—during normal workdays and business hours (this does NOT include University holidays), please email grading@utdallas.edu (24- to 48-hour response) OR call 972-883-2342.

### XI. Post-Semester Wrap-Up

#### A. Record keeping
- The university has record-keeping obligations to various accreditation agencies. Please consult with your program head regarding whether or not, and if so, what examples of student work must be archived, and in what way you will be expected to produce statistical evidence of aggregate Student Learning Outcomes and Course Learning Outcomes.
- Students have the right to request a review of the grades received in any class. According to the State of Texas Records Retention Schedule (Agency Item 762, [http://www.utdallas.edu/ehs/download/Records_Retention_Schedule.pdf](http://www.utdallas.edu/ehs/download/Records_Retention_Schedule.pdf)), all faculty members must retain student exams and other student work that has not been returned to students for one calendar year. Records may include but are not limited to: examinations and answers; quizzes and answers; course papers; term papers; and essay assignments.

#### B. TA evaluations
- TA Evaluation is performed at the end of each semester by the instructor. The TA is allowed to see the evaluation and make comments. Both the TA and the instructor should sign the evaluation and submit to the designated AA.
- See summary of graduate TA general information and responsibilities at [http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/ta_handbook.htm](http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/ta_handbook.htm)

#### C. Grade changes
Policies regarding grade changes may be seen in the current course catalog, [http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2016/undergraduate/policies/academic#grade-changes](http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2016/undergraduate/policies/academic#grade-changes).
1. Faculty-initiated

After a final grade has been recorded by the Office of the Registrar, faculty may change grades **only** to correct a clerical error or replace a grade of "incomplete" or "NR." A faculty-initiated change of a final grade may be submitted in Orion, and will be forwarded to the department or program head, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, and the school Dean for approval. Grade changes must be submitted by the end of the eighth week of the following long semester after the grade was awarded. Any grade change initiated after the eighth week of the long semester requires the approval of the instructor, the department or program head, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, the School Dean, and the Dean of Undergraduate Education.

2. Student-initiated

- The only grounds for considering a grade to be incorrect are either clerical error or that the grade is arbitrary or capricious. Examples of clerical error would include, but are not limited to, a mistake in adding component grades, a mistake in recording grades, or attributing a paper or examination to the wrong student. "Arbitrary or capricious" means that the grade cannot be considered reasonable given the material of the course, the overall performance of the class, and the individual performance of the student. The university assumes that course-work is best evaluated by the instructor in the immediate context of the course activity. Requests for reconsideration must show with clear and convincing evidence why this assumption should be set aside.

- If a student believes he or she has been assigned a grade on the basis of a clerical error or that the grade is arbitrary or capricious, the student should first seek to discuss the grade with the instructor. If this does not lead to satisfactory understanding, the student may file a formal appeal following the procedures described for academic grievances in the Rules, Regulations, and Statutory Requirements Section C. (See "Academic Grievances" in Appendix I, http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdsp5005).

- Sometimes, a student may ask you to change a grade without academic merit. Such a request may come with a wide range of comments involving the student’s emotional or financial state, his or her academic or non-academic workload, how well the student is doing in other courses, and the ramifications of the grade to the student’s GPA or scholarship. Additional arguments may be raised involving any number of perceived shortcomings in the textbook, the classroom, the classmates, the instructor, etc. None of these constitutes an acceptable basis for changing a grade that has been accurately delivered according to the actual performance of the student subject to the course guidelines.
• In responding to a student’s request for a higher grade, it is recommended that you be firm but kind. Avoid blaming a student at a time of distress, even if you feel the blame has been earned. It is reasonable, however, to say that the grade reflects the work that was delivered, and that is the only basis that exists for grading at UTD. At the same time, it is appropriate to sympathize with the student's situation, and you can recommend what can be done for better results next time, i.e., change the focus from negative (bad grade) to positive (future improvement).

• Although mistakes sometimes happen and must be corrected, please be aware that grade changes are especially scrutinized and improper ones can reflect badly on not only the instructor, but also the school and the university as a whole.