August 12, 2009

TO: Academic Senate Members

FROM: Office of Academic Governance
Julie Allen, Academic Governance Secretary

RE: Academic Senate Meeting

The Academic Senate will meet on Wednesday, August 19, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. in the T.I. Auditorium, ECS South 2.102.

Please bring the agenda packet with you to this meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at x6715.

Attachments

xc: David Daniel    James Marquart    Larry Redlinger    Tricia Losavio
    Hobson Wildenthal  John Wiorkowski  Darrelene Rachavong  Sgt. Rick Bauer
    Andrew Blanchard  Calvin Jamison    Abby Kratz          Deans
    Serenity King     Inga Musselman   Rhonda Blackburn   Diana Kao, SGA President

2009-2010 Academic Senate:

Amin Gutierrez de Piñeres, Sheila    Izen, Joseph
Anderson, Mark                     Kaplan, Marilyn
Andreescu, Titu                    Kieschnick, Robert
Beron, Kurt                        Kumar, Nanda
Bhatia, Dinesh                     Leaf, Murray *
Boots, Denise                      Menon, Syam
Breen, Gail
Burr, John
Cantrell, Cyrus
Chandrasekaran, R.
Cordell, David **
Dieckmann, Greg
Dowling, Jay
Durbin, Kelly
Hoffman, John
Holmes, Jennifer
Holub, Shayla
Huxtable-Jester, Karen
Ishak-Boushaki, Mustapha

*Speaker
**Secretary

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
AGENDA

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
AUGUST 19, 2009, 2:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  DR. DANIEL
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  DR. LEAF
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  DR. LEAF
   May 20, 2009 Senate Meeting
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT  DR. LEAF
5. FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE REPORT  DR. REDMAN
6. ALCOHOL IN THE PUB - STUDENT PROPOSAL  DR. LEAF
7. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES RECOMMENDATIONS FOR  DR. LEAF
   SENATE AND UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES
8. CEP  DR. CANTRELL
   Transfer of Credit
9. HANDBOOK ON OPERATING PROCEDURES (HOP)  MS. KING
   NEW POLICY: Red Flag Identity Theft Program
10. HOP: NEW POLICY on Payment to Human Subjects (Research)  MS. KING
11. POLICY MEMORANDA REVISION: Policy on Research Units  MS. KING
12. POLICY MEMORANDA REVISION: Intellectual Property Policy  MS. KING
13. ADJOURNMENT  DR. DANIEL
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
May 20, 2009

PRESENT: Sheila Amin Gutierrez de Piñeres, Mark Anderson, Kurt Beron, Gail Breen, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Kelly Durbin, John Hoffman, Jennifer Holmes, Karen Huxtable-Jester, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Surya Janakiraman, Robert Kieschnick, Murray Leaf, Paul Mac Alevey, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Michael Rebello, Elizabeth Salter, Richard Scotch, Robert Stern, Mary Urquhart

ABSENT: Titu Andreescu, James Bartlett, Dinesh Bhatia, Denise Boots, John Burr, Cyrus Cantrell, Gregg Dieckmann, Santosh D’Mello, Jay Dowling, Juan Gonzalez, Shayla Holub, Joe Izen, Marilyn Kaplan, Kamran Kiasaleh, Nanda Kumar, Adrienne McLean, Syam Menon, Dennis Miller, B.P.S. Murthi, Steven Nielsen, Tim Redman, Mark Rosen, Young Ryu, Chelliah Sriskandarajah, Lucien Thompson, S. Venkatesan

VISITORS: Hobson Wildenthal, Andrew Blanchard, Calvin Jamison Serenity King, Michael Coleman, Theresa M. Towner, Abby Kratz, Tonja Wissinger, Diana Kao, Chris Parr

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Dr. Wildenthal called the meeting to order. Dr. Daniel arrived shortly thereafter.

Dr. Daniel thanked the outgoing Academic Senate members for the service and welcomed the incoming members. He welcomes input from faculty governance.

Dr. Daniel asked if there were any questions or comments. He reported that the budget has almost been resolved; it looks positive thus far. This translates into the expansion of the faculty as the dollars can be made available to strengthen our programs. Next biennium may be more of a problem.

There was a question regarding the search for a new police chief. Dr. Jamison spoke regarding the search and that the job specifications have been completed. Mike Tacker, of The UT System, is our interim police chief.
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Dr. Salter made the motion to approve the agenda as circulated. Dr. Holmes seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Piñeres moved to approve the minutes of the April 15, 2009 meeting as circulated. Dr. Urquhart seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT

1. Staff Appreciation Day. Staff Council and the Business Affairs Office will be sponsoring a 3 day Staff Appreciation event on July 20, 21, and 22, 2009.

The list of events is as follows:
July 20, 10 a.m.: Dr. JoyLynn Reed will give a presentation on Health and Wellness
11 a.m.: Health and Wellness fair
July 21, 2 p.m.: Terry Cartwright will give a presentation on Customer Service
3 p.m.: Customer Service fair
July 22, 10:30 a.m.: Dr. Jamison will give a Welcome/Thank you speech
10:45 a.m. Sue Taylor will give a presentation on “Dare to Face Success”
11:30 a.m.: Lunch (all are invited, staff and faculty) with prizes, music and much more

Tricia Losavio, President of Staff Council, is asking for the Faculty support in allowing their staff to attend all of the events. If this is not possible due to the staff’s responsibilities they ask that you allow them to attend at least one event.

2. I have drafted a policy on closing programs and cutting faculty because of financial exigency and forwarded it to the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct to develop. The policy is intended to parallel our policy on program retrenchment for academic reasons as closely as makes sense. The basic definition of exigency is: “Financial exigency is an imminent financial crisis that threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and that cannot be alleviated by less drastic means.” The draft is meant to construe Regents Rules 310003, which outlines the process, so as to comport with the recommendations of the Faculty Advisory Council resolutions of December 4, 2008, in response to events at UTMB and with the AAUP Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure. With the agreement of the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct, I also submitted the draft to the UT System Faculty Advisory Council at its meeting this past May 14 and 15. They made some amendments and agreed to adopt the amended version as a model for all the campuses.

3. According to Marilyn’s notes from the Caucus meeting, toward the end several people voiced concerns regarding the summer schedule. There was not enough time between Spring and Summer and between Summer and Fall terms. We discussed this in Council,
where the underlying issue appeared to be the length of the summer term. Do we want to discuss this, and if so do we first want a committee to develop a definite proposal?

John Wiorowski, Chair of the Calendar Committee, was recognized and explained that the current schedule was so constrained that no more time was available. The only possibility was to reduce the number of weeks by increasing the number of hours per day of instruction. Since this was already in the agenda, the Senate agreed to continue the discussion at that point.

4. Abby Kratz has begun the process of generalizing the application for travel in the Archer program to cover all academic travel, and to provide feedback to faculty regarding students applying for travel who might pose a danger to themselves or others.

5. The faculty regent bill has now failed to get through the first funnel to the house floor. In the process, a substitute bill was accepted on April 29 that that was almost the same as what I originally drafted for the FAC. But there were two differences: first, the governor is not bound to appoint someone nominated by the Chancellor. Second, the definition of “faculty” no longer excludes individuals holding administrative appointments of dean or above. These changes were made in the House Jurisprudence Committee. The FAC opposed the changes, and the chair and I both wrote to Representative Pierson’s legislative liaison explaining why. We think they understood and would have pursued amendments on the floor. If the bill were not amended, we would have opposed it. Seeing what has happened in this session, we do not intend to try to reintroduce it again the next session. Instead, we will begin talking to our Regents about an alternative: to have FAC officers sit regularly with the BOR and its committees, rather than to be part of the audience at BOR meetings as is now the case.

6. The House version of the Concealed Carry bill also did not get past the first hurdle. It was buried even more deeply in the Calendar Committee’s list for approval than the faculty regent bill. As I have said, however, this does not mean that it is entirely dead. The Senate version, SB 1164, is still alive and if it passes the House version could come back to life. Yesterday, on the Senate floor, the Senate agreed to several amendments proposed by Senator Wentworth. One group would allow parents to request that a student be assigned to a dormitory in which concealed handguns were not permitted. The other would allow campuses to establish rules prohibiting license holders from carrying guns “if the institution receives notice from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under Section 61.0904(b), Education Code, concerning an increase in gun-related violence on higher education campuses.” A third amendment asked for a “study of gun-related violence on higher education campuses.” Evidently, Senator Wentworth recognizes that other Senators think the bill might rest on rather doubtful premises. These amendments might gut the major problem with the bill—prohibiting campuses from barring guns if they want to—but it would be still better not to have it at all.

7. The Academic Council has appointed the Committee on Committees. All those whose terms were expiring were reappointed: Cy Cantrell (ECS), Marie Chevrier (EPPS), and Juan Gonzales (NS&M). They have agreed to serve.
8. Marilyn Kaplan has offered to continue as Senate liaison to Student Government. Dr. Leaf asked if the Senate agreed. The Senate agreed.

9. Summer Senate meetings. The Senate agreed not to meet in June or July, unless a pressing matter came up and the Academic Council considered a meeting necessary.

Upon the request of Speaker Leaf, the Senate authorized an email ballot to approve candidates for degrees in the Fall Commencement if it would not be possible to approve these candidates at the August meeting.

5. FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Speaker Leaf reported:

The FAC met Thursday and Friday, May 14 and 15. I attended with David Cordell. Marilyn has gone to Europe. The main action item was approval of the Model Exigency Policy as noted, but there were a number of interesting and important conversations. I’ll just give the gist, and answer questions if you have them.

1. Raymund Paredes, chair of the Coordinating Board (CB). Topic was mainly CB policy on PhD programs. Discussion was partly stimulated by the fact that the CB has just turned a proposal for a PhD in Psychology at UTSA. The discussion was especially forthright. Mr. Paredes main theme was that we had too many PhD granting institutions, and not enough high quality PhD programs. We cannot get “tier 1” institutions by legislative declaration; they have to be funded. Right now we have too little funding and adding PhD programs will simply make funding even thinner. As benchmarks, he has selected a very sensible handful of other institutions: Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, and Arizona. And his point was that all of them are funded at substantially higher levels than the current seven “emerging research campuses.” He has been making the case to the legislature very plainly. The second topic was his insistence that there be a “market” for the graduates. We discussed this at length. The conception of a market need not be simple-minded. It is up to us to say what it is and make the case. The third topic was the idea that PhD programs have to be built on campuses with a strong undergraduate base. This has obvious unhappy implications for campuses which at the moment have what amounts to open admissions, but no one seriously argued with the idea.

2. Barry McBee, VC for governmental relations reported on the legislature. Financially, we look ok for this biennium but there is worry about the next, assuming that the federal stimulus program will not continue. It looks like some kind of bill on tuition will pass but it will not be a rollback and will continue to be in fairly good shape. His remarks on the gun bill and faculty regent are incorporated above.

3. Barry Burgdorf, General Council. The FAC mainly focused on recourse in the case that administrators or the regents did not follow regents’ rules. The answer is that regents’ rules are administrative law. Use what recourse is provided.
4. We had dinner with Chancellor Cigarroa at Bauer House. Nice digs and he impressed everyone as a very good person.

5. Francie Frederick, General Council to the Regents. Discussion mainly focused on the new regents and the possibility of a FAC representative as an alternative to the faculty regent. There are three: James R. Huffines, William Powell, and Robert L. Stillwell. Regent Huffines is a reappointment, and has also been reappointed Board chair. Regent Stillwell has ties to the Texas Public Policy Foundation. We will invite Regent Stillwell to the FAC. We will pursue the idea of the FAC chair as a representative with the Board.

6. Conversation with David Prior and Pedro Reyes. This covered many topics. Most of the time was devoted to the governor’s “seven breakthrough solutions.” Dr. Prior has generally been taking the approach of explaining to the governor’s office what we already do along the lines the “solutions” are demanding, and asking for objections. So far there have been no objections, and some of the demands have been modified. We will not adopt the proposal for “incentives” based on student evaluations, otherwise known as payment by applause meter.

7. Finally, we discussed briefly the wiki I have started: Texas Faculty Hi Ed Wiki. Please Google it and consider making contributions.

6. SUMMER SCHEDULE

The discussion of the summer schedule concerned the short length of time between the end of one semester and the beginning of the next. Dr. Wiorkowski discussed the academic calendar and the regulations of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. It was decided through these discussions that the schedule should remain as it is.

7. SENATE RESOLUTION ON FIREARMS

The proposed resolution was discussed. Dr. Leaf explained that the wording came from UT Austin and reflected the advice of scholars from their law school to avoid conflict with the state prohibition on lobbying by state employees. A correction to the university name and additional wording were proposed and accepted as by Dr. Leaf as the maker. Dr Holmes seconded the motion and also accepted the amendments. The amended resolution was.

Resolution:
The Faculty Senate at The University of Texas at Dallas believes that carrying firearms on the University campus by anyone other than law enforcement officers is detrimental to the educational environment and safety of the students, faculty, and staff.

The resolution was approved by the Academic Senate unanimously.
8. PROPOSED UNIVERSITY TESTING CENTER

Dr. Piñeres described the proposed University Testing Center. There were discussions regarding the budget for the center, the concept, and the use of the center. Dr. Leaf asked the Senate if they wished to endorse the proposal. The consensus was that they wished to do so. Dr. Leaf will charge the Committee on Academic Integrity to work with the administration on developing the proposal further.

Dr. Piñeres moved to endorse the proposal in principle. Dr. Kieschnick seconded the motion. The motion carried.

9. APPOINT SENIOR LECTURER FROM THE SCHOOL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Dr. Leaf explained the problem we have this year with Senate representation, which was originally raised by Dr. Salter. The Academic Senate does not have a representative from the School of Interdisciplinary Studies. We try to have at least one person from each school. For this reason, the rules provide that as the first step in the tallying process if at least one person is nominated from a school, the person from that school with the highest number of votes will be elected, regardless of their standing in the totals of votes all together. However, this rule pertains only to the tenure-system candidates. The non-tenure-system faculty (Senior Lecturers, etc.) all run as a single group and are voted on only by non-tenure-system faculty, without division by school. This is in part because only four positions are presently allowed and there are seven schools, and in part because there are no many different kinds of appointments in this group. There was a representative from the School of Interdisciplinary Studies who ran in the Senior Lecturer election this spring, but as it happens she came out fifth in order of ranking in the votes received. So she was not among the four elected. If she had been, Interdisciplinary Studies would have been represented and there would be no problem.

Senate rules also allow the Senate to appoint faculty to the Senate to fill vacancies left by Senators who leave or resign, but do not provide for a situation in which we have vacancies but no one has left or resigned.

Since there is only one tenure-system faculty member in the School of Interdisciplinary Studies apart from the Dean, the present situation is understandable. No one can be thought to have taken their faculty responsibilities lightly. But it would be extremely complicated to try to amend the bylaws to provide a remedy in advance for all the different ways this kind of situation might arise. Instead, Dr. Leaf recommended that we adopt a policy of acting in the spirit of our basic concern with effective representation and make appointments of this sort on an ad hoc basis as needed.

Accordingly Dr. Leaf asked for a motion to appoint the candidate next in order of voting priority in the Senior Lecturer election in order to provide the School of Interdisciplinary
Studies representation on the Academic Senate, since the regular election did not provide such representation.

There was further discussion on making the appointment, which included suggestions for amending the bylaws. Dr. Leaf agreed to find wording for the bylaws to expand the provision to assure at least one tenure-system representative for each school to include the possibility of a non-tenure-system representative.

Dr. Scotch made the motion to approve the appointment of the candidate. Dr. Holmes seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Dr. Salter introduced Dr. Tonja Wissinger, Senior Lecturer, School of Interdisciplinary Studies, as the person thus appointed.

10. CEP

10. A. Dr. Teresa Towner introduced the Doctoral Degree Proposal for the Doctor of Philosophy in Science/Mathematics Education.

Dr. Towner made the motion to approve the Doctoral Degree Proposal. Dr. Holmes seconded the motion.

Dr. Urquhart discussed the degree program and answered questioned regarding the requirements.

Dr. Leaf asked if there was further discussion. There being none, Dr. Leaf called for a vote. Dr. Towner made the motion. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion passed.

10. B. Dr. Coleman discussed the changes to Undergraduate Catalog. The section of the 2009 Undergraduate catalog supplement passed by CEP at their last meeting contained information on the academic disciplines and degrees offered. There were four substantive changes which had previously been approved by CEP and the Academic Senate. They are listed below with the link to their place within the catalog. The question here is only to approve final copy.

Degree in Actuarial Science
http://www.utdallas.edu/student/catalog/undergrad09/nsm/as.html

Degree in Emerging Media and Communication
http://www.utdallas.edu/student/catalog/undergrad09/ah/emac.html

Degree in Geospatial Information Sciences
http://www.utdallas.edu/student/catalog/undergrad09/epps/gis.html

Minor in Health Care Studies
http://www.utdallas.edu/student/catalog/undergrad09/is/is.html#bs
Other changes were administrative or editorial and were approved by the faculty within the academic unit where the changes were proposed.

Dr. Leaf asked for a motion to approve the Undergraduate Catalog. Richard Scotch made the motion. Sheila Pineres seconded. The motion passed.

11. HEARING TRIBUNAL SELECTION

Dr. Leaf discussed the list of twenty Hearing Tribunal members circulated in the agenda. The Regent’s Rules require that the Senate elect the panel by secret ballot. The Council is therefore offering this list as its nominees. It is the largely the same list as last year. The page with the list has spaces for additional names, and for Senators to indicate their vote. Dr. Leaf called for further nominations. Dr. R. Chandrasekaran was nominated and placed on the ballot. The ballots were distributed and the current Academic Senate was instructed to vote for twenty members for the Hearing Tribunal Pool by marking off (deselect) the one nominee(s) they did not favor. The ballots were collected and will be tabulated by the Academic Governance Secretary. The results will be reported in the minutes of the June Academic Senate meeting.

12. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INTERPRETATION OF THE BYLAWS

Dr. Leaf presented two sense of the senate resolutions on the interpretation of two questions that were raised regarding the Senate bylaws in the last round of elections, namely whether a person appointed as Associate Provost for less than half time was or was not an administrative appointment at the level of “Dean or higher,” and whether the allocation of seats for non-tenure-system representamens on the basis of ten percent of the number of senators meant ten percent of the number of Senate positions or of the number of Senators actually elected. The resolutions were as follow:

Sense of the Senate Resolution Regarding the Interpretation of Eligibility for Senate Election in the Handbook of Operating Procedure, Title III. 21. B.

1. It is the sense of the Senate that Title III.21.B.1., “that faculty members having administrative appointments at the level of Dean or higher are not eligible to serve on the Academic Senate” does not include tenured faculty serving as Associate Provosts for specific functions on less than half time appointments, provided that such faculty retain their normal faculty duties and responsibilities apart from serving in this capacity. In this interpretation, the Senate considers that the relevant interpretation of “Dean or higher” means that the person is either a Dean or someone superior to a Dean in the line of administrative officials responsible for faculty merit evaluation, recommendations regarding pay, and work assignments.

The purpose of the rule is threefold. First, it is to assure that the Senate is not encumbered in its ability to serve as free and open deliberative assembly. To this end, no member should have to fear that disagreements with another member might result in
retaliation in their conditions of work, nor should anyone be in a position to promise rewards in conditions of work in return for agreement. Second, it is to assure that academic policies are made by faculty who will be directly affected by them and will also be most directly responsible for carrying them out. And third, it is to assure that the Senate and Administration will be able to serve as checks on each other to assure that the operations of both remain transparent and in accordance with agreed-upon rules, policies, and procedures. We consider that maintaining eligibility for Associate Provosts who have earned their faculty rank through the peer review process, continue to be subject to that process, and retain their faculty duties as described is consistent with all these aims, and with the general spirit of participatory governance that we have tried to foster.

In addition, we support the Provost’s initiative in making such appointments to improve liaison with the faculty and faculty governance system, and consider that maintaining eligibility for such appointees is consistent with such support.

2. It is the sense of the Senate that the allocation of Senate positions to Senior Lecturers on the basis of “the total number of Senators” in Title III, 21, B. 3, should always be construed to mean the number of Senate positions to be filled by tenure-system faculty, not the number of tenure-system faculty actually elected in any given year. This is implicit in the requirement that the elections for Senior Lecturer positions and tenure-system positions should be carried on concurrently.

In discussion, Dr. Leaf was asked why we do not amend the bylaws. Dr. Leaf’s view was that in the case of the first resolution, this was an experimental situation that may be modified. It would be needlessly complicated to try to incorporate these considerations in the bylaws at this time when the situation itself might be dynamic. If we amend the bylaws it must go to OGC for approval. A sense of the senate resolution remains only in our minutes. It is appropriate for the Senate to decide how to interpret its own rules. With respect to the second resolution, Dr. Leaf considered that the interpretation was actually implicit in the fact that the bylaws have both the tenure system elections and the non-tenure-system elections running concurrently. So an amendment to underline this would be in a strict sense redundant. This is just additional clarification.

Robert Kieschnick moved to approve resolution number 1. Mark Anderson seconded. The motion carried.

Elizabeth Salter moved to approve the second resolution. Adrienne McLean seconded. The motion carried.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

Dr. Daniel asked for a motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED: ___________________________  DATE: ____________________

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Senate
March 5, 2009

David Daniel, President
The University of Texas at Dallas
800 W. Campbell Rd. AD22
Richardson, TX 75080-3021

Dear Dr. Daniel:

On behalf of Student Government and the students of UT Dallas, the Student Senate voices its unanimous support for the attached recommendation from the Alcohol in the Pub Advisory Committee.

The committee carefully researched the history of The Pub and reviewed input from several thousand students, staff, and faculty: its recommendation calls upon the University and its food service provider to facilitate the safe and legal service of beer and wine in The Pub.

We understand that this is a considerable undertaking and one that draws heavy criticism from its opponents. As representatives of the Student Body we are fully aware of and willing to accept this as a consequence of our endorsement. The call for alcohol service on campus has surfaced repeatedly over the past 25 years and gained support from faculty and staff, yet remains unanswered.

We simply cannot ignore the students who make this call; it is with these students in mind, and the best interests of the Student Body at heart, that we urge you to act upon the attached recommendation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Steven Rosson
Student Government President
The University of Texas at Dallas
INTRODUCTION
For 25 years, stakeholders at The University of Texas at Dallas have posed the question of whether alcohol should be available for purchase and consumption on campus. In November 2008, Student Government President Steven Rosson established the Alcohol-in-the-Pub Advisory Committee (AIPAC) as an ad-hoc committee of Student Government to examine community feedback and deliver a comprehensive and final recommendation to the University administration based on all available information.

HISTORY OF ALCOHOL IN THE PUB
Student demand for alcohol service on campus began during the April 1984 Student Senate elections when a referendum was placed on the ballot to determine student opinion regarding the establishment of an on-campus pub. The certified vote showed 543 students (78.6%) in favor and 147 (21.3%) opposed. President Robert Rutford asked an ad-hoc committee to review and evaluate carefully the legal and financial considerations of an on-campus pub with alcohol service. Nine months later, in January 1985, the Ad Hoc Pub Committee submitted its report, complete with analyses of related legal, licensing, and financial matters. Their ultimate opinion was "that an on-campus pub would be a viable enterprise here and that it would contribute to the development of the university community."

Fifteen years later in April 1999, a new Pub/Coffeehouse Committee delivered a report to the Academic Council that again detailed funding, management, liability, and safety. Its final recommendation was "that a campus Pub/Coffeehouse be established" and that "a liquor license to serve beer and wine ... be purchased by The University of Texas System." The committee emphasized that "students who choose to drink must learn to do so in a responsible manner [and] a Campus Pub/Coffeehouse would aid in this learning process." In September 1999, SGA President Jacob Gurwitz noted in a Senate-authorized memorandum to the Board of Regents that the pub issue had "a unified front within the school (93% student vote, a unanimous Faculty Senate vote, and the support of the President of the University." The University of Texas System Office of General Counsel subsequently explained that Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents prohibited alcohol in such an establishment due to Richardson being a 'dry' zone. It was suggested that this issue be revisited at a future time.

Discussions of an on-campus pub continued until February 2002 when The Pub officially opened its doors. Though it provided a venue for students to eat, drink, and socialize, it did so without serving alcoholic beverages as had been the original intent of the stakeholders who supported it. Though students continue to enjoy dining in The Pub, the question of serving alcohol has been resurrected repeatedly every year since.

In November 2006, voters in the City of Richardson voiced opposition to the 'private club' restriction for bars and restaurants that served alcohol and the ban on beer/wine sales for off-premises consumption. The City subsequently lifted these restrictions: Richardson is no longer a 'dry' zone.

Students, staff, and faculty have called for alcohol sales on campus repeatedly since 1984. Richardson is no longer a 'dry' zone and the principal legal impediment to this call no longer exists: demand for on-campus alcohol service remains strong.

FEEDBACK AND CONSIDERATIONS
In reaching consensus on a final recommendation, AITPAC consulted several sources of feedback and information. Surveys, personal interviews, direct correspondence, the Student Government online forum, Police data, and research into other Universities provided a comprehensive view of student opinion on the issue and were of tremendous aid to the committee in reaching a final conclusion.
THE STUDENT AFFAIRS SURVEY

AITPAC began its deliberations by examining input from a November 2007 survey that asked: “Should beer and wine be sold in The Pub after 5:00 p.m. to those 21 or older, with a 3-drink limit?” The survey had 3,485 respondents with 2,655 (76.2%) in favor and 844 (24.2%) opposed. The affiliation breakdown was 2,935 (84.4%) students, 163 (4.7%) faculty, and 481 (13.8%) staff.

The follow-up question read: “If ‘no’, why?” 837 respondents answered this question, with some saying that they only opposed the time restriction or the 3-drink limit. Others cited a host of reasons which committee members grouped into six main categories: the use of fee money to support alcohol use, a negative impact on campus life, personal distaste for drinking, University liability, enforcement difficulties, and students attending classes while intoxicated. We discussed each of these at substantial length and determined that some, such as the fee allocation, liability, and enforcement issues, were either based on incorrect assumptions or not directly applicable to the University.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ONLINE FORUM

In October 2008, Student Government added a poll and discussion thread to its online forum. The specific question asked “Would you support the sale of beer/wine in the Pub to those of legal drinking age?” 51% of respondents, which can include anyone with a University NetID, said “Yes, without additional restrictions.” 26% of respondents said “Yes, but only with time or other restrictions.” As is consistent with our other surveys, 22% said “No.” Students, staff, and faculty authored 31 written responses to the question, which remain posted on the forum and primarily fall within the six categories set forth above.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT SOUND-OFF

The next survey was a November 2008 Student Government sound-off in which Senators conducted face-to-face interviews with nearly 250 students. The most answered question was “Do you support alcohol in The Pub?” and approximately 80% of respondents were ambivalent to, in agreement, or in strong agreement. Fewer than 20% of students marked that they disagreed or strongly disagreed.

This sound-off was important to us because it is the most recent on the topic of alcohol in The Pub and is consistent with several past surveys: the 76.2% from the Student Affairs survey, the 77% from the Student Government online forum, and the 78% in the April 1984 referendum. Though much has changed about our University in the past 25 years, student demand for on-campus alcohol service has not descended below 76% in any of our research.

Each survey conducted over the past 25 years on the sale of beer/wine service on campus has yielded responses of at least 76% in favor.

UT DALLAS POLICE INFORMATION

In February 2009 the UT Dallas Police Department provided AITPAC with statistics on alcohol-related offenses. In 2007 there were 130 minors in possession or consumption of alcohol, 64 DWI/DUIs (including intoxicated adults and all minors), 24 public intoxications, 3 purchasing or furnishing alcohol to minors, and 7 violations of the Texas Open Container Law. 2008 saw a substantial decrease in most of these numbers: 86 minors in possession or consumption, 46 DWI/DUIs, 12 public intoxications, 4 purchasing or furnishing alcohol to minors, and 5 open container violations.
The UT Dallas Police Department could not speak to a specific reason for the decrease, though the committee noted that it corresponded with the legalization of beer and wine sales for off-premise consumption in Richardson. As more options became available to students for the safe and legal purchase and consumption of alcohol, the number of alcohol-related offenses sharply decreased. We do not purport the 2008 figures to represent a new all-time high, though we believe that serving alcohol on campus will ultimately lead to a safer and more law-abiding student body.

OTHER UNIVERSITIES

AITPAC found many Universities that allow the sale of alcohol on campus, though we focused specifically on The University of Texas at El Paso and The University of Texas at Austin because they are governed by the same State laws and Regents’ Rules as UT Dallas.

In both cases we found that the Universities themselves do not sell or serve alcohol, but rather designate an auxiliary for that purpose. At UT Austin, the Cactus Café and Bar, managed under the Texas Union, provides a full-service bar Monday through Thursday 5pm-midnight, Friday 5pm-2am, and Saturday 8:30pm-2am.

At UT El Paso, the Mine Shaft, located in the Student Union building, provides beer and wine Monday and Wednesday from 3pm-9pm and Thursday from 3pm-10:30pm. Their food services vendor, Sodexo, manages alcohol sales.

Some of the most prestigious schools in Texas allow the sale of alcohol on campus.

UT DALLAS STAFF COUNCIL

In 2008, the UT Dallas Staff Council sent a school-wide email to staff inviting all to provide input on the alcohol issue and attend a meeting on December 10th to discuss it in detail. At that meeting, staff representatives reported being contacted by constituents who wanted to provide their opinions in record numbers. After a lengthy discussion, Staff Council voted without dissent to support this endeavor. At its meeting on February 11, 2009, it was resolved that “The Staff Council unanimously supports the allowance of the legal sale and purchase of beer and wine in the UT Dallas Pub with the establishment of some regulations and measures which reasonably and prudently safeguards our community.”

THIRSTY THURSDAY

In October 2007 as part of Alumni Weekend and Homecoming, the Offices of Alumni Relations and Student Life invited students, faculty, and alumni to The Pub to partake in free food and beverages, including beer for those of legal age, at the first on-campus Thirsty Thursday event. It was heavily attended, feedback was exceedingly positive, and no serious disruptions were reported. The Office of Alumni Relations is currently planning a similar event in The Pub, New Grads’ Happy Hour, for May 2008.

Alcohol service on campus has not been shown to hurt the academic environment. Rather, from these events, it appears to foster social interaction within the school.
CONCLUSIONS
Based on direct feedback, independent research, and tangible data, the committee offers the following thoughts and a final recommendation on alcohol service in The Pub.

RATIONALE
Opposition to alcohol service on campus is not without merit. The committee strongly considered feedback from thousands of University stakeholders and understands that some are fundamentally opposed to alcohol use or feel strongly that it should not be provided at an institution of higher education. The committee respects these opinions but cannot ignore the potential benefits to student life and the calls of a vast majority of our campus community over the past quarter century.

The committee also notes that many concerns about the sale of alcohol are not applicable in practice. Student fee money, for example, is no longer used to subsidize The Pub, thus there would be no direct connection between fees and alcohol sales.

Enforcement of alcohol laws and other restrictions would not fall upon the University, but rather upon its food service provider. Employees serving alcohol can obtain the requisite certification from the Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission through a short, convenient online course. The course educates servers on the details of alcohol laws and how to oversee consumption responsibly. The committee feels that this adequately addresses questions of employee responsibility and enforcement.

Though safety concerns are inherent in any atmosphere where alcohol is used, the committee feels that driving while intoxicated poses a threat much greater than mere consumption. We believe the ability to purchase and consume alcohol in The Pub would cause a decrease in students driving off campus to consume alcohol and reduce the risk of alcohol-related accidents.

It is the opinion of the committee that alcohol service in The Pub would lead to a safer campus and enhance the ability for students, staff, faculty, and alumni to build social and mentoring relationships. Furthermore, the responsible use of alcohol in The Pub would serve as example for underage students of how they can safely and responsibly consume alcohol when they are 21.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION
When considered as a whole, our research shows that many students, staff, faculty, and administrators are at a general consensus that the benefits of serving alcohol, particularly in terms of enhanced safety and campus life, outweigh any costs. Certain restrictions on service would help preserve The Pub’s relaxed atmosphere and keep it a safe, enjoyable place for students to congregate.

To help ensure responsible drinking, the committee feels that alcohol service should be restricted to the late afternoon/evening hours with a limit of three drinks per customer. The specifics of service hours and how the limit would be enforced are best left to the University and The Pub management.

AIPAC concludes that alcohol service on campus would positively affect The University of Texas at Dallas and recommends that the University authorize and pursue the sale of beer and wine in The Pub through its food service provider.
Steven,

On Wednesday, December 10, 2008, the Staff Council along with our constituents discussed the issue of serving Beer and Wine in the UT Dallas Pub at length. As a result of our discussion, we took a vote. The Staff Council supported the sale and purchase of beer and wine in the UT Dallas Pub with some restrictions.

On Wednesday, February 11, 2009, the Staff Council was presented with the issue for some clarification. Again, there was unanimous support for the proposition. The resolution we support is as follows:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the University of Texas at Dallas Staff Council was presented with and reviewed information and concerns as it relates to the sale of beer and wine in the UT Dallas Pub.
WHEREAS, the University of Texas at Dallas Staff Council discussed this topic at length by bringing forth the positives and negatives of such a resolution.
WHEREAS, the University of Texas at Dallas Staff Council supports the establishment of some measures and regulations which reasonably and prudently ensures the safety of our community.
NOW, THEREFORE, the University of Texas at Dallas Staff Council is hereby resolved as follows:

The Staff Council unanimously supports the allowance of the legal sale and purchase of beer and wine in the UT Dallas Pub with the establishment of some regulations and measures which reasonably and prudently safeguards our community.

Chris Dickson
Fast President, UT Dallas Staff Council
UT System Employee Advisory Council Representative
Desk: 972-883-6783
Fax: 972-883-2568
dickson@utdallas.edu

"Be alert to give service. What counts a great deal in life is what we do for others."
# ALCOHOL IN THE PUB

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position, Major/Club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven Rosson (Chair)</td>
<td>Junior, Business Administration, President, Student Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prashant Raghavendran</td>
<td>Freshman, Neuroscience, Treasurer, Residential Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Barta</td>
<td>Senior, Neuroscience, President, Alpha Gamma Delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Reeves</td>
<td>Junior, Economics, Scholarship Chairman, Chi Phi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Jones</td>
<td>Sophomore, Arts &amp; Performance, Director of S&amp;S, Kappa Alpha Theta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina Shahrokhi</td>
<td>Junior, Undeclared, Co-Founder/Co-President, SPEAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberto Lopez</td>
<td>MBA, Business Administration, Assistant Manager, The Pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Thompson</td>
<td>Freshman, Neuroscience, President, Residential Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehsan Nourbakhsh</td>
<td>PhD Student, Computer Science, Director of IT, Global Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn H. Williams</td>
<td>PhD Student, Political Science, Interim President, Pi Sigma Alpha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITTEE NAME: ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
Charge: Policy Memorandum 02-III.27-86
Senate Concurrent

EX-OFFICIO (with vote)
Dean of Natural Sciences & Mathematics
Dean of Behavioral & Brain Sciences
Dean of Engineering & Computer Science

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
At least 11 voting members of the general faculty, 7 of which, including the Chair, shall be representatives from areas with the most involvement with and dependence on external funding
2-year terms
Deans of ECS, BBS & NSM
1 Dean (with vote) of remaining schools
1 year term*

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Research

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki (N) (8/31/2010)
Duncan MacFarlane (EC) (8/31/2010)
Aage Moller (B) (8/31/2010)
Todd Sandler (EP) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Alain Bensoussan (M) (8/31/2009)
Juan Gonzalez (N) (8/31/2009)
Gopal Gupta (EC) (8/31/2009)
Philip Loizou (EC) (8/31/2009)
XinChou Lou (N) (8/31/2009)
Mihai Nadin (A) (8/31/2009)

*DEAN: Hasan Pirkul (2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Suresh Sethi (M) (8/31/11)
Robert Serfling (N) (8/31/11)
Farokh Bastani (EC) (8/31/11)
Philip Loizou (EC) (8/31/11)
Diandra Leslie-Pelecky (N) (8/31/11)
Mihai Nadin (A) (8/31/11)

Dennis Kratz (A) (8/31/10)

CHAIRPERSON: Alain Bensoussan (M)
Philip Loizou (EC)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Phillip Loizou (EC)
Robert Serfling (N)
COMMITTEE NAME: CHANCELLOR’S COUNCIL/PRESIDENT’S OUTSTANDING TEACHING AWARDS COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 00-III.21-83 Senate Concurrent Committee

EX-OFFICIO (with vote)
Dean of Undergraduate Education
Student Government President (Diana Kao 09/10)

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
Dean of Undergraduate Education
President of the Student Government
5 members
3 year terms
3 faculty (3 previous award winners)
Chair - longest standing faculty member on committee

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Executive Vice President & Provost

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Michael Kilgard (B) (8/31/2011)
John Pomara (AH) (8/31/2011)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Gregory Thielemann (EP) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Ivor Page (EC) (8/31/2012)

CHAIRPERSON: Gregory Thielemann (EP) John Pomara (AH)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: John Pomara (AH) Michael Kilgard (B)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY
Charge: Policy Memorandum 05-III.21-90  Senate Concurrent Committee

EX-OFFICIO
Library representative (without vote)
nominated by Dean of Libraries
(Ellen Safley)

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
9 faculty, at least one from each school
2 students
2 years, staggered

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Michelle Nickerson (A) (8/31/2010)
Marilyn Kaplan (M) (8/31/2010)
Elizabeth Salter (IS) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Cyrus Cantrell (EC) (8/31/2009)
Robert Glosser (N) (8/31/2009)
William Pervin (EC) (8/31/2009)
Alice O'Toole (B) (8/31/2009)
Edwin Sha (EC) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Bruce Jacobs (EPPS) (8/31/2011)
Cyrus Cantrell (EC) (8/31/2011)
Robert Glosser (N) (8/31/2011)
William Pervin (EC) (8/31/2011)
Linda Thibodeau (B) (8/31/2011)
Ivor Page (EC) (8/31/2011)

STUDENTS:
Luis Torres (UG) (8/31/2009)
Lewis Chang (UG) (8/31/2009)

CHAIRPERSON: Cyrus Cantrell (EC)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Robert Glosser (N)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON CORE CURRICULUM
Charge: Policy Memorandum 95-III.25-66
Senate Concurrent Committee

EX-OFFICIO (without vote)
Dean of Undergraduate Education
University Registrar & Director of
Academic Records
Director of Undergraduate Advising

EX-OFFICIO (with vote)
Chair, CEP: Cy Cantrell (EC)

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Dean of Undergraduate Education

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Duane Buhrmester (B) (8/31/2010)
Shelley Lane (A) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Mary Chaffin (M) (8/31/2009)
Kruti Dholakia (EP) (8/31/2009)
Simeon Ntafos (EC) (8/31/2009)
Liz Salter (IS) (8/31/2009)

STUDENTS:
Stephanie Bouillon (UG) (2009)
Maria Islam (UG) (2009)
Alexandra Ransom (UG) (2009)
Dina Shahrokhi (UG) (2009)

CHAIRPERSON: Mary Chaffin (M)
Duane Buhrmester (B)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Simeon Ntafos (EC)
Simeon Ntafos (EC)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Mary Chaffin (M) (8/31/2011)
Kruti Dholakia (EP) (8/31/2011)
Simeon Ntafos (EC) (8/31/2011)
Liz Salter (IS) (8/31/2011)

(UG) (8/31/2010)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON DISTANCE LEARNING
Charge: Policy Memorandum 97-III.20-80 Senate Concurrent Committee

EX-OFFICIO (with vote)
Dean of Graduate Studies (Austin Cunningham)
Vice President, Chief Information Officer
Dean, School of Engineering &
    Computer Science (Mark Spong)
Vice President for Student Affairs (Darrelene Rachavong)
Dean, School of Management (Hasan Pirkul)
Distance Learning Coordinator (Rhonda Blackburn)

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Executive Vice President and Provost

MEMBERS Whose TERMS Are CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Marilyn Kaplan (M) (8/31/2010)
Homer Montgomery (N) (8/31/2010)
David Parry (A) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS Whose TERMS Are EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Wendy Hassett (EP) (8/31/2009)
Peter Lewin (M) (8/31/2009)
John Fonseka (EC) (8/31/2009)

LIBRARY REPRESENTATIVE
Carol Oshel (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Don Hicks (EP) (8/31/2011)
Dan Bochsler (M) (8/31/2011)
John Fonseka (EC) (8/31/2011)
Carol Oshel (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Marilyn Kaplan (M)
VICE CHAIRPERSON: Homer Montgomery (N)

Marilyn Kaplan (M)
Homer Montgomery (N)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Charge: Policy Memorandum 78-III.21-11 Senate Concurrent Committee

EX-OFFICIO
With vote
Chair, Committee on Core Curriculum

Without vote
Dean of Graduate Studies
Dean of Undergraduate Education
Assistant Provost
University Registrar & Director of
Academic Records

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
13 faculty members
2 from each school, except for
1 from Interdisciplinary Studies
2 students (non-voting)
1 graduate
1 undergraduate
2 year terms

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Dean of Graduate Studies
Dean of Undergraduate Education

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Paul Tracy (EP) (8/31/2010)
Robert Hilborn (N) (8/31/2010)
Cyrus Cantrell (EC) (8/31/2010)
Duane Buhrmester (B) (8/31/2010)
Karen Prager (I) (8/31/2010)
Theresa Towner (A) (8/31/2010) Dean Terry (A)
Mike Peng (M) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Dennis Miller (N) (8/31/2009)
William Pervin (EC) (8/31/2009)
Chelliah Sriskandarajah (M) (8/31/2009)
Walter Jay Dowling (B) (8/31/2009)
Sean Cotter (A) (8/31/2009)

STUDENTS:
Dina Shahrokhi (UG) (8/31/2009)
Elizabeth Agalaba (G) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Bruce Jacobs (EP) (8/31/2011)
Dennis Miller (N) (8/31/2011)
William Pervin (EC) (8/31/2011)
Sumit Sarkar (M) (8/31/2011)
Margaret Owen (B) (8/31/2011)
Milton Cohen (A) (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Cyrus Cantrell (EC)
VICE CHAIRPERSON: Theresa Towner (A)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING
Charge: Policy Memorandum 94-III.21-64
Senate Concurrent Committee

EX-OFFICIO (without vote)
Dean of Undergraduate Education
A&H Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
BBS Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
ECS Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
EPPS Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
IS Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
M Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
NSM Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
9 voting members
6 faculty members
1 from each school except for
Interdisciplinary Studies
2 students
1 technical expert
2 year terms

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Executive Vice President & Provost

TECHNICAL EXPERT
Rhonda Blackburn (OEE)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Monica Rankin (A) (8/31/2010)
John Santrock (B) (8/31/2010)
Matthew Goeckner (EC) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Mark Anderson (M) (8/31/2009)
Krutí Dholakia (EP) (8/31/2009)
Cynthia Ledbetter (N) (8/31/2009)

STUDENTS:
Dipti Lulla (UG) (8/31/2009)
Krissy Seaman (UG) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Livia Markoczi (M) (8/31/2011)
Greg Thielemann (EP) (8/31/2011)
Michael Biewer (N) (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Mark Anderson (M)
Matthew Goeckner (EC)

Vice CHAIRPERSON: Matthew Goeckner (EC)
Greg Thielemann (EP)
**COMMITTEE NAME:** COMMITTEE ON FACULTY MENTORING  
Charge: Policy Memorandum 04-I.2-89  
Senate Concurrent Committee

**EX-OFFICIO**

**SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:**
14 Faculty Members  
In consultation with the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity

**RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL**
Vice President for Diversity, Community Engagement (Magaly Spector)

**MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING**

**FACULTY:**
- Paul Jargowsky (EP) (8/31/2010)
- Orlando Richard (M) (8/31/2010)
- Hlaing Minn (EC) (8/31/2010)
- Robert Hilborn (N) (8/31/2010)
- Timothy Redman (A) (8/31/2010)
- Kathryn Stecke (M) (8/31/2010)
- Sheryl Skaggs (EP) (8/31/2010)
- Susan McElroy (EP)

**MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING**

**FACULTY:**
- Surya Janakiraman (M) (8/31/2009)
- Robert Glosser (N) (8/31/2009)
- Rachel Croson (EP) (8/31/2009)
- Adrienne McLean (A) (8/31/2009)
- Anne van Kleeck (B) (8/31/2009)
- Karen Prager (I) (8/31/2009)
- Vacant

**REPLACEMENTS NEEDED**
- Indranil Bardhan (M) (8/31/2011)
- Bob Glosser (N) (8/31/2011)
- Rachel Croson (EP) (8/31/2011)
- Marilyn Waligore (A) (8/31/2011)
- Anne van Kleeck (B) (8/31/2011)
- Karen Prager (I) (8/31/2011)

**CHAIRPERSON:** Rachel Croson (EP)

**VICE CHAIRPERSON:** Kathryn Stecke (M)

Rachel Croson (EP)  
Hlaing Minn (EC)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON FACULTY STANDING & CONDUCT
Charge: Policy Memorandum 78-III.21-13
Senate Concurrent Committee

EX-OFFICIO

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
5 faculty members
2 year terms

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Executive Vice President & Provost

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
William Cready (M) (8/31/2010)
Ivor Page (EC) (8/31/2010)
Melanie Spence (B) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Roderick Heelis (N) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Rockford Draper (N) (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Richard Scotch (EP)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Ivor Page (EC)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS
Charge: Policy Memorandum 08-III.21-98 Senate Concurrent Committee

EX-OFFICIO
up to 20 members from offices of:
Educational Enhancement
Information Resources
Registrar
Audit and Compliance
School of Management instructional designers

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
6 faculty members
one from each of six of the seven schools
and must use WebCT
2 year terms, staggered
(of initial six members,
3 appointed for 1 year term, and
3 appointed for 2 year terms)

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Associate Provost for Educational Enhancement

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Paul Jargowsky (EP) (8/31/2011)
Tom Brikowski (N) (8/31/2011)
Richard Golden (B) (8/31/2011)
John Gooch (A) (8/31/2010)
Dinesh Bhatia (EC) (8/31/2010)
Marilyn Kaplan (M) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:

CHAIRPERSON:
Marilyn Kaplan (M)

VICE CHAIRPERSON:
Paul Jargowsky (EP)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON QUALIFICATIONS OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
Charge: Policy Memorandum 78-III.21-16
Senate Concurrent Committee

EX-OFFICIO

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
12 tenured faculty, two from each school (with the exception of Interdisciplinary Studies) preferably at rank of Professor - no one holding an administrative appointment above the rank of Department Head shall be eligible to serve
2 year terms

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Executive Vice President & Provost

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Kenneth Balkus (N) (8/31/2010)
Greg Earle (N) (8/31/2010)
Richard Golden (B) (8/31/2010)
Adrienne McLean (A) (8/31/2010)
Aria Nosratinia (EC) (8/31/2010)
Brian Ratchford (M) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Christine Dollaghan (B) (8/31/2009)
Catherine Eckel (EP) (8/31/2009)
Clay Reynolds (A) (8/31/2009)
Kathryn Stecke (M) (8/31/2009)
Kang Zhang (EC) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Jay Dowling (B) (8/31/2011)
Catherine Eckel (EP) (8/31/2011)
Tim Redman (A) (8/31/2011)
David Mauer (M) (8/31/2011)
R. Chandrasekaran (EC) (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Catherine Eckel (EP)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Adrienne McLean (A)

Catherine Eckel (EP)

Adrienne McLean (A)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON STUDENT SCHOLARSHIPS
Charge: Policy Memorandum 78-III.21-18
Senate Concurrent Committee

EX-OFFICIO
(with vote)
Dean of Graduate Studies
Dean of Undergraduate Education

(without vote)
Director of Financial Aid
Director of Endowment Services and Compliance
Director of the Office of International Education

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Associate Provost responsible for Student Affairs

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Elizabeth Salter (I) (8/31/2010)
Shelley Lane (A) (8/31/2010)
Robert Stillman (B) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
John Hoffman (N) (8/31/2009)
Simeon Ntafos (EC) (8/31/2009)
Douglas Eckel (M) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
John Hoffman (N) (8/31/2011)
Kruti Dholakia (EP) (8/31/2011)
Simeon Ntafos (EC) (8/31/2011)
Douglas Eckel (M) (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Liz Salter (I)
Douglas Eckel (M)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: John Hoffman (N)
Shelley Lane (A)
2009 – 2010

COMMITTEE NAME: LIBRARY COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 78-III.21-14

EX-OFFICIO (without vote)
Dean of Libraries
Library General Administration (one member)

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
16 voting members
2 students, including one undergraduate & one graduate student
7 faculty - one from each school
7 members, one from each School’s Library Acquisition Committee nominated by School Deans
2 year terms

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Dean of Libraries

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Nasser Keh tarnavaz (EC) (8/31/2010)
John Mike Farmer (A) (8/31/2010)
Suresh Radhakrishnan (M) (8/31/2010)
Titu Andree scu (N) (8/31/2010)
Natalie Ring (A) (8/31/2010)
Jane Salk (M) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Steve Neilsen (N) (8/31/2009)
Susan Chizeck (I) (8/31/2009)
Richard Golden (B) (8/31/2009)
Michael Tiefelsdorf (EP) (8/31/2009)
Rockford Draper (N) (8/31/2009)
Ming Dong Gu (A) (8/31/2009)
Jeffrey Martin (B) (8/31/2009)

STUDENTS:
Ashley Hooker (UG) (8/31/09)
Megan Malone (G) (8/31/09)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Yuri Gartstein (N) (8/31/2011)
Susan Chizeck (I) (8/31/2011)
John Santrock (B) (8/31/2011)
Michael Tiefelsdorf (EP) (8/31/2011)
Warren Goux (N) (8/31/2011)
Charles Hatfield (A) (8/31/2011)
Pamela Rollins (B) (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Susan Chizeck (I)
VICE CHAIRPERSON: John Mike Farmer (A)
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COMMITTEE NAME: ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 94-III.24-63
University-Wide Committee

EX-OFFICIO

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
3 Faculty members
3 Deans
3 Year terms

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Executive Vice President & Provost

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Gregory Dieckmann (N) (8/31/2010)
Robert Stillman (B) (8/31/2010)
Myron Salamon (N & Dean) (8/31/2010)
Mark Spong (EC & Dean) (8/31/2011)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Hasan Pirkul (M & Dean) (8/31/2009)
Duncan MacFarlane (EC) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Hasan Pirkul (M & Dean) (8/31/2012)
Andrea Fumagalli (ECS) (8/31/2012)

CHAIRPERSON: Duncan MacFarlane (EC)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Gregg Dieckmann (N)

Gregory Dieckmann (N)
Andrea Fumagalli (EC)
COMMITTEE NAME: ACADEMIC CALENDAR COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 02-L2-85
EX-OFFICIO
University Registrar and Director of Academic Records

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
10 Voting members
1 University Registrar and Director of Academic Records (w/vote)
2 Administration
3 Faculty
2 Student Government
2 Staff
All but Registrar appointed annually

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Student Affairs

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Austin Cunningham (N) (8/31/2009)
Sheila Gutierrez-Pineres (EP) (8/31/2009)
Andras Farago (EC) (8/31/2009)

ADMINISTRATION:
John Wiorowski (M) (8/31/2009)
Douglas Eckel (M) (8/31/2009)

STAFF:
David Maldonado (8/31/2009)
Cheryl Friesenhahn (8/31/2009)

STUDENTS
Maria Islam (UG) (8/31/2009)
Samia Hossain (UG) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Austin Cunningham (N) (8/31/2010)
Sheila Gutierrez-Pineres (EP) (8/31/2010)
Andras Farago (EC) (8/31/2010)
John Wiorowski (M) (8/31/2010)
Douglas Eckel (M) (8/31/2010)
Maria Islam (UG) (8/31/2010)
Samia Hossain (UG) (8/31/2010)

CHAIRPERSON: John Wiorowski (M)
VICE CHAIRPERSON: Douglas Eckel (M)
COMMITTEE NAME: CAMPUS FACILITIES COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 81-I.2-42

EX-OFFICIO (without vote)
Dean of Graduate Studies
Vice President, Chief Information Officer
Associate Vice President for Facilities Management
Exec. Director of Strategic Planning & Analysis
Exec. Vice President & Provost
Staff Council Member

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
No fewer than 10 voting members
4 faculty
2 deans
1 student
1 representative from Student Affairs
1 off campus
1 Library staff
3 year terms

LIBRARY REPRESENTATIVE (with vote)
Mary Jo Venetis

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Business Affairs

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Murray Leaf (EP) (8/31/2010)
Thomas Linehan (A) (8/31/2010)
Mark Spong (ECS & Dean) (8/31/2010)

STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF:
Donna Rogers (8/31/2010)

STAFF COUNCIL (EX OFFICIO) (without vote):
Daniel Calhoun (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Midori Kitagawa (A) (8/31/2009)
Xinchou Lou (N) (8/31/2009)
Hasan Pirkul (M & Dean) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Tom Campbell (Callier) (8/31/2012)
John Ferguson (N) (8/31/2012)
Hasan Pirkul (M & Dean) (8/31/2012)

NON-UTD:
Unknown (unless Patti Henry-Pinch accepted for 08-09,
Then NON-UTD is current through 8/31/2011)

STUDENT:
Anthony Broderick (UG) (8/31/2009)

CHAIRPERSON: Murray Leaf (EP)
VICE CHAIRPERSON: Thomas Linehan (A)

THOMAS LINEHAN (A)

JOHN FERGUSON (N)
COMMITTEE NAME: CAMPUS WELLNESS COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 09-I.2-99

University Wide Committee

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
9 voting members
  3 faculty
  3 staff
  3 students

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Business Affairs

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Shayla Holub (B) (8/31/2011)
Michael Baron (N) (8/31/2011)
Eric Schlereth (A) (8/31/2010)

STAFF:
Vivian Rutledge
Roxanne Minnish
Danielle Derbes

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:

STAFF:

STUDENTS:
(8/31/2010)
(8/31/2010)
(8/31/2010)

CHAIRPERSON:

VICE CHAIRPERSON:
COMMITTEE NAME: CAMPUS WELLNESS COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 09-I.2-99

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
9 voting members
3 faculty
3 staff
3 students

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Business Affairs

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Shayla Holub (B) (8/31/2011)
Michael Baron (N) (8/31/2011)
Eric Schlereth (A) (8/31/2010)

STAFF:
Vivian Rutledge
Roxanne Minnish
Danielle Derbes

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:

STAFF:

STUDENTS:
(8/31/2010)
(8/31/2010)
(8/31/2010)

CHAIRPERSON:

VICE CHAIRPERSON:
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMENCEMENT COMMITTEE

Charge: Policy Memorandum 83-I.2-44

EX-OFFICIO (without vote)
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
and Dean of Students
Director of University Events
Speaker of the Faculty, Vice Chair
Dean of Graduate Studies
Dean of Undergraduate Education
Chief of Police
Associate Vice President for Facilities Management
Bookstore Manager
Coordinator of Student Health Services
Representative from Media Services
Representative from Alumni Services
University Registrar & Director of Academic
Records
Special Events Coordinator

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
2 faculty
2 student representatives (including the
president of the student body)
3 year terms

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Executive Vice President & Provost

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING

FACULTY:
Kathryn Evans (8/31/2011)
Fang Qui (EP) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING

STUDENTS:
Steven Rosson, SG President (08-09)
Unknown

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED

Diana Kao, SG President (2009-2010)
(8/31/2010)

CHAIRPERSON: Judi Hensley

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Murray Leaf (EP)

Judi Hensley
Murray Leaf (EP)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS (IRB)
Charge: Policy Memorandum 79-I.21-31

EX-OFFICIO (with vote)
Vice President for Research

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Research

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
No fewer than nine members
1 from off campus
2 year terms
Male & female members &
variety of professions
1 member whose primary expertise
is in a non-scientific area
(See charge for more requirements)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Jay Dowling (B) (8/31/2010)
Yu Wang (M) (8/31/2010)
William Katz (B) (8/31/2010)
Aage Moller (B) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
John Burr (N) (8/31/2009)
Rachel Croson (EP) (8/31/2009)
Shayla Holub (B) (8/31/2009)

STUDENT:
Yana Gelman (UG) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Gregory Thielemann (EP) (8/31/2011)
John Burr (N) (8/31/2011)
Rachel Croson (EP) (8/31/2011)
Bart Rypma (B) (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Aage Moller (B)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Ernan Haruvy (M)

Aage Moller (B)
John Burr (N)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE FOR THE SUPPORT OF DIVERSITY AND EQUITY
Charge: Policy Memorandum 97-I.2-81

EX-OFFICIO

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
11 faculty members (from each of the seven Schools)
3 Academic Administrators
8 staff members
2 year terms

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Diversity, CommunityEngagement (Magely Spector)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Margaret Owen (B) (8/31/2010)
Erin Smith (I) (8/31/2010)
Gail Breen (N) (8/31/2010)

STAFF:
Arthur Gregg (8/31/2010)
Jacqueline Long (8/31/2010)
Alex Nester (8/31/2010)
Yolande Porter (8/31/2010)
Vivian Rutledge (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Jorge Cobb (EC) (8/31/2009)
Holly Lutz (M) (8/31/2009)
Peter Park (A) (8/31/2009)
Orlando Richard (M) (8/31/2009)
Vacant (8/31/2009) (was Jin Liu) (EC)
Vacant (8/31/2010) (was Pat Michaelson) (A)

STAFF:
Marilyn Bechtol (8/31/2009)
Barbara Gordon (8/31/2009)
Pat McEachern (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Rym Wenkstern (EC) (8/31/2011)
Kathy Stecke (M) (8/31/2011)
Susan Briante (A) (8/31/2011)
David Ford (M) (8/31/2011)
Candice Mills (B) (8/31/2011)
Dave Edmunds (A) (8/31/2010)

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS:
Abby Kratz (8/31/2009)
Sherry Marek (8/31/2009)
Diana Willis (8/31/2009)

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS:
Abby Kratz (8/31/2011)
Sherry Marek (8/31/2011)
Diana Willis (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Abby Kratz

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Peter Park

Abby Kratz
Douglas Dow

and appointment from Office of Disabilities Services recommended
COMMITTEE NAME: INFORMATION RESOURCES SECURITY, PLANNING, AND POLICY COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 03-I.2-88

EX-OFFICIO (with vote)
Chief Information Security Officer

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
13 Voting Members
(7 tenure track faculty w/2 @ position of Dean or above)
1 staff - Audit and Compliance
1 staff - Academic Affairs
1 Staff Council
1 Staff - Office of VP for Research
1 Staff - Business Affairs

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President, Chief Information Officer

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Balaji Raghavachari (EC) (8/31/2010)
Mark Spong (EC Dean) (8/31/2010)

STAFF:
Rhonda Blackburn (8/31/2010)
Wanda Mizutowicz (8/31/2010)
Rene Herrera (8/31/2010)
Sanaz Okhovat (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY
Joe Izen (N) (8/31/2009)
Dennis Kratz (A & Dean) (8/31/2009)
Young Ryu (M) (8/31/2009)
Dean Terry (A) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Xinou Lou (N) (8/31/2011)
Myron Salamon (N & Dean) (8/31/2011)
Young Ryu (M) (8/31/2011)
Monica Evans (A) (8/31/2011)

STAFF COUNCIL:
Irene Bellatin (8/31/2009)

Arturo Elizondo (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Young Ryu (M)

CHAIRPERSON: Xin Chou Lou (N)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Dean Terry (A)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Balaji Raghavachari (EC)
COMMITTEE NAME: INSTITUTIONAL ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEE  
Charge: Policy Memorandum 79-1.2-30  
University-Wide Committee

EX-OFFICIO  
Vice President for Research  
(with vote)

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:  
6 members (no fewer than)  
3 year terms  
1 member Doctor of Veterinary Medicine  
1 must be a community member  
1 must be a practicing scientist experienced in research involving animals  
1 member must be a person whose primary concerns are in a non-scientific area

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL  
Vice President for Research

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING  
FACULTY:  
Gail Breen (N) (8/31/2011)  
Juan Gonzalez (N) (8/31/2011)

NON-UTD:  
* Tony Myers (8/31/2011)  
* Egeenee Q. Daniels (8/31/2011)  
* These are not approved by the Senate

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING  
FACULTY:  
Marco Atzori (B) (8/31/2009)  
Ernest Hannig (N) (8/31/2009)  
Michael Kilgard (B) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED  
Krista McIntyre Rodriguez (B) (8/31/2012)  
Steven Spiro (N) (8/31/2012)  
Lucien Thompson (B) (8/31/2012)

CHAIRPERSON: Juan Gonzalez (N)  
VICE CHAIRPERSON: Ernest Hannig (N)  
Juan Gonzalez (N)  
Lucien Thompson (B)
COMMITTEE NAME: INSTITUTIONAL BIOSAFETY COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 79-1.2-27
University-Wide Committee

EX-OFFICIO
Vice President for Research
Environmental Health & Safety Director
Biosafety Director

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
No fewer than five members
2 (at least, and not less than 20% of membership) shall not be affiliated with the University
3 year terms
Chair 2 year term and a member of the University Safety Council

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Business Affairs

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Jeff De Jong (N) (8/31/2011)
Dennis Miller (N) (8/31/2010) Li Zhang (N)
Betty Pace (N) (8/31/2011)
Stephen Spiro (N) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY
Santosh D’Mello (N) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Marco Atzori (B) (8/31/2012)
Steve Levene (N) (8/31/2012)

NON-UTD
Steve Dossett ?? (if Dossett and Viamonte accepted
Nancy Viamonte ?? for 08-09, then NON-UTD current through 08/31/11)

CHAIRPERSON: Dennis Miller (N)
Betty Pace (N)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Betty Pace (N)
Steve Levene (N)
COMMITTEE NAME: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 79-I.2-36 University-Wide Committee

EX-OFFICIO
Dean of Graduate Studies (Austin Cunningham)
Vice President for Business Affairs (Calvin Jamison)
Associate Vice President for Research (Rafael Martin)

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Research

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Anvar Zakhidov (N) (8/31/2010)
John Fonseka (EC) (8/31/2010)
Lawrence Cauller (B) (8/31/2010)

STAFF:
Rochelle Pena (8/31/2010)

NON-UTD:
Daniel Chalker (8/31/2010) (do not know if NON-UTD were ever sent appointment letters last year, so don’t know if they accepted)
Edwin Flores (8/31/2010)
Rob Miles (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Stan Liebowitz (M) (8/31/2009)
Roderick Heelis (N) (8/31/2009)
Tomislav Kovandzie (EP) (8/31/2009)
Duncan MacFarlane (EC) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Michael Rebello (M) (8/31/2011)
John Ferraris (N) (8/31/2011)
Dan Griffith (EP) (8/31/2011)
Yves Chabal (EC) (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: Duncan MacFarlane (EC)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: John Fonseka (M)
2009 – 2010

COMMITTEE NAME: RADIATION SAFETY COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 92-I.3-55

EX-OFFICIO (without vote)
University Environmental Health and Safety Director
Vice President for Research

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
At least three faculty members
Radiation Safety Officer (Chair)
3 year terms

STAFF
Radiation Safety Officer, Chair

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Business Affairs

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Ervin Fenyves (N) (8/31/2010)
Stephen Levene (N) (8/31/2011)
John Sibert (N) (8/31/2011)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED

CHAIRPERSON: Radiation Safety Officer (Kathy White)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Ervin Fenyves (N)
COMMITTEE NAME: UNIVERSITY SAFETY AND SECURITY COUNCIL
Charge: Policy Memorandum 91-I.3-53

EX-OFFICIO
Chief of Police
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
and Dean of Students
Associate Vice President for Facilities Management
University Environmental Health and Safety Director
Emergency Management Coordinator

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS
4 members from faculty
6 members from staff:
- Callier Physical Plant
- Workers Comp. Ins. Rep. from the Office of Environmental Health & Safety
- Science Laboratories
- ADA Comp. Officer
- Student Life (Disability Services)
- Staff Council

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS CONT.
2 Year Terms
2 Students- 1 Undergraduate, 1 Graduate
Chair-Faculty Member
Vice Chair- Staff Member

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Business Affairs

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Lawrence Overzet (EC) (8/31/2010)

STAFF:
Jamie Finch (EH&S) (8/31/2010) (no longer at UTD)
Ricky Robinson (FM) (8/31/2010)
Vivian Rutledge (HRM) (8/31/2010)
Kerry Tate (St.Lf) (8/31/2010)
Steven Walters (NSM) (8/31/2010)

SUGGESTION MADE TO ADD:
Office of Communications Representative
Meredith Dickinson

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
J.B. Lee (EC) (8/31/2009)
Phillip Anderson (N) (8/31/2009)

STAFF COUNCIL:
Lynne Boyer (8/31/2009)

STUDENTS:
Abhimanya Singh (UG) (8/31/2009)
Gillian Papanek (G) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Eric Vogel (EC) (8/31/2011)
Lee Bulla (N) (8/31/2011)

Lynne Boyer (8/31/2011)

CHAIR: Lawrence Overzet (EC)
VICE CHAIR: Sandra Mitchell (EH&S)
COMMITTEE NAME: STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 90-III.21-51
University-Wide Committee

EX-OFFICIO (without vote)
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and
Dean of Students
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
Associate Vice President for Budget and
Resource Planning

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
9 voting members
Including: 5 students
(3-2 year/2-1 year)
2 faculty
2 staff
2 year terms
Committee elects chair

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Student Affairs

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING:
FACULTY:
Simeon Ntafos (EC) (8/31/2010)
Laurie Zielger (M) (8/31/2010)

STAFF:
Amanda Ingram (8/31/2010)

STUDENTS:
Cody Eilrich (UG) (8/31/2010)
Dina Shahrokhi (UG) (8/31/2010)
Rachel Stratton (UG) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING:
STAFF:
Amanda Smith (8/31/2009)

STUDENTS:
Grace Bielawski (UG) (8/31/2009)
Steven Rosson (UG) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED:
Amanda Smith (8/31/2011)
(UG) (8/31/2011)
(UG) (8/31/2011)

CHAIRPERSON: (selected at first meeting)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: (selected at first meeting)
COMMITTEE NAME: UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INTEGRITY COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 95-III.21-67
University-Wide Committee

EX-OFFICIO (with vote)
Dean of Graduate Studies
Vice President for Research, Chair

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
8 tenured faculty at rank of full professor
3 year terms
Each school, except for Interdisciplinary Studies should be represented

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Executive Vice President & Provost

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Bart Rypma (B) (8/31/2011)
Charles Bambach (A) (8/31/2011)
Marianne Stewart (EP) (8/31/2011)
Robert Serfling (N) (8/31/2010)
Lakshman Tamil (EC) (8/31/2010)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Sam Efromovich (N) (8/31/2009)
Shun-Chen Niu (M) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Barry Seldon (EP) (8/31/2012)
Dean Sherry (N) (8/31/2012)
Vijay Mookerjee (M) (8/31/2012)

CHAIRPERSON: V.P. for Research (Bruce Gnade)

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Anthony Champagne (G) Marianne Stewart (EP)
COMMITTEE NAME: AUXILIARY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum 96-I.2-71 University Wide Committee

EX-OFFICIO (without vote)
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs & Dean of Students
Director of Food Services
Contract and Services Manager
UTD Bookstore Manager
Director of the Student Union

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
7 voting members
3 from faculty and staff
4 students
1 year term

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Assistant Vice President for Procurement Management

MEMBERS Whose TERMS ARE CONTINUING

MEMBERS Whose TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY:
Sheila Pineres (EP) (8/31/2009)

STAFF:
Unknown

STUDENTS:
Grace Bielawski (UG) (8/31/2009)
Nick Hinojosa (UG) (8/31/2)
Mackenzie Hird (UG) (8/31/2009)
Matthew Walt (G) (8/31/2009)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Sheila Pineres (EP) (8/31/2010)
Sean Cotter (A) (8/31/2010)
Amanda Smith (8/31/2010)

CHAIRPERSON: Peter Bond

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Sheila Pineres (EP)
Transfer of Credit

A degree-seeking student may petition to have graduate coursework taken at another institution be counted towards satisfying the master’s or doctoral degree requirements. To qualify for transfer of credit, the grade earned in the course must be a B or better from an accredited college or university and the course must not be a correspondence or extension course. Courses delivered in a distance learning format will be considered by the Graduate Dean on a case-by-case basis.

An official transcript and an official explanation of the course numbering system at the school where the credit was earned should accompany the transfer request that must be prepared by the student’s Graduate Program and submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies for approval.

Transfer of credit petitions are subject to the following limitations.

- no more than 25% of the total requirement of a masters degree may be transfer credits. Some degree programs have more restrictive transfer of credit requirements.
- Transfer of master’s level credit into a doctoral program is limited to a maximum of 36 hours.
- No more than 15 semester credit hours taken as a non-degree student at U.T. Dallas can be subsequently applied to a degree program at U.T. Dallas.

Exceptions to these transfer policies may be granted only on petition to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

All petitions for transfer of credit for coursework taken prior to enrolling at U.T. Dallas should be submitted to the student’s Program Graduate Advisor by the student prior to filing a Program of Studies; however, acceptance of transfer of credit hours will not occur until after the student has completed 9 semester credit hours at U.T. Dallas with a grade point average of at least 3.0. All petitions must be processed and approved no later than the semester prior to anticipated graduation. Accordingly, requests to take courses at another institution during the semester a student plans to graduate cannot be approved because the grades may not be received in time to certify the student for graduation.
Request to: Create New Policy on Red Flag Identity Theft Program

Person/group making request: Office of Finance in the Business Affairs Department

Responsible University Official: Dr. Calvin D. Jamison, VP for Business Affairs

Oversight of the policy administration by Wanda Mizutowicz, Assoc. VP for Finance

Suggested Stakeholder Review Plan: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Business Affairs, Information Resources and Research

Background Information/Rationale for request: A request was issued from UT System Office of General Counsel and Office of Compliance in April for each institution to develop an Identity Theft Policy. Included below is a copy of the directive. The initial requirement date was May 1, but that date was delayed until August 1, 2009.

RED FLAG RULES & IDENTITY THEFT PROGRAM GUIDANCE FROM THE UT SYSTEM OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL & OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE April 6, 2009

This initial communication is intended to provide each UT System institution with an overview of the Red Flags Rules and some basic resources to assist you to begin identifying offices and areas that may be subject to the rules so those areas can begin planning for compliance.

- The Office of General Counsel (OGC) and UT Systemwide Compliance Office (UTSCO) will be providing additional guidance, including a Model Policy that UT System institutions may adopt that addresses compliance with the Red Flag Rules. However, it will be up to each institution to develop its own Identity Theft Prevention Program in compliance with the Model Policy and the Red Flag Rules.

- OGC and UTSCO are also working to create information on best practices that can be used in the creation of institutional or office specific compliance programs.

- We will also be providing samples of the policies and or best practices developed by a UT System academic component and a health care component.

- OGC will be available to provide legal guidance on the requirements of the rules.

WHAT ARE THE RED FLAG RULES?: The Red Flags Rules are federal rules adopted by the Federal Trade Commission and other federal agencies which require entities that maintain certain accounts, which may include institutions of higher education, to protect consumers by developing and implementing written identity theft prevention programs. The specific rules applicable to institutions of higher education that have “covered accounts” are at 16 C.F.R. § 681.2.

WHAT IS A RED FLAG? “Red Flags” are suspicious patterns or practices, or specific activities that indicate the possibility that identity theft may occur or is occurring in
connection with an institution’s accounts that are subject to the Red Flag Rule. For example, if an institution requires a student to provide identification to obtain a student loan, an ID that looks like it might be fake or altered would be a “red flag” for the institution. If your institution provides health care for which it bills patients, a notice from a patient that she received a bill for services she never received could be a “red flag.”

**WHO MUST COMPLY:** UT System Institutions must comply with the Red Flag Rules if they have "covered accounts."

For purposes of the Red Flag Rules, an “account” is a continuing relationship between an institution and a person to obtain a product or service the consumer uses mostly for personal, family, household or business purposes. It may involve the extension of credit for the purchase of a product or service, or a deposit account. “Credit” includes any right to defer payment after a purchase.

A “covered account” is an “account” that involves multiple payments or transactions, which is primarily for personal, family or household purposes. A “covered account” is also any account for which there is a reasonably foreseeable risk of identity theft.

Student loans, medical services for which the patient does not pay the entire balance at the time the services are rendered, and employee parking plans for which the staff is billed on a monthly basis are all examples of a “covered account.” An institution that outsources services that involve providing “covered accounts” on behalf of the institution or that outsources the servicing of institution “covered accounts” must ensure, through the vendor contract, that the vendor has its own Identity Theft Program sufficient to protect the accounts or that the vendor contractually agrees to comply with the institution’s Identity Theft Program.

**A RED FLAG IDENTITY THEFT PROTECTION PROGRAM MUST INCLUDE** reasonable policies and procedures to detect, prevent and mitigate identity theft and enable the institution to:

- identify relevant "red flags" (patterns, practices, and specific activities that signal possible identity theft) and incorporate them into the program;
- detect the red flags that the program incorporates;
- respond appropriately to detected red flags to prevent and mitigate identity theft; and
- ensure that the Program is reviewed and updated periodically to reflect changes in risks.

The President of each institution, or in the case of System Administration, the Chancellor, must approve the initial written program. Following initial approval, the President or Chancellor may delegate Program oversight to appropriate senior
management. As part of its Program, the institution must train staff as necessary to implement the Program effectively.

Each institution should conduct an initial risk assessment to identify “covered accounts” and each Program must address and identify the risks the institution faces with respect to these accounts, based in large part on the institution’s previous experiences with identity theft. The Red Flag Rule allows for flexibility in the scope of the Identity Theft Prevention Program, depending on the institution’s activities and level of identity theft risk associated with the relevant covered accounts. If your institution or office determines that it has a minimal risk of identity theft, it may develop a streamlined program. An institution with a greater potential for risk will need to develop a more detailed program. All Red Flag Programs should be written, duly approved, and implemented. Some institutions may already have fraud and identity theft protection plans in place that can be simply reviewed and updated as necessary to comply with the Red Flag Rules.

RESOURCES:


FTC summary for health care providers at http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/edu/pubs/articles/art11.shtm


A helpful whitepaper for institutions that are or employ health care providers can be found at: http://www.worldprivacyforum.org/pdf/WPF_RedFlagReport_09242008fs.pdf

OGC/UTSCO WORKING GROUP:

Cotton, Traci- OGC,
Givens, David- UTSCO
Holthaus, Barbara- OGC
Plutko, Larry, Chief Compliance Officer - UTSCO
Temple, Lannis- OGC
Watkins, Lewis- UTSCO
University of Texas at Dallas Identity Theft Prevention, Detection and Mitigation Program

POLICY OVERVIEW

The University of Texas at Dallas has developed an Identity Theft Prevention, Detection and Mitigation Program to detect, prevent and mitigate Identity Theft in accordance with the 16 CFR 681.2, the Federal Trade Commission’s “Red Flag Rules.” The program is effective August 1, 2009, and will be maintained and updated annually.

DEFINITIONS

Account:

An Account is any continuing relationship between the University and an Account Holder that permits the Account Holder to obtain a product or service for personal, family, household or business purposes. It may involve the extension of credit for the purchase of a product or service, or a deposit account.

Account Holder:

A student, employee, retired employee, patient or other person that has a Covered Account held by or on behalf of the University.

Covered Account:

An Account the University offers or maintains or is offered or maintained by a vendor or other third party on behalf of the University primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, that involves or is designed to permit multiple payments or transactions; and any other Account the University offers or maintains for which there is a reasonably foreseeable risk to an Account Holder or to the safety and soundness of the University from Identity Theft, including financial, operational, compliance, reputation, or litigation risks. Examples of Covered Accounts include, but are not limited to: student loan and tuition accounts; patient medical service Accounts; Accounts associated with employee benefits; student debit cards; and meal plans.

Identity Theft:

Any use or attempt by an individual to use another person’s individual identifying information to obtain a thing of value to which the individual is not entitled including: money, credit, items, or services, such as medical care or education services.
**Individual Identifying Information:**

Any information that may be used alone or with other information to identify an individual, including, but not limited to: (1) name, social security number, date of birth, telephone/cell number, government issued driver’s license or identification number, alien registration number, passport number, employer or taxpayer identification number, credit/debit/banking account numbers; (2) unique biometric data such as fingerprint, voice print, retina or iris image or other unique physical representation; or (3) unique electronic identification number, address or routing code, IP or other computer identifying address, or telecommunication identifying information or other access device.

**Red Flag:**

A Red Flag is suspicious patterns or practices, or specific activities that indicate the possibility that Identity Theft may occur or is occurring in connection with the University’s Covered Accounts.

**RESPONSIBLE PARTIES**

The University President has appointed the Vice President for Business Affairs to be the Executive Sponsor of the Program. The Executive Sponsor has appointed the Associate Vice President as the Program Administrator. The Program Administrator’s responsibility is to develop and maintain a comprehensive university-wide program which includes:

- Completing a university wide risk assessment to identify departments which have Covered Accounts,
- Ensuring the appointment of Departmental Program Coordinators for departments that have Covered Accounts,
- Providing leadership and guidance to the Departmental Program Coordinators in the initial development and the on-going maintenance of the program,
- Developing training material and coordinating the training program, and
- Coordinating risk assessment and compliance reporting.

The Departmental Program Coordinators’ responsibility is to develop and maintain a comprehensive program for their respective departments, which includes:

- Performing initial and annual risk assessments in their departments to identify Covered Accounts,
- Developing the program for their Covered Accounts and ensuring that the program elements are commensurate with the level of risk identified,
- Ensuring that staff in their departments have been trained on the elements of the program as it pertains to their respective job responsibilities and that the training is effective, and
- Preparing reports on the status of the program.

**ELEMENTS OF UTD’s IDENTITY THEFT PROGRAM**

The University has developed and implemented two separate Identity Theft Prevention, Detection and Mitigation Programs: one for student and employee Covered Accounts and a
separate program for departments which have medical patient related Covered Accounts. The program documents can be found at the following websites:

http://www.utdallas.edu/finance/main/Student_Employee_Program.pdf


Both programs include:

- A list of Covered Accounts that are subject to the program, and the officer or employee responsible for oversight, compliance and periodic risk assessment to keep the program up to date and to keep the department in compliance with the program.

- Identification of the relevant "Red Flags" associated with the Covered Accounts within each department and office.

- Practices and procedures designed to:
  - Detect the presence of Red Flags in connection with all Covered Accounts that the program incorporates,
  - Respond appropriately to detected Red Flags to determine if Identity Theft is occurring or may occur,
  - Prevent the occurrence or terminate the on-going Identity Theft if possible, and
  - Mitigate any Identity Theft that has occurred.

- A requirement that the Program Administrator and the Departmental Program Coordinators periodically, but not less than annually, conduct a risk assessment to determine if changes to the existing program are required. In reviewing the program, the following factors should be considered:
  - Incidents of Identity Theft occurring since the last review,
  - Changes in methods of Identity Theft,
  - Changes in the type of Cover Accounts that the department maintains, and
  - Changes in methods to detect, prevent and mitigate Identity Theft.

- A requirement that the University provide initial training and periodic additional training to staff as necessary to implement and enforce the program effectively.

- A requirement for compliance reports to ensure compliance with the program.

**OVERSIGHT OF THIRD PARTY SERVICE PROVIDERS**

The University will require a written agreement that third party service providers who receive information related to the University’s Covered Accounts or who otherwise handle the University’s Covered Accounts, have a documented program in place that ensures compliance by the third parties with the Red Flag Rules with respect to the University Covered Accounts; or adopt and comply with the University’s program.
REPORTING

The Program Administrator will prepare an annual report which will include the following:

- The effectiveness of the policies and procedures in addressing the risk of Identity Theft,
- Status of third party service provider agreements relating to Covered Accounts,
- Significant incidents involving Identity Theft and management’s response, and
- Recommendations for material changes to the program.
**Request to:** Create a new policy on Payment to Human Subjects (Research)

**Person/group making request:** Wanda Mizutowicz/Business Affairs area

**Responsible University Official:** VP Calvin D. Jamison

**Suggested Stakeholder Review Plan:** Academic Affairs (CEP, Council, Senate review), Business Affairs, Research

**Background Information/Rationale for request:**

In the past several months, the Contracts and Grants Accounting Office has been experiencing an increased number of requests for the establishment of petty cash funds to pay individuals who are participating in sponsored research projects. Their office determined that major research universities have a policy and procedure for this effort and have drafted the attached policy for UT Dallas.
The University of Texas at Dallas
Policy and Procedures for the Payment of Research Subjects

DRAFT

This policy details the process for the payment of compensation to human subjects participating in research projects at The University of Texas at Dallas (UTD). University faculty and staff have the legal obligation to both maintain confidentiality of individuals who take part in University research studies and satisfy the demands of financial accountability. Therefore, this payment process has been designed to maintain research subject confidentiality to the extent possible under the law, while meeting Internal Revenue Service (IRS) reporting requirements and conforming to the University’s standard accounting and payment practices.

This policy and associated procedures are administered by the Office of Finance Contracts and Grants Accounting.

Consultation with the representatives of the above indicated offices when anticipating any form of incentive or compensation for research participants is highly recommended.

Process Goals

The method of compensation set forth in this document is designed to achieve the following goals:

• Ensure the confidentiality of research participants.

• Provide timely, convenient compensation to participants to facilitate, not hinder, the study.

• Provide sufficient financial documentation for the University’s records and for IRS purposes.

• Provide sufficient documentation that compensation was provided to research subjects for participation in a study.

• Ensure that appropriate internal controls and adequate safeguards exist for items of value used to compensate, whether cash, checks, or other.

Organizational Responsibilities

The Principal Investigator (PI) is responsible for the justification of subject compensation in the research protocol that must be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the IRB prior to performing the research. The protocol must specify the amount of payment and the proposed method and timing of disbursement of all payments.

The PI is also responsible for the accountability of funds received and disbursed to research participants.
UTD’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) is charged with the responsibility to review and approve both the amounts and methods of payment to ensure that they are not coercive and do not present undue influence to participate or to continue participation.

The Contracts and Grants Accounting (C&G Accounting) of the Office Finance is charged with the responsibility for oversight and approval of payments to research subjects from University administered funds. C&G Accounting works closely with the Office of Sponsored Programs and the Accounts Payable Department to ensure that all financial records and reporting meet the highest standards of financial accountability and are allowable on the specific sponsored program contracts and grants.

Limitations, Restrictions, and Special Considerations

1. IRS Regulations

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) requires human subject payments aggregating $600 or more paid to an individual during a calendar year be reported on Form 1099-MISC, Miscellaneous Income. Aggregate payments to subjects in IRB approved studies must be carefully tracked to ensure due diligence regarding this requirement. For studies that anticipate an aggregate payment to a single individual of $600 or more, the following information must be included in the informed consent document signed by the subject:

"Personal information about me, including my name, address, and social security number, will be released to the University for the purpose of payment and for tax reporting to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). I understand that UTD will issue me an IRS Form 1099, listing my payment as reportable income."

2. Limit on Single Cash Payments to Individuals

For single payments of cash to research subjects, the amount paid depends upon many factors. Since it is not appropriate to offer payment that is so high that it would encourage an individual to ignore or disregard the research risks, the IRB will not approve any compensation perceived as doing so. Although cash incentives are usually nominal, the nature of a study may justify higher amounts, especially if participation involves significant time or expense to the subject.

3. Payments using a UTD issued Credit Card

Using a UTD issued credit card to purchase goods or gift cards as compensation for research subjects is not allowed.

4. Payments via University Check

Issuing a University check to a research subject presents confidentiality issues. For studies that anticipate payment to subjects via University check, the following information must be included in the informed consent: "Personal information about me, including my name, address, and social security number, will be released to the University for the purpose of payment and for tax reporting to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), if necessary."
5. Payments to UTD Employees

Any payments to subjects who are UTD employees (including student workers) must be reported to the IRS as W-2 wages, regardless of the amount paid. These payments are subject to income tax and other withholdings as applicable, and the disclosure of personal information associated with these transactions present confidentiality issues. Researchers anticipating payments to UTD employees should contact the UTD Payroll Department for guidance prior to making such payments.

6. Payments to Non-Resident Foreign Nationals

There are various tax and UTD policy issues that must be addressed regarding payments to known non-resident foreign nationals (including foreign students). Payments made to Human Subjects who are nonresident aliens must be paid by an Accounts Payable check or through UTD Payroll if a foreign National is a UTD employee and must be reported on Form 1042-S, Foreign Person's U.S. Source Income Subject to Withholding, regardless of the dollar amount or W2. All payments to nonresident aliens are subject to 30% federal income tax. Researchers anticipating payments to Non-Resident Foreign Nationals should contact the UTD Payroll and Tax Compliance Office for guidance prior to making such payments.

7. Anticipated Changes to the IRB Approved Payment Schedule

For any changes in participant compensation or flexibility of the payment schedule, a modification to the existing protocol must be submitted to and approved by the appropriate IRB prior to implementation.

8. Using Non-Cash Items as Subject Compensation

There are basically two types of non-cash items that may, if approved by the IRB, be used as incentives or compensation for research participants.

a. Tangible Items of Small Value

If allowable under the terms of the grant or other source of funds, tangible items and objects of small value such as t-shirts, pens, key chains, and other souvenir items may be purchased and distributed to research participants. Although these items may be considered expendable, care should be taken not to over-purchase them. Principal Investigators are responsible for the safekeeping and appropriate documentation of the distribution of these items to subjects. Researchers anticipating the use of such items for subject payment should contact the C&G Accounting Office for guidance prior to purchasing such items.

b. Gift Cards & Gift Certificates

Using negotiable items, such as gift cards or gift certificates, requires very strict accountability. The IRS considers gift cards/certificates to be cash equivalents, thus the same tax issues apply to these as with more traditional payment methods. Therefore, these negotiable items must be treated like cash, and PIs are accountable...
for their safekeeping and appropriate documentation of their distribution to subjects.

Researchers will not be reimbursed for undistributed gift cards/certificates, so it is extremely important for researchers to avoid over-purchasing these items. The same control procedures described below for cash must be used for these negotiable items.

**Procedures for Receiving Cash for Direct Payment to Research Subjects**

1. **Coordination with the Contracts and Grants Accounting (C&G Accounting) Office**

   a) C&G Accounting will approve cash allocations for subject payments only for projects that satisfy the following criteria:

   • The IRB must have approved the research and the plan for payment of research subjects.
   • Sufficient funds must be budgeted in the sponsored program account, and the subject costs must be allowable under the terms of the grant or contract.
   • All of the administrative procedures set forth below have been followed.

   b) Many problems can occur with regard to subject payments that can seriously threaten or hinder research efforts. To avoid these problems and expedite the payment process, *Principal Investigators are strongly advised to meet with C & G Accounting after approval of the study protocol by the IRB*. All procedures, administrative requirements, and questions will be addressed at that time. It is also desirable for any involved project staff or departmental administrators to attend the meeting.

2. **Cash Requests**

The following procedure outlines the requirements for obtaining cash for disbursement of payments directly to research subjects, for the documentation of such payments, and for appropriate reconciliation of financial records. *C & Grant Accounting staff will be pleased to provide a more detailed explanation of the process and further instructions regarding the associated documentation.*

a. Procedure for obtaining cash.

   1) After protocol approval by the IRB and coordination with C&G Accounting, a UTD Payment Voucher (PV) must be prepared for the total amount required, payable to the Principal Investigator, and the following documentation must be attached:

   • A copy of the IRB approval letter.
   • A “SCHEDULE OF PLANNED SUBJECT PAYMENTS” must be prepared and attached or included on the PV. The estimated schedule must be consistent with the payment provisions approved by the IRB and include the anticipated dates, numbers of subjects, and amounts to be paid. The schedule is for planning purposes only. It need not be elaborate and may be prepared in any format. Each individual Payment Voucher request should not exceed the sum of $2500.00.

   2) The PV must be signed by the PI and the PI's Department Chair or the School Dean.
3) Submit the completed PV package to the C&G Accounting Office for review and approval a minimum of 5 working days prior to the date the funds are required.

4) C&G Accounting will submit the PV package to UTD’s Accounts Payable for payment within 2 working days after receipt.

5) Within 5 working days after receipt of the PV package from C&G Accounting, Accounts Payable will issue a check and inform C&G Accounting that it is ready to pick up.

6) Upon notification by Accounts Payable, C&G Accounting will contact the PI. A Research Subject Payment Affidavit will be attached. The AFFIDAVIT must be completed and signed by the person to whom the funds are being advanced.

b. Procedure for safeguarding and documenting cash payments to subjects

1) Checks received for subject payment represent a cash advance to the PI and the PI has the responsibility for the safeguarding the funds. Any cash maintained at UTD facilities must be kept in a safe or a locked box and the PI must ensure that standard UTD cash handling procedure and safeguards are being maintained.

2) The process used for payment must protect the confidentiality of the subjects.

   In the payment documentation required by the University the subjects must be identified only by code. Only the PI and designated staff should be able to link the codes to the individual subjects. Please note that for studies in which there will be multiple payments to a single subject, the code used for the subject must be identical for all payments to enable tracking of payments for IRS purposes.

3) During the conduct of the research, the preferred practice is to use a receipt book to record the date, amount of payment, and signature of the recipient.

   The name of the researcher making the payment also must be indicated on the receipt. The subject code should be on the receipt and it will be the only direct link to the subject other than the subject's signature. This code will be used as the subject identifier on “RESEARCH SUBJECT PAYMENT RECORD (R SPR)” that is returned to Contract and Grant Accounting for reconciliation of the PV. The receipt books are formal financial records and are subject to audit. They must be retained by the PI for the period required under the rules applicable to the source of funds used for payment.

c. Reconciliation of the Payment Voucher

1) Once the subject payments have been made or prior to the draw-down of additional funds to continue the study, the PV must be reconciled.

   If the study has ended and all of the allocated funds have not been paid to subjects, the balance must be returned for re-deposit into the account. If the study is to continue and additional funding is needed, the existing PV must be reconciled prior to the release of the additional funds. The PI can ensure a
seamless process by preparing in advance a new PV package for the additional funding. Concurrent with the reconciliation of the original PV, C& Grant Accounting will release the new PV for additional funding to Accounts Payable.

2) The “RESEARCH SUBJECT PAYMENT RECORD (RSPR)” is the document used to reconcile the PV.

If filled out by hand, the entries must be clearly legible. The RSPR is also available as an Excel file from C&G Accounting Office and may be downloaded. Electronic versions are preferred, but the form may be filled out by hand if the data entries are legible. The RSPR must include the following data:

- Project Title
- Principal Investigator Name
- Contract or Grant Account Number
- IRB Protocol Number
- PV Number
- Total Amount of PV
- All payments - listing for each subject code, date paid, amount paid, and name of the researcher making the payment.

3) The RSPR must be submitted to C& G Accounting as soon as possible after all subject payments have been made. If all of the allocated funds have not been paid to subjects, as documented in the RSPR, the balance must be returned to C&G Accounting for re-deposit into the account.

ATTACHMENTS:

- RESEARCH SUBJECT PAYMENT AFFIDAVIT Form
- RESEARCH SUBJECT PAYMENT RECORD (RSPR) Form
Cash Advance for Payments to Research Subjects

AFFIDAVIT

I, (name) ___________________________________________ (UTD Employee ID#) ______________
_________________,
Have read and understand the “Payments to Research Participants” Policy and Procedure and understand
my responsibilities.

I understand that, should I fail to account for the funds that I receive in accordance with these
procedures*, the amount of those funds will be deducted from my next Payroll check, or added as W-2
reportable wages for me and I will be taxed accordingly.

DATE: _______________________

PV: _______________________

AMOUNT RECEIVED: ______________

CHECK NUMBER: ______________

SIGNATURE: _______________________

PRINTED NAME: _______________________

DEPARTMENT: ________________________ MS __________

TELEPHONE #: _______________________

EMAIL: _______________________

*After funds are paid to participants, Principal Investigator must:

Return a copy of the original PV with completed Research Subject Payment Record (attached) to the
Contracts & Grants Accounting Office within ten (10) working days from receipt of the disbursed check,
or within prearranged schedule approved by the C&G Accounting Office.

Special Note:
Investigators interested in conducting research involving nonresident aliens or UTD employees
should contact the UTD Payroll and Tax Compliance Office prior to making any disbursements.
# RESEARCH SUBJECT PAYMENT RECORD

**PROJECT TITLE:**

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR NAME:**

**IRB PROTOCOL NUMBER:**

**SPONSORED PROGRAM ACCOUNT NUMBER:**

**TOTAL PAYMENT VOUCHER ADVANCED AMOUNT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Code</th>
<th>Date Paid</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>Researcher Making Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PAID TO RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS =** 0.00

**ADVANCE AMOUNT RETURNED =** 0.00
Request to: (create a policy/revise Policy XXXX)

Revise PM-28

Person/group making request:
Serenity King
Rafael Martin

Responsible University Official:
Provost

Suggested Stakeholder Review Plan: Choose Academic Affairs (CEP, Council, Senate review), Student Affairs, Business Affairs, Information Resources, Research, or a combination of any of the above

Academic Affairs
Research

Background Information/Rationale for request:

Policy Memorandum 28 had not been revised since 2000. In May 2006, Regents’ Rule 40602 Organized Research Units was written to define and govern the establishment and review process for institutes, laboratories, and centers that meet a $3M expenditure threshold. The revisions to this policy distinguish definitions, establishment procedures, and review processes between Organized Research Units as defined by Rule 40602 and University Research Units.
POLICY ON CENTERS—RESEARCH UNITS

The University of Texas at Dallas is dedicated to advancing research activities through the establishment of University Research Units and Organized Research Units. The role of Centers and research units in the University is to develop research activities in that support of the educational program and the academic goals of departments or degree programs. However, not all research activities require a Center to facilitate their development or sustenance. Research units may be identified primarily with one discipline or may be multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary. In general, Centers and research units should be established only where organized collective activities are involved, as opposed to a collection of individual research activities that are not interdependent. They should have a mission orientation as opposed to disciplinary orientation. They should have a promise of growth as measured by outside extramural funding or other quantitative measures. They should be integrated with the academic programs and in demonstrable ways must provide direct benefits to the academic programs.

Centers should be initiated only when there is a good prospect that the above requirements will be fulfilled. The formation of a Center is an administrative act, and hence it can only occur when University Administration is convinced that it is desirable in terms of the above requirements. The initiative for the formation of a Center will, in general, be within a School, and any proposal to establish a Center should be submitted through the School and the Graduate Dean to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

It is appropriate that initial funding be provided for a new Center, based upon the expectation that it can develop, secure outside funding, and assist the educational activities of the University. The matter of continuing funding should be decided in terms of the success of the Center in assisting the University in the pursuit of its educational objectives. The continuance or termination of Centers is a closely related question, and it should be decided on the same basis.

Funding needs of a Center are two-fold: Administrative and Research. The existence of a funding formula that essentially returns to the University for administrative purposes a fraction of the total research volume implies that this appropriation is to provide for all the administrative services required to support sponsored research on campus. It is generally accepted that this appropriation is inadequate to cover that part of total administrative costs properly attributable to
sponsor research activities on campus. Thus, no funds from this appropriation have been allocated to Centers. Instead, some of the Organized Research appropriation has been and is allocated to Centers to provide for the necessary research administration functions within the Centers.

Sponsored research benefits the University and its educational programs in many ways in addition to the research accomplishments and the research opportunities provided for graduate students. The volume of sponsored research affects several categories of appropriation to the University by the State, either directly or indirectly. Research accomplishments practically dominate the reputation of a university. Research participation by faculty largely sets the intellectual tone of the faculty. Opportunities for students to participate in front-line research is of paramount importance for a high quality graduate program. Although research activities on campus are not wholly dependent upon the existence of Centers, Centers that enhance the volume and quality of research on campus obviously contribute to the educational objectives of the University and the regard in which it is held nationally and internationally.

It is desirable to provide incentives to Centers to maximize their contributions to the University. The most direct advantage to the University of Center activities is the support of graduate students. Thus, it is appropriate that some part of the Organized Research funds be allocated to Centers in proportion to their support of graduate students with grant or contract funds. Such allocation should be small enough not to penalize other parts of the University for the existence of Centers, but large enough to encourage Centers to move in directions that enhance the achievement of University goals.

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH UNITS
University Research Units are centers, institutes, or laboratories that have annual expenditures of less than $3,000,000.

A university research unit (URU) is established upon approval of a submitted proposal to the Executive Vice President and Provost. The Provost will review and approve requests in consultation with the Vice President for Research. The proposal should be endorsed by all relevant department heads and deans. The template for the establishment of an URU is available on the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost's webpage but in general the proposal should include:

1. the purpose and the benefit of the URU to the university, including a mission statement and objectives of the URU and how it aligns with the university's strategic plan;
2. the director, faculty members, and other participants who will be involved with the URU;
3. planned activities;
4. space requirements;
5. a budget including the financial support required and the source of those funds; and
6. a proposed organizational structure.

If the URU wishes to have an Advisory Council, the dean must approve the potential member list
and forward that list to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost with the proposal. An advisory council or committee must be approved by the UT System Board of Regents in accordance with the Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, Rule 60302 "Advisory Councils of an Institution."

**ORGANIZED RESEARCH UNITS**
Organized Research Units conform to the criteria set forth in The University of Texas System Board of Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, Rule 40602 "Organized Research Units." Typically referred to as centers, institutes, or laboratories, organized research units have annual expenditures of at least $3,000,000.

An organized research unit (ORU) is established upon approval of a submitted proposal by an institution's president to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Each ORU must have a director and an advisory committee or council that must be approved by the UT System Board of Regents in accordance with the Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, Rule 60302 "Advisory Councils of an Institution." Proposals to name an ORU for an individual or entity must comply with the provisions of the Regents' *Rules and Regulations*, Rule 80307 "Naming Policy."

Guidance on what to include in the proposal to establish an ORU can be found in Section 3 of Rule 40602 or in the Organized Research Unit Template on the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost's webpage.

**EVALUATION**
ORUs are evaluated every five years using the university-wide assessment tool. In addition, evaluations shall occur in accordance with Regents' Rule 40602 which states that at least every six years an ad hoc committee shall be formed to assess the ORU's goals, objectives, present functioning, recent accomplishments, future plans, adequacy of space and budget allocations, and future prospects to contribute to the institution's vision and mission. This report will be forwarded to the president, who, in consultation with the Executive Vice President and Provost and the Vice President of Research, will determine whether the ORU will continue. The president will send the ad hoc committee's report to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

URUs are evaluated every five years using the university-wide assessment tool. The assessment reports should include estimated expenditures and should be forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost, who, in consultation with the Vice President for Research, will determine if the URU will continue.

The five year review cycle of ORUs and URUs occurs in conjunction with the review cycle of the school with which the ORU or URU director is affiliated.
## Request to Establish an Organized Research Unit (ORU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORU Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated School(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OVERVIEW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PURPOSE and BENEFIT of the ORU to the UNIVERSITY:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### MISSION STATEMENT:

### OBJECTIVES (align with Strategic Plan Initiatives):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LIST of FACULTY MEMBERS and OTHER PARTICIPANTS INVOLVED:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RESEARCH and other PLANNED ACTIVITIES:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE REQUIREMENTS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET (include financial support required and the source of those funds):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By my signature, I confirm I have read and approved the above proposal:

_____________________________________________________
Dean's signature

Please forward signed proposal to Assistant Provost Serenity King (MP 2.228 or AD 23 or serenity.king@utdallas.edu) who will log the request and route the proposal to the appropriate official.
# Request to Establish a University Research Unit (URU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URU Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated School(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OVERVIEW:

**PURPOSE and BENEFIT of the URU to the UNIVERSITY:**

## MISSION STATEMENT:

## OBJECTIVES (align with Strategic Plan Initiatives):

## LIST of FACULTY MEMBERS and OTHER PARTICIPANTS INVOLVED:

## PLANNED ACTIVITIES:

## SPACE REQUIREMENTS:
BUDGET (include financial support required and the source of those funds):

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE:

By my signature, I confirm I have read and approved the above proposal:

_____________________________________________________
Dean's signature

Please forward signed proposal to Assistant Provost Serenity King (MP 2.228 or AD 23 or serenity.king@utdallas.edu) who will log the request and route the proposal to the appropriate official.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

It is the objective of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas System (“Board”) and The University of Texas at Dallas (“UT Dallas”) to provide an intellectual property policy that will encourage the development of inventions and other intellectual creations for the best interest of the public, the creator, and the research sponsor, if any, and that will permit the timely protection and disclosure of such intellectual property whether by development and commercialization after securing available protection for the creation, by publication, or both. The policy is further intended to protect the respective interests of all concerned by ensuring that the benefits of such property accrue to the public, to the inventor, to the System and to sponsors of specific research in varying degrees of protection, monetary return and recognition.

The development, ownership, management, use and marketing of intellectual property developed at the UT Dallas are governed by Regents’ Rules and Regulations of The University of Texas System (“System”) Series 90000: Intellectual Property (“Regents Rules”). These may be found at the following site:

http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules/CompleteTOC-2.htm#intellectualproperty

This policy memorandum includes highlights of and references to key components of the Regents Rules for convenience. To the extent that provisions herein may vary from the Rules and Regulations, the latter shall govern.

I. Individuals and Intellectual Property Covered by this Policy

Individuals subject to this policy are defined by Regents’ Rule Series 90101, Sec.2 which states:
Individuals Subject to this Policy. This intellectual property policy applies (a) to all persons employed by the System or any of the institutions including, but not limited to, full and part-time faculty and staff and visiting faculty members and researchers, and (b) to anyone using the facilities or resources of the System or any of the institutions, including, but not limited to, students enrolled at a System institution whether undergraduate or master’s and doctoral students, or postdoctoral fellows. All individuals subject to this policy must assign their rights in intellectual property included under this policy in accordance with the provisions of Regents Rules Series 90102.

Intellectual property subject to this policy is defined by Regents’ Rule Series 90101, Sec.3 and, except for certain exclusions noted below, applies to all types of intellectual property, including, but not limited to, any invention, discovery, creation, know-how, trade secret, technology, scientific or technological development, research data, works of authorship, and computer software regardless of whether subject to protection under patent, trademark, copyright, or other laws.

II. Applicability of Policy and Ownership of Intellectual Property

A. Except as set forth in Subsections B1, B2, and B3, this policy shall apply to, and the Board may assert ownership in Intellectual Property created by:

1. All persons employed by UT Dallas;
2. All persons, including students, using the facilities of UT Dallas under the supervision of its employees;
3. Candidates for masters’ and doctoral degrees, and;
4. Postdoctoral and predoctoral fellows, and;

provided that such Intellectual Property:

a. is created by an employee within the course or scope of employment; or
b. is created on UT Dallas time, with the use of UT Dallas facilities or state financial support; or
c. results from research conducted within the System that is supported by Federal funds or third party sponsorship; or
d) is commissioned by the System or a component institution of System;
   • pursuant to a signed contract through which Intellectual Property is created by (a) an employee, student, or other individual commissioned, required, or hired specifically to produce such intellectual property by the System or any of the institutions and (b) an employee or student as part of an institutional project, or;
that fits within one of the nine categories of works considered “works made for hire” under copyright law.

B. This policy shall not apply to and Board shall not assert ownership rights in Intellectual Property that:

1. is faculty authored, scholarly works, art works, musical compositions and dramatic and non-dramatic literary works related to the faculty member's professional field, regardless of the medium of expression, unless such work is commissioned by or produced as a work for hire by the System or UT Dallas. Such work that is not subject to the provisions of Section A above is owned by the creator. Additionally, a scholarly work that is protected by copyright (defined as “an original work of authorship fixed in a tangible medium of expression”) protects a person's unique way of expressing something, but does not protect the underlying ideas or facts. More information about System Copyright Policy regarding distance learning, coursepacks, and copyrighted scholarly works is available at:
   a. http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/present.htm#copypol;
   b. http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/IntellectualProperty/Policies/iplainenglish.htm (System’s Intellectual Property Policy in Plain English), and;

2. is unrelated to an individual's employment responsibility that is developed on the individual's own time and without UT Dallas support or the use of UT Dallas facilities. Such property is owned by the creator, or;

3. is an invention that has been returned to the inventor in accordance with this Policy, through an invention assignment or license from UT Dallas and Board.

Further, neither the facilities nor the resources of the System or any of its component institutions may be used (a) to create, develop, or commercialize intellectual property outside the course and scope of employment of the individual (see Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 90102, Section 1) or (b) to further develop or commercialize intellectual properties that have been released (assigned) to an inventor (see Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 90102, Sections 2.2 and 2.3).

III. Office of Technology Commercialization
The Office of Technology Commercialization (“OTC”) reports to the Vice President for Research and is responsible for the management of all innovations that result from research conducted at UT Dallas. The mission of the OTC is to effectively and efficiently facilitate the evaluation, protection, patenting and transfer of commercially viable, UT Dallas innovations for the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefit of the citizens of the region and the state of Texas and society in general. The guiding philosophy of the OTC is to take a collaborative, partnering approach when working with inventors, industry partners, and investors. The OTC endeavors to be flexible, facilitative, and market-oriented with the objective of establishing long term, mutually beneficial relationships with UT Dallas faculty and partners.

IV. Advisory Bodies

A. The President of UT Dallas or his designate shall appoint an Intellectual Property Advisory Committee (“Committee”) to help administer intellectual property policy and make recommendations on such related matters as may be requested. The composition of the Committee shall include faculty members and such other individuals within or outside UT Dallas as may seem advisable. The President or his designate shall also appoint a Chair to direct and coordinate the activities of the Intellectual Property Advisory Committee. At the end of each fiscal year, the Office of Technology Commercialization shall provide to the Committee a copy of its annual report outlining its activities and achievements for that completed year.

B. The Intellectual Property Advisory Committee shall:

1. serve as an advisory body to the President and the Office of Technology Commercialization regarding matters related to commercialization activities and intellectual property policy, and, as required;
2. serve as a mediation body with respect to faculty disputes or grievances with UT Dallas in connection with intellectual property matters.

V. Submission of Intellectual Property and Assignment of Rights

A. “Before intellectual property subject to ownership by the Board is disclosed to any party outside the System, to the public generally, or for commercial purposes, and before publishing same, the creator shall submit a reasonably complete and detailed disclosure of such intellectual property to the President of the creator's institution for determination of System's interest” (Regents Rules and Regulations, Series 90102, Section 2.1). Disclosure of Inventions by UT Dallas Inventors should be made to the Office of Technology Commercialization at UT Dallas (OTC), using UT Dallas’ standard invention disclosure form as described located on the OTC website.

(Note: The recommended timing for invention disclosure submission is at least 30
days prior to public disclosure or disclosure otherwise outside the System, to permit sufficient time for review and possible protection of the Intellectual Property by UT Dallas)

B. The Office of Technology Commercialization in collaboration with other evaluators including members of the Intellectual Property Advisory Committee, on an ad hoc basis, will review the disclosure of intellectual property submitted by the creator, and will determine an appropriate course action with respect to an invention disclosure that will include one of the following:

1. That UT Dallas and the System assert rights of ownership in the Intellectual Property on behalf of the Board and obtain such protection for it as may be appropriate, or;

2. That UT Dallas, will license Intellectual Property directly to the inventor, or;

3. That the Board of Regents release rights of ownership in the intellectual property to the creator subject to such terms and conditions as may be appropriate.

C. Where UT Dallas and the System assert rights of ownership on behalf of the Board of Regents in intellectual property covered by this policy, it shall be mandatory that persons covered by this policy assign all rights in such property and any patents or other protection to the Board.

D. Any person who as a result of his or her activities creates Intellectual Property that is subject to this policy, other than on government agreements or other sponsored research projects where the grant agreements provide otherwise, should have a major role in the ultimate determination of how it is to be made public, whether by publication, by development and commercialization after securing available protection for the creation, or both.

VI. Licensing and Distribution of Income

A. In those instances where rights in UT Dallas Intellectual Property are licensed by the Board to third parties, the costs of licensing and obtaining a patent or other protection for the property shall first be recaptured from any royalties received.

B. The remainder of such royalty income (including license fees, prepaid royalties and minimum royalties) shall be divided as follows:
   1. Fifty percent (50%) to the creator(s) (“Creator(s)’ Share”), and
   2. Fifty percent (50%) to U. T. Dallas.

C. That portion of the System's share of licensing income that is allocated to UT Dallas shall be further allocated by the President for research purposes. The Intellectual
Property Advisory Committee may recommend ways in which such income may be applied to further develop and support the intellectual property interests of UT Dallas.

D. With the prior written permission of the President, future royalties payable to a faculty member pursuant to Section V. of this policy may be assigned to UT Dallas by the faculty member and designated for use in research to be conducted by such a faculty member.

E. If there are two or more creators or Inventors entitled to receive royalty income, from the Creators’ Share of royalty income, each Inventor or creator will receive a proportional allocation of the Creators Share, according to the percentage contribution of each of the respective Inventors or creators to the creation of the Intellectual Property. The percentage of inventive contribution will normally be determined according to an Inventors’ sharing agreement to be agreed upon by all contributing Inventors. “In the event that two or more Inventors who are entitled to share royalty income …cannot agree in writing on an appropriate sharing arrangement, that portion of the royalty income to which the creators are entitled will be distributed to them as the institution’s president or, in the event that the creators are located at two or more institutions within the System, the Chancellor may deem appropriate under the circumstances. This decision shall be binding on the creators.” (Regents Rules and Regulations, Series 90102, Section 3.4)

VII. Equity Interests

A. In agreements with business entities relating to rights in intellectual property owned by the Board of Regents, UT Dallas may receive equity interests as partial or total compensation for rights conveyed.

B. Consistent with Section 51.912, Texas Education Code, and subject to review and approval by the President, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor, and the Board, employees of UT Dallas who conceive, create, discover, invent or develop intellectual property may hold an equity interest in a business entity that has an agreement with the University and System relating to the research, development, licensing or exploitation of that intellectual property.

C. Dividend income and income from the sale or disposition of equity interests held by the Board shall belong to the System. UT Dallas may use the net income in accordance with Section VI.C. of this policy.

D. Dividend income and income from the sale or disposition of an equity interest held by an employee pursuant to an agreement between UT Dallas or System and a business entity relating to rights in intellectual property conceived, created, discovered, invented or developed by such employee shall belong to the employee.
E. Each UT Dallas employee named as an Inventor of Intellectual Property developed at UT Dallas that is the subject of a license to a third party of UT Dallas Intellectual Property will receive consideration in the form of a percentage of royalty income received by UT Dallas from such license, according to allocation set forth in Section VI.E above and/or from an equity interest in the third party licensee. In the event an Inventor of UT Dallas Intellectual property, entitled to receive consideration from a license to third party licensee of such Intellectual Property, does not receive an allocation of royalty interest according to Section VI above or an equity interest in the licensee, directly from such licensee, UT Dallas will negotiate with the third party licensee on behalf of the Inventor to enable the Inventor to receive an equity interest in such licensee.

VIII. Business Participation

A. Any UT Dallas employee who conceives, creates, discovers, invents or develops intellectual property (“Inventor”) may serve as a member of the board of directors or other governing board or as an officer or any employee (other than as a consultant) of a business entity that has an agreement with the UT Dallas relating to research, development, licensing, or exploitation of that intellectual property so long as the Inventor is in full compliance with the requirements of UT Dallas’ conflict of interest management plan as approved by the President of UT Dallas or his designate (http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/IntellectualProperty/conflict.htm); provided that if such Inventor has an agreement with any component of System other than UT Dallas, such review and approval will also be required of the President of that respective institution. (Regents Rules and Regulations, Series 90104, Section 1)

B. When requested and authorized by the President of UT Dallas or the Board as set forth in Section VIII A, an employee may serve on behalf of the Board as a member of the board of directors or other governing board of a business entity that has an agreement with the System relating to the research, development, licensing or exploitation of intellectual property.