MEMORANDUM
October 31, 2011

TO: Academic Council*

COPY TO: David Daniel              George Fair
          Hobson Wildenthal              Dennis Kratz
          Andrew Blanchard              James Marquart
          Calvin Jamison                Bert Moore
          Abby Kratz                    Bruce Novak
          John Workowski                Hasan Pirkul
          Austin Cunningham             Mark Spong
          Sheila Amin Gutierrez de Piñeres

FROM: Office of Academic Governance
      Vicki Carlisle, Academic Governance Secretary

SUBJECT: Academic Council Meeting

The Academic Council will meet on Wednesday, November 2, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Osborne Conference Room, ECSS 3.503. Please bring the agenda packet with you to the meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at vicki.carlisle@utdallas.edu or x6751.

Attachments

2011-2012 ACADEMIC COUNCIL

R. Chandrasekaran
David Cordell**
Murray Leaf*
Dennis Miller
Tim Redman
Richard Scotch
Tres Thompson
Sharkey Anderson, Student Government President

*Speaker
**Secretary
REVISED
AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
November 2, 2011
Osborne Conference Room, ECSS 3.503

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  DR. WILDENTHAL
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  DR. LEAF
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  DR. LEAF
   October 5, 2011 Meeting
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT  DR. LEAF
5. FAC REPORT  DR. LEAF
6. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM  DR. LEAF
7. SHOULD WE REVISE POLICY ON UPWARD EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS TO ALLOW PETITION BY FACULTY?  DR. LEAF
8. ADDITION OF MEMBERS TO CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE?  DR. LEAF
9. ADDITIONS/REVISIONS TO ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE  DR. LEAF/ SERENITY KING
10. CEP PROPOSALS  DR. CANTRELL
11. ADJOURNMENT  DR. WILDENTHAL
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

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

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
October 5, 2011

PRESENT:  David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Murray Leaf, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Dennis Miller, Tim Redman, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson

ABSENT:

GUESTS:  Andrew Blanchard, Austin Cunningham, Serenity King, Abby Kratz

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS

President Daniel called the meeting to order. He addressed the issue of revising the way that employee recognition is done and asked the Council for their input. He noted that this event has become more difficult to put on not only because of the downsizing of the administrative staff in his office but due to the costs incurred with the event and the gifts. One possibility would be to do away with the five-year recognition. It was the consensus of the Council that staff recognition is one area that really should not be changed much if at all in order to maintain goodwill. Dr. Daniel mentioned that just ordering gifts for everyone has become a huge task. There is a possibility that we could begin using an outside firm to take care of this aspect of the recognition.

President Daniel addressed the growth in student enrollment. One way that we can control growth is with the academic excellence scholarship, but we must be very careful about how we do this. We are likely to see school-based enrollment restrictions that have not been seen in the past, especially for classes with limited classroom and lab space.

The main concern that President Daniel is hearing from faculty and staff is with the PeopleSoft conversion and its effect on payroll processing. Dr. Jamison and his staff are working on the systemic problem of PeopleSoft. The other key area of concern is with parking. A meeting was held yesterday to discuss parking options and where additional parking lots could be constructed on campus. One of the main concerns is with events that bring a large number of off-campus traffic. In the future we will look at these events very closely and this will be a major consideration of prioritization. It is possible that we will have fewer of these events taking place during peak class times when parking is at a premium.

President Daniel reported that it appears our freshman and sophomore retention rate slipped about 1% last year. Our four-year graduation rate continues to be an area of major concern. Tim Redman stated that as less and less money is available for scholarships and grants, students have more pressure to work while they are going to school which in turn may affect the time it takes to graduate. This is not just an academic problem, it is a financial issue. President Daniel said that good advising is one key to helping students graduate on schedule. He will ask all Deans to take a very hard look at any degree programs that are more than 120
2. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
   Cy Cantrell moved to approve the agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The agenda was approved as circulated.

3. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**
   Cy Cantrell moved to approve the minutes. Richard Scotch seconded. The minutes were approved with one abstention.

4. **SPEAKER’S REPORT – MURRAY LEAF**
   Speaker Leaf stated that everything he needs to discuss is on the agenda.

5. **FAC REPORT – MURRAY LEAF**

6. **REPORT ON PLANNING RETREAT – PRESIDENT DANIEL**
   President Daniel asked that this be placed on the Senate agenda and ask the Senate at that time if there are any other related issues the Senate would like to address. Tim Redman asked if Dr. Daniel’s report could be circulated to the Tier 1 Committee as well so that everyone is working in the same direction.

   Tim Redman moved to place the report on the October Senate agenda. Richard Scotch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

7. **CEP PROPOSALS – CY CANTRELL**
   1.A. **POLICY TO ASSURE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY FOR MASTER’S THESSES AND DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS**
   Cy Cantrell presented this. He is confident that the policy can be approved. This change will allow the supervising committee to make a professional judgment in these cases and act accordingly. President Daniel asked that the wording relating to intentional plagiarism be revised. He also expressed concern over what might happen if a student gets plagiarism past the supervising committee and the committee is sued for negligence if the degree is revoked. He would like some type of protection for the faculty serving on these supervising committees. Committee members should be expected to use a reasonable standard of professional care in reviewing these submissions. Cy Cantrell moved to place this policy on the Senate agenda with the agreed amendments. Tim Redman seconded the motion. The motion carried.

   2.B. **PROPOSED GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS**
   Cy Cantrell moved to place this item on the Senate agenda. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

8. **ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY – MURRAY LEAF**
   Speaker Leaf stated that the Regents are still considering this issue and have not made their final recommendations. The Council unanimously agreed to wait until we receive the revised information from the Regents and address this subject at that time.

9. **INCENTIVES FOR TEACHING EFFORT AND BETTER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**
   Speaker Leaf noted that this issue was one of the items discussed during Dr. Daniel’s recent planning retreat. Dr. Daniel said that he will be forming a task force to address this issue and suggested that the Council wait until the task force has met and done their work to discuss this issue. The Council agreed.
10. NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES
   Serenity King presented this information. She noted that the Coordinating Board now has guidelines for the minimum criteria to be addressed. We can no longer just do an across the board school review. Reviews are based on CIP codes. The Coordinating Board will allow us to group certain CIP codes together as long as reasonable justification is made. Under the new guidelines, every graduate program must be reviewed every seven years. We are restricted to reviewing no more than 20% of our programs in a year. Out of our 130 degree programs, we will need to review 46 programs. Ms. King will distribute the review schedule to the Academic Program Review Committee and the Deans of all schools.

   Cy Cantrell moved to place this item on the Senate agenda. R. Chandrasekaran seconded. The motion carried.

1.11. DISCUSSION OF PHD GRADUATION RATE – MURRAY LEAF
   It was the consensus of the Council to wait for more data and information before bringing this item to the Senate.

1.12. AMENDMENT TO POLICY ON HOP COMMITTEE – MURRAY LEAF
   It was the consensus of the Council that no action is needed by the Senate.

1.13. GRANTING OF EXTRA CREDIT FOR COMPLETION OF ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION FORM
   There was brief discussion of this item and the sense was that this would be inappropriate as academic policy. Richard Scotch moved to not place this item on the Senate agenda. Dennis Miller seconded. The motion carried and the item will not be brought before the Senate.

   The agenda for the October 19, 2011 Academic Senate will be as follows:

   1. Discussion of New Academic Program Review Guidelines
      1.2. CEP Proposals:
         1.a. Policy to Assure Academic Integrity for Master’s Theses and Doctoral Dissertations
         1.b. Certificate Program in Enterprise Systems
      1.3. Report on President Daniel’s Planning Retreat

   Cy Cantrell moved to approve the Senate agenda as read. Tres Thompson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

   There being no further business, President Daniel adjourned the meeting.

   APPROVED: ____________________________ DATE: ____________________________

   Murray J. Leaf
   Speaker of the Senate
Policy Statement

The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to regular, substantive reviews of its academic administrators and to involvement of members of the faculty, staff, and students in these reviews.

I. Policy:
   A. The Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents, Rule 30501, Section 1 requires annual evaluation of all U.T. System employees to be used for the improvement of performance, promotion consideration, and merit salary review. Rule 31101, Section 3 of the Rules also requires that all academic administrators below the level of President receive periodic evaluations that include faculty, staff, and student input. To simplify the schedule of the review of academic administrators and to provide substantial feedback, every academic administrator at U.T. Dallas will be formally reviewed three years after the initial administrative appointment and at least every six years thereafter. The review shall be comprehensive and include input from faculty, staff, and students, and where appropriate alumni, community leaders, and other sources identified in the charge to the committee from the President or Provost. Comments by full-time faculty members in the appropriate academic unit will provide the faculty's response to the academic administrator's performance in that unit. Faculty members in an academic unit are encouraged, moreover, to provide information to an academic administrator's supervising officer at any time regarding that academic administrator's performance.
   B. For the purpose of this policy memorandum, an academic administrator is defined as an individual who has either direct and significant responsibility for determination of the duties, support, and/or compensation for faculty or has supervisory responsibilities over major academic support functions such as the library and research. In the current administrative structure at U.T. Dallas, academic administrators include the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost), the Vice President for Research, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean of Undergraduate Education, the School Deans, the Director of the Callier Center for Communication Disorders, the Dean of Libraries, the Director of Research Administration, the Department or Program Heads, and the Associate Deans in each School.
II. Procedures:
   A. Responsibility:
      1. The President has responsibility, directly or through designees, for appointment, review, and dismissal of all administrative officers, including the Provost, Vice Presidents, Deans, Directors, Department or Program Heads, and Associate Deans.
      2. The responsibility for the review of an academic administrator, with significant involvement of and input from full-time faculty will, in general, be delegated by the President to that administrator's immediate supervisor. Thus, the Provost and School Deans normally will conduct the reviews of the academic administrators whom they supervise.
   B. Review procedures:
      1. Reviews will normally be initiated by the administrator's immediate supervisor in the fall semester, but may occur at any time of the academic year. The immediate supervisor will be responsible for the development of a timetable for the review process.
      2. The immediate supervisor will be responsible for the distribution and collection of faculty comment forms and for the analysis of the responses on these forms.
      3. Faculty comment forms will be sent by the immediate supervisor to all full-time faculty members in the unit of the academic administrator being evaluated (see attached Form A). In the case of the review of the Vice President for Research, Dean of Libraries, Director of Research Administration, and Undergraduate and Graduate Deans, the Provost will distribute faculty comment forms to all full-time faculty (see attached Form C). In the case of the review of the Provost, the President will distribute faculty comment forms to all full-time faculty (see attached Form C). In the case of the review of a school dean, faculty comment forms will be sent to full-time faculty outside of the dean's school upon request to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (see attached Form B). Faculty comment forms from faculty within a school will be distinguishable from those submitted by faculty outside the school. In the case of Associate Deans, Department Heads, and Program Heads, the Dean of the School will distribute faculty comment forms to all full-time faculty within the school or department as appropriate.
      4. In addition, the immediate supervisor will contact faculty members to solicit individual (or group) interviews.
5. The immediate supervisor will also interview students from appropriate student organizations and will hold an open forum to garner student feedback. Similar meetings will be arranged to obtain input from the staff in the relevant academic unit.

6. To the extent allowed by law, supervisors will preserve the identity of the source of all written and verbal comments received from faculty in connection with the review of an academic administrator. No anonymous material other than the official surveys that correspond with this policy will be considered as part of the review.

7. After the immediate supervisor has received and analyzed faculty comments, as well as other feedback from staff and students, regarding an academic administrator under review, the immediate supervisor will meet with the academic administrator being reviewed to discuss the supervisor’s analysis of these comments and any action thought required for this analysis.

8. Following the immediate supervisor’s meeting with the academic administrator being reviewed, the supervisor will convene a meeting to communicate his/her response to the review to the faculty members in the relevant academic unit. In the case of a review of the Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Undergraduate Education, Dean of Libraries, Director of Research Administration, and Vice President for Research, the Provost’s response will be communicated to the Academic Senate.

9. Upon the completion of reviews of School Deans, Department or Program Heads, and Associate Deans, these administrators will meet with the faculties of the relevant academic units to discuss issues raised by faculty in the review process.

10. At the conclusion of the review process, the supervisor will forward the academic administrator’s review file and the supervisor’s written report containing the substance of the review to her/his own immediate supervisor.

11. A summary of the report will be provided to the administrator under review and to the administrator’s supervisor and will be made available to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Once a year the Provost will report to the Academic Senate regarding any reviews of academic administrators that have been conducted in the preceding year.

C. Faculty Evaluation of Academic Administrators Survey Form

1. Immediate supervisors will distribute, at a minimum, the relevant university survey form (Form A) that is attached to
this policy memorandum in the review of an academic administrator under this policy.

2. Any deletion or modification of the questions in the attached survey forms requires approval by the Academic Senate.

Policy Form: PM 96-III.30-68 Evaluation of Academic Administrators Surveys

Policy History

- Issued: April 18, 1996
- Revised: June 4, 1996
- Revised: September 16, 1999
- Revised: August 23, 2007

Policy Links

Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1047

Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1047

Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1047
Committee on the Core Curriculum - UTDPP1018

Policy Charge
Core Curriculum

Policy Statement
The Committee on the Core Curriculum is a Standing, Concurrent Committee of the Academic Senate regarding University-wide requirements for students seeking entrance to a baccalaureate degree from The University of Texas at Dallas.

The Committee is charged to evaluate and make recommendations to the Academic Senate regarding the University-wide General Education curriculum and its implications in terms of academic requirements for undergraduate admission and graduation, including transfer admission requirements. The Committee reviews and approves the suitability of particular U.T. Dallas courses that are submitted as designed to satisfy the University’s core curriculum requirements. It may also review lower-division courses offered by other Texas public colleges and universities that students submit to substitute for U.T. Dallas core courses. The Committee also monitors changes in state law and rules of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to ensure that U.T. Dallas requirements are in compliance with statewide requirements for core curriculum.

The Committee on the Core Curriculum shall act as the originator and developer of proposals regarding the core curriculum, just as the Faculty of the various Programs and Schools act regarding their majors' curricula and prerequisites. In so doing, the Committee on the Core Curriculum shall seek advice from all interested parties in the University, and call timely hearings of the faculty concerned with the core curriculum.

By November 1, the Chair of the Committee will provide the Speaker of the Faculty with a copy of the agenda established by the Committee for its work during the academic year.

Annually, but no later than August 31, the Chair of the Committee will provide the Speaker of the Faculty with a written report for the Academic Senate of the Committee’s activities for the prior academic year.
The Committee is composed of seven voting members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in Title III, Chapter 21, Section I.B.1. of The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures). Committee membership will be distributed across all seven schools. The Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy shall serve ex officio as one of the voting members. The Dean of Undergraduate Education, the University Registrar and Director of Academic Records, and the Director of Undergraduate Advising serve as non-voting, ex officio members. Four non-voting members are degree-seeking undergraduates including one lower-division student and one upper-division transfer student. The Chair of the Committee serves ex officio, with vote, on the Committee on Educational Policy. The Dean of Undergraduate Education serves as the Responsible University Official.

Unless specified otherwise in this charge, Committee members are appointed to two-year terms, and the Chair and Vice Chair are appointed annually. The terms for appointed members shall be staggered so that no more than one-half of the terms expire in any one year. Members may be reappointed by the President for additional terms upon nomination of the Academic Council. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President, upon nomination of the Academic Council, shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

**Policy History**

- Issued: April 4, 1995
- Revised: September 1, 1998
- Revised: June 3, 1999
- Editorial Amendments: September 1, 2000
- Revised: October 25, 2001
- Editorial Amendments: November 22, 2002
- Revised: October 19, 2004
- Editorial Amendments: June 7, 2006
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Link to printable version: [http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdp1018](http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdp1018)
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW - UTDPP1013

Policy Charge
Academic Program Review (PRC)

Policy Statement
All academic programs will be reviewed regularly to evaluate their quality and their
effectiveness in supporting the University's mission. As described by this policy, a standing
committee, the Program Review Committee (PRC), composed of members of The University of
Texas at Dallas faculty and academic administration, will oversee the review process. The
Committee will function in cooperation with the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost),
under whose auspices Academic Program Reviews are conducted

Program Review Committee (PRC)
This University committee will maintain general oversight of the review process to assure its
efficacy and uniformity. During each program review, one member of the PRC, designated the
PRC Monitor, will participate directly in the process. In addition to responsibilities as a regular
member of the Review Team, the PRC Monitor will have the additional duties of conferring with
and reporting to the PRC and, on the basis of knowledge acquired as a member of the PRC,
helping each Review Team insure consistency of its individual review with the overall Review
process. The entire PRC will evaluate the operation of the Review process on a continuing basis
and make an annual report to the Provost and Academic Senate. In this report it will recommend
any modifications of policy or procedure regarding reviews it considers desirable. In addition, it
will consult with and advise the Provost on other aspects of reviews as requested.

The PRC will consist of three faculty members and three Deans, appointed by the President.
Members from the faculty will be recommended by the Academic Senate after consultation with
the Committee on Committees. Deans will be recommended by the Provost. The three-year
terms of members will be staggered initially to provide retirement of one third of the members
each year. Members may be reappointed.

Frequency of Review
Academic Programs ("units") shall be reviewed at approximately 5-year intervals, or more
frequently if the Provost, in consultation with the appropriate Dean, finds that the circumstances
of a particular program suggest an earlier date. The 5-year interval provides a manageable
number (2 to 4) of program reviews each year and is long enough to reflect changes in programs
and their leadership. However, a program may not need to be reviewed if an external
accreditation review has occurred within the previous 5 years. Accreditation reviews should be
conducted in such a way as to substantially meet the goals outlined under The Review Procedure
below.

Criteria for Selection of Program for Review
The term "Academic Program" or "unit" as used in this document may refer either to a School or
to any academically coherent, distinctively functioning subdivision thereof. In order to be
separately reviewable under the terms of this policy, a unit must have tenured or tenure-track
faculty officially affiliated with it and must offer instruction leading to the awarding of degrees.
Appendix A, which may be modified from time to time by the Provost after consultation with the
PRC, lists examples of programs that might be reviewable under this policy.
Selection of units to be reviewed in a given year will be made by the Provost after consultation with the PRC and the appropriate Dean(s). The factors (not in priority order) to be considered in the selection of units for review include:

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

The Review Team
The evaluation in each review will be carried out by an ad hoc Review Team appointed and charged by the Provost. This Review Team's composition may vary from program to program, but will incorporate both internal and external members. Typically, it will include:

1. At least three individuals from other institutions that have programs similar to those of the unit under review, appointed by the Provost after consultation with the appropriate unit administrators.
2. At least two members from the U.T. Dallas faculty and academic administration who are not affiliated with the program to be reviewed, appointed by the Provost after consultation with the PRC.
3. One member of the PRC, to act as the PRC Monitor, appointed by the Provost after consultation with the PRC. This individual will not be affiliated with the program under review.

Additional members may be added as appropriate. One member of the Team, usually a member not affiliated with UT Dallas, will be designated Chair of the Review Team by the Provost at the time the Team is constituted. The Review Team will evaluate the unit as requested by a written charge prepared by the Provost after consultation with the PRC.

The Review Procedure
Reviews will be conducted as follows:

The unit undergoing review will consult with the Provost regarding selection of Review Team members, suitable dates for the Team's campus visit, and the detailed schedule of events during the visit. It will prepare a comprehensive self-study document (an internal planning document, not intended for general distribution) in accordance with guidelines and instructions issued by the Provost. It will also collaborate with the Provost in insuring that the Team's on-campus needs are met. The Provost will designate a Review Coordinator (the Dean, Head, Director, or suitable substitute) from the unit to see that the duties assigned to the unit in connection with the Review are carried out.

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

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

Along with addressing any unique aspects of its charge, the Review Team's report will assess the unit's overall performance and its specific strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for any changes the Team thinks are advisable. The evaluation should refer to the program's self-study and note items of agreement and disagreement between the Team's assessments and those of the self-study. Typically the Team will consider the undergraduate and graduate curricula and programs of instruction (including student learning outcomes), the student demand for these programs, the scholarly activity of the unit's faculty, the unit's facilities, the national stature and impact of the unit's programs, the quality of its students, the market for its graduates, the level of support for the unit, the effectiveness of the unit's leadership, and the effectiveness of the unit in furthering the university's Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity goals.

The faculty and administration of the unit will have access to the Team's final report, and the unit's chief administrative office in cooperation with faculty and staff will provide a written response to the report for the Provost, giving specific actions planned in the light of Team's recommendations. Where the unit disagrees with findings and/or recommendations of the Team, it will give its reasons for such disagreements. The unit's faculty will have access to this document as well as to the Review Team's report.

The Provost will discuss the Team's report and unit's response with the unit's administration and faculty. Finally, the Provost will prepare recommendations to the President to complete the review. These recommendations, together with the unit's Self-Study, the charge to the Review Team, the Review Team's report, and the unit's response, will constitute the official record of the Program Review of that unit.

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

APPENDIX A

Examples of Academic Components to be Reviewed as Units

1. School of Management
2. School of Interdisciplinary Studies
3. School of Arts and Humanities
4. Programs in Biology
5. Programs in Chemistry
6. Programs in Geosciences
7. Programs in Physics
8. Programs in Mathematical Sciences
9. Programs in Science Education
10. School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences
11. Programs in Computer Science
12. Programs in Electrical Engineering
13. School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences
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