MEMORANDUM
November 2, 2012
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The Academic Council will meet on WEDNESDAY, November 7, 2012 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.
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AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
November 7, 2012
Osborne Conference Room, ECSS 3.503

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS
   DR. DANIEL

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   DR. LEAF

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   October 3, 2012 Meeting
   DR. LEAF

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT
   DR. LEAF

5. FAC REPORT
   DR. LEAF

6. CEP PROPOSALS - TBA
   DR. CANTRELL
   A. Proposal for Master of Science Degree in Actuarial Science
   B. Proposal to Revise the Core Curriculum

7. CHANGES TO UTDPP1028 COMMITTEE ON LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS
   POLICY CHARGE
   DR. LEAF

8. AMENDMENT TO UTD 1077 CONCERNING PERSONNEL REVIEW COMMITTEE
   DR. LEAF

9. RECOMMENDATION TO SENATE OF MEMBERS OF INFORMATION SECURITY
   COMMITTEE
   DR. LEAF

10. REPLACEMENT FOR THERESA TOWNER ON FACILITIES OVERSIGHT
    COMMITTEE
    DR. LEAF

8. ADJOURNMENT
   DR. DANIEL
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 3, 2012

PRESENT: Hobson Wildenthal, Gail Breen, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran; David Cordell, Murray Leaf, Dennis Miller, Ravi Prakash, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Tim Redman

ABSENT: Tres Thompson

VISITORS: Abby Kratz

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS
Provost Wildenthal called the meeting to order. There were no questions.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
Cy Cantrell moved to approve the agenda as circulated. Richard Scotch seconded. The agenda was approved as circulated.

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

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT
Our new Annual Review Policy has gone forward for System approval. Meanwhile, the schools need to know what do for this year. I have advised that we circulate the revised policy without waiting for approval. The Academic Council agrees. There are two main reasons. The first is that it is substantially what we have been doing already. Second, until it goes into effect the status quo ante has to be presumed to prevail, and the status quo ante has been that we did not have a policy but rather a procedure issued by the Provost. I have, therefore, asked the Provost to circulate the new policy on the same authority, and he has agreed to do so. So all of your schools should have received it, and you should be working to implement it. This means that if you want to have further specifications of the standards for evaluation, you should be forming a faculty or faculty/administration body to begin writing them.

The charge for the Information Security Committee has also gone to System for approval. The HOP committee strongly suggested an editorial revision that I agreed to. The main amendment was to take a long qualifying phrase out the first sentence in the paragraph describing the general charge and make the first bulleted example of what the general charge entails.

The phrase was: “in planning and testing measures to provide security for the University for development and use of the university’s information resources in such a way as to comply with UT System security requirements for university information while not asserting undue claims
to own or access information owned by faculty or for which faculty are under obligation to other organizations.”

The bulleted statement is: “To plan and test measures to provide security for the University for development and use of the university’s information resources in such a way as to comply with UT System security requirements for university information while not asserting undue claims to own or access information owned by faculty or for which faculty are under obligation to other organizations.

Also, a staff member and a student member were added to the committee.

Since this did not seem to involve any substantive change in what the committee will actually do, I agreed that the amendments should go ahead and did not need to come back to the Senate.

5. FAC REPORT

Lewis Watkins, Chief Information Security Officer and Barbara Holthaus, Senior Attorney and System Privacy Coordinator, spoke to the FAC. It appears that Ms. Holthaus was the author of the paragraph in the letter from Dr. Reyes that claims that the university owns everything we produce in our capacity as faculty of the university. We had a rather lively discussion, in which my own assessment was that the faculty turned out to be more knowledgeable of the law than Ms. Holthaus expected, and Ms. Hotlhaus’ position appeared a good deal more shaky than she had perhaps realized. The opinion of the FAC was that there was considerable scope for improving the way the legitimate claims of the university were described and set off from the legitimate claims of the faculty.

We spent considerable time discussing both the encryption policy issues and the Conflict of Interest policy. As indicated in the notes I have circulated separately, we agreed that:

1. The central problem is with the requirement that the campuses policies all be “at least as stringent as” the Public Health Service requirements.

2. To deal with 1, it is essential to extract and clarify what the PHS means by “research” and by “data” in contrast to other meanings that are more relevant to the academic campus, as per problem A. Then we can show how alternative proposed policies are “as stringent” given the differences between fields. I think what we are saying is that “as stringent” has to be interpreted in terms of analogs in different fields, rather than transposing absolute rules to different fields. Putting the same point a different way, we need to show how the PHS conceptions of research, of data, and interests create confusion when applied to the kinds of research that the PHS does not recognize as research.

3. Also, we need to show how kinds of conflicts of interest the PHS are concerned with (where large amounts of money can be at stake) are not the sort of thing one finds in most other scholarly fields, where financial stakes are often nebulous, minimal, or very distant. Essentially much of scholarship produces public goods, not goods that can be controlled for private profit.

We will also set up working group to provide better regulation and support for the base level administrators on the UT campuses, and more transparency.
6. **CEP Proposals**
   Cy Cantrell stated that the CEP item has not been discussed by the Committee. Fundamentally this item originated in Dean Pineres’ office and was heavily re-worked by people from NS&M and ECS. The point is to have guidelines for the employment of student workers who are involved in the instructional program in some capacity. There is a bifurcation between students who are given academic credit for being teaching interns and students who are simply paid for grading. There is also a third category, students who are peer-led team learning leaders.

   Dr. Wildenthal questioned why we are giving academic credit to students for what is not an academic course. Dennis Miller noted that we do not have enough graduate teaching assistants to cover all the courses and this helps supplement that. Speaker Leaf said that he thought there was a past policy that addressed the idea that grades should not be used for compensation. Dr. Cantrell asked Speaker Leaf if he would be willing to attend the CEP meeting to voice this concern. Speaker Leaf said he would.

   Tim Redman moved to place this item on the Senate agenda if approved by the Committee on Educational Policy. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried.

7. **Residential Camps and Conferences Presentation**
   Speaker Leaf has a request from Pam McElrath, Assistant Director of Residential Life, to address the Senate to show what is available on campus for hosting groups and meetings. Tim Redman moved to put this item on the agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

8. **Revised Bylaws Guidelines for Schools**
   Speaker Leaf pointed out that these were not the guidelines, but rather the changes to be made in the guidelines.

   Tim Redman brought to the Council’s attention that Arts and Humanities does not have programs or departments, but different tracks. He further stated that there may or may not be coordinators within the different tracks.

   Under “key administrative processes” – Dr. Redman took issue with the following paragraph:

   “Agreements made with faculty to adjust the workload of a faculty member in a way that should be reflected in that faculty member’s annual reviews or periodic performance evaluation should be presented to the executive committee for approval or disapproval by majority vote. The approved change, when finalized by the administration, should be noted in the faculty member’s personnel file.”

   Provost Wildenthal suggested changing the wording to “. . . should be presented for review by the Executive Committee.”

   Appointments of tenure-track faculty: Tim Redman requested that “Departures from the normally assigned duties and standards of performance other than those stipulated in the conditions for the chair itself are subject to approval by the Executive Committee and should be noted in the faculty member’s personnel file.” be changed to read “Departures from the normally assigned duties and standards of performance other than those stipulated in the conditions for the chair itself are subject to review by the Executive Committee and should be noted in the faculty member’s personnel file.”

   The Council agreed that in each school the School Periodic Performance Evaluation Committee and the Faculty Personnel Review Committee should be merged.
Liz Salter asked if Directors of Centers and Institutes would be considered for evaluation as administrators. Provost Wildenthal said that our current policy does not address this issue specifically. It raises the question what exactly is a center? Cy Cantrell said that if someone has significant authority in terms of evaluating faculty performance then they should be subject to upward evaluation. Dr. Wildenthal stated that he agreed with this approach. Speaker Leaf said that he thought this could be accomplished with a slight amendment to the current policy on upward evaluation.

After further discussion the Council agreed that the suggested changes in the bylaws guidelines for schools be made and brought back to Council for further review.

9. **RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT – UTDPP1077**

Tim Redman suggested that the following paragraph dealing with the faculty personnel review committee “Only tenured faculty may serve on this committee and recommendations regarding tenured Associate Professors may be made only by tenured Professors. A majority of the members should be of the rank of full professor.” be changed to read “. . . and recommendations regarding tenured Associate Professors and Professors may be made only by tenured Professors.”

Cy Cantrell moved to place this item as amended on the Senate agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

10. **REPLACEMENT/ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS FOR CAMPUS FACILITIES COMMITTEE AND IACUC**

Speaker Leaf reported that he had asked the Committee on Committees for recommendations to replace Theresa Towner as Vice-Chair of the Campus Facilities Committee but had received no response. At Cy Cantrell’s suggestion, the Council agreed to return this item back to the Committee on Committees to name a replacement.

Sanaz Okhovat, Senior Director of Research Compliance has requested that Ernest Hannig and Kathan McAllister be added to the membership roster of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. Cy Cantrell moved to approve. There was discussion regarding the need to add additional members to the committee. Speaker Leaf did not know the reason for the request. Tres Thompson, chair of the committee, did not know of the request. Cy Cantrell suggested that the Council defer action on this item at this time and let the request for additional members, if needed, come from the chair of the committee.

11. **SENATE AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 17:**

CEP PROPOSAL ON UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING PARTICIPATION
RESIDENTIAL CAMPS AND CONFERENCES PRESENTATION
RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT –UTDPP1077 TENURE & REVIEW POLICY

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED: __________________________ DATE: __________________________
Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Senate
New Program Request Form for Bachelor’s and Master’s Degrees

**Directions:** An institution shall use this form to propose a new bachelor’s or master’s degree program. In completing the form, the institution should refer to the document *Standards for Bachelor’s and Master’s Programs*, which prescribes specific requirements for new degree programs. Note: This form requires signatures of (1) the Chief Executive Officer, certifying adequacy of funding for the new program; (2) a member of the Board of Regents (or designee), certifying Board approval, and (3) if applicable, a member of the Board of Regents or (designee), certifying that criteria have been met for staff-level approval. NOTE: Preliminary authority is required for all engineering programs. An institution that does not have preliminary authority for a proposed engineering program shall submit a separate request for preliminary authority prior to submitting the degree program request form. That request shall address criteria set in Coordinating Board rules Section 5.24 (a).

**Information:** Contact the Division of Academic Affairs and Research at 512/427-6200 for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Institution:</strong> The University of Texas at Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Program Name –</strong> Show how the program would appear on the Coordinating Board’s program inventory (e.g., <em>Bachelor of Business Administration degree with a major in Accounting</em>): Master of Science in Actuarial Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Proposed CIP Code:</strong> 52.1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Brief Program Description –</strong> Describe the program and the educational objectives: Actuaries use their statistical, probabilistic, mathematical, financial, management, economics and government policy skills to define, analyze, and solve business problems involving the cost of possible future events. Actuaries are employed by insurance companies, financial institutions, consulting firms, industrial corporations, government agencies, universities, accounting firms, and labor unions. There is also an emerging market for actuaries in banking, mortgage, social security, health care and public health industries. Both Texas and the Dallas-Fort Worth region need a graduate program in actuarial science. As stated in the UT Dallas’ Strategic Plan “...Without the engine of discovery, invention and entrepreneurship that a truly great graduate program provides our economic vitality as a state and a region is at risk...” This proposal for the graduate program in Actuarial Science in the Department of Mathematical Sciences at UT Dallas addresses the aforementioned issues. The Department of Mathematical Sciences is uniquely placed to offer this program. In Fall 2009, the department started a Bachelor’s program in Actuarial Science that in Fall 2012 grew to 57 students. Dr. Sam Efroimovich, Fellow of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics (IMS) and the American Statistical Association (ASA) and program head, and Dr. Natalya Humphreys, Fellow of the Society of Actuaries (SOA), the Associate Head of the program, are both involved in actuarial research currently supported by a grant from the Actuarial Research Foundation. Actuarial Science is primarily based on classical mathematics, applied mathematics, probability and statistics, and the department is known for its academic and teaching strength in these areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The objective of the proposed Master's Degree program in Actuarial Science is to educate future leaders of the actuarial industry with training in actuarial theory and methods in a wide spectrum of actuarial applications involving probabilistic and statistical models. All students will be prepared to take four actuarial qualified exams and will take two advanced actuarial classes to prepare for professional accreditation. Furthermore, students who did not take classes required for VEE (Validation of Educational Experience) credits in statistics, finance, and economics will have such an opportunity. This combined knowledge of mathematics – particularly of probability, statistics, and decision theory – together with knowledge of financial mathematics and insurance, the expected passing of four actuarial exams, and the three required VEE credits, graduates of the program will be able to work as senior actuaries in insurance, consulting, finance, government, and emerging markets.

5. **Administrative Unit** – Identify where the program would fit within the organizational structure of the university (e.g., *The Department of Electrical Engineering within the College of Engineering*):
   Department of Mathematical Sciences in the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

6. **Proposed Implementation Date** – Report the first semester and year that students would enter the program: Fall 2013

7. **Contact Person** – Provide contact information for the person who can answer specific questions about the program:
   
   **Name:** Bruce Novak  
   **Title:** Dean, School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics  
   **E-mail:** bxn111230@utdallas.edu  
   **Phone:** 972-883-2416

---

**Program Information**

**I. Need**

*Note: Complete I.A and I.B only if preliminary authority for the program was granted more than four years ago. This includes programs for which the institution was granted broad preliminary authority for the discipline.*

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

   Short-term evidence: The JobsRated.com [1] and Jobs Rated Almanac [2], which rank professions and occupations, have consistently rated the career of an actuary as one of the best jobs in North America. Wall Street Journal, using data from the George Town center on education and the workplace, ranks Actuarial Science as the top major with 0 percent
unemployment rate [3]. CNN Money, on May 15, 2012, ranked an actuary as number one among most lucrative professions. According to an online job search performed in September 2012, 265 actuarial jobs are open within 25 miles from Dallas (among them at least 43 require a Master’s Degree) and 688 actuarial jobs are open in Texas. Actuary.com ranks Texas as thirteen for open actuarial positions after such states as (New York, Massachusetts, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Washington, Ohio, Connecticut, Iowa, and New Jersey). According to DW Simpson, an actuarial recruiting firm, there were more than 2600 open positions for senior actuaries in US, Canada, and the Caribbean.

According to Actuary.com, 56 master’s degrees were confirmed nationally at 24 universities in 2011; of those, only two were produced in Texas by UT Austin’s actuarial science concentration in the mathematics program.

Long-term evidence: According to the recent Bureau of Labor Statistics occupational outlook handbook [4], employment of actuaries is expected to "...grow much faster than the average for all occupations..." Furthermore, employment of actuaries is expected to increase by 21 percent over the 2008-2018 period. Specifically, while employment of actuaries in 2008 was 19,700, the projected employment in 2018 is 23,900. While employment in the insurance industry - the largest employer of actuaries - will experience some growth, greater job growth for actuaries will occur in other industries, such as financial services and consulting. The Wall Street Journal stresses that, due to increased competition, job prospects are greatest for job seekers who have passed at least two of the initial exams and have a solid foundation in mathematics, including the ability to compute complex probability and statistics. According to “Actuarial Supply and Demand” [5], even with an immediate 2% increase in supply, it will take 40 years before supply, of actuaries catches up to the demand.

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

It is expected that graduate students will be recruited from three groups of potential candidates.

The first group of potential candidates consists of students finishing our own Bachelor program in Actuarial Science. In Fall 2012, we have 17 seniors who should graduate in 2013, and four expressed their interest in obtaining a Master’s Degree.

The second group of potential students to be enrolled in the Master’s Program, are those who currently have a Bachelor’s Degree in a different major and would like to continue their education and get a degree in Actuarial Science. For instance, in Fall 2012 in our Bachelor’s actuarial program, we have four students who already have a Bachelor’s Degree and would like to prepare for an actuarial career. Because there is no Master’s Program, they are forced to get a second Bachelor’s Degree.
The third group of potential students, who may be interested in the program, are those with Bachelor (or in some cases Master) degrees who are already working and would like to prepare for Actuarial Exams, get a Master’s Degree in Actuarial Science, and/or change profession. We have an example of such a potential student who is pursuing a Master’s Degree in statistics because we do not have the major. He is also working as an analyst.

For all these groups of potential students, we have students' testimonies on file that they are interested in the Master program.

Texas does not have a graduate major in Actuarial Science, although UT Austin has a master’s in mathematics with a concentration in actuarial science.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTSE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C1. Enrollment grows by about 5 full-time and 2 part-time students every year.
C2. Full-time students take 18 SCH per academic year and graduate in two years. Part-time students take 12 SCH per academic year and graduate in 3 years.
C3. Attrition rate is about 10% for part-time students during first year.

C4. The above-presented data is based on the information obtained from potential students. It is also supported by data from the current graduate program in Statistics at UT Dallas which is the closest in terms of the demand and enrollment projections. In the Fall 2012 18 students were admitted in the graduate program in statistics, and among them 10 into Master program. Among those 10, 5 are full-time and 5 are part-time students. A typical attrition among stat-students is below 5%. It is believed that the enrollment projections for actuarial program are very conservative.

C5. The Bachelor program in Actuarial Science, started in the Fall 2009, currently involves 57 students (Fall 2012). This exceeds the projected number (48) used in the New Program Request Form for Bachelor Degree in Actuarial Science. Among the current students are 8 freshman, 11 sophomore, 17 junior, 17 senior and 4 with bachelor degree in another major. It is our observation that many students joint the program during their junior year when they begin to realize the importance of their major. Five students have already graduated the program. It is reasonable to conjecture that at least 40 students will graduate over the period of next 5 years.

II. **Quality**

A. **Degree Requirements** – Use this table to show the degree requirements of the program. *(Modify the table as needed; if necessary; replicate the table for more than one option.)*

*The minimal total required number of classes for graduation is 36 SCH. Among them, 27 SCH of required courses and 9 of elective.*

B. **Curriculum** – Use these tables to identify the required courses and prescribed electives of the program. Note with an asterisk (*) courses that would be added if the program is approved. *(Add and delete rows as needed. If applicable, replicate the tables for different tracks/options.)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAT 6331</td>
<td>Statistical Inference I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ACTS 6301</td>
<td>Theory of Actuarial Models: Life Contingencies I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ACTS 6303</td>
<td>Theory of Actuarial Models: Life Contingencies II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ACTS 6304</td>
<td>Theory of Actuarial Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ACTS 6305</td>
<td>Advanced Actuarial Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ACTS 6306</td>
<td>Advanced Actuarial Applications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ACTS 6308</td>
<td>Advanced Actuarial Financial Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Prescribed Elective Courses (Student chooses three of the following)</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAT 6329</td>
<td>Applied Probability and Stochastic processes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 6338</td>
<td>Advances Statistical Methods II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 6343</td>
<td>Experimental Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 6347</td>
<td>Applied Time Series Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 7338</td>
<td>Time Series Modeling and Filtering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 6348</td>
<td>Applied Multivariate Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 6390</td>
<td>Topics in Statistics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 7334</td>
<td>Nonparametric and Robust Statistical Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 6313</td>
<td>Numerical Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 6321</td>
<td>Numerical Optimizations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 6301</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 6308</td>
<td>Regulations of Business and Financial Markets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 6310</td>
<td>Investment Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 6314</td>
<td>Fixed Income Securities and their Derivatives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 6360</td>
<td>Options and Future Markets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 6382</td>
<td>Numerical Methods in Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPRE 6335</td>
<td>Risk and Decision Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECO 6303</td>
<td>Business Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIM 6305</td>
<td>Accounting for Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POEC 5306</td>
<td>Macroeconomic Theory and Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POEC 5307</td>
<td>Economics for Public Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Faculty – Use these tables to provide information about Core and Support faculty. Add an asterisk (*) before the name of the individual who will have direct administrative responsibilities for the program. *(Add and delete rows as needed.)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Core Faculty and Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree and Awarding Institution</th>
<th>Courses Assigned in Program</th>
<th>% Time Assigned To Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.: Robertson, David Asst. Professor</td>
<td>PhD In Molecular Genetics Univ. of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>MG200, MG 285, MG824 (Lab Only)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Efromovich, Sam Endowed Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Statistics Moscow Physical-Technical Institute</td>
<td>STAT6331 STAT6337 ACTS6304 ACTS6305</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphreys, Natalia Clinical Associate Professor, FSA</td>
<td>PhD in Mathematics Purdue University</td>
<td>ACTS 6301 ACTS 6302 ACTS 6303 ACTS 6304</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron, Michael Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Statistics University of Maryland</td>
<td>STAT 6337 ACTS 6301 ACTS 6303 ACTS 6308</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty in Year 2 Clinical Ass. Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACTS 6301 ACTS 6303 ACTS 6305 ACTS 6306 ACTS 6308</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Support Faculty and Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree and Awarding Institution</th>
<th>Courses Assigned in Program</th>
<th>% Time Assigned To Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry Ammann Professor</td>
<td>PhD In Statistics Florida State</td>
<td>STAT 6329</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pankai Choudhary</td>
<td>PhD Statistics Ohio State University</td>
<td>STAT 6329</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Serfling Professor</td>
<td>PhD in Statistics North Carolina</td>
<td>STAT 6331</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A core of three current doctoral faculty of the Department of Mathematical Sciences, Dr. Sam Efromovich (The Head of Actuarial Program, Fellow of ASA, ISM and Academic Correspondent to CAS), Dr. Natalia Humphreys, Fellow of SOA, and Dr. Michael Baron together with another core faculty to be hired, will guarantee a high quality of the program. Currently the research of Dr. Efromovich and Dr. Humphreys is supported by a Grant from Actuarial Research Foundation, and research of Dr. Baron was supported by
Actuarial Research Foundation in the past. Furthermore, the research of Dr. Efrovich is supported by NSF and NSA Grants. It is also expected that Dr. Pankaj Choudhary and Dr. Robert Serfling will also participate in the program. These two professors, at different times, were involved in actuarial research supported by grants from actuarial societies.

D. **Students** – Describe general recruitment efforts and admission requirements. In accordance with the institution’s Uniform Recruitment and Retention Strategy, describe plans to recruit, retain, and graduate students from underrepresented groups for the program.

Students will be recruited from graduates of actuarial, finance and economics Bachelor programs at UT Dallas and from other universities at Texas and the U.S. Also, students with Bachelor degrees in other majors, where the mathematics is traditionally a core subject, as well as students with a non-actuarial master degree, who would like to change the profession, will be also recruited as full-time students. Part-time students will be primarily recruited from currently working professionals with a Bachelor or Master degree who would like to change their profession, and employees of local insurance, consulting and financial companies who already are working toward earning their actuarial associate accreditation. Using the UT Dallas recruitment database, special attention will be devoted to recruitment and retaining students from underrepresented groups via mentoring by graduate advisors and volunteers with actuarial experience. There are no additional prerequisites for admission into the proposed program beyond those required for admission to UT Dallas graduate Statistical program.

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

The Library continues to build its collections in support of all programs at UT Dallas. The library collections are built by acquiring materials selected by librarians from reviews in the discipline and from recommendations made by faculty members and students.
Overall, the actuarial science collection will be adequate to begin the program upon receipt of the books and journals that are on order. Over the next 5 years, the Library will spend a total of $55,500 on acquisitions for the master’s program in actuarial science.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150 books in actuarial science</td>
<td>$12,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 books in stochastic processes</td>
<td>$21,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 journal in actuarial science ($500/yr)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 additional journals ($4,000 /yr)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $55,500

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

The university has all necessary facilities and equipment to support the program. A new hire in year 1 will get a $10,000 start-up package which includes a new computer.
G. **Accreditation** – If the discipline has a national accrediting body, describe plans to obtain accreditation or provide a rationale for not pursuing accreditation.

Although there is no professional program accreditation, at the same time several specific classes may be accepted by actuarial societies as Validation by Education Experience (VEE) in Statistical Methods, Corporate Finance, and Economics. Further, actuarial societies can assign the actuarial program a status of the Center of Actuarial Excellence. To get this status, the program should produce at least 10 students per year over last 4 years and have a curriculum which prepares for 4 actuarial exams. It is well expected that the proposed program will meet these requirements in 5 years.

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

A departmental advisory committee consisting of four faculty members from the department will be responsible for overseeing the evaluation of the program and its effectiveness.

- The number of quality of applicants will be used as indicators of the effectiveness of recruiting efforts and growth of the program.
- End-of-semester student evaluations will assess teaching effectiveness of the faculty and the achievement of learning objectives for the courses.
- Annual student surveys will assess the adequacy of academic advising.
- Annual self-assessment of the program will be conducted and the necessary action will be taken.
- Exit interviews of graduating students will be conducted to assess their perception of the program and how it may be strengthened.
- Follow-up interviews of graduates will be conducted every three years to assess how well the program prepared them for their professional careers.
- Surveys of employers of graduates will be conducted to assess how well the students were prepared for the job, and also to identify the needs of the employers.

An institutional advisory committee, assigned by the provost's office and consisting of 3 faculty, will review the program every other 2 years using the above-formulated criteria and make its own recommendations.

The feedback from the surveys will be used to validate the content of the program, and necessary adjustment will be made to realign the program as needs change or assessment shows inadequate performance. UT Dallas' institutional assessment process will be also used for the same purposes.
III. Costs and Funding

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Year Costs</th>
<th>Five-Year Funding</th>
<th>Five-Year Funding</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel(^1)</td>
<td>$491,624</td>
<td>Reallocated Funds</td>
<td>$13,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Anticipated New Formula Funding(^3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library, Supplies, and Materials</td>
<td>$55,500</td>
<td>Special Item Funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^2)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Other(^4)</td>
<td>$1783445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$557,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>$557,124</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Report costs for new faculty hires, graduate assistants, and technical support personnel. For new faculty, prorate individual salaries as a percentage of the time assigned to the program. If existing faculty will contribute to program, include costs necessary to maintain existing programs (e.g., cost of adjunct to cover courses previously taught by faculty who would teach in new program).
   A new faculty is hired during year 2 with the salary $110,000 with the start-up package of $10,000. Clerical/staff is reallocated with the cost for 1st year being $2,600. 3% cost of living increase per year.

2. Specify other costs here (e.g., administrative costs, travel). Other funding will be provided by UT Dallas during first two years of the program.

3. Indicate formula funding for students new to the institution because of the program; formula funding should be included only for years three through five of the program and should reflect enrollment projections for years three through five.
   Anticipated New Formula Funding is based on 16.5, 21 and 21 FTEs (1 FTE is equal to 24 SCH) for years three to five.
   Funding coefficient is 4.18 per weighted SCH for Masters in liberal arts, and the rate per weighted SCH is $62.19.

4. Report other sources of funding here. In-hand grants, “likely” future grants, and designated tuition and fees can be included.
1. **Adequacy of Funding** – The Chief executive officer shall sign the following statement:

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

______________________________  
Chief Executive Officer        Date

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

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

______________________________  
Board of Regents (Designee)                   Date of Approval

3. **Board of Regents Certification of Criteria for Commissioner of Assistant Commissioner Approval** – For a program to be approved by the Commissioner or the Assistant Commissioner for Academic Affairs and Research, the Board of Regents or designee must certify that the new program meets the eight criteria under TAC Section 5.50 (b):  The criteria stipulate that the program shall:

(1) be within the institutions current Table of Programs;
(2) have a curriculum, faculty, resources, support services, and other components of a degree program that are comparable to those of high quality programs in the same or similar disciplines at other institutions;
(3) have sufficient clinical or in-service sites, if applicable, to support the program;
(4) be consistent with the standards of the Commission of Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and, if applicable, with the standards or discipline-specific accrediting agencies and licensing agencies;
(5) attract students on a long-term basis and produce graduates who would have opportunities for employment; or the program is appropriate for the development of a well-rounded array of basic baccalaureate degree programs at the institution;
(6) not unnecessarily duplicate existing programs at other institutions;
(7) not be dependent on future Special Item funding
(8) have new five-year costs that would not exceed $2 million.

_ On behalf of the Board of Regents, I certify that the new program meets the criteria specified under TAC Section 5.50 (b)._

______________________________  
Board of Regents (Designee)                   Date
Revision to Core Curriculum

The Core Curriculum committee has voted unanimously to revise the core requirements for fall 2014 to correspond with the recommendations of the THECB as follows:

6 hours: Communications
3 hours: Mathematics
6 hours: Life and Physical Sciences
3 hours: Language; Philosophy & Culture
3 hours: Creative Arts
6 hours: America History
6 hours: Government
3 hours: Social and Behavioral Sciences
Plus 6 hours of Component Area Option courses to be defined at the school/major level

Total 42 credit hours
Changes to UTDPP1028 Committee on Learning Management Systems Policy Charge
FROM: Richard Golden, Chair, LMS Committee (October, 2012)

Change 3rd line of attached memo on 1st page:
“regarding the educational software package and tools employed for instructional purposes.”

Change sentence near bottom of 1st page:
“Ideally, one member would be from each of six of the seven schools in the University.

Change sentence near bottom of 1st page from
Up to twenty additional members, ex-officio, may be appointed upon nomination of the Responsible University Official from the offices of Educational Enhancement, Information Resources, the Registrar, Audit and Compliance, and the instructional designers in the School of Management. The Associate Provost for Educational Enhancement/Director of Elearning at UTD serves as the Responsible University Official.

Change sentence on 2nd page from:
“Of the initial seven Committee members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty, three four shall be appointed to one year terms and three shall be appointed for two year terms.”
UTDPP1028 - Committee on Learning Management Systems

Policy Charge

Learning Management Systems

Policy Statement

The Committee on Learning Management Systems is a Concurrent Committee of the Academic Senate charged to analyze, support, and provide advice and recommendations regarding the educational software package employed for instructional purposes. The Committee will advise the Responsible University Official on all aspects of the use and operation of such software and, if necessary, the selection of any successor software. It will also assist in long term planning and in designing and implementing programs for faculty instruction in the use of such software.

The Committee will also advise the President through the Academic Senate on strategy and policy regarding university software to support instruction. The Committee will communicate with the Committee on Distance Learning and, with them, will advise the Executive Vice President and Provost on academic and faculty issues that pertain to the maintenance, use, and improvement of this software.

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 six 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), pursuant to the applicable procedures outlined in Title III, supra. The criteria for appointment shall be that they will be faculty who use WebCT and will represent a broad spectrum of disciplinary content and levels of instruction. Ideally, one member would be from each of six of the seven schools in the University. Up to twenty additional members, ex-officio, may be appointed upon nomination of the Responsible University Official from the offices of Educational Enhancement, Information Resources, the Registrar, Audit and Compliance, and the instructional designers in the School of Management. The Associate Provost for Educational Enhancement serves as the Responsible University Official.
The terms for appointed faculty members shall be staggered so that no more than one-half of the terms expire in any one year. Of the initial six Committee members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty, three shall be appointed to one year terms and three shall be appointed for two year terms. Thereafter, unless specified otherwise in this charge, Committee members are appointed to two-year terms, and the Chair and Vice Chair are appointed annually. 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 Links

- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1028
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1028
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1028
Faculty Personnel Review Committee

Faculty Personnel Review Committees are chaired by the Dean of the School and must include at least two tenured faculty members from the School to be elected by the school faculty. A committee will be by plurality ballot. The following rules may be established to be determined by the Dean in consultation. Service on the Personnel Review Committee should rotate among the tenured faculty on an staggered annual cycle with no member’s term to exceed two years. Only tenured faculty may serve on this committee, and recommendations regarding tenured Associate Professors and Professors may be made only by tenured Professors. A majority of the members should be of the rank of full professor.

All tenure-system faculty members will have their previous year's work reviewed annually by the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. For this purpose, the faculty member's record will include, but need not be limited to, the documents in the annual review of faculty before the Dean of the School has made his or her preliminary assessment. The Committee will also have access to annual reviews for previous years. This annual review will lead to one of three recommendations:

1. In the case of faculty in their first or second year of service, to not reappoint the faculty member.
2. To retain the faculty member for another year without additional review, or
3. To recommend that an ad hoc committee be composed to assess the faculty member's suitability for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

These recommendations will be communicated by the Dean to the Provost according to the schedule.

A faculty member may request an ad hoc committee review even if the School's initial decision is not to initiate such a review. Such requests will be submitted to the Dean of the School for recommendation to the Provost.
1. Purpose

This policy is not intended to alter the standards used in faculty reviews at UT Dallas.

The university conducts annual reviews of faculty in accordance with Regents’ Rules 31102 and 30501. Annual reviews should focus primarily on individual merit in relation to the performance of assigned duties. A faculty member’s duties are normally defined by university and school or department (unit) policies, but individual faculty members may negotiate a modification in duties with their unit dean. Such modifications must be recorded in the faculty member’s file.

The primary purpose of the review is to compare the faculty member’s performance with the assigned duties and to provide guidance to the faculty member accordingly.

In the following, the term “unit” shall mean university, school, or department. For example, standards for promotion and tenure may be defined at one of these levels. In the case of a particular faculty member being reviewed under this policy, the appropriate standards will be defined by existing and evolving standards as applied to all faculty members within the faculty member’s immediate unit.

If merit increases are recommended by the Program Head, or the Dean of the school, the recommendations should be consistent with these evaluations.

2. Categories of Evaluation.

Evaluations will be made in the same areas of activity as are considered in promotion and tenure: namely, (1) creative productivity and professional achievement, (2) teaching effectiveness and (3) university citizenship. If the faculty member has administrative duties, these should also be included.

Guidelines for what should be considered under each of these headings and the standards to be applied should be articulated by the faculty of each unit and included in the unit’s bylaws. The guidelines should state the standards, the philosophy or purpose behind them, and the unit officers responsible for preparing the evaluation. Such evaluations will make use of directly known and objective information, ignoring hearsay and anonymous inputs. Faculty members are encouraged to call the attention of the Dean of their School to accomplishments or
activities that they believe might be overlooked in order to assure that the information about these contributions are included.

3. Standards of Evaluation by Category and Overall

For each of the three areas considered, faculty members being reviewed shall be placed in one of the following categories: a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations; c. does not meet expectations; d. unsatisfactory. Expectations shall be set by each school according to the faculty member’s assigned duties, rank and discipline, in accordance with the following general principles.

3.A. Standards in each category of evaluation.

The following notes provide guidelines for assigning judgments. The examples given below are not meant to be exhaustive or strict. The standards prescribed by unit policies must be implemented with care and consideration for the importance of Academic Freedom and the good intentions of hard working faculty members.

3.A.1). "Exceeds expectations." This judgment should reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond normal expectations for faculty in the discipline and unit. A judgment that a person exceeds expectations in creative productivity could reflect one or more important publications, research results, sponsored research activities, external recognition for scholarly or creative achievement, or other such activities that bring notable recognition or honor to the university.

In teaching, a judgment of exceeding expectations should be based on multiple indices in addition to end of semester student course evaluation surveys, such as special accomplishments of students, winning a Unit, University, or System level award for outstanding teaching, and faculty peer evaluations.

"Exceeds expectations." In service this classification could reflect election or appointment to particularly noteworthy positions in the university or other organizations, or special commendations for service on university, outreach, governmental, or scholarly organizations.

3. A.2). "Meets expectations." In any given year, most faculty members should meet expectations in accordance with their assigned duties. It should be understood that there is year-to-year variation in all faculty activities.

3.A.3). "Fails to meet expectations." Such a judgment should indicate a failure beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be correctable.
Indications of failure to meet expectations in scholarly productivity could be a consistent record of failing to publish with no record of significant work in progress, no other creative productivity, and no compensating production under way. Indications of failure to meet expectations in teaching would be an exceptional level of complaints, failure to meet classes, failure to update material for classes from time to time in order to assure adequate preparation of students for the field, unfavorable peer evaluation of teaching if the unit arranges for such evaluation, or failure to carry a normal teaching load. Indications of failure to meet expectations in service would be refusal to accept appointments or failure to exercise diligence and responsibility in carrying out appointments.

3.A.4). "Unsatisfactory." This judgment would indicate a failure to meet expectations and doing so in a way that reflects disregard of previous written advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or that involves prima facie professional misconduct or dereliction of duty.

3.B. Overall Evaluations. Consistent with our requirement for promotion that a faculty member be "excellent" in either scholarly creativity or teaching and at least adequate overall, judgments in the annual reviews should also put more weight on scholarly creativity and teaching, but still require adequacy in service.

3. B. 1). An overall evaluation of "exceeds expectations" requires that a faculty member exceeds expectations in either scholarly creativity or teaching, and is at least adequate in service for the faculty member's discipline, rank, and assigned duties.

3.B.2). An overall evaluation of "meets expectations" requires that a person meets expectations in at least two of the three evaluation categories: scholarly productivity, teaching, and service. Details of the expectations for scholarly productivity should be provided by unit guidelines.

For faculty whose contractual obligations do not include scholarly productivity, failure to engage in such activity will not be judged in a negative way, but their file should provide evidence that they remain current and knowledgeable in their teaching discipline(s).

3.B.3). An overall evaluation of "fails to meet expectations" requires that a person fails to meets expectations in scholarly productivity, teaching, or service, where such failure is clearly below the normal range of year to year variation in output that can be regarded as normal for the person's discipline, rank, and assigned duties. For faculty who are only expected to teach, "fails to meet expectations" would mean failure to teach the agreed upon course.
load and/or indications of teaching effectiveness consistently in the lower quartile, to the extent that such a measure is meaningful. For faculty whose duties include administration, expectations for the quanta of research output and teaching load may be appropriately reduced.

3.B.4). An overall judgment of “unsatisfactory” should only be used if scholarly activity is persistently unsatisfactory and the faculty member refuses to agree to a suitable modification of duties, or if teaching is persistently unsatisfactory. UTD faculty are expected and required to teach, and should demonstrate a commitment to doing it well. Good service should not be a replacement for unsatisfactory scholarly activity or teaching, although it should not be ignored. The unit policy should provide guidance on this weighting.

4. Evaluation Process

4.A. Preparation of file by faculty member

Each February, each faculty member will prepare an annual report with information under the following headings. Further details for preparing the report, including suggested templates for different entries, will be posted on the website of the Academic Vice President and Provost.

I. Name, School, Program or Field, Date of Submission

II. A narrative of one page or less, giving your professional history, principal current professional interests, and most note-worthy accomplishments. This brief biographic profile should communicate the significance of what you do, what you have accomplished, and what you are planning to do in the future, to a varied audience, including prospective graduate students, new faculty colleagues, or outsiders searching for a prospective employee, consultant, expert commentator, guest columnist, speaker to a professional or non-professional group, etc. In composite, these profiles constitute the portrait of the University.

III. Scholarly and creative activity, categorized and sequenced as follows:

(PLEASE FOLLOW THE ATTACHED FORMATTING GUIDELINES)

a) authored books
b) edited books
c) refereed publications
d) complete articles in edited volumes
e) refereed conference publications or abstracts
f) juried exhibitions
g) invited performances, colloquia presentations or exhibitions
h) unreferred publications
i) unreferred abstracts
j) self-initiated exhibitions, lectures or performances
k) submitted manuscripts, including when submitted and to whom
l) U.S. Patents awarded
m) other activities: lectures, speeches, presentations not documented in a publication

IV. Proposal and Grant Activity
a) Proposals submitted: title, agency submitted, time duration, total requested.
b) Grants received: title, agency granting, total requested, amount granted if different from total amount, start date, and time duration.
c) Names of doctoral students (≥30 graduate hours) and stipend amounts (does not include tuition or benefits) whom you supported on contracts and grants, e.g., Jane Smith $20,000.

V. Teaching activities: list for each term, e.g.

a) Organized courses
   Semester    Prefx    Number    Course Name    Enrollment

b) Individual instruction supervised
c) Calendar year: names of graduated students upon whose dissertation committees you served.
d) Calendar year: names of masters and doctoral students who graduated under your supervision.
e) Calendar year: employer and position for doctoral students who graduated under your supervision in the previous calendar year.
f) Calendar year: for each doctoral student (≥30 graduate hours) by name under your supervision.

   aa) number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, e.g., Jane Smith 2
   bb) number of juried creative/performance accomplishments
   cc) number of book chapters
   dd) number of books
   ee) number of external presentations

VI. Learning Assessment Activities:
   a) narrative of assessment activities undertaken based on learning objectives of organized courses
   b) brief description of factors that may have influenced the results of those activities
c) actions you intend to take to improve student learning, i.e.
"closing the loop"

VII. Professional service activities:
  a) UTD administrative duties
  b) school committees
  c) university committees
  d) outside Chair appointed by Graduate Studies for doctoral
      final oral exam
  e) special service contributions to program, school, or university
  f) service contributions external to UTD, e.g., professional
      society officer, journal editor, conference organizer, etc.
  g) consultant activities

VIII. Special professional recognition: internal and external honors,
  awards, citations, prizes, etc.

4.B. The primary evaluation will be prepared by the unit administrator immediately
  responsible for the faculty member under review. School guidelines will specify
  who this is. The recommendation to be sent to the Provost for the school will be
  prepared by the School Dean, taking into account unit evaluations as well as
  considerations of equity and need across the school as a whole and the advice of
  other members of the Dean's administrative structure as might be appropriate in that
  School.

4.C. Provision for corrections and objections. Unit guidelines should provide at
  least one opportunity for the faculty member being evaluated to see the draft
  evaluation and offer responses or corrections. The School Dean's evaluation will be
  shown to the faculty member evaluated, in writing. The faculty member will
  countersign to show that he or she has read the evaluation and signify his or her
  agreement or otherwise by checking one of two boxes marked, "Agree," and
  "Disagree." If the faculty member objects to the evaluation, he or she may describe
  that objection in writing within a period of two weeks (seven days). The Dean's
  evaluation will then be forwarded to the provost with the faculty member's
  objection, if any.

Unit guidelines may also include provision for review of the recommendations by a
faculty committee, such as a school Executive Committee or a peer review
committee.

5. Uses of the evaluations.
Evaluations should be used to determine merit for merit raises.

One or more evaluations of "exceeds expectations" may also provide a basis for recommendation for special honors or for initiating consideration for more rapid or extraordinary promotion following the processes provided for in the university policy on promotion and tenure. Annual reports from previous years, that were carried out under a different policy from this one, must be integrated with current year’s findings with care. This would require much more complete and comprehensive documentation than is required for the annual review.

An evaluation of "fails to meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory" in any one category may be used to determine recommended remedial actions, such as teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, or mentoring in research issues or service expectations. Remedial actions may include adjustments of assigned duties. Remediation efforts should be described in a written plan. Such plan may include provisions for monitoring progress.

A tenured faculty member whose overall evaluation is "unsatisfactory" for two consecutive years may be subject to a comprehensive periodic performance evaluation (post-tenure review), as provided for in the policy on periodic performance evaluations. The decision to undertake a comprehensive period performance evaluation shall be made by the university Provost in consultation with the Dean of the School.

6. Clarifications and complaints.

Faculty members are encouraged to seek clarification of their salary increases whenever they have questions or dissatisfactions concerning them. Pursuit of such questions or complaints fosters better internal University communications and improves operation of the mechanisms for setting salary increases. Queries should be lodged with the School Dean. In Schools where Unit Heads provide an initial merit increase recommendation for the Dean, a preliminary discussion should be held with the Unit Head. If the matter remains unresolved fifteen days after discussion with the Dean, it may properly be taken to the Provost and, if unresolved there within fifteen days, to the President.

The university grievance policy is applicable.
Procedures Governing Periodic Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty - UTDPP1064

Policy Statement

Preamble

Tenure protects scholars and teachers from adverse actions by those who disagree with their findings and teachings; tenure also provides faculty with the long-term security which is vital if they are to undertake high potential, lengthy, risky research; thus, it discourages intellectual censorship and encourages the search for truth, thereby benefiting society at large. However, regular review of all faculty, including those with tenure, is fundamental to the advancement of the University. This document describes procedures for review of tenured faculty.

Nothing in this policy memorandum shall be interpreted or applied to infringe on tenure, academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights, nor to require faculty to reestablish their credentials for tenure.

Definitions

A. Faculty Categories

1. School Faculty: School faculty are those faculty members who report to a school Dean, including those who report through Department Heads to a school Dean.

2. Administrative Faculty: Administrative faculty are those faculty members who do not report, directly or indirectly, to a school Dean.

3. Concurrent Faculty: Concurrent faculty are those faculty members who, for part — but not all — of their assignments report, directly or indirectly to a school Dean.

B. Duties: For the purposes of this document, duties (to the University) are activities to which a faculty member is assigned and for which the University provides infrastructure and fiscal resources. Most faculty members mentor individual students, teach organized classes or laboratories, engage in research or creative activities, and serve the University, the community, and their profession through committee assignments and elective or appointive offices. Some also engage in clinical or administrative activities. The exact ratio of these duties varies considerably from one faculty member to another. The ratio of duties can also vary over time. At the time tenure is awarded, duly appointed faculty committees and responsible administrators have determined that a faculty member has performed adequately in both teaching and research or creative activities, and has shown excellence in...
one of those arenas. Service expectations may change after tenure is awarded, particularly in the case of senior faculty. When a School Faculty member wants to assume a set of duties significantly different from the norm typical of his or her instructional unit, the faculty member should seek approval for such action from the school Dean or the Dean's delegate (Department Head, when appropriate). A Dean does not have authority to approve or disapprove specific research topics, but does exercise approval authority when a faculty member proposes to engage in a set of duties which is atypical for the instructional unit. If such approval is obtained, the faculty member’s performance will be judged against the approved set of duties. Otherwise a faculty member will be judged against the duties typical for his or her instructional unit. The modified set of duties does not go into effect until the Dean notifies the faculty of the School or Department as appropriate. Concurrent and Administrative Faculty should consult with the individual(s) to whom they report in order to construct a written description of their set of duties. To the extent that their duties parallel those of School Faculty, Concurrent Faculty are expected to meet the norm for other faculty in their instructional unit.

C. A Periodic Performance Evaluation (PPE) is the evaluation process described in this document.

D. The PPE Review File is the file created for the purpose of the Periodic Performance Evaluation. It may contain material from a variety of sources within the university community, including material copied from the faculty member's permanent academic file.

E. The PPE Evaluator (Evaluator) is the University official responsible for preparing the PPE Review File and for making the finding. For School Faculty the Evaluator is the Dean of their school. For Concurrent Faculty, the Evaluators are their school Dean and the other administrator to whom they report. For Administrative Faculty, the Evaluator is the administrator to whom they report.

F. Finding: A finding is the Evaluator's written recommendation resulting from the Periodic Performance Evaluation of a tenured faculty member.

1. The finding must evaluate the faculty member's performance in the activities in the current set of duties and reach a conclusion based on one of two assessments by the Evaluator:

a. Advisory: An Advisory finding may be approbative or it may offer advice for improvements or modifications in the faculty member’s performance. The finding may be accompanied by a plan for allocation of additional resources intended to enhance the faculty member’s performance.
b. Adverse: For School Faculty, an Adverse finding is a recommendation that the tenured faculty member's performance has been sufficiently detrimental to the University and/or its students for a sufficiently long period that consideration of charges for termination under the procedures of Rule 31008, concerning Termination for Good Cause, of the Regents’ Rules and Regulations, is a possibility. It must be supported by a written, detailed argument and data that demonstrate professional incompetence or dereliction in the traditional domains of research, service, clinical duties (where relevant), and especially teaching, or other good cause. For Concurrent and Administrative Faculty, an Adverse finding will result in the termination of the administrative assignment and the return of the faculty member to School Faculty status.

2. The finding may recommend a set of duties to govern the next PPE period.

G. Detrimental Performance: Detrimental performance must be defined relative to the set of duties, which can vary across Departments and Schools and among individual faculty within Programs and Schools (Sec. I.B.). However, it must entail dereliction and/or incompetence in one or more of the faculty member's duties. Examples may include but are not limited to: (a) a failure to meet classes, (b) a failure to engage in remedial activities to improve teaching efforts or an inability to benefit from such remedial activities, (c) a refusal to accept teaching assignments within the faculty member's expertise, (d) a refusal to engage in research and/or creative activity which may include submission of grants or scholarly activity for publication, and (e) a failure to shoulder a reasonable share of administrative work. Failure to publish or to win external research funding, is not, in itself, proof of incompetence or dereliction in research.

Procedures for All Faculty

A. All faculty members are subject to annual review. It is expected that Deans, Department Heads, and other administrators will make use of the annual review process to identify faculty whose performance does not meet the general performance levels of their unit and to provide those individuals with advice, support, and/or warnings, as appropriate. Written evaluations used in annual reviews will be subsequently included in PPE Review Files. Countersigning or other methods shall be used to certify that the faculty member has been made aware of these evaluations.

B. This document describes procedures for Periodic Performance Evaluations for tenured
Procedures Governing Periodic Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Faculty which are to be conducted every six years except in rare circumstances such as overlap with approved leave, promotion, review for appointment to an endowed position, or review described in the following paragraph. The existence of the PPE process does not preclude administrative action based on annual reviews or other good cause. Administrative Faculty are to be reviewed every five years, as described in Policy Memorandum 96-III.30-68 Faculty Involvement in the Evaluations of Academic Administrators, which review is to be concurrent with the review described in this document.

C. The Periodic Performance Evaluation shall include review of the faculty member's duties such as teaching, research, service, administration, and, for faculty with clinical responsibilities, patient care.

D. Individual notice of intent to conduct a Periodic Performance Evaluation must be given to a tenured faculty member at least six months prior to the initiation of the Evaluation, which begins September 15 with the submission of materials by the faculty member. One month before the initiation of the Evaluation, the Evaluator who is conducting the evaluation shall notify the faculty within the School and the Speaker of the Faculty, who in turn will inform the Academic Senate membership and the President of the Student Government Association about the PPE, who is to be evaluated, and the PPE procedures.

E. The PPE Review File shall be constructed as follows:

1. The PPE process is intended to be an internal review of the faculty member's performance of his/her range of duties. Solicitation of materials or evaluations from outside the University community is inappropriate, and such materials shall not be included in the PPE Review File.

2. The faculty member being evaluated shall submit to his/her Evaluator or arrange for submission of (a) a resume, including a summary statement of professional accomplishments, (b) where existing, the approved range of duties, (c) results of annual evaluations for the previous six years, where available, and (d) evaluations of teaching from students and other sources, in accordance with policy of the relevant instructional unit. The faculty member may provide copies of a statement of professional goals, a proposed professional development plan, and any other materials the faculty member deems appropriate.

3. The Evaluator may add to the file (a) any material from the faculty member's permanent academic files which he/she deems appropriate and (b) any signed, written material which he/she deems appropriate to the PPE process.

4. In addition, the Evaluator shall add to the file any signed, written material received
through relevant sources such as faculty, students, and the Student Government Association.

5. No anonymous material, except for teaching evaluations obtained in accordance with University policy, may be included in the file, and those reading the PPE Review File should identify and give no weight to hearsay material.

6. At any point in the PPE process, the faculty member being evaluated may see the PPE Review File upon reasonable notice, may copy material contained in the PPE Review File, and may supplement the file. The Evaluator must notify the faculty member under review of any material which he/she adds to the PPE File, and the faculty member is entitled to 10 working days to supplement the file with a written response.

**Procedures for School Faculty**

A. All evaluations must be based only on material in the PPE Review File.

B. After the end of the faculty member's response period (II.E.6), the Dean shall make a written preliminary evaluation and shall send that evaluation to the faculty member, the relevant Department Head (if appropriate) and to the School Peer Review Committee (SPRC).

C. The Program Head (if appropriate) and SPRC shall each examine the PPE Review File, and each shall provide the faculty member under evaluation with the opportunity to discuss the PPE Review File and the preliminary evaluation. The Program Head (if appropriate) and the SPRC will subsequently provide a written response to the preliminary evaluation. The faculty member under review may also provide a response. The responses become part of the PPE Review File.

D. After receiving the responses of the faculty member under review (if any), the Department Head (if appropriate) and the SPRC, the Dean shall re-examine the PPE Review File and make a written finding no later than November 15, unless the President approves an extension.

E. The Dean's finding and the response of the SPRC must be communicated in writing to the faculty member and the Department Head (if appropriate). The faculty member will be given the opportunity to discuss the finding with the Dean and will be allowed 10 working days to respond in writing to the finding. The finding and the faculty member's written response become part of the PPE Review File. After 10 working days, the Dean shall send the PPE Review File to the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost), who will notify
the Dean and faculty member of its receipt within 10 working days.

F. If the Dean has made an Adverse finding, the Provost shall notify the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct and forward the PPE Review File to the Committee of Faculty Standing and Conduct within 10 working days.

G. The Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct shall examine the PPE Review File and prepare a written report which addresses, at least, the following issues:

1. Since tenure carries the expectation of continuing employment, the University bears the burden of proof in removing tenure. The report shall assess the degree to which the PPE Review File demonstrates that the tenured faculty member's performance has been sufficiently detrimental to the University and/or its students for a sufficiently long period that termination under the procedures of Rule 31008, concerning Termination for Good Cause, of the Regents’ Rules and Regulations, is a possibility.

2. In the event that the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct concurs with the Adverse finding, its report shall address the advisability of an additional review period and the duration and performance expectations for such review period. The report becomes part of the PPE Review File.

H. After receipt of the report from the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct, the Provost shall send copies of the report to the faculty member and the Dean and allow 10 working days to receive written responses, which become part of the PPE Review File. The Provost shall review the PPE Review File and decide on one of the following options as an appropriate action:

1. Conversion of the Adverse finding to an Advisory finding and termination of the PPE process for the faculty member;

2. Acceptance of the Adverse finding and establishment of an additional review period including its duration and performance expectations;

3. Acceptance of the Adverse finding and recommendation to the President that charges for termination of the faculty member be initiated in accord with the Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 31008 concerning Termination for Good Cause.

The Provost shall notify the Dean and the faculty member of his or her decision. The Provost may issue a preliminary assessment and provide a period for comment from the Dean and faculty member prior to making a decision.

I. If the Provost decides that an additional review period is appropriate, the faculty member's performance during the additional review period is to be governed by an additional review
period document, which should specify the faculty member's duties, resources to be made available, and the timetable and criteria for interim and end of period evaluations. The construction of the extended review period document is the responsibility of the Dean who shall consult with the faculty member, the Department Head (if appropriate), the School Personnel Review Committee, and the Provost prior to issuing the document.

J. At the end of the additional review period, a review in the manner of a Periodic Performance Evaluation is to be conducted, with the faculty member having access to the same procedures and protections which would be in place for a Periodic Performance Evaluation, except that the Dean shall forward her/his assessment directly to the Provost, who must now choose either option H.1 or option H.3 from Section III.H above. The Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct does not review the file.

K. The entire PPE process is confidential. However, if the faculty member makes comment in a public forum on the results of the evaluation, then the University, through its administration, may also make public comment.

Procedures for Concurrent and Administrative Faculty

A. Concurrent Faculty: The Evaluators of a Concurrent Faculty member shall make separate findings in their evaluations of the duties arising from the faculty member's School Faculty and Administrative Faculty roles. The procedures in Section III of this document shall govern the PPE process in so far as the School Faculty role is evaluated. The procedures in Section IV.B. shall govern the PPE process in so far as the Administrative role is evaluated, except that a Concurrent Faculty member for whom the School Faculty finding is Advisory shall not be subjected to the PPE process until the normal six year review cycle.

B. Administrative Faculty: The Evaluator of an Administrative Faculty member must prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member, provide a copy to the faculty member, provide the opportunity for the faculty member to discuss the evaluation with him/her, and provide the faculty member with the opportunity to place a written statement in the PPE Review File. An Adverse finding by the Evaluator will result in the termination of the administrative appointment and the return of the faculty member to School Faculty status. Such faculty must be reviewed under the School Faculty provisions of this document in the first review cycle after three full academic years have passed since their return to School Faculty status.

Review of PPE Process

The President is to review the results of each year's Periodic Performance Evaluations with the
Academic Council. In this review, the President shall present the results without identification of individual faculty members. If, however, a faculty member has made public comment about the results of his/her PPE, the President may discuss that case with the Academic Council. The Academic Council is to prepare and present to the Academic Senate, the CAO, and the President a report, in which the faculty reviewed are not identified, which contains recommendations about the Periodic Performance Evaluation process.

**Phase-In**

A. Faculty tenured before the 1992-93 academic year will be assigned the years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 for their initial Periodic Performance Evaluation by lot, with approximately 20% of such faculty to be reviewed each year.

B. A faculty member appointed with or promoted to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor after the 1992-93 academic year shall be reviewed every six years after his/her appointment or promotion.

**Non-Interference with Rights**

The adoption of the Procedures for Periodic Performance Evaluation by The University of Texas At Dallas Academic Senate shall not be interpreted or applied to infringe on tenure, academic freedom, due process, or other protected rights.

**Peer Review Committees**

A. The School Peer Review Committee (SPRC) is appointed by the Dean in accordance with an election by secret ballot with a nominations procedure decided by the School and restricted to the tenured faculty in the School. The SPRC is not identical to and may be a different committee than the Faculty Personnel Review Committee as described in Policy Memorandum 75-III.22-3 (which deals with promotion, reappointment, and tenure), though some or all of the members of the SPRC may be members of the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. But in all cases, the SPRC will be an elected body.

B. The Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct is appointed by the President from nominations submitted by the Committee on Committees and confirmed by the Academic Senate ([Handbook of Operating Procedures, Title III, Chapter 21 Faculty Governance, IV.A.1.b and IV.B.1.c.(5)]).
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CHARGE: UNIVERSITY INFORMATION SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The University Information Security Advisory Committee is a concurrent committee of the Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas.

The Committee will advise the University of Texas at Dallas Information Security Officer in planning and testing measures to provide security for development and use of the university’s information resources in such a way as to comply with UT System security requirements for university information. University obligations are established by the U. T. System system-wide policy UTS165, U. T. System Information Security Action Plan, and Texas Administrative Code 202, and related interpretive statements such as The University of Texas System Laptop Computer Encryption Implementation—Frequently Asked Questions. The committee’s areas of concern include but shall not be limited to:

- Recommend policies or guidelines to develop and align information security strategies with applicable laws and regulations.

- Monitor policies and procedures to ensure compliance while not asserting undue claims to own or access information owned by faculty or for which faculty are under obligation to other organizations.

- Recommend procedures for IT systems and practice to lower risk of exposure of information and IT resources. Procedures and practice may include appropriate technical infrastructure and security controls in the IT environment.

- Assist in identifying and classifying information.

- Assess and evaluate security incident management and make recommendations for improvements.

- Recommend procedures that increase the security of business continuity and recovery plans.

- Monitor implementation of the UTD policies by the Information Security office.

- Assist in developing plans and methods for education and outreach in the UTD community to explain the need for security measures and assure effective faculty participation.

The Committee shall be composed of at least eleven voting members. Seven shall be tenure-track faculty, 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). At least three faculty members shall have expertise in areas of computer security. All shall be selected to represent as much of the range of university as well as non-university
information that faculty create and use in the course of their professional activities as is practicable. In addition, there shall be one representative each from Academic Affairs, the Office of the Registrar, the Office of Sponsored Projects, a staff representative selected by the Staff Council, and a student selected by the Student Government. One of the faculty members shall be Chair. The Chair and Vice Chair shall be appointed annually by the President upon approval by the Academic Senate.

The University Attorney shall be a member ex officio. The University Information Security Officer shall be the Responsible University Official.

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

The Committee shall meet at least bimonthly during the Fall and Spring semesters. No plan or policy shall be implemented by the Information Security Officer without first being reviewed by the Committee. The Committee shall indicate its approval or disapproval by majority vote. If the Committee disapproves, the Chair shall convey the vote and the reasons to the Vice-Provost and Chief Information Officer. Additional meetings will be called by the Chair or RUO as necessary.
UT Policy on Encryption

The purpose of encryption is to protect information on the encrypted media or device. The purpose of this policy is to describe the kinds of information the University of Texas may protect by means of requiring encryption of the computers or other devices that it resides on.

Information that should be on encrypted drives is of the following three types: A) information the university administration creates and uses for its administrative purposes, B) information the university is legally obligated to protect in the sense of assuring that it does not become public except as required by law, and C) information in which the university has a proprietary interest but which was created by faculty.

A. Information the university owns for its internal business purposes, which cannot be construed as owned by faculty although faculty may have access to it. If a faculty member retains any of this information, it should be on encrypted media. This information is of the following kinds:

   A.1. Business records maintained by any office under the Vice President for Business Affairs unless this is deemed public information.
   A.2. Student records maintained by the University Registrar.
   A.3. Records maintained by the Office of the President unless this is deemed public information.
   A.4. Records maintained by the Office of the Provost, the academic deans reporting to the Provost, and department chairs reporting to the academic deans. Examples include personnel recommendations and upward evaluation of administrators. Exemptions include all information that must be made public under HB 2504 of 2009 and all information defined as public information in the Texas Government Code, 5.A.552. This includes faculty salary information, teaching load information, and course evaluations.
   A.5. Information on other students, staff, or faculty that could be used for identity theft, impersonation, or embezzlement. Examples are university computer account net-ids and passwords, social security numbers, Medicare numbers, bank account numbers and information, credit/debit card numbers and information, taxpayer numbers, or copies of identifying documents.

B. Information that the university is legally obligated to protect.

   B.1. Medical records with personally identifiable information as defined in Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) and in regulations pertaining to the protection of human subjects in human subjects research as required in the University human subjects review.
B.2. Education records as defined in the Family Education Rights to Privacy Act (FERPA). Using the subdivisions of the Act itself, these are defined in the Act as meaning:

(a)... those records that are:
(1) Directly related to a student; and
(2) Maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a party acting for the agency or institution.

(b) The term does not include:
(1) Records that are kept in the sole possession of the maker, are used only as a personal memory aid, and are not accessible or revealed to any other person except a temporary substitute for the maker of the record.
(2) Records of the law enforcement unit of an educational agency or institution, subject to the provisions of § 99.8.
(3)(i) Records relating to an individual who is employed by an educational agency or institution, that:
(A) Are made and maintained in the normal course of business;
(B) Relate exclusively to the individual in that individual's capacity as an employee; and (C) Are not available for use for any other purpose.
(ii) Records relating to an individual in attendance at the agency or institution who is employed as a result of his or her status as a student are education records and not excepted under paragraph (b)(3)(i) of this definition.
(4) Records on a student who is 18 years of age or older, or is attending an institution of postsecondary education, that are:
(i) Made or maintained by a physician, psychiatrist, psychologist, or other recognized professional or paraprofessional acting in his or her professional capacity or assisting in a paraprofessional capacity;
(ii) Made, maintained, or used only in connection with treatment of the student; and
(iii) Disclosed only to individuals providing the treatment. For the purpose of this definition, “treatment” does not include remedial educational activities or activities that are part of the program of instruction at the agency or institution; and
(5) Records created or received by an educational agency or institution after an individual is no longer a student in attendance and that are not directly related to the individual's attendance as a student.
(6) Grades on peer-graded papers before they are collected and recorded by a teacher.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1232g(a)(4))

http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?c=ecfr&sid=11975031b82001bed902b3e73f33e604&rgn=div5&view=text&node=34:1.1.1.33&idno=34
The implication of (a) is that all records maintained by the registrar are covered. Courts have construed this as including disciplinary records. The clear sense of (b) (1), however, is that records maintained by individual faculty members for their own purposes and not intended to be communicated to others are not covered. Since it is an explicit requirement of FERPA that faculty cannot themselves post grades with information that identifies the students who earn them, it follows that grade records maintained by faculty are not covered until they transmitted to the registrar for inclusion in the student’s official record. Therefore the University has no basis for claiming an obligation to require encryption of faculty computers on which the faculty member keeps their personal records on student’s performance.

The implication of (b)(3)(i) is that records kept by faculty of their student employees, including Teaching and Research Assistants, are also not included, and that the University similarly has no obligation to assure that computers or media with these records should be encrypted.

Letters of recommendation written by faculty in response to requests by students are not prohibited by FERPA.

The other definitions should speak for themselves, with one exception. This pertains to communication among faculty regarding students that is not intended to be reflected in the official transcripts and will not be reflected in such transcripts. Is a note or an email from one faculty member to another about a student an “educational record” in the meaning of the act. Since it is written and created by the faculty member as “a person active for the educational institution” such a communication may appear to fall under the meaning of “educational record.” But in view of the purpose of the Act, this reading is unjustified.

The purpose of the Act is to specify conditions for disclosure to individuals or agents outside the school or university and to clarify the rights students have in regard to such information as will be so disclosed. These rights include the right to inspect the record and offer corrections. So the question has to be whether it was the intent of Congress to give students the right, or to say that they had the right, to discover and correct what faculty may say to each other about them whenever such communications are written but not when they were spoken.

This is an unreasonable construction for several reasons. First, while the ordinary common law distinction between libel and slander distinguishes between written and spoken communication, there is no common low protection that applies only against written statements that may be injurious but not to the same statement if is written; that is, the protection is against injury, not against injury though just one mode of expression. Second, to hold that a written note or an email communication from one faculty member to another is subject to being seen and corrected by the student it is about leads to an absurd infinite regression. For example, if a first email was corrected would the reply to it also need to be
corrected? Then the reply to that? And where would all these original and corrected notes or emails reside? It is absurd to hold that it was the intent of the Congress to make all notes or all emails on faculty computers available to student inspection and correction, then further to require faculty to retain all such original and corrected notes or emails (and all correspondence about these corrections) for the length of time a university is expected to retain an official record, such as a transcript. Clearly, the kinds of “educational records” the Act envisions are authoritative one-of-a-kind university records in a strict sense, and not private communications among faculty within an institution that are part of the normal course of carrying out their duties.

This interpretation is not vitiated by noting, as was often done after the Virginia Tech shootings and in the subsequent report to the Governor of Virginia, that FERPA does not prevent faculty and officials from sharing “educational records” in order to maintain campus safety. The fact that it is permissible to share educational records in a clear sense in order to maintain campus safety does not mean that it is reasonable to construe everything that can be shared as such a record. The absurdity of equating personal emails with official transcripts given the other requirements regarding educational records under the Act still remains. It therefore still follows that the University cannot claim an obligation or right to protect such emails or similar unofficial and informal correspondence under the Act.

Nor does the Act imply that the university would be subject to sanctions in the event records are “disclosed” by means of the theft of a computer. The forms of disclosure envisioned by FERPA do not include theft. Moreover, the Act specifically avoids establishing liability to an individual for a disclosure of information pertaining to that individual, whether accidental or otherwise. Penalties will only be for a failure to have a policy or practice for disclosures that is compliant with the Act (Section 99.66 of the Act).

B.3. Research information that the university is required to protect as an explicit condition of the grant or contract that is providing the funding for the research.

C. Information that the university has a proprietary interest in, and that it may protect.

C.1. Patentable discoveries or inventions in which the University has a proprietary interest, until such time as that patent is sought or the invention is placed in the public domain, or the University expressly abandons its proprietary interest in accordance with Regents Rule 90101. This includes “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. (90101 Sec. 3)” However, it excludes “the copyright of scholarly or educational materials,
artworks, musical compositions, and literary works related to the author's academic or professional field, regardless of the medium of expression. This applies to works authored by students, professionals, faculty, and non-faculty researchers” (90101 Sec. 4).

C.2. Information and documents that the University has contracted with faculty to produce, when retaining the information in a secure form is explicitly required in the contract. Examples are consulting contracts faculty members may agree to, or on-line course material they may contract to create.

D. University-related information on faculty computers that the University does not own and does not have an obligation to control includes the following:

D.1. Material authored by faculty and subject to copyright, beginning with the author’s copyright that applies at the time of creation. This includes all notes, drafts, and compilations of relevant material that may be used in the creative process, whether exclusively authored by the faculty member or in the form of annotations and notes on material the faculty member has collected through the internet or by any other means.

D.2. Direct communications with students. Examples include exchanges of emails regarding course assignments, academic progress, appointments, or general advice and counseling.

D.3. Professional correspondence not subject copyright, such as correspondence with colleagues, artistic, literary, scholarly and scientific societies, publishers, potential publishers, funding sources, and professional associations such as faculty unions and the American Association of University Professors.

D.4. All communications with federal agencies protected by the Privacy Act of 1974.

D.5. Teaching materials, course notes, syllabi, and web-site files created by the faculty member. The exception is if these materials were developed under contract to the university and the contract specifies that they belong to the university.

D.6. Private non-professional correspondence through university provided emails or other information services.

D.7. Any copyrighted material placed by the faculty member in the public domain. This excludes patentable discoveries or inventions that can only be placed in the public domain by agreement with the university.