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AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
October 7, 2009

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  DR. DANIEL
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  DR. LEAF
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  September 2, 2009 Meeting  DR. LEAF
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT  DR. LEAF
5. FAC REPORT  DR. LEAF
6. FACULTY SENATE VOLUNTEER TO SERVE ON THE CAMPUS HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE  DR. LEAF
7. POLICY ON EXIGENCE  DR. LEAF
8. CEP  DR. CANTRELL
9. REQUEST TO CREATE A NEW POLICY: FITNESS FOR DUTY  MS. KING
10. PROVOST’S REPORT ON PROGRAM REVIEWS AND DEANS’ REVIEWS  DR. WILDENTHAL
11. COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORTS  DR. LEAF
12. APPOINT DINESH BHATIA CHAIR OF LMS COMMITTEE  DR. LEAF
13. APPROVE AMENDMENT TO CHARGE OF DISTANCE LEARNING  DR. LEAF
14. ADJOURNMENT  DR. DANIEL
Academic Council Minutes
September 2, 2009

ITEM #3

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 official minutes.

Academic Council Meeting
September 2, 2009

PRESENT:  Kurt Beron, Cy Cantrell, David Cordell, Karen Huxtable-Jester, Murray Leaf, Dennis Miller, Tim Redman,

VISITORS:  Hobson Wildenthal, Andrew Blanchard, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Diana Kao

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS, QUESTIONS

Dr. Wildenthal called the meeting to order. Dr. Daniel will make announcements when he arrives.

Dr. Daniel is anxiously awaiting the final number of tenure/tenure-track faculty. There are now 425 or so. Next year’s growth of income will be related to tuition increase or increase in enrollment. We have a huge infusion of cash for professorships and chairs. Dr. Daniel is pleased with the job the Provost Office and the Schools have done in hiring faculty.

In the following year enrollment will be up 1%-2%, the new system complicated the enrollment process, freshman applications were up and the new housing is full.

Dr. Daniel spoke regarding the matching funds; these are gifts to support the work that the faculty does and the students that work for the faculty, faculty chairs, university level graduate student fellowships or to implement endowed research programs. Dr. Daniel will welcome the input from faculty, at an academic council meeting or at a senate meeting.

Dr. Beron asked about Data Acquisition. Dr. Leaf will write to the incoming Chair of the Library Committee.

There was a question regarding the hiring process for the New Police Chief. Dr. Daniel stated that the committee, chaired by Dr. Jamison and Dr. Rachavong, were doing their careful due diligence and a candidate would probably be selected with a week or two.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Dr. Beron made the motion to approve the agenda. Dr. Redman asked that the agenda be amended to include a report on the 40th Anniversary. Dr. Cantrell seconded the motion to approve the amended agenda. The motion carried, the agenda was approved.
3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Dr. Cantrell made the motion to approve the minutes of the August 5, 2009 meeting. Dr. Beron seconded the motion. The motion passed, the minutes of the August 5th meeting were approved.

4. SPEAKERS REPORT

1. Robert Kieschnick has resigned from the Academic Council and Senate. He is the area coordinator for the finance and managerial economics group. As such, he often have to fill in when a faculty person cannot meet their teaching commitment. This semester, he has been unable to find a replacement for someone that was to teach a required course that is scheduled from 1:30 to 4:15pm on Wednesdays. Dr. Chandrasekaran is the alternate. I will ask him if he can serve.

2. We are compiling a list of those who have declined committee appointments, and will have to get back to the Committee on Committees about the positions. One important disappointment is that Marilyn Kaplan will be unable to chair the Learning Management Systems and Distance Learning Committees. She has just been appointed assistant Dean, and will not have the time.

3. My presentation to the BOR on our effort to get a faculty regent law passed seems to have been well received. We will now pursue the alternative: having a regular representative from the Faculty Advisory Council (or perhaps two, one from the medical campuses and one from the academic campuses).

4. Since we are now a smaller group, Dr Leaf asked if there was interest in going back to the President’s Conference Room for our meetings. There was none.

5. FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY REPORT

Dr. Redman reported on the progress of the plans for UTD’s 40th Anniversary. Dr. Rindler has a copy of the speech that was to be made by President John F. Kennedy at the Trade Mart in November 1963.

The plans are progressing and the list of speakers is being finalized. A site, a type of “wiki”, has been developed for people to share their memories and thoughts regarding the University’s Anniversary Celebration.

6. CEP

Dr. Cantrell introduced the proposal for the Ph.D. in Arts and Technology. He asked for approval to place the proposal on the September Senate agenda if the proposal is approved by the CEP, if CEP does not approve it will go back to the originators.
Dr. Cantrell made the motion to place on the Senate agenda. Dr. Redman seconded the motion, with the caveat that if not approved by CEP the item would be removed from the Senate agenda. The motion to place on the Senate agenda passed, pending approval of the proposal by CEP.

The second item is the proposed Undergraduate Minor: Global Communication and Leadership. Dr. Cantrell proposed that if CEP does not approve it will be returned to Arts and Humanities.

Dr. Cantrell also discussed his satisfaction with the online graduate application. The checklist is in place. The system is up and running well. The capability to place the information in Orion is in place.

6. GUEST SPEAKER AT SEPTEMBER SENATE MEETING

Dr. Rhonda Blackburn, Associate Provost, will speak on WebCT and e-learning. Dr. Beron made the motion to approve placing Dr. Blackburn on the September Senate agenda. Dr. Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion was approved. Dr. Blackburn will speak on WebCT and e-learning.

7. GUEST SPEAKER AT SEPTEMBER SENATE MEETING

Dr. Jim Gary, Vice President for Information Resources, on laptop security. Dr. Leaf discussed the encryption of laptops. Dr. Daniel discussed that there should be a document in place, a courtesy to the faculty.

Dr. Cantrell made the motion to place Dr. Gary on the September Senate agenda. Dr. Redman seconded the motion. The motion passed. Dr. Gary will speak at the September Senate meeting.

8. POLICY MEMORANDA REVISION: Intellectual Property Policy

Dr. Leaf asked for a motion to place this policy revision on the agenda. Dr. Cantrell made the motion to place on the agenda. Dr. Beron seconded the motion. The motion passed. Dr. MacFarlane will make a presentation at the September Senate meeting.

9. COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORTS

Dr. Leaf asked for a motion to place all Committee Annual Reports on the Senate agenda that are receive in time for the meeting. Dr. Cordell made the motion. Dr. Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion passed.

10. RELEASE AND DISCLOSURE FORM FOR ACADEMIC TRAVEL

(Discussion Only)

The Council discussed what kind of clearance procedure is necessary for students traveling
with faculty for academic work. Partly in consequence of an incident last fall, and a subsequent meeting of concerned faculty and staff, Dr. Kratz had developed a form for students to give permission for criminal background checks. One question was whether such permission was necessary at all. Another is whether such a check had to be done for all students or whether it could be selective. Dr. Kratz argued that if release and disclosure is done for any students, it should be done for all. Further discussion concerned whether this policy should apply only to foreign travel, or to both local travel, and who would evaluate background checks.

Ms. King noted that the proposed forms had gone before the Handbook on Operation Procedures (HOP) committee. Questions from the HOP committee were: what is done with the information, what is the policy, and what happens to the student. The Council concluded that the matter was not ready to present to the Senate. Dr. Leaf said he would look into alternatives.

11. POLICY ON FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

Two versions of the draft policy that had been reviewed and approved by the Committee of Faculty Standing and Conduct were presented to the Council. The difference concerned the appeal procedure. In one version, it was directly from Regents Rules. In the other, it utilized our own grievance policy, which differs from that in Regents Rules. Dr. Leaf noted that the procedure in Regents Rules dates from before the Regental requirement that campuses have grievance policies, and is presently under review at the System level.

Dr. Redman made the motion to place both policies on the Senate agenda. Dr. Cantrell seconded the motion.

Dr. Daniel argued that it was inappropriate to consider a policy that differed from the Regents’ rules.

Dr. Wildenthal indicated dissatisfaction with the criterion for exigency being that the financial crisis had to threaten the “survival” of the institution. Dr. Leaf noted that this wording was from the AAUP guidelines, and hence would be what has been defined by case law.

There was further committee discussion of both policies.

Dr. Daniel expressed his concern with sending both policies forward to the Senate, but noted that he supports having such a policy.

Ms. King noted that Office of General Counsel had asked us for suggestions. Dr. Leaf noted that he had been placed on a task force to consider the issue at the System level.

Dr. Cantrell moved to postpone placing the policy on the Senate agenda. Dr. Redman seconded the motion. The motion passed. The Policy on Financial Exigency was postponed.
12. SENATE STRATEGIC PLANNING

The Senate had previously agreed to consider setting up a strategic planning committee, but at the time did not know if there were school plans. We now have the school plans. The question before the council is whether to first try to integrate the plans and then set the emergent issues before the Senate, or brings the several plans to the Senate and let them try to decide how to integrate them. The Council agreed that the Speaker and Council should try to pull them together first.

Discussions of strategic planning led to a question on the program and decanal reviews for this past year. Dr. Wildenthal agreed to report on the reviews.
Dr. Cantrell moved to place the Provost’s report on the Senate agenda. Dr. Redman seconded the motion. The motion passed

13. AGENDA FOR SENATE

Ph.D. Program Proposal in Arts and Technology
Guest speakers: Dr. Rhonda Blackburn, e-learning and WebCT; and Dr. Jim Gary, laptop security
Dr. MacFarlane’s Report of Intellectual Property
Receive Additional Committee Reports

Dr. Cantrell made the motion to accept the proposed Senate agenda. Dr. Redman seconded the motion. The motion to approve the agenda passed.

14. ADJOURNMENT

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

APPROVED: ______________________________                     DATE: _____________
Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Faculty
September 23, 2009

TO: All Committee Members

REFERENCE: Appointees to Campus Housing Advisory Committee

Dear Colleagues:

Pursuant to the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents, the University of Texas System, Series 20201, Section 4, and pursuant to Title V: Rules on Student Services and Activities, Chapter 53, Article II, Section 2, (4) of the University's Handbook of Operating Procedures, I am appointing you to the Campus Housing Advisory Committee effective October 1, 2009, through September 30, 2010. Please note the first meeting will be held on October 15 from 2:30 to 4:00 p.m., in the Gemini Room of the Student Union (SU2.504).

The membership of the Committee will be as follows:

**STUDENTS**
- Residential Senators: Braeden Mayer
- Student Government Residential Student: Bryan Thompson
- Peer Advisors: Ty Andrews, Amiee Wilkerson
- RHA Member: Rachel Ortega
- Freshman Living in Apartments: Heather Lister
- Freshman Living in Residence Hall: Nick Rotundo
- Non-Freshmen Living in Apartments: Amanda Klasing, Sitara Paladugu

**EX-OFFICIO w/o vote**
- President or Vice President of Student Government
- Director of Residential Life
- Dean of Undergraduate Education
- Dean of Graduate Studies
- Vice President for Business Affairs
- Community Director of Waterview Park
- Director of Housing Operations
- Faculty Senate Representative
- Dr. Ravi Prakash

**RUO**
- Vice President for Student Affairs

I hope you will agree to serve on this Committee. Please let me have your acceptance or denial to serve on this Committee by October 1, 2009 via e-mail: jackie.broussard@utdallas.edu

Sincerely,

Darrelene Rachavong
Vice President for Student Affairs
DRAFT U T DALLAS POLICY ON FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

Preamble

The policy in Rule 31003, Section 1, of the Regents’ Rules and Regulations (http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules.htm#A4) concerning the Abandonment of Academic Positions or Programs calls for the President of the University to determine institutional procedures for an in-depth review to inform and guide decisions on these matters. Section 2 concerns elimination for “Academic Reasons.” Section 3 concerns elimination due to financial exigency. In accord with Rule 31003, U. T. Dallas policy and procedures relating to Section 3 are as follow.

1. GENERAL POLICY ON INTERPRETATION OF REGENT’S RULES

A. Regents Rule 31003, abandonment of academic positions or programs must be interpreted in the light of Rule 40101 which gives faculty the “major role” in regard to “general academic policies and welfare” and related matters and in the light of the further provisions that assign these faculty responsibilities to the faculty governance organization and require that the organization and procedures of the governance organization be set out in the university Handbook of Operating Procedures and subject to governance review and approval. In addition, the University accepts the recommendations regarding declarations of exigency in the American Association of University Professors “Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.”

B. The term “faculty committee” as used in Regents Rules section 31003 shall be understood here as meaning the Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas, the regular committees of the Senate, or any ad hoc committee that the Senate may assign responsibilities to in order to respond to the exigency. It does not include committees that the Senate does not constitute or approve.

2. INITIAL DECLARATION OF FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

A. Financial exigency is an imminent financial crisis that threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and that cannot be alleviated by less drastic means than termination of faculty. Whenever there is reason to anticipate that the University is sufficiently threatened by financial exigency, declines in enrollment, or changes in educational needs to endanger the continuance of the University's obligations to faculty members with tenure or those on regular academic appointments, the President at the earliest date possible shall inform the Faculty Senate and all potentially affected budgetary units of the problem.

The President shall consult with the Senate and the concerned budgetary units to determine the nature and seriousness of the problem, the most appropriate of the possible courses of action to be taken, and the means of safeguarding faculty rights and interests, including tenure rights. Alternative courses of action, other than reducing faculty, to be considered should include but are not limited to reduction in staff or administration, temporary reductions in pay, reduction by attrition, non-paid leave, early retirement buyouts, elimination of bonuses, demotions, and
selective non-paid leave. If reductions in faculty are unavoidable, the University shall make
every reasonable effort to reassign affected faculty members to other suitable work and to aid
them in finding other employment.

B. On the basis of these deliberations, the President shall write an Initial Declaration of
Financial Exigency giving the extent and scope of the emergency and the general approach to be
taken to respond to it.

3. CONCURRENCE OF THE SENATE

A. The President shall submit the Initial Declaration of Exigency to the Senate for advice and
concurrence. Concurrence requires a majority vote of the Senate. This process may involve
amendments, mutually agreed upon. Concurrence will result in a joint Senate-presidential
Exigency Plan. The joint Plan shall include a formula for the membership of the committee
“composed of faculty and administrative personnel to make recommendations to the president as
to which academic positions and/or academic programs should be eliminated as a result of the
financial exigency” in accordance with rule 3.1, as well as the general criteria the committee
should apply in making its recommendations.

B. Procedure in the event of non-concurrence. If the Senate does not concur, the President shall
nevertheless establish an exigency committee as described below and seek the Senate’s
recommendations for faculty to serve on it. If the Senate fails to provide such recommendations,
the President shall establish a committee of at least seven members and appoint faculty at his
discretion from among the tenured faculty, not holding administrative positions at the level of
dean or above. The remaining requirements of Regent’s Rules sections 31003, sections 3.2 to 3.5
will be carried out as described in section 4.

4. PROCEDURE FOR ELIMINATING POSITIONS

A. Upon concurrence, the Senate shall nominate faculty to serve on the committee to review the
President’s declaration, assure that there is no alternative to the proposed actions, and develop a
process to make the needed decisions as outlined in Regents Rules 31003, Section 2, 3.2 to 3.5,
provided that:

(1) For section 3.1, the “committee composed of faculty and administrative personnel” the
general size and composition of the committee shall be agreed upon by the Senate and the
President, provided that it has at least seven members, three of whom will be faculty. Once
this is done, the Senate will nominate the faculty members. At least a majority of the faculty
nominated will be tenured. Non-tenured faculty shall be senior non-tenure system clinical
faculty with substantial experience in the university. The nominations should seek to
represent the university as a whole, not just programs initially slated to be reduced or just
those not so slated, and at least some of them will have served on the Committee for
Qualifications of Academic Personnel. The President shall not appoint faculty to the
committee who are not nominated by the Senate. This committee shall be called hereafter the
Exigency Committee.
(2) For section 3.2, assessment of academic programs. The Exigency Committee will provide a written report of its analysis of programs, which shall be submitted to the Senate for review and response before recommendations are made for specific positions to be eliminated. As stated in the Rule, “The committee will review and assess the academic programs of the institution and identify those academic positions that may be eliminated with minimum effect upon the degree programs that should be continued. The review will include, but not be limited to, an examination of the course offerings, degree programs, supporting degree programs, teaching specialties, and semester credit hour production.” The Committee shall consider and may offer advice on all avenues by which terminations of faculty members can be avoided or minimized, and, as well, by which the negative effects of any necessary terminations can be mitigated. Unless an extension is approved by the President, the Committee shall complete its work in a period of time no longer than 60 days.

(3) In section 3.3, Review Consideration. The Exigency Committee next recommends specific positions to be eliminated. These recommendations should also be contained in a written report. The recommendations should be related to the Exigency Committee’s assessment of programs. If other officers of the university, such as deans or program chairs, are involved in identifying individuals whose appointments are to terminated, the process for obtaining these recommendations should be described in the report. The Exigency Committee will have available the personnel records of those being considered including current curriculum vitas, annual reports, promotion committee reports and recommendations, and results of periodic performance reviews. It will have access to full personnel files. Faculty whose positions would be jeopardized by the proposed actions will be provided the opportunity to contribute meaningfully to the Committee's review process, including the ability to respond in writing to the recommendations.

(4) For section 3.4, Tenure Preference. In applying the rule as stated, the Exigency Committee should not apply an unduly narrow interpretation of the idea that two candidates should be “equally qualified” before preference is given to one with tenure over one without. Preference should be given to tenured faculty over non-tenured if they are have approximately the same qualifications and prospects, and to more senior faculty over less senior provided that their accomplishments are roughly proportional to their relative academic lifetimes. The decisions should be consistent with the general principle that greater contributions will gain greater consideration.

(5) In section 3.5, Recommendation. According to the Rule, “upon completion of its review, the Exigency Committee shall promptly recommend to the president those persons who may be terminated, ranked in order of priority, with the reasons for their selection. The president shall, with such consultation with institutional administrative officers as they may deem appropriate, determine which academic positions are to be terminated because of the financial exigency and shall give the holders of these positions written notice of the decision.” The Exigency Committee recommendations to the President shall be made in writing. Unless an extension is approved by the President, the Committee shall complete its work in a period of time no longer than 60 days from the submission of the initial recommendations identifying the programs or positions to reduce or eliminate.
5. PROCEDURE FOR NOTICE AND APPEAL

A. Appeal Procedures. The hearing committee shall set the date, time, and place for hearing the appeal for reconsideration. Such hearing shall be held within 30 days of the date of the written request unless the person to be terminated waives such time requirement; however, such hearing shall be held within 90 days from the date of the request. The hearing committee shall conduct the hearing in accordance with the following conditions and procedures set out in Regents Rules 31003, Section 3.8.

(a) The hearing will be closed to the public unless requested to be open by the appealing person.

(b) The appealing person may be represented by legal counsel at their expense.

(c) The appealing person and the institution may offer any written evidence or oral testimony that is material to the issues.

(d) The burden shall be upon the appealing person to show by a preponderance of the credible evidence that:

(1) Financial exigency was not in fact the reason for the initial decision to reduce academic positions; or

(2) The decision to terminate the appealing person as compared to another individual in the same discipline or teaching specialty was arbitrary and unreasonable.

(e) No other issues shall be heard or considered by the hearing committee.

(f) The hearing committee shall make written findings of fact and recommendations to the president of an institution as soon as practical following the hearing. The president shall have the final decision to either accept or reject the recommendation of the hearing committee.

B. The employment of a tenured faculty member who is to be terminated under this policy shall not end before that person has had reasonable time to close down their research or other such facilities in a non-destructive way. During this period of employment and for 3 additional years, the terminated faculty member shall have the right to first consideration among equally qualified candidates for any faculty position at U. T. Dallas for which a recruitment and hiring process is conducted and for which the faculty member in question formally applies. In addition, the considerations specified in Rule 31003, Section 3.6.

6. NO CONCURRENT REPLACEMENTS

If appointments are terminated, the University will not at the same time make new appointments except in extraordinary circumstances where a serious distortion in the academic program would otherwise result. Similarly, the appointment of a faculty member with tenure will not be
terminated in favor of retaining a faculty member without tenure, except in extraordinary circumstances where a serious distortion of the academic program would otherwise result.
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: An institution which does not have preliminary authority for the proposed program shall submit a separate request for preliminary authority. 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.

Administrative Information

1. Institution: The University of Texas at Dallas

2. Program Name – Show how the program would appear on the Coordinating Board’s program inventory [e.g., Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Electrical Engineering].

   Master of Science in Innovation and Entrepreneurship

3. Proposed CIP Code: 52.0701

4. Program Description – Describe the program and the educational objectives.

   Today’s business climate is driven by innovation, demanding that organizations respond to a dynamic and ever-changing set of customer requirements with creative and entrepreneurial solutions. This program “addresses a weakness that exists in most businesses: few people have the experience and/or knowledge to successfully craft, sell and launch a new business area.”

   The Master of Science in Innovation and Entrepreneurship (MSIE) will prepare students for successful business careers in entrepreneurial new ventures, entrepreneurial finance (venture capital/private equity), or innovation-related roles in mature organizations (product planning, product marketing, product development, etc.). This degree will complement baccalaureate or advanced degrees in a scientific or engineering discipline, and will be valued by employers in technology-related or consumer products industries.

   The program will provide students with a solid foundation in the management disciplines essential to the successful innovation of new ideas, new products and new business models, whether in the context of an entrepreneurial startup or within the more structured environment of a mature corporation.

   The MSIE program will provide a general business foundation in accounting, organizational behavior, marketing, and strategic management (a total of 12 credit hours), two prescribed courses in entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial finance (a total of 6 credit hours) four focus track electives (12 credit hours), plus two free electives (6 credit hours) for a total of 36 credit hours.
Each group of four focus track electives has been selected from among the eleven other graduate courses in innovation and entrepreneurship currently offered within the School of Management. These tracks will permit the students to focus either on: (a) new venture development; or (b) innovation within the corporation, or an appropriate combination of both. The two free electives may be selected from among these courses or, with permission of the faculty, any of the other graduate offerings of the School of Management.

Students interested in innovation and entrepreneurship currently have the option of an MS/MAS degree with a concentration in Innovation and Entrepreneurship (36 hours) or an MBA with a concentration in Innovation and Entrepreneurship, although these options have limitations compared to the MSIE program. The concentrations in both degree programs are currently focused primarily on new venture development rather than on innovation within the corporation.

The business core of the MS/MAS primarily develops technical/analytical skills (accounting, economics, information technology, and quantitative analysis of risk and uncertainty), as compared to the marketing/strategy/management focus of the MSIE curriculum. The MBA degree provides a broad-based management-oriented core, but requires a total investment of 53 credit hours. Further, the MSIE program permits students to enroll in up to 24 credit hours in the discipline (vs. 15 in the MBA or MS/MAS concentrations).

We expect to initially draw some students from these programs as shown in the table on page 6. We anticipate, however, that the MS/MAS program will still be viable and that the MBA program will not be materially impacted. Fall 2008 enrollments for the MS/MAS and MBA programs were 153 and 1,144, respectively. Spring 2009 enrollments for the MS/MAS and MBA programs were 79 and 1,062, respectively. The decline in the MS/MAS program was offset, to a significant extent, by increased enrollment in three new MS degree programs in Finance, Supply Chain Management and Healthcare Management.

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

School of Management, The University of Texas at Dallas

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

Spring Semester 2010

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

Name: Hasan Pirkul
Title: Dean, School of Management, The University of Texas at Dallas
E-mail: hpirkul@utdallas.edu
Phone: 972-883-2705
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 for graduates in the job market.

Entrepreneurial job creation is the engine of our economy, and the education and training of individuals capable of providing energy and leadership to this essential market segment has never been more needed.

A recently published study\(^1\) utilizing 1977-2005 data from the National Bureau of Economic Research reports considerable churn in the employment statistics, with an average annual job creation rate of about 18 percent of employment and an annual job destruction rate of about 16 percent, for a net job creation rate of 2% of employment over the period. While very large firms employ more individuals in the aggregate, the overwhelming majority of net new job creation is concentrated in new and younger enterprises – the byproduct of a high rate of innovation and new enterprise formation.

The need for talented individuals trained in the processes of innovation and entrepreneurship is not limited to new ventures. There is a recognized need, among mature organizations in the technology community, for engineers and scientists who possess sufficient business training and expertise to effectively evaluate opportunities and risks and to manage and facilitate the processes of innovation. This is supported by the comments of a senior manager at Raytheon:

“The [MSIE] program…addresses a vacuum that exists in most businesses: few people have the experience and/or knowledge to successfully craft, sell and launch a new business area.

“High-tech businesses…would hire as well as send existing employees into the program. It fits well into a number of our more externally focused functions: business development, product management, marketing and sales, program management, and even engineering management.

“In larger organizations…that are functionally organized, they would most likely bring such people into engineering and program management. Without work experience, they would probably be brought into entry level positions. The larger organizations would probably engage best with this program by sending their existing employees.”

Many of the Professional MBA and MS/MAS students enrolled in the current concentrations in Innovation and Entrepreneurship are employed in engineering and product development roles by local companies (e.g., Texas Instruments, Raytheon, Hewlett Packard, Lockheed Martin) engaged in the semiconductor, telecommunications, information technology, defense and similar industries. These students (and in many cases, their employers) have recognized the need to

supplement their technical skills with specific management training in the disciplines surrounding new product development, innovation and technology commercialization.

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

Graduate courses in innovation and entrepreneurship were first offered by the School of Management (SOM) in Fall 2002. A full offering of undergraduate courses and concentrations in the MBA, MS and BA programs were offered by the SOM in Fall 2005. Since that time, student demand has grown rapidly, to a current level (academic year 2008-2009) of more than 965 students enrolled in innovation and entrepreneurship courses. Over the past four academic years, student enrollments have increased over the prior year by an average of 43% annually, reflecting strong and growing student interest both in the academic program and in career opportunities in the field.

In 2008-2009, 368 students enrolled in master’s level programs took graduate courses in innovation and entrepreneurship. Although concentrations are not currently tracked in enrollment statistics, it is estimated that 20%-30% of these students will complete the concentration in innovation and entrepreneurship within the degree program. Interviews with students reveal that approximately half of these students (or about 35 per year) would have enrolled in the MSIE program.

The majority of the student population for the proposed program will be comprised of working professionals in local technology-based companies. The experience of our sister institutions in the UT System provides support for our projections of student demand. Two programs, similar in student population, scope, focus and objectives are currently offered within the UT system. UT Austin offers a 36 hour Master of Science in Science and Technology Commercialization (MS STC), and UT San Antonio offers a 33 hour Master of Science in Management of Technology (MS MOT). Neither of these programs are directly comparable to the proposed program, although there are a number of common elements.

MS STC has graduated approximately 500 students since its inception in 1996 (average of 38 graduates per year). Approximately 60% of these graduates are currently employed in large technology-based companies in technology development, new product development, or product marketing roles; approximately 10% are employed in technology transfer positions; the remainder are currently pursuing entrepreneurial ventures.

The MS MOT program at UT San Antonio, started in 1994, provides graduate education focused on the management of technology for engineering and technical professionals. This 33 hour degree program is aimed at working professionals and has averaged about 20 graduates per year over the past several years.

Although the McCombs School at UT Austin and the College of Business at UT San Antonio are larger in total enrollment than the School of Management at UT Dallas, the enrollments in Masters programs at the UT Dallas SOM is greater than the graduate
enrollments at either of these two schools. Although the proposed program would be drawing from a larger target population, both in terms of current graduate school enrollments and the total population in the market area, we have projected enrollments and graduation rates comparable to those of the programs at our sister schools (see below).

In the local market, Southern Methodist University launched an MS in Entrepreneurship program in 2007. Approximately 35 students were enrolled in the initial offering of this 16 month program.

In conversations with senior HR and operating executives at several area technology-based companies, they have expressed their desire for innovation management–trained scientists and engineers and their support for the proposed program. Graduates would be considered prime candidates for strategic marketing, technology management, marketing management, product marketing and sales force management positions.\(^2\) One such company, Texas Instruments, has projected requirements in the range of 15-20 students per year for the proposed program.

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.

<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>New MSIE Students Enrolled</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from MS/MAS or MBA Programs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Total Enrollments</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year FT Enrollment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year PT Enrollment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year Total Enrollment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTSE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative MSIE Graduates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have assumed, throughout the projection period, that approximately 1/3 of the students will be enrolled on a full-time basis (24 credit hours/year), with the remainder enrolled on a part time basis (12 credit hours per year).

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.)*

---

\(^2\) Letters of endorsement from Texas Instruments and Raytheon Corporation are attached.
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.

No new courses will be required to implement the MSIE program. Each of the required courses is currently being offered by the School of Management. Projected enrollments will be incremental to current enrollments in these courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Core Curriculum (18 credit hours)</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIM 6305</td>
<td>Accounting for Managers (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB 6301</td>
<td>Organizational Behavior (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPS 6310</td>
<td>Strategic Management (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKT 6301</td>
<td>Introduction to Marketing (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP 6370</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP/FIN 6315</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Finance (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Electives (18 credit hours)</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Venture Focus Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP 6378</td>
<td>Managing the Emerging Enterprise (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP 6380</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Marketing (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP 6385</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Business Strategies (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP 6387</td>
<td>Forecasting Industry and Technology Futures (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Innovation within the Corporation Focus Area** |
| ENTP 6375         | Technology and New Product Development (3 cr) | SOM |
| ENTP 6387         | Forecasting Industry and Technology Futures (3 cr) | SOM |
| ENTP 6388         | Managing Innovation within the Corporation (3 cr) | SOM |
| ENTP 6398         | The Entrepreneurial Experience (3 cr)          | SOM |
### Free Electives (ENTP Courses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTP/FIN 6316</td>
<td>Private Equity (3 credits)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP 6392</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship in the Social Sector (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP 6395</td>
<td>Topics in Innovation &amp; Entrepreneurship (3 cr)</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Free Electives (Other)

With faculty permission, students may choose up to two electives from among other SOM offerings in the AIM, FIN, ISOM, MKT, or OSIM (BPS, OB and IM) areas.

### 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.

<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>Springate, David Professor</td>
<td>DBA, Harvard University</td>
<td>ENTP/FIN 6315, ENTP/FIN 6316</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picken, Joseph C. Clinical Professor*</td>
<td>PhD in Business Administration (Strategic Management) The University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>ENTP 6380, ENTP 6385, ENTP 6378, ENTP 6392</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah, Rajiv Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Ph. D in Electrical Engineering, Rice University; EMBA, Southern Methodist University</td>
<td>ENTP 6375, ENTP 6388, ENTP 6398</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragozzino, Roberto Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Business Policy and Strategy, The Ohio State University</td>
<td>BPS 6310, ENTP 6370</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected New Faculty in Year 2010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Percent of time assigned to program reflects the percentage of the individual faculty teaching load represented by the indicated courses. Because the same course may be required in more than one degree program, students enrolled in a given course may be pursuing an MBA, an MS/MAS or an MS in Innovation & Entrepreneurship. Our projections assume that approximately one third of the students enrolled in any given course in innovation and entrepreneurship will be pursuing an MS in Innovation and Entrepreneurship degree.
### Table: Faculty Support

<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>Anderson, Mark Associate Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D., Accounting, University of Florida</td>
<td>AIM 6305</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumar, Nanda Associate Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Management Science, University of Chicago</td>
<td>MKT 6301</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dess, Gregory G. Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Strategic Management, University of Washington</td>
<td>BPS 6310 ENTP 6395</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford, David Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Organizational Analysis, University of Wisconsin (Madison)</td>
<td>OB 6301</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robb, Robert Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>MS in Environmental Biology, University of Utah.</td>
<td>ENTP 6370</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bochsler, Dan Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>MBA, University of Houston</td>
<td>ENTP 6375 ENTP 6388</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimzey, Jackie Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>MBA, University of Dallas; MS in Management, Abilene Christian University; AACSB Certification for Professionally Qualified Faculty</td>
<td>ENTP 6370 ENTP/FIN 6316</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedigo, Madison Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>MBA, The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>ENTP 6315</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected New Faculty in Year 2010</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Students

- **Students** – Describe general recruitment efforts and admission requirements. Describe plans to recruit and admit students from underrepresented groups for the program.

  This program will participate in the general recruitment efforts of the School of Management and will have the same admission requirements as the other master’s programs of the school.

  The School of Management at UT Dallas will make every effort to recruit and retain underrepresented students into this program. Such efforts will include, but not be limited to, advertising the program widely to communities and organizations with underrepresented populations; open houses, providing needed advising to such students on their academic work; and helping them on their career path.
The Institute for Innovation and Entrepreneurship at UT Dallas (IIE), which is closely allied and shares a number of common faculty with the MSIE program, is actively engaged with the National Foundation for Teaching Entrepreneurship (NFTE) which is focused on inner city schools. Under grant agreements with the Texas Instruments Foundation, the IIE routinely meets aggressive targets for diversity in funded programs.

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 collections in entrepreneurship and small business are considered substantial and more than adequate to begin a graduate program in this area.

The McDermott Library book collection was compared to the collection available through Southern Methodist University for entrepreneurship. The collection at the McDermott Library provides approximately 5% more material than that at SMU. The McDermott Library collections were compared with those at the Western Carolina University Library which already supports a master’s degree in entrepreneurship. The collection at Western Carolina University is approximately 8% larger than at the University of Texas at Dallas. This discrepancy will be evaluated to identify and purchase approximately 50 titles. The library will allocate approximately $500 annually to increase the book acquisitions in this area.

The journal collection was evaluated against two other universities. Approximately 13 new journals need to be ordered in the next three years to equal the titles available at other universities. The 2009 costs of these acquisitions is approximately $6500. Subscriptions to the journals will be initiated in the next three years.

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.

Current facilities are adequate to support the program. The School of Management building was newly constructed in 2002, with cutting edge computing and other teaching facilities and technologies. The building offers adequate facilities and equipment, in terms of office and classroom spaces, computing, research and teaching resources to accommodate the proposed program.

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

Currently, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) is the accreditation body that accredits business school programs. Their standards for a business school can be found at http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards.asp. The School of Management was accredited by AACSB in 2002 and will be accredited again in 2011. The proposed degree utilizes existing courses (as a part of our current MS degree program) which meet the stated standards.
III. Costs and Funding

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

The majority of the courses proposed for this program are currently being offered by the School of Management at UT Dallas. All faculty required for the program are currently on board as of academic year 2009-2010. Projected student enrollments represent incremental enrollments in existing sections of courses currently offered within the MBA and MS/MAS concentrations. The costs reflected herein are allocated across existing and new programs as a percentage of earned credit hours. Over the five year period, it is anticipated that approximately one third of the total credit hours of courses in innovation and entrepreneurship will be earned in the proposed new degree program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Year Costs</th>
<th>Five-Year Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel¹</td>
<td>$1,018,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library, Supplies, and Materials</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other²</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$1,027,248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Personnel costs are projected based on scheduled load for assigned faculty factored by student count by graduate degree program (total loaded salary cost reduced by undergraduate and non-entrepreneurship teaching load; entrepreneurship teaching load allocated across programs as a percentage). No additional regular sections will be added to accommodate this program.
2. No incremental administrative or travel costs will be incurred as a result of this program.
3. Incremental formula funding projected for years three through five of the program only for students new to program at current rate of $218.37 per credit hour.
4. Incremental formula funding (designated fee) projected for years three through five of the program only for students new to program at current rate of $60 per credit hour.
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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 institution’s 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
May 29, 2009

Dr. Joseph C. Picken
School of Management
The University of Texas at Dallas
800 West Campbell Road SM 43
Richardson, Texas 75080-3021

Dear Dr. Picken:

I have reviewed your draft proposal for the new Master of Science in Innovation and Entrepreneurship degree program, and I offer my endorsement and support for this initiative.

There is a recognized need, within our company and among other organizations in the technology community, for engineers and scientists who possess sufficient business training and expertise to effectively identify and evaluate opportunities, and manage and facilitate the processes of innovation. The curriculum focused on innovation within the corporation appears to be well-designed and effectively addresses a workforce skill need that we have today. It is my belief that we will continue to have a strong need for innovative and entrepreneurial talent in the future.

In my view, the ideal candidate for this degree program would be a high potential, technically-trained individual with 4-6 years of engineering experience. Graduates would be considered prime candidates for strategic marketing, technology management, engineering management, product marketing, or sales force management positions within several of our organizations.

As the program becomes established, I anticipate that Texas Instruments would encourage and support enrollment in this degree program as part of our ongoing talent development activities.

Please keep us advised of your progress in the development and implementation of this exciting new program.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Steve Lyle
Manager
Diversity & Workforce Development
June 5, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is offered in strong support for Dr. Picken’s proposed degree program. The program addresses a weakness that exists in most businesses: few people have the experience and/or knowledge to successfully craft, sell and launch a new business area. Intrapreneurship is a much needed critical skill in existing businesses to drive innovation into economic growth.

High-tech businesses like ELCAN would hire as well as send existing employees into the program. It fits well into a number of our more externally focused functions: business development, product management, marketing and sales, program management, and even engineering management.

Other businesses in the area would certainly take advantage of this program in terms of both talent development and hiring graduates. As a long time member of the Metroplex Technology Business Council Board of Directors who serves on the Executive Committee and chairs the Talent Development Committee, I believe this program aligns well with the economic development interests of the large number of high-tech organizations in the North Texas region.

Sincerely,

Paul Klocék
General Manager
ELCAN Optical Technologies
a Raytheon Company
**Request to:** Create a New Policy for Section D in BA Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual

**Person/group making request:** Larry Wilson, Assistant VP, Human Resources Management

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

**Suggested Stakeholder Review Plan:** All Stakeholders: Academic Affairs (CEP, Council, Senate review), Student Affairs, Business Affairs, Information Resources, Research

**Background Information/Rationale for request:**

There are times when an employee’s behavior is such that they need to be sent home as they are unfit for duty. UT Dallas has modeled this policy after UT Austin’s Fitness for Duty Policy and recommends it for consideration by the committee.
FITNESS FOR DUTY

A. Policy Statement

The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to providing a safe workplace for the benefit of the University community. In order to provide a safe work environment, employees must be able to perform their job duties in a safe, secure, productive, and effective manner, and remain able to do so throughout the entire time they are working. Employees who are not physically or emotionally fit for duty may present a safety hazard to themselves, to other employees, to the University, or to the public.

B. Scope

This policy applies to all University staff and faculty.

C. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to establish the procedures by which the University evaluates an employee’s fitness for duty when an employee is:

1. Having observable difficulty performing work duties in a manner that is safe, secure, productive and effective for the employee, for the employee’s coworkers, for the University, or for the public, as determined by the supervisor; or

2. Posing an imminent and serious safety threat to self or others.

D. Definitions

*Fit for duty* means able to perform the duties of the job in a safe, secure, productive, and effective manner as determined by the supervisor.

*Health service provider* is a doctor of medicine or osteopathy, dentist, podiatrist, clinical psychologist, optometrist, nurse practitioner, nurse-midwife, or a licensed clinical social worker that is authorized to practice in the state of Texas or in the state the employee resides for employees who reside outside the state of Texas.

*Supervisor* means: for staff, the person to whom they report; and for faculty, their department head or Dean.

E. Employee Responsibilities

1. Employees are responsible for managing their physical and emotional health in a manner that allows them to safely perform their job responsibilities.
2. Employees must report to work fit for duty and must perform their job responsibilities in a safe, secure, productive, and effective manner during the entire time they are working.

3. Employees are responsible for notifying their supervisors when they are not fit for duty or when they feel they may become unfit for duty.

4. Employees are responsible for notifying the supervisor when they observe a coworker acting in a manner that indicates the coworker may be unfit for duty. If the supervisor’s behavior is the focus of concern, an employee may inform the upper level manager or may call Human Resources Management (HRM) for additional guidance.

F. Employer Responsibilities

1. Supervisors are responsible for observing the attendance, performance, and behavior of the employees they supervise.

2. Supervisors/managers are responsible for following this policy’s procedures when presented with circumstances or knowledge that indicate that an employee may be unfit for duty.

3. Confidentiality of medical records: Any document containing medical information about an employee is considered a medical record and is regarded as confidential. If a department has any medical information about an employee, that information should be maintained in a file separate from all other employee records.

G. Human Resources Management Responsibilities

1. Human Resources Management (HRM) is responsible for assisting the supervisor assess the severity of the employee’s behavior. HRM will apply a “prudent person” rule in evaluating the reported behavior to determine if the behavior rises to the level of not fit for duty.

2. If the employee is determined to be not fit for duty, and it is determined that a fitness for duty evaluation is in the best interest of the University, HRM will supply the supervisor with a form for the employee to use in obtaining the fitness for duty review.

H. Procedures

1. The supervisor who receives reliable information that an employee may be unfit for duty, or through personal observation believes an employee to be unfit for duty, will validate and document the information or observations as soon as is practicable. Behaviors that may trigger the need to evaluate an employee’s fitness for duty include, but are not limited to:

   a. problems with dexterity, coordination, concentration, memory, alertness, vision, or speech;
b. inappropriate interactions with coworkers or supervisors such as angry outbursts, refusal to cooperate with reasonable requests, throwing objects, slamming doors, inappropriate or uncontrollable crying;

c. threatening behavior or statements, including suicidal threats.

2. The supervisor will present the information or observations to the employee at the earliest possible time in order to validate them; and will allow the employee to explain his or her actions, or to correct any mistakes of fact contained in the description of those actions. The supervisor may suggest the employee take a break in order to regain their composure, or the supervisor may suggest the employee take the rest of the day off to allow the employee time to deal with the issue causing the problem behavior. If the supervisor is convinced that the employee is not fit for duty, s/he will then contact Human Resources who will assist in determining whether the employee should leave the workplace immediately because the employee is not fit for duty. The supervisor should create and maintain appropriate documentation of all conversations with the employee related to fitness for duty issues.

3. In situations where there is a basis to think that a crime may have been committed and/or the employee is making threats to harm himself or herself or others, or is acting in a manner that is immediately dangerous to himself or herself or others, the supervisor must contact The University of Texas at Dallas Police Department. Contact Human Resources regarding the fitness for duty procedure after the immediate safety issue has been addressed.

4. In all other circumstances the supervisor shall take appropriate action, including contacting HRM, as soon as possible after he or she receives reports and validates or personally observes an employee’s unfit behavior. After regular business hours the supervisor should determine whether the employee should be sent home and then the supervisor should arrange to contact HRM the next business day.

5. Based on the descriptions provided by the supervisor, HRM will assist the supervisor in determining whether a fitness for duty evaluation is required and, if so, the type of evaluation needed and the type of health service provider to make the evaluation. HRM will then provide a form to the supervisor containing that information, and the supervisor will provide the form to the employee. HRM will assist in determining the type of leave to be used pending a complete assessment of the situation.

6. HRM will provide a form for the designated health service provider to complete to certify whether the employee is fit to return to work. The form will include a behavioral description of the circumstances leading to the request for evaluation, and a list of the employee’s relevant duties. HRM may communicate with the health service provider as necessary.

7. In most cases, the employee will be responsible for the cost of the fitness for duty evaluation, if not covered by the Employee Assistance Plan or the employee’s health plan.
8. Based on information provided by the health service provider, HRM will advise the supervisor whether the employee should return to work and, if so, the conditions of return, including whether the employee must attend a reentry conference with the supervisor and HRM, and whether additional follow-up meetings are necessary. The final decision on whether a provider’s certification will be accepted lies with the employee’s departmental management. A second independent health service provider certification may be requested in some cases. The University will be responsible for the cost of the second independent provider’s certification.

9. The employee must comply with all aspects of the fitness for duty and evaluation procedures, including furnishing necessary consent and release forms to the health service provider. Noncompliance may be grounds for disciplinary action up to and including termination. Information will be requested from the health service provider regarding work restrictions that may be required upon the employee’s return to work.

10. Application of this policy is not intended as a substitute for other University policies or procedures related to performance; nor is it intended as a substitute for discipline. Situations involving violations of University policies or practices may result in disciplinary action being taken.

**For More Information:**

a. Questions regarding fitness for duty should be directed to Human Resources Management.

b. For information about the Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team (BAIT) for UT Dallas students, please see http://www.utdallas.edu/judicialaffairs/documents/bait.pdf
September 15, 2009

To: The Academic Senate

From: Catherine C. Eckel, Chair, Committee on Qualifications

Subject: Annual Report of the Committee on Qualifications, 2008-2009

1. Membership

The Committee on Qualifications consisted of Kenneth J. Balkus (NSM), Christine Dollaghan (BBS), Greg Earle (NSM), Catherine Eckel (EPPS and Chair), Richard Golden (BBS), Robert Lowry (EPPS), Adrienne McLean (A&H and Vice Chair), Aria Nosratinia (ECS), Brian Ratchford (SOM), Richard C. Reynolds (A&H), Katherine Stecke (SOM), and Kang Zhang (ECS).

2. Procedure and meetings

Several changes were made from previous years to the procedure used by CQ to evaluate cases for third-year review, tenure, and promotion. These changes were made in order to improve the quality of decisions made by the Committee and provide more detailed reports on the Committee’s deliberations for each case.

First, the meeting schedule was changed to allow for fewer, but longer, meetings. In particular, three meetings were held to review cases, one for each rank. This change was made to facilitate comparisons across cases and to improve consistency in recommendations. The first two were half-day meetings, but a full day was allotted for the tenure meetings. On January 6, the Committee met to discuss all reviews for promotion to the rank of Professor. Third-year review cases were considered on February 6, and sixth-year and tenure cases on February 20. A final meeting on March 6 was held to evaluate the Committee’s work and make recommendations for changes to the promotion and tenure guidelines and procedures. The Committee met with Provost Wildenthal on March 26 to discuss the recommendations.

Second, the structure of the Committee’s deliberations was changed. For each case, one committee member was assigned to be the “primary” reviewer and another to be “secondary.” While all committee members were expected to read and consider all cases, the Committee found it useful to have this structure to help focus the discussion. The two
reviewers were from outside the candidate’s school in order to avoid conflicts of interest, and they did not act as advocates for their assigned cases. Efforts were made to match reviewers to cases that were not too far from their areas of expertise, when possible; for example, committee members from NSM could review ECS cases, etc. The primary reviewer was asked to prepare a document and make a brief presentation summarizing the case, including its strengths and weaknesses. This was followed by a full discussion and vote. The secondary reviewer was responsible for taking notes and writing up the Committee’s discussion. In some cases the Committee found it useful to have a “do not discuss” category for unambiguous cases. The assigned reviewers then forwarded summary documents to the Chair, who then combined the two documents into a letter detailing the Committee’s discussion and recommendation for each case. These letters were reviewed and revised by the committee members, and a final version submitted to Dowla Hogan who prepared it for signatures.

Third, a representative from the Provost’s office was asked to sit in on the meetings, though that person did not of course have a vote or participate in the discussion of candidates. This representative helped clarify questions about procedures and policies, and served as a useful conduit for information as the electronic file process was developed (see 3 below). In addition, such a person can act as a repository of information, helping to provide continuity from year to year in the Committee’s procedures, and facilitating needed changes in the review process as they arise.

3. Electronic files

Another important change was the development of a secure website that could accommodate electronic files for the documents for each case under review. During 2008-2009 a pilot program took the hard copy files and scanned them for posting on the website. For the 2009-2010 review cycle the site has been improved so that each candidate can now upload their own documents. At each subsequent level, reviewers can view these documents as needed and upload relevant materials (external and internal review letters, etc.).

4. Review activity

During its regular meetings, the Committee reviewed 14 third-year review cases, 13 sixth-year reviews, 5 additional cases for tenure, and 7 cases for promotion to Professor. These are detailed in the attached table. In addition, the committee reviewed and approved 5 cases for new hires with tenure.

5. Final meeting and evaluation

Because a number of changes had been made to CQ protocol, a special meeting of the Committee was held on March 6 to evaluate the procedural changes and suggest improvements at all levels. The Committee members evaluated very positively the reduction of the number of meetings to three, the structure of the review procedure, and the inclusion of a representative from the Office of the Provost. Holding one meeting for
all decisions of a particular type made the review process more consistent, and the new structure produced much more detailed records of the Committee’s deliberations. The attendance by Associate Provost Inga Musselman at the meetings was most helpful, and the Committee really appreciated her input. The Committee was extremely pleased by the move to electronic files, which made reviewing the files much more manageable. Members of the Committee made numerous suggestions for clarifications and changes to all phases of the review procedure, which were intended to streamline the process and improve the average quality of the materials. Most of these were implemented this cycle as Dr. Musselman briefed the new Ad Hoc Committee chairs and candidates for review at each level. In addition, committee members had multiple suggestions for improving the electronic file format and access. Overall the changes were very well received. During the meeting with Dr. Wildenthal on March 26, he also commended the changes.

6. Thanks!

The move to electronic files required an enormous amount of investment on the part of the University and the Provost’s office. The transition went extremely well, and I and the other members of the Committee very much appreciate all the time and effort that went into making it successful. The implementation of the Committee’s suggestions for modifications in the website and review procedures is due to the extraordinary efforts of Associate Provost Inga Musselman. In addition, the Committee was very ably assisted, as always, by Dowla Hogan.
Committee on Qualifications
2008-2009
Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Reappointment Decisions

Reappointment at Assistant Professor:

Fourteen faculty members were reviewed for reappointment as assistant professors. All fourteen received positive recommendations from CQ for reappointment, and the Provost and President agreed.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure (or Tenure Only):

Eighteen faculty members were reviewed for tenure. Thirteen of these were sixth-year review cases, four were considered for promotion and tenure with prior service elsewhere, and one case was for tenure only. The committee recommended in favor of tenure at the rank of Associate Professor for fourteen, and against tenure for four. The Provost and President agreed with thirteen of the fourteen positive recommendations and three of the four negative recommendations, overturning one in each category.

Promotion to Professor:

Seven faculty members were reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor. Six were recommended for promotion by the Committee, with one recommendation against promotion. The Provost and President agreed in all seven cases.

Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Reappointment Decisions by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts and Humanities</th>
<th>Economics, Political and Policy Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
<td>2 promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 promoted to Professor</td>
<td>2 promoted to Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior and Brain Sciences</th>
<th>Natural Science and Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering and Computer Science</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
<td>3 reappointed at Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 tenured at Associate Professor</td>
<td>2 promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 denied Tenure and terminated</td>
<td>2 denied Tenure and terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 denied promotion to Professor</td>
<td>1 promoted to Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Murray Leaf, Speaker of the Faculty
From: Mary Chaffin, Chair Core Curriculum Committee
Date: July 20, 2009
Re: Core Curriculum Committee - Annual Report for 2008-2009

On behalf of the Core Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to report its actions for the past academic year. We met eight times during the year to discuss changes proposed for the core and address requests for exceptions to the core.

Core Curriculum Course Change Requests:
- MECH 1v95 Fundamentals of Mechanical Engineering (030)
  - Concern that core courses do not have "v" numbers.
  - CCC is concerned about the science content of the course.
  - This issue was tabled for later discussion, and then dropped.
- AMS 3384 North American Archaeology (080)
  - Prefix change requested from AMS to ISGS.
  - Approved.
- NATS 2v10 Chaos and Fractals (030)
  - This course will have a non "v" number in the fall 2009 when course numbers are assigned.
  - Designed for CV students.
  - Approved.
- ISNS 3355 The Science of Cars (030)
  - Approved.
- COMM 3300 Reading Media Critically (010)
  - Approved
- Math 1316 Trigonometry (020)
  - Approved.
Core Curriculum Exception Requests:
These are requests made by ADU's for exceptions to the core for students that had taken the wrong courses thinking they fulfilled core curriculum requirements.

- BIOL 4v90 (010)
  - A biology student took this as advanced writing.
  - **Approved** - added to core for spring 2002 only.

- HUMA 1315 (040)
  - A biology student took the incorrect course at Dallas County Community College.
  - **Denied** – student must take a humanities course that meets the core requirements.

- EE 4488/CE 4488/ TE 4488 (010)
  - ECS student took wrong advanced writing course.
  - Was previously added to core for spring 2008 – request is for fall 2007.
  - **Approved** - added one section for the fall 2007. All should be removed from core for spring 2009.
  - All ECS students should take ECS 3390 for advanced writing.

- PHYS 1100 (030)
  - **Approved** – added one section for the fall 2005. This student claimed misadvising.

- BA 4305-502 (010)
  - A biology student was misadvised.
  - **Approved** – added one section for the fall 2008.

- CHEM 4v91 (010)
  - A bio/chemistry student is currently (spring 2009) in the wrong class for advanced writing.
  - **Denied** – Karen will drop/add the student to the correct course.

Assessment of the Core Curriculum:

- We visited with the Office of Student Support and Assessment about concerns of assessment of the core. We agreed that now that our SACs visit is over that we should step back and evaluate our processes to make assessment more efficient and more meaningful.

- OSSA returned to us with a timeline for core assessment. We will operate on a three year cycle with year 1 being a planning phase, year 2 being data collection and year 3 being reporting. This will allow more time to study our results and make adjustments to our curriculum based on our findings.
Other Business:

- The last sentence in the catalog copy for the humanities requirement stated: "Students must complete at least one course that is representative of literature, philosophy, cultural studies, modern language, or classic language." An ECS student requested that a Japanese language course that she had taken be counted as humanities core. Shelley Lane had denied the request. The CCC supported her decision and agreed that advanced languages might fulfill the core requirement but that first year courses did not as they focused on vocabulary and grammar. Shelley Lane rewrote the catalog description to remove the ambiguity: "Students must complete at least one course that is representative of literature, philosophy, or cultural studies."

- At the end of the spring semester, the Academic Affairs Committee of the UTD Student Government proposed that we allow foreign language credit to fulfill the humanities credit. This issue is pending for discussion in the fall 2009.
Distance Learning Committee
2008/2009 Annual Report
8/18/09

• The committee met 3 times over the year, in November, January, and April. Most of our time was taken up with the upgrade of WebCT to Vista. Rhonda Blackburn announced that with WebCT on the new server, it would be a good time to rename the learning management system something that was not tied to a brand name. She also announced that faculty would begin requesting their courses to be populated on the system, rather than having them automatically loaded.

• It was decided that we should survey both faculty and students concerning WebCT usage, in order to customize training for the new version. The target date for the survey was early February, which would have allowed enough time to deal with any concerns faculty might have. Additionally, Rhonda Blackburn was to visit the Academic Senate, to present the coming changes.

• Regarding training for faculty, it was suggested that OEE reach out and conduct training sessions to small groups of faculty rather than relying on them to attend prescheduled training sessions. To my knowledge this only occurred in SOM the week of 8/10.

• The surveys were sent out by OEE in May, between the spring and summer semesters. The committee has not received any survey results yet.

• Rhonda Blackburn did not ever attend a senate meeting.

• Note that while there was discussion about faculty requesting courses on WebCT, there were never any implementation details shared by OEE. Several of the specifics that have recently come to light are either troublesome or unacceptable:
  
  o Timing
    • Courses cannot be requested earlier than 1 week prior to the start of classes. Even given the ability to make course templates, this is not enough time.
    • Since new faculty, adjuncts and teaching TAs may not be “in the system” it would be helpful if an administrator or a TA could access the system for them
    • It was not clearly understood that this would be an every semester process. In other words, if Dr. A teaches the same course every semester, why must this process, which could easily be automated, be manually run by each instructor, every semester?
    • Courses will be deleted 2 weeks after the end of the grading period
- There is no allowance for incompletes
- There is no easy way to access the course for grade disputes
- Many faculty members use WebCT as a method of archiving assignments, emails, etc. for the 1 year period we are required to retain student course information.

Ultimately, it is the sense of the committee that though we were asked for our opinion, it was ignored. Additionally, the name change from WebCT to eLearning does nothing to improve a system that many faculty members believe is, at the least, inadequate. We do not understand the reasons for these changes, some of which seem arbitrary, particularly when the faculty is being asked to complete tasks which used to be automated.
This committee met once during the academic year. It needs to meet more often to play an effective role on campus and I regret that I was not able to provide more leadership during this past year. For this committee to reach its potential, it should develop a regular monthly meeting schedule early in the year. Administrative support for scheduling meetings, etc. would be very valuable.

Part of our meeting focused on teaching awards. In our discussion, it was observed that there is a lot of disparity across schools in terms of the number of teaching awards made by each school. Also, there are very few university-level teaching awards. The committee was in favor of proposing that additional teaching awards be established at the university level and recommended that awards be considered for innovations in teaching and for teaching excellence by junior faculty (less than five years from completing their PhD or less than five years at UTD). Nominations for such awards might come from students, administrators or faculty.

Rhonda Blackburn made presentations about WebCT (now elearning), the Classroom Experience Project and Instructional Technology. We had planned to discuss Teaching Academy Certification but time constraints prevented us from doing this.
Memorandum

To: Murray Leaf, Speaker of the Faculty
Cc: Magaly Spector, RUO
From: Rachel Croson, Chair Faculty Mentoring Committee
Date: September 1, 2009
Re: Faculty Mentoring Committee-- Annual Report for 2008-2009

The Faculty Mentoring Committee met twice in Fall 2008 to discuss and implement mentoring activities. The Committee's activities were conducted in parallel with the development and piloting of a new Faculty Mentoring Program at UT Dallas, to which the Committee contributed substantially. Below I describe each of these activities in turn.

Faculty Mentoring Committee

In the past, the activities of this committee have been somewhat sporadic. This year we scheduled two in-person meetings at the beginning of the Fall 2009 semester in order to discuss and assign duties to each committee member.

Each committee member was provided with a list of the untenured faculty in their school. They were instructed to contact each of the faculty on the list, either in person, via phone, or via email. When multiple representatives from each school were on the committee, the list was divided up.

The contact was designed to accomplish a number of goals. First, the committee member was to "check in" with the junior faculty, see if they needed advice or guidance that was not currently being provided. Second, the committee member was to ensure that the junior faculty member knew about and was involved in whatever programs were currently in place at the individual school. The existence and effectiveness of these programs varies widely between schools, and we wanted to be sure not to override the programs which currently existed. Third, the committee member was to introduce the new Faculty Mentoring Program (still in its pilot stage) to the junior faculty members (s)he contacted, and to encourage them to participate.

Committee members followed up with the committee chair to confirm they had indeed been in touch with the junior faculty to whom they were responsible, and to ask questions and make suggestions about the new Faculty Mentoring Program, described in more detail below.
New Faculty Mentoring Program

In parallel with the activities of the Committee, a working group was formed to design and implement the new Faculty Mentoring Program. That group consisted of:

Rachel Croson, Chair, Faculty Mentoring Committee

Magaly Spector, RUO, Faculty Mentoring Committee
Lauren DeCillis, Director of Galerstein Women’s Center

Rhonda Blackburn, Assistant Provost, Office of Educational Enhancement
Shaun Longstreet, Coordinator of Educational Enhancement
Christine Salmon, Coordinator of Educational Enhancement

Emily Tobey, Associate Provost
David Ford, Professor OSIM in School of Management

With input from members of the Faculty Mentoring Committee, this working group designed and implemented a pilot Faculty Mentoring Program. The Faculty Mentoring Committee was instrumental in disseminating information about this program, and encouraging junior faculty to take part.

The program began January, 2009 with 24 junior faculty participants from six schools. A list of participants can be found in an addendum to this report (addendum 1), and details about the program can be found in the attached brochure (addendum 2). Participants have reported exceptionally positive experiences. A summary of responses from our three-month evaluation is also included here (addendum 3).

Future Plans

Our hope is to “roll out” the new Faculty Mentoring Program to all new and existing untenured faculty at UT Dallas in January 2010. Croson presented the program at the New Faculty Orientation and has begun receiving applications from our incoming untenured faculty. We plan to contact our existing junior faculty, and invite them again to participate for the January 2010-January 2011 session.

Funding for this program has been provided by the Provost and President’s office. This funding covers the cost of the workshops (lunches, room setup, ...) and $1000 for each participant to pay to bring their senior external mentor to campus during the year. Funding has been allocated for the next cycle (Jan 2010-Jan 2011).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentee</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department/Area/Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhaskar</td>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chetan</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>Literary Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaohu</td>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umit</td>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashaunda</td>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihaela</td>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu</td>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying</td>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christa</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candice</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cihan</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkan</td>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint</td>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tianbing</td>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jie</td>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM

WHO CAN PARTICIPATE?

 progarm

MENTORING

WHY MENTORING?

ENHANCEMENT or professional and academic success, improved opportunities across campus and beyond, assistance in obtaining and maintaining held of interest, or appropriate
promotion. Non-UT Dallas mentors and faculty at other academic institutions will support junior faculty in their held, assist them in research and networking, and ensure their mentees are well-prepared for their careers.

ASSISTANCE in defining career goals and developing a research plan for the lab. The program seeks to provide a supportive and encouraging environment for mentees to learn and grow.

CONNECTION to organizational structure, access to UT Dallas resources, development of professional and personal development, and enhancement of research and teaching.

This program has opened up many new doors for my career. It's been reassuring to hear of others summarying my career goals to myself, whileI'm hearing about them do the field, and my mentors [has helped] me with my career. Building a relationship with my external administrative role at UT Dallas and my mentor concerning my scholarships, I'm able to discuss a variety of ideas with my colleagues.

My mentors have helped create a culture about the state of my area and of the field. It's been reassuring to hear of others who have experienced the same challenges and successes. The program has helped me to explain my path and proposal writing. Building a relationship with my external administrative role at UT Dallas and my mentor concerning my scholarships, I'm able to discuss a variety of ideas with my colleagues.
September 2, 2009

To:    Dr. David Cordell, Secretary
       Academic Senate

From:  Dr. Richard K. Scotch, Chair
       Committee on Faculty Standing & Conduct

Re:    Report on Committee Activities in 2008-2009 Academic Year

Our committee has had modest activity during the 2008-2009 Academic Year.

In September 2008, we reviewed an allegation of misconduct by a student against a faculty member referred to us by then Vice Provost Robert Nelson. It was our consensus that there was insufficient evidence in the file to support the allegation, and that no remedial action was necessary.

At the request of Speaker Murray Leaf and the Compliance Training staff, members of the committee reviewed changes in the Annual Compliance Training in January 2009 and served as beta testers for the training. We found that the changes generally represented an improvement over past training procedures, although individuals had several specific suggestions and comments about the material we reviewed.

Finally, during the summer months, at the request of Speaker Leaf, the committee reviewed alternatives for a proposed UT Dallas Financial Exigency policy. After initial discussion in May, a subcommittee comprised of Dr. Ivor Page and Dr. Richard Scotch continued to review policy drafts with Speaker Leaf over the summer.

There was no further business for the committee in the past year.
FACULTY LIBRARY COMMITTEE MEETING, November 14, 2008

Susan Chizeck, chair

Attendees introduced themselves and identified their school/department.

Attending:

IS: Susan Chizeck (chair)
AH: Michael Farmer (vice chair), Ming Dong Gu, Natalie Ring
BBS: Richard Golden, Jeffrey Martin
ECS: Nasser Kehtarnavaz
EPPS: Michael Tiersdorf
SOM: Jane Salk
NS: Rockford Draper
Library: Larry Sall, Ellen Safley, Jean Vik, Mary Jo Venetis

Not attending:

Titu Andreescu (N), Steve Nielsen (N), Suresh Radhakrishnan (M), Doug Watson (Ep), students Ashley Hooker, Megan Malone

Dean Larry Sall welcomed the committee and presented the Library’s materials budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009. The student Library fee has been increased to $14 per semester hour which will provide approximately $4.5 million in the Library materials budget. The wages and benefits of the Library staff ordering and processing these materials also come out of this budget. Maintenance on the software used for the Library’s day-to-day business is included in this budget.

Dr. Sall distributed a printout of the materials budget for 2008-2009 showing a breakdown in how the money is being allocated. There is not a specific allocation given to each school, but the Library liaisons are reviewing and ordering relevant material as well as placing orders for titles requested by faculty (except for textbooks.) There is a purchase request form (Suggest a Title) on the Faculty Resources section of the Library web page which can be used to submit requests. (http://www.utdallas.edu/library/faculty/index.html)

A major concern of the Library is the dwindling amount of space available for stacks and study areas. In 2012 there will be new buildings coming online and the Dean has been told by University administration that non-Library staff will be moved out of McDermott Library and the Library will occupy the whole building at that time. Meanwhile, the Library is buying electronic material to replace print journal titles
as they become available and weeding the print copies to make more room for study areas and new titles.

The Library is conducting frequent surveys to see how we are doing and what can be improved. As a result of requests from across the University, the leisure reading collection has been restored. This is a program to lease titles rather than purchasing them, and new titles are added each month.

Dr. Mary Jo Venetis, Associate Library Director for Technical Services, gave a report on the Texas Digital Library program which is a statewide program spearheaded by the University of Texas and Texas A & M to digitize and make available the intellectual output of participating universities. The McDermott Library repository currently includes the Special Collections History of Aviation digital collection. Each school can have its own repository linked from the main UTD repository page called Treasures @ UT Dallas (http://lib.treasures.utdallas.edu). The Forum on Financial Crisis sponsored by the School of Economic, Political, and Policy Sciences has been added to the repository and includes the podcast of the event. The main page is still under construction, but should be completed soon. The repository can include images, videos, documents, podcasts, and many other formats.

Question: What is the approval process for vetting materials submitted to the repository?
Answer: That needs to be discussed and policies developed.

Question: Is this something that every public university in Texas is doing?
Answer: It is more than public universities. Some private universities are also participating. A list of those members participating in the project can be found at http://www.tdl.org/members/

Question: Will this expand the number of ejournals available to UTD?
Answer: There are plans to develop an ejournal about the Texas Digital Library which would be made available through the repository, but that is the only one so far.

Dr. Sall pointed out that any monograph written by a UTD faculty author will be purchased and added to the Library’s collection. Also, if a faculty member serves on the editorial board of a journal, the Library should be notified so that title can also be added to the collection.

Dr. Ellen Safley, Senior Associate Library Director gave a presentation on copyright and licensing issues. Copies of a special Library newsletter insert entitled “Copyright Guidelines for Electronic & Print Reserves” were distributed. A copy of the Library’s guidelines for print and electronic reserves can be found at http://www.utdallas.edu/library/services/reserves/reservesc.htm

Question: Why can I not place a digital copy of one play from a collection of plays on reserve?
Answer: A play is a complete work and may be copyrighted individually even though it is a chapter in a collection. Copyright law prohibits making a reproduction of an entire work to be placed on reserve. We would have to look at each book to make a determination.

The licenses the Library signs for our electronic resources have restrictions unique to each vendor. The license usually specifies who can have access to a resource (currently enrolled students and current University employees). It also specifies how access can be achieved (IP authentication, password, etc.),
and how the campus community can use the resource (usually for educational purposes only) “may view, download, or print individual articles, individual chapters, or other individual items for their educational/scholarly use.” The Library cannot profit from the license and allow people to pay for access/document delivery. The information cannot be altered, reformatted, redistributed, etc. The vendor can deny access to UTD if they detect excessive or robotic downloading of articles.

Question: Has this ever happened?
Answer: Yes. Recently two vendors denied UTD access for four days while we investigated what appeared to be robotic downloading of whole issues. We have had other incidents involving both students and faculty.

Question: Why can’t Visiting Scholars have remote access?
Answer: Our licenses state that only “currently enrolled students and current faculty and staff” can be given remote access.

Question: Why are faculty members who will be teaching in an upcoming semester denied access prior to the start of the semester?
Answer: The Library receives a daily file from HR of all who are considered current employees. Once a faculty member is included in that file, their remote access goes into effect.

Other concerns from faculty:

Question: Does the Library keep statistics of online orders requested?
Answer: The liaisons keep a record of all the requests they receive.

A list of liaisons by school is available at http://www.utdallas.edu/library/askalib/liaison.htm.

Question: So the liaison system seems to be working to order materials?
Answer: Letters are sent to Deans and faculty requesting lists of titles that their school needs. We are proactive in replacing materials with new formats, such as changing videos to DVD as they become available. Some of the videos that we own are not available on DVD, just as some journals are not available in electronic format.

Question: How do we compare to our peers in Library collections, journal holdings, etc.?
Answer: Dr. Safley is working on a comparison between our Library with the lower third of the Association of Research Libraries. The latest figures available are from 2006. We have some gaps in the collection caused by the addition of new degrees in areas where we have never collected. Dean Sall would like to see a lump sum provided for Library materials as part of the start-up costs for a new degree program.

The LibQual survey conducted the last three years shows that the faculty feels the Library does not have enough books or journals for their field of study. Specific requests should be sent to Dr. Safley (safley@utdallas.edu).
Some concerns were raised about eBook access. For example, a faculty member assigned one as required reading, but the students were unable to get in; they can print only one page at a time; they are limited to reading a certain number of pages during a session. This sounds like an eBook provided through NetLibrary. These books were purchased for the entire UT system by Austin. If we know the title being used, we can add extra copies.

Questions: Are there any plans to restore the approval plan?
Answer: Circulation statistics of titles received on the approval plan show less than 25% of them circulated during the first few years of ownership. The librarians prefer to buy selectively from lists of titles based on our approval profile and from reviews.

Questions: Why are faculty members only allowed to check out books for a semester?
Answer: We have tried to match the circulation policies at other UT system libraries. One week before the last day of finals, semester loans can be renewed online or by calling the circulation desk. If the books go one day past the due date, they must be brought to the Library so they can be checked in before they can be checked out again. Faculty members are not charged overdue fines, but if they have a book that goes 60 days overdue they will be charged the cost of replacing the book plus a $25.00 processing fee for the staff time it takes to search for the book, determine it has not accidentally been placed back on the shelf, order a new copy, catalog it and prepare it for circulation.

The need for a Spring Faculty Committee meeting will be determined and scheduled at a later date.
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate
From: Alain Bensoussan, Chair Research Advisory Committee
Date: September 3, 2009
Re: Research Advisory Committee - Annual Report for 2008-2009

During the 2008-2009 Academic year, the Research Advisory Committee consisted of:

Alain Bensoussan, Bruce Gnade, Juan Gonzalez, Gopal Gupta, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Philip Loizou, Xinchou Lou, Duncan MacFarlane, Rafael Martin, Aage Moller, Bert Moore, Mihai Nadin, Hasan Pirkul, Myron Salamon, Todd Sandler, Mark Spong, Hobson Wildenthal
Philip Loizou was co-Chair.

General Comments

Four meetings have been organized. It seems that in a year it is difficult to have more. Nevertheless it limits the possibilities of issues to be considered. We have focused on discussions on the strategies of various schools (not all), and identification of common problems. We have appreciated the presence of the Provost at all meetings (of course the VP Research attended also all meetings). This has permitted to have an excellent exchange and a fruitful debate. For instance, the discussion on the measures to attract a larger number of PhD has finally conducted to the President decisions concerning PhD students tuition.

The minutes of the meetings are enclosed.

October 17, 2008

Alain Bensoussan proposed that the committee should first gather information (e.g., research success stories) from the Deans and Faculty, and then focus on strategies to improve research productivity.

Bruce Gnade, representing the OSP office, presented slides summarizing UTDs research expenditures and UTD’s research goals. Some of the goals mentioned included a production of 300 PhDs per year and $100M per year in external research within an eight year time frame. In terms of priorities, he mentioned the submission of a competitive NSF Center proposal. Currently, for FY07 we had 132 PhD students, with total expenditures of $46.5M in FY07, and $57.7M in FY08. Total IDC is about $6.8M.
Dean Pirkul suggested that we should count summer faculty salary as additional research expenditures. Rafael Martin said it is an accounting issue, but certainly doable (will present an approach in the next meeting).

Bruce Gnade mentioned that UTD was able to tap into the ETF funds with several start-up and spinoff companies working closely with the University. The total ETF funding reached $15M in the last three years.

After Bruce’s presentation, Dean Spong gave a brief summary of the Emmitt project and its status. Emmitt money is fading down, and the Jonsson School cannot provide any more matching to future projects. He can only support projects requiring matching or large multi-investigator proposals (MURs). Some issues facing us: (1) drop in number of PhD students after Emmitt (2) faculty need to budget tuition in future grant proposals (RA/TA tuition was taken care by Emmitt money before). Dean Spong made the following proposal to address the tuition issue: After PhD students defend their dissertation proposal, they should be eligible for a tuition waiver (to be taken care of by the Provost’s office). When asked how the School of NSM handles currently the tuition fees, Dean Solomon said that he uses IDC to cover tuition. Bruce Gnade said he will look into how much money would be required by the Provost’s office to take care of tuition fees for post-proposal PhD students.

Following Dean Spong’s discussion of the tuition-fee proposal, Aage Moller mentioned that he tried in the past (as OSP director) to hire a professional grant writer for the OSP office. One minor problem is that this would require that faculty submit their proposals at least 1-2 weeks in advance to the OSP office. Such a writer can also help students win more fellowships (e.g., NSF graduate fellowships). At the very least, perhaps a grant writer can be used to assist in large Center proposals. Rafael Martin supported this position. Rafael Martin suggested the creation of a junior faculty group, in which the faculty would critique each other’s proposals.

Alain asked Dean Spong to present in the next meeting achievements from the Emmitt Project, and perhaps lessons learned. Dean Spong further updated everyone on what’s next for the Johnsson school: A search is on for a Dept Head and faculty in the Mechanical Engineering Department (30 freshmen students enrolled this year), a bioengineering program in progress – proposal in UT System to become a third partner to the UTA-UTSW program. Once approved, a new Bioengineering Dept will be created with a plan of hiring 15-16 faculty (with split appointments with UTSW). The plan is to hire 3-5 faculty/yr for next 5 yrs with the goal of reaching 40 faculty and 300 students within next 3 yrs. Next, the creation of a Systems Engineering and Management Department will follow. First as a certificate program will be presented to the industry to solicit interest. This will be a joint program with the School of Management.
November 25, 2008

Provost Wildenthal distributed detailed budget charts and summarized the research expenditures of all Schools. The total research expenditures across all schools were $24M in Y2008, and the indirect cost return was $7M. Target funding should reach $60M. Provost mentioned that the operation of the OSP office improved over time (now under the leadership of Bruce Gnaide), but UTD lacks federal supported Research Centers (e.g. NSF’s ERC).

Dean Spong continued his presentation of the Emmitt project status, and mentioned that Emmitt funds were used for startup packages, equipment, RA salaries, scholarships and matching funds.

Dean Salamon provided an overview of his school comprising of 6 Departments and 75 faculty members. There are 5 institutes/Centers in the school of NSM: Nanotech, Lithospheric Studies, Space Sciences, Sickle Cell Center and Advanced Imaging Research Center (AIRC). School’s research expenditures last year were $8M in direct costs. Thirty PhD students graduate per year, the majority (64%) of which are on contract/grant support. He mentioned some of the obstacles facing his school which included lack of space in Founder’s building and heavy teaching loads (2+2). RA tuition (about $500K/yr) is currently being paid by IDC returned to the school. Another issue is that the joint research carried out by NSM faculty with UTSW does not get accounted for (approximately $1M/yr through AIRC). It is also difficult to appoint UTD students/post-docs on UTSW funding.

Alain brought up some strategic issues for discussion in next meeting: (a) large scale grants, (b) increase of number of proposals, (c) increase research productivity.

March 12, 2009

Alain started the meeting with notice to the fact a report from the committee would need to be prepared by September and that the committee should meet one or two more times before the report was prepared.

Dean Bert Moore provided an overview of his school which consists of 4 main programs, Cognition and Neuroscience, Psychological Sciences, Communication Sciences and Disorders and Audiology. There are 3 research centers: Callier Center, Center for Brain health and Center for Children and Families, with various research labs. Graphs for BBS Research Expenditures from 2005 thru 2009 and for Grants were provided to the committee, along with a spreadsheet listing Awarded Grants for FY 08 and FY 09 (copies attached). Dean Moore mentioned the following as challenges/issues that he feels the school faces: 1) Predictable screen for start-up packages for new faculty; 2) Need for incentives to reward faculty for their efforts in submitting proposals; 3) teaching loads – need for common university policy regarding “buyouts”; 4) Need for faculty to mentor new/younger faculty regarding proposals/research activity; 5) Need for improved
infrastructure support, i.e., Office of Vice President for Research; 6) Financial support for research faculty; and 7) Indirect cost return.

Alain called on Rafael Martin regarding options and scenarios regarding Ph.D. tuition. Rafael asked that Dean Spong pose the question for the committee. Dean Spong expressed the need for the tuition of Ph.D. students to find its way back to the schools given the fact once a Ph.D. candidate has finished his/her course work, their tuition is still very high. Could a nominal tuition fee be charged to the Ph.D. candidate to enable them to continue their access to the school and the faculty not take a hit? Dean Spong suggested that a new source needs to be found to reduce the tuition when only signing up for thesis hours.

Provost Wildenthal addressed the issues posed by Dean Moore — there is not enough start-up support, knew of no other incentive for faculty to apply for grants other than for their own financial support over the summer, teaching load/buyout does not impact the school’s aggregate income but does indeed need to have a university wide policy for the morale and cultural impact on the academic community. He mentioned that the support infrastructure of the school is weak at this time (regarding space, etc.) because we do not have enough money. He addressed the tuition issue posed by Dean Spong by stating that he and Dr. Gnade will prepare a draft proposal/report which will be sent the committee for their approval/signature.

Rafael Martin reported that the Research Office had been discussing ways to improve its ability to help the faculty with their proposals/applications. The committee recommended that 1) a grant writer be hired by VPR’s office to specifically to write the proposals, 2) encourage mentoring by faculty of new faculty for submitting their proposals, and 3) offer a course in writing grants. The committee agreed to recommend this to the Office of the Vice President.

Priorities of the committee meeting were agreed to be:

1) Ph.D. tuition proposal as soon as possible.
2) Recommendation to the Office of VPR to hire a person to write/help write grants.

Dean Brian Berry will be asked to make presentation on EPPS research at next meeting.

June 8, 2009

Dean Berry provided an overview of the EPPS school comprising of 7 programs including criminology, economics, geography and geospatial sciences, political science, public affairs, public policy and political economy, and sociology. There are 8 Institutes/Centers in the school of EPPS that are actively funded by NSF and the Dept. of Education. The School’s total funding reached $8.3M with a total of $1.5M in research expenditures in FY’08. The number of students enrolled in EPPS increased from 150 in Y2003 to 400 in Y2008. Some of the issues facing the school of EPPS include: (1) the challenge in maintaining and supporting the current research infrastructure, and (2) the
need for better computing lab resources to accommodate the increase in computer-intensive research.

Following Dean Perry’s presentation, Provost Wildenthal took the floor and discussed some issues facing the University along with some decisions/directions pursued by the Provost’s office. The provost mentioned that there will be a decrease in start-up funds owing to a 25% decrease in endowment funds from the UT-System. The UT-System will not support the construction of new buildings in the next 1-2 yrs. In terms of space, there are plans to purchase the Raytheon building and invest ($4-5 M) in renovating 95,000 sq. ft. of space. The Information Resources or Dept of Mechanical Engineering might move there. Finally, the Provost talked about the need for an increase in number of PhD students supported by external grants and contracts. The cost for PhD tuition fees can be quite expensive ($12,000/yr) and he offered to pay the tuition fees (effective Fall’09) for all PhD students whose salaries are paid from “non-base-budget” funds. A PhD graduate student is defined as one who has accumulated 30 or more hours of graduate course work or has an MA/MS degree and has formally advanced to graduate status by the student’s Department/Program.
Scholarship Committee 2008-2009
Final Report

by

Elizabeth Salter, PhD
Chair of the Scholarship Committee

Voting Members of the Committee were Michael Coleman, Austin Cunningham, Douglas Eckel, John Hoffman, Shelley Lane, James Murdoch, Simeon Ntafos, Elizabeth Salter, and Robert Stillman. Also included in correspondence with the committee were non-voting members: Cathy Coursey, Amy Meaders, Sheila Pineres, Tracey Rockett, and Barbara Seale. Tracey Rockett was not a member of the committee but is learning the procedures hoping to be Chairman next year.

Meetings were held over the internet via e-mail containing no identification numbers. Original applications were posted on the scholarship drive which was available to all members of the committee.

The process for awarding scholarships began with the Committee Chair updating the cumulative GPA of applicants to the latest completed semester - spring 2009. Amy Meaders composed a master chart of the applicants for the scholarships, and the chair of the committee used this list to make her own lists, sorted by revised GPA and also sorted by need as determined by Financial Aid. The applicants were also sorted into Graduate and Undergraduate applications as some awards are limited to a specific group. Late applications, applications with letters not on official university/community college letterhead, and incomplete applications were eliminated from consideration.

For each scholarship (except the Northwood and the Women’s Center), the chair of the committee reviewed and prepared a spreadsheet listing the criteria and the steps in deliberation for the proposing of the awards. This was then sent to the Committee for comments and/or a vote to accept or reject the nominations. The comments were then answered by the chair of the committee and the vote was taken. When a majority of the votes supporting the nominations were in, then the chair of the committee notified Amy Meaders that the scholarship committee had approved the scholarship recipients. For the scholarships chosen by other bodies (Northwood and Women’s Center) the best procedure is to send the applicants to the Scholarship Committee for vetting for eligibility, and then sending the vetted applications to the other bodies for final decision making. If the procedure is done in reverse then candidates can be chosen whom the Scholarship Committee considers to be ineligible and substitutions must be found. The latter procedure is more cumbersome.

Merit based scholarships were given to the students with the top GPA. However, most university wide scholarships handled by the Scholarship Committee had a need based component which required a fafsa (an application for financial aid) to be on file. Need was then determined by the Financial Aid Office. After each award requiring financial aid was made, the chair of the committee deducted the amount of the award from unmet need, so need changed
throughout the scholarship awarding process. This is why some people have multiple need based awards, because even with multiple awards, their need was the highest of all student applicants.

**Recipients** of the awards and the amounts are attached in a spreadsheet (Appendix 1).

**Comparison** of Scholarships awarded by the Scholarship Committee over the past 4 years is attached (Appendix 2)

**Comments:**
In appendix 2, the NIL designation means that the Scholarships are no longer available, that there are insufficient funds currently to meet the designated minimum award or that these scholarships are no longer administered by the Scholarship Committee. Last year (2007/2008) the International Education Fund Scholarship - a very complicated scholarship was removed from the purview of the University Scholarship Committee and handled by a committee from the Provost’s Office. The Southwest Airlines Scholarship was a one-time only award in 2007/2008. The Moller Endowed Scholarship this year (2008/2009) did not contain sufficient funds to make the minimum disbursement, so the funds will be kept for next year.

The Scholarship Committee made 87 awards with the details provided in Appendices 1 and 2; the total awarded was $161,450. The individual scholarship awards ranged from $1,000. (with one person getting 2 x $500. awards) to $8,500. The maximum received by any one person was $9,500, and that was to a person who got $8,500 and $1,000 for a need based award. The typical award was for $1,000. with the Scholarship Committee trying to disburse the money as widely as possible.

One area that should be better communicated to faculty/advisors writing letters of recommendation is that all letters submitted on behalf of Scholarship applicants have to be on UTD letterhead.

**Problem:**
An issue arose this year with the Clark Scholarships after the final report was written. (This is being added after the final report was sent to the Scholarship Committee. It will be sent again.) The Clark was designed to attract and keep students who begin as a transfer student and then can be re-activated through the senior year and even into the first year of graduate school. At UT-Dallas. A problem arose this year because none of last year’s recipients applied for the scholarship and so none of them received it. **There needs to be clarification.** We need to state that scholarships are not automatic and need to be applied for each year as the Scholarship Committee has no way of knowing if the former recipient is even planning to attend the next year. Second if a student wishes to apply for the scholarship in subsequent years, is there a minimum CGPA and number of hours that must have been taken to receive the award? Since we have so many very bright students completing for this award, I would like to suggest that to be eligible the continuing student must be either a Senior or first year graduate student in September, with a CGPA of at least 3.75. While these are just suggestions, the Scholarship
Committee of 2009-2010 must decide upon these issues before the posting of the Clark Scholarship for 2010.

**Trends:**

The Bernard Parsons Scholarship will no longer be assigned to the University wide Scholarship Committee. It will in future be handled within EPPS.

The Women’s Center Scholarship reflected new wording which suggested that preference would be given to women in STEM programs. For that reason virtually the only applicants for this award were the women to whom preference was to be given.

The Holocaust Studies Scholarship was not assigned to the University wide scholarship committee this last year (2008/2009).

The removal of even one scholarship from the list decreases the overall pool of money available to the general university community. Some schools within the university are financially better endowed than others, and so the general university wide scholarships are the only avenues available to the students at every school. By putting preferences on awards such as the one from the Women’s Center, it minimizes access to many deserving women who may not be in these STEM areas. While only three scholarships are affected this year, I hope that this is not the beginning of a trend to shift awards to the schools, slowly depleting the general university – wide scholarship coffers. Also it is my hope that more “general scholarships” are sought for the university rather than strictly targeting new scholarship monies for specific programs and schools within the university.

Respectfully submitted

Elizabeth Salter PhD
Chairman of the Scholarship Committee
Amend the charge of the Committee on Distance Learning to add a representative of the library staff as a voting member.