MEMORANDUM
July 29, 2015

TO: Academic Council*

COPY TO: Hobson Wildenthal
Inga Musselman
Andrew Blanchard
Calvin Jamison
Abby Kratz
John Wiorkowski
Austin Cunningham

FROM: Office of Academic Governance
Christina McGowan, Academic Governance Secretary

SUBJECT: Academic Council Meeting

The Academic Council will meet on WEDNESDAY, August 5, 2015 at 2:00 p.m in the Osborne Conference Room, ECS South 3.503. Please bring the agenda packet with you to the meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at cgm130130@utdallas.edu or x4791.

Attachments

2015-2016 ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Gail Breen
Matt Brown
David Cordell**
Greg Dess
Eric Farrar
Murray Leaf***
Ravi Prakash
Viswanath Ramakrishna
Tim Redman *
Liz Salter
Richard Scotch ***
Tres Thompson
Caitlynn Fortner, Student Government President

*Speaker
**Secretary
*** Vice-Speaker

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
August 5, 2015
Osborne Conference Room, ECS South 3.503

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS          Dr. Wildenthal
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA                                    Dr. Redman
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   July 1, 2015 Meeting                                      Dr. Redman
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT                                          Dr. Redman
5. FAC REPORT                                                Dr. Leaf
6. CEP Recommendations                                       Suresh Radhakrishnan
7. Legislation Summary                                       Serenity King
8. SACS Recommendations                                      Serenity King
9. Follow Up on 60X30TX Strategic Plan                      Serenity King
10. Annual Reports                                            Dr. Cordell
11. April Caucus Meeting Minutes                              Dr. Redman
12. Regents Rule 31008- Disciplinary Tribunal Pool           Dr. Leaf
13. 3+3+3 Committee on Non-tenure system faculty             Dr. Scotch
14. Discussion: Part-Time Faculty Employment                 Dr. Redman
15. Recommendations from the Committee on Committees         Dr. Redman
16. ADJOURNMENT                                              Dr. Wildenthal
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

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

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
JULY 1, 2015

PRESENT: Hobson Wildenthal, Inga Musselman, Gail Breen, Matt Brown, David Cordell, Gregory Dess, Eric Farrar, Murray Leaf, Ravi Prakash, Liz Salter, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Richard Scotch

ABSENT: Tim Redman, Tres Thompson

VISITORS: Andrew Blanchard, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Caitlynn Forner, Grant Branam

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions
   Interim President Wildenthal called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM. The UT System Chancellor has called Wednesday bi-weekly teleconferences at 2 PM with all school presidents. He will look for alternatives.

   Serenity King updated the Council on the results of the SACSCOC Second Monitoring Report. SACS has cleared principle 3.4.5 but asked for additional documentation for 3.3.1.1. This report is currently due to SACS September 7th, which is ahead of the typical due date for faculty to submit their assessment report data to the Assessment Office staff. The Assessment Office is pushing to have all the materials in earlier from the faculty. This will be discussed in additional detail at the August Senate meeting.

   At this time Interim President Wildenthal turned the meeting over to Interim Provost Inga Musselman.

   Murray Leaf made the recommendation that a procedure be created to keep a record of all Faculty meetings. This will allow for better record keeping of faculty decisions and discussions. Currently CEP, Senate, and Committee records are kept in files. Dean Blanchard noted that CUE will shortly be putting eight years of documents on a searchable database.

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

3. Approval of Minutes
   An amendment was made to list Inga Musselman as absent rather than present. Greg Dess moved to approve the amended minutes. Murray Leaf seconded. The minutes were approved.

4. Speaker’s Report
   1. Speaker Redman is in Italy. He will return on July 26th.
2. In Speaker Redman’s absence, Vice-Speaker Leaf has emailed all of the committee chairs regarding the upcoming Committee on Committees meeting on July 30th. A question was raised if he needed to attend.

3. All other items were on the agenda.

5. FAC/TCFS Report- Murray Leaf

The previously circulated copy of the amended intellectual property document has not gotten a response. Dr. Leaf plans to continue to press in the FAC. It will be on the fall agenda for FAC.

The Guns on Campus law will also be on the fall agenda. FAC representatives support a unified approach across the system to address this issue. The effective date for the open carry will be August 2016. The campuses have until then to create relevant policies. Chief of Police Larry Zacharias is reviewing the law, and is drafting a policy. It will be circulated to all groups on campus. He will collaborate with the other System schools as well. It was noted that the new Deputy Chancellor David Daniel does have this on his 2015-2016 agenda.

SG President Caitlynn Fortner raised the question of how the student will know that the Guns on Campus policy will not go into effect until August of 2016. Unless students are notified it is possible that students may attempt to carry in fall 2015. It was suggested that a discussion of ideas and issues be given at a senate meeting.

6. Approval of Summer Graduates

The Senate will be polled for approval via the preapproved method. A tally of votes will be kept and when majority is reached Vice-Speaker Scotch will be alerted.

7. Annual Committee Reports- David Cordell

Several committees have submitted their reports. By alerting the committees early, more committees have submitted their annual reports in a timely manner. The response has been better than anticipated.

8. New Business

Calvin Jamison gave the council an update on the construction on campus. He continues to remind everyone, “It will look good when it is done.” He will present a full report at a fall Senate meeting.

Viswanath Ramakrishna requested that more vegan options be available on campus. Jamison responded that more options are now available in the dining halls. However, there will be more vegan options in the Student Union in the near future. Unfortunately, there are currently no options available for Kosher and Halal.

Andrew Blanchard noted to the Council that the testing center gave 40,000 exams in a 12 month period. Currently they are working to refine the procedures. Many of the exams administered were multiple choice on paper. They have requested that faculty would not do paper driven exams, but use the electronic capabilities available.
Abby Kratz advised the creation of the Office of Institutional Scholarship Administration, which will be headed by herself, with Chris McGowan as her Administrative Assistant. She is working to have consistency in the awarding of scholarships across campus. She requested that Council member speak with faculty in their schools and, should their area be affected, let Dr. Kratz know so she can incorporate their input into the overall plan.

9. **Senate Agenda for August 19, 2015:**

None added during the meeting.

There being no further business Greg Dess moved to adjourn. Viswanath Ramakrishna seconded. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 3:02 PM.

APPROVED: ______________________________ DATE: ______________________________

David Cordell
Secretary of the Faculty
New Graduate Courses
To be offered in 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status/School</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBSC</th>
<th>ENCS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New courses added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EPPS would like to add one more course to the fall 2015 schedule.
School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences (EPPS)
Courses to be offered in fall 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-open</td>
<td>add *</td>
<td>epps6353 (r1)</td>
<td>epps6353.2</td>
<td>EPPS 6353 Ethics for Professionals, Academics &amp; Researchers (3 semester credit hours) This course examines issues of professional, academic and research ethics. Topics include theories of ethics, ethical motives, and case study applications. (3-0) R</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130 2015-05-28 13:41:49 44.0501.00.01 audit: -3.1 m index: -3.1 m match_fail</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td>series_head</td>
<td></td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>audit: 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>request notes</td>
<td>Requested by Vy Trang on 2015-05-27 12:51:49 via Eform and course to be offered in fall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peoplesoft diff:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPPS 6353 Ethics for Professionals, Academics &amp; Researchers (3 semester credit hours) This course examines issues of professional, academic and research ethics. Topics include theories of ethics, ethical motives, and case study applications. (3-0) R</td>
<td>show fields: epps6353.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cat_repeat_units: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cat_core:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cat_subtitles: no_subtitles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

update req group
Good Morning Jennifer,

We received a response from Dr. Cunningham.

Thank you,

Darren D. Climer
Assistant Director
Office of the Registrar

The University of Texas at Dallas
800 W. Campbell Rd.
Richardson, TX 75080
Tel: 972-883-4056

From: Cunningham, Austin
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2015 2:07 PM
To: Climer, Darren
Subject: Fwd: July 2015 GRAD Supplemental Course

Graduate council has approved

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Cunningham, Austin" <cunning@utdallas.edu>
Date: July 24, 2015 at 4:51:04 PM CDT
To: "Gonzalez, Juan" <jgonzal@utdallas.edu>, "Balsara, Poras" <poras@utdallas.edu>, "STILLMAN, ROBERT" <stillman@utdallas.edu>, "Jacob, Varghese" <vjacob@utdallas.edu>, "Wilson, Michael" <mwilson@utdallas.edu>, "Piquero, Alex" <axp116030@utdallas.edu>, "Fair, George" <gwfair@utdallas.edu>
Cc: "Underwood, Marion" <undrwd@utdallas.edu>, "Mcdowell, Jennifer" <jpazik@utdallas.edu>
Subject: Fwd: July 2015 GRAD Supplemental Course

This is an urgent action item ... New research ethics course request that epps needs included in the catalog. please review and render an electronic decision. Thank you

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:
Good Afternoon,

Attached is the July 2015 GRAD Supplemental Course PDF for the Graduate Council’s review. There is only one course, EPPS 6353, being considered as a new course addition for the fall 2015 portion of the 2015-16 catalog. If possible, please let us know the Council’s decision by July 28, 2015, so that we can make and review any necessary changes prior to the CEP submission deadline.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Darren D. Climer  
Assistant Director, Academic Cataloges  
Office of the Registrar  
The University of Texas at Dallas  
800 W. Campbell Rd.  
Richardson, TX 75080  
Tel: 972-883-4056
EPPS XXXX: ETHICS FOR PROFESSIONALS, ACADEMICS & RESEARCHERS

Spring Semester 2016
Tuesday, 7:00-9:45PM

Instructor: Thomas B. Spencer
Office Hours: By Appointment in Green Hall
Office: 214-645-7143                        email: tland@UTDallas.edu

COURSE PREREQUISITES

Graduate student in good standing.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The goal of this course is to meet objectives while exploring three different types of ethics and ethical behavior.

- **Professional Ethics**: The standards of behavior accepted in a place of business
- **Academic Ethics**: Avoiding common lapses of judgement such as plagiarism or cheating while upholding scientific rigor for classes or publication.
- **Research Ethics**: The legal rules and expectations required to conduct research.

Exploring these three distinct types of ethics will allow students to develop a better understanding of ethical issues students may encounter in their daily lives.

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES/OUTCOMES

- To become aware of, to identify, and to critique various ethical theories.
  - Explain why ethics are important in a professional setting
  - Understand how ethics lead to responsible actions in an academic setting
  - Discuss and understand the requirements for ethical research

- To speak with clarity and conviction about ethical motives and convictions.
  - Be able to research, discuss and present an ethical issue of their choosing

- To identify ethical case studies and discuss and share the conflicts embedded in them.

- To obtain an understanding of the nature and definition of research and an appreciation of the importance of good research
  - Create an ability to draw on these theories and concepts in order to analyze and evaluate research case studies.
REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS AND MATERIALS

Textbooks


Articles / Online Sources


More TBD

ASSIGNMENTS

Grading

Grading for this course shall be structured as follows: 93-100=A, 90-92=A-, 87-89=B+, 83-86=B, 80-82=B-,
Written Assignments and Projects:

Current event Article 5%: Students will sign up and present in class a summary of a current event that covers something that someone did that May or may or may not have been ethical. The article must be published within 4 weeks of the in-class presentation and by a reputable news source (no personal websites or blogs). Students are expected to bring copies of the article for peers.

Class Attendance / Participation 10%: As this class will be relying heavily on discussion during class sessions, attendance and participation is weighted heavily. Failure to attend or participate in discussion will make an entire letter grade difference. See Class Participation below.

Class Participation. Each week, the instructor will introduce the subject scheduled for discussion, connect it to broader themes and additional topics to be covered in the course, briefly present some material, and often pose some questions for discussion. However, a major portion of class meetings is devoted to a broader discussion, analysis, and critique of the topics, approaches, and readings under review as well as practical discussion. Students have the responsibility to contribute to the scholarly interchange during this activity. Accordingly, it is expected that all participants will complete readings on schedule and be prepared regularly to comment on and assist in the analysis of the literature and issues under discussion. To ensure the development of a quality discussion, students may be called on to discuss topics from the weekly readings. Thus, attendance and participation are expected and integral to the full learning experience. If you know you will not be able to attend, please let me know in advance via e-mail or telephone.

NOTE: More than two absences will affect your final grade.

Peer Article Review (2) 20%: Students will sign up and present in class a summary of two (2) peer reviewed articles concerning ethics. The student presentation is expected to be roughly 15 minutes with additional time set aside for discussion. The student will then submit a formal summary of the article not to exceed 4 pages, double spaced.

- One of the articles will be selected from the list of articles in the Articles/Online Sources section of this syllabus.
- One of the articles will be selected from a peer reviewed source of the student’s choosing. The article must be approved by the professor before presentation. Students are expected to bring copies of the article for peers.
Midterm 20%: Students will have an in-class midterm in week 8 that will build on topics discussed in class up to that point. The midterm will be open books/notes.

Research Paper (Final) 30%: Students will pick an ethical issue of your choice based upon your interests (field of study, profession, thesis, or dissertation topic). The issue should be outside of the covered material in the class, but can call back top topics or models discussed in class. Once approved by the professor, students will generate a research paper that explains the issue and argues for an outcome. Guidance and expectations will be distributed in class.

In-Class Presentation of Research 15%: Each Student will have 20-25 minutes to present their findings in week 15 and 16. This presentation will be based on your final research paper and should be treated as a presentation to a board of directors or professional peers.

Week 2 Pop Quiz 2%: If you are counting and have read this far, you realize that this class has a total point structure of 102. In week 2 we will have a brief “Pop” quiz to determine students’ baseline understanding of ethical principles. If you attend, and do not leave before the quiz is offered, there is a good chance you will earn 2 points.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR

NOTE: The course syllabus may be amended at any time by the professor. If necessary, the updated syllabus will be posted on eLearning and its changes discussed in class.

Week 1: Introduction to the Course

- 4 Part Breakdown of the Semester
  - Part 1: History of Ethics
  - Part 2: Professional Ethics
  - Part 3: Academic Ethics
  - Part 4: Research Ethics

Week 2: Understanding Ethics:

- Chapter 1: Introduction (Svara)
  - A Not-So-Pop Quiz
- Chapter 2: Administrative Ethics: Ideas, Sources, and Development (Svara)

Week 3: Understanding Ethics:
Looking at Ethics Across Groups & Definitions

- Cultural Ethics
- Military Ethics
- Professional Ethics
- Academic Ethics
- Research Ethics

Week 4: Professional Ethics:

- **Chapter 3:** Refining the Sense of Duty: Responsibilities of Public Administrators and the Issue of Agency v (Svara)
- **Chapter 4:** Reinforcing and Enlarging Duty: Philosophical Bases of Ethical Behavior and the Ethics Triangle (Svara)

Week 5: Professional Ethics:

- **Chapter 5:** Codifying Duty and Ethical Perspectives: Professional Codes of Ethics (Svara)
- **Chapter 6:** Undermining Duty: Challenges to the Ethical Behavior of Public Administrators (Svara)

Week 6: Professional Ethics:

- **Chapter 7:** Deciding How to Meet Obligations and Act Responsibly: Ethical Analysis and Problem Solving (Svara)
- **Chapter 8:** Acting on Duty in the Face of Uncertainty and Risk: Responsible Whistleblowing (Svara)

Week 7: Professional Ethics:

- **Chapter 9:** Elevating Ethical Behavior in the Organization (Svara)
- **Chapter 10:** Mandating Duty: External Measures to Promote Ethics (Svara)

Week 8: Midterm

- **Midterm:** Midterm will be open books/notes and cover the materials in the first half of the course.

Week 9: Academic Ethics

- Preface
- A Note on Using on Being a Scientist
• Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research 1 Terminology: Values, Standards, and Practices (On Being)
• Part I (Steneck)
• Part V (Steneck)
• The Researcher in Society 48 Historic Case Study: Ending the Use of Agent Orange,(On Being)

**Week 10: Academic Ethics**

• Part III Conducting Research (Steneck)
• Data Management Practices (Steneck)

**Week 11: Academic Ethics**

• Mentor and Trainee Responsibilities (Steneck)
• Collaborative Research (Steneck)

**Week 12: Academic Ethics**

• Part IV (Steneck)
• Reporting and Reviewing Research (Steneck)

**Week 13: Research Ethics**

• Conflict of Interest (Steneck)

**Week 14: Research Ethics**

• Authorship (Steneck)
• Authorship and the Allocation of Credit 35 Case Study: Who Gets Credit? Historic Case Study: Who Should Get Credit for the Discovery of Pulsars? (On Being)

**Week 15: Research Ethics / Final Student Presentations**

• Part II (Steneck)
• IRB / IACUC (Steneck)

**Week 16: Final Student Presentations Continued**

**CLASS NOTES**

**Attendance Policy.** Students in our graduate program display very high levels of conscientiousness about class attendance and participation and lead understandably busy lives. This course will follow a mandatory attendance policy. As noted earlier, students’ participation grades will be reduced for absences from class. Any student who misses more than two classes should expect to receive a grade no higher
than “B+” in this course. Major professional obligations or personal emergencies will, of course, not be counted against students under this policy at the professor’s discretion. Students should consult with the professor about such unavoidable absences before class begins. Tardiness and early departures will also lead to reduced participation grades. If a student must miss class, he or she is responsible for ALL material presented in class. There will be material presented in the classroom that cannot be found in the textbooks or course readings. It is your responsibility to get notes from other students after an absence. The professor will not provide class notes to students. The course materials and course syllabus are available through eLearning.

Cell Phones and other devices. Cell phones must be turned off or are in “silent” or “vibrate” mode during class. Repeated interruptions will result in points being deducted from class participation. If you really must answer a call, please leave the classroom immediately.

Late or Missed Work and Exams. Written assignments are due at 11:55PM on their due date. Assignments may be submitted via email (attached file) by prior arrangement with the instructor if the student will not be able to attend class.

- Assignments that are one day to one week late: 10 points will be deducted (out of 100).
- Assignments that are one week to two weeks late: 20 points will be deducted.
- Assignments will not be accepted more than two weeks late.

Late or make-up exams will not be given except under exceptional documented circumstances at the sole discretion of the instructor.

Incomplete Grade Policy. As per university policy, incomplete grades will be granted only for work unavoidably missed at the semester’s end and only if 70% of the course work has been completed. An incomplete grade must be resolved within eight (8) weeks from the first day of the subsequent long semester. If the required work to complete the course and to remove the incomplete grade is not submitted by the specified deadline, the incomplete grade is changed automatically to a grade an F.

Student Conduct & Discipline. The University of Texas System and The University of Texas at Dallas have rules and regulations for the orderly and efficient conduct of their business. It is the responsibility of each student to be knowledgeable about the rules and regulations which govern student conduct and activities. General information on student conduct and discipline is published on the UTD website.
The University of Texas at Dallas administers student discipline within the procedures of recognized and established due process. Procedures are defined and described in the Rules and Regulations, Board of Regents, The University of Texas System, Part I, Chapter VI, Section 3, and in Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities of the university’s Handbook of Operating Procedures. Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations (SU 1.602, 972/883-6391).

A student at the university neither loses the rights nor escapes the responsibilities of citizenship. He or she is expected to obey federal, state, and local laws as well as the Regents’ Rules, university regulations, and administrative rules. Students are subject to discipline for violating the standards of conduct whether such conduct takes place on or off campus, or whether civil or criminal penalties are also imposed for such conduct.

**Academic Integrity.** The faculty expects from its students a high level of responsibility and academic honesty. As a general rule, scholastic dishonesty involves one of the following acts: cheating, plagiarism, collusion and/or falsifying academic records. Students suspected of academic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary proceedings.

Plagiarism, especially from the web, from portions of papers for other classes, and from any other source is unacceptable and will be dealt with under the university’s policy on plagiarism (see general catalog for details). This course will use the resources of turnitin.com, which searches the web for possible plagiarism and is over 90% effective.

**Email Use.** The University of Texas at Dallas recognizes the value and efficiency of communication between faculty/staff and students through electronic mail. At the same time, email raises some issues concerning security and the identity of each individual in an email exchange. The university encourages all official student email correspondence be sent only to a student’s U.T. Dallas email address and that faculty and staff consider email from students official only if it originates from a UTD student account. This allows the university to maintain a high degree of confidence in the identity of all individual corresponding and the security of the transmitted information. UTD furnishes each student with a no cost email account that is to be used in all communication with university personnel.
Withdrawal from Class. The administration of this institution has set deadlines for withdrawal of any college-level courses. These dates and times are published in that semester's course catalog. Administration procedures must be followed. It is the student's responsibility to handle withdrawal requirements from any class. In other words, I cannot drop or withdraw any student. You must do the proper paperwork to ensure that you will not receive a final grade of "F" in a course if you choose not to attend the class once you are enrolled.

Student Grievance Procedures. Procedures for student grievances are found in Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities, of the university’s Handbook of Operating Procedures. In attempting to resolve any student grievance regarding grades, evaluations, or other fulfillments of academic responsibility, it is the obligation of the student first to make a serious effort to resolve the matter with the instructor, supervisor, administrator, or committee with whom the grievance originates (hereafter called “the respondent”). Individual faculty members retain primary responsibility for assigning grades and evaluations. If the matter cannot be resolved at that level, the grievance must be submitted in writing to the respondent with a copy of the respondent’s School Dean. If the matter is not resolved by the written response provided by the respondent, the student may submit a written appeal to the School Dean. If the grievance is not resolved by the School Dean’s decision, the student may make a written appeal to the Dean of Graduate or Undergraduate Education, and the dean will appoint and convene an Academic Appeals Panel. The decision of the Academic Appeals Panel is final. The results of the academic appeals process will be distributed to all involved parties. Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations.

Disability Services. The goal of Disability Services is to provide students with disabilities educational opportunities equal to those of their non-disabled peers. Disability Services is located in room 1.610 in the Student Union. Office hours are Monday and Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.; Tuesday and Wednesday, 8:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.; and Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. The contact information for the Office of Disability Services is:

The University of Texas at Dallas, SU 22
PO Box 830688
Richardson, Texas 75083-0688
(972) 883-2098 (voice or TTY)
Classes enrolled students with mobility impairments may have to be rescheduled in accessible facilities. The college or university may need to provide special services such as registration, note-taking, or mobility assistance.

It is the student’s responsibility to notify his or her professors of the need for such an accommodation. Disability Services provides students with letters to present to faculty members to verify that the student has a disability and needs accommodations. Individuals requiring special accommodation should contact the professor after class or during office hours.

**Religious Holy Days.** The University of Texas at Dallas will excuse a student from class or other required activities for the travel to and observance of a religious holy day for a religion whose places of worship are exempt from property tax under Section 11.20, Tax Code, Texas Code Annotated. The student is encouraged to notify the instructor or activity sponsor as soon as possible regarding the absence, preferably in advance of the assignment. The student, so excused, will be allowed to take the exam or complete the assignment within a reasonable time after the absence: a period equal to the length of the absence, up to a maximum of one week. A student who notifies the instructor and completes any missed exam or assignment may not be penalized for the absence. A student who fails to complete the exam or assignment within the prescribed period may receive a failing grade for that exam or assignment. If a student or an instructor disagrees about the nature of the absence [i.e., for the purpose of observing a religious holy day] or if there is similar disagreement about whether the student has been given a reasonable time to complete any missed assignments or examinations, either the student or the instructor may request a ruling from the chief executive officer of the institution, or his or her designee. The chief executive officer or designee must take into account the legislative intent of TEC 51.911(b), and the student and instructor will abide by the decision of the chief executive officer or designee.

**Off-Campus Instruction and Course Activities.** Off-campus, out-of-state, and foreign instruction and activities are subject to state law and University policies and procedures regarding travel and risk-related activities. Information regarding these rules and regulations may be found at the website address given below. Additional information is available from the office of the school dean. ([http://www.utdallas.edu/BusinessAffairs/Travel_Risk_Activities.htm](http://www.utdallas.edu/BusinessAffairs/Travel_Risk_Activities.htm))

All questions are welcome.
The Future of Higher Education in Texas

Dr. Larry R. Faulkner
Vice-Chair, Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee

Presentation to Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
July 23, 2015
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a postsecondary credential or degree.
Texas Higher Education Strategic Planning Process

- **Expert Testimony**
- **THECB Data Analysis**
- **Vetting by Stakeholders**

---

**Planning Committee**

- Develops Goals, Targets, and Strategies

---

**Coordinating Board Adopts Plan**

---

**Legislature and Institutions**

---

**higher Ed Strategic Plan 2030**

---

- *Monitor Progress and Promote Effective Strategies through 2030*
- *Fund and Implement through 2030*
A New Texas Higher Education Strategic Plan

60x30TX

Completion
Marketable Skills
Student Debt
60x30TX Builds on Achievements of CTG

2030-2045 Plan

60x30TX

Closing the Gaps
The 2015-2030 plan proposes four student-centered goals.

**60x30**
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a certificate or degree.

**Completion**
By 2030, at least 550,000 students in that year will complete a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from an institution of higher education in Texas.

** Marketable Skills**
By 2030, all graduates from Texas public institutions of higher education will have completed programs with identified marketable skills.

**Student Debt**
By 2030, undergraduate student loan debt will not exceed 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions.
60×30
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a certificate or degree.

Summary of Targets
Incrementally increase overall postsecondary attainment.

Strategy
Respond to the needs of the changing population of Texas so students are supported into and through higher education.
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a postsecondary credential or degree.

**Strategy examples:**

- Aggressively **promote college attainment** to students and parents prior to high school.
- Develop and implement **education and curriculum delivery systems** to make higher education available to a broader and changing population.
- Provide high-quality **education** programs for educationally underserved adults.
- Develop practices to encourage **stop-outs** with more than 50 semester credit hours to return and complete a degree or certificate.
- Collaborate with the Texas Workforce Commission to identify **critical fields** and to update them periodically.
Our future workforce will demand even more postsecondary trained and educated workers

In 1973, only 28% of all U.S. jobs required postsecondary education/skills. By 2020, 65% of all new U.S. jobs will require this level of education.

59% of all new jobs in Texas will require postsecondary training or education by 2020. Currently, 35% of Texans aged 25-34 have an associate degree or higher.
COMPLETION
Goal: By 2030, at least 550,000 students in that year will complete a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from an institution of higher education in Texas.

Summary of Targets

— Increase the number of Hispanic, African American, male, and economically disadvantaged completers.

— Increase the percent of public high school graduates who enroll directly in a Texas institution of higher education.

Strategies

— Support the completion pipeline by providing access to multiple postsecondary options.

— Improve academic preparation and academic support for students to enter and complete higher education.

— Structure programs and support services to be responsive to the changing needs of the student population to help students persist through key transitions in higher education.
COMPLETION
Goal: By 2030, at least 550,000 students in that year will complete a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from an institution of higher education in Texas.

Support the completion pipeline by providing access to multiple postsecondary options.

Strategy Examples

• Scale up and share practices that guide students to higher education.

• Collaborate with K-12 in improving college and career readiness.

• Increase the participation of economically disadvantaged high school students in dual credit and other college-level courses.

• Build credentials at each level with the aim of reducing course work duplication and time to subsequent degrees.
COMPLETION
Goal: By 2030, at least 550,000 students in that year will complete a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from an institution of higher education in Texas.

Improve academic preparation and academic support for students to enter and complete higher education.

Strategy Examples
• Scale up and share practices that support students in their academic preparation for postsecondary education.

• Streamline credential pathways through the P-16 continuum to ensure that secondary education graduation plans, including endorsement coursework, prepare high school graduates for completing a postsecondary credential.

• Scale up and share practices that support underprepared students to increase persistence and completion and to reduce their time to degree.
COMPLETION
Goal: By 2030, at least 550,000 students in that year will complete a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from an institution of higher education in Texas.

Structure programs and support services to be responsive to the changing needs of the student population to help students persist through key transitions in higher education.

Strategy Examples

• Use innovative approaches for content delivery and assessment to improve completion and reduce student cost.

• Employ High-Impact Practices (HIPs). HIPs are evidence-based teaching and learning practices shown to improve learning and persistence for college students from many backgrounds. Various practices demand considerable time and effort, facilitate learning outside of the classroom, require meaningful interactions with faculty and students, encourage collaboration with diverse others, and provide frequent and substantive feedback.

• Increase use of predictive analytics to identify and assist students at risk of not completing.
What is a marketable skill?

Students exit from any degree program with a variety of skills.

Marketable skills are those valued by employers that can be applied in a variety of work settings, including interpersonal, cognitive, and applied skill areas. These skills can be either primary or complementary to a major and are acquired by students through education, including curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities.
MARKETABLE SKILLS

Goal: By 2030, all graduates from Texas public institutions of higher education will have completed programs with identified marketable skills.

Summary of Targets

– By 2020, institutions will have created and implemented a process to identify and regularly update marketable skills for each of their programs, in collaboration with business and other stakeholders.

– Maintain the percentage of students who are found working or enrolled within one year after earning a degree or certificate.

Strategies

– Identify marketable skills in every higher education program.

– Communicate marketable skills to students, families, and the workforce.
MARKETABLE SKILLS

Goal: By 2030, all graduates from Texas public institutions of higher education will have completed programs with identified marketable skills.

Identify marketable skills in every higher education program.

Strategy Examples

• Convene a statewide group to explore general characteristics of marketable skills by meta-majors. This group should include representatives from institutions, industry, and other relevant stakeholders.

• Establish collaborations among institutions, state, regional, and local employers to define desirable skills, and identify in-demand programs and courses that offer those skills.

• Leverage existing efforts to ensure that marketable skills are addressed in every program.
MARKETABLE SKILLS

Goal: By 2030, all graduates from Texas public institutions of higher education will have completed programs with identified marketable skills.

Communicate marketable skills to students, families, and the workforce.

**Strategy Examples:**

• Increase the quality and availability of information targeted to students about the transition from higher education to the workforce, including information about the transferability and alignment of skills. This information should be available through academic and career advising strategies.

• Ensure marketable skills are integrated into curricula so that students can demonstrate and communicate those skills through established mechanisms.
STUDENT DEBT
Goal: By 2030, undergraduate student loan debt will not exceed 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions.

Summary of Targets
– Maintain undergraduate student loan debt at or below 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions.
– Decrease the excess semester credit hours that students attempt when completing an associate or a bachelor’s degree.
– Work to limit debt so that no more than half of all students who earn an undergraduate degree or certificate will have debt.
STUDENT DEBT

Goal: By 2030, undergraduate student loan debt will not exceed 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions.

Strategies

– Finance higher education in a manner that provides the most effective balance among appropriations, tuition and fees, and financial aid.

– Make higher education more affordable for students.

Affordability Examples:

• Fully fund grants for eligible students.

• Support innovative approaches for more affordable credentials.

• Reduce time to degree through alternate degree pathways to completion.
STUDENT DEBT

Goal: By 2030, undergraduate student loan debt will not exceed 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions.

Strategies

Build the financial literacy of Texans to promote a better understanding of how and why to pay for higher education.

Financial Literacy Examples:

• Implement personal financial literacy programs to support students going to college.

• Convene a statewide advisory group to determine ways to better advise students and parents on financial aid options and the impact of those options on students’ finances before and during their college careers.
THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN TEXAS

WOODY L. HUNT, CHAIRMAN
HIGHER EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

July 23, 2015
Let’s talk about higher education in Texas.

• Where do we stand with higher education in Texas today?
• Why is it so important to our state?
• What can we do to “raise the bar” of higher education?
CLOSING THE GAPS
ANNUAL DEGREE COMPLETION MORE THAN DOUBLED FROM 2000 TO 2014

IN 2000, ESTABLISHED A GOAL OF 163,000 ANNUAL POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIALS BY 2015

*THE GOAL WAS LATER INCREASED TO 210,000 TO REFLECT INCREASE IN POPULATION.

THAT GOAL WAS ACHIEVED IN 2011
246,499 IN 2014

ACTUALS
2000 116,235
2003 132,478
2006 155,527
2009 188,927
2011 221,538
2014 2015 246,499
Texas’ healthy business environment has become a **major contributor** to our **educational attainment** goals.
added period

Reeves, Ramona, 7/21/2015
TEXAS HAS BENEFITED FROM IMPORTING COLLEGE-EDUCATED RESIDENTS

NET ANNUAL MIGRATION BY DEGREE LEVEL - 22-64 YEAR OLDS
AVERAGE FROM 2011 - 2013

NET ANNUAL IMPORTS
95,818 WITH POSTSECONDARY ATTAINMENT

TOTAL NET ANNUAL IMPORTS
201,530

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; ACS Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) Files
Does "Graduate" mean Master's and Doctorate and Professional degrees?

Reeves, Ramona, 7/21/2015
**Closing the Gaps by 2015’s** goals seemed bold at the time and helped bring Texas on par with comparable states. International data on attainment levels, however, suggest that the bar was set too low.

**Far too low.**
TEXAS IS LOSING GROUND
Percent of adults with an associate degree or higher.

Source: Education at a Glance 2014, OECD Indicators and American Communities Survey Public Use Microdata Sample 2013
Texas attainment levels have stayed relatively steady, but in a global economy, staying steady = falling behind.
TEXAS IS LOSING GROUND

COMPARING TEXAS WITH NATIONS AND OTHER STATES
PERCENTAGE OF YOUNG ADULT DEGREE ATTAINMENT - (AGES 25-34)

Source: OECD, Education at a Glance 2014 (for 2012);
U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey One-Year Public Use Microdata Sample File
Our future workforce will demand even more postsecondary-trained and -educated workers.

In 1973, only 28% of all U.S. jobs required postsecondary education/skills. By 2020, 65% of all new U.S. jobs will require postsecondary education/skills.

59% of all new jobs in Texas will require postsecondary training or education by 2020.

Currently, 35% of Texans ages 25-34 have an associate degree or higher.
circle on right says "65% of all new jobs" will require postsecondary, but sentence beneath says "59% of all new jobs"?

Reeves, Ramona, 7/21/2015
SIGNIFICANT WORK REMAINS TO ENSURE TEXAS SUSTAINS PROGRESS

• Texas is doing better but falling farther behind.

• It is an urgent matter that Texas increase the knowledge and skills of its workforce to globally competitive standards.

• Failure to do so will have serious economic consequences for both the state and its citizens.
SIGNIFICANT WORK REMAINS TO ENSURE TEXAS SUSTAINS PROGRESS

• We must be much **more aggressive in our expectations and our policies** – incrementalism is not a solution.
  o Benchmark against global best performance
  o Be much more strategic in:
    • Increasing capacity to deliver instruction
    • Investing public resources

• As largest donor and regulator, the **state’s role is central in laying out educational goals** for our state’s workforce and our public institutions.

• In setting goals, the **state must prioritize completion**.
The Relationship Between **Educational Attainment**, **Personal Income**, and the **State New Economy Index** (2012)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey; Bureau of Economic Analysis; ITIF 2012 New Economy Index
Texas Personal Income per Capita as a Percent of the U.S. Average
(1980-2012)

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis
Texas must sustain educational progress. Barrier #1: Demographics
PERCENT OF 0-24 YEAR-OLDS IN U.S. WHO ARE BLACK OR HISPANIC (2013)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013 State Population Estimates
TEXAS POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY RACE/ETHNICITY (TOTAL AND K-12)

Source: Texas Data Center; U.S. Census Bureau, National Center for Education Statistics
## DIFFERENCE IN COLLEGE ATTAINMENT BETWEEN WHITES AND MINORITIES IN U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
<th>Underrepresented Minorities (Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Alaska Native)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-13 American Community Survey (ACS) Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) File
Despite more postsecondary completions, attainment among Hispanics, African Americans, and poor students remains low.
PROJECTED CHANGE IN TEXAS POPULATION
BY AGE AND RACE/ETHNICITY, 2010-2030

Source: Texas State Data Center, Office of the State Demographer
Texas must sustain educational progress Barrier
#2: Economics
PERCENT OF TEXAS FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN 17 AND YOUNGER
BY INCOME QUARTILE, 2012

Source: US Census Bureau: American Community Survey
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS ENROLL AND COMPLETE AT LOWER RATES

STUDENT PIPELINE BY ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGE
TRANSITION RATES FROM 8TH GRADE TO COLLEGE COMPLETION

Of Fall 2004 8th Graders, how many were:

- 95 Not Economically Disadvantaged
- 92 Economically Disadvantaged
- 79 Not Economically Disadvantaged
- 60 Economically Disadvantaged
- 66 Not Economically Disadvantaged
- 40 Economically Disadvantaged
- 30 Not Economically Disadvantaged
- 10 Economically Disadvantaged

Source: THECB, TEA, 2014
THE CONSEQUENCES OF INACTION
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT WILL DROP IF CURRENT PROGRESS DOES NOT ACCELERATE.

2030 PROJECTED CHANGE IN EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF POPULATION, AGES 25-64
SAME ATTAINMENT RATES BY RACE/ETHNICITY ASSUMED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or GED</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Texas State Data Center Population Projections. U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey and 2010-12 American Community Survey Three-Year PUMS.
PERSONAL INCOME WILL DROP IF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT RATES DO NOT IMPROVE

PROJECTED CHANGE IN PERSONAL INCOME PER CAPITA, AGES 25-64
WITH SAME ATTAINMENT RATES BY RACE/ETHNICITY

$40,066  $37,147
2012  2030

Sources: Texas State Data Center Population Projections. U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 ACS and 2010-12 ACS Three-Year PUMS.
WITHOUT IMPROVEMENTS, STATE REVENUES WILL DECLINE AND EXPENDITURES WILL INCREASE

CHANGES AS A RESULT OF NOT IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AMONG BLACKS AND HISPANICS - YEAR 2030 ESTIMATES

Sources: Texas State Data Center, 2009 American Community Survey (PUMS), 2008-10 Current Population Survey (PUMS)
GLIMPSE INTO THE FUTURE:
THE HISTORY OF EL PASO
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME AND EDUCATION ATTAINMENT
1950 TO 2012, EL PASO RELATIVE TO TEXAS

EL PASO EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY RACE (25-64 YEARS)
ASSOCIATE DEGREE AND HIGHER (%)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-12 American Community Survey Three-Year Public Use Microdata Sample.
TEXAS MUST ADDRESS CHALLENGES TO MAINTAIN A GLOBALLY COMPETITIVE WORKFORCE

• **Raise education attainment levels** to meet or exceed our competitors

• **Shrink disparities** across race/ethnic groups.

• Get more students into **high-demand technical fields**.

• **Improve skills of adult population** by bringing them back into the education system.
THESE **CHALLENGES** ARE BEING ADDRESSED BY THE TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
We must **all work together** to ensure the progress of education in Texas.

THANK YOU
June 2015 – Draft of the Next Higher Education Strategic Plan for Texas
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Preamble to the 2015-2030 Texas Higher Education Plan

Higher education institutions improve the lives of Texans. They educate our teachers, nurses, and technicians. They find cures for life-threatening diseases and develop technologies that make our lives easier. They inspire, educate, and equip our students to be their best, encouraging them to be more civic-minded, helping them interact in diverse communities, and giving them a passion for lifelong learning. They retrain our adult population, including veterans, helping them find meaningful careers. They enrich us through the arts and new ideas. The impact of higher education is immeasurable.

Because of the importance of higher education, Texans united around the goals of the previous statewide plan, Closing the Gaps by 2015. Over a 15-year period, beginning in 2000, the Legislature approved and funded new higher education institutions, appropriated $3.3 billion for TEXAS Grants to help low-income students attend college, and increased funding for programs in critical fields. Institutions of higher education in the state responded by increasing access and improving completions. In 2014, they enrolled more than 1.6 million students – an increase of almost 600,000 since 2000. The institutions also awarded almost 250,000 bachelor’s degrees, associate degrees, and certificates – approximately 130,000 more than in 2000.

Texas institutions have distinctive strengths that include conducting world-class research, serving underrepresented student populations, and developing new certificate and degree programs quickly in response to local workforce needs. Yet they have one thing in common: They help students succeed. The new higher education plan, 60x30TX, focuses on this common goal by striving for 60 percent of the 25- to 34-year-old Texas workforce to hold a certificate or degree by 2030. The plan seeks to increase student success through the combined expertise and resources of many stakeholders. Because of these collaborative efforts, Texas institutions of higher education will have more opportunities to develop their unique institutional identities, which will enrich the state.

The 60x30TX higher education plan is bold. Because of the creativity and hard work of the faculty, administrators, and staff at our institutions of higher education over the past 15 years, Texas is ready. Our foundation is strong. We have the potential to achieve things we could not have imagined 15 years ago. We invite you to join us as we work together to make higher education attainable for Texans of all backgrounds.
The 60x30TX higher education strategic plan contains four broad goals. Each goal contains a set of targets that will move the state toward reaching one or more goals. Many stakeholders across Texas will need to develop and implement a wide range of strategies to meet each target.

The Overarching Goal – 60x30
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a certificate or degree.

The 60x30 Goal is essential to the future prosperity of Texas. Without bold action, Texas will face a future of diminished incomes, opportunities, and resources.

By 2030, at least 550,000 students in that year will complete a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from an institution of higher education in Texas.

The Completion Goal complements the 60x30 Goal by supplying graduates of all ages from all two- and four-year institutions of higher education in Texas. Texas will need to continue the degree production increases of recent years to reach this goal, with large increases required among targeted groups.

The Third Goal – Marketable Skills
By 2030, all graduates from Texas public institutions of higher education will have completed programs with identified marketable skills.

The Marketable Skills Goal emphasizes the value of higher education in the workforce. Students need to be aware of the marketable skills embedded in their academic programs. This goal charges two- and four-year public institutions in Texas with documenting, updating, and communicating the skills students acquire in their programs. Private institutions of higher education in Texas may opt in to participate in this goal.

It is important to note that the Marketable Skills Goal does not diminish higher education’s obligation to produce well-rounded and well-informed individuals familiar with all fields of human activity and with a strong understanding of our country’s founding principles.

The Fourth Goal – Student Debt
By 2030, undergraduate student loan debt will not exceed 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions.

The Student Debt Goal aims to help students who graduate with debt complete their programs with manageable debt. This goal is designed to balance the levels of student loan debt with a graduate’s earning potential during the first year after college.

Maintaining Excellence, Focusing on Skills
Since the adoption of the last higher education plan in 2000, Texas has become increasingly engaged in a global economy dependent on skilled and knowledgeable workers. Many of those workers must come from the state’s institutions of higher
education. While continuing to pursue increased knowledge and higher standards of excellence in teaching, research, and innovation, two- and four-year colleges in Texas will need to consider more explicitly the primary reason most students attend college: to get a better job and achieve a better life.

For Texas to solve problems and address public concerns now and in the future, it must have a large workforce with the skills and knowledge to push the state forward. This workforce must be educated and able to adapt and compete at the highest levels to maintain a strong state economy.

**Shifts in Demographics**

As this plan moves forward, the 25- to 34-year-old population in Texas will be increasingly Hispanic. Hispanics, along with African Americans, are traditionally underrepresented in the state’s higher education institutions and will be critical to this plan’s success. The 60x30TX plan includes key targets for these and other critical groups. Reaching this plan’s targets will be important for reaching its goals.

**Student-Centered**

By charting a student-centered course and prioritizing higher education completion and workforce readiness, this plan enables the state, institutions of higher education, and the private sector to set Texas on a path toward continued prosperity. To compete and remain relevant in the future, Texas students must earn quality postsecondary credentials with skills that employers need. Furthermore, if graduates are to contribute to the state’s revenue and have the means to pursue personal goals, they must complete their programs with no debt or with manageable debt, relative to their starting wage after college.

**Latitude in Pursuing the Goals**

Although the 60x30TX plan focuses on higher education in Texas and its relationship to the workforce, one size does not fit every institution of higher education in the state. The plan provides latitude for two- and four-year institutions and encourages local creativity in pursuing the 60x30TX goals, as institutions continue to pursue their own unique missions.

The 60x30TX plan addresses students’ desires for a better life, employers’ desires to remain competitive, and the state’s need for a robust economy. This plan also strengthens the excellence and quality in Texas higher education by challenging the state’s two- and four-year institutions to prepare students for the jobs of the future, while inspiring them to contribute to a greater Texas society. The 60x30TX plan sets goals for Texas higher education that cannot be postponed without postponing the progress of Texas.
Introduction

Texas has become increasingly engaged in a global economy dependent on skilled and knowledgeable workers. Most of those workers must come from higher education. Although the state is doing better at increasing college completions for students who have not traditionally earned certificates or degrees in large numbers, it has not improved quickly enough or broadly enough to keep up with changes in the state’s demographics. Completions in higher education in Texas must reflect the population as a whole.

The challenge is clear: Students from all backgrounds, especially those traditionally underrepresented in higher education, must complete certificates and degrees in large numbers if the 25- to 34-year-old workforce in 2030 is to remain globally competitive and prosperous. Failure to do so will result in lower incomes and a lower percentage of educated Texans in 2030 than in 2015, losses that will spell a decline in the economic future of Texas and the opportunities available to its people.

While continuing to pursue increased knowledge and higher standards of excellence in teaching, research, and innovation, two- and four-year colleges in Texas will need to consider more explicitly the primary reason most students attend college: to get a better job and achieve a better life.

Local Creativity Encouraged

In light of the mission of higher education, the expectations of students, and the reality of a global marketplace, the question is how can Texas two- and four-year colleges achieve their missions, as well as educate students to enter the workforce and compete in a global market? The 60x30TX plan responds to this question by laying out ambitious goals for statewide educational attainment, completions of two- and four-year certificates and degrees, marketable skills, and student debt.

The aim of the plan is to help students achieve their educational goals and help the state remain globally competitive for years to come. Although the 60x30TX plan focuses on higher education and its relationship to the workforce, one size does not fit every institution of higher education in Texas. The 60x30TX plan provides the latitude for institutions to pursue the plan’s goals while also pursuing their unique institutional missions and goals. This plan encourages local creativity in pursuing the 60x30TX goals and targets.

Skills Deficits, Attainment, and Completion

In 2012, the globally focused Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) listed Texas as one of several states experiencing skills deficits. The OECD found that some sectors of the state’s economy could not hire enough workers with the required skillsets to meet workforce demand, resulting in lost revenue for the state. Although Texas saw a large in-migration of workers and the state met most of the goals and targets set in the previous higher education plan, only 35 percent of the 25- to 34-year-old population held an associate or higher degree in 2013, far less than many other states and nations. Adding certificates earned by this age group only increased the number of graduates with a postsecondary credential to about 38 percent.

The percentages suggest a link between the number of Texans holding a
certificate or degree and the state’s deficit in skilled workers. Certainly, Texas made big strides during the years of the previous higher education plan, Closing the Gaps by 2015. At the outset of that plan in 2000, about 116,000 students annually completed an associate, a bachelor’s, or a certificate. The goal of that plan was to reach 210,000 postsecondary awards annually by 2015. The state reached this goal in 2011, four years ahead of schedule. By Fiscal Year 2014, the annual number of undergraduate awards had increased to about 251,000.

**Workforce Alignment**

Yet those successes are only the beginning. The demand for skilled and knowledgeable workers continues to outpace workforce supply in Texas. For the state to remain competitive and prosperous, it will need approximately 60 percent of its 25- to 34-year-olds to hold a quality certificate or degree by 2030. (Indeed, some experts, such as Anthony Carnevale of Georgetown University, believe that Texas will need to reach this goal even sooner.) Without this kind of bold action, Texas will face a future of diminished incomes, opportunities, and resources.

The 60x30TX plan, however, recognizes that differences of interpretation exist about workforce needs for the future. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) estimates, for example, are used sometimes to show that significantly fewer than 60 percent of workers will need a college credential to satisfy future workforce demand. The BLS, however, has clarified that its estimates, while useful for a range of purposes, are based on current education requirements for typical entry-level workers. These estimates are not meant to account for workers needed at all levels or to project overall educational demand for future workers. Specific details aside, what everyone can agree on is that having a degree matters — and employers are willing to pay for it.

A degree isn’t enough, though. Texas students will need to match their credentials to employer needs. The role of higher education in helping students and employers coordinate their efforts will be essential. Otherwise, as Jeff Strohl of Georgetown University points out: “Without this [collaboration], increased education can just mean increased unemployment and higher levels of mismatch.” Alignment with the workforce is very important, but teaching students in broad ways that allow for flexibility in career choices is also important. Texas students need both skills and broader learning to succeed in the workplace.

### Supporting students through completion to become more actively engaged citizens and to strengthen the Texas economy means addressing college affordability and making explicit the workplace skills learned in programs.

#### Greater Representation, Demographic Shifts

The goal of 60 percent attainment by 2030 will require solutions from both public and private sectors but is achievable if a wide and representative range of Texans has access to a postsecondary education. Appealing to a wide range of Texans will be important given the population increase among Hispanics, who accounted for 65 percent of the state’s population growth in the 2010 census. Other minority populations also grew significantly, while the numbers for the white population remained relatively flat. The demographic changes in the state underscore the need to achieve greater educational attainment among Texans of all backgrounds.

#### Social Mobility and Affordability

Preparing students to enter community colleges and universities and supporting them through the completion of certificates and degrees will mean demonstrating that higher education is still the best path toward greater social and economic mobility. Although college is not
appropriate for every student, striving toward educational parity between economically disadvantaged students and their non-disadvantaged counterparts is important for achieving an adaptable, innovative, and diverse workforce in Texas. Not all the solutions are up to two- and four-year colleges, but they will play a critical role.

History proves more education is good for the economy and good for the middle class. With its newly educated workforce and the skills they acquired, the GI Bill brought a great economic boon after the 1940s. In *Soldiers to Citizens*, Suzanne Mettler states: “Millions used generous, dignified benefits to seize opportunities and become more actively engaged citizens.” Supporting students through completion to become more actively engaged citizens and to strengthen the Texas economy means addressing college affordability and making explicit the workplace skills learned in programs.

**Student-Centered**

The 60x30TX plan lays out a comprehensive approach that focuses heavily on the needs of students and will need the support of both public and private stakeholders to succeed. Students, after all, are the ones who will decide to pursue higher education. Their decisions will influence the future prosperity of Texas and will affect the state’s ability to meet its needs for educated and skilled workers.

The intention of the goals and targets described in this plan is to help students, institutions of higher education, employers, and the state to succeed and flourish using a shared vision of excellence for higher education in Texas. Developed with input from school administrators, higher education leaders, community leaders, private industry, elected officials, former faculty, and other stakeholders, the 60x30TX plan establishes ideals for higher education in Texas that will help secure the state’s place in a global economy.

**A Living Document**

Like its predecessor, the 60x30TX plan seeks to create qualitative results built on quantitative foundations. It is also a living document designed to track the state’s progress toward the higher education goals in this plan.

**The Work Ahead**

According to the OECD rankings, the U.S. provides the least economic mobility among developed nations. The OECD does not rank individual states among its list of countries, but the Social Mobility Index, which focuses on higher education policy related to economic disparities among students, ranks Texas higher education 21st in providing students with opportunities for economic and social mobility. These rankings are not likely to improve without bold action.

**Economic Disadvantage, Demographics, and the Workforce**

The pipeline to the state’s higher education starts with a K-12 public school population in which 60 percent of students qualify for free or reduced-price lunches. The 2003 to 2013 graduation report for Texas shows that only about 10 percent of the poorest eighth-grade students in Texas attain a postsecondary credential when tracked for
11 years. Without focused action and attention to these economically disadvantaged students, Texas cannot remain competitive.

Even beyond ethnicity, economic disadvantage is the best indicator in determining an individual’s likelihood of attaining education past high school. For the state to remain competitive in the future, its two- and four-year colleges will need to make substantial efforts to reach out to students from all backgrounds.

Anthony Carnevale (Georgetown University) has stated that a majority of future jobs in the nation and in the state will require a postsecondary credential. He asserts that as early as 2020, “Fewer jobs will be available to people with less than high school or only a high school diploma.” This is important because of the state’s shift in demographics to a largely Hispanic population. The 25- to 34-year-old population, the target age group of the 60x30 Goal, is projected to grow 41 percent among Hispanics between 2015 and 2030. Although the state has made strides among Hispanic Texans, poverty among this population has increased, especially among those with lower levels of education.

As former Texas and U.S. demographer Steve Murdock points out in Changing Texas, without bold action, workers of all backgrounds who possess only a high school education or less will increase from 48 percent in 2010 to 53 percent in 2050, and this increase will lead to more pronounced and long-term workforce shortages. Texas must continue working toward parity for traditionally underrepresented populations in higher education.

**Decrease in Global Ranking**

The population and geographic size of Texas is greater than that of many countries. Placing the state’s educational attainment in this context highlights the relative decline over time. In 2013, Texans of ages 55 to 64 achieved associate and higher degrees in numbers that placed this age group between the third and fourth highest-ranking OECD nations. Although Texans of ages 25 to 34 attained associate and higher degrees at increased rates during 2013, they did not keep pace with the rest of the world. As a result, this age group fell between the 23rd and 24th highest-ranking OECD nations in educational attainment – a relative and notable decline in the state. Increasing the diversity of students in higher education will help bolster the state’s resources and talent and will lead to a more diverse workforce and greater global competitiveness.

**Re-imagining College**

Texas also must continue to re-imagine “college” and “college-going” in broader terms. At stake are the state’s workforce needs, the economic viability of its future, and the ability to remain competitive in a global economy.

For some students, college will mean earning a certificate in a yearlong program. For other students, college will mean earning an associate or bachelor’s degree by attending traditional classes or
by participating in competency-based programs. For still others, college will mean earning associate degrees through dual credit or early college high school programs.

College may take place on a brick-and-mortar campus or on a device in a student’s living room. Regardless of the credential or method used to attain it, a college education will translate into more engaged citizens and greater prosperity for individuals, which in turn will translate into greater economic prosperity for the state.

Some Benefits of Higher Education

Higher education is not only about producing degrees and doing research, but also about spurring new businesses. Economic growth, productivity, and development flourish when paired with the skills and new ideas students gain from higher education. Entrepreneurship programs and small business institutes, for example, nurture new businesses.

Some headlines about student loan debt often fail to acknowledge the skills gained in college, but higher education is a boon for the state’s economy. A report by the group Economic Modeling Specialists International (EMSI) for Fiscal Year 2013 found that money spent by institutions and students on higher education in Texas boosted the state’s economy in a one-year period equal to $143.9 billion, or 11 percent of the gross state product.

Although these numbers validate the recent achievements of higher education in the state, more can be accomplished. Individuals with postsecondary degrees and credentials are less likely to need public assistance programs or to enter the correctional system. By its nature, higher education increases knowledge and skills and results in greater individual marketability, wealth, and self-reliance, which reduces dependence on public programs.

Individual Return on Investment

Experts from the Brookings Institution’s Hamilton Project found that, “On average, the benefits of a four-year degree are equivalent to an investment that returns 15.2 percent per year.” The EMSI report supports this claim and asserts that...
Texas students who complete degrees will account for $524.9 billion in added income during their working lives.

Savings in public programs means more money for the state and for individuals in Texas. The nationally focused College Board report Education Pays found that 12 percent of high school graduates, versus 2 percent of bachelor’s graduates, lived in households that relied on SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) benefits in 2011. Higher education benefits the state, the individual, and society in measurable and specific ways that must be encouraged and strengthened.

### Into Higher Education and Through Completion

The overarching 60x30 Goal of this plan is for 60 percent of 25- to 34-year-olds in Texas to hold a certificate or degree by 2030. Tracking the attainment levels for this age group and asking, “How educated are they?” will provide an indicator of the state’s economic health in the future. Tracking this goal also may reveal future workforce deficits in areas that require postsecondary training.

All Texas two- and four-year institutions of higher education, whether public, independent, or for-profit, will play a crucial role in meeting the 60x30 overarching goal. Aligning postsecondary programs with the state’s workforce needs will require a thoughtful process that not only acknowledges the value of workforce demands, but also acknowledges the creativity, diversity, and varied strengths of students. Many of those workforce skills will include soft skills and knowledge not easily aligned with a specific job or industry. Liberal arts studies, for example, often hone these skills and over time create flexibility and resourcefulness for individuals, allowing them to adapt nimbly to the jobs of the future while meeting the needs of today.

**K-12, Two-year, and Four-year Alignment**

The state will achieve its goals for higher education through many strategies that will influence students to complete certificates and degrees. Creating pathways for students to all careers, including high-demand jobs, will require higher levels of cooperation among higher education, K-12 education, and workforce leadership. For example, two- and four-year colleges will need to collaborate and align lower-division curricula so that students receive a coherent and rigorous general education, while being assured that their courses will transfer and count toward degrees. In addition, Texas will need more online education and innovation, such as applied baccalaureates (e.g., BAT and BAS degrees) offered through traditionally two-year colleges or competency-based programs offered through universities. Texas institutions of higher education will need to work together more closely on such issues as teacher training, professional development, and college readiness. These strategies and others will help Texas reach the targets in this plan and will produce greater outcomes for students and for the state.
Vision for the 60x30TX Higher Education Strategic Plan

Higher education is attainable for Texans of all backgrounds through challenging and diverse learning environments that foster individual potential and maximize the societal and economic contributions of graduates.

The 2030 Higher Education Goals for Texas

The pages that follow lay out the goals, targets, and strategies of the 2015-2030 higher education strategic plan for Texas.

Goals: The goals contain broad language to provide latitude in achieving them. Although measurable, each goal’s design allows institutions to respond according to the role institutions have in achieving them within the state’s higher education system. The result of many meetings and discussions, the plan’s goals rest on a careful assessment of the possible.

Targets: The plan’s targets are key to achieving each goal. Additional targets easily could have been included in the plan, but the ones chosen are critical for the state’s future workforce needs and prosperity. One plan cannot respond to every educational aspiration or take into account the missions of every two- and four-year college in the state, but a statewide plan can drive success in key areas through focused goals and targets. If the state and its institutions of higher education implement successful strategies to reach each target, the state will reach each goal.

Strategies: Developing and implementing strategies to reach each target will require the work of many stakeholders across the state. Successful strategies will require both top-down and bottom-up approaches at institutions of higher education and both public and private partnerships. Institutions will need to collaborate with state agencies, such as the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), and the Texas Education Agency (TEA), as well as local, regional, and national companies. The challenge will be to develop fluid strategies that produce changes over time. The strategies presented are only some of the strategies that will help institutions reach the targets and goals laid out in the 60x30TX plan.
Overarching Goal

The 60x30 Goal asks industry, government, two- and four-year institutions of higher education, and community organizations in the state to strive for greater prosperity for Texas and its nearly 27 million residents. The goal focuses on 25- to 34-year-olds who hold a degree or certificate because this age group represents the future of the state and its ability to compete and prosper.

Learning leads to earning, and higher education unlocks opportunities for individuals whose resources might otherwise remain limited. The ability to roam intellectually, to aspire, and to realize those aspirations are the hallmarks of higher education and the foundation for the best and most resourceful workers. In turn, those workers can help to create the most dynamic workplaces.

Higher Education and the Workplace

Higher education increases freedom from poverty, affords social mobility, and encourages greater participation in the public arena. It often produces individuals who are more skilled at solving problems and have a greater capacity for navigating their lives. A competitive Texas economy depends on its people having opportunities for more financial means and greater social well-being.

Far from resting solely on the shoulders of institutions of higher education in the state, this goal belongs to those who desire to train and retain a globally competitive workforce. It also belongs to those who desire greater prosperity for Texans from all backgrounds.

Big State, Bold Numbers

The 60x30 Goal takes into account both graduates of Texas institutions and the in-migration of new residents who hold certificates or degrees. Whether someone living in Texas earns a certificate or degree in or out of state, it will be counted. For this reason, the state will need to retain graduates from Texas institutions of higher education, as well as attract graduates from other states. To achieve this, in fact, the state will need to improve at a higher rate of attainment than the average of the five best years since 1998. Bold but achievable, the 60x30 Goal will translate into 2.7 million 25- to 34-year-olds in Texas who hold certificates or degrees in 2030.

American Community Surveys data showed in 2013 that an estimated 1.3 million Texans in the target age group held a certificate or degree. For Texas residents of ages 25-34 to reach
the U.S. educational attainment level of 42 percent, the state would need 234,004 more residents with associate and bachelor’s degrees. Continuing this trend will result in a poorer and less-competitive state. For Texas to remain globally competitive and for its people and communities to prosper, achieving the 60x30 goal is critical.

**Strategies to Achieve this Goal**

TEA data show that Hispanics and African Americans make up more than 60 percent of the K-12 pipeline for higher education in Texas – a reason for government, institutions, community organizations, and business leaders to rally around the common cause of ensuring Texans of all backgrounds have access to higher education and the means to pursue it.

Leaders also will need to encourage and support economically disadvantaged students in pursuing higher education. More than 60 percent of high school graduates in Texas are economically disadvantaged as well. The state cannot hope to reach the 60x30 Goal without their participation and completions.

Two-year institutions can support efforts to reach this goal by strengthening connections and partnerships with local and regional organizations and local school districts. Four-year institutions can help by building or strengthening their connections to local or regional organizations and independent school districts. In short, for 60 percent of 25- to 34-year-olds in Texas to hold a certificate or degree by 2030, industry, government, community organizations, K-12, and higher education will need to work together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal and Interim Benchmarks</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percent of Texans ages 25-34 with a certificate or degree to at least ...</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These benchmarks ensure progressive improvement of state educational attainment throughout the plan years. (38.3% as of 2013)*

**Strategies**

Respond to the needs of the changing population of Texas so students are supported into and through higher education.

*For example:*  
1. Aggressively **promote college attainment** to students and parents prior to high school.  
2. Develop and implement **education and curriculum delivery systems** to make higher education available to a broader and changing population.  
3. Provide high-quality adult education programs to improve educational attainment for educationally underserved adults.  
4. Improve opportunities for **students** to pursue and complete higher education, including developing practices to encourage **stop-outs** with more than 50 semester credit hours to return and complete a degree or certificate.  
5. Collaborate with the TWC to identify **critical fields** and to update them periodically.
The Completion Goal, unlike the 60x30 Goal, pertains solely to credentials produced by Texas institutions of higher education, and it applies to students of all ages. To meet the future workforce needs of Texas, the state’s two- and four-year colleges will need 550,000 completions by students in 2030, a significant annual increase in the number of postsecondary awards. In total, during the 15 years this goal is measured, Texas will award 6.4 million certificates and degrees, if the goal is reached.

The Target Populations for this Goal

The increase in awards not only accounts for an annual growth rate of about 4 percent for certificate and degree completions but also accounts for large population increases. This rate of growth may not seem aggressive until stakeholders examine the targets for this goal. Its aim is not only to achieve a large number of completions from Texas institutions but also to achieve parity in Texas higher education for underrepresented populations, such as African Americans, Hispanics, males from these and other populations, and economically disadvantaged students.

In addition to those populations, institutions will need to target female STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) students, veterans, adults who have completed courses and left without completing degrees, and students in adult basic education programs, among others. Reaching this goal also will require greater numbers of college-ready high school graduates and will mean directing more participants from the state GED and adult basic education programs toward certification and degree programs. Reaching, enrolling, and graduating students who are at risk of foregoing or stopping out of higher education without a degree because of economic factors will be important, and institutional innovation can address some of these issues. Although overlap exists among the targets (e.g., a student may be both Hispanic and economically disadvantaged), reaching each target will make a difference in the state’s future and move it toward greater prosperity.

Time-to-Degree Factors

Substantial evidence suggests that institutions need to be more prescriptive in their efforts to help students narrow their choices as they navigate higher education. Of students who “stopped out” of higher education between 2008 and 2012, 48,000 four-year students had stopped out with 90 or more semester credit hours, and 161,000 two-year college students had stopped out with 55 or more semester credit hours.
Since 2000, Texas has made measurable progress in improving graduation rates, but it must sustain and strengthen these efforts for the state to compete successfully with other states and countries. As of 2014, the state’s six-year graduation rate was 60.5 percent for public, four-year institutions, but if the two most selective public universities in the state are extracted from the data, the state’s overall graduation rate falls to around 53 percent. For two-year institutions, the current six-year graduation rate for associate degrees is about 28 percent.

**Strategies to Achieve this Goal**

To reach the Completion Goal, Texas institutions of higher education will need to support students early to help them persist in their higher education. This may include:

- Expanding co-requisite course opportunities for developmental education students. These courses allow students to take credit-bearing courses while they take developmental education courses to improve their skills.
- Considering competency-based programs that allow an adult student to move through blocks of classes based on what the student knows, for a fixed semester cost, regardless of the number of courses the student completes successfully in one semester.
- Using assessments, such as the Texas Success Initiative Assessment, which will enable institutions to accurately determine students’ strengths and weaknesses and give advisers the ability to provide better counseling to students based on this information.
- Implementing electronic degree plans that allow students to input majors and receive a list of the required courses needed to complete a specific degree in four years could help students avoid taking classes unnecessarily and could shorten the time to a degree.

P-16 councils, adult education learning programs, dual credit programs, early college high school programs, and affordable baccalaureates will help connect institutions to local and regional groups and will support more completions statewide. Two- and four-year institutions working together can also support each other in reaching this goal.

Studies show that achieving 30 semester credit hours (SCHs) in Texas during the first year of college is critical for students to persist and complete. Achieving 30 SCHs in the first year might happen in a number of ways, including: (1) by students taking two semesters of 15 SCHs during the traditional academic year, or (2) by students taking two semesters of 12 SCHs during the traditional academic year and one session of 6 SCHs during the summer. Reducing the time to a degree will help students persist in completing postsecondary credentials, which will increase the number of graduates and help the state to reach this goal.

Inherent in increasing completions is the need to strengthen guided pathways between two- and four-year colleges and to align lower-division curricula across institutions and degree programs. Doing so will place students on paths to receive coherent and rigorous educations that will transfer between colleges and count toward degrees.

**How the Completion and 60x30 Goals Differ**

The Completion Goal closely relates to, but differs from, the 60x30 Goal in important ways. The Completion Goal tracks annual awards earned for students of all ages; the 60x30 Goal tracks the educational level of the state’s 25- to 34-year-old population.

The Completion Goal contains targets that build toward 550,000 awards earned only from two- and four-year colleges in Texas. Growth in certificates and degrees among two- and four-year colleges will be critical for reaching 60 percent in the 60x30 Goal, but it will be only part of the solution for reaching that goal.

The Completion Goal helps ensure that growing numbers of Texans, and the state as a whole, reap the personal and societal benefits that come from completing high-quality degrees and certificates.
Goal and Interim Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal and Interim Benchmarks</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of students completing a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from an institution of higher education in Texas to at least …</td>
<td>376,000</td>
<td>455,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first four targets are directly related to the Completion Goal. To reach this goal, Texas will need to maintain the strong degree production increases that it has experienced in recent years. (298,989 as of 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets to Reach the Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of Hispanic students completing a certificate or degree to at least …</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This target and the next one will help increase parity across completers for groups that have traditionally been underrepresented. (Hispanics 89,355 as of 2014; African Americans 37,658 as of 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of African American students completing a certificate or degree to at least …</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of male students completing a certificate or degree to at least …</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of women enrolled in and graduating from higher education institutions has grown and men are not keeping pace. This target provides a means to monitor progress toward gender parity. (122,744 as of 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of economically disadvantaged undergraduate students (Pell Grant recipients) completing a certificate or degree to at least …</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>246,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economically disadvantaged students are less likely to succeed in higher education than their non-economically disadvantaged peers. This target emphasizes the importance of improving completion rates for this subgroup. (107,419 as of 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of all Texas public high school graduates enrolling in an institution of higher education in Texas by the first fall after their high school graduation to at least …</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who enroll directly from high school into college are much more likely to be college ready. This target helps to ensure high school graduates enroll in higher education at rates that support the Completion Goal. (54.2% as of 2014)
Strategies

Support the completion pipeline by providing access to multiple postsecondary options.

For example:
- Scale up and share practices that guide students to higher education.
- Increase the participation of economically disadvantaged high school students in dual credit and other college-level courses.
- Build credentials at each level with the aim of reducing course work duplication and time to subsequent degrees.
- Reach out to K-12 to collaborate in improving college and career readiness.

Improve academic preparation and academic support for students to enter and complete higher education.

For example:
- Scale up and share practices that support students in their academic preparation for postsecondary education.
- Streamline credential pathways through the P-16 continuum to ensure that secondary education prepares high school graduates for completing a postsecondary credential.
- Scale up and share practices that support underprepared students to increase persistence and completion and to reduce their time to degree.

Structure programs and support services to be responsive to the changing needs of the student population to help students persist through key transitions in higher education.

For example:
- Use innovative approaches for content delivery (e.g., block scheduling) and assessment to improve completion and reduce student cost.
- Employ High-Impact Practices (HIPs). HIPs are evidence-based teaching and learning practices shown to improve learning and persistence for college students from many backgrounds. Various practices demand considerable time and effort, facilitate learning outside of the classroom, require meaningful interactions with faculty and students, encourage collaboration with diverse others, and provide frequent and substantive feedback.
- Increase use of predictive analytics to identify and assist students at risk of not completing.
This higher education plan defines marketable skills as:

Those valued by employers that can be applied in a variety of work settings, including interpersonal, cognitive, and applied skill areas. These skills can be either primary or complementary to a major and are acquired by students through education, including curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities.

In an era of increasing global competitiveness, what is the best way to meet workforce needs? Some say, for example, colleges and universities are not meeting workforce needs by graduating too many English and philosophy majors for the job market. The assumption is that some programs of study result in graduates who lack marketable skills. This is not so, especially in Texas where public institutions of higher education have implemented the Core Curriculum, which has six Core Objectives, three of which often are thought of as marketable skills: communications, critical thinking, and teamwork. A student who completes the Core Curriculum will exit with those skills at a basic level.

As students move through progressively higher levels of degree attainment, i.e., an associate to a bachelor’s, they gain progressively higher skill levels. If they are not doing so already, two- and four-year institutions will be able to advance this work by making students aware that they are learning marketable skills in the Core Curriculum.

In 2014, more than 90 percent of employers who participated in a national survey conducted by Hart and Associates identified these skills and abilities as important for new hires:

- Capacity to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve complex problems
- Ability to demonstrate ethical judgment and integrity
- Ability to demonstrate intercultural skills
- Capacity for continued new learning

This list makes it clear that liberal arts and other majors have much to contribute to the workforce, but how can the state ensure that all graduates not only gain marketable skills but also can articulate them to potential employers? Students in Texas are currently graduating from two- and four-year colleges around the state. This goal simply asks institutions to think more explicitly about the programs they offer.

**Thinking Explicitly about Skills**

The programs at many Texas institutions already include learning outcomes within the framework of their courses. The Marketable Skills Goal goes a step further and asks institutions to think explicitly about the job skills students learn within programs. The goal also asks institutions to consider the educational experiences within each program and the functional value of those experiences in the workplace. In other words, this goal asks institutions to think about how students succeed in the workplace.
This change in thinking will result in students being able to articulate their acquired skills to potential employers on a résumé or in a job interview. The capacity to articulate acquired skills will help students to succeed in greater numbers and will help Texas meet its workforce needs. This goal also may incentivize students to complete their degrees as they take courses and begin to see how finishing their programs will benefit them in the workplace.

**Marketable Skills for All Programs, All Types of Degrees**

Identifying marketable skills for each program of study may seem daunting, but this task speaks to why many students pursue higher education. In a 2012 UCLA study, 88 percent of surveyed students identified getting a better job was the motivation for going to college. Given students’ desires to get better jobs and employers’ desires to hire the best workers, identifying marketable skills gained through higher education is essential for both students and employers.

All program types will undergo the process of creating, identifying, and updating marketable skills for this goal, which takes into consideration the complex and diverse nature of the state’s workforce that will affect those tasks. The list of marketable skills that institutions of higher education develop for their programs will be varied and extensive and may require frequent updates, but continuously updating skills will be important because neither academia nor business can predict how skills will evolve or emerge over the next 15 years. Although this goal focuses on Texas public two- and four-year colleges, private and independent institutions of higher education may choose to opt in to this process to align with the efforts of public institutions.

Reaching the 60x30 Goal of 60 percent, however, will be a great achievement only if the skills attained by Texas students – coupled with the skills of those who migrate into the state – meet the demands of the workplace. If most graduates, for example, hold an associate degree, but the available jobs require bachelor’s degrees, Texas will not meet market demand. For this reason, the types of awards held by Texans will be tracked to ensure that the supply of degrees aligns with workforce demand.

**Benefits for Institutions, Students, Employers**

Mapping marketable skills within individual programs of study is central to this goal. This process will make students more aware of the skills and knowledge they are learning, will help institutions identify the skills and knowledge that accompany programmatic learning outcomes, and will help employers understand how those skills align with prospective jobs. To reach this goal, Texas institutions of higher education will need to forge and maintain close partnerships with business organizations and prospective employers to get feedback about the skills needed in specific fields.

**Strategies to Achieve this Goal**

Institutions will need to implement strategies, such as building networks of paid internships, which count as college credit for students. Institutions also may need to consult chambers of commerce, workforce development boards, and other workforce-related organizations to identify marketable skills for particular jobs and industries.

**How this Goal Connects to the 60x30 and Completion Goals**

The Marketable Skills Goal connects to the 60x30 Goal by aligning higher education with workforce needs. It connects to the Completion Goal by providing students with a clearer picture of how their courses relate to workplace success, which may encourage them to persist toward degree completion.

This goal will create new lines of communication between institutions and employers that will open doors to student opportunity and employer satisfaction and innovation. At the same time, this goal will create greater institutional awareness of unique program offerings and opportunities.
By 2020, institutions will have created and implemented a process to identify and regularly update marketable skills for each of their programs, in collaboration with business and other stakeholders.

Students need to be aware of the marketable skills affiliated with their programs. The targets above ensure that institutions document, update, and communicate to students the skills acquired in their programs so that students can communicate those skills to potential employers. Target years can be modified to accommodate institutional program review cycles.

Maintain the percentage of students who are found working or enrolled within one year after earning a degree or certificate.

Having a substantial portion of Texas completers who remain in the state and are employed or pursuing additional education after completing a credential is important for the state’s future. (77.1% as of 2013)

Strategies

Identify marketable skills in every higher education program.

For example:

- **Convene a statewide group** to explore general characteristics of marketable skills by meta-majors. This group should include representatives from institutions, industry, and other relevant stakeholders.
- **Establish collaborations** among institutions, state, regional, and local employers to define desirable skills, and identify in-demand programs and courses that offer those skills.
- **Leverage existing efforts** (e.g., using Liberal Education and America’s Promise – LEAP – initiative) to ensure that marketable skills are addressed in every program.

Communicate marketable skills to students, families, and the workforce.

For example:

- Increase the quality and availability of information targeted to students about the transition from higher education to the workforce, including information about the transferability and alignment of skills. This information should be available through academic and career advising strategies.
- Ensure marketable skills are integrated into curricula so that students can demonstrate and communicate those skills through established mechanisms.
The Student Debt Goal addresses balancing and managing student loan debt. The intention is to address student loan debt in Texas before it becomes unmanageable and deters greater numbers of students from seeking a degree. Each Texas public institution of higher education may address this goal and its targets differently, but every institution should seek to create an environment in which the debt students carry after graduation is manageable.

**Who Influences College Affordability**

College affordability impacts student debt load, and unchecked student debt impacts life choices such as buying a house, raising a family, and saving for retirement. The health of Texas depends on a population that is economically healthy and has discretionary income. College affordability is key, and three groups directly influence college affordability:

- **Students** – Students can make an impact by maintaining the lowest possible debt levels and making good decisions about their time and finances during and after college, by maintaining affordable college lifestyles, and by understanding the total cost of borrowing money.
- **Two- and four-year colleges** – Colleges can affect affordability by striving to reduce expenses, while maintaining quality and ensuring that students know what they are buying and where their educational choices will lead them after college.
- **The state** – The state can influence affordability by adequately funding higher education.

As with other states, about half of the Texas budget comes from taxes. The more discretionary income individuals have, the greater their purchasing power and the greater the state’s potential revenues. Individual purchasing power also affects local governments that heavily depend on property taxes for their operating budgets. A population that can contribute to these tax bases is vital, and students saddled with unreasonable loan debt will be hard pressed to contribute.

**The Challenge of More Efficiency**

Texas is close to the national average for the cost of a certificate or degree at 1.3 credentials per $100,000 in expenditures. The state’s public institutions ranked 28th nationally in 2013 in state funding, with students receiving an amount of state support also on par with the national average, at about $5,300 per full-time student equivalent.

The challenge is that Texas ranked 23rd in the U.S. in 2013 in the percentage of undergraduate students considered economically disadvantaged, a population projected to grow. To achieve the

---

**Figure 6.** Texas gets 1.3 degrees per $100,000 in expenditures.
Completion and Student Debt Goals, higher education must become more affordable to more of the population. One way to do that is for all stakeholders to work together to reduce the cost per degree.

**Texas Student Debt on the Rise**

Although Texas student debt has not reached national levels, it is on the rise at a rate of 8 to 9 percent annually. At this pace, student debt will become a deterrent to much larger numbers of Texans making decisions about pursuing higher education. To help students avoid debilitating debt after graduation, Texas public institutions of higher education will need to examine the affordability of attaining a certificate or degree. The less affordable a higher education is, the more debt students will accrue and the more access will be denied for those with the greatest financial need. This goal focuses on student loan debt in relation to first-year earnings with the understanding that college affordability is critical to achieving this goal and the other higher education goals in this plan.

**Students with Debt but No Degree**

The Student Debt Goal also considers default rates in maintaining a healthy balance between debt levels and earning power. Data from Texas Guaranteed, which are included in the *State of Student Aid and Higher Education in Texas* report, indicate default rates have risen in the last 10 years and that a larger share of students with small loans default when compared to students with large loans. For students who borrow and do not complete their degrees, the average default rate is higher. The state comptroller’s data shows that about one-quarter of Texas student borrowers borrow less than $5,000 and leave college without a degree; of those, one in four defaults.

This issue highlights the connection between the Student Debt and Completion Goals in this plan. Because loan debt undermines the perceived return on investment in higher education, this issue affects the decisions of potential students to pursue college, which has long-term repercussions for students’ earning power and the state’s workforce needs. Given the higher income and tax base associated with education past high school, the state’s revenues will suffer if some students perceive that higher education is an option reserved only for some Texans.

**Strategies to Achieve this Goal**

To achieve this goal, institutions will need to steer students toward degree plans early in their postsecondary careers. Complete College America and others suggest that institutions of higher education need to be more prescriptive in helping students narrow their choices when navigating through higher education. Emphasis in this area will help students avoid taking excessive SCHs, which lead to greater costs and more debt in pursuit of an associate or bachelor’s degree. As of 2014, Texas Guaranteed found that students in Texas averaged 98 SCHs to complete a two-year degree and 145 SCHs to complete a four-year degree, while most programs of study require only 60 and 120 SCHs, respectively. Excessive semester credit hours for degree completion in Texas contribute to student debt and less than timely completions.

Continued institutional emphasis on on-time completion will be integral to helping students avoid the higher costs associated with attending college for a fifth or sixth year in pursuit of a degree. Many studies have shown that the costs associated with the fifth and sixth years of continuous study among six-year graduates are much higher than the first four years and produce much greater student debt. Returning to an expectation that students graduate in four years will help to reduce student debt.

**Student Choices Based on Talent, Interests**

Another intention of this goal is to balance costs relative to areas of study so
that students can choose programs based on their talents and aspirations and not solely based on the needs of the job market or the starting salary for a particular field. Loan debt, for example, might discourage some students from pursuing a career in K-12 teaching because teachers’ starting salaries are generally lower than the mean for all starting salaries of four-year graduates. The same is true for social workers, journalists, artists, and community workers. As a result, the state could experience greater shortages in important fields, such as teaching and social work, if student loan debt spikes to the point at which a majority of students choose programs based entirely on their potential income.

Connection to the 60x30 Goal

The intent of this goal is to increase access and persistence, expand students’ options for careers after graduation, and advance other life choices. Helping students complete credentials and balance debt load will help the state reach the 60x30 Goal and will help two- and four-year colleges in Texas reach the Completion Goal. This goal also will lead to healthier individual finances among graduates and a stronger state economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal and Interim Benchmarks</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain undergraduate student loan debt at or below 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These benchmarks ensure student loan debt levels stay in balance with the earning potential of the credential. (60% as of 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets to Reach the Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the excess semester credit hours (SCHs) that students attempt when completing an associate or a bachelor’s degree.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This target focuses on decreasing the total SCHs to degree to reduce costs and debt. (21 as of 2014)

| Work to limit debt so that no more than half of all students who earn an undergraduate degree or certificate will have debt. | 50% | 50% | 50% |

This target focuses on decreasing the overall number of students who have student loan debt. (50.7 as of 2014)
Strategies

Finance higher education in a manner that provides the most effective balance among appropriations, tuition and fees, and financial aid.

Make higher education more affordable for students.

For example:

- Fully fund grants for eligible students.
- Support innovative approaches for more affordable credentials.
- Reduce time to degree through alternate degree pathways to completion.

Build the financial literacy of Texans to promote a better understanding of how and why to pay for higher education.

For example:

- Implement personal financial literacy programs to support students going to college.
- Convene a statewide advisory group to determine ways to better advise students and parents on financial aid options and the impact of those options on students’ finances before and during their college careers.
The Challenge for Higher Education in Texas

The purpose of the 60x30TX plan is to set goals for higher education in Texas for the next 15 years. This plan takes bold steps toward helping the state to meet the needs of its workforce, communities, and individuals.

To compete and remain relevant in the future, Texas students must attain quality postsecondary credentials, and they must complete those credentials and exit their programs with skills employers need. If students are to graduate, contribute to the state’s revenue, and become more engaged citizens, they also must exit their programs with no debt or with manageable debt, given their incomes. This plan addresses each of these areas through higher education goals aimed at the continued progress of Texas.

By design, this plan is Texas-bold and Texas-achievable. As President John F. Kennedy once said about going to the moon:

We choose to go to the moon ... and do other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard, because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win.

(For more information about how this plan was developed, see Appendix A.)
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Appendix A: History of the Texas Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee for the 60x30TX Plan

On Dec. 9, 2013, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) staff distributed a memorandum requesting nominations for advisory committee members to all the chancellors and presidents of Texas institutions of higher education. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) sought (1) former governing board members of Texas institutions of higher education, or (2) former presidents and chancellors of higher education institutions. THECB staff also sent requests to the business community and asked for nominations for business representatives who would be willing and able to contribute meaningfully to the work of the committee. The deadline for all nominations was Jan. 10, 2014.

After THECB staff received nominations, they reviewed them to ensure statewide coverage and even representation of all stakeholders. THECB staff then verified that nominees were willing to serve and recruited members from unrepresented areas. Many of the former presidents and chancellors also had worked in faculty positions during their careers.

On Jan. 6, 2014, the 30-day period from the comment period for the new rules concerning the establishment of the Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee ended with no comments received.

At the quarterly meeting of the THECB on Jan. 23, 2014, the THECB: (1) adopted the rules for the Texas Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee (TxHESPC), and (2) voted to authorize the Board Chair and the Chair of the Board Committee on Affordability, Accountability and Planning to approve the membership of the Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee.

Final membership of the Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee was approved in late February 2014, with formal invitation letters sent to Strategic Planning Committee members on Feb. 21.

With the exception of July and December, members of the 2014-15 TxHESPC met monthly from March 2014 through June 2015. The election of the chair and vice chair and charge to the committee occurred at the first meeting. Every meeting included presentations by one or two guest speakers and THECB staff, followed by substantial committee discussion. Speakers included both regional and national experts on topics related to the goals. These discussions led to the goals, targets, and strategies of this plan.

Characteristics of the 60x30TX Plan

The TxHESPC focused on these characteristics for the next long-range higher education plan for Texas. It needed to:

- Be concise and focused
- Contain two to five goals
- Set measurable targets
- Contain broad strategies
- Respond to statewide needs
- Respond to regional needs
- Stimulate creativity and adaptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of the 2014-15 Texas Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woody Hunt, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry R. Faulkner, Ph.D., Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James R. Anderson, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Basaldua, M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Bawcom, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Dickerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon H. Dovalina, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. D. “Doug” Hodo, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright Lassiter, Jr., Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald “Dee” Margo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Obriotti Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley (Neeley) Richardson, Ed.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Murdock, Ph.D., Special Advisor for Demographics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Glossary

Adult degree completer: Any student who has several years of life and/or work experience and previous college coursework who returns to an institution of higher education and completes a postsecondary credential.

Affordable baccalaureate: The Texas Affordable Baccalaureate (TAB) program is a lower-cost affordable degree. As of 2015, the TAB program offers one program of study, Organizational Leadership. Tuition for this degree is $750 per term. Students are able to accelerate through as many courses per term as possible, provided they demonstrate mastery of the subjects. A student entering the program with no prior college credit should be able to complete the degree in three years for between $13,000 and $15,000.

Competency-based education: Competency-based education is a flexible way for students to get credit for what they know; build on their knowledge and skills by learning more at their own pace; and earn high-quality degrees, certificates, and other credentials that help them in their lives and careers. Students in these programs show what they know and how well they know it through multiple ways of evaluating their learning. This is another choice for learning offered at some institutions through a variety of programs, with full support to help students when needed.

Co-requisite courses: Courses required to be taken at the same time.

Economically disadvantaged: High school students are identified as economically disadvantaged if they receive free or reduced-price lunch while attending high school. College students are identified as economically disadvantaged if they receive Pell at any time while earning their degree.

Guided pathways: A structured plan that clearly delineates the requirements and sequence of a program of study.

 Marketable skills: Those [skills] valued by employers that can be applied in a variety of work settings, including interpersonal, cognitive, and applied skill areas. These skills can be either primary or complementary to a major and are acquired by students through education, including curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities.

Meta-major: A grouping of courses to guide a first-year student toward a major in an area (e.g., science, business, arts and humanities, education) while the student still progresses toward graduation. All degrees in a meta-major share common courses. Undecided students can use a meta-major pathway to make more focused, intentional progress toward a degree, thus eliminating the accumulation of unnecessary courses and credits.

Postsecondary credential: A degree or a level I, II, or III certificate.

Soft skills: Skills broadly applicable to the workplace, but also broadly applicable to higher education. Included would be skills such as communication, both written and oral, critical thinking, and teamwork.

Stop-out: A student who temporarily withdraws from school or delays the pursuit of higher education with the intention of re-enrolling in the future.
The Academic Calendar Committee is a University-wide, Standing Committee appointed by the President, not reporting to the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas.

The Committee has ten voting members. The University Registrar and Director of Academic Records is a member ex officio (with vote). The other nine members are appointed or reappointed by the President annually. Two members are representatives from the administration, nominated by the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost). Three members are representatives of the faculty, nominated by the Speaker of the Senate. Two members are representatives of student government, nominated by the President of the Student Government. Two members are representatives of the University Staff, nominated by the Chair of the Staff Council. There is no limit to the number of successive terms a member may serve. Rather, those responsible for providing nominees shall attempt to seek individuals particularly interested in the task of the committee, and the President shall attempt to assure as much continuity in membership from year to year as possible. One member shall be designated by the President as Chair.

Current Membership: Paul Battaglio (co-chair), Andrew Blanchard (co-chair), Blair Flicker, Jennifer McDowell, Tara Lewis (present for Megan Gray), Sheila Rollerson, Brooke Knudtson (SG President), Nicole Watson, Jessica Meah, Jennifer Holmes, Matthew Bondurant
2014-2015 Academic Calendar Meeting Dates and Agenda Items

Monday, February 10, 2014 – 2:30PM
- Welcome New Committee Members
- Invite comments from Dr. Wildenthal
- Review previous minutes
- Discussion of schedules
- Frequency of future meetings

Friday, October 10, 2014 – 9:30AM
- Discussion of academic calendar and dates.
- Motion to approve academic calendar through fall 2017 Made by: Andrew Blanchard and seconded by Paul Battaglio. All in favor none opposed.
- The Academic Calendar Committee is reviewing a document “Principles for the Development of the Academic Calendar” to provide UT Dallas with a consistent basis for constructing the academic calendar. The document should be ready for faculty review spring 2015.
- Discussion of the Thanksgiving Holiday week and consensus to keep the week a fall break where classes do not meet.
- The meeting was cordial and discussion was collegial.

Tuesday, Feb 10, 2015 – 2:00PM
- Welcome New Members
- Development of the 2016 & 2017 Academic Calendar
- Fall Break Discussion
- Discussion on Principles for the Development of the Academic Calendar
TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Richard Scotch and Robert Kieschnick  
RE: Annual Report or Advisory Committee on the University Budget  
DATE: July 6, 2015

The Budget Advisory committee members (listed below) met in October 2014 with Dr. Murray Leaf to identify areas for the committee to focus upon over the coming year.

In November 2014, a sub-set of the committee meet with President Daniel and other members of the administration to discuss faculty salaries. A preliminary analysis of the faculty data focusing on racial and sexual discrimination was prepared but not vetted by the full committee as more work on the data was deemed necessary.

In January 2015, President Daniel invited members of the committee to attend the annual budget hearings. From February until early April, different members of the committee attended all the various budget presentations. In April, Dr. Scotch and Dr. Kieschnick met with Dr. Daniel and Terry Pankratz to both hear the administration’s thinking on reconciling the various budget requests, and to give feedback on their proposed budget reconciliation strategy.

Pursuant to these meetings, the committee felt that it was appropriate to meet with Dr. Andy Blanchard to develop a better understanding of the university’s scholarship programs as a significant proportion of the university’s budget is devoted to its various scholarship programs. The committee meet with Dr. Blanchard in April and learned quite a bit about our scholarship programs, both in terms of their costs and benefits.

Finally, in April the committee discussed further work and agreed that additional data on faculty salaries needed to be collected in the next year to address compression issues in more depth.

Members of the Advisory Committee on the University Budget:

FACULTY
- Richard Scotch (EP) (8/31/2015) Chair
- Robert Kieschnick (M) (8/31/2016) Vice Chair
- Jay Dowling (B) (8/31/2015)
- Monica Evans (A) (8/31/2016)

RUO: Executive Vice President & Provost
- Rebecca Files (M) (8/31/2017)
- D.T. Huynh (EC) (8/31/2016)
- Duncan Macfarlane (ECS) (8/31/17)
- Ramachandran Natarajan (M) (8/31/2017)
- Robert Serf ling (N) (8/31/2015)
July 21, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Academic Council

FROM: Judy L. Barnes, Director of University Events


1. Membership

The Commencement Committee is a University-wide Standing Committee appointed by the President not reporting to the Academic Senate, The University of Texas at Dallas.

The voting members of the Commencement Committee included two members of the faculty, Kathryn Evans (School of Arts and Humanities) and Bruce Jacobs (School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences); and two student representatives including the President of Student Government, Brooke Knudtson, and Undergraduate Student, Garrett Staas (UG-ECS).

Non-voting members included: Director of University Events, Judy Barnes (Chair); Speaker of the Faculty, Tim Redman (Vice Chair); University Registrar and Director of Academic Records, Jennifer McDowell; Associate Vice President for Business Affairs, Rick Dempsey; Dean of Undergraduate Education, Andy Blanchard; Dean of Graduate Studies, Austin Cunningham; Chief of Police, Larry Zacharias; Bookstore Manager, Brian Weiskopf; Dean of Students, Gene Fitch; Media Services Representative, Darren Crone; Alumni Relations Representative, Erin Dougherty and appointed in FY 15, Rena Piper, Event Planner from the Office of the President and Lauraine O’Neil, Office of Communications.

2. Meetings

Two meetings of the Commencement Committee were conducted during the 2014-2015 academic year. A meeting held on September 23, 2014 discussed the Spring, 2014 ceremonies results and upcoming Fall, 2014 ceremonies. [Meeting agenda and minutes are attached.]

The second meeting of the Committee was held on February 15, 2015 to discuss Fall, 2014 results and in preparation for the Spring, 2015 commencement ceremonies. [Meeting agenda and minutes are attached.]
## COMMENCEMENT COMMITTEE 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>9/20/2014</th>
<th>2/5/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Director of University Events (Chair)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>Dean of Undergraduate Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>Crone</td>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Dampsey</td>
<td>Associate VP for Facilities Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Kinnard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Dougherty</td>
<td>Alumni Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Fitch</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>University Registrar and Director of Academic Records</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Lauraine</td>
<td>O'Neil</td>
<td>Office of Communications</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ray Willhoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Rena</td>
<td>Piper</td>
<td>Event Planner - Office of the President</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Redman</td>
<td>Speaker of the Faculty (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Murray Leaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Weiskopf</td>
<td>Bookstore Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Zacharias</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Faculty Appointment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Faculty Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Kudtson</td>
<td>Student Government President</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>Staas</td>
<td>UG-ECS</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guest:** Wanda Trotta
Commencement Committee Meeting
September 23, 2014
Agenda

I. Welcome
   a. New Committee Members

II. Review of Spring 2014 Commencement
   a. 9 Ceremonies
      b. RSVP at Time of Application
      c. Accessible Ramp
      d. ECS Senior Project

III. Fall 2014 Commencement
   a. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers
      b. Ceremonies
      c. Omit Alumni Speech
      d. Later Dates—will run into Winter Break (end earlier on Sat. to break down)
      e. Countdown to Commencement—September 30

IV. Discussion
   a. Student Speakers—Deadline November 3
      b. Orator solutions
      c. Faculty Regalia and Sale
      d. Summer Graduate Walk Policy—current catalog Fall only
      e. Miscellaneous
Commencement Committee Meeting  
September 23, 2014
Minutes

I. In Attendance: Judy Barnes, Darren Crone, Austin Cunningham, Erin Dougherty, Gene Fitch, Jennifer McDowell, Rena Piper, Larry Zacharias, Kathryn Evans, Brooke Knudston, Murray Leaf (in lieu of Tim Redman), Ray Willhoft (in lieu of Lauraine O’Neil), Kelly Kinnard (in lieu of Rick Dempsey), and Wanda Trotta (guest)

II. Welcome
   a. New Committee Members – Judy Barnes introduced new members to the committee and discussed who was no longer with the committee. A representative from Communications was added to our member list and Student AccessAbility was withdrawn as they reside under the Dean of Students who serves on the committee.

III. Review of Spring 2014 Commencement
   a. 9 Ceremonies (11 with Hooding and Honors included) – Judy reviewed participation numbers with the committee and discussed the decreased time of 30 minutes between ceremonies. The decreased time seemed to work well for all parties involved and we will continue to schedule the ceremonies in 2.5 hr intervals.

   b. RSVP at Time of Application – This past Spring was the first time the Registrar office allowed graduates to RSVP for commencement participation at the same time they applied to graduate. This system helped us to get fairly accurate predictions for the ceremonies and we will continue this with future ceremonies.

   c. Accessible Ramp – It was decided to retire the wheelchair ramp due to being unreliable. As another accommodation option, we added an accessible ramp for disability access to the stage. The ramp was successfully utilized by two students and received positive feedback from faculty and staff. Media Services also added that it made their access easier as well. We will begin meeting with vendors this semester to have a ramp installed for Fall ceremonies.

   d. ECS Senior Project – A senior group was assigned a project to debut during graduation involving RFID cards that would be scanned as students crossed the stage to display their name on the screen above the stage. The project was approved to be tested during one of the ceremonies and worked successfully. However, because we do not have the department or staff to manage the program, we will not be utilizing it in the future.
IV. Fall 2014 Commencement
   a. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers — numbers have come in and it appears we can carry out commencement in 6-7 ceremonies.

   b. Ceremonies — Judy proposed 7 ceremonies with 4 taking place on Friday (ECS, JSOMU, JSOMG1, JSOMG2) and 3 on Saturday (AH/NSM, EPPS/IS, BBS). Austin then proposed an alternative schedule after looking at the numbers with only having 6 ceremonies keeping the original 4 on Friday and moving IS with AH/NSM and combining BBS and EPPS. The committee unanimously agreed to this suggestion.

   c. Omit Alumni Speech — the VP for Development and Alumni Relations has recently left the university. With this departure, Judy asked the committee how they felt with eliminating the Alumni speech. Erin agreed with this recommendation but suggested Dr. Daniel briefly welcome them as alumni and announces the Memories on the Mall. The committee supported this idea.

   d. Later Dates—will run into Winter Break (end earlier on Sat. to break down) — Last Spring, the Student Government President surveyed students across campus to ask for their preference on Commencement dates for Fall (early December before finals or Late December immediately following finals). The students all responded with wanting to have the ceremonies take place following their finals. Therefore, Fall commencement is taking place December 19 & 20.

   e. Countdown to Commencement—September 30 – Will be held in the VCB atrium as in the past. Rena worked with Julianne Fowler to have a magnet created which listed all of the important dates for commencement listed to hand out to students.

V. Discussion
   a. Student Speakers—Deadline November 3 – New application is posted and available. The first ad ran in this week’s Mercury. This year, the committee will request finalist to submit a video of their speech to aid in making final decisions.

   b. Orator solutions — Judy discussed with the committee the difficulty of locating orators for the ceremonies each semester. Options for hiring outside orators were not supported by the committee. Instead, the committee suggested charging the associate deans of each school with the responsibility. Judy will present the suggestion to the Deans Council for their support.
c. Faculty Regalia and Sale – In the past, the President’s Office has paid for the regalia rentals for the first 50 faculty. However, there are several key faculty members who continuously take advantage of this benefit for multiple regalia required events instead of purchasing their own. The committee suggested no longer offering to pay for rentals and instead providing the rental information to the faculty along with regalia sale information to encourage them to purchase their own.

d. Summer Graduate Walk Policy—current catalog Fall only – Undergraduate and graduate students only. This does not include doctoral hooding.

e. Miscellaneous –

- Erin mentioned she has been receiving numerous questions from students wondering why we do not host commencement at another larger venue off of campus. Austin commented that we surveyed the students years ago and they wanted it on campus and, additionally, there isn’t a place to go. Erin recommended surveying the student body again as a means to validate our decisions with the students. Judy asked the committee if anyone was interested in steering the survey for the student body and Brooke volunteered. All suggested questions will be sent to Rena for Judy and Rena to review. Judy and Rena will then communicate these approved questions with Brooke. Austin suggested the university consider moving to school based ceremonies in the future with one large commencement for all. It was agreed by the committee that this was not ideal at this time.
- Darren requested a minimum of 3 days for set-up of media services for commencement. Judy requested a set-up flow chart from them. Rena will follow-up with Darren on exact set-up dates.
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Commencement Committee Meeting  
February 5, 2015  
Agenda

I. In attendance: Judy Barnes, Andy Blanchard, Darren Crone, Austin Cunningham, Rick Dempsey, Erin Dougherty, Gene Fitch, Jennifer McDowell, Lauraine, O’Neil, Rena Piper, Tim Redman, Brian Weiskopf, Larry Zacharias, Bruce Jacobs, Brooke Knudtson, and Garrett Staas

II. Review of Fall 2014 Commencement
a. 6 Ceremonies – Judy discussed RSVP and participation numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceremony</th>
<th>RSVP</th>
<th>Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECS – Fri. 9am</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOMU – Fri. 11:30am</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOMG1 – Fri. 2pm</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOMG2 – Fri. 4:30pm</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH/IS/NSM – Sat. 9am</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS/EPPS – Sat. 11:30am</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Returned to after finals – Size of ceremonies and later December dates after finals concluded worked well and received positive feedback from students. We will continue to schedule later dates moving forward. Time between start of one ceremony to the start of the next (2.5 hrs) proved to be challenging when the “weather plan” for MOM was implemented. We will continue with 2.5 hrs increments but will need to make alternative weather plans (see below).

c. RSVP at Time of Application—first for Fall as we started in Spring 2014 – Will continue with this process moving forward.

d. Speaker videos before selection – For the Fall Student Speaker application process, we required finalists selected by the committee to send in a video of their speech delivery as the last step in the review process before picking the speaker. This proved to be very beneficial and efficient in the selection process and the committee will continue with this process moving forward.

e. ETC...regalia orders, omitted Alumni speech, orators, MOM weather

- Regalia orders – This Fall was the last semester the Office of the President will rent regalia for faculty participating in commencement. Faculty are now encouraged to purchase their own regalia versus renting. The Office of the
President will keep a small supply on hand for those who need them; on a first come, first serve basis.

- Omitted Alumni speech – Last Spring we opted to omit the Alumni speech from the commencement script and decided to continue with that same format for the Fall. With the merge of Development and Alumni Relations and Office of Communications, we revisited this topic to see if we should consider adding the speech back in. All were in favor of continuing to omit the speech. Recommendation will be made to the President.

- Orators – In Fall we implemented a stipend for staff who orated during commencement. This seemed to help alleviate the stress with finding people to commit to helping with this task during commencement. We will continue with this process moving forward.

- MOM weather plan – We were forced to implement the MOM weather plan during the Fall ceremonies. This proved to be quite difficult to get the people out of the gymnasium in a timely manner and posed a huge safety risk with the amount of people in the building. All agreed that this process would not be done again. Suggestions were given for the following: placing alumni gift under chairs; setting up a tent shelter outdoors; or presenting gifts as they exit the stage to return to their chairs. Alumni relations will discuss suggestions and notify us of their updated weather plan.

III. Spring 2015 Commencement
   a. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>RSVP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPS</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOM</td>
<td>875 Grad/ 434 Undergrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Ceremonies – 9 ... 2 Thurs., 4 Fri., 3 Sat. [or 8?] – Recommendation of the committee to proceed with 8 ceremonies (2 Thurs., 3 Fri., 3 Sat.). Committee also suggested that moving forward there should be a set ticket allocation standard minimum of 5 tickets across the board for each ceremony and issue extras when able.

c. Countdown to Commencement—February 24
IV. Discussion
   a. Student Speakers—Deadline March 25 – will add advertisement to digital boards across campus

   b. Summer Graduate Walk Policy—process for approving exceptions – both undergraduate and graduate deans opposed to exceptions. Recommendation made for school based recognitions.

   c. Revisit Student Survey

   d. Miscellaneous
Committee on Qualifications Annual Report to the Senate, 2014-2015 Academic Year

July 1, 2015

Members of the Committee:

David Channell (A&H) Gregory Dess (SOM) Walter Dowling (BBS)
Daniel Griffith (EPPS) Ali Hooshyar (NS&M), Chair Jason Jue (ECS)
Elena Katok (SOM) Kamran Kiasaleh (ECS) Alex Piquero (EPPS), Vice-chair
Neil Roemer (A&H) Marion Underwood (BBS) Li Zhang (NS&M)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of review</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
<th>2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third-year, mid-probationary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure review &amp; Promotion to Assoc Prof</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc to Full Prof</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside hires with tenure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall workload increased by about 13%, mainly due to the increase in the number of third-year mid-probationary reviews.

Meeting schedule, operating procedures, and workload:

**Mid-probationary, tenure, and promotion reviews.** Prior to CQ’s evaluation, a candidate for tenure/promotion is reviewed by an ad hoc committee, has a faculty vote with recorded minutes, and is the subject of a Dean’s report. The components analyzed were research/creative activity, teaching effectiveness, and service. UTD policy requires excellence in either teaching or research/creative activity and if teaching is excellent, then the candidate should have performed well in research/creative activity.

CQ met as a committee on six Friday mornings: January 9, 16, 23, and 30, and February 6 and 13. The expectation was that all CQ members read all the cases. Each CQ member was assigned one case to summarize per session, and one case to take notes on the CQ discussion. It takes several days to prepare for each weekly meeting. The chair merged the summary and discussion for a final report, which were usually one to two pages. CQ considered the following factors for cases with tenure: (1) sufficient documentation to support the recommendation for or against promotion; (2) independent letters from at least five external evaluators (independence was
defined as not having a self-interested association with the candidate for promotion); (3) clear articulation of the strengths and weaknesses of each case; (4) school-specific guidelines; and (5) consistency within individual schools. Since the Provost and the President concurred with all of the CQ’s (2014-2015) recommendations, there was no need for the Provost to meet with the CQ to discuss any of the recommendations.

**External hires with tenure.** CQ evaluates all external hires with tenure. These are conducted via email because they are often time-sensitive. CQ has imposed a 48-hour turnover. For hires at the same rank (e.g., an Associate Professor from another institution hired as an Associate Professor at UTD), our operating procedures allow the Chair to determine how many CQ member responses are sufficient (after the 48-hour period). This accommodates unusual times for the hires (e.g., summer). For hires that involve a promotion (e.g., an Associate Professor hire as a Full Professor), seven affirmative votes (a majority) are required. However, thanks to our dedicated CQ members and availability via Internet, almost all cases have been reviewed with 91%-100% of CQ members participating. The types of hires are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous rank</th>
<th>Proposed rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof w/o tenure</td>
<td>Associate Prof with tenure</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof with tenure</td>
<td>Associate Prof with tenure</td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof with tenure</td>
<td>Full Prof with tenure</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof w/o tenure</td>
<td>Full Prof with tenure</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof with tenure</td>
<td>Full Prof with tenure</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations and suggestions for improvements:**

It is estimated that each case requires about one hour. Up to 12 cases per week may be considered, which can require almost two full days per week. The chair probably spends double that time. If the number of reviews increases by about 25%, then the procedures will be a full-time task for the chair. As the university expands, so will the number of cases reviewed. In the not distant future, assigning academic workload credit to CQ members may need to be taken into consideration.

Thanks to the continued efforts of Dr. Inga Musselman (Senior Vice Provost) who holds annual meetings with the candidates for promotion and ad hoc committee chairs to discuss the review process and procedures, the following usual issues that are of concern in the review process seem to have been effectively dealt with: publication authorship (listing of all authors, determining contribution of candidate for evaluation), number of PhD students supervised, indication of UTD student authorship, independent research done at UTD (as opposed to research done as a PhD or post-doctoral associate), including the mid-probationary report during tenure review, teaching evaluations. The reports provided by the ad hoc committees were generally of high quality,
reasons for their recommendations were well justified with supportive documents and details of their reasoning.

The most frequent concern raised for several cases involved the outside hires with tenure. When promotions were involved (about half the cases), the external letters were not always independent (e.g., PhD mentors or co-PIs on grants). The written policy for outside letters is stated in UTDPP1057:

For tenured appointments, the Search Committee should solicit at least five independent judgments of the candidate's qualifications (these may include, but must not be limited to, individuals recommended by the candidate).

Even so, the rules were not always met. CQ is mandated to not seek additional information beyond what is provided. We have the option of not voting, but standing on such a principle has not been considered productive, especially since many of these hires were time-sensitive. Furthermore, unlike the well-documented reports of ad hoc committees, most search committee reports usually do not clearly justify the reason for their recommendations. It is believed that if the search committee reports were required to be written using the same format as applies to reports of ad hoc committees, the review process for the outside hires would be greatly improved. Again thanks to Dr. Inga Musselman, who has communicated this need to the Deans, two of the schools (ECS & SOM) have started to provide better documentation and justification for outside hires. They should be commended and it is hoped that other schools will soon follow similar procedures for the outside hire reviews.

A final comment concerns the participation of Dr. Inga Musselman, who represents the Provost’s office at CQ meetings. She is not a voting member of the committee, and she does not participate in discussions, except to clarify matters of policy. Nonetheless, she has had an impact on the quality of reviews within UTD. She provides instructions to ad hoc committee chairs and candidates for promotion, with the result of higher quality information from both. She is knowledgeable about CQ deliberations. It is felt that the conscientious efforts of Dr. Inga Musselman over the years have improved the review process by her acting as an intermediary between the candidates for promotion, the ad hoc committees, and CQ. We understand that with her expanded administrative role as Acting Provost, time constraints may make it too difficult for her to continue her participation at CQ meetings. However, it is hoped that a way could be found so that CQ could continue benefiting from her vast experience, knowledge and dedication on CQ matters.
Date: July 15, 2015

To: David M. Cordell, Secretary, Academic Senate

From: Robert Lowry, Chair, Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct

Subject: Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct 2014-2015 Annual Report

The Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct had one issue to address during the 2014-2015 academic year. A formal grievance was filed under UTDPP1050 which reached us on April 10, 2015. All five members of the committee actively participated in a discussion of the case, reached a consensus, and reviewed a draft decision. We issued a decision April 24 dismissing the grievance in part, but finding that the grievant had stated a prima facie case in part. Both parties opted for mediation. Finding a mediator proved to be difficult. The policy requires that the mediator be a tenured faculty member, but so far as we know there are no tenured faculty members with formal training in mediation. Moreover, this was the first formal grievance to go to mediation in at least four years, so we don’t have a pool of past mediators to call on. Finally, many faculty members are reluctant to get involved, especially when the parties are represented by legal counsel as was the case here. Eventually, Dr. Dan Arce (EPPS) agreed to serve as mediator and the mediation occurred July 2, 2015. Dr. Arce submitted his report July 7 stating that the parties had reached a settlement that required only signatures from the Vice Chancellor and General Counsel of the UT System and the President of UT Dallas to become final.

This experience leads me to make the following suggestions:

First, it might be useful if the Speaker of the Senate would ask each dean at the beginning of the academic year to nominate two tenured faculty members who might make good mediators. Good candidates might be current or (perhaps better) former program heads or department chairs who have some experience resolving disputes. Former associate or assistant deans might also be asked to serve. It may be that current assistant or associate deans would be viewed as part of “management,” even if they are from a different school than the parties. Perceived fairness on the part of the mediator is important if the mediation is to succeed. Given that we only had one formal grievance go to mediation in the last four years, two potential mediators from each school should be plenty.
Second, the section of UTDPP1050 dealing with how the Committee may respond to the mediator’s recommendation in the absence of a settlement appears to include two mutually incompatible provisions. Section 4.2.2 states that if the Committee “rejects a recommendation to settle or to dismiss the grievance, it shall proceed to appoint a grievance panel.” Section 4.2.3 states that “[i]f the mediator’s recommendation to settle or to appoint a grievance panel is rejected … [the Committee] shall dismiss the grievance …” This needs to be revised so that it is clear what happens if the Committee rejects a mediator’s recommendation to settle.

Third, in order to prepare for a possible grievance panel I read the remainder of the policy, and the best word I can use to describe it is “ugly.” The procedures are incredibly detailed and convoluted, and some of the provisions strike me as questionable. For example, should assistant professors really be required to serve on a grievance panel on a case where the Provost’s decision during the informal grievance process is being challenged? The only grounds for being excused under the current rules are “extreme hardship or for conflict of interest.” (Sections 5.1.1, 5.1.4) I don’t have a specific recommendation, and it occurs to me that the current procedures are so forbidding they may actually create a significant incentive to settle grievances either informally or through mediation! Nonetheless, I recommend that next year’s Committee should review this policy early in the year and consider whether they want to propose amendments.
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

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

ACADEMIC SENATE CAUCUS MEETING
April 15, 2015

Present: Robert Ackerman, Karen Baynham, Lisa Bell, Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia, Gail Breen, Mathew Brown, R. Chandrasekaran, Nadine Connell, David Cordell, Mieczyslaw Dabkowski, Greg Dess, Vladimir Dragovic, Monica Evans, Eric Farrar, Todd Fechter, Bernard Ganglmair, Lev Gelb, Jennifer Holmes, Forthee Honhon, Carie Lambert, Murray Leaf, Vance Lewis, Michele Lockhart, Ramachandran Natarajan, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Michael Rebello Tim Redman, Christopher Ryan, Liz Salter, Betsy Schlobohm, Richard Scotch, Sabrina Starrman, Tres Thompson, Michael Tiefelsdorf, Tonja Wissinger,

Absent: Naofal Al-Dhahir, Frank Anderson, Zalman Balanov, Poras Balsara, Judd Bradbury, John Burr, Patrick Brandt, George Decourcy, Eugene Deluke, Gregg Dieckmann, John Ferguson, Andrea Fumagalli, Nicolas Gans, Yulia Gel, Ali Hooshyar, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Joe Izen, Wieslaw Krawcewicz, Jason McAfee, Syam Menon, Dennis Miller, B.P.S. Murthi. Emire Muslu, Jinkyung Na, Simeon Ntafos, Jared Pickens, Matthew Polze, Scott Rippel, Mark Salamasick, Murat Torlak, Alejandro Zentner,

Visitors: Jennifer McDowell, Mary Jo Venetis

1. Call to Order, Introduction of Senate Members
Speaker Redman called the meeting to order at 1:02 PM. The Senators-elect introduced themselves. Speaker Redman noted that David Cordell is the Elected Secretary of the Senate and Christina McGowan is the Staff Secretary for the Senate.

2. Description of Agenda: Election and Setting Priorities
Speaker Redman described the purpose of the meeting. It is to elect the Speaker, the Secretary, and the Academic Council, and to set the priorities for the 2015-2016 year.

3. Description of Officers duties, and Academic Council
Speaker Redman gave a summary of Former Speaker Murray Leaf’s report from the April 2014 Caucus. There are two dominant types of Faculty Senate models in the United States. The first is that the faculty is advisory. The Senate is advisory to the administration; the senate committees are advisory to the Senate and so forth. The other is the Shared Governance model. In the shared governance model, faculty and administration share responsibility for policy development. The Faculty Senate handles the academic side, while administration handles the administrative side—although each in consultation with the other. The UTD Senate is based on the idea of shared governance. The Senate itself is the policy making body for the faculty, subject to being over-ruled by the entire faculty if they hold a meeting. The committees of the Senate are executive committees. The Senate makes the policy, the committees interpret the policies of the senate for their respective concerned administrators. The administrators carry out the policies. We seem quite clearly to be widely recognized as the best example of shared governance in Texas, although at UT Austin there is also very substantial faculty autonomy and responsibility at the departmental level.
The ‘Speaker’ is not the chair of the Senate. The actual chair of the senate is the President of the University. In the absence of the president and provost, the speaker will chair the meeting, but otherwise, what you will generally see is that the President chairs but the speaker or other faculty lead discussion on specific items. The Speaker is also the ex officio chair of the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees is appointed each year by the Academic Council. The Speaker is also an ex officio member on five other committees. The Speaker and Secretary are members of the UT system Faculty Advisory Council. The Speaker, Secretary, or designate are representatives of UTD in the Texas Council of Faculty Senates. The Senate has a Faculty Liaison with Student Government. The Speaker is responsible for the liaison. The Speaker serves on the Safety and Security Council and the Handbook of Operating Procedures Committee. Members of this committee cannot out-vote the Speaker on matters of academic policy. The Senate bylaws have been amended to add two new positions to the Senate, two Vice-Speakers to assist the Speaker in his duties. The Vice Speakers are appointed by the Speaker.

The Secretary is responsible for communication within the Senate organization. This includes responsibility for the minutes. The Secretary is the chair of the Senate Election committee. The Secretary supervises the corresponding staff secretary. Like the Speaker, the Secretary acts as the Faculty’s representative at the Faculty Advisory Council and the Texas Council of Faculty Senates.

The Academic Council is the Agenda Committee for the Senate; it is NOT an executive committee. The Council does not make decisions in place of the Senate. The Senate is the policy making body. The Council is representative of the Senate members. The members serve as back up for the Speakers and/or Secretary if needed at FAC or on some committees. They appoint the Committee on Committees. They will vote on some replacements for Committee appointments when Senate approval is not required.

4. Votes on officers:
According to the Senate Bylaws, the Speaker and Secretary are elected separately from the Council members. Speaker Redman noted per the bylaws the Speaker’s term is two years, and the current term will not end until May 31, 2016. No vote for Speaker is necessary until that time. Speaker Redman reappointed Murray Leaf and Richard Scotch as Vice Speakers.

Speaker Redman called for nomination for Secretary of Faculty Senate. Richard Scotch nominated David Cordell. David Cordell accepted the nomination. Speaker Redman requested further nominations. There were no other nominations. Nominations were closed. Richard moved to elect David Cordell by acclamation. David Cordell was re-elected by acclamation.

Speaker Redman opened the floor to nominations for Academic Council.

5. Priorities for 2015-16:
The agenda packet included a review of priorities that were set by Caucus in 2014. After discussion within the Caucus, additional items for 2015-16 include the following:

- Revive the review of faculty salary conversion and inversion since the previous study has not been addressed. Possibly perform an additional study.
- Address “family and child” issues on campus, including updating the ‘Children on Campus’ policy, and adding changing tables in all bathrooms, male and female.
- Continue addressing Intellectual Property concerns.
- Address space issues, including the needs of classrooms, labs, and housing.
- Increase cross school curriculum cooperation.
- Research the possibility of credit union, similar to the one at UT Austin.
- Review of individual school acceptance requirements.
- Review of the campus safety and security.
- Encourage a greater faculty role in the governance of the university, specifically more input in the selection of deans. Faculty on search committees should be filled from the Faculty Senate.
- Continue to address non-tenure system faculty contract issues.

6. **Summer meeting Schedule:**
   There will not be a June or July Senate meeting. The Council will meet. The regular meeting schedule will resume on August 5, 2015.

7. **Announcement of New Academic Council:**
   Gail Breen, Matt Brown, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Liz Salter, Eric Farrar, Greg Dess and Tres Thompson were elected to the 2015-2016 Academic Council.

There being no further business, Speaker Redman adjourned the meeting at 1:50 pm.

APPROVED: ___________________________   DATE: _____________

Tim Redman
Speaker of the Academic Senate
Per the June 2008 minutes, the recommended was to create our 20 member pool would be:

*Twenty members of the pool are to be selected by the Academic Senate via open nominations and a secret ballot during its last meeting of each academic year. Twenty additional members are to be appointed by the President to the pool by June of each year. The names of the faculty members selected for the pool (both those chosen by the Academic Senate and the President) will be published in the Academic Senate's June minutes.*

**Listing of Pool members from the June 2008 minutes.**

1. Herve Abdi (BBS)
2. Poras Balsara (E)
3. Duane Buhrmester (BBS)
4. Lloyd Dumas (S)
5. David Edmunds (A)
6. Euel Elliott (S)
7. Andras Farago (E)
8. Donald Gray (N)—Professor Emmeritus
9. Robert Marsh (N)
10. George McMechan (N)
11. Simeon Ntafos (E)
12. Karen Prager (G)
13. Stephen Rabe (A)
14. Suresh Radhakrishnan (M)
15. Ram Rao (M) – Founders Professor
16. Suresh Sethi (M)
17. Dean Sherry (N)
18. Marianne Stewart (S)
19. Hal Sudborough (E)
20. Emily Tobey (BBS)
1. Title

Termination of a Faculty Member

2. Rule and Regulation

Sec. 1 Termination for Good Cause. Termination by an institution of the employment of a faculty member who has been granted tenure and of all other faculty members before the expiration of the stated period of appointment, except as is otherwise provided in Rule 31007, Section 5, and Texas Education Code Section 51.943, or by resignation or retirement, will be only for good cause shown. Faculty member, as used in this Section, includes a professional librarian with an academic title. In each case the issue of good cause will be determined according to the equitable procedures provided in this Section.

Sec. 2 Review of Allegation. The president of the institution (the president) shall assure that all allegations against a faculty member that involve the potential for termination are reviewed under the direction of the chief academic officer unless another officer is designated by the president. The faculty member who is the subject of the allegations shall be given an opportunity to be interviewed and shall have the right to present a grievance, in person or through a representative, to the chief academic officer on an issue or subject related to the allegations under review. The chief academic officer or another individual designated by the president if the allegations pertain to the chief academic officer shall take the grievance, if any, into consideration prior to making a determination whether the allegations are supported by evidence that justifies the initiation of termination procedures. Upon making that determination, the chief academic officer or other appropriate designee will recommend to the president whether to proceed with charges for termination. Failure to present a grievance to the chief academic officer or other appropriate designee prior to his or her recommendation shall not preclude a faculty member from presenting an issue or subject to the special hearing tribunal in defense of charges for termination that may result from the review. A tenured faculty member who is recommended for termination on the basis of periodic evaluation must be given the opportunity for referral of the matter to nonbinding alternative dispute resolution, as required by Texas Education Code Section 51.942 and in compliance with applicable policies and procedures for alternative dispute resolution within The
University of Texas System or any of the institutions, prior to referral of the charges to a hearing tribunal under Section 4 of this Rule.

Sec. 3 Response to Allegation. If the president determines that the allegations are supported by evidence that justifies the initiation of termination procedures, the president will meet with the faculty member, explain the allegations and supporting evidence, and give the faculty member a reasonable amount of time, as determined by the president, to respond either orally or in writing. In cases of incompetency or gross immorality where the facts are admitted, or in cases of felony conviction, the hearing procedures of Section 4 of this Rule shall not apply, and dismissal by the president will follow.

Sec. 4 Hearings Tribunal. In cases where other offenses are charged, and in all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused faculty member will be informed in writing of the charges. If the president determines that the nature of the charges and the evidence are such that it is in the best interest of the institution, the accused faculty member may be suspended with pay pending the completion of the hearing and a final decision. A special hearing tribunal of at least three faculty members will hear the charges. The academic rank of each member of the tribunal must be at least equal to that of the accused faculty member. The accused faculty member will be notified of the names of the faculty members selected for the tribunal and of the date, time, and place for the hearing. Such notification shall be made at least eight workdays prior to the hearing. The hearing tribunal members are appointed by the president from a standing panel (pool) of members of the faculty. At least 50% of the panel members from which the hearing tribunal members are appointed shall be selected by a procedure established by the faculty governance organization, an existing faculty committee with oversight for university-wide faculty committee selection. The president shall appoint the remaining members of the panel. A minimum of one member of a hearing tribunal appointed by a president is to be from among panel members selected by the faculty input, existent faculty committee, or faculty governance procedure. The president may request counsel from the System Administration’s Office of General Counsel to advise the hearing tribunal.

4.1 Right to Cross-examine. In every such hearing the accused faculty member will have the right to appear in
person and by counsel of the accused's selection and to confront and cross-examine witnesses who may appear. If counsel represents the accused faculty member, the institution is entitled to be represented by counsel from System Administration’s Office of General Counsel.

4.2 Right to Testify. The accused faculty member shall have the right to testify, but may not be required to do so. He or she may introduce in his or her behalf all evidence, written or oral, which may be relevant and material to the charges.

4.3 Record of Proceeding. A stenographic or electronic record of the proceedings will be taken and filed with the Board of Regents, and such record shall be made accessible to the accused.

4.4 Burden to Prove Good Cause. A representative of the institution may appear before the hearing tribunal to present witnesses and evidence in support of the charge against such faculty member, and such institutional representatives shall have the right to cross-examine the accused faculty member (if the faculty member testifies) and the witnesses offered in behalf of the faculty member. The institution has the burden to prove good cause for termination by the greater weight of the credible evidence.

4.5 Make-up of Hearing Tribunal. The hearing tribunal shall not include any accuser of the faculty member. If the accused faculty member is not satisfied with the fairness or objectivity of any member or members of the hearing tribunal, the faculty member may challenge the alleged lack of fairness or objectivity, but any such challenge must be made in writing to the hearing tribunal at least three workdays prior to the date for the hearing. The accused faculty member shall have no right to disqualify any member or members from serving on the tribunal. It shall be up to each challenged member to determine whether he or she can serve with fairness and objectivity in the matter, and if any challenged member should voluntarily disqualify himself or herself, the president shall appoint a substitute member of the tribunal from the panel described in Section 4 of this Rule.
4.6 Findings and Recommendations. The hearing tribunal, by a majority of the total membership, will make written findings on the material facts and will make a recommendation of the continuance or termination of the accused faculty member. The hearing tribunal, by a majority of its total membership, may make any supplementary suggestions it deems proper concerning the disposal of the case. The original of such findings and the recommendation, with any supplementary suggestions, shall be delivered to the president and a copy to the accused. If minority findings, recommendations, or suggestions are made, they shall be similarly treated. The original transcript of the testimony and the exhibits shall also be forwarded to the president.

4.7 President’s Report. Within fourteen (14) workdays after receipt of the findings and recommendations of the hearing tribunal, the president shall make one of the following decisions based solely on the evidence of record in the proceedings and report that decision in writing to the accused faculty member:

(a) The president may decide to dismiss the matter or impose sanctions short of termination. In this case, the president’s decision is final and the Board of Regents will not review the matter.

(b) If the allegations are supported by evidence that constitutes good cause for termination, the president may decide to recommend termination to the Board of Regents. If so, the president shall forward the findings and recommendations of the hearing tribunal, the original transcript of the testimony and the exhibits to the Board of Regents for its review, along with the president’s report. If the president’s recommendation is not the same as the majority recommendation of the hearing tribunal, the president shall state the reasons for the president’s decision to recommend termination in his or her report. The accused faculty member may, within seven workdays after receiving the president’s report, submit a written response to the Board of Regents. The response must be based solely on the evidence of record in the proceeding.
Sec. 5 Board Review. The Board of Regents, by a majority of the total membership, will approve, reject, or amend such findings, recommendations, and suggestions, if any, or will recommit the report to the same tribunal for hearing additional evidence and reconsidering its findings, recommendations, and suggestions, if any. Reasons for approval, rejection, or amendment of such findings, recommendations, or suggestions will be stated in writing and communicated to the accused.

Sec. 6 Reasons for Termination Not Required. Full-time faculty members who are notified in accordance with Rule 31002, Section 1 of the Regents’ Rules and Regulations, concerning notice of nonrenewal, that they will not be reappointed or who are notified in accordance with Rule 31007, Section 5 and Rule 31002, Sections 1 and 2 that the subsequent academic year will be the terminal year of appointment shall not be entitled to a statement of the reasons upon which the decision for such action is based. Such a decision shall only be subject to review pursuant to the following procedures:

6.1 Grievance. The affected faculty member may present a grievance, in person or through a representative, to the chief academic officer or another individual designated by the president if the allegations pertain to a chief academic officer on an issue or subject related to the nonrenewal decision. The chief academic officer shall meet with the faculty member. Unless a review by a hearing tribunal is requested and granted, pursuant to Section 6.2 below, the nonrenewal decision shall not be subject to further review.

6.2 Hearing Tribunal to Hear Grievance. A review by a hearing tribunal shall be granted only in those cases where the affected faculty member submits a written request for review by a hearing tribunal to the president and describes in detail the facts relied upon to prove that the decision was made for reasons that are unlawful under the Constitution or laws of Texas or the United States. If the president determines that the alleged facts, if proven by credible evidence, support a conclusion that the decision was made for unlawful reasons, such allegations shall be heard by a hearing tribunal under the procedures in Section 4 of this Rule as in the case of dismissal for cause, with the following exceptions:
(a) The burden of proof is upon the affected faculty member to establish by the greater weight of the credible evidence that the decision in question was made for reasons that are unlawful under the Constitution or laws of Texas or the United States.

(b) The administration of the institution need not state the reasons for the questioned decision or offer evidence in support thereof unless the affected faculty member presents credible evidence that, if unchallenged, proves the decision was made for unlawful reasons.

(c) The hearing tribunal shall make written findings and recommendations based on the evidence presented at the hearing and shall forward such findings and recommendations with the transcript and exhibits from the hearing to the president.

(d) The president may approve, reject, or amend the recommendations of the hearing tribunal or may reach different conclusions based upon the record of the hearing. The decision of the president shall be final.

3. Definitions

Faculty Member – a faculty member is any individual holding an academic title listed in Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 31001, Section 2, with the exception of Assistant Instructors, Teaching Associates, and Teaching Assistants.

4. Relevant Federal and State Statutes

*Texas Education Code Section 51.942* – Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

*Texas Education Code Section 51.943* – Renewal of Faculty Employment Contracts

5. Relevant System Policies, Procedures, and Forms

Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 31001 – Faculty Appointments and Titles
6. **Who Should Know**

   Administrators
   Faculty

7. **System Administration Office(s) Responsible for Rule**

   Office of Academic Affairs
   Office of Health Affairs

8. **Dates Approved or Amended**

   Editorial amendment to Section 3 made August 4, 2014
   Editorial amendment to Section 6.2 made October 2, 2009
   February 12, 2009
   Editorial amendment to Sec. 1 made April 8, 2008
   December 10, 2004

9. **Contact Information**

   Questions or comments regarding this Rule should be directed to:

   - bor@utsystem.edu
2015-2016

Committee Name: Academic Tribunal Pool

Charge: Policy Regents Rules 31008

Special Requirements:
- 20 members in pool
- Representatives from each of the schools

Members Whose Terms are Continuing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replacements Needed</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Policy Statement

Preamble

The ideal of a research university is a university in which all those who convey knowledge are also engaged in producing it. Further, those engaged in producing knowledge require and should have, as a necessary condition in support of their freedom of inquiry, the protection of tenure. The faculty of The University of Texas at Dallas has been dedicated to this concept since the University began and this dedication does not waver. Other things being equal, as many of the faculty as practicable should hold tenure-system appointments. However, in practice a substantial component of instructional responsibilities will continue to be met with faculty who are not part of the tenure system. The term “nontenure-system faculty” means faculty with classroom or class-laboratory responsibilities who are hired for a fixed term of service and who are not subject to the various rules and regulations pertaining to tenure-system faculty. Nontenure-system faculty titles may include but are not limited to the following: Senior Lecturer 1, Senior Lecturer 2, Senior Lecturer 3, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Full Professor (Clinical Professor).

It is the policy of The University of Texas at Dallas that nontenure-system faculty should be treated as true colleagues in a collective academic enterprise. Nontenure-system faculty should have the same kinds of working conditions and expectations of fair and considerate treatment as tenure-system faculty and should be able to work with tenure-system faculty as genuine colleagues. Accordingly, the purpose of this policy is to require the establishment of processes for nontenure-system faculty hiring and evaluation. This policy is to be implemented in the several schools as the responsibility of the School Deans and Faculty. Promotion recommendations regarding nontenure-system faculty are not to be reviewed by the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel. The Academic Senate will exercise general oversight with respect to the academic policy referenced herein. The Executive Vice President and Provost will exercise general oversight with respect to letters of appointment and compliance with Regents’ Rules and Regulations.

Standards of Evaluation

1. Peer-Reviewed Research and Academic Achievement. Except for Research Professors, peer-reviewed research and academic achievement are not required of nontenure-system faculty as part of their normal assigned responsibilities at U. T. Dallas. However, nontenure-system faculty have the same standing to seek funding for, and to pursue,
funded research as other faculty. If peer-reviewed research and academic achievements, such as maintaining an academic qualification required by accreditation boards, are required as a condition of employment, this requirement must be specified and should be included in the evaluation. When not required, they may still be noted in peer reviews. Evidence of research and academic achievements can include publication in peer-reviewed journals; monographs which contribute to advancing knowledge or its utilization in the resolution of societal problems; development of widely adopted clinical or educational techniques which advance the quality of life; presentations at professional gatherings; literary publications, performances, and visual and other artistic contributions in regional and national exhibitions.

2. Teaching. It is important that evaluating committees seek a variety of ways to evaluate an individual's teaching. Teaching effectiveness is not to be measured solely in terms of teaching in organized courses. It also includes the ability and willingness to develop new courses and to teach a wide variety of courses. Evaluating committees should consider the importance of such courses to the instructional programs, and the development of innovative teaching methods. Teaching also extends to curriculum development and student advisement.

3. University Service and Citizenship. University citizenship is that amorphous blend of willingness to participate actively as citizens in the life of the University and as collegial representatives of the University in extramural settings. Service, in contrast to administration, includes membership in governance bodies and committees, program planning and development, public service, and special assignments from Deans or the University Administration.

4. Administration. Nontenure-system faculty may be assigned duties that require academic knowledge and experience, but are also heavily administrative, such as Associate Deans for Undergraduate Education, graduate student advisor, and graduate clinical instructor or coordinator. Aspects of this type of activity that indicate good or poor performance include overall work-load or case-load, the overall levels of satisfaction and good order in the program, letters or other expressions of satisfaction or dissatisfaction from students, colleagues, or immediate supervisors, and the development of innovative methods or program designs.

**Procedures**

1. Inclusion in bylaws. Procedures for hiring and peer review of nontenure-system faculty should be incorporated in the bylaws of the School.

2. Rank and recognition of employment history. Nontenure-system faculty titles should be given in accordance with Regents’ *Rules and Regulations* Rule 31001, Part 2, Sec. 2.2. Criteria for these differentiations might include relevant degrees, teaching experience, work experience, research experience, and creative contributions. A change in title for a nontenure-system faculty member whose contract is being renewed should be based on a record of excellence relevant to their assignments or reflect distinguished attainments relevant to their assignments.

3. Hiring. For hiring nontenure-system faculty, each School or Department should institute a committee or designate an already existent committee as a search committee. Whenever
possible, at least one nontenure-system faculty member at the highest rank should be included on the search committee. The search committee will recommend a candidate and an initial hiring rank to the Dean and/or Program Head. Whenever possible, program faculty will be given the opportunity to comment on this recommendation prior to any formal job offer.

4. Teaching Evaluation. Each School should establish or designate a committee to review and provide advice on the teaching performance of nontenure-system faculty. This evaluation may be assigned to the School Committee on Effective Teaching. For this purpose, the committee should include an appropriate number of nontenure-system faculty members, depending on their number in the School. A School Committee on Effective Teaching is mandated by UTDPP1006.

5. Orientation programs and advice. Each School or Department with nontenure-system faculty should develop orientation programs and materials for them and assure that there are procedures and processes to provide ongoing advice. This program should involve both more experienced nontenure-system faculty and tenure-system faculty. If there is a mentoring program, nontenure-system faculty should be included as appropriate given their work assignments and numbers in the School. Each School or Department should clearly designate a faculty member or faculty body to consult with each nontenure-system faculty member in regard to his or her academic responsibilities. Nontenure-system faculty should also consult regularly with their School Deans and Associate Deans.

6. Periodic Review. All faculty at U. T. Dallas are subject to an annual administrative review. For annual administrative reviews, nontenure-system faculty will submit annual review documents in the same manner and at the same times as tenure-system faculty.

7. Contract Term and Renewal. Under Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule Number 31001, the longest contract available to nontenure-system faculty is three academic years (renewable). Initial appointments are typically one year but can be as long as three years in situations deemed appropriate by the Dean and Provost. If a position is expected to be short term, it should be clearly identified as a visiting or a lecturer position. One year contracts and all initial contracts are deemed to be probationary. Subsequent contracts shall be offered on or before May 15, if possible. At the discretion of the Dean and the Provost, subsequent contracts may be offered for one, two, or three years. Three year annually renewable contracts should typically be awarded to faculty whose work clearly exceeds expectations.

8. Promotion Process Each School or Department with nontenure-system faculty should develop a process for review of nontenure-system faculty involving tenure-system faculty and above-rank nontenure-system faculty as appropriate in the School or Department. These reviews should strive for an even consideration of strengths and weaknesses and should attempt to commend performance that is already outstanding as well as give constructive advice where performance can be improved. The weighting of the standards of evaluation should reflect the employment contract. The interpretation of the standards of evaluation should reflect the interpretations of the School or Department bylaws. The reviews may result in recommendations of non-renewal, renewal in rank, renewal at a higher rank, renewal with recognition of excellence or distinction, or changes in assignment. Two of the more common promotional lines for nontenure-system faculty are Senior Lecturer 1 or Clinical Assistant, to Senior Lecturer 2 or Clinical Associate, to Senior Lecturer 3 or Clinical Full.
9. **Deadline.** All reviews should be complete by March 30 each year.

## Review of Files

A nontenure-system faculty member who will be reviewed by a faculty body under this policy is responsible for preparing the file that will constitute the essential basis for this review. The Review File as submitted by the nontenure-system faculty member to the School Dean, Department Chair, or Program Head will include a complete professional curriculum vitae from the nontenure-system faculty member which covers the areas of assigned responsibility and any additional areas the candidate wishes to have considered. For teaching evaluation, information should include statistical summaries of the teaching evaluation form for each course taught during the previous six regular, long semesters (including transcripts of or original comments by students) as well as information on course content and process, such as copies of syllabi and exams. Upon receipt of the basic Review File from the nontenure-system faculty member, the Office of the Dean will inventory the contents and insert a copy of the inventory in the file. The designated reviewing committee has the authority and responsibility to add material to the basic Review File, these additions being clearly identified components of the Review File. Possible additions will include items such as the letters from external and internal evaluators for the committee's review of teaching performance, and the committee's recommendations. All these additions will be entered on the file inventory sheet.

## Right to View Files

If a nontenure-system faculty member under review requests to see his or her file during the review process, the Dean, Department Chair, or Program Head shall make the file available within three working days.

## Opportunities

Nothing in this policy or in the bylaws of a School or Department should be construed as precluding nontenure-system faculty members from applying and being considered for tenure-system positions in the manner established for those positions.

## Grievance and Appeal

Faculty grievance procedures which apply to tenure-system and nontenure-system faculty are specified at [http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1050](http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1050).
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Policy Statement

Preamble

The ideal of a research university is a university in which all those who convey knowledge are also engaged in producing it. Further, those engaged in producing knowledge require and should have, as a necessary condition in support of their freedom of inquiry, the protection of tenure. The faculty of The University of Texas at Dallas has been dedicated to this concept since the University began and this dedication does not waver. Other things being equal, as many of the faculty as practicable should hold tenure-system appointments. However, in practice a substantial component of instructional responsibilities will continue to be met with faculty who are not part of the tenure system. The term “nontenure-system faculty” means faculty with classroom or class-laboratory responsibilities who are hired for a fixed term of service and who are not subject to the various rules and regulations pertaining to tenure-system faculty. Nontenure-system faculty titles may include but are not limited to the following: Senior Lecturer 1, Senior Lecturer 2, Senior Lecturer 3, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Full Professor (Clinical Professor).

It is the policy of The University of Texas at Dallas that nontenure-system faculty should be treated as true colleagues in a collective academic enterprise. Nontenure-system faculty should have the same kinds of working conditions and expectations of fair and considerate treatment as tenure-system faculty and should be able to work with tenure-system faculty as genuine colleagues. Accordingly, the purpose of this policy is to require the establishment of processes for nontenure-system faculty hiring and evaluation. This policy is to be implemented in the several schools as the responsibility of the School Deans and Faculty. Promotion recommendations regarding nontenure-system faculty are not to be reviewed by the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel. The Academic Senate will exercise general oversight with respect to the academic policy referenced herein. The Executive Vice President and Provost will exercise general oversight with respect to letters of appointment and compliance with Regents’ Rules and Regulations.

Standards of Evaluation

1. Peer-Reviewed Research and Academic Achievement. Except for Research Professors, peer-reviewed research and academic achievement are not required of nontenure-system faculty as part of their normal assigned responsibilities at U. T. Dallas. However, nontenure-system faculty have the same standing to seek funding for, and to pursue,
funded research as other faculty. If peer-reviewed research and academic achievements, such as maintaining an academic qualification required by accreditation boards, are required as a condition of employment, this requirement must be specified in writing and should be included in the evaluation. When not required, they may still be noted in peer reviews. Evidence of research and academic achievements can include publication in peer-reviewed journals; monographs which contribute to advancing knowledge or its utilization in the resolution of societal problems; development of widely adopted clinical or educational techniques which advance the quality of life; presentations at professional gatherings; literary publications, performances, and visual and other artistic contributions in regional and national exhibitions.

2. Teaching. It is important that evaluating committees seek a variety of ways to evaluate an individual's teaching. Teaching effectiveness is not to be measured solely in terms of teaching in organized courses. It also includes the ability and willingness to develop new courses and to teach a wide variety of courses. Evaluating committees should consider the importance of such courses to the instructional programs, the willingness to teach evening or Saturday courses, and the development of innovative teaching methods. Teaching also extends to curriculum development and student advisement.

3. University Service and Citizenship. University citizenship is that amorphous blend of willingness to participate actively as citizens in the life of the University and as collegial representatives of the University in extramural settings. Service, in contrast to administration, includes membership in governance bodies and committees, program planning and development, public service, and special assignments from Deans or the University Administration.

4. Administration. Nontenure-system faculty may be assigned duties that require academic knowledge and experience, but are also heavily administrative, such as Associate Deans for Undergraduate Education, graduate student advisor, and graduate clinical instructor or coordinator. Aspects of this type of activity that indicate good or poor performance include overall work-load or case-load, the overall levels of satisfaction and good order in the program, letters or other expressions of satisfaction or dissatisfaction from students, colleagues, or immediate supervisors, and the development of innovative methods or program designs.

 Procedures

1. Inclusion in bylaws. Procedures for hiring and peer review of nontenure-system faculty should be incorporated in the bylaws of the School.

2. Rank and recognition of employment history. Nontenure-system faculty titles should be given in accordance with Regents' Rules and Regulations Rule 31001, Part 2, Sec. 2.2. Criteria for these differentiations might include relevant degrees, teaching experience, work experience, research experience, and creative contributions. A change in title for a nontenure-system faculty member whose contract is being renewed should be based on a record of excellence relevant to their assignments or reflect distinguished attainments relevant to their assignments.
1. Hiring. For hiring nontenure-system faculty, each School or Department should institute a committee or designate an already existent committee as a search committee. Whenever possible, at least one nontenure-system faculty member at the highest rank should be included on the search committee. The search committee will recommend a candidate and an initial hiring rank to the Dean and/or Program Head. Whenever possible, program faculty will be given the opportunity to comment on this recommendation prior to any formal job offer.

3.2. Faculty voting on appointments. Faculty recommendations for initial appointments or promotions to a higher rank should be approved by a vote of the tenured faculty of the concerned School or Department, and those nontenure-system faculty of higher rank if provided for in the bylaws of the School. Faculty recommendations for initial appointments or promotions to the third rank should be approved by a vote only of the Full Professors of the concerned School or Department, together with those of the highest rank if provided for in the bylaws of the School. Votes should be taken by secret ballot of the faculty eligible to vote.

5. Teaching Evaluation. Each School should establish or designate a committee to review and provide advice on the teaching performance of nontenure-system faculty. This evaluation may be assigned to the School Committee on Effective Teaching. For this purpose, the committee should include an appropriate number of nontenure-system faculty members, depending on their number in the School. A School Committee on Effective Teaching is mandated by POLICY MEMORANDUM 90-III.21-70 UTDPP1006, which requires in part:

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

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

8. Procedures for periodic collection of reliable and verifiable information related to teaching performance including periodic classroom visits by designated faculty to supplement information taken from sources such as course syllabi and student course evaluations.

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

10.4. Orientation programs and advice. Each School or Department with nontenure-system faculty should develop orientation programs and materials for them and assure that there are procedures and processes to provide ongoing advice. This program should involve both more experienced nontenure-system faculty and tenure-system faculty. If there is a mentoring program, nontenure-system faculty should be included as appropriate given their work assignments and numbers in the School. Each School or Department should clearly designate a faculty member or faculty body to consult with each nontenure-system faculty member in regard to his or her academic responsibilities. Nontenure-system faculty should also consult regularly with their School Deans and Associate Deans.
Periodic Review. Under Regents’ Rules and Regulations, the longest contract available to nontenure-system faculty is three academic years (renewable). The practice at U.T. Dallas is to issue annual contracts. All faculty at U.T. Dallas are subject to an annual administrative review. For annual administrative reviews, nontenure-system faculty will submit annual review documents in the same manner and at the same times as tenure-system faculty.

Contract Term and Renewal. Review Process. Under Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule Number 31001, the longest contract available to nontenure-system faculty is three academic years (renewable). Initial appointments are typically one year but can be as long as three years in situations deemed appropriate by the Dean and Provost. Individuals hired with Senior Lecturer or Clinical titles are presumed to be hired as faculty whose contracts will be renewed as long as their performance meets expectations and there are no programmatic or financial issues. If a position is expected to be short term, it should be clearly identified as a visiting or a lecturer position. One year contracts and all initial contracts are deemed to be probationary. For the initial one-year contract case, assuming 1) no programmatic or financial issues and 2) an initial annual review with a ranking of “meets expectations” or better, a second one-year contract shall be offered to the nontenure-system faculty member. Assuming performance which meets or exceeds expectations and with no programmatic or financial issues affecting the position, subsequent contracts shall be offered on or before May 15, if possible. At the discretion of the Dean and the Provost, subsequent contracts may be offered for one, two, or three years. Three year annually renewable contracts should typically be awarded to faculty whose work clearly exceeds expectations of the respective years as follows:

At the end of the second year, a two year contract (or in the case of contracts with an initial three years, a three year contract) may be offered at the discretion of the Dean and the Provost. Otherwise, the individual will be offered a one year annually renewable contract.

At the end of the third year and in subsequent years, a two year, annually renewable contract will be offered unless, at the discretion of the Dean and the Provost, an annually renewable three year contract is offered. Anyone with a three year contract shall continue to be offered annually renewable three year contracts. Three year annually renewable contracts should typically be awarded to faculty whose work clearly exceeds expectations.

Thus assuming a nontenure system faculty member meets expectations and there are no programmatic or financial issues, that nontenure-system faculty member will have completed three years of service before receiving a two or three year contract. Nontenure system faculty members whose initial appointment is for three years will immediately be in a three-year annually renewal contract cycle.

Multi-year contracts anticipate performance that meets or exceeds expectations. If performance in the first year of a multiyear contract does not meet expectations, the dean may dismiss the individual. If performance in subsequent years does not meet expectations, the faculty member may be informed of the nonrenewal of their contract, but will be retained for an additional year. If performance improves to the level of meeting or exceeding expectations, the Dean may restore the multi-year contract previously in effect, or may defer the restoration of a multi-year contract until the end of a subsequent probationary year.
If a significant drop in enrollment or other systematic financial issue necessitates the non-renewal of a contract, a clear written explanation must be provided to the nontenure-system faculty member. If the situation improves while the nontenure-system faculty member is still employed, and if the faculty member met expectations in his/her most recent performance appraisal, that person’s contract shall revert to the contract term that would have been in place without the financial issue. If a contract that is not renewed for financial reasons results in termination of employment, and if the financial situation improves resulting in the search for an equivalent position within a two year period, the terminated individual shall be offered the position as long as he/she met expectations in the most recent appraisal.

To reinstitute the policy of offering three-year contracts to non-tenure system faculty whose performance meets expectations, current contracts should reflect past dates of initial employment at the University. For example, an individual in the third year of employment whose service meets expectations should be offered a two-year contract.

6. Promotion Process Each School or Department with nontenure-system faculty should develop a process for review of nontenure-system faculty involving tenure-system faculty and above-rank nontenure-system faculty as appropriate in the School or Department. These reviews should strive for an even consideration of strengths and weaknesses and should attempt to commend performance that is already outstanding as well as give constructive advice where performance can be improved. The weighting of the standards of evaluation should reflect the employment contract. The interpretation of the standards of evaluation should reflect the interpretations of the School or Department bylaws. The reviews may result in recommendations of non-renewal, renewal in rank, renewal at a higher rank, renewal with recognition of excellence or distinction, or changes in assignment. Two of the more common promotional lines for nontenure-system faculty are Senior Lecturer 1 or Clinical Assistant, to Senior Lecturer 2 or Clinical Associate, to Senior Lecturer 3 or Clinical Full. If the committee recommends promotion, the recommendation should be accompanied by a vote of the faculty of the unit as outlined in Section 4 above.

Deadline. All reviews should be complete by March 30 each year.

Review of Files

A nontenure-system faculty member who will be reviewed by a faculty body under this policy is responsible for preparing the file that will constitute the essential basis for this review. The Review File as submitted by the nontenure-system faculty member to the School Dean, Department Chair, or Program Head will include a complete professional curriculum vitae from the nontenure-system faculty member which covers the areas of assigned responsibility and any additional areas the candidate wishes to have considered. For teaching evaluation, information should include statistical summaries of the teaching evaluation form for each course taught during the previous six regular, long semesters (including transcripts of or original comments by students) as well as information on course content and process, such as copies of syllabi and exams. Upon receipt of the basic Review File from the nontenure-system faculty member, the Office of the Dean will inventory the contents and insert a copy of the inventory in the file. The...
designated reviewing committee has the authority and responsibility to add material to the basic Review File, these additions being clearly identified components of the Review File. Possible additions will include items such as the letters from external and internal evaluators for the committee's review of teaching performance, and the committee's recommendations. All these additions will be entered on the file inventory sheet.

**Right to View Files**

If a nontenure-system faculty member under review requests to see his or her file during the review process, the Dean, Department Chair, or Program Head shall make the file available within three working days.

**Opportunities**

Nothing in this policy or in the bylaws of a School or Department should be construed as precluding nontenure-system faculty members from applying and being considered for tenure-system positions in the manner established for those positions.

**Grievance and Appeal**

Faculty grievance procedures which apply to tenure-system and nontenure-system faculty are specified at http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1050.

Procedures for appeal of a decision on reappointment or promotion to a nontenure-system position are in Rule 30602 of the Regents’ Rules and Regulations at http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules/30000Series/30602.pdf.

**Policy History**

- Issued: June 9, 2008

**Policy Links**

- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1062
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1062
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1062
Bravo Brad, Bravo.
You speak truth to power.

Your Email should be published in the Chronicle of Higher Education, the New York Times, the New Yorker, New York Review of Books, etc.

I suspect when we calculate your worthy efforts to teach UTD students and count the hours you put in, you earn less than the miserly Texas minimum wage of $7.25 an hour and way below the $15 an hour the states of the Pacific Northwest (where I live) hope to establish.

We often judge enterprises like Wal-Mart and McDonald's as notorious abusers of employees. In fact, universities throughout the United States treat faculty and staff in far worse fashion.

Long ago, I had a candid talk with my daughter, who wanted to pursue a Ph.D., about the increasingly appalling work conditions that characterize university life. She would have made a great historian. But I am so thankful she chose to go to law school.

A couple of points I would add to your excellent analysis. As Dr. Sean Cotter has eloquently and correctly observed, part of the drive to limit tenure track appointments is a matter of domination and control. The more part-time labor the greater the power of university presidents, provosts, deans, associate deans, etc. You, Brad, have few rights and can be dismissed with impunity.

In terms of salaries, the real issue is the dramatic rise in salaries of academic administrators (at all levels) throughout the United States, the UT System and UTD. It is akin to the obscene salaries that corporate CEO's and Hedge Fund managers (and sports stars) garner. TT faculty have been limited to 1-2% raises per year over the past decade. Such belt-tightening has never been applied to administrators. If you want to really raise your blood pressure, Brad, check out the salaries of administrators (at all levels) in the UT System and UTD. It would be nice if faculty meetings addressed serious and weighty issues. Don't hold your breath, Brad. It has rarely happened in the 38 years I have been at UTD.

I am "semi-retired" now. But when I return to campus in January, I would like to meet you Brad.

Best,
Stephen G. Rabe
Ashbel Smith Chair in History
To: Reynolds, R. Clay; Lane, Shelley; 'ah.fac@utdallas.edu'; 'Ah.lec@utdallas.edu'
Subject: RE: [ah.fac] Emergency Faculty Meeting

Dear Colleagues,

I'm not at all certain if I was included in this email distribution purposefully or by mistake. As an adjunct in A&H I am typically excluded from common university business such as attending faculty meetings, sponsoring student organizations, and overseeing student independent studies. This despite the fact that adjuncts in A&H make up the majority of the teaching faculty. But since I was included in this email distribution I will take the opportunity to comment, and I greatly appreciate your taking the time to read.

I cannot attend the faculty meeting tomorrow because I will be working one of the three jobs I currently have on my plate. Multiple jobs is a simple reality for many if not most part time faculty because their pay for teaching is poverty-level. Hard numbers: I am about to begin my 3rd year as an adjunct Theatre professor at UTD, and despite a persistent push on my part to remedy the practice of paying professors poverty wages, I just received my Fall offer letter which includes the same wage I was paid last semester: $3500 per class. And I fought hard to get that pay raised from $2887 per class. I teach two classes per semester (I am not allowed to teach more because doing so would violate state and federal PT/FT classification rules), so over nine months I’m paid $14,000. My guess is that most A&H adjuncts are still at the lower level of pay, which equals $11,548 over nine months for teaching 4 classes. Compare this to the median A&H FT professor teaching 5 classes and being paid $65,000 plus full benefits. (Of note: up until last semester adjunct faculty were excluded from any benefits. Now if 2 classes are taught in a semester, an adjunct is considered “50% or above” and qualifies for part time benefits; unfortunately the available benefits are prohibitively expensive, translating into an effective continued exclusion from benefits.)

Obviously this situation affects me and all adjuncts negatively; it is all but guaranteed to cause stress, anxiety, feelings of degradation, alienation, inadequacy, and low morale, indeed resentment. But the issue at hand is not my well-being, it is the student’s. To that end I have only one question: does anyone on this email distribution truly believe that poverty wage-paid professors who are stressed, degraded, alienated, and resentful represent the university's best attempt at ensuring consistent positive student outcomes?

According to the Texas Higher Education Accountability System<http://www.txhighereddata.org/Interactive/Accountability/>, 73.1% of lower division undergraduate classes at UTD were taught by non-tenure/tenure track professors in 2013, the last year of available data. Many of these are the very classes that shoulder the responsibility of preparing freshman and sophomore students for upper division and graduate coursework. And this is exactly where the university is failing its students. I strongly argue it is not a stretch to correlate poverty wage pay for adjuncts, who teach the majority of these lower division classes, with poor student outcomes.

Do other valid reasons exist to explain, for instance, the shockingly high percentage of undergraduate students who cannot write at an acceptable, let alone exceptional, academic level? Yes, many of which have been enumerated already. But I urge decision makers to avoid falling into the trap of treating symptoms while allowing causes to continue festering. For example, adding classes is fruitless if the professors teaching those classes cannot properly and fully dedicate their
energy to teaching due to temporal, financial, spiritual, and psychological constraints and stresses caused by their employment situation.

Please make addressing the reliance on poverty wage-paid adjuncts a priority in your deliberations on how best to improve student outcomes. As you likely know, this is a nationwide issue…UTD and the UT System can either lead on instituting change, or follow and risk being left behind.

And again, many thanks for your time.

Warm Regards,

Brad Hennigan
Adjunct Professor of Theatre
University of Texas at Dallas
Committee on Effective Teaching - UTDPP1024

Policy Charge: Effective Teaching

Policy Statement

The Committee on Effective Teaching is a Concurrent Committee of the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas. The Committee oversees and encourages the development of a wide range of tools and facilities to promote excellence in teaching across all disciplines and levels within the University. It will, on a continuing basis, refine the definition and measurement of excellence in teaching, and advise the University and Academic Senate of needs for and availability of new technology and training for teachers.

The competitions for all University level teaching awards will be managed by the Committee. It will forward its recommendations for award winners to the President.

The Committee will receive annual reports from each individual School Committee on Effective Teaching and will facilitate and evaluate the work of the School committees. The Committee will forward the individual School reports and its summary evaluation report annually to the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost).

The Committee will create and refine procedures for the training of and monitoring of the teaching effectiveness of graduate teaching assistants.

The Committee will receive complaints about and requests for improvements in the teaching environments on campus and pass on recommendations for improvements to the University administration.

The Committee will encourage and review the funding of projects in the use of new technology and new teaching methods, both on campus and by transmission to remote sites. It will also advise the University administration and Academic Senate on ways to ease the transition to "the high tech classroom."

As part of the general requirement to improve awareness of new ideas and new technologies, the Committee will occasionally invite renowned speakers to give seminars on campus.

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

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

The Committee is composed of voting members that include one faculty member from each school appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in UTDPP1088), two students, and one technical expert or librarian. The Graduate Dean, the Dean of Undergraduate Education and such Associate Deans for Undergraduate Education of the schools who have not been appointed as voting members serve as non-voting members, ex officio. The Provost serves as the Responsible University Official.

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

Policy History

Commented [MC1]: Graduate Dean was added per the request of the CoC on 7/30/15.
• Issued: May 1, 1994
• Revised: September 1, 1998
• Editorial Amendments: September 1, 2000
• Revised: December 15, 2000
• Editorial Amendments: November 22, 2002
• Editorial Amendments: June 29, 2006
• Revised: November 3, 2008
• Editorial Amendments: May 28, 2015

Policy Links
• Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1024
• Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1024
• Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1024
Committee on Learning Management Systems - UTDPP1028

Policy Charge

Learning Management Systems

Policy Statement

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

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

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

Annually, but no later than August 31, the Chair of the Committee will provide the Speaker of the Faculty with a written report for the Academic Senate of the Committee’s activities for the prior academic year.

The Committee is composed of eight members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty, (as defined in UTDPP1088), pursuant to the applicable procedures outlined in UTDPP1088, supra. The criteria for appointment shall be that they will be faculty who use WebCT and will represent a broad spectrum of disciplinary content and levels of instruction. Ideally, one member would be from each of the schools in the University. Up to twenty additional members, ex-officio, may be appointed upon nomination of the Responsible University Official from the offices of Educational Enhancement: Learning, Information Resources, the Registrar, Audit and Compliance, and the instructional designers in the School of Management. The Associate Provost for Educational Enhancement serves as the Responsible University Official.
The terms for appointed faculty members shall be staggered so that no more than one-half of the terms expire in any one year. Of the initial eight Committee members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty, four shall be appointed to one year terms and four shall be appointed for two year terms. Thereafter, unless specified otherwise in this charge, Committee members are appointed to two-year terms, and the Chair and Vice Chair are appointed annually. Members may be reappointed by the President for additional terms upon nomination of the Academic Council. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President, upon nomination of the Academic Council, shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

Policy History

Editorial Amendments: May 28, 2015

Policy Links
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The Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel is a standing, concurrent committee of the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas.

The Committee is charged with reviewing all recommendations from faculty ad hoc committees and School Deans regarding the initial hiring, promotion, and promotion to tenure of members of the faculty, assuring that high academic standards are maintained, that appropriate and uniform procedures were followed in the review process, and that the evidence supports the recommendations. The Committee is further charged with reviewing and assessing the standards of excellence for the various academic ranks and for tenure, making due allowance for the different traditions and requirements of the different disciplines.

The Committee receives recommendations from the faculty ad hoc committee following review of the file by the Dean of the School. The Committee is responsible for certifying that the evidence in the file substantiates the recommendation of the ad hoc committee. The Committee then forwards the file with its recommendations to the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost). Questions of general policy that arise from the Committee's deliberations are to be forwarded to the Academic Senate through the Academic Council. The Committee will report to the Senate through the Council indicating the issues and problems encountered in the review process.

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

Annually, but no later than August 31, the Chair of the Committee will provide the Speaker of the Faculty with a written report for the Academic Senate of the Committee’s activities for the prior academic year.

The Committee is composed of twelve tenured members, two from each school (with the exception of Interdisciplinary Studies), appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in UTDPP1088Title III, Chapter 21, Section I.B.1. of The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures), and preferably at the rank of Professor, except that no one holding an administrative appointment above the rank of Department Head shall be eligible to serve. Membership of
the Committee is drawn from the several Schools. Members, however, are members at large and are not representative of or advocates for a particular School. The Provost serves as Responsible University Official.

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

Policy History

Issued: September 4, 1978
Revised: November 12, 1979
Revised: October 15, 1993
Revised: September 1, 1998
Revised: November 13, 1998
Revised: August 24, 1999
Editorial Amendments: September 1, 2000
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Policy Links

Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1031
Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1031
Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1031
Committee on Student Scholarships - UTDPP1038

Policy Charge

Student Scholarships

Policy Statement

The Committee on Student Scholarships is a standing, concurrent committee of the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas.

The Committee reviews and makes recommendations concerning all University policies and procedures in regard to student scholarships. The Committee also serves as the selection committee for all scholarships that require a local selection committee not otherwise specified in the conditions of the program or bequest establishing the scholarship. In addition to any specific criteria governing awards of competitive scholarships to students, such as major field of study, the Committee, after giving primary consideration to the applicant’s scores on standardized tests and scholastic records, both as regards the type and nature of courses taken and the grades achieved in specific courses, may consider and give positive weight to such factors as the following in designating recipients:

- achievements in work experiences
- community service
- extracurricular activities; leadership
- surmounting obstacles to the further pursuit of higher education
- socioeconomic background
- educational level
- status as a first generation college student

The Dean of Undergraduate Education shall submit an annual report on the University’s Academic Excellence Scholarship Program to the Committee for review. Committee recommendations for changes and enhancements to the program are forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

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

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

The Committee is composed of eight appointed members selected from among the Associate Deans for Undergraduate Education or heads of graduate programs of the schools. In addition, the Dean of Undergraduate Education and the Dean of Graduate Studies serve as voting members, ex officio. The Director of the Office of Financial Aid, the Director of the Office of Institutional Scholarship Administration, the Director of Endowment Services and Compliance, and the Director of the Office of International Education serve as non-voting members, ex officio. The Associate Provost responsible for student affairs serves as the Responsible University Official.
Unless specified otherwise in this charge, Committee members are appointed to two-year terms, and the Chair and Vice Chair are appointed annually. The terms for appointed members shall be staggered so that no more than one-half of the terms expire in any one year. Members may be reappointed by the President for additional terms upon nomination of the Academic Council. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President, upon nomination of the Academic Council, shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.
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Committee Name: Advisory Committee on Research

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1033

2015 - 2016

Ex-Officio (with vote)
Dean of Natural Sciences & Mathematics
Dean of Behavioral & Brain Sciences
Dean of Engineering & Computer Science
Dean of Arts & Humanities
Dean of Economics, Political & Policy Sciences

Special Requirements:
At least 11 voting members, 7 of which, including the Chair, shall be members of the general faculty from areas with the most involvement with and dependence on external funding.

2-year terms
Deans of ECS, BBS, NS&M, A&H & EPPS
1 Dean (with vote) of remaining schools
1-year term

Responsible University Official
Vice President for Research

Members Whose Terms are Continuing

Members Whose Terms Are Expiring
Faculty:
Anvar Zakhidov (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Julia Evans (BBS) (8/31/2015)
John Hansen (ECS) (8/31/2015)
Paul Pantano (NSM) (8/31/2015)
(Added During meeting)
Todd Sandler (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Marjorie Zielke (AH), (8/31/2015)

Chair: Anvar Zakhidov (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Julia Evans (BBS) (8/31/2015)

Replacements Needed

Rosanna Guadagno (ATEC) (8/31/2016)
Colleen G Le Prell (BBS) (8/31/2016)
John Hansen (ECS) (8/31/2016)
Paul Pantano (NSM) (8/31/2016)
Michael Kesden (NSM) (8/31/2016)
Alex Piquero (EPPS) (8/31/2016)
Peter Park (AH) (8/31/2016)

Paul Pantano (NSM) (8/31/2016)
John Hansen (ECS) (8/31/2016)
2015-2016

Committee Name: Chancellor’s Council/
President’s Outstanding Teaching Awards Committee

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1039

Ex-Officio (with vote)
Dean of Undergraduate Education
Student Government President

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

Responsible University Official
Executive Vice President and Provost

Members Whose Terms are Continuing
Faculty:

Mathew Goeckner (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Aage Møller (BBS) (8/31/2015)
John Sibert (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Chair: John Sibert (NSM) (8/31/15)

Vice-Chair: Aage Moller (BBS) (8/31/15)
Brady McCary (8/31/17)

Members Whose Terms are Expiring
Mathew Goeckner (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Aage Møller (BBS) (8/31/2015)
John Sibert (NSM) (8/31/2015)

Replacements Needed
Rebecca Files (13-14 &14-15 winner) (8/31/2018)
Brady McCary (12-13 winner) (8/31/2017)
Matthew Goeckner (11-12 winner) (8/31/2016)

Matthew Goeckner (8/16/16)

Brady McCary (8/31/2017)
**Committee Name:** Committee on Academic Integrity  
**Charge:** Policy Memorandum UTDPP1012  
**Senate Concurrent Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex-Officio</th>
<th>Special Requirements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library representative (without vote)</td>
<td>9  Faculty, at least one from each school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominated by the Library Director</td>
<td>2  Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-year terms, staggered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible University Official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Whose Terms are Continuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carie Lambert (AH) (8/31/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Vieraitis (EPPS) (8/31/2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Whose Terms are Expiring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Macfarlane (ECS) (8/31/2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvo Desmedt (ECS) (8/31/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gooch (AH) (8/31/2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sven Kroenger (BBS) (8/31/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Lehmann (ECS) (8/31/2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Representative:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Glosser (NSM) (8/31/2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Appointed by Student Government)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replacements Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Smith (JSOM) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Salter (IS) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvo Desmedt (ECS) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Schlereth (AH) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sven Kroenger (BBS) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Banner (ATEC) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuanwei Zhang (NSM) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Chair: Duncan Macfarlane (ECS) (8/31/2015) |
| Vice Chair: Liz Salter (IS) (8/31/2015)    |
Committee Name: Committee on the Core Curriculum

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1018

2015-2016

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

Ex-Officio (with vote)
 Chair, CEP

Special Requirements:
 8 voting members from faculty
 All schools represented
 4 students (without vote)
   degree-seeking undergraduates including
   one lower-division student and one upper-
   division transfer student
 2-year terms, staggered

Responsible University Official
 Dean of Undergraduate Education

Members Whose Terms are Continuing
 Marilyn Kaplan (SOM) (8/31/2016)
 Dennis Miller (NSM) (8/31/2016)
 Shelley Lane (AH) (08/31/2016)
 Carol Lanham (EPPS) (8/31/2016)

Members Whose Terms are Expiring

Faculty:
 Simeon Ntafos (ECS) (8/31/2015)
 Tonja Wissinger (IS) (8/31/2015)
 Melanie Spence (BBS) (8/31/2015)

(ATEC)

Students:
 (Appointed by Student Government)

Replacements Needed

Simeon Ntafos (ECS) (8/31/2017)
 Tonja Wissinger (IS) (8/31/2017)
 Melanie Spence (BBS) (8/31/2017)
 Eric Farrar (ATEC) (8/31/2017)

Chair: Marilyn Kaplan (SOM) (8/31/2016)
 Vice Chair: Dennis Miller (NSM) (8/31/2016)
Committee Name: Committee on Distance Learning
Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1021

Concurrent

Ex-Officio (with vote)
Dean of Graduate Studies
Vice President, Chief Information Officer
Dean, School of Engineering & Computer Science
Vice President for Student Affairs
Dean, School of Management,
Distance Learning Coordinator – eLearning
Director

Special Requirements:
6 faculty members
6 ex-officio, voting members
2-year terms, staggered

Responsible University Official
Vice Provost

Members Whose Terms are Continuing

FACULTY
Chris Ryan (AH) (8/31/2016)
Mary Urquhart (NSM) (8/31/2016)

Members Whose Terms are Expiring

Faculty
Mark Thouin (SOM) (8/31/2015)
Linda Keith (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Dan Bochsler (SOM) (8/31/2015)
Larry Chasteen (SOM) (8/31/2015)

Chair: Mark Thouin (SOM) (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Linda Keith (EPPS) (8/31/2015)

Replacements Needed

Mark Thouin (SOM) (8/31/2017)
Sarah Maxwell (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
Cassini Nazir (ATEC) (8/31/2017)
Andras Farago (ECS) (8/31/2017)

Chris Ryan (AH) (8/31/2016)
Sarah Maxwell (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
### 2015-2016

**Committee Name:** Committee on Educational Policy

Charge: Policy UTDPP1023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex-Officio (with vote)</th>
<th>Special Requirements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Committee on Core Curriculum</td>
<td>2 faculty from each school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex-Officio (without vote)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>1 from Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>2 students (non-voting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Provost</td>
<td>1 graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Registrar &amp; Director of Academic Records</td>
<td>1 undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible University Official</strong></td>
<td>2-year terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Undergraduate Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Members Whose Terms are Continuing

**Faculty:**
- Tonja Wissinger (IS) (8/31/2016)
- Peter Assmann (BBS) (8/31/2016)
- Yuri Gartstein (NSM) (8/31/16)
- Ravi Prakash (ECS) (8/31/2016)
- John Gooch (AH) (8/31/2016)
- Lowell Doug Kiel (EPPS) (8/31/2016)
- Syam Menon (SOM) (8/31/16)

**Members Whose Terms are Expiring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Replacements Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shayla Houlb (BBS) (8/31/2015)</td>
<td>Shayla Houlb (BBS) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suresh Radhakrishnan (SOM) (8/31/2015)</td>
<td>BPS Murthi (JSOM) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ATEC)</td>
<td>Lisa Bell (ATEC) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ATEC)</td>
<td>Monica Evans (ATEC) (8/31/2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karl Wolff (Graduate Student)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Johannesen (Undergraduate Student)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chair:** Suresh Radhakrishnan (M) (8/31/2015)

**Vice Chair:** Clint Peinhardt (EPS) (8/31/2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(ATEC)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Zweck (NSM) (8/31/2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Zweck (NSM) (8/31/2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hatfield Jr (AH) (8/31/2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hatfield Jr (AH) (8/31/2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (ATEC)
2015-2016

**COMMITTEE NAME:** COMMITTEE ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1024

Senate Concurrent

**EX-OFFICIO (without vote)**

Dean of Undergraduate Education
A&H Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
BBS Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
ECS Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
EPPS Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
IS Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
JSOM Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
NSM Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education
ATEC Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education

**SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:**

11 voting members
7 faculty members
2 students
1 technical expert

2-year terms, staggered

**RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL**

Executive Vice President & Provost

**TECHNICAL EXPERT**

Simon Kane (Provost’s Technology Group)

**MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING**

Karen Huxtable-Jester (BBS) (8/31/2016)
Matthew Polze (SOM) (8/31/2016)
Angela McNulty (IS) (8/31/2016)
Marion Underwood (BBS) (8/31/2016)

**MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING**

Mohammad Akbar (N) (8/31/2015)
Rebecca Files (SOM) (8/31/2015)
Mohamad Saquib (ECS) (8/31/2015)

Matthew Polze (SOM) (8/31/2016)
Marion Underwood (BBS) (8/31/2016)

**STUDENTS:**

Hannah Steiner (UG-IS)
Priya Mathew (UG-BBS)

**CHAIR:** Karen Huxtable-Jester (BBS) (8/31/2016)

**VICE CHAIR:** Mohammad Akbar (NSM) (8/31/2015)

**REPLACEMENTS NEEDED**

Gregg Dieckmann (NSM) (8/31/2017)
Rebecca Files (SOM) (8/31/2017)
Vincent Ng (ECS) (8/31/2017)
Sean McComber (ATEC) (8/31/2017)
Paul Battaglio (EPPS) (8/31/2016)
Sabrina Starnman (AH) (8/31/2016)

**STUDENTS:**

Hannah Steiner (UG-IS) (8/31/2016)
Priya Mathew (UG-BBS) (8/31/2016)

Karen Huxtable-Jester (BBS) (8/31/2016)

Gregg Dieckmann (NSM) (8/31/2017)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON FACULTY MENTORING

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1026

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:

- 12 Faculty members
- 2 Representatives of the Office of the Provost
- In consultation with the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
- 2-year terms, staggered

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL

Executive Vice President & Provost

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING

- Dinesh Bhatia (ECS) (8/31/2016)
- Homer Montgomery (NSM) (8/31/2016)
- Dan Bochsler (SOM) (8/31/2016)
- Garry Bolton (SOM) (8/31/2016)
- Vladimir Dragovic (NSM) (8/31/2016)
- Kathryn Stecke (SOM) (8/31/2016)
- Walter Voit (ECS) (8/31/2016)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING

- Karen Prager (IS) (8/31/2015)
- Nicole Leeper Piquero (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
- Frank Dufour (AH) (8/31/2015)
- Yuly Koshevnik (NSM) (8/31/2015)
- Jackie Nelson (BBS) (8/31/2015)

CHAIR: Karen Prager (IS) (8/31/2015)

VICE CHAIR: Nicole Leeper Piquero (EPPS) (8/31/2015)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED

- Karen Prager (IS) (8/31/2017)
- Nadine Connell (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
- Midori Kitagawa (ATEC) (8/31/2017)
- David Patterson (AH) (8/31/2017)
- Jackie Nelson (BBS) (8/31/2017)

Homer Montgomery (NSM) (8/31/2016)

Dinesh Bhatia (ECS) (8/31/2016)
2015-2016

Committee Name: Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct
Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1027

Special Requirements:
5 Faculty members
2-year terms, staggered

Responsible University Official
Executive Vice President and Provost

Members Whose Terms are Continuing
Christine Dollaghan (BBS) (8/31/2016)
Brian Ratchford (SOM) (8/31/2016)

Members Whose Terms are Expiring
Ivor Page (EC) (8/31/2015)
Mohammad Hooshyar (NSM) (8/31/2015)

Replacements Needed
Thomas Brunell (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
Si Zheng (ECS) (8/31/2017)
Roderick Heelis (NSM) (8/31/2017)

Chair: Robert Lowry (EP) (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Ivor Page (EC) (8/31/2015)

Christine Dollaghan (BBS) (8/31/2016)
Roderick Heelis (NSM) (8/31/2017)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1028

EX-OFFICIO

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

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:

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

- Quarterly report to the Senate

- Ex-O

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL

Vice Provost

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING

- Gene Deluke (SOM) (8/31/2016) – 2 year term
- John McCaskill (EPS) (8/31/2016) – 2 year term

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING

- Richard Golden (BBS) (8/31/2015)- 1yr. term
  Karl Ho (EPPS) (8/31/2015)- 1 year term
  (ATEC)- 2 year term
  Kendra Cooper (ECS) (8/31/2015)- 1 yr. term
  Yuly Koshevnilk (NSM) (8/31/2015)- 1 yr. term
  (IS)-2 year term

CHAIR: Richard Golden (BBS) (8/31/2015)
VICE CHAIR: Karl Ho (EPPS) (8/31/2015)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED

- Richard Golden (BBS) - 1yr. term (8/31/2017)
  Karl Ho (EPPS) - 1 year term (8/31/2017)
  Kyoung Lee Swearingen (ATEC)- 2 year term (8/31/2017)
  Kamil Sarac (ECS) (1 yr. term) (8/31/2017)
  Michael Baron (NSM) (1 yr. term) (8/31/2017)
  Barbara Ashmore (IS) (2 yr. term) (8/31/2017)
  Jay Ingrao (AH) (2 yr. term) (8/31/2017)
  Karl Ho (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
  Richard Golden (BBS) (8/31/2017)

<- Exception being made to allow for all schools
To have a representation. After 2016, this slot
Will not be filled.
Committee Name: Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel
Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1031

2015 - 2016

Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel

Special Requirements:
Two from each school (with the exception of Interdisciplinary Studies) preferably at the rank of Professor – no one holding an administrative appointment above the rank of Department Head shall be eligible to serve 2-year terms, staggered

Ex-Officio

Li Zhang (NSM) (8/31/2016)
Kamran Kiasaleh (EC) (8/31/2016)
David Channell (AH) (8/31/2016)
Greg Dess (SOM) (8/31/2016)
Marion Underwood (BBS) (8/31/2016)

Responsibility University Official

Executive Vice President and Provost

Members Whose Terms are Continuing

Mohammad Ali Hooshyar (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Alex Piquero (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Marilyn Waligore (AH) (8/31/2015)
Walter Dowling (BBS) (8/31/2015)
Marion Underwood (BBS) (8/31/2016)

Members Whose Terms Are Expiring

Mohammad Ali Hooshyar (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Alex Piquero (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Daniel Griffith (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Elena Katok (SOM) (8/31/2015)
Jason Jue (ECS) (8/31/2015)

(<- New Graduate Dean)

Mohammad Ali Hooshyar (NSM) (8/31/2017)
Robert Lowry (EPPS) (8/31/2016)
Dong Li (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
Mike Rebello (JSOM) (8/31/2017)
Ramaswamy Chandrasekaran (ECS) (8/31/2017)
Herve Abdi (BBS) (8/31/2017)
Marilyn Waligore (AH) (8/31/2017)
Roger Malina (ATEC) (8/31/2017)
Paul Fishwick (ATEC) (8/31/2017)
John Hart (BBS) (8/31/2016)

Chair: Mohammad Ali Hooshyar (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Alex Piquero (EPPS) (8/31/2015)

Mohammad Ali Hooshyar (NSM) (8/31/2017)
Marilyn Waligore (AH) (8/31/2017)
## COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON STUDENT SCHOLARSHIPS

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1038

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **EX-OFFICIO (WITH VOTE)** | Dean of Graduate Studies  
Dean of Undergraduate Education |
| **EX-OFFICIO (WITHOUT VOTE)** | Director of Financial Aid  
Director of Endowment Services and Compliance  
Director of the Office of International Education  
Director of Office on Institutional Scholarship Administration |
| **RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL** | Associate Provost responsible for Student Affairs |
| **SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:** | 8 members from among the Associate Deans for Undergraduate Education, or heads of graduate programs in the 8 schools  
2-year terms, staggered  
↩ New Office as of 6/1/15 |
| **MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING** | Dachang Cong (IS) (8/31/2016)  
Melanie Spence (B) (8/31/2016) |
| **MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING** | Simeon Ntafos (ECS) (8/31/2015)  
Shelley Lane(AH) (8/31/2015)  
Marilyn Kaplan (SOM) (8/31/2015)  
Carol Lanham (EPPS) (8/31/2015)  
Dennis Miller (NSM) (8/31/2015)  
(ATEC) |
| **REPLACEMENTS NEEDED** | Simeon Ntafos (ECS) (8/31/2017)  
Shelley Lane(AH) (8/31/2017)  
Marilyn Kaplan (SOM) (8/31/2017)  
Carol Lanham (EPPS) (8/31/2017)  
Dennis Miller (NSM) (8/31/2017)  
Frank Defour (ATEC) (8/31/2017) |
| **Chair:** | Simeon Ntafos (EC) (8/31/2015)  
Shelley Lane(AH) (8/31/2017) |
| **Vice Chair:** | Shelley Lane(A) (8/31/2015)  
Carol Lanham (EPPS) (8/31/2017) |
2015 - 2016

COMMITTEE NAME: LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Charge: Policy UTDPP1076

Committee Members

EX-OFFICIO (WITHOUT VOTE)

Dean of Libraries
Library General Administration (one member)

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL

Director of Library

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING

Susan Chizeck (I) (8/31/2016)
Robert Ackerman (BBS) (8/31/2016)
Nina Baranchuk (SOM) (8/31/2016)
Surya Janakiraman (SOM) (8/31/2016)
Mieczyslaw Dabkowski (NSM) (8/31/2016)
Xin-Lin Gao (ECS) (8/31/2016)
Mark Rosen (AH) (8/31/2016)
Kevin Siqueira (EPPS) (8/31/2016)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING

Faculty:
Daniel Wickberg (AH) (8/31/2015)
Zalman Balanov (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Richard Golden (BBS) (8/31/2015)
Young-Joo Lee (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Stephen Levene (NSM) (8/31/2015)

(ATEC)

(AEPC)

Students:
Alex Katz (Graduate)
Kathleen Alva (Undergraduate)

Chair: Daniel Wickberg (A) (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Susan Chizeck (I) (8/31/2016)

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:

18 voting members
2 Students, including one undergraduate and one graduate student
8 faculty – one from each School
8 Members, one from each school’s Library Acquisition Committee nominated by School Deans

2-year terms, staggered

Replacements Needed

Theresa Towner (AH) (8/31/2017)

Dmitry Rachinskiy (NSM) (8/31/2017)

Richard Golden (BBS) (8/31/2017)

Jonas Bunte (EPPS) (8/31/2017)

Dachang Cong (IS) (8/31/2017)

Angela Lee (ATEC) (8/31/2017)

Maximilian Schich (ATEC) (8/31/2017)

Lawrence Chung (ECS) (8/31/2017)

(8/31/2016)

(8/31/2016)

Theresa Towner (AH) (8/31/2017)

Susan Chizeck (I) (8/31/2016)
2015 - 2016

COMMITTEE NAME: ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1013

Committee Name: Academic Program Review

EX-OFFICIO

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL

Executive Vice President and Provost

Members Whose Terms are Expiring

Faculty:
R. Chandrasekaran (ECS) (8/31/2015)
James Bartlett (B) (8/31/2016)
Dohyogh Kim (EPPS) (8/31/2016)
Linda Thibodeau (BBS) (8/31/2016)
George McMechan (NSM) (8/31/2016)

(5)

Deans:
George Fair (Dean, IS) (8/31/2016)
Hasan Pirkul (Dean, SOM) (8/31/2016)
Ellen Safley (Library) (8/16/2016)
Bruce Novak (Dean, NSM) (8/31/2015)

Vice Chair: R. Chandrasekaran (ECS)

Chair: George McMechan (NSM) (8/31/2017)

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:

6 Faculty members
4 Deans
1-year terms, renewable

Replacements Needed

Kamran Kiasaleh (ECS) (8/31/2016)
James Bartlett (B) (8/31/2016)
Dohyogh Kim (EPPS) (8/31/2016)
Linda Thibodeau (BBS) (8/31/2016)
George McMechan (NSM) (8/31/2016)

(8/31/2016)

Bruce Novak (Dean, NSM) (8/31/2015)

James Bartlett (B) (8/31/2016)

George Fair (IS) (8/31/2016)
Hasan Pirkul (SOM) (8/31/2016)
Ellen Safley (Library) (8/16/2016)
Dennis Kratz (AH) (8/31/2016)

Dennis Kratz (AH) (8/31/2016)
**COMMITTEE NAME:** ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1084

Senate
Concurrent

---

**EX-OFFICIO**

Associate VP for Business Affairs

---

**SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:**

10 Faculty members
  One voting member shall be appointed from the faculty of each School and two voting members shall be chosen from the faculty at large for special expertise or interest in institutional budgeting.

3-year terms, staggered

---

**RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL**

Executive Vice President and Provost

---

**MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING**

**FACULTY:**

Robert Kieschnick (SOM) (8/31/2016)
Monica Evans (ATEC) (8/31/2016)
Rebecca Files (SOM) 8/31/2017
D.T. Huynh (ECS) (8/31/2016)
Duncan Macfarlane (ECS) (8/31/2017)
Ramachandran Natarajan (SOM) (8/31/2017)

---

**Members Whose Terms are Expiring**

Richard Scotch (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Jay Dowling (BBS) (8/31/2015)
Robert Serfling (NSM) (8/31/2015)

(AH)

---

**Replacements Needed**

Richard Scotch (EPPS) (8/31/2018)
Jay Dowling (BBS) (8/31/2018)
Robert Serfling (NSM) (8/31/2018)
Matt Brown (AH) (8/31/2018)

---

**Chair:** Richard Scotch (EPPS)(2015)
**Vice Chair:** Robert Kieschnick (SOM)(2016)

---

**Richard Scotch (EPPS) (8/31/18)**

**Robert Serfling (NSM) (8/31/18)**
2015 - 2016

Committee Name: Information Security Advisory Committee

Charge:                                                                                                                                          Senate
Concurrent

Ex-Officio

University Attorney

Responsible University Official

Office of Academic Affairs
Office of the Registrar
Office of Sponsored Projects

Members Whose Terms are Continuing

Faculty:
Joe Izen (NSM) (8/31/2016)

Members Whose Terms are Expiring

Ravi Prakash (ECS) (8/31/2015)
Fang Qiu (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Kevin Hamlen (ECS) (8/31/2015)
Dinesh Bhatia (ECS) (8/31/2015)
Tres Thompson (BBS) (8/31/2015)

Outside the University

Member of Student Government

Daniel Zinni

Staff Council

Daniel Calhoun (8/31/15)

Chair: Ravi Prakash (ECS) (8/31/15)  
Vice Chair: 

Special Requirements:

7 Tenure Track Faculty members (3 of which have expertise in computer-security.
2 Security experts from Outside the University
1 Student Government member
1 Staff Council Member

2 year appointment

Replacements Needed

Ravi Prakash (ECS) (8/31/17)
Daniel Griffith (EPPS) (8/31/17)
Kevin Hamlen (ECS) (8/31/17)
Atanu Lahiri (JSOM) (8/31/17)
Scott V Swearingen (ATEC) (8/31/17)

(8/31/16)
(8/31/16)
(8/31/17)
(8/31/17)

Ravi Prakash (ECS) (8/31/17)
Joe Izen (NSM) (8/31/2016)
2015 - 2016

Committee Name: Academic Calendar Committee

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1011

Ex-Officio – with vote

University Registrar and Director of Academic Records

Special Requirements:

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

1 year appointments

Responsible University Official

Executive Vice President & Provost

Members Whose Terms are Expiring

Faculty:
Matthew Bondurant (AH) (8/31/2015)
Paul Battaglio (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Jennifer Holmes (EPPS) (8/31/2015)

Administration:
Andrew Blanchard (8/31/2015)
Blair Flicker (8/31/2015)

Students:
Jessoca Meah (UG-BBS) (8/31/2015)
Nicole Watson (UG-SOM) (8/31/2015)

Staff:
Megan Gray (8/31/2015)
Sheila Rollerson (8/31/2015)

Chair: Andrew Blanchard (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Paul Battaglio (EP) (8/31/2015)

Replacements Needed

Kenneth Brewer (AH) (8/31/2016)
Sherri Li (EPPS) (8/31/2016)
Jennifer Holmes (EPPS) (8/31/2016)
Andrew Blanchard (8/31/2016)
Blair Flicker (8/31/2016)

Sheila Rollerson (8/31/2016)

Megan Gray (8/31/2016)

Jennifer Holmes (EPPS) (8/31/2016)
2015 - 2016

Committee Name: Campus Facilities Committee

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1025

Ex-Officio (without vote)

Executive Vice President and Provost
Vice President of Research
Assistant Vice President of Environmental Health and Safety
Director of Media Services
Assistant Vice President of Auxiliary Services
Director of Networking and Telecommunication Services
Staff Council Member
Assoc. VP for Facilities Management

Special Requirements:
No fewer than 10 voting members

Ex-Officio (without vote)
Executive Vice President and Provost
Vice President of Research
Assistant Vice President of Environmental Health and Safety
Director of Media Services
Assistant Vice President of Auxiliary Services
Director of Networking and Telecommunication Services
Staff Council Member
Assoc. VP for Facilities Management

Special Requirements:
No fewer than 10 voting members
4 Faculty
2 Deans

Responsible University Official
Vice President for Administration

Members Whose Terms are Continuing
Faculty
Denise Boots (EP) (8/31/2016)
Eric Farrar (AH) (8/31/2016)
Mark Spong (EC & Dean) (8/31/2016)

Library Representative
Ellen Safley (8/31/2016)

Staff Council (Ex-Officio)
Jay Jascott (8/31/2016)

Student Affairs Staff
Matt Grief (8/31/2016)

Members Whose Terms are Expiring
John Ferguson (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Dennis Kratz (AH & Dean) (8/31/2015)
Tom Campbell (CD) (8/31/2015)

Replacements Needed
Michele Hanlon (AH) (8/31/17)
Dennis Kratz (AH & Dean) (8/31/17)
Ernest Hannig (NSM) (8/31/17)

Student
Anupam Kumar (UG-ECS) (8/31/2015)

Chair: Denise Boots (EP) (8/31/2016)
Vice Chair: John Ferguson (NSM (8/31/2015)

(8/31/2016)
2015 - 2016

COMMITTEE NAME: COMMENCEMENT COMMITTEE

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1020

EX-OFFICIO (without vote)

Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
Director of University Events
Speaker of the Faculty (Vice Chair)
Dean of Graduate Studies
Dean of Undergraduate Education
Chief of Police
Associate Vice President for Facilities Management
Bookstore Manager
Coordinator of Student Health Services
Representative from Media Services
Representative from Alumni Services
University Registrar & Director of Academic Records
Special Events Coordinator

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:

2 Faculty
2 Student representatives (including the President of the Student Body)
3-year terms

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL

Executive Vice President and Provost

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING

FACULTY:
Doug Kiel (EPPS) (8/31/2016)
Kathryn Evans (AH) (8/31/2017)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING

FACULTY:
NONE

STUDENTS:
Brooke Knudtson, SG President (8/31/2015)
Jessica Palacios Gutierrez (UG-SOM) (8/31/2014)

Caitlynn Fortner, SG President (8/31/2016)

(8/31/2016)

Chair: Judy Barnes, Director of University Events
Vice Chair: Tim Redman, Speaker of Faculty Senate

Tim Redman, Speaker of Faculty Senate 2016
Committee Name: Committee on Parking and Transportation

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1030

Ex-Officio (without vote)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President for Facilities Management or designee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Disability Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Transportation Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. VP for Budget and Resource Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Requirements:

- 6 voting members
- 2 Faculty
- 1 Staff
- 2 Students
- 1 Staff Council
- 2-year terms

Responsible University Official & Chair

Vice President for Administration

Members Whose Terms are Continuing

**Faculty:**

- John Wiorkowski (M) (8/31/2016)

**Staff:**

- Kent Mecklenburg (8/31/2016)

**Staff Council:**

- Lynn Butler (8/31/2016)

Members Whose Terms are Expiring

**Faculty:**

- Thomas Brunell (EPPS) (8/31/2015)

**Students:**

- Brooke Knudtson (UG-EPPS) (8/31/2015)
- Nancy Fairbank (UG-NSM) (8/31/2015)

Replacements Needed

- Daniel Rajaratnam (JSOM) (8/31/2017)
  
(8/31/2016)
COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1035                  University-Wide Committee

EX-OFFICIO (WITH VOTE)
Vice President for Research

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Research

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
Faculty:
Elena Katok (SOM) (8/31/2016)
William Katz (BBS) (8/31/2016)
Ryan McMahan (ECS) (8/31/2016)
Aage Møller (BBS) (8/31/2016)
Daniel Krawczyk (BBS) (8/31/2016)
Michael Rugg (BBS) (8/31/2016)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
Faculty:
Robert Ackerman (BBS) (8/31/15)
Bobby Alexander (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Li Zhang (NSM) (8/31/2015)

Non-Science Representative
Shelby Hibbs (AH) (8/31/2017)

Staff
James Cannici (8/31/2015)
Susie Milligan (8/31/2015)
Sanaz Okhovat (8/31/2015)
Kerry Tate (8/31/2015)

Non-UTD Representatives
Randal Boss (8/31/2015)
Judge Daniel Curran (8/31/2015)

Student
Pramukh Atluri (UG-BBS) (8/31/2015)

Chair: Aage Møller (BBS) (8/31/2016)
Vice Chair: Daniel Krawczyk (BBS) (8/31/2016)

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS
No fewer than nine (9) members
1 off-campus representative
variety of professions
1 member whose primary expertise is in a
(See charge for more requirements)
2-year terms

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Andrea Warner-Czyz (BBS) (8/31/2017)
Bobby Alexander (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
Li Zhang (NSM) (8/31/2017)
Shelby Hibbs (AH) (8/31/2017)

(8/31/2017)
(8/31/2017)
(8/31/2017)
(8/31/2017)

Aage Møller (BBS) (8/31/2016)
Daniel Krawczyk (BBS) (8/31/2016)

(8/31/16)
### Committee Name:
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity

### Charge:
Policy Memorandum UTDPP1022

**University-Wide Committee**

### Ex Officio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible University Official</th>
<th>Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Faculty members (from each of the eight Schools)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Academic Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Staff members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Members Whose Terms are Continuing

#### Faculty
- Mandy Maquire (BBS) (8/31/2016)
- Michelle Lockhart (SOM) (8/31/2016)
- Erin Smith (IS) (8/31/2016)
- Abby Kratz (8/31/2015)
- Sherry Marek (8/31/2015)
- Eloise Square (8/31/2015)

### Administration
- Yolande Evans (8/31/2015)
- Misty Hawley (8/31/2015)
- Carrilaine Schneckner (8/31/2015)
- Daniel Hernandez (8/31/2015)
- Letitia Andrews (8/31/2015)
- Jane Shipman (8/31/2015)
- Yue (Selina) Gu (8/31/2015)
- Harriett (DeAnn) Hegi (8/31/2015)

**Chair:** Rashaunda Henderson (ECS) (8/31/2016)  
**Vice Chair:** Raul Rojas (BBS) (8/31/2015)

### Members Whose Terms are Expiring

#### Faculty
- Asli Leblebicioglu (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
- Meghna Sabharwal (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
- Kim Knight (ATEC) (8/31/2015)
- Sherri Li (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
- Shilyh Warren (AH) (8/31/2015)
- David Ford (SOM) (8/31/2015)
- Raul Rohas (BBS) (8/31/2015)
- Toyah Miller (JSOM) (8/31/2017)
- Meghna Sabharwal (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
- Lloyd Dumas (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
- Kimberly Hill (AH) (8/31/2017)
- Orlando Richard (SOM) (8/31/2017)
- Rula Rojas (BBS) (8/31/2017)
- Rym Zalila-Wenkstern (ECS) (8/31/2017)
- Sabrina Starnman (AH) (8/31/2017)

#### Staff
- Yolande Evans (8/31/2015)
- Misty Hawley (8/31/2015)
- Carrilaine Schneckner (8/31/2015)
- Daniel Hernandez (8/31/2015)
- Letitia Andrews (8/31/2015)
- Jane Shipman (8/31/2015)
- Yue (Selina) Gu (8/31/2015)
- Harriett (DeAnn) Hegi (8/31/2015)

**Chair:** Rashaunda Henderson (ECS) (8/31/2016)  
**Vice Chair:** Raul Rojas (BBS) (8/31/2015)

**Replacements Needed**

- Toyah Miller (JSOM) (8/31/2017)
- Meghna Sabharwal (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
- Kim Knight (ATEC) (8/31/2017)
- Rym Zalila-Wenkstern (ECS) (8/31/2017)
2015 - 2016

Committee Name: Information Resources, Planning, and Policy Committee

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1003

Ex Officio (with vote)
Chief Information Security Officer

Responsible University Official
Vice President & Chief Information Officer

Staff
Sanaz Okhovat (Research Compliance) (8/31/2015)
Toni Stephens (Audit & Compliance) (8/31/2015)
Randal Rikel (Administration) (8/31/2015)

Members Whose Terms are Continuing
Faculty
Robert Morris (EPS) (8/31/2016)
Latifur Khan (ECS) (8/31/2016)
Mark Spong (ECS & Dean) (8/31/2016)

Members Whose Terms are Expiring
Faculty
Syam Menon (SOM) (8/31/2015)
Thom Campbell (BBS) 8/31/2015
Todd Fechter (ATEC) (8/31/2015)<-Interim Dean
Bert Moore (BBS & Dean) (8/31/2015)

Staff Council
Arturo Elizondo (8/31/15)

Chair: Syam Menon (M) (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Todd Fechter (AH) (8/31/2015)

Special Requirements
13 Voting Members
   (7 tenure-track faculty w/2 at position of Dean or above)
1 Staff – Audit and Compliance
1 Staff – Academic Affairs
1 Staff Council
1 Staff – Office of VP for Research
1 Staff - Administration
Two-year terms

Replacements Needed

Young Ryu (JSOM) (8/31/2017)
Bart Rypma (BBS) (8/31/2017)
Steven Billingslea(ATEC) (8/31/2017)
Bert Moore (BBS & Dean) (8/31/2017)

(8/31/2017)

Robert Morris (EPS) (8/31/2016)
Steven Billingslea(ATEC) (8/31/2017)
Committee Name: Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1014

Ex-Officio (with vote)
Associate Vice President for Research

Special Requirements
No fewer than 6 (six) members
1 Member a Doctor of Veterinary Medicine
1 Community representative
1 Must be a practicing scientist experienced in research involving animals
1 Must be a person whose primary concerns are in a nonscientific area
3-year terms

Staff
Larry Zacharias, Chief of Police
Kelly Kinnard, Director of Physical Plant Services

Non-UTD Representatives
Tony Myers (8/31/2017)*
Egeene Q. Daniels, DVM (8/31/2017)*
Bill Alsup (8/31/2017)*
(*not approved by the Senate)

Members Whose Terms are Continuing
Faculty
Gail Breen (NSM) (8/31/2017)
Li Zhang (NSM) (8/31/2016)

Non-Science Representative
Matt Brown (AH) (8/31/2017)

Members Whose Terms are Expiring
Faculty
Lucien Thompson (BBS) (8/31/2015)
Leonidas Bleris (ECS) (8/31/2015)

Chair: Lucien Thompson (BBS) (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Leonidas Bleris (ECS) (8/31/2015)
2015 - 2016

Committee Name: Institutional Biosafety & Chemical Safety Committee
Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1016

Ex-Officio
Vice President for Research
Environmental Health & Safety Director
Biosafety Officer

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

Responsible University Official
Vice President for Business Affairs

Members Whose Terms are Continuing
Faculty
John Burr (NSM) (8/31/2017)
Paul Pantano (NSM) (8/31/2016)

Non-UTD Members
Steve Dossett (8/31/2014)
Nancy Viamonte (8/31/2014)

Members Whose Terms are Expiring
Lee Bulla (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Jeff De Jong (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Wenchuang Hu (NSM) (8/31/15)
Jon Ploski (BBS) (8/31/2015)
Michael Biewer (NSM) (8/31/2015)

Chair: Lee Bulla (N) (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Paul Pantano (N) (8/31/2016)

Replacements Needed
Lloyd Lumata (NSM) (8/31/18)
Jason Slinker (NSM) (8/31/18)
Rockford Draper (NSM) (8/31/18)
Jon Ploski (BBS) (8/31/2018)
Heng Du (NSM) (8/31/18)
Paul Pantano (NSM) (8/31/2016)
Lloyd Lumata (NSM) (8/31/18)
2015 - 2016

COMMITTEE NAME: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1083

EX-OFFICIO (WITH VOTE)

Dean of Graduate Studies
Vice President for Administration
Associate Vice President for Technology Commercialization

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Research

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
Bill Frensley (ECS) (8/31/2016)

NON-UTD REPRESENTATIVES
Daniel Chalker (8/31/2016)
Edwin Flores (8/31/2016)
Rob Miles (8/31/2016)

STAFF
Jau Silber (8/31/2016)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
Ray Baughman (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Thom Linehan (AH) (8/31/2015)
Fang Qiu (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Poras Balsara (ECS) (8/31/2015)
Sanda Harabagiu (EC) (8/31/2015)
Michael Kilgard (BBS) (8/31/2015)

Chair: Thom Linehan (N) (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Fang Qiu (EPPS) (8/31/2015)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED
Ray Baughman (NSM) (8/31/2017)
Fang Qiu (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
Banks Miller (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
Viswanath Ramakrishna (NSM) (8/31/2017)
Lakshman Tamil (ECS) (8/31/2017)
Fang Qiu (EPPS) (8/31/2017)
Scot Gresham Lancaster (ATEC) (8/31/2017)

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

7 Voting members from among the voting faculty to provide broad representation of faculty research interests in the university. One voting member form the faculty will be Chair, one will be Vice Chair.

The President, at his or her discretion, may appoint up to three non-voting non-UT Dallas members to advise the voting members

2-year terms, staggered
2015 - 2016

**COMMITTEE NAME:** RADIATION SAFETY COMMITTEE

**Charge:** Policy Memorandum UTDPP1032

**University-Wide Committee**

---

**EX-OFFICIO (without vote)**

- University Environmental Health and Safety Director
- Vice President for Research

---

**SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS**

- At least three faculty members
- Radiation Safety Officer (Chair)
- 3-year terms

---

**STAFF**

Radiation Safety Officer, **Chair**

---

**RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL**

Vice President for Administration

---

**MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING**

- Stephen Spiro (NSM) (8/31/2016)
- Dean Sherry (NSM) (8/31/2017)
- Kelli Palmer (NSM) (8/31/2017)

---

**MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING**

- **(4)** Julia Chan (NSM) (8/31/2018)
- **(5)** Zhenpeng Qin (ECS) (8/31/2018)

---

**CHAIR:** Kathy White, Radiation Safety Officer and University Safety Officer

---

**VICE CHAIR:** Stephen Spiro (N) (8/31/2016)

---
2015 - 2016

COMMITTEE NAME: UNIVERSITY SAFETY AND SECURITY COUNCIL
Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1036

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

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Business Affairs

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY
Robert Wallace (ECS) (8/31/2016)
John Worrall (EPPS) (8/31/2016)

STAFF
Chad Thomas (8/31/2016)- Staff Council

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
FACULTY
Lawrence Overzet (EC) (8/31/2015)
Carol Cokely (BBS) (8/31/2015)

STUDENTS
Michael Hankin (UG-ECS) (8/31/2015)
Richard Hicks (G-EPPS) (8/31/2015)

Chair: Larry Overzet (ECS) (8/31/2015)
Vice Chair: Chad Thomas (8/31/2016)

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS
4 members from faculty
6 members from staff
1 Callier Center physical plant
1 Worker’s Comp. Ins. Rep. from the Office of Environmental Health & Safety
1 Science Laboratories
1 ADA Compliance Officer
1 Student Life (Disability Services)
1 Staff Council

Chairs of the Following Committees:
Campus Facilities
Institutional Biosafety
Parking and Security
Radiation Safety
2 students – 1 undergraduate; 1 graduate
Chair-Faculty Member
Vice Chair-Staff Member
2-year terms, staggered

Replacements Needed
Greg Metz (AH) (8/31/2017)
Carol Cokely (BBS) (8/31/2017)

(8/31/2016)

(8/31/2016)

John Worrall (EPPS) (8/31/2016)

(STAFF)
COMMITTEE NAME: STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Charge: UTDPP 1037

2015 - 2016

Ex-Officio (Without Vote)
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Student Affairs
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
Associate Vice President for Budget and Resource Planning

Special Requirements
9 Voting Members
Including:
5 Students
(3 with two-year terms; 2 with one-year term)
2 Faculty
2 Staff
2-year terms
Committee elects Chair

Responsible University Official
Vice President for Student Affairs

Members Whose Terms Are Continuing

Faculty
Jared Pickens (SOM) (8/31/2016)
Sean Cotter (AH) (8/31/2016)

Staff
Lynn Butler (8/31/2016)
Melissa Wyder (8/31/2016)

Members Whose Terms Are Expiring

Faculty
Jared Pickens (SOM) (8/31/2016)

Students
Russel Charlie Hannigan (UG) (8/31/2016) - 2 year
Brooke Knuton (UG) (8/31/2016) – 2 year
Aishwarya Ravin (UG) (8/31/2016) - 2 year
Zac Evans (UG) (8/31/2015) - 1 year
Nancy Fairbank (UG) (8/31/2015) - 1 year

Replacements Needed
Kathryn Evans (8/31/2016)

Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>(08/31/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>(08/31/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>(08/31/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>(08/31/2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>(08/31/2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2015 - 2016**

**COMMITTEE NAME:** UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INTEGRITY COMMITTEE  
Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1034  
University-Wide Committee

**EX-OFFICIO (with vote)**

Dean of Graduate Studies  
Vice President for Research, **Chair**

**RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL**

Executive Vice President and Provost

**SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS**

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

**MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING**

Tomislav Kovandzic (EP) (8/31/2016)  
Xinchou Lou (N) (8/31/2016)  
Kamran Kiasaleh (EC) (8/31/2016)  
Christine Dollaghan (BBS) (8/31/2017)  
Thomas Riccio (AH) (8/31/2017)

**MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING**

Anthony Champagne (EPPS) (8/31/2015)  
Michael Rebello (SOM) (8/31/2015)  
Dean Sherry (NSM) (8/31/2015)  
___ ATEC  
Anthony Champagne (EPPS) (8/31/2018)  
Vijay Mookerjee (JSOM) (8/31/2018)  
Dean Sherry (NSM) (8/31/2018)  
Paul Fishwick (ATEC) (8/31/2018)

**Replacements Needed**

**Chair:** Bruce Gnade (VP for Research)

**Vice Chair:** Anthony Champagne (EP) (8/31/2015)  
**Bruce Gnade (VP for Research)**  
**Anthony Champagne (EPPS) (8/31/2018)**
Committee Name: Auxiliary Services Advisory Committee

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1015

Ex-Officio (without vote)

Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
Auxiliary Services Manager
Director of Food Services
Director of Student Union
UTD Bookstore Manager

Special Requirements:

7 Voting members
3 From faculty and staff
4 Students
1-year term

Responsible University Official

Assistant Vice President for Procurement Management

Members Whose Terms are Expiring

Faculty:
Jessica Murphy (AH) (8/31/2015)
Banks Miller (EPS) (8/31/2015)

Staff:
Jayar Medlock (8/31/2014)

Students:
Brooke Knudtson (UG-EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Nancy Fairbank (UG-EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Zach Stokes (UG-ECS) (8/31/2015)
Chidi Echebiri (UG-SOM) (8/31/2015)

Replacements Needed

Faculty:
Enric Madriguera (AH) (8/31/2016)
Young-Jo Lee (EPS) (8/31/2016)

Staff:

Students:

(8/31/2016)

(8/31/2016)

(8/31/2016)

(8/31/2016)
2015 - 2016

COMMITTEE NAME: CAMPUS WELLNESS COMMITTEE

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1017
University-Wide Committee

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Administration

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING

FACULTY:
Monica Rankin (AH) (8/31/2015)
Nadine Connell (EPPS) (8/31/2015)
Shayla Holub (BBS) (8/31/2015)

STAFF:
Michele Brown (8/31/2015)
Nancy Bryant (8/31/2015)
Karen Garcia (8/31/2015)

STUDENTS:
Andrei Rosu (UG-BBS) (8/31/2015)
Vedika Hgrawl (UG-ECS) (8/31/2015)
Sukaina Syed (UG-EPPS) (8/31/2015)

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
NO FEWER THAN 9 MEMBERS
3FACULTY
3Staff
3Students
Chair appointed by President

** 1 year terms

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED

Natalie Ring (AH) (8/31/2016)
Linda Keith (EPS) (8/31/2016)
Francesca Filbey (8/31/2016)

CHAIR:

Vice Chair:
2015 - 2016

COMMITTEE NAME: UNIVERSITY SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1078

University-Wide Committee

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Vice President for Administration

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:

7 VOTING MEMBERS
3 Faculty
   1 From NSM or ECS (alternating)
   1 From EPPS, AH, or SOM (alternating)
   1 Chair – tenured faculty actively concerned with sustainability research or teaching

* 1 year terms

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
Babak Fahimi (ECS) (8/31/2015)
Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki (NSM) (8/31/2015)
Doug Goodman (EPPS) (8/31/2015)

STAFF:
Craig Lewis (8/31/2015)

STUDENTS:
Katie Truesdale (UG) (8/31/2015)
Doug Goodman (UG) (8/31/2015)

REPLACMENTS NEEDED
Lev Gelb (ECS) (8/31/2016)

Doug Goodman (EPS) (8/31/2016)

Dan Bochsler (SOM) (8/31/2016)

CHAIR: Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki (NSM) (8/31/2015)

Vice Chair: Doug Goodman (EPPS) (8/31/2015)

Doug Goodman (EPS) (8/31/2016)

Dan Bochsler (SOM) (8/31/2016)
2014 - 2015

**COMMITTEE NAME:** UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL AND DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES

**Charge:** Currently at OGC University-Wide Committee

---

**EX-OFFICIO**

Chair of Faculty Standing and Conduct

**SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:**

2 Deans of Schools
2 Faculty

**RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL**

2 year term of service

---

**MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING**

**FACULTY:**
Poras Balsara (ECS) (8/31/2016)
Viswanath Ramkrishna (NSM) (8/31/2016)

**Deans:**
Bert Moore (BBS) (8/31/2016)
Dennis Dean (EPPS) (8/31/2016)

---

**Members Whose Terms are Expiring**

**REPLACEMENTS NEEDED**

NONE

**NONE (8/31/17)**

---

**Deans:**

NONE

**NONE (8/31/17)**

---

**Chair:** Bert Moore (BBS) (8/31/2016)
**Vice Chair:** Poras Balsara (ECS) (8/31/2016)