MEMORANDUM
February 27, 2017

TO: Academic Council*

COPY TO: Richard C. Benson
Hobson Wildenthal
Inga Musselman
Andrew Blanchard
Calvin Jamison
Abby Kratz
John Wiorowski
Marion Underwood

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

SUBJECT: Academic Council Meeting

The Academic Council will meet on **WEDNESDAY, March 1, 2017** at **1:00 p.m.** in ATEC 1.201. Please bring the agenda packet with you to the meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at cgm130130@utdallas.edu or x4791.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-2017 ACADEMIC COUNCIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gail Breen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cordell**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Dufour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hefley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Holmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Izen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Leaf***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi Prakash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Schlobohm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Redman *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Scotch ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tres Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Padigela, Akshitha - Student Government Pres.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
March 1, 2017
ATEC 1.201

1. Call To Order, Announcements & Questions  Dr. Benson
2. Approval of the Agenda  Dr. Redman
3. Approval of Minutes –February 1, 2017 Meeting  Dr. Redman
4. Speakers Report  Dr. Redman
5. QEP Presentation  Serenity King
6. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates  Serenity King
7. TXCFS/FAC REPORT  Drs. Leaf & Cordell
8. Student Government Report  Akshitha Padigela
9. CEP Recommendations
   A. Pending March 7th Meeting  Clint Peinhardt
10. Report on the survey of NSM’s Shadow work  Matthew Goeckner
11. Revisions to UTDPP1019-Committee on Committees  Dr. Redman
12. BBS School By-laws  Chris Dollaghan
13. International Education Development Committee Charge  Serenity King
14. Revisions to UTDPP1092- International Oversight Committee  Serenity King
15. SFDA Policy for non-tenure system faculty  Dr. Redman
16. Scholars at Risk Network  Dr. Redman
17. Discussion: Hiring of our own PhD’s  Dr. Redman
18. Adjournment  Dr. Benson
Item 3:
Previous Meeting Minutes
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
FEBRUARY 1, 2017

PRESENT:  Inga Musselman, Gail Breen, David Cordell, Frank Dufour, William Hefley, Jennifer Holmes, Joe Izen, Murray Leaf, Ravi Prakash, Tim Redman, Maribeth Schlobohm, Richard Scotch, Tonja Wissinger

ABSENT:  Richard Benson, Hobson Wildenthal, Tres Thompson,

VISITORS:  Andrew Blanchard, Colleen Dutton, Matthew Goeckner, Edward Harpham, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Akshitha Padigela, Terry Pankratz, Marion Underwood,

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions

Inga Musselman called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM. President Benson and Hobson Wildenthal were off campus. On January 29, 2017, President Donald Trump signed an executive order that imposed a 90-day travel ban on citizens from Syria, Iraq, Iran, Sudan, Libya, Yemen and Somalia. President Benson has tasked members of campus to keep him informed on how this order will impact the campus’s international staff and students. It was noted that the ban could seriously affect graduate students for fall 2017.

On January 31, 2017, Gov. Greg Abbott issued a hiring freeze for positions supported by state funds through August 31, 2017. This has raised quite a few concerns regarding the open job positions on campus. Dr. Musselman assured the council members that the university would do what it can to retain TAs and adjunct professors.

On February 1, 2017, $10 million gift from Margaret McDermott to support undergraduate research and rename the Honors College to the “Hobson Wildenthal Honors College.” The university is grateful for the gift and to Dr. Wildenthal for his long term leadership.

Dr. Musselman commented on the white supremacy posters posted across the campus, as they have in other universities in north Texas. The University’s leadership is aware of the posters and is working with Tim Shaw to understand the first amendment rights, and also Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which refers to conditions of hostile environments. She reaffirmed the commitment of the university leaders and employees of the University of Texas at Dallas we are a community for which inclusion and diversity is critical.

The ribbon cutting for the Student Services Building Addition will take place on February 2, 2017. The new engineering building is now coming up from the ground. The concrete floors will be poured in March 2017. The Office of Administration will send Matthew Grief, Assoc. VP of Student Affairs in charge of Housing Operations, a schedule of when the pours will occur. Since the pouring will take place between 1-4 AM, there will be concerns about noise for the apartments near the build site. Dr. Musselman opened the floor for questions, but there were none.
2. **Approval of the Agenda**
   David Cordell requested that a discussion on the FY 18 Academic Senate Election be added to the agenda after the SACSCOC report. Murray Leaf requested that a discussion on a resolution of support for President Benson be placed after the discussion on the FY 18 Academic Senate Election. Richard Scotch moved to add the discussions on discussion on the FY 18 Academic Senate Election, a discussion on a resolution of support for President Benson, and to approve the agenda as amended. Bill Hefley seconded. The motion carried.

3. **Approval of Minutes**
   Murray Leaf moved to approve the December 7, 2016 minutes as circulated. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

4. **Speaker's Report**
   1. Speaker Redman suggested that Scholars at Risk Network be brought up at the March Council meeting.  
   2. All other items were on the agenda.

5. **Policies on Committees – Tim Redman**
   A concern was brought to Speaker Redman's attention at the end of the January 18, 2017, Academic Senate meeting. In the past, the Committee on Committees has recommended faculty members for committee service, but when the committee charge states that student representatives are required, Student Government makes the recommendation. When the charge states that staff representatives are required, Staff Council makes recommendations. There has not been a time when the President has not approved the recommendations.

   An issue has arisen on the Student Fee Advisory Committee where the Responsible University Official (RUO) did not recognize the staff appointees and did not allow the staff appointees to participate in a committee meetings. It was Speaker Redman’s opinion that the RUO was acting beyond his authority. Speaker Redman recommended that the individual involved be asked to attend the February 18, 2017, Academic Senate meeting and explain his actions. It would be up to the Academic Senate to reaffirm the university policy on committees, namely that the RUO does not have the authority to prevent appointees from participating in meetings. Joe Izen moved to have the RUO appear before the Academic Senate to defend his actions. Ravi Prakash seconded. The motion carried unanimously. Speaker Redman will speak with the RUO and advise them to attend the meeting on February 18, 2017.

6. **SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates – Serenity King**
   The chair of the SACSCOC visiting committee has been selected, Dr. Alan Boyette from University of North Carolina Greensboro. The university has extended an invitation to visit but at the time of the meeting a response has not been received. Ms. King will hope to have more information at the Academic Senate meeting.

   Ms. King’s office has been helping Christina McGowan update the Academic Senate website; however the site was running on outdated software. To allow for further updates to the site it will need to be overhauled, and rebuilt.
The QEP committee will meet during the week of February 6, 2017. It will present recommendations to senior leadership and then at the March Academic Senate meeting. The reason for this timing is UT System’s Student Success Initiative, i.e. Quantum Leap (QL) number nine. QL nine has three pillars: Belonging, Finances, and Advising. “No student will not graduate due to finances. No student will leave the institution because of a lack of belonging or sense of engagement. All students will be advised to get through their degrees, on time, and into the job market.” This ties in with our QEP. The committee wishes to overlay our QEP with the QL instead of doing something completely separate and possibly conflicting.

Ms. King informed the Council that SACSCOC has published a draft of the updated principles. There are now 83, down from 96. SACSCOC has requested comments from different institutions on the new principles. Our university is under the old principles and will not be affected by the new principles until our next review.

7. TXCFS/ FAC Report- Murray Leaf
The January FAC meeting was attended by Murray Leaf and David Cordell. In general, the meeting was taken up almost entirely with the chancellor’s “quantum leaps” initiatives. However, since a good part of this is focused on shared governance this does fit with long-standing FAC concerns and is welcome on most campuses. It is particularly welcome on the health campus, where faculty governance is least well developed—if it is developed at all.

Specific topics were as follows:

Thursday, January 19

Tony Cuolo, Associate Vice Chancellor for Leadership Development and Veterans Affairs discussed the Women’s Senior Leaders Network/Shared Governance initiative. This involves several members of the Faculty Advisory Council and other women on other campuses. The aim seems to be to bring more women into higher administration.

Campus Reports and discussion of campus issues related to shared governance, student success, non-tenure-track faculty, academic time and faculty burnout. Chair Ross had instructed track members to focus on shared governance in their reports and to keep the reports brief.

Dr. Steve Leslie, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, spoke of the importance of the Faculty Advisory Council but made no mention of upcoming considerations of policy that Faculty Advisory Council should be involved in, apart from the ongoing discussions of the Chancellor’s initiatives.

Mr. Phillip Dendy, Chief Compliance and Risk Officer, and Mr. Trey Atchley, Chief Inquiry Officer, described their jobs. The system wants to press harder on compliance. It was not clear why. Mr. Atchley was previously an investigator with the FBI and apparently will be focused on criminal matters.

Dr. Beth Lynn Maxwell, Chief Health Research Officer in the Office of Health Affairs and Associate General Counsel in the Office of General Counsel, is the replacement for Patricia Hearne. This means that she is the primary system administrator concerned with intellectual property
commercialization. She did not continue to assert Dr. Hearn’s sweeping claims to the effect that the regents own everything faculty members create “in the course and scope of employment,” but she also did not mention the FAC’s previous expressions of concern with such claims. She described her optimism for IP development.

Friday, January 20 – ASH 208

Dr. Stephanie Huie, Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives and Mr. Patrick Francis, Associate Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs described the UT System Study on Causes and Consequences of Burnout. This apparently included a fairly detailed survey. It may be focused only on the medical campuses. The survey revealed, and probably reflected, feelings of ill-treatment due to salary compression and inversion as well as to pressure on faculty to compensate for recent reductions in funding from the National Institutes of Health that have not been recognized by changes in administrative policies regarding workload and promotion. When Stephanie or someone else describing the report noted that the concern with inversion arose because some older faculty being paid only $200,000 a year or more saw that younger faculty were being paid $500,000 or more, there was a more or less collective gasp from the academic campus representatives followed by rapid loss of interest.

Committee Reports included unanimous approval by the FAC of a final version of the protocol for the campus visits to assess the state of shared governance and see what the System might do to strengthen it. Visits will be by Tony Cuculo and one of the co-chairs of the FAC governance committee, depending on whether it is a health or academic campus. The protocol includes the requirement that each campus will prepare an electronic dossier for the visit. Murray Leaf will provide an initial example that can serve as a template.

Dr. David Daniel, Deputy Chancellor, and Dr. Raymond Greenberg, Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs, took part in a general discussion of issues of interest to the Council.

Dr. Rebecca Karoff, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, gave a follow-up to her previous report on steps to improve Student Success/TPI in the Quantum Leaps initiative. As before, the three main aims of the initiative are not problematic; the question is how to apply them to the variety of campuses within the system and the variety of students within the campuses. A major focus continues to be to develop metrics. Metrics continue to include four- and six-year graduation rates and nothing else.

8. FY18 Senate Elections- David Cordell
   Dr. Cordell circulated a document listing the dates associated with the election process. He noted that the time frame was identical to FY17. Joe Izen moved to place the item on the Academic Senate agenda for approval. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

9. A Resolution of support for President Benson- Murray Leaf
   Murray Leaf moved to place on the February Academic Senate agenda a resolution of support of a statement by President Benson concerning the travel ban imposed by President Donald J. Trump. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried. Dr. Leaf will provide the wording for the resolution before the senate meeting.
10. **Student Government Report – Akshitha Padigela**
   Student Government (SG) has been adding more benches across campus. Having access to more benches on campus will give students better opportunities to be outside in the nice weather.

11. **CEP Recommendations – Tim Redman**
   Due to the scheduled meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy occurring after the Academic Council meeting the chair, Clint Peinhardt requested that any item approved by CEP during their meeting be added to the Academic Senate agenda. Maribeth Schlobohm moved to add the approved CEP items be placed on the Academic Senate agenda following their February 7, 2017, meeting. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

12. **Rescind of UTDPP1054: Graduate Studies Committee – Serenity King**
   Because of the yearly review of policies by the Handbook of Operating Procedures Committee, many Academic Affairs policies are being reviewed this year. UTDPP 1054 was reviewed by the Graduate Council, which requested that the policy be rescinded since the respective schools’ bylaws currently specify how that school handles its graduate studies programs. Richard Scotch moved to place UTDPP1054 on the Academic Senate agenda. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

13. **FY 2016 Annual Committee Reports – David Cordell**
   David Cordell moved to place acceptance of the annual reports on the Academic Senate agenda. Maribeth Schlobohm seconded. The motion carried.

14. **Discussion: “Shadow Work” Discussion – Tim Redman**
   The issue regarding the Sponsored Project Certification has been dealt with but the underlying problems still needed to be addressed. Two proposed options were presented1) turn the issue over to an existing committee, for example, the Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee, or 2) create a committee in the style of the Handbook on Operating Procedures (HOP) Committee. The HOP committee model would allow the input of the different stake-holders across campus. Speaker Redman noted his recommendation was the HOP-style committee. The floor was turned over to Matthew Goeckner.

   The School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM) has worked to remove excessive work within that school. There have been a rash of instances in which a form is created but then is discovered to be impractical and/or user unfriendly. Cornell University performed a study on this type of work, called ‘shadow work’, in 2016. Dr. Goeckner hopes our university will perform a similar study on our campus. The study would allow for the problem areas on our campus to be addressed more efficiently. The floor was turned over to Joe Izen.

   Over the past six months the Academic Senate has tackled various issues, specifically OneCard reports, and Time Reporting. It occurred to Dr. Izen that there is something systemic concerning how new electronic forms and paperwork are being done on campus. He observed two main issues of concern: 1) overzealous certification, and 2) excessive forms. Dr. Izen requested that each of the high paperwork generating offices work together to make sure there is sufficient user input so that future problems can be minimized.
The current process to create electronic forms is typically initiated when an administrative unit requires a new form. If that unit does not have someone in house to develop the form, it turns to the Office of Information Technology (OIT). OIT creates the form, but neither users nor faculty with expertise are consulted sufficiently. After the forms are rolled out to the users, it is found that the user does not received the specific information for their position, and there are no mechanics in place to allow them to address this issue. The floor was then opened to full discussion.

Dr. Leaf noted that the ad hoc group that had been assembled to create the ‘one button’ for time reporting concerns, worked well. That group is now tackling the OneCard report issue. They have run into difficulties with SciQuest. Dr. Leaf raised the question of how the university can discern where this is going and institutionalize it effectively so that all the right people can be in the room at the right time. Dr. Leaf recommended that the issue be sent to the University Information Technology Planning and Policy (UITPP) Committee. Dean Ted Harpham, chair of the ITPP Committee, disagreed. He did not feel that the committee would be appropriate to address the issue. The problem is multifaceted, and goes beyond electronic forms.

Vice-President Terry Pankratz noted his support on rectifying the problem. He had three recommendations for the Council. First, that a survey be conducted on the campus to ascertain where the biggest pain points are, and what the top priorities should be. Second, the Office of Budget and Finance keeps an ongoing list of what issues their office is currently addressing. By sharing this list with various groups it may allow them insight concerning what issues are being addressed, and when they will be addressed. Much of the list concerns items that may not be of interest to the users, but users would be able to give input. Lastly, he recommended that an ombudsperson not be used, and to have a forum for feedback instead.

It was decided that an initial survey would be constructed by Matthew Goeckner. The finding will be shared with the Academic Council at its March 1, 2017, meeting. Following those findings the survey can be rolled out to the full campus with the help of Terry Pankratz's office. Maribeth Schlobohm moved to table the discussion until the March 1, 2017 meeting following the completion of the “shadow work” survey in NSM. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

15. Senate Agenda for February 15, 2017:
1. Call to Order, Announcements, and Questions
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of the Minutes
4. Speaker’s Report
5. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates
6. TXCFS/ FAC Report
7. Student Government Report
8. CEP Recommendations
9. Senate Elections
10. Resolution of Support for President Benson
11. Rescind of UTDPP1054-Graduate Studies Committee
12. FY 16 Annual Committee Reports
16. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Murray Leaf moved to approve adjournment. David Cordell seconded. Inga Musselman adjourned the meeting at 2:40 PM.

---

APPROVED: ______________________________ DATE: ______________________________

Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty
SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates (http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/)
Serenity Rose King
Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination, SACSCOC Liaison
Academic Council and Academic Senate
March 2017

1. Reaffirmation Updates

   A. QEP
Item 9:
Committee on Educational Policy
March 2017
Updates – Pending March 7, 2017 meeting
Committee on Committees - UTDPP1019

Policy Charge

Committee on Committees

Policy Statement

The Committee on Committees is a Standing, Concurrent Committee of the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas. Members of the Committee are appointed by the President upon nomination by the Academic Council.

The Committee is charged to advise the Academic Council on faculty membership for the standing and ad hoc committees of the Academic Senate; to study the organization and operation of Senate committees, making recommendations with respect to improvements in the structure and effectiveness; and to advise the President on faculty membership for University-wide standing committees.

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

The Committee is composed of members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in UTDPP 1088), consisting of one person appointed to represent each of the Schools, the Speaker of the Faculty, President of Staff Council or designee, and President of Student Government as ex officio (with vote). The Executive Vice President and Provost serves as the Responsible University Official.

The term of office for appointed committee members shall be effective June 1 to May 31, and members may be reappointed by the President for additional terms upon nomination of the Academic Council. The terms for appointed members shall be staggered so that no more than one-half of the terms expire in any one year. 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.

The Speaker of the Faculty serves as the Chair of the Committee. The term of office for the Speaker shall expire upon the selection of the Speaker-Elect, who serves until the next election.

Policy History

- Issued: May 31, 1984
- Revised: May 13, 1985
- Revised: May 1, 1988
- Revised: November 1, 1990
- Revised: October 15, 1993
- Revised: September 1, 1998
• Editorial Amendments: September 1, 2000
• Editorial Amendments: April 18, 2006
• Revised: January 5, 2017

Policy Links

• Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1019
• Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1019
• Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1019
School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences

Bylaws

Approved by the unanimous vote of the BBS Faculty on September 5, 2014

PREAMBLE

The mission of the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences is to understand the intersection of mind, brain and behavior; to enhance the health, education, and quality of life of children and families; and to create and implement technologies and therapies that repair and strengthen human abilities. We accomplish these goals by recruiting and supporting outstanding faculty to do innovative research and offer student training in a climate that fosters collaboration across disciplines. The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences offers excellent educational programs at all levels, including carefully designed courses and ample opportunities for mentoring in research laboratories and in internship settings. We seek a high level of engagement with the Dallas, Richardson, Plano, and other North Texas communities by offering a broad array of clinical services, public lecture series, and faculty experts as consultants and speakers for community groups.

The academic programs of the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences are organized into three major areas: Cognition and Neuroscience, Communication Sciences and Disorders, and Psychological Sciences. The Cognition and Neuroscience Area includes undergraduate programs in Cognitive Science and in Neuroscience, a masters program in Applied Cognition and Neuroscience, and a doctoral program in Cognition and Neuroscience. The Communication Sciences and Disorders Area includes an undergraduate program in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, a masters program in Communication Disorders, and doctoral programs in Audiology and in Communication Sciences and Disorders. The Psychological Sciences Area includes undergraduate programs in Psychology and in Child Learning and Development, masters programs in Psychological Sciences and in Human Development and Early Childhood Disorders, and a doctoral program in Psychological Sciences. Each major area is guided by an Area Head and an Associate Area Head who lead the faculty in developing and delivering the academic curriculum. Faculty members have a primary affiliation with one major Area but are encouraged to participate in multiple areas.

The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences faculty also participate in four vibrant Centers: the Callier Center for Communication Disorders, the Center for BrainHealth, the Center for Children and Families, and the Center for Vital Longevity. The Centers enhance the academic programs by housing research activities and providing important training opportunities for students as well as clinical services and outreach programs for the community. Each Center has its own leadership, operating procedures, and bylaws.

The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences conducts business through the regular meetings of Area faculty, and at least twice yearly meetings of the entire school faculty, conducted by the Dean. We have long maintained a collegial, collaborative atmosphere in which Deans, Associate Deans, and Area Heads regularly consult with faculty members, and in which suggestions and concerns are openly shared with the leadership of the school.
FACULTY

The voting members of the faculty in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences are individuals defined as voting members of the General Faculty per UT DPP1088, i.e., includes (1) faculty appointed half-time or more to UTD who hold the rank of Regental Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Instructor; and (2) all tenured and tenure-track professors faculty appointed full-time to UTD who hold the rank of Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, or Senior Lecturer.

Also consistent with UT DPP1088, non-voting members of the faculty of SBBS are all persons who hold the following titles: Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Assistant Professor; Clinical Instructor, and Instructor (less than half-time appointments); Lecturer; Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Assistant Professor; Professor Emeritus and Associate Professor Emeritus; and Research Scientists and Research Associates holding appointments outside the classified pay plan of the University. All faculty meetings are open meetings and instructors may attend, except for meetings involving faculty personnel decisions, which may only be attended by above-rank faculty.

Faculty members are assigned to academic programs within the school by self-selection. There is no limitation on the number of programs with which a faculty member can affiliate. For administrative purposes, each faculty member is required to select one of the three major areas of BBS (Cognition and Neuroscience, Communication Sciences and Disorders, and Psychological Sciences) as his or her primary administrative home, but faculty also may select an unlimited number of secondary affiliations with other BBS areas and programs. Faculty members also may be affiliated with one or more of the School’s Centers in the School by mutual agreement of between the faculty member, the Center Director, the relevant Area Head, and the Dean. Disputes regarding faculty affiliations with programs or centers will be resolved first by discussion between the faculty member and the Area Head or the Center Director, and if they cannot be resolved, then by discussion with the Dean.

SBBS FACULTY MEETINGS AND VOTING BY THE SCHOOL FACULTY

Regular Meetings

At minimum, two regular meetings of the voting faculty of BBS will be held each academic year, one near the start of the fall semester and one near the beginning of the spring semester. Additional meetings may be called by the Dean if necessary for academic reasons, or if requested by members of the voting faculty. Regular meetings will be chaired by the Dean or the Dean’s Designee. A quorum for a regular faculty meeting will be a majority of the voting faculty who are in residence that term. A quorum of the voting faculty is required for any votes on major changes in academic policy. Minutes will be kept by the Associate Dean for Programs and Administration and will be made available to faculty via email. Meetings will be announced at least two weeks in advance with an agenda distributed at least one week in advance. Additional items proposed during the meeting not on the published agenda will be accepted by majority vote. Major decisions will be confined to meetings held during the nine month terms for which most faculty members are appointed.

Caucus Meetings
Caucus meetings of the voting faculty may be held without the Dean or Associate Deans being present, though caucus meetings cannot make policies for the school that require the assent of the Dean. Caucus meetings can formulate positions to be considered with the Dean at regular meetings. A faculty member or a group of faculty members can call a caucus meeting of the faculty via email. Every effort should be made to announce a caucus meeting two weeks in advance and to circulate an agenda, but in the case of urgent matters, meetings may be called on shorter notice.

**Conduct of Business**

Given our long history of cooperation and collaboration among faculty members and leaders in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, meetings will be led by the Dean, with ample opportunity for questions and discussion by faculty members. Faculty meetings will not be conducted following Robert’s Rules of Order unless the majority of faculty members present vote to invoke these rules at a particular meeting.

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS**

**Dean**

The Dean of the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences leads and supports the faculty in the school’s missions of understanding the intersection of mind, brain and behavior; enhancing the health, education, and quality of life of children and families; and creating and implementing technologies and therapies that repair and strengthen human abilities. The Dean works with the Associate Deans and Area Heads to recruit and support outstanding faculty to do innovative research and offer student training in a climate that fosters collaboration across disciplines. The Dean works with the Associate Deans and Area Heads to offer excellent educational programs at all levels, including carefully designed courses and ample opportunities for mentoring in research laboratories and in internship settings. The Dean fosters a high level of engagement with the Dallas, Richardson, Plano, and other North Texas communities by supporting the faculty in offering a broad array of clinical services, public lecture series, and faculty members as consultants and speakers for community groups. The Dean is responsible for the finances and physical resources of the school, and represents the school to the Provost and President. The Dean recommends the appointment of new faculty to the Provost, in consultation with faculty search committees. With the exception of the elected Academic Advisory Council and the Faculty Personnel Review Committees, the Dean appoints the members of school faculty committees in consultation with the Academic Advisory Council. The Dean appoints members of search and Ad Hoc tenure and promotion committees in consultation with the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. The Dean is primarily responsible for annual reviews of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members, and conducts Periodic Performance Reviews in consultation with the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. The Dean works collaboratively with the Associate Deans and the Area Heads to foster a collaborative, collegial environment where different disciplines are respected, newer faculty are mentored and supported, open communication about challenges is fostered, and new initiatives are welcomed and carefully considered.

**Associate Dean of Graduate Studies**

The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies leads all efforts to enhance graduate education across programs in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences (BBS). This includes coordination across
graduate degree programs in curricula, semester course offerings, graduate student recruitment, 
compliance with institutional and state policies related to graduate education, and appointment and 
assignment of teaching and research assistants. The Associate Dean convenes and works with the 
School’s Graduate Studies Committee to oversee and advance graduate education in the School. With 
the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies coordinates 
course scheduling and faculty teaching assignments across school programs. The Associate Dean works 
with graduate students having academic difficulty, and responds to graduate students’ concerns and 
academic grievances, often by involving the relevant Area Head. The Associate Dean for Graduate 
Studies serves as the BBS Representative on the Committee for Graduate Education, develops 
curriculum and program milestones so as to comply with state mandates, and communicates all 
institutional and state policies to faculty. The Associate Dean is responsible for coordinating the 
periodic evaluation of graduate programs. The Associate Dean is charged with maintaining the quality 
and integrity of graduate education across programs in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies is appointed by the Dean in consultation with BBS 
faculty. The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies must be a tenured faculty member.

**Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies**

The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies leads all efforts to enhance undergraduate 
education across programs in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences. The Associate Dean 
convenes and works with the Undergraduate Studies Committee to oversee and advance undergraduate 
education in the School. The Associate Dean oversees the development of all recruitment activities and 
materials to attract outstanding undergraduates. The Associate Dean supervises the academic advisors 
in implementing university policies and advising undergraduates. The Associate Dean for 
Undergraduate Studies supports high quality teaching by developing teaching policies and 
communicating these to faculty; and consulting with new faculty on teaching needs, expectations and 
policies. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies is responsible for developing and revising 
webpages to communicate with undergraduate students about academic issues, and for holding a yearly 
majors meeting and other professional development events for undergraduate students. With the 
Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies coordinates course 
scheduling across school programs. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies works with 
undergraduate students having academic difficulty, and responds to undergraduates’ concerns and 
academic grievances, often by involving the relevant Area Head. The Associate Dean for 
Undergraduate Studies serves as the BBS Representative on the Committee for Undergraduate 
Education (CUE), develops Core curricula so as to comply with state mandates, and communicates all 
institutional and state policies to faculty. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies is responsible 
for coordinating reviews for accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) 
for undergraduate programs. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies is charged with 
maintaining the quality and integrity of undergraduate education across programs in the School of 
Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies is appointed by the Dean in consultation with BBS 
faculty. The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies must be a tenured faculty member.

**Associate Dean for Programs and Administration**

This position in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences is charged to work with the 
Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the Dean to 
ensure that School programs are effective and in compliance with institutional policies and objectives.
Specifically, the holder of this position facilitates activities such as faculty reviews, faculty hiring, faculty governance, program reviews, accreditation compliance, teaching effectiveness, research infrastructure, community outreach, faculty mentoring and other operational domains. The Associate Dean for Programs and Administration also guides special projects and participates with the other Associate Deans, the Academic Advisory Council, Area Heads and Center Directors to develop priorities for new initiatives.

The Associate Dean for Programs and Administration is appointed by the Dean in consultation with BBS faculty. The Associate Dean of Programs and Administration must be a tenured faculty member.

Area Head for Cognition and Neuroscience

The Area Head for Cognition and Neuroscience leads the faculty in enhancing programs and curricula in Cognition and Neuroscience, with the support of the Associate Area Head and in coordination with the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. The Area Head oversees the development and the review of the Cognition and Neuroscience curriculum at the undergraduate, masters, and doctoral levels. The Area Head provides information to the Associate Deans of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies for SACS reviews. The Area Head reviews and updates the catalogue annually, and insures that all courses are offered as indicated in the catalogue.

The Area Head leads the faculty in developing priorities for new faculty hires. The Area Head communicates with faculty and lecturers about teaching assignments and provides the Cognition and Neuroscience portions of the schedule to the Associate Deans for Undergraduate and Graduate Studies for coordination across programs. The Area Head is responsible for selecting, appointing, and evaluating all lecturers in Cognition and Neuroscience. The Area Head supervises the recruitment of doctoral students in Cognition and Neuroscience, oversees admissions decisions, and plans a variety of activities for Cognition and Neuroscience doctoral students to create an intellectually rich graduate student culture that prepares students for professional careers. The Area Head provides input to the Dean for consideration in annual evaluations and Periodic Performance Evaluations of faculty.

The Area Head is appointed by the Dean in consultation with area faculty, for a term of five years, renewable. The Area Head must be a tenured faculty member.

Area Head for Communication Sciences and Disorders

The Area Head for Communication Sciences and Disorders leads the faculty in enhancing programs and curricula in Communication Sciences and Disorders, with the support of the Associate Area Head and in coordination with the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. The Area Head oversees the development and the review of the Communication Sciences and Disorders curricula at the undergraduate, masters, and doctoral levels. The Area Head provides information to the Associate Deans of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies for SACS reviews and for reviews by accrediting bodies for professional degrees in speech-language pathology and in audiology. The Area Head reviews and updates the catalogue annually, and insures that all courses are offered as indicated in the catalogue. The Area Head leads the faculty in developing priorities for new faculty hires. The Area Head communicates with faculty and lecturers about teaching assignments and provides the Communication Sciences and Disorders portions of the schedule to the Associate Deans for Undergraduate and Graduate Education for coordination across programs. The Area Head is responsible for selecting, appointing, and evaluating all lecturers in Communication Sciences and Disorders. The Area Head supervises the recruitment of doctoral students in Communication Sciences and Disorders, oversees admissions decisions, and plans a variety of activities
for doctoral students to create an intellectually rich graduate student culture that prepares students for professional careers. The Area Head provides input to the Dean for consideration in annual evaluations and Periodic Performance Evaluations of faculty.

The Area Head is appointed by the Dean in consultation with area faculty, for a term of five years, renewable. The Area Head must be a tenured faculty member.

**Area Head for Psychological Sciences**

The Area Head for Psychological Sciences leads the faculty in enhancing programs and curricula in Psychological Sciences, with the support of the Associate Area Head and in coordination with the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. The Area Head oversees the development and the review of the Psychological Sciences curricula at the undergraduate, masters, and doctoral levels, as well as the undergraduate program in Child Learning and Development (CLDP). The Area Head provides information to the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies for SACS reviews. The Area Head reviews and updates the catalogue annually, and insures that all courses are offered as indicated in the catalogue. The Area Head leads the faculty in developing priorities for new faculty hires. The Area Head communicates with faculty and lecturers about teaching assignments and provides the Psychological Sciences and Child Learning and Development portions of the schedule to the Associate Deans for Undergraduate and Graduate Education for coordination across programs. The Area Head is responsible for selecting, appointing, and evaluating all lecturers in Psychological Sciences. The Area Head supervises the recruitment of doctoral students in Psychological Sciences, oversees admissions decisions, and plans a variety of activities for Psychological Sciences doctoral students to create an intellectually rich graduate student culture that prepares students for professional careers. The Area Head provides input to the Dean for consideration in annual evaluations and Periodic Performance Evaluations of faculty.

The Area Head is appointed by the Dean in consultation with area faculty, for a term of five years, renewable. The Area Head must be a tenured faculty member.

**CENTERS AND INSTITUTES**

Members of the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences faculty have the opportunity to participate in four affiliated research Centers: the Callier Center for Communication Disorders, the Center for BrainHealth, the Center for Children and Families, and the Center for Vital Longevity. The Centers enhance the academic programs by housing research activities and by providing important training opportunities for students as well as clinical services and outreach programs for the community. Each Center has its own leadership and operating procedures, and its own by-laws. Center Directors will only propose new hires in consultation with Area faculty, consistent with Area priorities for hires, and will notify the Dean and program area faculty prior to proposing new positions.

**EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS**

Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and Area Heads are subject to upward evaluation under the UTD policy on *Evaluation of Academic Administrators - UTDPP1047.*

**STANDING COMMITTEES**
Academic Advisory Council

The Academic Advisory Council consists of the Dean, the three Associate Deans, the three Area Heads, and three elected members: one from Cognition and Neuroscience, one from Communication Sciences and Disorders, and one from Psychological Sciences. The Academic Advisory Council will meet monthly to discuss academic policy. The Associate Dean for Programs and Administration will prepare minutes of each Academic Advisory Council meeting which will be shared with all BBS faculty.

Faculty Personnel Review Committee

The Faculty Personnel Review Committee (FPRC) is an elected faculty committee that consults with the Dean on the appointment of Ad Hoc Committees for promotion and tenure reviews, policies on annual reviews of faculty, Periodic Performance Evaluations, reviews of applications for Special Faculty Development Assignments, and appointment of all search committees. As stated in UTDPP1077, Faculty Personnel Review Committees are chaired by the Dean of the School and must include at least four tenured faculty members from the School elected by the faculty. Because only equal or above-rank faculty can participate in these reviews, this committee should consist of tenured full professors. Members of the committee will be elected for two year terms with no members succeeding themselves. The election of the Faculty Personnel Review Committee will be conducted each spring by the Associate Dean for Programs and Administration.

All tenured and tenure-system faculty members other than tenured Professors will have their previous year’s work reviewed annually by the Faculty Personnel Review Committee. This annual review can lead to:

1. A recommendation that an Ad Hoc committee be composed to assess the faculty member's suitability for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, or
2. In the case of faculty in their first or second year of service, a recommendation that the faculty member not be reappointed.

These recommendations will be communicated by the Dean to the Provost according to the schedule. A faculty member may request an Ad Hoc committee review even if the School’s initial decision is not to initiate such a review. Such requests will be submitted to the Dean of the School for recommendation to the Provost.

Teaching Effectiveness Committee

Consistent with As mandated by POLICY MEMORANDUM 96 III.21-76 UTDPP1006, the BBS Teaching Effectiveness Committee (TEC) is an independent faculty committee charged with developing a teaching evaluation process for faculty with classroom or class-laboratory teaching responsibilities, compiling information on teaching performance, providing teaching performance feedback to the individual faculty member and to the dean, and identifying individual faculty deserving recognition or needing improvement. UTDPP 1006 mandates that the process will conduct systematic evaluations of teaching following procedures developed by the committee. Procedures for evaluating faculty teaching must include: written objective standards for evaluating teaching performance, including student course evaluations, teaching load contributions, diversity of courses covered, course development and administration, and factors such as thesis and dissertation supervision. Standards must also include procedures for periodic collection of reliable and verifiable information related to teaching performance including periodic classroom visits by designated faculty to gather direct observation information that supplements information taken from sources such as course syllabi, the learning assessment activities
portion of the Annual Reports of Professional Activities and Accomplishments, and student course evaluations, classroom observations by designated faculty members, examination of syllabi and student evaluations, and student course evaluations. The process should specify a mechanism for communicating results of the evaluation to the faculty member, who in turn may comment on the results of his or her evaluation and provide information they feel is pertinent to the teaching evaluation process.

The Chair of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee will be appointed each year by the Dean, and the Associate Dean for Programs and Administration will support the work of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee. Members of the committee will be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Chair for one year terms, renewable. Each year, the TEC will prioritize the evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty members coming up for promotion in the subsequent year, so that TEC reviews will be available in the early fall of the year of the promotion review. Results of TEC reviews will be shared with the faculty member with being reviewed and with his or her area head, and with the chair of the TEC, Associate Deans.

Committee for Undergraduate Studies

The Committee for Undergraduate Studies will be chaired by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and will advise on matters related to academic policy, including but not limited to: curriculum review and development, honors programs, activities to increase undergraduate engagement and retention, and future goals for strengthening all undergraduate programs. Committee members will be appointed to one-year terms, renewable, by the Dean in consultation with the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, with representation across the three major areas of BBS: Cognition and Neuroscience, Communication Sciences and Disorders, and Psychological Sciences. The committee will meet at least once in each fall and spring semester, and more frequently as needed.

Committee for Graduate Studies

The Committee for Graduate Studies will be chaired by the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and will advise on matters related to academic policy, including but not limited to: curriculum review and development, requirements and timelines for progress toward the degree, professional development activities to enhance graduate student culture, and future goals for strengthening all graduate programs. Committee members will include each Area Head and other members to be appointed to one-year terms, renewable, by the Dean in consultation with the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. The committee will meet at least once in each fall and spring semester, and more frequently as needed.

OTHER COMMITTEES

Other temporary committees may be established and appointed by the Dean to meet academic and administrative needs. Faculty members wishing to establish such committees or to participate in them should consult with the Dean and with the Associate Deans. These committees may be dissolved when the designated project is complete or when committee members decide that further work on the particular project would no longer be fruitful.

KEY ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES

State of the School Report and Consultation
The Dean will present a “state of the school” report to the faculty at the beginning of each academic year at a meeting of the school faculty. This will include plans for searches and other program initiatives. The meeting should provide opportunity for discussion. At the end of each spring term, the Dean will report on the outcomes of plans and initiatives and the faculty should again have the opportunity to discuss and offer suggestions.

Appointments of Tenure System Faculty

All appointments of tenure-system faculty in the University of Texas at Dallas shall be made in accordance with UTDPP1057, the General Standards and Procedures: Initial Appointments to the Ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor—UTDPP1057. Hires of tenure system faculty in BBS will follow the guidelines below.

Each tenure-track faculty search is an opportunity to fill critical needs for our current programs, strengthen our teaching and research and thus our national reputation, and broaden the expertise needed to best serve our students. Therefore, in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, proposals for academic positions will always be formulated with broad faculty input from faculty members in the Areas that the new appointment would serve. Faculty searches are initiated by the relevant Area faculty and are the outcome of the Area faculty’s assessment of expansion and replacement needs. Proposals for a particular search will be made in the context of established Area priorities. Area faculty will meet annually to discuss general hiring priorities and make recommendations to the Dean regarding needed specific searches. Recommendations to the Dean will include key phrases for the search ad formulated to attract the broadest possible pool of candidates most likely to best meet Area priorities. The language of search ads will be sufficiently broad to attract a sizable pool.

The following set of guidelines for searches in BBS is designed to augment the detailed search procedures outlined in the UTD policy titled “General Standards and Procedures: Initial Appointments to Ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor [UTDPP1057]”. The heart of this policy is contained in the following steps quoted directly from the university policy guidelines.

The appointment process is shown below. It should be followed strictly.

1. Approval of academic positions by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the School Dean.
2. Submission of search plan including documentation of compliance with affirmative action procedures to the Provost by the School Dean.
3. Approval of the search plan by the Provost.
4. Evaluation of applicants and identification of preferred candidates by the Search Committee.
5. Interviews conducted with preferred candidates.
6. Vote of the Area faculty on the recommendation of the Search Ad Hoc Committee by the voting faculty should include all appropriate rank tenure-track in the Area in which the appointment will be made.
7. Recommendation for appointment of all candidates deemed acceptable by the Search Committee and summary report of compliance with University affirmative action procedures added to candidate’s file and forwarded to the School Dean.
8. Recommendation by the School Dean added to the candidate’s file and file forwarded to the Committee on Qualifications (CQ).
9. CQ forwards file including its recommendation to the Provost.
Note that both a preferred and one or more alternate candidates may be recommended for appointment through this process.

A note regarding Internal Candidates - Hiring internal candidates is not encouraged and should present an exceptional opportunity. Internal candidates may choose to apply for an advertised position and this will require sensitivity in handling communication regarding the search process. A recommendation to hire an internal candidate will require strong arguments that no other candidate could better serve program needs, and stringent documentation that external candidates were recruited energetically and that the search was conducted fairly and impartially. Searches that result in recommendations to hire internal candidates will receive additional scrutiny at each step of the process.

Opportunity Hires - In exceptional situations, an opportunity to recruit a faculty member(s) may require an expedited search process, because of the necessity of rapid response and/or the sensitivity of the situation. Examples might include candidates who help to achieve institutional and school goals of increasing faculty diversity or high profile senior faculty who might not have emerged through the usual search mechanisms. Although such searches may be expedited, Area faculty must first be consulted before the expedited process is initiated. In addition, as described above, the search must be conducted through a specially appointed faculty search committee and candidates approved by a vote of the relevant Area faculty.

**APPOINTMENTS AND PEER REVIEW OF NON-TENURE-SYSTEM FACULTY**

The term “non-tenure system track faculty” has two meanings at UTD. The first meaning is specified in UTDPP1062, which defines nontenure-system faculty as those 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; their titles include Senior Lecturers and Clinical Assistant/Associate/Full Professors. To hire these faculty, UTDPP1062 specifies that the School or Department should appoint or designate a search committee that should include, whenever possible, at least one nontenure-system faculty member at the highest rank. The search committee recommends a candidate and an initial hiring ranks to the Dean and/or Program Head and program faculty should have the opportunity to comment on the recommendation prior to any formal job offer, whenever possible.

UTDPP1061 governs a different type of nontenure-system faculty, defined as those who are hired to teach specific courses, offered for academic credit, on a course-by-course basis and who are not subject to the procedures for tenure-system faculty. As specified in UTDPP1061, the responsibility for the initial hiring of these faculty, and for evaluating their performance, will be hired and reappoins primarily placed with the Dean, using whatever advice and recommendations from Area Heads or other members of the Dean’s administrative structure as appropriate in the School. The Dean, Area Head or Program Head certifies the credentials of selected candidates using the University’s specified process and form; these forms along with search plans and results of each pool of applicants is submitted each semester to the OEVP and Provost.

All UTD faculty are subject to an annual administrative review. Nontenure-system faculty as defined in UTDPP1062 will submit annual review documents in the same manner and schedule as tenure-system faculty, to the Dean, the Area Head, and the Program Head. The review file submitted to
the Office of the Dean for evaluation by the designated reviewing committee should include a complete professional curriculum vitae covering the areas of his or her assigned responsibility, including statistical summaries of the UES teaching evaluation form for each course taught during the previous six regular long semesters (including transcripts of or original comments by students) and other course information such as syllabi and exams. The review committee can add clearly identified material to the review, such as evaluation letters, the committee’s review of teaching performance in consultation with the Area faculty, and the Associate Deans, and when relevant, the Center Directors. The teaching of non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated by the Area Head in consultation with the Associate Deans.

For nontenure-system faculty as defined by UTDPP1061, evaluation of performance is primarily placed with the Dean in consultation with the faculty. Consistent with UTDPP1006, BBS Area Heads have developed evaluation procedures appropriate for their circumstances, including the opportunity for the faculty member to respond to the review report.

**CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Tenure system faculty will be evaluated for promotion and tenure following the procedures outlined in Policy Memorandum in university policy—UTDPP1077, General Standards and Procedures, Faculty Promotion, Reappointment and Tenure.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievement will be assessed in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The candidate's research has contributed significantly to the field and, where appropriate, the candidate's clinical innovations have had an impact on clinical practice.
2. The candidate has demonstrated through performance at UTD the ability to conduct independent research.
3. The candidate's independent research has contributed significantly to the field.
4. For candidates with clinical responsibilities as part of their academic appointment, evidence that clinical duties are performed in an excellent manner and that the candidate provides innovative and creative contributions in the clinical domain.

For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievements will be assessed as follows:

1. Scholars in related fields recognize as notable the contributions of the candidate.
2. The candidate has made an impact in the field of the candidate's scholarly pursuits.

For candidates with clinical responsibilities as part of their academic appointment, evidence that clinical duties are performed in an excellent manner and that the candidate provides innovative and creative contributions in the clinical domain.

As do all schools at UTD, BBS has supplementary guidelines that appear in as part of this policy; these are summarized below. These guidelines may be amended or revised by a majority vote of the tenured faculty in BBS.

As stated in UTDPP1077, the following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standard of Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement for the review of faculty in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

The candidate must present evidence of an ability to maintain a successful scholarly career.
The most significant evidence of creative productivity and professional achievement for faculty members in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences is publication in peer-reviewed journals, chapters, books, or monographs. Other forms of evidence of scholarly contributions are success in attracting extramural support, abstracts of presentations before professional groups, and invited presentations. Although the pattern may vary across individual faculty, a significant record of contribution in these various categories is expected from a typical faculty member in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

The Callier Center for Communication Disorders' presence in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences gives not only a distinctive quality to the School, but also a distinctive quality to some faculty appointments within the School. Faculty may have small to significant clinical service and/or clinical supervision responsibilities as part of their faculty duties. These clinical duties naturally influence the amount of effort that is devoted to other forms of teaching and scholarly productivity. These clinical responsibilities also introduce distinctive issues in the evaluation of contributions in the clinical role. The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences recognizes clinical contributions as being a component of the overall assessment of faculty contributions for those faculty members whose appointments include clinical duties. In general, faculty holding clinical appointments are expected to make teaching and scholarly contributions of equal quality to other faculty in the School but with a lesser expectation of the quantity of such contributions, proportionate to the percentage of time committed to clinical activity. The qualitative evaluation of clinical contributions is difficult given the private nature of the clinical process but there are some measures by which candidates may be reasonably evaluated. Criteria by which the School will evaluate clinical contributions may include: evidence that the candidate's clinical innovations have had an impact on clinical practice, testimony from knowledgeable professionals who regularly interact with the clinical role of the candidate, sampling of client satisfaction with the candidate's services, leadership roles in clinical professional organizations on a state, regional, or national level, appointments to government or professional committees who oversee clinical preparation and certification, other evidence of clinical contributions including preparation of professional materials for dissemination of information, professional presentations and writings of a primarily clinical nature, and indices of clinical contributions to the community as well as the Callier Center.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievement will be assessed in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The candidate's research has contributed significantly to the field and, where appropriate, the candidate's clinical contributions and innovations have had an impact on clinical research and/or practice.
2. The candidate has demonstrated through performance at UTD the ability to conduct independent research.
3. The candidate has the ability to attract external support at a level appropriate to the development and sustenance of an active research program in his or her area.
4. The candidate has demonstrated the ability to successfully guide doctoral students' research and dissertations.
5. The candidate's independent research has contributed significantly to the field.
6. For candidates with clinical responsibilities as part of their academic appointment, evidence that clinical duties are performed in accordance with best clinical practices and that the candidate provides innovative and creative contributions in the clinical domain.
For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievements will be assessed as follows:

1. Scholars in related fields recognize as notable the contributions of the candidate.
2. The candidate has made a significant impact in the field of the candidate’s scholarly pursuits.
3. The candidate has a sustained record of scholarly contribution through publications, invited presentations, and extramural support.
4. For candidates with clinical responsibilities as part of their academic appointment, evidence that clinical duties are performed in accordance with best clinical practices and that the candidate provides innovative and creative contributions in the clinical domain.

CREATING NEW DEGREE PROGRAMS

The School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences welcomes initiatives for possible new degree programs and is committed to considering these carefully. Proposals for new programs may originate from the BBS Dean, Associate Deans, Area Heads, Program Faculty, or Center Directors. All proposals for new degree programs must be discussed at regular Area faculty meetings to which all faculty members are invited. Area faculty will approve written proposals of new degree programs by majority vote. If a new degree program involves multiple Areas or Centers, then approval of new degree programs will be by majority vote of all program faculty members. Results of the votes should be reported to the Committee on Educational Policy and the Faculty Senate in requests for Senate approval of the new programs.

CLOSING EXISTING DEGREE PROGRAMS

Combining or eliminating degree programs and transferring their faculty to other programs in the school requires majority, in-person votes by the Area faculty and voting school faculty with a quorum present, at a meeting announced at least two weeks in advance. Votes in Areas should be taken before a school wide vote. Votes in Areas should be made available to program faculty (if any) before they vote; results of the vote in Areas and programs should be made available to entire school faculty before they vote. Elimination of programs that would result in termination of tenured faculty requires conformance to Regents Rule 31003, Section 2, Elimination of Academic Positions of Programs: Elimination for Academic Reasons as implemented in the UTD Academic Program Abandonment Policy - UTDPP1000.

AUTHORITY

No provisions in the various bylaws may override or contravene established university or Regents’ policies.

PROVISIONS FOR AMENDING THE BYLAWS

By-laws may be amended by majority vote of the voting faculty at a school wide faculty meeting with a quorum present, which must be announced two weeks in advance.
International Education Development Committee – UTDXX####

Policy Charge

International Education Development Committee

Policy Statement

The International Education Development Committee (IEDC) is a university-wide standing committee appointed by the President.

The IEDC is dedicated to strengthening and to enriching the development of strategic international programs and institutional partnerships that contribute to UT Dallas’ mission. IEDC members include representatives from across campus, including faculty members, administrative leaders, and international education specialists. The committee meets once per month as necessary to review and to discuss strategic issues of UT Dallas internationalization, including the feasibility of proposed international programs and international partnerships.

Programs and partnerships under the purview of this committee include, but are not limited to: education abroad programs, faculty-led international programs, reciprocal student exchange agreements, affiliation agreements, degree program agreements, dual degree program agreements (undergraduate and graduate), and Cotutelle agreements.

The Committee:

1. Establishes guidelines and processes, suggests policy recommendations to the Council for Undergraduate Education/Council on Graduate Education, as appropriate, and Committee on Educational Policy and proposes institutional structures to support a holistic, strategic approach to international programs and partnerships.
2. Evaluates the design and implementation of international programs and partnerships to support alignment with established institutional criteria, professional standards, best practices, and institutional mission.
3. Reviews new international program and partnership proposals and makes recommendations to the Provost and President for final approval.

The Committee will be composed of the following members appointed by the President: four faculty, nominated by the Committee on Committees for two-year staggered terms, the Dean of Undergraduate Education, the Dean of Graduate Studies, a designee from the Honors College, the Vice President for Research, the University Registrar, the Assistant Vice President for International
Programs, the SACSCOC Liaison, the Director of Admissions, the International Partnership Development Director or their designee, and the Director of Education Abroad or their designee. The Assistant Vice President for International Programs will chair the Committee. All members will serve as voting members regarding policy recommendations; the Director of Admissions, the University Registrar, the International Partnership Development Director or their designee, and the Director of Education Abroad or their designee will serve as non-voting members regarding partnership agreements. The term of office for Committee members will be for two years. The Provost will serve as the Responsible University Official for this committee.

Policy History

- Ad Hoc IPD Committee Issued: November 2014
- Issued: Month, Day 2017

Policy Links

- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdxx###
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdxx###
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdxx###
International Oversight Committee - UTDPP1092

Policy Charge

International Oversight Committee

Policy Statement

The International Oversight Committee (IOC) is a university-wide standing committee appointed by the President. The IOC does not report to the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas (UT Dallas).

The IOC is dedicated to preserving academic freedom and the University's robust research agenda, while remaining committed to the safety and security of UT Dallas students, faculty, and staff during international travel as well as to the safety and security of UT Dallas international students in the United States. The Committee has been established to develop guidelines and formulate policies to maintain the health and safety of UT Dallas students, faculty, and staff who study or conduct research and/or business internationally. The Committee is charged with assessing levels of risk in countries or regions with significant health or safety concerns, and where University-related programs and travel are occurring or proposed. The Committee is dedicated to preserving academic freedom and the University’s robust research agenda, while remaining committed to the safety and security of UT Dallas students, faculty, and staff during international travel.

Committee members include representatives from across campus, including faculty members, administrative leaders, and international travel and risk specialists. The committee meets each semester-month as required to review international program proposals to high-risk regions, and to discuss policies.

The Committee is charged with evaluating any UT Dallas activity or travel to high risk regions; coordinating University emergency responses to assist both UT Dallas travelers abroad and UT Dallas international students in the United States; and developing guidelines and formulating policies to maintain the well-being and safety of UT Dallas travelers to international regions.

1. Evaluation of UT Dallas programs and travel in high risk countries or regions: High risk countries or regions are those in which warnings or alerts have been issued by the U.S. Department of State, or where significant health or safety concerns are present. The Committee will evaluate proposed programs and travel requests to high risk regions according to well defined criteria, to determine adequate safeguards are in place before an approval to travel is granted. Such criteria may include, but will not be limited to, the following: the nature and scope of the travel alert / warning and/or health or safety concern; the experience of the faculty program leaders and in-country staff; the strength of the in-country infrastructure; the specific steps taken to inform all travelers about known risks; the specific steps taken to mitigate known risks and their likely effectiveness; the academic or university related purpose for which the authorization is being sought; whether the opportunity is for undergraduate, graduate or professional training; the education, research, or professional training importance of the opportunity in relation to the student's academic program; the political and physical conditions in-country; travel conditions and the ability to evacuate all travelers, if necessary; and the manageability of legal risk to the institution. Assessment of levels of risk in countries or regions with significant health or safety concerns, and where University-related programs and travel are occurring or proposed; evaluation of risk mitigation plans; committee-level approval of high-risk region travel requests for individual travelers, group travelers, and education abroad programs.

2. Coordination of participating in the University's international emergency response: The Committee will develop and initiate a coordinated UT Dallas emergency response strategy by taking into account specific issues, including but not limited to: identifying the context of emergency or crisis; assessing
potential risk to the faculty, staff, or students involved including the nature, duration and severity of any risk, and identifying appropriate resources and activation of appropriate emergency response plans to assist in addressing a situation, by providing analysis of risk mitigation options when appropriate.

3.—Development of guidelines and formulation of policies to maintain the health and safety of UT Dallas students, faculty and staff who conduct research and/or business internationally. The IOC will develop guidelines and formulate policies on international travel pertaining to: oversight, prevention-mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery.

The Committee will be composed of the following eight voting members appointed by the President: three-four faculty members, the Dean of Students, an Associate Provost, a representative from the Office of the Vice President for Research, the Dean of Students, and the Assistant Vice President for International Programs. The following persons will serve as non-voting members: International Center Risk and Insurance Analyst, Director of Education Abroad, University Attorney, representative from the Office of Environmental Health and Safety, and representative from Human Resources, the Assistant Vice President for Procurement, the Vice President for Communications, and the Vice President for Research or their designees.

The Committee will be chaired by a representative from the International Center Risk and Safety Office. The Assistant Vice President for International Programs serves as the Responsible University Official. The term of office for Committee members will be for two years, and the President can reappoint members for additional terms. The Assistant Vice President for International Programs will serve as the Responsible University Official for this committee. The Committee will determine a schedule of meetings that includes at least two per semester at a time and place designated by the Chair. Additional meetings will be called by the Chair or RUO as may be necessary.

Policy History
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