MEMORANDUM
April 25, 2016

TO: Academic Council*

COPY TO: Hobson Wildenthal
        Inga Musselman
        Andrew Blanchard
        Calvin Jamison
        Abby Kratz
        John Wiorkowski
        Marion Underwood
        Dennis Dean
        George Fair
        James Bartlet
        Bruce Novak
        Hasan Pirkul
        Mark Spong

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

SUBJECT: Academic Council Meeting

The Academic Council will meet on WEDNESDAY, May 4, 2016 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015-2016 Academic Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gail Breen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cordell**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Dess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Farrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Leaf***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi Prakash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viswanath Ramakrishna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Redman *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Scotch ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tres Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonja Wissinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlynn Fortner, Student Government President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Speaker
**Secretary
*** Vice-Speaker

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS
   Dr. Wildenthal
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   Dr. Redman
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –
   April 6, 2016 Meeting
   Dr. Redman
4. Speakers Report
   Dr. Redman
5. SACS Reaffirmation Updates
   Serenity King
6. TXCFS/FAC REPORT
   Dr. Leaf
7. Student Government Report
   Akshitha Padigela
8. CEP Recommendations
   Clint Peinhardt
   A. Addition to Syllabus template on Title IX
   B. Scholarship Programs
   C. Graduate Courses for possible future use
   D. Allowing electronic submissions of dissertations
      a. Amendments to UTDP 1052
      b. Catalog updates
9. Hearing Tribunal Appointments
   Dr. Redman
10. Appointment to the Committee on Committees
    Dr. Redman
11. UTHealth Houston IFC Report Regarding Intellectual Property
    Dr. Leaf
12. Discussion of Toefl scores
    Jennifer Holmes
13. Updated UTS 180
    Tim Shaw
14. Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee
    Dr. Redman
    UTDPP 1003
15. Amendments to UTDBP 3050- Scholarships, Fellowships and Other
    Appointments and Monetary Awards to Students
    Abby Kratz
16. Battery Disposal
    Joe Izen
17. ADJOURNMENT
    Dr. Wildenthal
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
APRIL 6, 2015

PRESENT: Hobson Wildenthal, Inga Musselman, Gail Breen, Matt Brown, David Cordell, Gregory Dess, Eric Farrar, Murray Leaf, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Tim Redman, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Tonja Wissinger

ABSENT: None

VISITORS: Andrew Blanchard, Caitlynn Fortner, Ted Harpham, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Clint Peinhardt, Marion Underwood

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions
Interim President Wildenthal called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM. He had just returned from a faculty lunch. A summary of his presentation at the lunch was that the university is doing well financially, but that Vice-Presidents will be working with a 5% budget cut. At a fundamental level, the income per student is going down because the university is allocating 2% of the total budget to salary increments, and the university is gaining 1% in tuition increase, but only one-third of the students will pay the increase. The university’s net income operating income will go down by 1%, and will further go down by another 1% next year. On the other hand, because the university is expecting a 6-9% enrollment increase, the university’s gross income will go up 6-9%. There must be a distinct difference between the effective income per student and the gross income. The university will continue to function on the increase on enrollment. The university is going downhill on a per capita basis and will continue to do so until the regents let the university raise tuition to account for at least salary increases and other forms of inflation. The University is in great shape financially but is 1% poorer. The increase in enrollment will continue to stress teaching, parking, and space issues, but it was noted that is a much better problem to have a 10% increase instead of a 3%.

Recently Dr. Wildenthal reviewed plans for the new mechanical engineering building. The building will be on the site of the Clark Center. The completion date for the new building is 2 years away. There is much anticipation for the new BBS Callier building which will be ready for fall 2016. He then opened the floor to questions, but there were none.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Murray Leaf moved to add a senate election report following the Speakers Report, and to move item 10 following the election report, and to approve the amended agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Murray Leaf seconded. The minutes were approved.

4. Speaker’s Report
1. Speaker Redman noted the Senate Caucus will take place April 20, 2016 at 1 PM. He wished to discuss moving the annual General Faculty meeting to the caucus for the 2016-2017 school year. Murray Leaf moved to change the time of both Academic Council and Senate from 2 PM to 1 PM starting June 1. Tres Thompson seconded. The motion carried.

2. The May Academic Council meeting will be a joint meeting between the 2015-16 Academic Council and the 2016-17 Council Elect. The first meeting of the FY 17 Council will be the first Wednesday in June.

3. All other items were on the agenda.

5. **Election Report – David Cordell**  
   As of the start of the meeting 48 of the senator elects have confirmed they are willing to serve. Two have declined their election, and one has not responded.

6. **Amendments to UTDPP1003- Information Technology Resources Security Planning and Policy Committee- Ted Harpham**  
   Previously the committee handled information security concerns, but that responsibility has been taken over by the Information Security Advisory Committee. Since Dr. Harpham took over the committee he has worked with the various stakeholders to make sure that it is mutually beneficial for all concerned. The committee charge referred to policies that no longer exists, and the amendments remove those references and update the membership. Dr. Harpham will send recommendations for the FY17 members to the committee on committees. Matt Brown moved to place the item on the Senate agenda. Murray Leaf seconded.

7. **Update on the UT Dallas’ Reaffirmation Project – Serenity King**  
   The steering committee had its first meeting. Each reaffirmation committee will have its first meeting in April. There were three faculty members who declined their appointments, and will need to be replaced. Two must be tenure-track faculty and the third must be non-tenure-track. It was suggested that replacement suggestions come from the Council. The replacement were as follows: for Randall Lehmann, Jill Duquaine-Watson from Interdisciplinary Studies; for David Channell, Ali Hooshyar from NSM; for Erin Smith, Shilyh Warren from Arts and Humanities.

8. **FAC/TCFS Report- Murray Leaf**  
   There will be a Faculty Advisory Council meeting on April 7-8, 2016. A full report will be given at the April 20, 2016 Senate meeting. Murray Leaf moved to place the report on the Senate agenda. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

9. **Student Government Report- Caitlynn Fortner**  
   Student Government (SG) has passed a resolution on April 5, 2016 called the ‘Green Initiative’. Beginning on Earth day, April 22, SG will be collecting suggestions from students for ‘Green’ or sustainable projects. SG use their remaining project budget will implement one of those ideas over the summer months. The next SG administration will be implementing the project. Speaker Redman reminded SG that they will need to appoint someone for the Committee on Committees for the July meeting.

10. **CEP Recommendations- Clint Peinhardt**  
    A. Questions for new Course Form
This was in result of direction that came from Academic Senate to stop duplication of courses.

1. **How does this course fit in the curriculum? Major/Core/Elective**
   (can select more than one)

2. **Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum? If so, which?**

3. **Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course identification numbers below.**

   __________  
   __________  

4. **How does the proposed course differ from those identified in question 3 (target audience, content, learning outcomes etc.)?**

5. **Faculty contact person**

Murray Leaf moved to place this recommendation on the Senate agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

**B. Revisions concerning Bachelor Degree Equivalencies for Graduate Admissions**

The revisions lift the requirements that bachelor degree requirement must be a four year degree. The university has been admitting international students who have less than four years. Previously the international students were required to take an additional 24 credit hours. The university realizes that not all international degrees are equivalent and that some students will still need to complete preparatory work here, but the faculty want the flexibility to determine which high-quality students should be admitted without the leveling work. Richard Scotch moved to place this recommendation on the Senate agenda. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

**C. First 40- Undergraduate Catalog**

The major changes are to the admission requirements, application deadlines, and financial aid. The application deadlines were aligned to earlier timelines to be more competitive. Administrative updates were made to the tuition and financial aid portion.

Under ‘Application fees and deadlines’, Speaker Redman suggested the friendly amendment to change “Application is completed” to read, “Application is completed and submitted”. Clarification was requested as to what ‘AMP’ was. It was suggested the wording of “AMP, formerly known as ‘A Modest Proposal’” be amended. Speaker Redman noted the section for student government was left out of the undergraduate portion, but was found in the graduate portion. Matt Brown moved to place the item on the senate agenda. Tonja Wissinger seconded. The motion carried.

**D. First 40- Graduate Catalog**

The requested changes parallel the changes made to the undergraduate. The Graduate application deadlines were aligned to earlier timelines to be more competitive. The graduate catalog was updated similarly to the undergraduate portion. An updated copy will be submitted for the senate meeting. Matt Brown moved to place the item on the senate agenda. Greg Dess seconded. The motion carried.

**E. New Graduate Audiology Course**
The course had been a special topics course during the summer for several years. Greg Dess moved to place consideration of AUD7360 on the senate agenda. Viswanath Ramakrishna seconded. The motion carried.

F. Non-Academic Withdrawal Process
There have been students who have been abusing the system by selectively withdrawing from some courses, but not all, based solely on their likely grades. The system is being amended so that when Non-Academic Withdrawal is requested the deans themselves will be included in the discussions. Murray Leaf moved to place this recommendation on the Senate agenda. Greg Dess seconded. The motion carried.

G. Second Baccalaureate Degree
This change is recommended due to students who are going for a second bachelor's degree that is actually a double major. The amendments now spell out the requirements for a second Baccalaureate. This is a clarification in the policy rather than a change in policy. It was noted that the Graduate Council will be addressing later the issue of multiple masters degrees. Richard Scotch moved to place the item on the Senate agenda. Gail Breen seconded. The motion carried.

11. Approval of Spring 2016 Graduates – David Cordell
David Cordell moved to place the list of Spring Graduates for 2016 on the senate agenda. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

12. Amendments to UTDPP1017-Campus Wellness Committee – Murray Leaf
The proposed amendments came directly from the committee itself. The committee has been working all year to consider updates to the charge. The committee’s aim is now focused on Faculty and Staff versus students, who have their own committee. The money the committee uses for their programs comes from the tobacco fine that faculty/staff pay to smoke. The committee wanted to 1) clarify what it does, 2) remove the student membership, 3) tailor the charge to comport with what they are doing now, and 4) describe what they want to do in the future. One proposed amendment to the charge would add: “The chair and vice chair are appointed by president on the recommendation of staff council.” The purpose of the amendment was to align the charge with a previous minor amendment that had already gone to Office of General Council. Murray Leaf moved to place the recommendation on the senate agenda. Gregg Dess seconded. The motion carried.

13. Amendments to UTDPP1088- Faculty Governance – Murray Leaf
UTDPP1088 currently states the following: “The President of the University convenes the university community, faculty, and staff, for a ‘State of the University Report’ each year in October.” The recommendation is to change the wording to the following: “The President of the University convenes the university community, faculty, and staff, for a ‘State of the University Report’ each year, usually in October.” Speaker Redman suggested that the FY17 State of the University Address take place on the 5th Wednesday of the month of November.

Speaker Redman raised a concern under Section 1. General Faculty, B. Membership Privileges. He suggested that there may be conflict in school bylaws, specifically in the Schools of Management and Interdisciplinary Studies, regarding who qualifies as voting faculty. Murray Leaf did not feel that this was a conflict, and the policy was targeted at the overall university. He stated that the definition of voting faculty within a school could be different for each school. Speaker Redman responded that Section 5 notes that faculty of the schools and departments should vote on their own members and
cannot exclude general faculty votes. Speaker Redman went on to suggest an amendment in which “…except where spelled out in individual school by laws…” is added. This is for school governance, and schools may modify their requirements. Richard Scotch suggested that schools should not exclude, but that may add more to their own voting faculty if they wish.

Matt Brown moved to divide the question to vote on the editorial amendment in section 1. General Faculty, C.1, and to table the amendments to Section V. School and Disciplinary Legislative Bodies, A. Schools until further research has been conducted. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion to place the item on the Senate agenda carried.

14. Discussion of Child Care during Exams
Following discussion it was decided that this topic would be referred to the women’s center, and the child care office. Speaker Redman would follow up with the director of the on campus child care center. He will report back at the May meeting with his findings.

15. Faculty Time Reporting – Tres Thompson
Recently there were changes in how Faculty were to report sick time. The faculty did not feel that their time was used wisely doing this process. The previous process allowed the faculty to notify their administrative assistance, and the new process requires them to enter the information via a website. The faculty expressed their displeasure that the instructions provided them were unclear, and unhelpful. Speaker Redman would follow up with Colleen Dutton in HR, and possibly Payroll. He will report back at the May meeting with his findings. The item was later added to the April Senate agenda.

16. One Card Reporting – Tres Thompson
The previous system was awkward, but the new system is even more difficult to work with. Faculty are required to directly reconcile their one cards with the bank itself. The instruction on the website and the handouts distributed by Procurement were not clear. As this is an accounting procedure, and it should be handled by someone other than faculty. Speaker Redman noted he would follow up with Terry Pankratz and Debbie Reynolds, and report back to the Council at the May meeting his findings. The item was later added to the April Senate agenda.

17. Senate Agenda for April 20, 2016:
   1. Update on the UT Dallas’ Reaffirmation Project
   2. TXCFS/ FAC Report
   3. Student Government Report
   4. CEP Recommendations
      a. Questions on New Course Form
      b. Revision concerning Bachelor Degree Equivalencies for Graduate Admission
      c. First 40 – Undergraduate Catalog
      d. First 40 – Graduate Catalog
      e. New Graduate Audiology Course
      f. Non-Academic Withdrawal Process
      g. Second Baccalaureate Degree
   5. Approval of Spring Graduates
6. Amendments to UTDPP1003- Information Technology Resources Security Planning and Policy Committee
7. Amendments to UTDPP1017-Campus Wellness Committee
8. Amendments to UTDPP1088- Faculty Governance

20. Adjournment
There being no further business Interim Provost Inga Musselman adjourned the meeting at 3:23 PM. Murray Leaf moved to adjourn. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

APPROVED: ______________________________ DATE:_____________________________
Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty
1. Department of Education (DOE) Letter
   • Waiting on SACSCOC’s formal response

   • Guidelines added to QEP website
   • June 1 deadline for Top 5 Topics
     o First-Year Experience
       ▪ Proposals under this topic may include programs to improve retention and success during and after students’ first year at UT Dallas.
     o Communication Counts
       ▪ Proposals under this topic should address ways to improve students’ interpersonal skills and written and oral communication.
     o Wellness
       ▪ Proposals under this topic may include programs to support the health of students’ minds, bodies, and social contributions with the goal of improving academic performance and overall lifelong health.
     o Curricular Globalization
       ▪ Proposals for this topic should consider ways to enhance cross-cultural exchange and learning opportunities.
     o Digital Learning: Innovation and Integration
       ▪ Proposals for this topic may include ideas for improving student learning through digital learning programs and initiatives.

3. Reaffirmation Committees (Materials and Updates)
   • Meetings – all met in April 2015; reported back to Steering Committee
     o Website will be updated to include future meeting schedule
     o Some committees will meet during summer 2016
   • Materials (minutes, agendas, etc.) will be added to website

4. Program Head meetings completed /documentation online
Item 6:
Faculty Advisory Council
Report of Meeting
University of Texas System Faculty Advisory Council
Ashbel Smith Hall, April 7-8, 2016

The UTD representatives were Murray J Leaf and David Cordell.

Background: Before the meeting, Chancellor McRaven had expressed strong interest in supporting faculty governance. In response to that interest, the FAC had done two things. First, in 2015/2016, it surveyed the faculty governance leaders on the several campuses on the state of faculty governance of shared governments on their campus. In the survey, six of the campuses reported serious problems or little-to-no shared governance. Four institutions reported “moderately effective” or mixed results in their shared governance procedures. Only four of the fourteen reported having “very effective” shared governance structures and cultures of communication. Second, a sub-committee of the FAC has been working on a “white paper” on shared governance for the chancellor, to be accompanied by a very brief executive summary. Tony Cucolo, the chancellor’s liaison to the FAC, has been working closely with the group.

2. The first guest was Ernest Aliseda, newly appointed regent and chair of the Academic Affairs committee. He mainly asked questions and the FAC members tried to respond. His first question was how to measure success. The FAC response was to reject the use of four-year graduation rate and argue for a diverse range of indicators. He seemed responsive. The conversation shifted to what the regents could do to enhance faculty governance. Despite some initial disagreement within the FAC, consensus settled on the view that the Regents Rules are adequate in defining the areas of responsibility where faculty traditionally have the major voice in making policy. The basic list is in Regents Rules 40101. The Rules are also clear in saying that the responsibilities assigned to faculty should be understood as carried out by faculty governance organizations. This is most explicit in Regents Rules 20201:4.9.(b), which requires each campus president to ensure that all policies that come under Rule 40101 are reviewed by the elected governance body of the campus before they are submitted to the Regents for final approval for inclusion in the campus Handbook of Operating Procedures. The problem is that on most campuses, particularly health campuses, these provisions are not implemented. I also noted our objections to the Regents Rule on intellectual property. The FAC members responded in agreement but we did not go into it.

Dual credit was also discussed. It is a major concern for some member institutions.

2. The next guest was Chancellor McRaven. He reiterated his view of the importance of shared governance. There was some discussion about his “Quantum Leap” initiatives. We also went over the main points of the executive summary of the white paper although he had not yet seen it. As with Regent Aliseda, discussion emphasized that while the current Regents Rules are adequate, most campus administrations are
not acting in accord with them. He had also asked for one or two points that he should focus on with each campus president. We agreed that these points would not be provided by the FAC as a whole but rather the FAC would solicit them from each campus faculty governance organization. We emphasized that the chancellor should meet with the leadership of the faculty governance organization on the several campuses. Just talking to the presidents is not enough.

3. The next conversation was with David Daniel, Deputy Chancellor, and Raymond Greenberg, Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs. It paralleled the discussions with the chancellor.

4. Next was Dr. Rebecca Karoff, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. She is new to the UT system and this was her first meeting with the FAC. Her major area of concern will be the Quantum Leaps. We also discussed dual credit.

5. The rest of the first day was devoted to committee meetings. David Cordell is co-Chair of Faculty Quality. I attended the meeting of the Governance committee. They were charged with recommending final version of the Executive Summary. In response to confusion in the mornings discussions, I added language noting Regents Rule 20201:4.9.(b), and relating it to 40101. It was approved.

I also introduced UTD’s Sense of the Senate resolution on Title IX. It turned out that everyone present had been given the same interpretation on their respective campuses and had the same objections to it. So we agreed to circulate it to the full FAC for wider discussion. Andrea Gore, Chair of the UT Austin Faculty Council, was particularly adamant and supportive.

6. The next morning was devoted to more committee meetings followed by committee reports. Several resolutions were passed. These were:

To approve the executive summary on governance for the Chancellor.

To circulate the draft White paper to constituent campuses for common comment before making the final revision.

To include non-tenured clinical faculty on promotion and tenure review committees on health campuses. (This may have been withdrawn.)

To circulate to the campuses the results of the UT Health Science Center, Houston faculty governance survey of faculty regarding the office of technology transfer and development of intellectual property.

To seek advice and consent of FAC on executive actions not covered in Guidelines (bylaws):
Be it resolved that any time that the Executive Committee establishes a practice not in the guidelines, or interprets the guidelines in a new way, they should advise the full Faculty Advisory Council and seek their consent by at least a majority vote.

7. The next period was for “urgent campus issues.” We discussed Title IX. Although I had circulated the UTD document the night before, apparently no one had read it carefully. So I briefly explained the situation. Andrea Gore elaborated for UT Austin. I called for a show of hands to indicate what other campuses were being given the same interpretation. Although three of the health campuses’ representatives did not seem to know what we were talking about, all of the academic campuses and one health campus (UTMB) said that they were being given the same interpretation as UT Dallas. It therefore seems evident that the source is the UT system legal office. The FAC therefore agreed to place it on the agenda for the next meeting and to ask Dan Sharphorn, head of the Office of General Counsel, to come to discuss it.

8. The final meeting was with Dr. Steve Leslie Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. He began by commenting on the very successful search for a replacement for President Daniel at UTD. Dr. Benson seems well chosen to continue the progress. The overall focus was, again, support for shared governance paralleling the discussion with the Regent Aliseda, Chancellor McRaven, Dr. Daniel, and Dr. Greenberg.

9. The last item of business was election of new Chair-elect. Jonathan Chen, of UT Southwestern, was elected by acclamation.

Murray J Leaf
14 Apr 2016
Item 8: CEP Recommendations
Students considering sharing personal information in email, in person, or within assignments or exams should be aware that faculty members and teaching/research assistants are required by UT Dallas policy to report information about sexual misconduct and may identify the complainant to the UT Dallas Title IX Coordinator. Students who wish to have confidential discussions of incidents related to sexual harassment or sexual misconduct should contact the Student Counseling Center (972.883.2527 or after hours 972-UTD-TALK or 972.883.8255), the Women’s Center (972.883.8255), a health care provider in the Student Health Center (972.883.2747), the clergyperson of their choice, or an off-campus resource (i.e. rape crisis center, doctor, psychologist). Students who are sexually assaulted, harassed, or victims of sexual misconduct, domestic violence, or stalking, are encouraged to directly report these incidents to UT Dallas Police Department at 972-883-2222 or to the Title IX Coordinator at 972-883-2218. Additional information and resources may be found at:
http://www.utdallas.edu/oiec/title-ix/resources/
One of an instructor’s responsibilities is to help create a safe learning environment on our campus. Instructors also have a mandatory reporting responsibility related to their role as a “responsible employee” pursuant to federal law and UT Dallas Prohibited Discrimination and Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct Policy – UTDBP 3102. Under federal law and UT Dallas Policy, a Responsible Employee is required to report possible violations of the policy to the Title IX Coordinator/or a Deputy Coordinator. Those individuals may need to act to maintain campus safety and must determine whether to investigate further under Title IX, regardless of the complainant’s request for confidentiality. A link to the policy can be found at: https://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3102

It is an instructor’s goal that a student feels able to share information related to their life experiences in classroom discussions, in written work, and in one-on-one meetings. The instructor will seek to keep information a student shares private to the greatest extent possible. Before a responsible employee receives any information that a student may wish to keep confidential, the employee should ensure that the student understands the employee’s reporting obligations and inform the student of the availability of the confidential resources detailed below. Responsible employees will also advise the student of the student’s right to request confidentiality when contacted by the Title IX Coordinator/Deputy Coordinator regarding a report, which the Title IX Coordinator will consider and discuss with the student. Responsible employees will not pressure a student to request confidentiality or to make a full report.

As a student, you may discuss and report an incident of sexual misconduct, and receive educational and prevention information with a counselor in the Student Counseling Center (972.883.2527 or after hours 972-UTD-TALK or 972.883.8255), the Women’s Center (972.883.8255), a health care provider in the Student Health Center (972.883.2747), the clergyperson of your choice, or an off-campus resource (i.e. rape crisis center, doctor, psychologist, etc.) without concern that the incident will be reported to the Title IX Coordinator.

Additional information and resources may be found at: http://www.utdallas.edu/oiec/title-ix
Also, as a point of comparison, below is language used at the Colorado State.

Title IX Syllabus/Course Information Language

Faculty are encouraged to include the following approved language regarding Title IX reporting and student resources in their course syllabi or course content handouts to students.

COURSE CONTENT NOTE: CSU’s Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Stalking, and Retaliation policy designates faculty and employees of the University as “Responsible Employees.” This designation is consistent with federal law and guidance, and requires faculty to report information regarding students who may have experienced any form of sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, relationship violence, stalking or retaliation. This includes information shared with faculty in person, electronic communications or in class assignments. As “Responsible Employees,” faculty may refer students to campus resources (see below), together with informing the Office of Support and Safety Assessment to help ensure student safety and welfare. Information regarding sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, relationship violence, stalking and retaliation is treated with the greatest degree of confidentiality possible while also ensuring student and campus safety.

- Any student who may be the victim of sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, relationship violence, stalking or retaliation is encouraged to report to CSU through one or more of the following resources: Emergency Response 911
- Deputy Title IX Coordinator/Director of Support and Safety Assessment (970) 491-1350
- Colorado State University Police Department (non-emergency) (970) 491-6425

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards

James C. Dockery, JD
Assistant V.P., Office of Institutional Equity & Compliance
Title IX Coordinator
University of Texas at Dallas
800 West Campbell Rd, SPN 15
Richardson, TX 75080-3021

Tel: 972.883.2292
Fax: 972.883.2156
James.Dockery@utdallas.edu
www.utdallas.edu/oiec/
www.utdallas.edu
General/Endowment Scholarship Programs

The University of Texas at Dallas offers a number of endowed scholarships that are administered by a school, department, or program. Students are encouraged to contact their school dean or program office to obtain information about review eligibility criteria and scholarship opportunities via the centralized listing managed by the Office of Financial Aid.

In accord with Chapter 54 of the Texas Education Code provided below, all applications for competitive academic scholarships for undergraduate study are reviewed by the Committee on Student Scholarships and/or the Undergraduate Scholarship Committee in the appropriate academic unit.

The Texas Education Code contains specific requirements for a scholarship to be considered competitive:

Texas Education Code Competitive Scholarship
Sec. 54.213. SCHOLARSHIP STUDENT
(a) An institution of higher education may charge a nonresident student who holds a competitive scholarship of at least $1,000 for the academic year or summer term for which the student is enrolled resident tuition and fees without regard to the length of time the student has resided in Texas. The student must compete with other students, including Texas residents, for the scholarship and the scholarship must be awarded by a scholarship committee officially recognized by the administration and be approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under criteria developed by the coordinating board.

(b) The total number of students at an institution paying resident tuition under this section for a particular semester may not exceed five percent of the total number of students registered at the institution for the same semester of the preceding academic year.

(c) The difference between tuition charged to the student under this section and the tuition the student would be charged if this section did not apply to the student shall not be accounted for in such a way as to reduce the general revenue appropriation to an institution of higher education that charges a nonresident student resident tuition and fees under this section.

Transferred and redesignated from Texas Education Code, Section 54.064 by Acts 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., Ch. 359, Sec. 1, eff. January 1, 2012.

Scholarships are awarded in accordance with the published eligibility criteria and award factors set forth by each respective program. Factors that may influence scholarship
awarding include donor or program specifications, financial need for need-based scholarships, and availability of funding. Committees responsible for awarding a competitive scholarship may consider and give positive weight to such factors as the following:

In addition to any specific criteria governing awards of competitive scholarships (e.g., major field of study), the committee responsible for such awards will give primary consideration to the applicant's academic records, both evaluating the type and nature of courses taken and the grades achieved in specific courses. The committee may also consider and give positive weight to such factors as the following in designating recipients:

- SAT or ACT scores
- Class rank, academic record
- Success in advanced courses
- National recognition
- Achievements in work experiences
- Community service
- Extracurricular activities and leadership activities
- Surmounting obstacles to the further pursuit of higher education
- Socioeconomic background
- Educational level
- Status as a first generation college student

The criteria cited above is not an exhaustive list and some factors are only applicable to incoming freshman applicants.

Scholarships typically are awarded in the spring semester for disbursement during the following academic year. Please visit UT Dallas Scholarships for more information.
Scholarship Programs

Information about a variety of scholarships awarded on the basis of academic merit and achievement is available from the Office of Financial Aid. The University of Texas at Dallas also offers a number of endowed scholarships that are administered by a school, department, or program. Students are encouraged to contact their school dean or program office to obtain information about eligibility criteria and scholarship opportunities via the centralized listing managed by the Office of Financial Aid.

In accord with Chapter 54 of the Texas Education Code provided below, all applications for competitive academic scholarships for graduate study are reviewed by the Committee on Student Scholarships and/or the Graduate Scholarship Committee in the appropriate academic unit.

Texas Education Code Competitive Scholarship
Sec. 54.213. SCHOLARSHIP STUDENT

- (a) An institution of higher education may charge a nonresident student who holds a competitive scholarship of at least $1,000 for the academic year or summer term for which the student is enrolled resident tuition and fees without regard to the length of time the student has resided in Texas. The student must compete with other students, including Texas residents, for the scholarship and the scholarship must be awarded by a scholarship committee officially recognized by the administration and be approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under criteria developed by the coordinating board.
- (b) The total number of students at an institution paying resident tuition under this section for a particular semester may not exceed five percent of the total number of students registered at the institution for the same semester of the preceding academic year.
- (c) The difference between tuition charged to the student under this section and the tuition the student would be charged if this section did not apply to the student shall not be accounted for in such a way as to reduce the general revenue appropriation to an institution of higher education that charges a nonresident student resident tuition and fees under this section.

Transferred and redesignated from Texas Education Code, Section 54.064 by Acts 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., Ch. 359, Sec. 1, eff. January 1, 2012.

Please visit UT Dallas Scholarships for more information.

Scholarships are awarded in accordance with the published eligibility criteria and award factors set forth by each respective program. Factors that may influence scholarship awarding include donor or program specifications, financial need for need-based scholarships, and availability of funding. Committees responsible for awarding a
competitive scholarship may consider and give positive weight to such factors as the following:

Graduate Scholarships General Selection Criteria:

- Courses taken
- Grades received in specific courses
- Good academic standing
- Demonstrate academic promise
- Full or part-time enrollment
- Degree seeking
- Financial need may be considered but is not required

The criteria cited above is not an exhaustive list. Please visit UT Dallas Scholarships for more information.
Graduate Courses for Possible Future Use as Graduate Credit

Undergraduates may take up to 12 semester credit hours of graduate courses to reserve for possible application toward a graduate degree. To register, undergraduate students must obtain permission from the course instructor and from the graduate advisor of the program in which the course is offered. Such courses with an earned grade of 'B' or better may be eligible for application to the student's graduate record when the student is admitted to a graduate program. These courses will not apply to the student's undergraduate degree and will not affect the student's undergraduate GPA.
Graduate Courses for Possible Future Use as Graduate Credit

Undergraduates may take up to 12 semester credit hours of graduate courses to reserve for possible application toward a graduate degree. To register, undergraduate students must obtain permission from the course instructor and from the graduate advisor of the program in which the course is offered. Such courses with an earned grade of 'B' or better will be eligible for application to the student’s graduate record when the student is admitted to a graduate program. These courses will not apply to the student's undergraduate degree and will not affect the student's undergraduate GPA.
Policy Statement

1. PROGRAM OF STUDIES: Each student admitted to a Graduate Program will have a specific program of studies, outlined in the current graduate catalog that is agreed to in consultation with the appropriate committee, graduate advisor or administrator for that degree program. Students enrolled in master's degree programs must have a completed "Program of Studies/Degree Plan" filed in and approved by the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies prior to the student's registration for his or her 19th semester credit hour in the degree program. The form will be completed and revised, if necessary, each semester under the guidance of the student's graduate advisor. For each student enrolled in a doctoral degree program, the academic advisor in consultation with the student, will prepare and submit a completed and updated "Milestones Agreement Form" annually to the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. The completed form will define academic milestones and timeline required to earn the doctoral degree and the progress being made by the student in meeting each requirement.

   1. Exception: Common Master's Program: In those Graduate Programs where a common program of studies is prescribed for all Master's students, differing only in elective courses comprising less than one-third of the total required degree semester credit hours, the Graduate Program can file a model "Program of Studies" with the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. Any student wishing to deviate from that approved model Program of Studies must file an Individual Program of Studies developed and approved by the appropriate committee or administrator for that program prior to the student's registration for his or her 19th degree semester hour taken at U. T. Dallas.

   2. Exception: Common Doctoral Core: In those Graduate Programs where a common doctoral core is prescribed for all students, differing only by the area of specialization chosen, the Graduate Program can file a model "Program of Studies" with the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. Any student wishing to deviate from that approved model Program of Studies must file an Individual Program of Studies developed and approved by the appropriate committee or administrator for that program prior to the student's registration for his or her 50th degree semester hour taken at U. T. Dallas.

   3. Additional Master's Degrees: Students wishing to earn additional Master's degrees at U. T. Dallas must develop an approved Program of Studies through the Program offering that degree prior to enrolling in additional courses. The program can allow up to 15 semester credit hours earned in a previous degree program toward the additional degree. Additional credits may be accepted from the previous degree upon the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies. In no case will credits counted for a previous degree be allowed to exceed one-half the total hours required for the additional master's degree program.
4. Graduation Under a Particular Catalog: Provided the requisite courses continue to be offered, the student is bound by the course work requirements of the catalog in force at the time of admission, within a six-year limit for the completion of the master's degree and ten years for the doctoral degree. With the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies the student may elect to be bound by the catalog in force at the time the student applies for graduation. This regulation applies to specific course work and the number of semester credit hours for the academic degrees set forth in the catalog. All other requirements will change or be continued with the issuance of new graduate catalogs.

5. TRANSFER CREDIT: To qualify for transfer credit, the grade earned in the course must be a B or better and the course must not be a correspondence, extension or pass/fail course. Courses delivered in a distance learning format will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Petitions for transfer of credit must be prepared by the Graduate Program and submitted for approval by the Dean of Graduate Studies. Petitions may be approved at the time of the student's first enrollment; however, no actual acceptance of transfer credit will occur until after the student has completed 9 semester credit hours of courses at U. T. Dallas with a grade point average of at least 3.0. Petitions for transferring courses taken before enrolling as a graduate student at U. T. Dallas must be submitted prior to filing the Program of Studies. Petitions for transfer credit must be accompanied by a copy of the student's transcript showing the course(s) in question.

   1. No more than 25% of the total requirement of a master's degree may be transfer credits. Some degree programs have more restrictive transfer of credit requirements.
   2. Doctoral Degree: A master's degree or its equivalent may be transferred from another university for up to 36 semester hours of credit towards a doctoral degree.
   3. Non-Degree Students: No more than 15 semester credit hours taken as a Non-Degree Student may be subsequently transferred to a degree program at U. T. Dallas. No petition is necessary for any of this coursework to be included in a student's Program of Studies.
   4. Exceptions: Exceptions to these transfer policies may be granted only on petition to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Such a petition could be for the program of an individual student or for the model Program of Studies (See "Exceptions" on page 1 of this policy).

5. DEGREE REQUIREMENTS: The student will complete the course work degree requirements when he or she completes the previously filed program of studies with acceptable grades.

   1. Required Semester Credit Hours: The minimum required semester credit hours in a Program of Studies required for the degree will be those shown in the catalog applicable to the student at the time of his or her admission or readmission to the program. In no case will a student be allowed to graduate with less than 30 approved graduate semester credit hours (including approved graduate transfer credit hours) for the master's degree.
   2. Required Grade Point Average: In order to qualify for graduation, students must maintain a 3.0 grade point average in their degree program's core
courses. However, individual programs may have more stringent grade point requirements in selected courses, which must be satisfied for graduation. The minimum acceptable University grade point average for graduation is 3.0 for all graduate courses taken in the student’s degree program at U. T. Dallas.

3. Research Involving Animal or Human Subjects
   1. Research Involving the Use of Animals (Policy Memorandum 79-I.2-30): Any student who intends to conduct research, (whether funded or not funded) which would involve animals must obtain permission from the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). Permission to use an animal in research must be obtained prior to ordering, bringing to campus or housing on campus an animal. The required form to request approval may be obtained from the Office of Research Compliance.
   2. Research Involving Human Subjects (Policy Memorandum 79-I.2-31): Any student who intends to conduct research, on or off campus, in partial or complete fulfillment of a course requirement, thesis or dissertation, which would involve human beings as subjects must obtain permission, prior to undertaking the research, from the University’s Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB). Any research activity, including but not limited to surveys, questionnaires, interviews, standardized and non-standardized tests, and/or simple research experiments, which include the participation of human beings, regardless of age of participant, must have approval from the IRB. The required forms to request approval may be obtained from the Office of Research Compliance.

3. Admission to Doctoral Candidacy: The research potential and ability of each doctoral student to both understand and integrate previous coursework will be evaluated before a student can be admitted formally to doctoral candidacy. The format of this evaluation, hereafter referred to as a qualifying examination, varies amongst the degree programs, and can be obtained from the student's Graduate Program Office. A student failing the Qualifying Examination is terminated as a doctoral student in that program unless a two-thirds majority of the examining committee vote that a second examination be permitted. All committee members should have all the evidence of the student's academic record and Qualifying Examination performance prior to this vote. The second examination typically would be taken no sooner than three months after the first examination, and no later than one year after the first examination. Students failing the second examination will not be allowed to pursue a doctoral degree in that program. Under no circumstances will a third examination be allowed. The student will have advanced to candidacy when the student has
   1. passed the qualifying examination,
   2. been assigned an approved Supervising Committee, and
   3. satisfied any other Program or School candidacy requirements.

Candidacy must be achieved before a student is eligible to enroll in dissertation courses.

4. THESIS AND DISSERTATION REQUIREMENT
1. Dissertation Proposal: Content: The Dissertation Proposal should be prepared by the student in consultation with the student’s Supervising Committee. The proposal should include:
   1. A tentative title of the dissertation describing the topic as accurately and briefly as possible.
   2. The background of the research, the hypotheses to be tested or concepts to be explored, and the methodology to be employed. It should also address the relationship of the proposed work to existing work in the field, at U. T. Dallas or elsewhere, its intended outcome, and its contribution to the field.
   3. A schedule of the remaining research activities, including major completion milestones.
   4. A set of up to five "key words" to assist in establishing the Data Base on Theses and Dissertations.

5. Dissertation Proposal: Approval: The proposal should be prepared by the student in consultation with the student’s Supervising Professor, who will approve the document before its submission to the appropriate committee or administrator for that Department or Program. After its approval at the Department, Program, School, or Interdisciplinary Degree Committee level, the proposal will then be forwarded to the Dean of Graduate Studies, together with the Department’s or Program’s nominations for Supervising Professor and members of the Supervising Committee and the anticipated time of completion.

6. Supervising Committee: General: The recommended Supervising Committee for the student is submitted by the appropriate committee or administrator for that Department or Program to the Dean of Graduate Studies for approval. Subsequent changes in membership must also be subject to approval by the appropriate committee or administrator for that Department or Program, and in turn the Dean of Graduate Studies. Individuals qualified for service on the Supervising Committee will be voting members of the General Faculty (as defined by The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures), Adjunct Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Distinguished Scholars in Residence, Emeritus Faculty, Research Professors, Research Scientists, Senior Lecturers, or Visiting Faculty who hold the highest earned degree in the field or fields concerned or exhibit an equivalent record of accomplishment. In addition to the master’s and doctoral degree membership composition as defined in sections D and E below, additional members outside the General Faculty may serve with the special approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies. Members of the Supervising Committee will also be members of the Examining Committee. (*)In the case of Adjunct Faculty, a General Faculty member will be appointed to co-chair the Supervising Committee.

7. Supervising Committee: Master's Degree with Thesis: Appointment of a Master’s thesis Supervising Committee consisting of at least three members is a function of the degree program expected to confer the student’s degree. Additional members may be appointed. All appointments must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies. The appropriate committee or administrator of
the program in consultation with the student, will nominate:
1. the Chair, who serves as the supervisor of the research, will ordinarily be a voting member of the General Faculty holding the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor. Adjunct Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Distinguished Scholars in Residence, Emeritus Faculty, Research Professors, Research Scientists, Senior Lecturers, or Visiting Faculty who hold the highest earned degree or exhibit an equivalent record of accomplishment in the field or fields of the research or aesthetics may be appointed as Chair if he/she receives a 2/3 majority recommendation of the Professors of the academic discipline and approval of the Academic Dean of the School offering the degree.

2. not less than two voting members of the General Faculty from the graduate degree program expected to confer the student's degree; and

3. if necessary, a third representative appointed by the appropriate committee or administrator for that discipline.

Any school varying from the above procedures in constituting Supervising Committees must have had prior approval from the Dean of Graduate Studies.

8. Supervising Committee: Doctoral Degree: Appointment of a Doctoral dissertation Supervising Committee consisting of at least four members is a function of the degree program expected to confer the student's degree. Additional members may be appointed. All appointments must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies. The appropriate committee or administrator of the program, in consultation with the student, will nominate:

1. the Chair, who serves as the supervisor of the research, will ordinarily be a voting member of the General Faculty holding the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor. Adjunct Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Distinguished Scholars in Residence, Emeritus Faculty, Research Professors, Research Scientists, Senior Lecturers, or Visiting Faculty who hold the highest earned degree or exhibit an equivalent record of accomplishment in the field or fields of the research or aesthetics may be appointed as Chair if he/she receives a 2/3 majority recommendation of the Professors of the academic discipline and approval of the Academic Dean of the School offering the degree.

2. not less than three voting members of the General Faculty, from the graduate degree program expected to confer the student's degree; and

3. if necessary, a fourth representative appointed by the appropriate committee or administrator for that discipline.

Schools varying from the above procedures in constituting Supervising Committees must have had prior approval from the Dean of Graduate Studies.

2. SUPERVISION: The Supervising Committee will meet with the candidate soon after the Dean of Graduate Studies has approved membership of the Committee. The intention of this initial meeting should be to discuss potential problem areas in the proposal and to establish a procedure that the Committee wishes to adopt to follow the research to a successful conclusion, e.g., the frequency and format of contact between candidate and Committee. The Supervising Committee must meet at least once annually, assess the student's progress, and send a report on that progress to the
appropriate committee or administrator for that program and to the Dean of Graduate Studies. This report should describe any problems which have the potential to delay the research beyond its anticipated completion date. A copy of this report must also be sent to the student. The student can request a meeting of the Supervising Committee through a written request to the appropriate committee or administrator for that program. The appropriate committee or administrator for that program will be responsible for convening such a meeting, generally within two weeks of the student's request, unless this timing is impossible owing to the absence of the Supervising Professor. No more than one student-initiated meeting can be called within an academic year. Provision for coverage of leaves of absence of either students or committee members will have been discussed at the initial meeting of the Supervising Committee. Any arrangements for surrogate supervision or changes in the student's plans will be communicated to the appropriate committee or administrator for that program, in writing, with a copy to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Because of the relationship between the student and the Supervising Committee, committee members on leave of absence or who have left their positions with the university may be given permission to remain on the committee by the Dean of Graduate Studies. However, they must agree to be active participants in supervisory activities and to be present for the final examination. If this is not possible, the committee member must be replaced and a new member of the General Faculty must be submitted for approval.

1. Manuscript Preparation: Style and format requirements have been established for theses and dissertations prepared at U. T. Dallas. Prior to submitting manuscripts, candidates should consult the Guide for the Preparation of Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations which can be obtained from http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/dgIndex.htm.

2. Committee Approval of the Manuscript: Approval of the thesis or dissertation to go forward for examination can only be given after the members have considered the entire manuscript. Members of the committee who do NOT agree that the manuscript is examinable, whether in the majority or not, should inform the Department Head or program administrator immediately, and in writing, so that such objections may be discussed with the Supervising Professor and the candidate.

3. Independent Research Competence: The dissertation must demonstrate an independent research competence on the part of the candidate that substantially adds to knowledge in the candidate's field with respect either to its intellectual substance or professional practice. The dissertation should be of such standard as to warrant publication in peer reviewed journals or scholarly books or monographs or equivalent.

4. Submission of the Final Draft of the Thesis or Dissertation: Once the candidate has, in the judgment of the Supervising Professor, prepared an examinable thesis/dissertation manuscript, it should be distributed to the other members of the Supervising Committee, allowing them a minimum of two weeks to review the document. After reading the document, a majority of the Supervising Committee members must agree that the document is ready to be defended before a request for a Final Oral Examination may be submitted and an examination date scheduled. Committee members should ensure that the manuscript is complete, has been rigorously proofread (preferably by a
professional proofreader), and meets scholarship standards for theses or dissertations. The Supervising Professor of the student then submits a copy of the dissertation and the Request for Final Oral Examination form, signed with no more than one dissenting vote by the Supervising Committee members to the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, which shall approve the scheduling of the Final Oral Examination. Members of the committee who do NOT agree that the manuscript is examinable should inform the appropriate committee or administrator for that program immediately, and in writing, so that such objections may be discussed with the Supervising Professor and the candidate. The Final Oral Examination cannot be scheduled until a resolution has been reached with, at most, one dissenting vote.

5. Required Copies Submission of Final Approved Thesis or Dissertation

1. Students must submit a final approved, electronic version of their dissertation/thesis to the Office of Graduate Studies. An electronic version of the dissertation/thesis will be held by the library and available to the public. An electronic copy must also be submitted to UMI/ProQuest who will make it publicly available in hard copy and on the web. Information about required format and the submission process can be found at http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/dgIndex.htm.

   1. Thesis Copies: Three official hard copies of thesis are required. After final approved copies have been bound, one hard copy shall be available to the public in the university library; one copy will be sent to the supervising professor and one copy will be sent to the department/program office. One disk with the thesis in a PDF file is required. This electronic copy will be sent to UMI who will make it available in hard copy and on the web.

   2. Dissertation Copies: Three final approved copies are to be bound; one hard copy shall be available to the public in the university library; one copy will be sent to the supervising professor and one copy will be sent to the department/program. One disk with the dissertation in a PDF file is required. This electronic copy will be sent to UMI who will make it available in hard copy and on the web.

6. FINAL ORAL EXAMINATION

1. Examining Committee: Upon the submission of the dissertation to the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean will appoint the Examining Committee. The membership of the Examining Committee will include all members of the Supervisory Committee plus a non-voting representative appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies. The representative serves as the Chair of the Examining Committee. An examiner external to the University may also be appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies on the recommendation of a member of the Supervising Committee or the candidate.

2. Conducting the Examination: Formal arrangements, such as time and place for the Final Oral Examination, are made by the appropriate committee or administrator for that program, in consultation with the candidate and the Examining Committee, and with the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies. All members of the Examining Committee must be present for the examination to be valid, unless a prior written exemption has been granted by the Dean of Graduate Studies. If a member of the Examining Committee is absent without
the approval of the Dean, then the Chair of the Examining Committee shall not hold the defense. The defense shall be rescheduled by the Dean of Graduate Studies. In any case, only one member may be absent without requiring a substitute. The examination will be conducted by the Chair in a manner appropriate to the material presented, and in accordance with current University regulations. The discussion will primarily focus on the candidate's
research, although aspects of the general field in which it was conducted may also be covered.

1. The final oral examination shall be conducted in three phases.
   1. Phase I. The candidate will make a formal public presentation of the research. That presentation is open to the public, and members of the audience may ask questions. The Supervising Professor will chair this phase and supervise the questioning.
   2. Phase II. Following the public presentation, the candidate will be examined by the members of the Examining Committee. This part of the examination is not open to the public. Depending upon the school’s policy, other members of the faculty may also attend that part of the examination. This portion of the examination will be chaired by the representative of the Dean of Graduate Studies.
   3. Phase III. After the completion of the oral examination, the Examining Committee will vote on the results of the Final Oral Examination The committee will reach agreement on one of the five possible outcomes listed below with no more than one dissenting vote. If the committee cannot reach agreement on one of the options, then the candidate will have failed the oral examination and the manuscript will not be accepted.
      1. Passed the oral examination and manuscript accepted,
      2. Passed the oral examination and manuscript accepted pending specified revisions,
      3. Second oral examination required, but manuscript accepted or accepted with specified revisions,
      4. Major revisions of the manuscript and a second final oral examination required,
      5. Oral examination failed, manuscript not accepted and the committee recommends dismissal from the program.: Following the vote of the Examining Committee, the Dean's representative shall complete the Examination Report, to be forwarded to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

4. Procedures concerning Acceptance, Specified and Major revisions, and Failure are as follows:
   1. Accepted - The committee agrees that the dissertation is acceptable either without any revisions, or with minor revisions such as corrections of typographical errors or changes of a minor editorial nature. It is the Supervising Professor's responsibility to ensure that such corrections are made. The final corrected and approved copies of the dissertation must be submitted to the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies within the same semester. If the final approved copy is not submitted within the semester, the results of the examination will be changed to Accepted Pending Specified Revisions and will be dealt with as specified under that result.
2. Accepted Pending Specified Revisions - The Committee agrees that the dissertation is acceptable pending changes, which may include insertions or deletions. Such changes would be of the kind which do not radically modify the development/argument of the dissertation but which go beyond minor revisions. The practical criterion will be that the committee is able to specify such changes with precision. It is the responsibility of the Supervising committee to certify that all such changes have been made. If the final approved copy is not submitted by the end of the semester following the examination, the results of the examination will be changed to Referred Pending Major Revisions and will be dealt with as specified under that result.

3. Referred Pending Major Revisions - The Committee agrees that the dissertation requires substantive changes in order for the dissertation to be acceptable. Detailed reasons for this decision must be supplied by the Chair of the Examining committee to the Dean of Graduate Studies, the appropriate committee or administrator for that program, and the candidate concerned. These recommendations on required changes must be approved by all members of the Committee. The committee reconvenes within a period not to exceed twelve months to conduct a second Final Oral Examination. This second attempt on the Final Oral Examination will be the final attempt by the student. If the Final Oral Examination and the written manuscript are not graded within the Accepted category, the student is dismissed from the program.

4. Failure - If the majority of the Examining Committee votes for failure of the oral and the non-acceptance of the manuscript, the student will be dismissed from the program. In no case will a third oral be given.

5. Registration During Manuscript Revision: Regardless of the revisions to be made, the student will be required to register for three credit hours and pay fees until the revisions are accepted by the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

6. Impact of revisions upon time limit for degree completion: The ten-year time limit for completion of the degree is still in effect while these revisions are being completed.

7. Intellectual property right protection: In order to protect patent or other intellectual property rights, the Dean of Graduate Studies may, upon request, delay for a period of one year the binding, distribution, and/or publication in microfilm of the dissertation.

3. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

1. Examinations or Proposal Presentation: A student must be registered for at least three semester credit hours of graduate course work during the semester in which any major degree examination, such as the Qualifying Examination, Final Written Examination, or Final Oral Examination, is taken, or during the semester in which the proposal is submitted for approval
2. Procedures are outlined in the Graduate Catalog - Continuous Enrollment for Thesis or Dissertation: Once a student has enrolled in thesis or dissertation unless a leave of absence has been granted, that student must maintain continuous enrollment (not necessarily for thesis or dissertation) of at least three semester hours during consecutive long semesters until the final approved copy of the manuscript has been deposited in the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. If the approved copy of the manuscript has been deposited in the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies too late to permit graduation during that semester, but before the Census day of the Full-Term session (as defined in the academic calendar) of the subsequent semester, the student may register in absentia for his/her final semester of graduation.

3. Enrollment During the Semester of Graduation: With the exception of in absentia registration, doctoral students must be enrolled in at least 1 credit hour in the semester in which they graduate. Enrollment for 1 semester credit hour in the final semester is only allowed once. However, the individual degree program may require more than 1 credit hour be taken during the graduation semester.

4. TIME LIMITS: All requirements for a graduate degree, including transfer of credit must be completed within the specified time period. Students exceeding the specified time limit will not be eligible for their degree and will be dismissed from that graduate program. An approved leave of absence will not alter the time limits placed on graduate degrees.

1. Master's Degree: All requirements for the Master's degree must be completed within one six-year period. Work over six years old, whether done at this University or elsewhere, will not count towards the Master's degree except through the petition process described in the "Time Limit: Exceptions" section.

2. Doctoral Degree: All requirements for the Doctoral degree must be completed within one ten-year period. Work over ten years old, whether done at this University or elsewhere, will not count towards the Doctoral degree except through the petition process described in the "Time Limit: Exceptions" section. Students whose master's degrees are accepted for full credit toward a Ph.D. must complete all requirements for the doctoral degree within one eight-year period. Work exceeding these limits, whether done at this university or elsewhere, will not count towards the degree.

3. Exceptions — Course Work: The time limits affecting course work taken early in a graduate program can be waived only when a student can demonstrate to the appropriate committee or administrator for that program that:

   1. the substantive material in the course is still relevant to the curriculum and,
   2. the student still retains a substantial grasp of the material taught in the course.

In such case, the acceptability of the course work in the student's Program of Studies must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies upon the recommendation of the appropriate committee or administrator for that program.

4. Exceptions — Research: The time limits can be waived only for research extending beyond the prescribed limits and only in exceptional cases where the
student, Supervising Professor, and the appropriate committee or administrator for that program can demonstrate that:

1. substantial progress has been made in the research effort and the student can successfully complete the thesis or dissertation within a two term extension, including the summer term, and
2. a schedule to complete the research has been developed including major milestones of accomplishments. In such a case, the acceptability of the plan to finish the research must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies upon the recommendation of the appropriate committee or administrator for that program.

3. Procedures Prior to Graduation: An Application for Graduation must be filed during the semester of graduation on or before the date stipulated in the Academic Calendar.
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“Required Copies of Dissertation and Thesis

A final, approved electronic version of the dissertation/thesis is required by Office of Graduate Studies. An electronic copy of the dissertation/thesis will be held by the library and available to the public.

An electronic copy must be submitted to UMI/ProQuest. UMI will publish and make the dissertation/thesis available to the public for purchase both on the web and in hard copy.

For more information on this policy please review UTDPP1052 - Policy on Procedures for Completing a Graduate Degree: Thesis and Dissertation Requirement"
Item 9: Appointment of Academic Dishonesty Pool
Committee Name: Academic Tribunal Pool
Charge: Policy Regents Rules 31008

Special Requirements:
20 members in pool
Representatives from each of the schools
One year term, may be reappointed

Members Whose Terms are Continuing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replacements Needed</th>
<th>Faculty:</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fonseka (ECS)</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murat Kantarcioglu (ECS)</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Rotea (ECS)</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovidiu Daescu (ECS)</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euel Elliott (EPPS)</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Yuan (EPPS)</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Jacobs (EPPS)</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Assmann (BBS)</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Prager (BBS)</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne van Kleeck (BBS)</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Dess (SOM)</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Liebowiz (SOM)</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijay Mookerje (SOM)</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George McMechan (NSM)</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Heelis (NSM)</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Sherry (NSM)</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Malina (ATEC)</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fishwick (ATEC)</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Cohen (AH)</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Waligore (AH)</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
Item 10:
Committee on Committees
2016-2017

COMMITTEE NAME: COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Charge: Policy Memorandum UTDPP1019
Senate Concurrent

EX-OFFICIO (with vote)
Speaker of the Faculty Senate

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:
7 members of General Faculty
1 from each of 8 schools, excluding IS
2 year terms

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Executive Vice President and Provost

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE CONTINUING
FACULTY:
Matt Brown (AH) (5/31/17)
Balaji Raghavachari (ECS) (5/31/17)
David Cordell (SOM) (5/31/17)
Monica Evans (ATEC) (5/31/17)

MEMBERS WHOSE TERMS ARE EXPIRING
Sheryl Skaggs (EPPS) (5/31/16)
John Hoffman (NSM) (5/31/16)
Robert Stillman (BBS) (5/31/16)

CHAIR: Tim Redman (AH) (5/31/16)

REPLACEMENTS NEEDED

TIM REDMAN
These bylaws describe the procedures of the Committee on Committees pursuant to its charge from the Academic Senate. As such, they are not to be interpreted in any way that is inconsistent with that charge. They are intended as a record of normal practice rather than a set of rigid rules. They are an aide memoire for the committee and a way to inform the faculty generally of the way the committee seeks to carry out its duties. The committee may depart from these procedures when it appears necessary in order to fulfill its ultimate task of provide the best possible personnel for the university committees with the least possible disruption to their other scholarly and university duties.

1. *Calendar.* The Committee on Committees should be appointed by the incoming Council in May or June. The Committee will try to assure that the initial round of appointments is complete before the end of August each fall term. The Committee should have prepared its initial list by early July, to be submitted to the Council in that month, after which it will be placed on the Senate agenda for the third week in July. If there is no meeting of the Academic Council scheduled for the beginning of July the Committee on Committees will submit the list to the Council by email and ask for approval by email ballot. At that time, the council may suggest changes. If the changes are incorporated the Council will be re-polled. When the council agrees to approve it by email ballot, the list will then be submitted to the full Senate before the end of July, either by email or in a formal meeting if it is called.

2. *Preparation by Governance office:* To prepare for the committee’s discussions, the Governance Secretary compiles a packet that consists of a list of all the committees, their current charges, their current memberships with dates of service, and a list of those members who the Committee needs to find replacements for. This is circulated to all the members of the Committee.

3. *Preparation by chair.* To prepare for the initial meeting of the Committee, the chair asks the outgoing chair of each Senate committee for general recommendations on the performance of the members of their committee for the previous year, particularly with a view toward determining which members appeared particularly interested and were possibly suitable for serving as chair or vice chair in the future, as well as for those continuing members who seemed particularly uninterested and/or failed to attend.

4. *Preparation by members.* To prepare for the meeting, each member will make up a comprehensive list of the faculty in their school, determine which committees they are committed to as continuing members, and according to their judgment attempt to determine which committees they would like to serve on or be particularly able to serve on.

5. *General policy in appointments.* Insofar as possible, the members of the Committee on Committees will attempt to assure that the work of committees is distributed evenly among all faculty able to serve, and that each committee will have a balance of senior and junior faculty and a balanced representation from various segments of the faculty that the committee affects.

6. *Policy for CQ.* With respect to the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel, the Committee on Committees is required to appoint two members from each school except for General Studies. In addition, it will attempt to appoint at least a few relatively new faculty as well as faculty who have had long service at UT Dallas and reflect the different recognized modes of scholarly analysis. In view of the exceptionally high work load, the Committee on Committees will also as a rule not simultaneously appoint faculty to CQ and other committees, and certainly not to
CQ and the CEP. The Committee on Committees will also arrange appointments so that one of the two members from each school will be appointed in alternate years. The Committee on Committees will also bear in mind that it has been a long-standing policy of the University that insofar as possible faculty sitting on CQ should not also chair ad hoc committees presenting cases to CQ.

7. Policy for CEP. With respect to the Committee on Educational Policy, especially in years when catalog copy will be approved, the Committee on Committees will bear in mind that members from the several schools on this committee frequently serve as liaison between the CEP and those schools. As for CQ, the Committee on Committees will avoid appointing individuals to CEP simultaneously with other high work-load committees.

8. Relation to Committee on Committee’s RUO (the Provost) for appointments to Senate committees. With respect to Senate committees, the Committee on Committees recognizes its relation to the Provost as being that the Committee will apprise the Provost of its recommendations and take into account any advice the Provost may offer concerning those appointments, but the final recommendation will be made by the committee and the final decision will be made by the Senate. In the event that those nominated are unable to serve, the Committee on Committees will nominate replacements to forward to the Senate.

9. Relation to Provost for appointments to University committees. With respect to University Committees, the Committee on Committees recognizes its relation to the Provost as that of offering its best advice. The committee should be informed if the final appointments differ from those approved by the Senate in order to adjust the information it may need to refer to for further appointments later in the year. In the event that those nominated are unable to serve, the Committee on Committees will be available for further consultation but will not attempt to fill the vacancies unless asked to do so by the Provost.

10. Replacing continuing members of Committees. The Committee on Committees may replace a member on the request of that member or upon their departure from the University or the like at any time. It may replace a member who does not attend meetings upon request of the chair of the concerned committee at any time. In either case, it will inform the Academic Council at the next Council meeting, but will not wait for Council approval to finalize the change.

11. Letters. Letters of appointment will be issued each year by end of August for all faculty serving on committees, continuing as well as newly appointed. Letters will be accompanied by a copy of the charge of the committee. Letters will also be sent to all RUOs and members Ex Officio. Letters to RUOs will be accompanied by a copy of the University memorandum on duties of Chairs and RUOs.
Item 11: Discussion on Intellectual Property
Intellectual Property

Overview and Background:

A taskforce was formed at UT System to revise the current Regents Rules concerning Intellectual Property. This taskforce produced a new Regents Rule (90101, Intellectual Property: Preamble, Scope, Authority), which was passed by the Board of Regents in August 2015. In September, Dr. Sereno (Chair of IFC) invited representatives from the Office of Legal Affairs (Ms. Meredith Mills, Senior Legal Officer), the Office of Technology (Mr. Bruce Butler, Vice President, Office of Technology Management), and the faculty (Drs. Hunter and Planque, Chair and Assistant Professor in the Department of Pathology) to each give a short presentation to the IFC, with additional time allowed for questions. All parties were interested in increased commercialization, but there were striking differences in knowledge of recent policy changes, satisfaction of current processes, need for change, and what changes might help.

A subcommittee of the IFC was charged with creating a short online survey to gauge more widespread faculty experience and opinion concerning intellectual property and commercialization. The survey was made available for 2 weeks in January to faculty from the six schools of UTHealth Houston. Respondents (n=216) represented all ranks (39% Assistant, 24% Associate, and 29% Full Professors), many tenured (45%) or with less than 4 years of experience as a faculty member (37%), and many affiliated with the Medical School (46%). The survey included a part (Part 1) for all respondents (n=216) and a part (Part II) for those who had completed an OTM disclosure (n= 33).

Findings:

Part 1: All respondents
Most respondents were unaware of the new Regents rule on IP (68%). Only 22% of respondents had approached OTM with an idea or product and 15% had completed an OTM disclosure. Respondents were split with respect to satisfaction with IP and commercialization efforts at UTHealth: 69% neutral, 13% somewhat or very satisfied, and 16% somewhat or very dissatisfied. Most of the faculty thought information sessions for faculty (44%) and more staff (46%) and more financial support (43%) for OTM would be somewhat helpful to enhance commercialization. Further, a substantial minority of faculty thought information sessions for faculty (33%) would be very helpful, whereas, in contrast, a substantial minority thought more staff (29%) and more financial support (28%) for OTM would be not helpful. A majority of faculty (64%) did not want IP and commercialization explicitly included as criteria for promotion and tenure. Of the 21% of faculty who did think it should be included among the criteria for promotion and tenure, 24 offered suggestions on how it should be assessed, including 6 comments that absence, should not be a negative.

There were over 50 suggestions or concerns expressed about how to enhance commercialization. These comments ranged from those expressing a lack of information or clarity of the process, a need to
provide support (e.g., protected time, encouragement, or incentives to faculty), problems with the process, and concerns about conflict of interest and/or conflict with UTHealth mission.

Part 2: Those respondents with UTHealth OTM experience
A minority of faculty (19%) approaching OTM reported IP that was salable as is, with little or no development. The majority of faculty reported an estimated value of IP as less than one million dollars (66%), as well as reported that the estimated potential value would increase with further research and/or development (79%). The majority of faculty (66%) reported that in at least one case OTM, the inventor, and/or a third party decided to pursue protection or licensing of the IP.

Survey and Subcommittee Report:
The attached survey (Appendix A) and subcommittee report (Appendix B) is a preliminary attempt to examine and elucidate issues concerning intellectual property and commercialization at UTHealth Houston. It is neither complete nor comprehensive. Nevertheless, it provides insight into an important issue. Further, it includes a rich set of suggestions and/or concerns expressed by faculty about intellectual property and commercialization at UTHealth.

Summary and Recommendations:
Many faculty and their students do research, teach, create, and invent, and in the process develop intellectual property. Further, many faculty are interested in commercialization and feel that the potential value would increase with further research and/or development. Nevertheless, most faculty are not engaged with the OTM and/or commercialization activities at UTHealth. Further, many are unsure about engagement. In addition, the majority are presently not in favor of including it as a required criteria for promotion and tenure. Together these findings suggest that although there is great potential for growth of commercialization at UTHealth, there are serious issues and/or concerns that faculty express that may impede such a direction. The changes to the Regents rules do not deal with the many concerns expressed by faculty, nor do they incentivize faculty to engage, no matter how interested.

We strongly recommend the following to enhance commercialization at UTHealth.
1. Inclusion of diverse faculty input in any process to improve commercialization.
2. Information gathering to identify concerns and/or bottlenecks and possible suggestions for simple solutions to reduce such impeding conditions.
3. Information gathering to identify low-hanging fruit to incentivize faculty, especially in cases where the University is unable or unwilling to invest. Agreements should be consistent with the maturity of the intellectual property.
4. A more inclusive and direct approach in dealing with faculty input, concerns, and issues.

Although most faculty reported an estimated value of their IP as less than one million dollars, even a small return on such products, with little or no investment by the University, would return income to the University. This report, with attached survey and subcommittee report, is a first preliminary attempt to examine and elucidate the issues. Even though preliminary, we sincerely hope it provides some insight and suggestions concerning advancement of intellectual property and commercialization at UTHealth Houston.
Appendix A: Survey
UT IP and Commercialization

* Required

Are you aware that a new Regents Rule 90101 on Intellectual Property regarding ownership of products developed by faculty was passed by the Board of Regents in August 2015? *

☐ Yes
☐ No

Have you ever approached or provided Office of Technology Management with an idea or product for copyright, patent, or commercialization? *

The Office of Technology Management (OTM) at UTHealth is an entity that is designed to assist in the process of taking a product to commercialization.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Experience

Did you complete an OTM disclosure form? *

☐ Yes
☐ No

Experience, continued

How many separate OTM disclosure forms have you completed? *

1

OTM sponsored commercialization

How many of the following filings did OTM financially support?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more don't know
### Third party supported commercialization

How many of the following filings did a third party financially support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9 or more</th>
<th>don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copyrights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional patents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent prosecution (to granting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing or commercialization agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Self-financing

How many of the following filings did you financially support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9 or more</th>
<th>don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copyrights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional patents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent prosecution (to granting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing or commercialization agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intentions for IP, Category of IP, Value of IP

When you approached OTM, what were your intentions concerning the IP?
(For separate instances, check all that apply.)

- A patent to retain intellectual control of basic research for further exploration.
- A patent to lay a basis for possible commercial development.
- A patent that might be salable as is, with little or no development.
- Other: [ ]

**How many cases in each general category?**
(Select a single best category for each separate instance.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Category</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recombinant DNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genomics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software and/or hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some institutions have a general policy that there be a threshold of value (based on expected revenue) as a criterion for deciding to file a patent. What is your estimated potential value (in $ million) of the IP when you approached OTM?
(For separate instances, check all that apply.)

- < $1M
- $1- 5M
- > $5M

**Would the estimated potential value depend on further research and/or development?**
(For separate instances, check all that apply.)

- Yes
- No

**In at least one case, did OTM, the inventor, and/or a third party decide to pursue protection or licensing of the IP?** *

- Yes
- No
Experience

In how many cases did OTM decide NOT to pursue protection of the IP, but inventor and/or third party decided to pursue protection at own expense? *

0

In how many cases did OTM pursue protection of the IP and/or license IP to an entity in which at least one inventor has a financial interest? *

0

Release and/or licensing of IP

How many times was IP released to inventors or licensed to an entity in which at least one inventor has a financial interest? *

0

Timeframe

In what time did you get a signed release or licensing to an entity in which the inventor has a financial interest? (please indicate how many separate IP in each time frame)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>within 6 months</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>within 1 year</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>within 2 years</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>greater than 2 years</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditions-Release
If IP was released to inventors, did UTH health request (check all that apply):

☐ Reimbursement of any patent expenses?
☐ A percentage of revenue?
☐ A percentage of gross profit (after subtraction of costs)?
☐ Other: _____________________________

Conditions-Licensing
If IP was licensed to inventors, did UTH health request (check all that apply):

☐ Reimbursement of any patent expenses?
☐ A minimum licensing fee?
☐ Milestone payments?
☐ Guaranteed royalties?
☐ Other: _____________________________
Satisfaction with UT Commercialization Efforts

How satisfied were you in the efforts and processes to commercialize at UTHealth? *

○ very satisfied
○ somewhat satisfied
○ neutral
○ somewhat dissatisfied
○ very dissatisfied

Future Intent and Comments on UT Commercialization Efforts

Do you think that you will approach or provide OTM with an idea or product for copyright, patent, or commercialization in the next 5 years? *

○ Yes
○ No
○ Not sure

How would you rate the following recommendations to enhance commercialization at UTHealth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Not helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat helpful</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide more information sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add more staff to OTM office</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add more financial support to OTM office</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any other suggestions to enhance commercialization at UTHealth?


Promotion and Tenure

In your opinion, should IP and commercialization activities be explicitly included among the criteria for promotion and tenure? *

Promotion and Tenure, followup

What commercialization activities should be considered in promotion and tenure, and how should these be assessed?

Demographics

What is your rank?
- Instructor
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Prefer not to identify

What is your academic track?
- Non tenure track
- Tenure track
- Prefer not to identify

How many years have you been a faculty member at UT?
- 0-4
- 5-9
- 10-19
- 20 or more
- Prefer not to identify

What is your primary academic school affiliation?
- Medical School
- Dental School
- School of Public Health
Nursing School
School of Biomedical Informatics
Prefer not to identify

Submit
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UT IP and Commercialization Survey Report
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Introduction

Purpose: To assess faculty experience with the commercialization process and suggestions for enhancement.

Background: A revised Regent’s Rule (Rule: 90101) was passed by the Board of Regents in August 2015 regarding Intellectual Property, including language with more comprehensive UT ownership of products developed by faculty. Recommended policy concerning its implementation on campuses is being formalized in Austin. This survey is designed to gather information about the UT faculty experience in commercialization of their ideas or products and any suggestions how to make this process more effective at UTHealth. The Office of Technology Management (OTM) guides the application of copyright, patents, and assists in brokering commercial and distribution deals, and licensing arrangements, among other tasks. The Office has processed, per year, about 40 US provisional, utility, and PCT applications and about 30 licenses or options executed. The IP and commercialization survey represented one strategy to determine needs to improve the commercialization process at UT.

Methods: An online survey of 8 questions (6 Likert Scale type questions and 2 open ended questions) was developed to give insight on faculty experience, intentions, and suggestions regarding the commercialization process. The survey was made available through Google Forms to faculty at the various UTHealth schools in Houston on January 8th, 2016 and closed on January 22nd, 2016. This report provides a descriptive ‘snap shot’ of the data collected from 216 respondents.

Results: Results are provided for the entire respondent sample (Part 1) and a subsample of respondents experienced with OTM (Part 2). Respondents (n=216) represented assistant professors (39%), full professors (29%), and Associate Professors (24%), primarily tenured (45%), with less than 4 years of experience as a faculty member (37%), and affiliated with the UT Medical School (46%) (Figure 1).

PART 1. Experiences and thoughts from the general sample regarding IP and Commercialization at UTHealth.

Experience with commercialization: Most respondents were unaware of the regents rule on IP (68%) and had not approached OTM with any commercialization proposals (78%) (Figure 2). Of those approaching OTM 69% (15% of total sample) had completed an OTM disclosure form (Figure 3). In addition, a minority of respondents (18%) were intending to approach OTM in the next 5 years with an idea for commercialization (Figure 4). However, many (44%) were unsure about whether they would do this. Of the 33 respondents with prior experience 17 (52%) indicated that they would approach or provide OTM with an idea or product for copyright, patent, or commercialization in the next 5 years. Eleven (33%) indicated they were not sure and five (15%) indicated they would not do this.
Satisfaction with Commercialization: Respondents were largely neutral regarding satisfaction with efforts and processes to commercialize at UTHealth (69%) (Figure 5). The remainder of the respondent sample split on being somewhat or very satisfied (13%) or somewhat or very dissatisfied (16%). Respondents largely agreed that strategies of information sessions (77%), adding more financial support (60%), and adding more staff (58%) to improve OTM services would be somewhat or very helpful (Figure 6).

Suggestions to enhance commercialization: From the two open ended questions respondent’s suggestions to enhance commercialization at UTHealth included 57 responses (Figure 7), which were summarized as follows:

1. Visibility: Need for increased visibility for OTM.
2. Resources: OTM needs more resources to serve as advocates for faculty in the process of commercialization of IP.
3. Clarity: Process for commercialization of intellectual property is not clear to faculty, especially those who have not undergone the process. For example: legal language is confusing, there are no clear deadlines, lack of clarity as to what happens if IP is not approved for commercialization. For example, create a webinar on Commercialization of Intellectual Property-similar to HIPPA and branding training to help faculty, especially new hired faculty, understand process. Provide scenarios of the different parts of the process. For example, what would be an ideal scenario where something is approved for commercialization and what happens if it is not approved.
4. Disconnect with the academic mission: Concern by some faculty that there is a danger or needed disconnect between philosophy of commercialization of private industry and research/education missions of UTHealth.
5. Problems with the process: Concern of lost opportunities.
6. Relevancy: Concern that this issue is not relevant to most faculty because they are not involved in research that included suggested strategies, recommendations to clarify and inform faculty about the process (including orientation of new faculty to this), identification of problems with the process, and concerns about commercialization in academics. Respondents also suggested a lack of relevance to their work, lack of knowledge about the process, or provided other adjunct, or no, comments.

The majority of respondents (64%) did not agree that “IP and commercialization should be explicitly included among the criteria for promotion and tenure” (Figure 8). Twenty seven respondents provided suggestions for how IP and commercialization should be addressed in P&T (Figure 9):

1. Inclusion: IP & commercialization should be part of P&T, but not mandated. Low activity in the area should not count against an application for P&T.
2. Metrics: If included in P&T, then metrics like number and type of patents (e.g. educational material, health product, drug, etc.) and measures of impact to community/population (e.g. units sold or population reached locally, nationally, and internationally), royalties/income to UTHealth and licensing should be considered.
PART 2. Experiences and thoughts from those respondents with OTM experience.

Commercialization activity: Thirty three respondents had OTM experience (15% of the total respondent sample). The number of separate OTM disclosures in the sample ranged from 1 (82%) to 5 (3%) (Figure 10). Most commercialization activity occurred in licensing or commercialization agreements with 39% of respondents reporting from 1 (27%) to 6 (3%) instances of this activity (Figure 11). Next was provisional patents (33%), patent applications (27%), copyrights (15%), and patent prosecuting (14%). Most commercialization activity supported by a third party occurred in licensing or commercialization agreements with 18% of respondents reporting from 1 (9%) to 5 (3%) instances of this activity (Figure 12). Next was patent applications (15%), patent prosecuting (9%), provisional patents (6%), and copyrights (3%). Most self-financing occurred in licensing or commercialization agreements (6%) (Figure 13).

Reasons for approaching OTM about IP: The reasons for approaching OTM regarding IP were to obtain a patent to lay the basis for possible commercial development (44%), for copyright and commercialization (21%), and to potentially sell a patent ‘as’ is with little or no development (19%) (Figure 14).

IP Categories: Categories of IP were primarily medical technology (30%), software/hardware (24%), diagnostics (21%), and pharmaceuticals (18%) (Figure 15). Instances for any single respondent totaled up to 4 for medical technology and software/hardware.

Value of IP: Estimated value of IP based on respondent self-report ranged from less than one million dollars (66%) to over 5 million dollars (24%) (Figure 16). Most respondents (79%) believed that the estimated value of the IP would increase on the basis of further research and/or development (Figure 17, Q7a).

Pursuit of IP protection or licensing: Most respondents (66%) indicated that OTM, the inventor, and /or a third party decided to pursue protection or licensing of the IP on at least one occasion (Figure 17, Q7b). In a minority of cases (15%) OTM decided not to pursue protection of the IP but the inventor or a third party decided to do so at their own expense (Figure 18; Q8a). OTM pursued protection of the IP and/or license to an entity in which at least one inventor had a financial interest on 17 occasions (52% of reported cases) (Figure 18; Q8b). IP was released to the inventors or licensed to an entity in which at least one inventor had a financial interest on 13 occasions (22% of reported cases) (Figure 18;Q8c).

Time to IP release: The timeframe between the release of IP or licensing to an entity in which the inventor has a financial interest occurred usually within 6 months (6 reported occurrences) or within 1 year (7 reported occurrences)(Figure 19). Three reported occurrences took over 2 years.

Conditions of IP release: OTM conditions related to the release of IP to inventors included that UTHealth retain a percentage of revenue (33%), that UTHealth be reimbursed any patent expenses (22%), and that UTHealth retain a percentage of gross profit (22%) (Figure 20). OTM conditions related to the licensing of IP to inventors included that UTHealth retain a minimum licensing fee (33%), that UTHealth receive milestone payments (23%), that UTHealth retain guaranteed royalties (23%), and that UTHealth receive reimbursement of any patent expenses (15%) (Figure 21).
Summary

Most faculty are not engaged in IP and Commercialization (IP&C) activities at UTHealth. Many are unsure about engagement suggesting a potential for growth of IP&C activities in UTHealth. Suggestions indicate a need for OTM to continue to increase visibility and to demonstrate proactive dedication and commitment to IP&C through collaboration and encouragement of UTHealth faculty to engage in the IP&C process. Some processes (e.g. limiting the time period required to make a decision on the release of IP to investigators, a sense of obstructionism, and review of legal services) need further understanding and potential mitigation. Suggestions include a need to raise faculty awareness and familiarity with the IP&C process by making the steps clearer and to partner faculty through the process. Faculty did not want IP&C explicitly included in the T&P criteria or to have low or no IP&C activity count against T&P. Further understanding of faculty concerns seems warranted. However, there is a minority acceptance of the inclusion of IP&C in T&P and suggested metrics to be considered in T&P assessment.

Acknowledgements:
Thanks to:

• Sara Dube for compiling quantitative data and charts.
• Dr. Marina Gallagher for processing open-ended responses.
• IFC Administrative Affairs subcommittee, Dr. Ross Shegog, and Dr. Anne Sereno for content, survey development, and review
Figure 1. Respondent Demographics (n=216)

**Rank**
- Assistant Professor: [VALUE] (n=14)
- Associate Professor: [VALUE] (n=84)
- Professor: [VALUE] (n=52)
- Instructor: [VALUE] (n=52)
- Prefer Not to Identify: [VALUE] (n=4)

**Academic track**
- Tenure: [VALUE] (n=12)
- Non Tenure: [VALUE] (n=98)
- Prefer Not to Identify: [VALUE] (n=106)

**Years as a faculty member**
- 0-4: [VALUE] (n=79)
- 5-9: [VALUE] (n=52)
- 10-19: [VALUE] (n=36)
- 20 or more: [VALUE] (n=38)
- Prefer Not to Identify: [VALUE] (n=11)

**Primary school affiliation**
- Medical School: [VALUE] (n=19)
- Dental School: [VALUE] (n=12)
- School of Public Health: [VALUE] (n=100)
- Nursing School: [VALUE] (n=32)
- School of Biomedical Informatics: [VALUE] (n=44)
- Prefer Not to Identify: [VALUE] (n=9)
Figure 2. Awareness of Regent's Rule & OTM Involvement (n=216)

Q1. Are you aware that a new Regents Rule 90101 on Intellectual Property regarding ownership of products developed by faculty was passed by the Board of Regents in August 2015?

Q2. Have you ever approached or provided Office of Technology Management with an idea or product for copyright, patent, or commercialization?

Figure 3. Completion of OTM Disclosure Form (n=216)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>168 (78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Intention to approach or provide OTM with an idea or product for copyright, patent, or commercialization in the next 5 years (n=216)
Figure 5. Satisfaction will efforts and processes to commercialize at UTHealth (n=216)

Figure 6. Ratings of helpfulness of recommendations to enhance commercialization at UTHealth (n=216)
## Figure 7. Suggestions to Enhance Commercialization at UTHealth (n=57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>SUGGESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>We need to do a great deal more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Help doctors with great ideas – don’t act as a stumbling block and be obstructionist. Help align inventors with industry partners. Obtain better in house patent attorneys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In my humble opinion you guys are asking the wrong question. Instead of the staff members reaching out to OTM the process is vice versa. OTM should reach out and promote to get commercialization from the ideas of the employee like in other institutions that do well this. The more OTM encourage, facilitates and motivates commercialization in a day to day activities the more transparent and successful OTM will be. Starting this survey by presenting the link to the OTM regulation shows how the imposition of the &quot;law&quot; is what OTM seeks. My recommendation is to approach it in the vice versa to be successful. Best wishes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>faculty are creators; in many cases, they have specialized knowledge that can help avoid the pitfalls, highlight the advantages, and best direct commercialization of IP; if the conditions remove them from the process or are not conducive (either time-wise; financially, whatever), they will not invest time approaching OTM or protecting inventions. This is especially important if the University does not have the funds to protect these inventions. Faculty understand that the University may be extremely limited in its ability to protect all the IP that everyone produces. However, if the conditions were more favorable for release and successful commercialization, then more faculty might succeed in commercialization, which would bring back more money to the University (even if they retained a smaller percentage). With time and financial return, the University would be able to see what IP might be a better bet and would be able to support that IP (garnering higher percentages) and release less IP. However, with current conditions, much IP that the University cannot support just fails because the conditions are too dire. If the conditions for IP, where the University was not interested or could not afford to protect, were such that faculty were incentivized to commercialize IP, then even 2% of many successful IPs (whether small or big successes) would be a lot of risk-free income back to the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My only experience was some 30 years ago when the regulations and process was simple and the infrastructure to support it less well developed. It still seems to require initiation by the faculty member, and likely this is still the most appropriate and cost effective way to take the first step.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The University of Utah is one of the leaders in this field, even trumping Harvard et. al. There might be something learned from them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I need more time to develop ideas, which usually means research. My teaching responsibilities tend to limit the time I have available for these activities. Teaching is fulfilling, but if you want to encourage faculty to participate in activities that could result in more public/private partnerships, then faculty members like myself need to have adequate time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Setting a fixed time for OTM to make a yes/no decision to either patent the IP or release the IP to the investigators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Profit share with inventors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot;Tie commercialization of products into personal salary benefits. Also, an ethical review board is needed to approve of products in that they have of actual medical benefit in order to be accepted into the incentive program. Include a particular incentive towards innovation on reducing the effects of climate change as this is the single most important issue for our society right now.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Provide better incentives and support to inventors!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Advertise the common folk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CLARIFY / INFORM ABOUT THE PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Make a webinar or some description of the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Develop a stepped guide/framework (or decision tree) that explains each step and decision point toward the different commercialization possibilities. This will enable faculty to understand the process and plan around it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Instead of sending us links to a page that contains lawyer’s language, put it in lay words, so everyone can understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Process is poorly understood by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Increase visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Many faculty have ideas but need interaction to improve creative ideas and know what to pursue. Design Thinking 2 hour workshops with faculty across disciplines can get the creative juices going and improve on potential ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I know my supervisor could not be more supportive of innovation. However, for a multitude of reasons, other staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I'm a new junior faculty member, and no mention about commercialization at UT has been made. I didn't hear about this at any orientation, including my school's faculty orientation. I have no idea what the policies and protocols are relative to this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>As a relatively new faculty, I have not been introduced to any of this process or office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I was essentially told that my finding was not suitable for a patent but I suspect it would have been.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>More consideration of the rights of the authors of educational materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Encourage the process. There seems to be zero interest in doing this here. It almost seems frowned upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>UTHealth appears overly risk averse, e.g., not allowing faculty to participate in governance of a startup. Other institutions recognize that they can encourage research and innovation, attraction and retention of strong faculty, and generate income for the university when they provide more means and support faculty's efforts to commercialize and hold both faculty positions and administrative positions in a startup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I have not yet needed to use this service, but I have spoken to some local vendor start-ups who are looking for faculty assistance. The message was essentially &quot;UTHealth has some brilliant people we would love to work with. But it is a major hassle to deal with UTHealth intellectual property groups. I would much rather work with Baylor for this reason.&quot; In addition, fellow faculty said they turn down such opportunities because of the extra burden placed on such rules. Need to make this easier is the message I hear!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Repeal Rule 90101, particularly Sections 2, 6, 9 and 10. The UT system is draconian and silly in its attempts to control everyone. It makes us not want to innovate due to all the red tape, legalistic threats, and trying to control rather than support its staff, faculty and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Provide a more open and interested attitude to ideas--even if the final decision is not to pursue a patent or license. The attitude I experienced was one of discouragement rather than being helpful. No effort was made to identify private funding opportunities, so I've decided to openly publish my findings and not worry about patent protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The current process is a joke. The current regime should be replaced with a fresh service-oriented attitude and work ethic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Replace the current group at OTM. They do not know how to commercialize a patent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I have serious concerns about conflicts of interest in medicine. I'm not at all confident they can be &quot;managed&quot;. I think we need more not less separation between academic endeavors designed to promote health and wellness and efforts that are driven by profit motive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Don't commercialize UTHealth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Read: Bad Pharma, How drug companies mislead doctors and harm patients, by Ben Goldacre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>As a purported academic institution, I think we should avoid becoming simply a factory of 'products' which leads to outmoded Taylorist models of management. For all the talk of innovation, UTHealth is a fine example of organizational inertia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I believe we should NOT commercialize university research as it goes against the very core tenets of the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Don't see much relevance for my work (behavioral research).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Not sure if adding more staff or financial support to OTM office will have an impact. Would assume that it would, but since I have had no personal encounter with that office I can't say if those changes would effect considerable change (good or bad).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I have no experience with commercialization at UTHealth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>(No - I am only teaching faculty, not research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>My research does not lead to any commercialization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Having never worked with them, I do not feel qualified to address questions about staffing or finances. In general, I would suggest hiring quality - that is knowledgeable and helpful people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I have not had experience, so cannot contribute much to improve this service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 45 | Well, since I have never had contact with OTM my answers to the question above is not relevant, as was my answer to the question 2 questions ago in which I answered "neutral". You should have had a "not applicable" to that one, and to the one
above a column that says "never had contact with OTM" would be more accurate. How do I know if they need more staff or financial support, having never had contact with them??

LACK OF KNOWLEDGE, OTHER, OR "NO COMMENT"

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I don’t know enough about current OTM staffing and funding to comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I know nothing about the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>&quot;Section 1.5 of Rule 90101 states &quot;The primary research-related duties of members of the faculty at U. T. System institutions are to teach, study, investigate, discover, create, disseminate, develop professionally, and infuse new knowledge into their classes and student interaction.&quot; is confusing. The primary research mission is to infuse knowledge into classes? This is better stated as &quot;The primary research-related duties of... are to investigate, discover, create, disseminate new research related knowledge. This should coincide with professional development and the enrichment of both student curriculums and student interactions.&quot;. Finally, this rule in my view is weak on stating the public obligation of UT faculty, staff and students. It is the citizens of Texas that provide much of the funding for the system - where in this rule does it say that this citizenry should benefit from the research enterprise? What is the conduit through which that flows? How can that benefit be tracked? If we are to believe that the UT Regents are the representatives of this citizenry, then how do they discharge this essential responsibility. My apologies if I have missed this.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I spent 9 years at Purdue working with the engineers. I taught a class for nursing and engineering students. Several products were created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>You need to provide a NA category for answers; otherwise some of your data will be skewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>It seems better now. UT just needs to realize that it cannot own everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>No (n=6 &quot;no&quot; responses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8. Promotion and Tenure: Should IP and commercialization activities be explicitly included among the criteria for promotion and tenure? (n=216)**

![Figure 8](chart.png)
Figure 9. Activities for consideration for P&T, and how these should be assessed (n=27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>SUGGESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think these activities should be mentioned and assigned a value, but NOT MANDATED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>They should be highly valued and additive, not required. Products, contracts with local, state, federal and international entities based upon innovation and problem solving often leading to product design, solutions, cost containment, model programs, etc...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>These should only be considered as an elective positive factor. Their absence should NEVER be a detraction from an individual's portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>They should not be viewed negatively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I have no specific view how to implement. But it seems fairer that the efforts and accomplishments of commercialization activities are reasonably considered for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Patents. Royalties/Income. Licensing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Any completed patents should be a positive, absence should not be a negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Scholarly educational activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Impact on the profession, publications, peer esteem, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Creation of startup companies and health products that ultimately help the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>like publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Commercialization represents translation of research to practice and therefore is appropriate to consider. Metrics of intellectual productivity include number and type of patents. Measures of community impact include licensing agreements and dissemination (e.g. units sold or population reached locally, nationally, and internationally).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I'm not sure what activities should be considered but as things currently stand I would suggest: a) Any activity in terms of filing a patent or having teamed up with a company or the creation of a company should be considered in your favor. b) Some scientific endeavors do not lend themselves to commercialization. So having not done any in a) above should not count against your promotion and tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Development of relationships with industry, product development, patenting, commercial income generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Increasing profitability, lowering costs of operation, or coming up with new income streams should definitely be considered in promotion and tenure. I also think consideration should be offered to supervisors of people who come up with innovations, as we all know how important it is for the boss to encourage creative thinking rather than being threatened by it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>contributions to science/patient care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Patents and trademarks past, present, and future!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Commercialization activities should be counted as productive activities and rewarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Research disclosures, patents filed, patents awards, and copyright disclosures for either education materials of software should be considered. These should be assessed by 1) count in each category listed above, 2) licensing of IP, 3) royalties/fees received by the university through OTM or through service centers, etc, or 4) number of web users for free software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Perhaps commercialization activities should not be required, but I submit that they should be considered as scholarly activity in the promotion and tenure review process, given the extensive time investment that can be involved in developing, securing, and commercializing IP, as well as the deleterious impact that investment of time can have on productivity according to more &quot;traditional&quot; metrics of scholarly work (e.g., manuscripts, abstracts, etc. - which might not even be advised for a particular technology, depending upon the status of the IP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>patents should be worth at least a publication, commercialization should be seen as dissemination of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>patent, trade secret, copyright, know-how service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Any product that improves health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Am one of few in my department and is not considered as part of promotion at all. Not a part of CV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Not sure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10. Number of disclosure forms submitted to OTM (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosure Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Types of OTM sponsored commercialization (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyrights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Third party supported commercialization (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyrights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13. Self-financing (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyrights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14. Intentions concerning the IP when OTM was approached (n=31 respondents/ n=43 responses)

- A patent to retain intellectual control of basic research for further exploration.
- A patent to lay a basis for possible commercial development.
- A patent that might be salable as is, with little or no development.
- Licensing (survey, software, curriculum)
- Copyright and commercialization (books, software, curricula)
- Trade secrets/source code
Figure 15. Categories of IP (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Pharmaceuticals</th>
<th>Recombinant DNA</th>
<th>Genomics</th>
<th>Medical technology</th>
<th>Software and/or hardware</th>
<th>Diagnostics</th>
<th>Educational material</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 (82%)</td>
<td>32 (97%)</td>
<td>31 (94%)</td>
<td>23 (70%)</td>
<td>25 (76%)</td>
<td>26 (79%)</td>
<td>27 (82%)</td>
<td>27 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16. Estimated potential value of IP when OTM was approached (n=29)

Figure 17. Estimated potential value after further research and pursuit of IP protection or licensing

Q7a. Would the estimated potential value depend on further research and/or development? (n=29)

Q7b. In at least one case, did OTM, the inventor, and/or a third party decide to pursue protection or licensing of the IP? (n=33)
Figure 18. OTM pursuit of protection of IP, licensing of IP, or release of IP to inventors (n=22)

Q8a. In how many cases did OTM decide NOT to pursue protection of the IP, but inventor and/or third party decided to pursue protection at own expense?

Q8b. In how many cases did OTM pursue protection of the IP and/or license IP to an entity in which at least one inventor has a financial interest?

Q9. How many times was IP released to inventors or licensed to an entity in which at least one inventor has a financial interest?

Figure 19. Timeframe for release of IP or licensing to an entity in which the inventor has a financial interest (n=22)

Timeframe [within 6 months]

Timeframe [within 1 year]

Timeframe [within 2 years]

Timeframe [greater than 2 years]
Figure 20. OTM conditions related to release of IP to inventors (n=5 respondents / n=9 responses)

- Reimbursement of any patent expenses
- A percentage of revenue
- A percentage of gross profit (after subtraction of costs)
- Not applicable – intellectual property was not released (OTM did not successfully pursue patent because of filing errors)
- Research needs prior approval of President
- Limited consideration allowed for expenses to protect IP
- Waive interest you might have in revenues received by UTHealth
- Broad conditions for revoking release
- A security interest
- Allowance for UTHealth to have separate confidential disclosure agreements with third parties related to IP
Figure 21. OTM conditions related to licensing of IP to inventors (n=7 respondents/ n= 13 responses)

- Reimbursement of any patent expenses
- A minimum licensing fee
- Milestone payments
- Guaranteed royalties
- Not applicable – intellectual property was not released (OTM did not successfully pursue patent because of filing errors)
Item 13:
Amendments to
UTS 180
Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment

2. Policy

Sec. 1 Applicability. This policy applies to all UT Dallas employees.

Sec. 2 Purpose. This policy is intended to protect the credibility and reputation of UT Dallas and its employees.

Sec. 3 Primary Responsibility. The primary responsibility of employees of UT Dallas is the accomplishment of the duties and responsibilities assigned to one’s position of appointment.

Sec. 4 Un-Managed Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment Prohibited. UT Dallas employees may not have a direct or indirect interest, including financial and other interests, or engage in a business transaction or professional activity, or incur any obligation of any nature that is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of the employees’ duties to their institution.

Activities on behalf of outside entities or individuals must not interfere with an employee’s fulfillment of his/her duties and responsibilities to UT Dallas. Such conflicts of commitment may arise regardless of the location of these activities, the type of outside entity, or the level of compensation.

Sec. 5 Use of Property. UT Dallas property may only be used for State purposes appropriate to UT Dallas’s mission. Use of UT Dallas property for any outside activity must be approved in accordance with applicable rules and policies.

Sec. 6 Noncompliance. Noncompliance with this policy may subject one to discipline in accordance with applicable procedures up to and including termination of employment.

Sec. 7 Education and Training. This policy and other related policies will be distributed to those responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests on an annual basis. Individuals responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests will be subject to training on an annual basis.

Sec. 8 Definitions.

Conflict of Commitment - A state in which the time or effort that a UT Dallas employee devotes to an outside activity directly or significantly interferes with the employee’s fulfillment of their institutional responsibilities or when the employee uses State property without authority in connection with the employee’s outside employment, board service, or other activity (See Sec. 8, RR 30104). Exceeding the amount of total time permitted by institution policy for outside activities creates the appearance of a conflict of commitment.
Conflict of Interest - A significant outside interest of a UT Dallas employee or one of the employee’s immediate family members that could directly or significantly affect the employee’s performance of the employee’s institutional responsibilities. The proper discharge of an employee’s institutional responsibilities could be directly or significantly affected if the employment, service, activity or interest: (1) might tend to influence the way the employee performs his or her institutional responsibilities, or the employee knows or should know the interest is or has been offered with the intent to influence the employee’s conduct or decisions; (2) could reasonably be expected to impair the employee’s judgment in performing his or her institutional responsibilities; or (3) might require or induce the employee to disclose confidential or proprietary information acquired through the performance of institutional responsibilities.

Immediate Family Members - include:

a) a spouse;

b) a dependent child or stepchild or other dependent, for purposes of determining federal income tax liability during the period covered by the disclosure statement; and

c) a related or non-related, unmarried adult who resides in the same household as the individual and with whom the individual is financially interdependent as evidenced, for example, by the maintenance of a joint bank account, mortgage, or investments.

Cross References

Links to forms

Etc.
1. **Title**

Outside Activity Policy: Executive Officers and Employees Involved in Procurement Activities or Contract Management

2. **Policy**

Sec. 1 **Applicability.** This policy applies to all UT Dallas Executive Officers, Employees Involved in Procurement Activities, and employees involved in contract management.

Sec. 2 **Purpose.** This policy is intended to protect the credibility and reputation of UT Dallas and its employees, by providing a framework to address conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment, and outside activities.

Sec. 3 **Value in Certain Outside Activities.** Regents’ Rule 30104 permits UT Dallas employees to engage in outside work or activities, subject to State laws, UT System and UT Dallas rules or policies. UT Dallas encourages outside activities that clearly contribute to the mission of the institution and/or provide important elements of professional development related to their institution responsibilities.

Sec. 4 **Approval for Outside Activities Required.**

All Executive Officers, Employees Involved in Procurement Activities, and employees involved in contract management must electronically request and receive prior approval for the following activities:

(i) all outside employment or other compensated activity;

(ii) any outside activity, regardless of compensation, that reasonably appears to create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment; and

(iii) outside board service as described in Section 7.4 below.

Sec. 5 **Disclosure of Outside Activities and Interests.**

5.1 With the exception of the President and the minimum purchasing threshold discussed below, all Executive Officers, Employees Involved in Procurement Activities, and employees involved in contract management shall electronically disclose for themselves and for immediate family members:

(i) a description of the nature and extent of all outside employment or other compensated activity;

(ii) a description of the nature and extent of any outside activity, regardless of compensation, that reasonably appears to create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment;

(iii) a description of the nature and extent of outside board service as described in Section 7.4 below,
(Outside Activities for Executive Officers and Procurement Officials)

(iv) a description, including the amount of compensation or interest, of any substantial interest in a business entity which should be provided no later than 30 days after acquiring the interest;

(v) a description of gifts over $250. Do not include gifts received from: one’s parent, child, sibling, grandparent, or grandchild; one’s spouse or the spouse of anyone mentioned above; or the parent, child, sibling, grandparent, or grandchild of one’s spouse;

5.2 The President is required by state law to file Personal Financial Statements with the Texas Ethics Commission. In lieu of filing the information listed in Section 5.1, the President shall file a duplicate copy of their Personal Financial Statement with the Office of the Chancellor at the time that it is filed with the Ethics Commission. If the President seeks an extension of the time to file a Personal Financial Statement with the Texas Ethics Commission, the President must also notify the Chancellor’s Office of the extension.

5.3 Outside activity disclosed under institutional policy developed pursuant to UTS 175, “Disclosure of Significant Financial Interests and Management and report of Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research,” need not be re-disclosed.

5.4 Minimum Purchasing Threshold: Employees Involved in Procurement Activities who are not authorized to make purchases of $15,000 or more, and who make no decisions or recommendations regarding purchases of $15,000 or more, are not required to disclose their outside activities and interests in the U.T System electronic disclosure database.

5.5 In determining whether activity should be disclosed, the individual should resolve the doubt in favor of disclosure.

5.6 Officers and employees covered by this policy with nothing to disclose must affirmatively indicate that fact in the electronic database.

Sec. 6 Electronic Database.

UT System Administration shall develop a shared service electronic reporting system that is consistent with this policy. Institutions may choose to utilize this system to meet the reporting guidelines outlined below or they may choose to electronically collect and transfer equivalent data to UT System Administration using their own electronic systems. Data transfers to UT System Administration shall occur on at least a bi-annual basis. All data locally collected and transferred to UT System Administration must comport with the data definitions, template, and format provided by UT System Administration.

Sec. 7 Outside Activity Guidelines.
7.1 Approval Authorities. The President has appointed the following individuals as the approval authorities under this policy:

(a) For Executive Officers: the President; or for the President, the Executive Vice Chancellor
(b) For Employees Involved in Procurement Activities: their supervisor
(c) For employees involved in contract management: their supervisor

7.2 Time Commitment

No outside activity may be approved if it creates a conflict of commitment. The time commitment of outside activities must not interfere with an employee’s primary responsibility to UT Dallas. While the permissible level of time commitment to outside activities can vary depending upon the positions involved, under no circumstances may it exceed an average of one day (8 hours) per week, during the term of an appointment, without the express approval of the President.

7.3 Categories of Outside Activity

(a) Activity that clearly contributes to the mission of UT Dallas. Some outside activities clearly contribute to the mission of UT Dallas or UT System and/or provide important elements of professional development related to the employee’s institutional duties and responsibilities. These activities, when disclosed and approved, are permitted, can be encouraged, and may be performed during normal operating hours. Examples of these activities include:

   Engaging in professional activity such as providing expert testimony, providing consulting services, professional/clinical practice, and serving on a board of directors

(b) UT Dallas employees may also engage in activity that does not necessarily contribute to the mission of UT Dallas or provide elements of professional development related to their institutional duties and responsibilities, so long as it does not reasonably appear to create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment with the employee's institutional duties and responsibilities. Any such activity must take place only outside of normal operating hours, without use of institutional resources, and must be disclosed and approved as required by this policy.

7.4 Accounting for Outside Board Service

(a) Recognizing the benefit to be derived by UT Dallas from outside board service, and after thorough consideration of the time commitment that might be involved, time spent on uncompensated service on nonreligious boards, other
than for reimbursement of usual and customary expenses, may be deemed to be of service to the UT Dallas and may not require the use of a person’s own time, with prior disclosure and approval before engaging in such service.

(b) Service on an outside board for which the employee is compensated, and any service to a religious organization whether or not compensated, must be on the person’s own time. If the service occurs during normal office hours, the person must use vacation time, compensatory time, or other appropriate leave while providing the service. The service should be without cost to UT Dallas; and, except for service to religious organizations, must be disclosed and approved prior to engaging in such service.

(c) Participation on the board of a municipality; local religious congregation; neighborhood association; public, private or parochial school; political organization; youth sports or recreation league; affinity group such as the local orchid society or model train collectors club; and other similar outside boards on which the service is primarily personal rather than professional in nature and does not require time away from UT Dallas responsibilities, is permitted without the requirement of disclosure and advance approval if it does not create a conflict of interest or conflict of commitment or the appearance of a conflict of interest or conflict of commitment.

Sec. 8 Additional Process Requirements.

8.1 Management Plans. Management plans must be in place for all employees covered by this policy for outside activities that may create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment before activity begins. Management plans will be developed by [Designated Official] and approved by [Next Senior Official].

8.2 Appeals. Individuals whose request for approval of outside activity is denied may request that the denying authority reconsider the decision and provide an explanation in writing. If the individual remains unsatisfied with the decision, he or she may access standard grievance procedures to the extent that they are otherwise applicable.

8.3 Prospect and Retrospective Approval. In rare instance, outside activity may be approved retrospectively when the individual is called upon to assist in an emergency or urgent situation where it would be impossible or unreasonable to obtain advance approval. In such cases, the activity must be fully disclosed and approval sought from the appropriate authority as soon as reasonably possible.

Some activity may also be prospectively approved, for up to one year, when an individual describes to the approving authority as fully as reasonably possible the general nature and extent of anticipated, but not confirmed, outside opportunities.

8.4 Confidential Outside Activity. If an individual wishes to engage in an activity for which some or all of the relevant information is confidential, the approving
authority may nonetheless approve the activity without requiring full written disclosure upon satisfaction that there is a compelling reason to treat the information confidentially and the activity is otherwise fully compliant with this policy and all other applicable laws and UT Dallas and UT System policies.

8.5 Rescinding Approvals. An approving authority may rescind an approved outside activity upon receipt of information indicating that the activity is not consistent with this policy or any applicable law or UT Dallas or UT System policy. The individual for whom the activity may be rescinded shall be given notice of the information and an opportunity to respond.

Sec. 9 Noncompliance. Noncompliance with this policy may subject one to discipline in accordance with applicable procedures up to and including termination of employment.

Sec. 10 Annual Report. Employees shall review and finalize all disclosures after the end of the calendar year during the annual reporting period (January through March of the following year).

Sec. 11 Education and Training. This policy and other related policies will be distributed to those responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests on an annual basis. Individuals responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests will be subject to training on an annual basis.

Sec. 12 Definitions.

**Business Entity** - Any entity recognized by law through which business is conducted, including a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint stock company, receivership, or trust.

**Compensation** - Any form of benefit including but not limited to salary, retainer, honoraria, intellectual property rights or royalties, or promised, deferred, or contingent interest. It also includes sponsored travel or reimbursement.

**Conflict of Commitment** - A state in which the time or effort that a UT Dallas employee devotes to an outside activity directly or significantly interferes with the employee’s fulfillment of their institutional responsibilities or when the employee uses State property without authority in connection with the employee’s outside employment, board service, or other activity (See Sec. 8, RR 30104). Exceeding the amount of total time permitted by institutional policy for outside activities creates the appearance of a conflict of commitment.

**Conflict of Interest** - A significant outside interest of a UT Dallas employee or one of the employee’s immediate family members that could directly or significantly affect the employee’s performance of the employee’s institutional responsibilities. The proper discharge of an employee’s institutional responsibilities could be directly or significantly affected if the employment, service, activity or interest: (1) might tend to influence the way the employee performs his or her institutional responsibilities, or the employee
knows or should know the interest is or has been offered with the intent to influence the employee’s conduct or decisions; (2) could reasonably be expected to impair the employee’s judgment in performing his or her institutional responsibilities; or (3) might require or induce the employee to disclose confidential or proprietary information acquired through the performance of institutional responsibilities.

**Employees Involved in Procurement Activities** - An employee who makes decisions or recommendations regarding:

- a) contract terms or conditions on a contract;
- b) who is to be awarded a contract;
- c) preparation of a solicitation for a contract; or
- d) evaluation of a bid or proposal.

**Executive Officer** - includes, but is not limited to, the President, all individuals who report directly to the President (other than administrative support positions), and any employee who exercises broad and significant discretion over key institution functions. The following positions are hereby designated as Executive Officers:

[List positions]

**Immediate Family Members** - include:

- a) a spouse;
- b) a dependent child or stepchild or other dependent, for purposes of determining federal income tax liability during the period covered by the disclosure statement; and
- c) a related or non-related, unmarried adult who resides in the same household as the individual and with whom the individual is financially interdependent as evidenced, for example, by the maintenance of a joint bank account, mortgage, or investments.

**Nature and Extent** - Shall include a description of the activity, the time commitment, the amount of compensation, if any, and the anticipated length of time the commitment is expected to continue.

**Outside Board** - The board, council, or other governing or advisory body of a business, civic, professional social, or religious organization, whether for profit or nonprofit.

**Outside Employment** - Any activity performed by an employee, other than fulfilling employment obligations at UT Dallas, for which remuneration is received, including distance teaching.

**Substantial Interest in a Business Entity** - For purposes of this policy, means:
(1) a controlling interest;

(2) ownership of more than 1 percent of the voting interest;

(3) ownership of more than $5,000 of the fair market value;

(4) a direct or indirect participating interest by shares, stock, or otherwise, regardless of whether voting rights are included, in more than 1 percent of the profits, proceeds, or capital gains; or

(5) service as an officer.

Not to include investments in mutual funds or retirement accounts, so long as the individual does not directly control the investment decisions made in those vehicles.
1. Title

Outside Activity Policy for All Employees, Excluding Executive Officers and Employees Involved in Procurement Activities or Contract Management

2. Policy

Sec. 1 Applicability. This policy applies to all UT Dallas employees, excluding Executive Officers, Employees Involved in Procurement Activities, or employees involved in contract management who are governed by [policy name and number].

Sec. 2 Purpose. This policy is intended to protect the credibility and reputation of UT Dallas and its employees, by providing a framework to address conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment, and outside activities.

Sec. 3 Value in Certain Outside Activities. Regents’ Rule 30104 permits UT Dallas employees to engage in outside work or activities, subject to State laws, UT System and UT Dallas rules or policies. UT Dallas encourages outside activities that clearly contribute to the mission of the institution and/or provide important elements of professional development related to their institution responsibilities.

Sec. 4 Approval for Outside Activities Required.

All employees must electronically request and receive prior approval for the following activities:

(i) all outside employment or other compensated activity;
(ii) any outside activity, regardless of compensation, that reasonably appears to create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment;
(iii) outside board service as described in Section 5.4 below.

Sec. 5 Outside Activity Guidelines.

5.1 Approval Authorities. The President has appointed the following individuals as the approval authorities under this policy:

(a) For members of the faculty: [e.g. the Dean or Department Chair (in large units)]
(b) For deans and department chairs: [e.g. the Provost or President]
(c) For administrative and professional staff: [their supervisor]
(d) For other employees: [their supervisor]

5.2 Time Commitment
No outside activity may be approved if it creates a conflict of commitment. The time commitment of outside activities must not interfere with an employee’s primary responsibility to UT Dallas. While the permissible level of time commitment to outside activities can vary depending upon the positions involved, under no circumstances may it exceed an average of one day (8 hours) per week, during the term of an appointment, without the express approval of the President.

5.3 Categories of Outside Activity

(a) Some activity is so integral to the mission of UT Dallas that it is encouraged and may be performed during normal operating hours and may be considered pre-approved, so long as the activity does not reasonably appear to create a conflict of interest and the amount of time committed does not interfere with employee's institutional duties and responsibilities. These activities include the following:

Serving on a federal, state, or local government agency committee, panel, or commission. Acting in an editorial capacity for a professional journal. Reviewing journal manuscripts, book manuscripts, or grant or contract proposals. Attending and presenting talks at scholarly colloquia and conferences. Developing scholarly communications in the form of books or journal articles, movies, television productions, and similar works, even when such activities result in financial gain, consistent with intellectual property and other applicable U. T. System and institution policies and guidelines. Serving as a committee member, an officer, or a board member of a professional or scholarly society.

(b) Activity that clearly contributes to the mission of UT Dallas. Some outside activities clearly contribute to the mission of UT Dallas and/or provide important elements of professional development related to the employee’s institutional duties and responsibilities. These activities, when approved, are permitted, can be encouraged, and may be performed during normal operating hours. Examples of these activities include:

Engaging in professional activity such as providing expert testimony, providing consulting services, professional/clinical practice, and serving on a board of directors

(c) UT Dallas employees may also engage in activity that does not necessarily contribute to the mission of UT Dallas or provide elements of professional development related to their institutional duties and responsibilities, so long as it does not reasonably appear to create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment with the employee's institutional duties and responsibilities. Any such activity must take place only outside of normal operating hours, without use of institutional resources, and must be approved as required by this policy.
5.4 Accounting for Outside Board Service

(a) Recognizing the benefit to be derived by UT Dallas from outside board service, and after thorough consideration of the time commitment that might be involved, time spent on uncompensated service on nonreligious boards, other than for reimbursement of usual and customary expenses, may be deemed to be of service to the UT Dallas and may not require the use of a person’s own time, with prior approval before engaging in such service.

(b) Service on an outside board for which the employee is compensated, and any service to a religious organization whether or not compensated, must be on the person’s own time. If the service occurs during normal office hours, the person must use vacation time, compensatory time, or other appropriate leave while providing the service. The service should be without cost to UT Dallas; and, except for service to religious organizations, must be approved prior to engaging in such service.

(c) Participation on the board of a municipality; local religious congregation; neighborhood association; public, private or parochial school; political organization; youth sports or recreation league; affinity group such as the local orchid society or model train collectors club; and other similar outside boards on which the service is primarily personal rather than professional in nature and does not require time away from UT Dallas responsibilities, is permitted without the requirement of approval if it does not create a conflict of interest or conflict of commitment or the appearance of a conflict of interest or conflict of commitment.

5.5 In determining whether activity should be disclosed, the individual should resolve the doubt in favor of disclosure.

Sec. 6 Additional Process Requirements.

6.1 Management Plans. Management plans must be in place for all employees for outside activities that may create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment before activity begins. Management plans will be developed by [Designated Official] and approved by [Next Senior Official].

6.2 Appeals. Individuals whose request for approval of outside activity is denied may request that the denying authority reconsider the decision and provide an explanation in writing. If the individual remains unsatisfied with the decision, he or she may access standard grievance procedures to the extent that they are otherwise applicable.

6.3 Prospect and Retrospective Approval. In rare instance, outside activity may be approved retrospectively when the individual is called upon to assist in an emergency or urgent situation where it would be impossible or unreasonable to
obtain advance approval. In such cases, the activity must be fully disclosed and approval sought from the appropriate authority as soon as reasonably possible.

Some activity may also be prospectively approved, for up to one year, when an individual describes to the approving authority as fully as reasonably possible the general nature and extent of anticipated, but not confirmed, outside opportunities.

6.4 Confidential Outside Activity. If an individual wishes to engage in an activity for which some or all of the relevant information is confidential, the approving authority may nonetheless approve the activity without requiring full written disclosure upon satisfaction that there is a compelling reason to treat the information confidentially and the activity is otherwise fully compliant with this policy and all other applicable laws and UT Dallas and UT System policies.

6.5 Rescinding Approvals. An approving authority may rescind an approved outside activity upon receipt of information indicating that the activity is not consistent with this policy or any applicable law or UT Dallas or UT System policy. The individual for whom the activity may be rescinded shall be given notice of the information and an opportunity to respond.

Sec. 7 Noncompliance. Noncompliance with this policy may subject one to discipline in accordance with applicable procedures up to and including termination of employment.

Sec. 8 Education and Training. This policy and other related policies will be distributed to those responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests on an annual basis. Individuals responsible for approving and managing outside activities and interests will be subject to training on an annual basis.

Sec. 9 Definitions.

**Business Entity** - Any entity recognized by law through which business is conducted, including a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint stock company, receivership, or trust.

**Compensation** - Any form of benefit including but not limited to salary, retainer, honoraria, intellectual property rights or royalties, or promised, deferred, or contingent interest. It also includes sponsored travel or reimbursement.

**Conflict of Commitment** - A state in which the time or effort that a UT Dallas devotes to an outside activity directly or significantly interferes with the employee’s fulfillment of their institutional responsibilities or when the employee uses State property without authority in connection with the employee’s outside employment, board service, or other activity (See Sec. 8, RR 30104). Exceeding the amount of total time permitted by institutional policy for outside activities creates the appearance of a conflict of commitment.
Conflict of Interest - A significant outside interest of a UT Dallas employee or one of the employee’s immediate family members that could directly or significantly affect the employee’s performance of the employee’s institutional responsibilities. The proper discharge of an employee’s institutional responsibilities could be directly or significantly affected if the employment, service, activity or interest: (1) might tend to influence the way the employee performs his or her institutional responsibilities, or the employee knows or should know the interest is or has been offered with the intent to influence the employee’s conduct or decisions; (2) could reasonably be expected to impair the employee’s judgment in performing his or her institutional responsibilities; or (3) might require or induce the employee to disclose confidential or proprietary information acquired through the performance of institutional responsibilities.

Employees Involved in Procurement Activities - An employee who makes decisions or recommendations regarding:

a) contract terms or conditions on a contract;

b) who is to be awarded a contract;

c) preparation of a solicitation for a contract; or

d) evaluation of a bid or proposal.

Executive Officer - includes, but is not limited to, the president, all individuals who report directly to the president (other than administrative support positions), and any employee who exercises broad and significant discretion over key institution functions. The following positions are hereby designated as Executive Officers:

[List positions]

Immediate Family Members - include:

a) a spouse;

b) a dependent child or stepchild or other dependent, for purposes of determining federal income tax liability during the period covered; and

c) a related or non-related, unmarried adult who resides in the same household as the individual and with whom the individual is financially interdependent as evidenced, for example, by the maintenance of a joint bank account, mortgage, or investments.

Nature and Extent - Shall include a description of the activity, the time commitment, the amount of compensation, if any, and the anticipated length of time the commitment is expected to continue.

Outside Board - The board, council, or other governing or advisory body of a business, civic, professional social, or religious organization, whether for profit or nonprofit.
Outside Employment - Any activity performed by an employee, other than fulfilling employment obligations at UT Dallas, for which remuneration is received, including distance teaching.

Substantial Interest in a Business Entity - For purposes of this policy, means:

1. a controlling interest;
2. ownership of more than 1 percent of the voting interest;
3. ownership of more than $5,000 of the fair market value;
4. a direct or indirect participating interest by shares, stock, or otherwise, regardless of whether voting rights are included, in more than 1 percent of the profits, proceeds, or capital gains; or
5. service as an officer.

Not to include investments in mutual funds or retirement accounts, so long as the individual does not directly control the investment decisions made in those vehicles.
Item 14:
Amendments to Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee – UTDPP1003
Policy Charge

Information Resources Security Technology Planning and Policy Committee - UTDPP1003

Policy Statement

The Information Resources Security Technology Planning and Policy Committee is a University-wide Standing Committee.

The Committee will advise and assist the Vice President, Chief Information Officer in long range planning for development and use of the university's information resources in such a way as to strike the best possible balance between outreach for education, support of research, and the maintenance and operations of information security technology on campus. With respect to long-range planning, the Committee will deal with all aspects of information resources technology including existing and emerging requirements, current and anticipated technologies and preferred policies and practices. The committee is expected to maintain liaisons with the Committee on Distance Learning, the Committee on Effective Teaching, the Information Security Advisory Committee, and all other university and administrative committees whose work bears on issues of information resources technology. With respect to security, the committee will have a permanent subcommittee on security compliance to oversee the University's compliance with U. T. System system-wide policy UTS165, U. T. System Information Security Action Plan, and Texas Administrative Code 202.

Responsibilities of the full committee include but are not limited to:

1. Participation in the creation and implementation of long-range plans for Information Resources Technology development and utilization. Within that process, the committee will assist in the identification and prioritization of goals, objectives and action items. Completed planning efforts will be documented by the Office of the Vice President, Chief Information Officer and submitted to the Academic Senate before being submitted to the President's Cabinet or concerned State of Texas agencies in a timely manner.

2. Monitoring, review and audit of the implementation of the UTD policies related to information technology.
The Committee shall be composed of at least thirteen voting members. Seven shall be tenure-track faculty, including at least two holding administrative positions of Dean or above, appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in UTDPP1088: Faculty Governance, Section 1.B.1, Title III, Chapter 21, Section 1.B.1 of The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures). In addition, there shall be one representative each from the Office of Institutional Compliance Audit and Compliance, Academic Affairs, the University Staff Council, the Office of the Vice President for Research, and the Office of the Vice President for Administration, one graduate student and one undergraduate student. The University Chief Information Security Officer shall be a member ex officio, with vote. The Vice President, Chief Information Officer (under the terms of U. T. System system-wide policy UTS165) is the Responsible University Official (RUO).

The security compliance subcommittee shall consist of the Chief Information Security Officer and at least one committee member from Audit and Compliance, one from Academic Affairs, one from the Office of the Vice President for Research, one from the General Faculty, and one each of the University staff and Information Resources staff. Membership of the subcommittee shall be determined by majority vote of the full committee.

In consultation with the full committee, pursuant to system-wide policy UTS165, the task of the subcommittee on security compliance shall be to advise the Vice President, Chief Information Officer on ways to carry out the tasks assigned in system-wide policy UTS165, namely to:

- Analyze information to determine whether it is confidential, sensitive, both or neither.
- Prepare a security plan to protect information identified as confidential, sensitive or both.
- Assign management responsibility for implementing the security plan.
- Train personnel to treat information resources properly.
- Monitor the treatment of information resources to ensure compliance with the security plan.
- Submit planning documents and reports to state agencies as required.

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

The Committee will meet annually in October to organize subcommittees or other working units for fulfilling its responsibilities and to determine a schedule of meetings that includes at least one per quartertwo 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. The Chair and Vice Chair are appointed annually by the President.

Policy History
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Item 15:
Amendments to UTDBP 3050-Scholarships, Fellowships and Other Appointments and Monetary Awards to Students
Scholarships, Fellowships and Other Appointments and Monetary Awards to Students

Awards for scholarships, fellowships, stipends, etc., are granted at the undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate academic levels. Funding emanates from a variety of sources including federal and state funds, gifts from individuals, and private foundations.

Administration

Need Based Programs: The Office of Financial Aid administers those programs which are supported by federal and state funds and those which specify financial need as a primary requirement for eligibility. In the latter category, for scholarships funded by private gifts and grants that are administered by Financial Aid, applicants are screened for eligibility requirements in that office and recipients are selected by the University Committee on Student Fellowships and Scholarships. This Committee is appointed by the President with the advice of the Academic Council.

Merit Based Programs: Programs based solely on academic merit are administered by various university departments, schools, and other units including the offices of cabinet-level officers as well as the Deans of the Schools, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean of Undergraduate Education and the University Committee on Student Fellowships and Scholarships.

Scholarship and fellowship awards are determined by selection committees appointed by the university officials responsible for the scholarship programs. The University Committee on Student Fellowships and Scholarships is appointed by the President with the advice of the Academic Council. In the case of programs within the Schools, selection committees are appointed by the Deans of the Schools annually with the approval of the appropriate Graduate or Undergraduate Dean. University-wide programs based on academic merit are administered by the Dean of Graduate Studies or Undergraduate Education, who may appoint a selection committee with approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost for Academic Affairs. In the case of programs within the Schools, selection committees are appointed by the Deans of the Schools annually.

Coordination: The Office of Financial Aid, as the University's central location for information on all scholarships and fellowships, and other monetary awards awarded, is advised of awards made by the Schools or the Graduate or Undergraduate Deans through the University's "Appointment Form for School Scholarships, Fellowships and Other Awards" (see Exhibit D11). processes all awards once the appropriate approval and notification has been made by the applicable account manager and awarding authority.

Establishment of Scholarships and Fellowships
University Affairs: The Office of Development is responsible for University fund raising and communication with donors. Establishing scholarship selection criteria is a negotiation process that takes place between the donor and the Office of Development, in cooperation with the Office of Institutional Scholarship Administration and any involved university unit, at the time a gift is made to establish a scholarship, fellowship, or other monetary student award. The criteria must be carefully developed to ensure that both university and donor objectives are met in accordance with institutional, state, and federal policy. Criteria may include, but are not limited to, GPA requirements, standardized test score minimums, financial need, major or area of study, enrollment hours, and extracurricular activities not related to athletics. The donor may also elect to make the award renewable and define conditions under which renewal may occur. The donor may not name a specific student to receive a scholarship.

All contributions, including those accepted by colleges, schools, and departments, will be processed through the Office of Development. Full reporting and approval procedures for acceptance of private gifts from all sources, including individuals, foundations, and corporations, must be followed in accordance with The University of Texas System Systemwide Policy UTS 138. All scholarship/fellowship accounts are established by and through the Office of Development. Any University office receiving a check to support a scholarship/fellowship should forward the check and any stipulations by the donor to the Office of Development.

Awarding Scholarships

All scholarship/fellowship accounts are established by and through the Office of Development. Prior to establishing a new account, the Office of Development determines from the Executive Vice President and Provost the appropriate administrative unit to serve as account manager.

The availability of each scholarship and fellowship must be advertised through the Office of Financial Aid and through the appropriate area(s) for which the award is designated. Prior to advertising any scholarships or fellowships, the awarding unit is responsible for checking account balances to verify the availability of funds. The awarding unit should maintain the account and is responsible for the account balances.

All awards to or on behalf of a student must be approved by the appropriate account manager and awarding authority before submittal to the Office of Financial Aid in order for payments of scholarship funds to authorize to students. The chair of the scholarship committee is responsible for assuring that all awards approved by the account manager and awarding authority are true and accurate.

Scholarships from annual gifts should not be awarded if funds have not been received prior to the year of award. For endowments, awards can only be made based on the projected income to be earned by September 1 of the academic year of the award. Due to funding limitations, not all students meeting the minimum requirements will be awarded a scholarship.
Account Manager: Prior to establishing a new account, the Office of Development determines from the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs the appropriate administrative unit to serve as account manager.

Processing Award Checks
Scholarship and fellowship awards initiated by University offices other than the Office of Financial Aid are made by completing the "Appointment Form for School Scholarships, Fellowships and Other Awards" (see Exhibit D11).
Prior to approving the appointment form, the account manager must verify that the account has sufficient funds budgeted for scholarship expenditures.

A. Continuing accounts (e.g., endowed accounts) should be budgeted during the regular budget cycle.

B. The Development Office will provide the account manager with a copy of the gift receipt form which creates the fund account number for new and/or annual gifts for scholarships and fellowships. Upon receipt of this form, the account manager must process a Budget Adjustment Form (BAF) and a Signature Authority Form to create the appropriate budget for the funds and to allow the account manager to process Purchase Vouchers for award checks.

A separate appointment form must be completed for each account to be charged. Multiple recipients and/or multiple payments for each recipient may be scheduled on a single appointment form, provided only one account is being charged.

A Purchase Voucher (see Exhibit D12) for each recipient should be prepared by the account manager for each issue date for which a recipient is scheduled on the appointment form. The account manager is responsible for submitting the Purchase Voucher to Accounts Payable at least two weeks prior to the date a recipient is scheduled to receive an award check. In the case of a single payment to a recipient, the appointment form will be forwarded to Accounts Payable with the Purchase Voucher. When multiple payments to a recipient are scheduled on the appointment form, Accounts Payable will maintain a file copy of the appointment form and voucher and issue payments as directed by the form and voucher. Accounts Payable will verify that the student/employee is still with the University before each subsequent payment is made. If there is a change in status of the appointment, it is the responsibility of the account manager to notify Accounts Payable in writing. All award checks are forwarded to the Bursar’s Office for distribution to recipients. If an exception to this procedure is necessary, written instructions regarding the disposition of the check(s) should be attached to the Purchase Voucher(s). Such exceptions will be subject to approval by the Director of Financial Services.

Upon receipt of the appointment form, Accounts Payable will indicate the date of receipt and distribute copies as indicated on the form. In the case of multiple payments to a recipient scheduled on a single appointment form, Accounts Payable will provide the Office of Financial Aid with a copy of the authorizing appointment form as each Purchase Voucher is processed.
The Office of Financial Aid will notify the Registrar of out-of-state and foreign students who receive competitive academic scholarships or fellowships that qualify the recipient to pay the same tuition as a Texas resident.

Appointments conditioned upon a service being rendered by the recipient should be routed through the Payroll Office prior to Accounts Payable to ensure proper deductions are calculated.

**Awards Qualifying for Tuition Waivers**

**Competitive Scholarship Waivers, under section 54.213 of the Texas Education Code:**

“An institution of higher education may charge a nonresident student who holds a competitive scholarship of at least $1,000 for the academic year or summer term for which the student is enrolled resident tuition and fees without regard to the length of time the student has resided in Texas. The student must compete with other students, including Texas residents, for the scholarship and the scholarship must be awarded by a scholarship committee officially recognized by the administration and be approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board under criteria developed by the coordinating board.

The total number of students at an institution paying resident tuition under this section for a particular semester may not exceed five percent of the total number of students registered at the institution for the same semester of the preceding academic year.”

In accordance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC), RULE §21.2263 to be considered competitive, a scholarship must:

1. Total at least $1,000 for the period of time covered by the scholarship, not to exceed 12 months;

2. Be awarded by a scholarship committee authorized in writing by the institution’s administration to grant scholarships that permit this waiver of nonresident tuition;

3. Be awarded according to criteria published in the institution’s paper or electronic catalog, available to the public in advance of any application deadline;

4. Be awarded under circumstances that cause both the funds and the selection process to be under the control of the institution; and

5. Permit awards to both resident and nonresident persons.

Under this Rule, a waiver based on a competitive scholarship lasts for the period of the scholarship (up to a 12-month period). The scholarship award must specify the term or terms in which the scholarship will be in effect. If the scholarship is terminated, so is the waiver. If the scholarship is to be issued in multiple disbursements and less than $1,000 is issued when a scholarship is terminated, the student does not owe a refund for the tuition that has been waived, since the waiver
was originally made in a good faith expectation of a scholarship for at least $1,000, but the waiver is canceled for the terms for which the scholarship is canceled.

The Office of Financial Aid applies the in-state tuition waiver for nonresident students who receive competitive academic scholarships or fellowships that qualify the recipient to pay the same tuition as a Texas resident.

The chairperson of the selection committee certifies that the criteria used by the committee does or does not meet the definition of a "competitive academic scholarship" cited above. The form also indicates the appointment period for the award which stipulates the academic year in which a competitive academic scholarship is in effect.

The Office of Institutional Scholarship Administration will maintain a list of all approved competitive scholarships/fellowships and ensure awards are disbursed to students in accordance with federal, state and institutional regulations.

A nonresident student who is awarded a competitive academic scholarship in the amount of $1,000 or more may pay the same tuition as a resident of Texas during the registration period in which the competitive academic scholarship is in effect.

A competitive academic scholarship is defined as an award made in competition with other students, including Texas residents, to encourage academic excellence in the academic program in which the recipient is enrolled.

The chairperson of the appropriate selection committee certifies on the "Appointment Form for School Scholarships, Fellowships, and Other Awards" that the criteria used by the committee does or does not meet the definition of a "competitive academic scholarship" cited above. The form also indicates the appointment period for the award which stipulates the registration period(s) in which a competitive academic scholarship is in effect.

Third Party Awards

Third party awards are defined as those scholarships, fellowships, or other awards which are awarded to a student enrolled for course work at U.T. Dallas by a funding agency which is not part of the U.T. Dallas administration. Normally, students apply directly to such agencies and award checks may or may not be transmitted to the student via the University.

All third party award checks when received by any university office should be forwarded to the Office of Financial Aid for processing through Accounts Payable, including distribution to the student via the Bursar's Office.
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