MEMORANDUM
September 18, 2015

TO: Academic Council*

COPY TO: Hobson Wildenthal  Denis Dean
Inga Musselman  George Fair
Andrew Blanchard  Dennis Kratz
Calvin Jamison  Bert Moore
Abby Kratz  Bruce Novak
John Wiorkowski  Hasan Pirkul
Austin Cunningham  Mark Spong

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

SUBJECT: Academic Council Meeting

The Academic Council will meet on WEDNESDAY, October 7, 2015 at 2:00 p.m in the Osborne Conference Room, ECS South 3.503. Please bring the agenda packet with you to the meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at cgm130130@utdallas.edu or x4791.

Attachments

<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
AGENDA
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
October 7, 2015
Osborne Conference Room, ECS South 3.503

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS  
   Dr. Wildenthal

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  
   Dr. Redman

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES -September 2, 2015 Meeting  
   Dr. Redman

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT  
   Dr. Redman

5. Committee Replacements  
   Dr. Redman

6. FAC REPORT  
   Dr. Leaf

7. CEP Recommendations  
   Clint Peinhardt
   A. Distance Learning Syllabi
   B. BS in Public Policy
   C. Official Academic Transcript Notation Policy
   D. Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog Concentration and Transcript Policy
   E. Supplemental Undergraduate Courses
   F. Supplemental Graduate Courses (Pending)

8. Information Security Presentation  
   Nate Howe

9. Campus Updates Presentation  
   Calvin Jamison

10. FY 15 Committee Annual Reports  
    Dr. Cordell

11. UTD Consensual Relationships Policy  
    Colleen Dutton

12. 3+3+3 Committee on Non-tenure system faculty  
    Dr. Scotch

13. Legislative Summary  
    Serenity King

14. Assessment Committee Charge  
    Serenity King

15. Textbook Adoption Process  
    Carrie Chutes

16. Amendments to Committee Charges  
    Tim Redman

17. Regent Rules 31008- Termination of a Faculty Member Pool  
    Murray Leaf

18. Policy on Criminal Background Checks  
    Murray Leaf

19. 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
SEPTEMBER 2, 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

ABSENT: Tonja Wissinger

VISITORS: Andrew Blanchard, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Caitlynn Forner, James Dockery, Alex Piquero, Colleen Dutton, Clint Peinhardt

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions
   Interim President Wildenthal called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM. He opened the floor to questions. There were none.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   Richard Scotch made a motion to move items 6, 14, and 17 following the Speakers Report, and approve the amended agenda. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

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

4. Speaker's Report
   1. He anticipated a short agenda for the September Senate meeting, as it will follow the State of the University Address, at 2:30 PM. For 2016 it may be a good idea to reschedule the Senate meeting so that it does not follow the State of the University Address.
   2. It will be possible to have a December Senate meeting due to how the calendar falls.
   3. Liz Salter has requested to be removed from the Council and Senate due to family medical reasons. She recommended Tonja Wissinger to fill her position. David Cordell made the motion of consent. Seconded. The motion carried.

5. Concealed Carry on Campus- Alex Piquero
   Alex Piquero is the Campus Representative on the System Campus Carry Committee. There will be conference calls between him and the other representatives every Friday afternoon starting on September 11, 2015. The topic of discussion will be places for exclusion. A University work group is being created. Alex will be presenting to Student Government on September 8, 2015. Alex will be able to give further information follow each conference call. The law will go into effect on August 1, 2016. Richard Scotch made a motion to place it on the September senate agenda. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried.

6. Sexual Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy- James Dockery
James Dockery’s area took the UT System model policy and added UTD specific language. Following a discussion with Abby Kratz it was found that numbering on the policy needed to be corrected. 6.2B there was a typographical error, which will be corrected. Following a discussion with Gene Fitch, the student appellate section was removed and placed in the Student Conduct policy. Richard Scotch made a motion to place it on the September senate agenda. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

7. Recommendations for Committee Replacements
A question was raised regarding the Committee on Departmental Procedures. Murray Leaf moved to refer the matter back to the Committee on Committees. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried. A list of replacement recommendations will be on the October Council Agenda.

8. FAC/TCFS Report- Murray Leaf
The next meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council will be September 3-4, 2015. Matt Brown moved to have a full report from the meeting be presented at the September Senate meeting. Greg Dess seconded. The motion carried.

9. CEP Recommendations- Clint Peinhardt
   A. BA in Math
       The rational for the new degree was to encourage math majors to have more flexibility. This will increase the numbers who graduate with math and can teach at the high school level. Currently there is a lower percent versus the other STEM programs. There is a need for properly trained mathematic teachers, and it is continuing to grow. The degree is targeted for students who do not wish to go into a graduate program in math but may wish for a double major. Currently the UTeach program would like to attract more math majors at the High School level. The Math department has found that students are not completing a degree and are instead transferring to Interdisciplinary studies. Through this path graduates are using a loophole that allows them to teach at the high school level even though they are not properly certified. This new BA in Math rectifies the situation.
       Greg Dess moved to place the item on the September senate agenda. Viswanath Ramakrishna seconded. The motion carried.
   B. Marburg Dual Degree Program
       UTD has an existing Master of Science in International Political Economy and they are proposing creating a dual degree with the Philipps University of Marburg, Germany. One year will be done at UTD the other at Marburg. 51% of the degree will be done at UTD. The number of students would be balanced per year. It is estimated to be five per year from each school. A Master’s Thesis is required for the University of Marburg. CEP moved to place it on the Senate agenda.

10. UTD Consensual Relationships Policy- Colleen Dutton
    The policy is based on UTS 184. A model policy was submitted to each system school to make local policies. She will be working closely with the Provost to implement processes across the campus once the policy is approved. Speaker Redman suggested that the footnote be moved up into the main document for further clarification. An updated document will be submitted at the October Council meeting.
11. Proposed revisions to UTS 180- Murray Leaf
Murray Leaf moved to place an explanation of the amendments on the September Senate agenda. Greg Dess seconded. The motion carried.

12. Annual Reports- David Cordell
As of meeting time, no additional reports had been received. Secretary Cordell will send out a reminder to all FY 15 Committee Chairs who have yet to submit reports. Cordell moved to place it on the October Senate agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

13. Promotion and tenure actions for the previous year – Inga Musselman
Acting Provost Inga Musselman gave a report for the Promotion and Tenure actions for the 2014-2015 academic year. 12 faculty requested review for promotion to the rank of professor 11 of the 12 were granted it, with one reappointed as an associate professor with tenure. Seventeen faculty were reviewed for tenure. 16 were granted tenure and promoted to associate professor and one was provided with a terminal year appointment. There were no disagreements between the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel and the Provost.

14. 3+3+3 Committee on Non Tenure System faculty – Richard Scotch
The policy was completed in June and was discussed at the August Council meeting; however it was delayed from August to allow David Cordell and Richard Scotch to present. David Cordell moved to place on the October Senate agenda. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried.

15. One Card Presentation
After a discussion it was found this item was no longer relevant or required. Should it be a concern later on it will be brought back up to the council for consideration.

16. Legislative Summary- Serenity King
Serenity King gave a summary of various pieces of legislation that would affect the university.

84th Legislative Summary
As a System, we analyzed over 2,600 bills, creating over 10,000 analyses. At UT Dallas, we analyzed over 360 higher-education related bills, creating over 1,200 analyses.

State
General Appropriations Act authorized a 3.6% increase over the previous biennium for a total of $209.4 billion. 51% is general revenue (GR).
Supplemental Appropriations bill appropriates $12.7 million (GR) in special item funding for UT System institutions. No rainy day fund used for this biennium.

Higher Education
$14.7 billion in GR. This figure includes amounts for employee benefits. This is an increase of $1.4 billion in GR or 10.6% increase from the previous biennium.

UT System
$3.6 billion in GR. This is an increase of 7.8% over the previous biennium. $1.7B is for the general academic institutions.

**UT Dallas**

$3.2 million increase in GR, but an overall $31 million increase in all funds for the biennium.

**Formula Funding**

Rate per weighted semester credit hour increased from $54.86 to $55.39 for instruction and operations.

Rate per predicted square foot increased from $5.56 to $5.62 for the infrastructure formula.

**Tuition Revenue Bonds**

Authorized capital construction projects at 64 campuses, including $70M toward UT Dallas’ $110M engineering building.

**Texas Research Incentive Program (TRIP)**

$138.1 million is appropriated for emerging research institutions for the Texas Research Incentive Program of which $40 million will come to UT Dallas to match private donations for research already received. This was a $68.1M increase over funds allocated last Session.

**Research Funding**

New classification of research funds into three distinct funds; $117.1m for core research support fund in which UT Dallas is included. Represented a $1M increase in core research funding to UT Dallas.

**Governor’s University Research Initiative**

$40M appropriations to attract Nobel Laureates and National Academy Members to Texas public universities.

**National Research University Fund (NRUF)**

$61.1M appropriations. UT Dallas must meet certain benchmarks before participating in this fund. Expected participation in FY 2018.

**Special Item Funding**

UT Dallas received an additional special item funding of $1M/biennium for the Academic Bridge Program.

**Hazlewood, TEOG, Vetoes**

**Bills:**

**Admissions:**

SB 1543: Students with nontraditional secondary education (including home school and nonaccredited private school) are admitted based on the same standards as students who graduated from a public high school, *including specific standardized testing requirements*. This applies to students for the fall 2016 semester.

**Financial Aid:**

HB 700: Abolishes Texas B-on-Time loan. Renewals will be awarded until fall 2020. (Loan forgiveness if graduated in 4 years or 5 for engineering and maintained other eligibility requirements)
SB 686: Repeals language that the legislature could not appropriate GR to the fund; makes changes to eligibility for math and science scholars loan repayment program
SB 1066: T-STEM Challenge Scholarship Program, removes the requirements that recipients of the scholarship either be employed by a STEM-related business or enrolled in upper-level STEM courses. Recipients now just must be employed and in a STEM program, including certificate or associate degrees.

Curricula and Programs
HB 505: Removes restrictions on dual credit including student status and limitations on the number of hours
HB 1054: Adds a definition of “basic academic skills education” (non-course competency-based developmental education programs and interventions designed for students whose performance falls significantly below college readiness standards) to the Texas Success Initiative and requires that institutions offer developmental coursework for basic academic skills education. The THECB will determine the cut scores.
HB 1992: In establishing minimum required scores on AP exams, an institution may not require a score of more than three unless the institution’s CAO determines, based on evidence, that a higher score on the exam is necessary to indicate preparation to be successful in a related, more advanced course for which the lower-division course is a prerequisite. A study is due to the THECB by 2019 of performance (GPA’s), retention rates, and graduation rates for students who complete a lower division course and students who received credit with a score, and the data must be disaggregated by score.
SB 453: Allows for a scaled score of 50 (rather than 60) or higher on an exam administered through the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) for students in grades 6-12
SB 674: Educator certification that requires bachelors’ degrees will now require training and instruction regarding mental health, substance abuse, and youth suicide.
SB 1750: Bill increases to at least 20% the number of work study positions that must be located off-campus. UT Dallas’ career center is confident this is not an issue for us.

Administration and Governance
HB 699: Requires sexual assault policy that is to be approved by the Board of Regents prior to adoption; Regents Rules (20201) delegates HOP approvals to Executive Vice Chancellor and OGC, so Regents Rule may require a revision. Policy must include definitions of prohibited behavior, sanctions for violations, and protocol for reporting and responding to reports of campus sexual assault. The policy must be included in the institution’s student handbook, and a webpage must be dedicated solely to this policy. Bill requires each undergraduate transfer to attend an orientation on the sexual assault policy before or during the first term. Each institution shall review the policy each biennium, and with Board of Regent’s approval, revise the policy as necessary.
HB 197: Requires a dedicated webpage regarding mental health resources including the address of the nearest local mental health authority
SB 1624: Requires that each entering full-time undergraduate and graduate student have information about available mental health and suicide prevention services offered by the institution and about early warning signs/appropriate interventions
HB 910: Open carry: still prohibited in institutional buildings and on any public or private driveway, street, sidewalk or walkway, parking lot, parking garage, or other parking area of an institution.

SB 11: Concealed carry: includes college campuses but does allow institution’s to set rules, regulations, and other provisions regarding the carrying provided that these rules do not generally prohibit or have the effect of generally prohibiting license holders from carrying concealed handguns on the campus. UT System is working on this; Dr. Alex Piquero is UT Dallas’ campus carry liaison to System.

HB 1295: Section 1: Requires a faculty member to disclose the identity of each sponsor of the research in all public communications where the content of the public communication is based on the results of sponsored research. “Public communication” is defined to mean “oral or written communication intended for public consumption or distribution, including: (a) testimony in a public administrative, legislative, regulatory, or judicial proceeding, (b) printed matters including a magazine, journal, newsletter, newspaper, pamphlet, or report; or (c) posting of information on a website or similar internet host for information. Additional sections of this bill but apply to research and procurement.

SB 20: State agency contracts: analysis on-going.

SB 24: Requires training for members of governing boards of institutions. Any new regent who has not completed the training is prohibited from voting on budgetary or personnel matters until he/she completes the training.

Resources:
Legislative Summaries UT System: [http://www.utsystem.edu/offices/governmental-relations/legislative-summaries](http://www.utsystem.edu/offices/governmental-relations/legislative-summaries)
Legislative Summaries THECB: [http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/Summary%20of%20Higher%20Education%20Legislation](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/Summary%20of%20Higher%20Education%20Legislation)
Texas Legislature Online: [http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/](http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/)
UT Dallas Vice President for Public Affairs Amanda Rockow (arockow@utdallas.edu; x2107)
University Attorney Tim Shaw (tim.shaw@utdallas.edu; x5291)
Assistant Provost Serenity King (serenity.king@utdallas.edu; x6749)

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

17. Amendments to Committee Charges
A. Wellness Committee
Speaker Redman suggested that the President appoint the chair, and per the amended charge have Staff Council appoint the vice chair. Speaker Redman will contact Staff Council to get their feedback.

B. Committee on Committees:
As there are a great deal of Student Government appointments to committees it was suggested by Speaker Redman that the Student Government President be appointed to the Committee on Committees per the amended charge. The only reservation expressed was the matter of confidentiality. SG President Caitlynn Forner supported this change as it would help Student Government be more involved in the appointment process.

C. Chancellor’s Teaching Award
After review it was found the committee charge was out of date. Several questions and concerns were raised. Vice Speaker Leaf moved to have “Chancellor’s Council Award”
struck from the committee charge. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried. An updated charge will be presented at the October Council meeting for editorial approval.

D. Academic Program Review
The language in the charge has been updated to reflect the Coordinating boards requirements. Murray Leaf moved to place it on the September Senate agenda. Greg Dess seconded. The motion carried.

18. Regents Rules 31008- Disciplinary Tribunal Pool- Murray Leaf
The Tribunal Pool should have been reviewed every year in June, however that had not been done since 2008. Murray Leaf moved to place the list of recommendations on the October Senate Agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

19. Discussion on the Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity- Murray Leaf
In FY15 the appointed chair declined the position. When the position was offered to the vice chair, they also declined. The then Vice President of vice president for Diversity and Community Engagement, Magaly Spector attempted to find a committee chair. She was not successful. George Fair is now the Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement and has now appointed a chair. It was decided that the Committee on Committees should not appoint a chair but should use the recommended chair from George Fair.

20. New Business
Calvin Jamison updated the Council on the situation of parking around the campus. Parking Garage IV will break ground on September 24, 2015. This will require an extension to Lot U of 350 spaces, and of Lot T of 314 places to elevate the loss of the spaces in Lot I. there was a possibility that editorial amendments to the Academic Program Review Committee charge may be brought to the Senate for approval.
The new Faculty Staff Wellness Center will officially open on September 10, 2015. The new lactation rooms have been completed in Founders.

21. Senate Agenda for September 16, 2015:
1. Canceled Carry on Campus
2. Sexual Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy
3. CEP Recommendations
4. Proposed revisions to UTS 180
5. Academic Program Review Committee Charge

22. Senate Agenda for October 21, 2015:
1. Consensual Relationships Policy
2. Annual Committee Reports
3. 3+3+3 Committee on Non Tenure System faculty
4. Legislative Summary
5. Regents Rules 31008- Disciplinary Tribunal Pool

There being no further business Interim President Wildenthal adjourned at 3:27 PM.
Item #3

APPROVED: ______________________________ DATE:______________________________
Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty
Item 21: Senate Approval of Committee Replacements
Requesting Senate Approval for Nominees for Committee Replacements

(S3) Committee on Academic Integrity

- **Tim Christopher** is the suggested replacement for Olivia Banner (ATEC).
- **Erin Smith** is the suggested replacement for Liz Salter (IS).
- **Eric Schlereth** is the suggested Chair replacement.

(S5) Distance Learning Committee

- At the recommendation of Dean Mark Spong, **Steve Yurkovich** will be added to this committee.

(S8) Committee on Faculty Mentoring

- **Orlando Richard** is the suggested replacement for Dan Bochsler (SOM)

(S10) Committee on Learning Management Systems

- **Hlaing Minn (ECS)** is the suggested replacement for Kamil Sarac (ECS).
- **Susan Minkoff (NSM)** is the suggested replacement for Michael Baron (NSM).
- **Jonathan Frome (IS)** is the suggested replacement for Barbara Ashmore (IS).

(S12) Committee on Student Scholarships

- **Carol Lanham (EPPS)** is the suggested replacement Chair.
- **Simeon Ntafos (ECS)** is the suggested replacement Vice-chair.

(S13) Library Committee

- **Shalini Prasad (ECS)** is the suggested replacement for Xin-Lin Gao (ECS).
- **Sean Cotter (AH)** is the suggested replacement for Mark Rosen (AH).
- **Jennifer Hudson (AH)** is the suggested replacement for Daniel Wickberg (AH).

(S14) Academic Program Review Committee

- **Shayla Holub (BBS)** is the suggested replacement for James Bartlett (BBS) as both member and CHAIR.
(S15) Advisory Committee to the University Budget
- **Larry Overzet (ECS)** is the suggested replacement for Duncan Macfarlane (ECS)
- **Bob Glosser (NSM)** is the suggested replacement for Robert Kieschnick (SOM).

(U7) Information Resources, Planning & Policy Committee
- **Edward Harpham (Honors-Dean)** is the suggested replacement for Bert Moore (Dean-BBS) as both member and CHAIR.
- **Michael Tiefelsdorf (EPPS)** is the suggested replacement for Robert Morris (EPS).

(U8) Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
- **Greg Dussor (BBS)** is the suggested replacement for Shalini Prasad (NSM).
- ****A question was raised should Lucien “Tres” Thompson be reappointed chair, or should Greg Dussor be the chair per the recommendation of the RUS Bruce Gnade?

(U9) Institutional Biosafety & Chemical Safety Committee
- **Kelli Palmer (NSM)** is the suggested replacement for Rocky Draper (NSM).

(U12) University Safety and Security Committee
- **Greg Metz (NSM)** is the suggested replacement for John Worrall as CHAIR.

(U14) University Research Integrity Committee
- **Monica Evans** is going to speak with Paul Fishwick regarding why he declined the position. There must be 1 representative from each school who is a tenured PROFESSOR. The one available alternate is a tenured associate professor.
- **Christine Dollaghan** is the suggested Vice-Chair.
Item 7: CEP
Recommendations
Course Information
Course Number/Section
Course Title
Term

Professor Contact Information
Professor
Office Phone
Other Phone
Email Address
Office Location
Online Office Hours
Other Information

Course Pre-requisites, Co-requisites, and/or Other Restrictions

Course Description

Student Learning Objectives/Outcomes

Required Textbooks and Materials
Required Texts

Required Materials

Suggested Course Materials
Suggested Readings/Texts

Suggested Materials

Textbooks and some other bookstore materials can be ordered online through Off-Campus Books or the UT Dallas Bookstore. They are also available in stock at both bookstores.
Technical Requirements
In addition to a confident level of computer and Internet literacy, certain minimum technical requirements must be met to enable a successful learning experience. Please review the important technical requirements on the Getting Started with eLearning webpage.

Course Access and Navigation
The course can be accessed using the UT Dallas NetID account at: https://elearning.utdallas.edu. Please see the course access and navigation section of the site for more information.

To become familiar with the eLearning tool, please see the Student eLearning Tutorials. UT Dallas provides eLearning technical support 24 hours a day/7 days a week. The eLearning Support Center services include a toll free telephone number for immediate assistance (1-866-588-3192), email request service, and an online chat service.

Communication
This course utilizes online tools for interaction and communication. Some external communication tools such as regular email and a web conferencing tool may also be used during the semester. For more details, please visit the eLearning Tutorials webpage for video demonstrations on eLearning tools.

Student emails and discussion board messages will be answered within 3 working days under normal circumstances.

Distance Learning Student Resources
Online students have access to resources including the McDermott Library, Academic Advising, The Office of Student AccessAbility, and many others. Please see the eLearning Current Students page for details.

Server Unavailability or Other Technical Difficulties
The University is committed to providing a reliable learning management system to all users. However, in the event of any unexpected server outage or any unusual technical difficulty which prevents students from completing a time sensitive assessment activity, the instructor will provide an appropriate accommodation based on the situation. Students should immediately report any problems to the instructor and also contact the online eLearning Help Desk. The instructor and the eLearning Help Desk will work with the student to resolve any issues at the earliest possible time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT/DATES</th>
<th>TOPIC/LECTURE</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT / ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 MM/DD-MM/DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 MM/DD-MM/DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MM/DD-MM/DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MM/DD-MM/DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 MM/DD-MM/DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 MM/DD-MM/DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MM/DD-MM/DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 MM/DD-MM/DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proctored Final Exam Procedures
If your course has a proctored exam requirement, please see the Student Success Center Proctored Exam website to make arrangements.

Grading Policy

Course Policies
Make-up exams
Extra Credit
Late Work
Special Assignments
Class Participation
Classroom Citizenship

Comet Creed

This creed was voted on by the UT Dallas student body in 2014. It is a standard that Comets choose to live by and encourage others to do the same:

“As a Comet, I pledge honesty, integrity, and service in all that I do.”

UT Dallas Syllabus Policies and Procedures

The information contained in the following link constitutes the University’s policies and procedures segment of the course syllabus.

Please go to http://go.utdallas.edu/syllabus-policies for these policies.

The descriptions and timelines contained in this syllabus are subject to change at the discretion of the Professor.
New Program Request Form for Bachelor’s and Master’s Degrees

**Directions:** An institution shall use this form to propose a new bachelor’s or master’s degree program that is in the field of engineering or has costs exceeding $2 million for the first five years of operation. In completing the form, the institution should refer to the document *Standards for Bachelor’s and Master’s Programs*, which prescribes specific requirements for new degree programs. Note: This form requires signatures of (1) the Chief Executive Officer or Chief Academic Officer, certifying adequacy of funding for the new program and the notification of other institutions; (2) a member of the Board of Regents (or designee), certifying Board approval. **NOTE:** Preliminary notification is required for all engineering programs. Prior to submission of an engineering program proposal, the institution should notify the Division of Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research of its intent to request such a program.

For more information: Contact the Division of Workforce, Academic Affairs and Research at 512/427-6200.

### Administrative Information

1. **Institution:** University of Texas at Dallas

2. **Program Name** – Show how the program would appear on the Coordinating Board’s program inventory (*e.g.*, Bachelor of Business Administration degree with a major in Accounting):
   
   Bachelor of Science in Public Policy

3. **Proposed CIP Code:** 44.0501

4. **Number of Required Semester Credit Hours (SCHs)** (*If the number of SCHs exceeds 120 for a Bachelor’s program, the institution must request a waiver documenting the compelling academic reason for requiring more SCHs):** 120

5. **Brief Program Description** – Describe the program and the educational objectives:

   The Bachelor of Science in Public Policy is a degree program intended for individuals who will systematically analyze public policy issues, implementation, and analysis. An interdisciplinary approach, drawing upon the insights of Political Science, Economics, and other related fields, is necessary since the world’s most pressing problems are not bound by traditional disciplinary boundaries. Students will be prepared for entry-level analytical and administrative positions in a wide array of professional settings in the public, nonprofit, and private sectors.

   1. Students will analyze the politics of public policy decision-making and the pros and cons of different policy options.
   2. Students will understand the principal policy making institutions and the ways in which they formulate debate and implement public policies. Students will examine legislative, executive, and non-governmental roles in policy formation at different levels of government and how various institutions interact and set policy priorities.
   3. Students will effectively communicate, both in memo form and oral summary, policy findings.
   4. Students will complete a capstone project that analyzes knowledge in a substantive area of public policy.

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

   The School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences (the Public Policy and Political Economy Department)
Program Information

I. Need

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

The proposed BS in Public Policy fills a gap in our curriculum offerings. Within the Public Policy and Political Economy program, we currently have a BA and BS in International Political Economy. However, these degrees are designed to fill the needs of the globally oriented. The BS in public policy will appeal to those students who want an interdisciplinary blend of economics and policy but who have an interest in domestic applications.

Additionally, there is little overlap with existing undergraduate degree programs in the school. It should be noted that there is very little overlap with the existing undergraduate Public Affairs (PA) degree. Only three PA classes may be counted toward this degree and none of these are core, required classes. Moreover, Public Administration/Public Affairs is not the same as public policy. There are distinct differences and training that are reflected in divergent career paths (local government placement versus federal government and policy jobs). Finally, there are different governing organizations of public administration and public policy (Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration - NASPAA vs. the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management - APPAM). In summary, we believe this new degree plan will capture an untapped interest in an undergraduate domestic public policy degree to complement our interdisciplinary International Political Economy degrees in our Public Policy and Political Economy Program.

A brief perusal of public policy jobs from the following sites showed a robust demand for graduates in Dallas: Career Builder listed 234 jobs, Monster 47, and Glassdoor 247 on January 6, 2015. However, public policy graduates also typically gain a specialization. Nationwide, according to P. Carnevale, Jeff Strohl, and Michelle Melton’s study, What’s it worth? The Economic Value of College Majors (Georgetown University Center for
Education and Workforce 2011), public policy undergraduates most often go into the following industrial sectors: education, information, public sector, transportation, or financial services.

The primary public policy organization, APPAM (Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management) has a website for public policy job searches. The website http://publicservicecareers.org lists the following current job openings for public policy alumni with only bachelor degrees: Market Analyst, Research Assistant, Writer, or Policy Analyst, Lead Contract Specialist, Administrative Services Manager, and Project Coordinator. Leading public policy analysis company, Mathmatica, lists the following job openings appropriate for people with undergraduate degrees in public policy: Data Analytics Associate, Director – Advanced Analytics, Research Programmer, Data Analytics Enterprise Architect, Junior Statistical Programmer, Program Integrity Analyst, Research Programmer, Nutrition Research Associate, Survey Questionnaire Programmer I-III, Program Analyst, and Program Associate. Sample salaries on jobs for seekers with only an undergraduate degree include the following ranges (July 13, 2015) $60,756 - $73,920, $58,593.60 - $80,683.20, and $51,971-$70,474.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics does not categorize public policy analysts generally, but related specializations of analysts are reported. The projected job outlook, from 2012-22, is strong.

- Market Research Analysts: the demand is predicted to increase 32%, with an employment increase of 131,500.
- Cost Estimators: the demand is predicted to increase 26% from 2012-22, with an employment change of 53,000, for Operations Research Analysts, the demand is predicted to increase 27% from 2012-22, with an employment change of 19,500
- Management Analysts: the demand is predicted to increase 19% from 2012-22, with an employment change of 133,800
- Social and Community Service Managers: the demand is predicted to increase 21% from 2012-22, with an employment change of 27,700
- Political Science: The demand is predicted to increase 21%
- Other possible job titles include Program Evaluator, Regulatory Affairs Specialist, Program Managers for government, non-profit or corporate employers

The program will encourage internship placement in the following areas:

Federal government: Within the federal government, undergraduate students will be encouraged to participate in the Pathways Internship Program. Agencies include Securities and Exchange Commission, Department of Interior, Department of the Treasury, Department of Justice, Executive Office of the President, Social Security Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Labor, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Department of Health and Human Services, etc. Other federal agencies include the Center for Disease Control, Congressional Budget Office, Department of Transportation, Library of Congress, National Park Service, Security and Exchange Commission, etc.

Policy Institutes/Non-Profit: Alliance for Health Reform, American Public Health Institute, American Enterprise Institute, Aspen Institute, Association of American Universities, Bipartisan Policy Center, Carter Center, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Center for Economic and Policy Research, Center for the Study of the
Presidency and Congress, Children’s Defense Fund, Economic Policy Institute, Migration Policy Institute, Roosevelt Institute Summer Academy, Urban Institute, etc.

Private Sector: Mathmatica, ABT, various consulting firms, etc.

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

Currently, in the state of Texas, there are only three similar programs at the undergraduate level. However, all are in private institutions. Rice University offers a Policy Studies major as a second major requirement. Southern Methodist University (SMU) offers bachelors degrees in Public Policy while Trinity University offers an Urban Studies major with an Urban Issues and Policy concentration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice Policy Studies (Second Major Requirement), Houston</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU Public Policy, Dallas*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity (Urban Studies degree with an Urban Issues and Policy concentration), San Antonio</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SMU statistics obtained from SMU’s Enrollment reporting “Headcount Based Reports: Declared Academic Plans (Majors/Minors)” located at [https://sites.smu.edu/des/registrar/reporting/?a=archive&r=Declared%20Academic%20Plans%20(Majors/Minors)](https://sites.smu.edu/des/registrar/reporting/?a=archive&r=Declared%20Academic%20Plans%20(Majors/Minors))

Many leading schools of public policy have recently added Bachelors degrees in Public Policy, including the Frank Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy at the University of Virginia, the Edward Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers, the Sanford School of Public Policy at Duke, and the Robert F. Wagner School of Public Service at NYU. Additionally, in the 2014 spring APPAM conference, Dr. Greg Thorson, of the University of the Redlands, presented a paper, “Preparing Tomorrow’s Public Servants at the Undergraduate Level: The Creation of a New Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Public Policy Major at the University of Redlands.” In fact, a 2001 book, by Featherman and Vinovskis, *Social Science and Policy Making: A Search for Relevance in the Twentieth Century* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press), highlights public policy as one of the most rapidly growing fields in social science. Surveys of University of Redlands students indicated, “their interest appeared to be driven by their desire to apply scientifically rigorous analysis to specific substantive fields such as the environment, education, and health care” (Thorson 2013, 4).
C. Enrollment Projections – Use this table to show the estimated cumulative headcount and full-time student equivalent (FTSE) enrollment for the first five years of the program. (Include majors only and consider attrition and graduation.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTSE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the number of students who would be interested in a minor of public policy (18 hours), in our conversations with some computer science faculty, the best estimates are that 10-25 a year would be interested in a public policy minor. This population would likely draw from students who have significant IB or AP credit from high school. We would similarly reach out to other majors.

At UT Dallas, we offer undergraduate degrees in International Political Economy (BA & BS). This has been a popular major, despite only being approved in summer of 2007. However, this is a distinct major, with a strong international focus and a requirement of two years of foreign language study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPE BA&amp;BS</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent Enrollment in Select Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>Recent Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 3325</td>
<td>American Public Policy</td>
<td>Fall 2014, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 3322</td>
<td>Constitutional Law</td>
<td>Fall 2014, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 4343</td>
<td>Congress and Public Policy</td>
<td>Spring 2013, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 3362</td>
<td>The American Political Institutions</td>
<td>Spring 2015, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIM 4311</td>
<td>Crime and Justice Policy</td>
<td>Spring 2015, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 4336</td>
<td>Environmental Economic Theory and Policy</td>
<td>Spring 2015, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 3377</td>
<td>Urban Planning and Policy</td>
<td>Fall 2014, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 4386</td>
<td>Social Policy in Modern Societies</td>
<td>Spring 2014, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 4350</td>
<td>Public Agencies, Management and Ethics</td>
<td>Spring 2015, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 4355</td>
<td>Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>Fall 2014, 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Semester Credit Hours</th>
<th>Clock Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education Core Curriculum (bachelor’s degree only)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Courses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Electives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Electives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify, e.g., internships, clinical work)</td>
<td>(if not included above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bachelor degree should not exceed 120 Semester Credit Hours (SCH) per Board rule 5.44 (a) (3). Those that exceed 120 SCH must provide detailed documentation describing the compelling academic reason for the number of required hours, such as programmatic accreditation requirements, statutory requirements, or licensure/certification requirements that cannot be met without exceeding the 120-hour limit.

In the General Education Core Curriculum, in the Component Area Option, students will be required to take EPPS 2301 Research Design in the Social and Policy Sciences and one of the following: EPPS 2302 Methods of Quantitative Analysis in the Social Policy Sciences or EPPS 2303 Descriptive and Inferential Statistics for the Social and Policy Sciences.

B. Curriculum – Use these tables to identify the required courses and prescribed electives of the program. Note with an asterisk (*) courses that would be added if the program is approved. (Add and delete rows as needed. If applicable, replicate the tables for different tracks/options.)

Given this is an interdisciplinary degree, only one organized class (Capstone) would need to be added along with five independent study classes if the degree were approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECON 2302</td>
<td>Principles of Microeconomics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 3310</td>
<td>Intermediate Microeconomic Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 3311</td>
<td>Intermediate Macroeconomic Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 3304</td>
<td>Principles of Geospatial Information Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 3325</td>
<td>American Public Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 3322</td>
<td>Constitutional Law</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefix and Number</td>
<td>Prescribed Elective Courses (8 of the following)</td>
<td>SCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIM 4311</td>
<td>Crime and Justice Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 3330</td>
<td>Economics of Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 4320</td>
<td>Public Sector Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 4336</td>
<td>Environmental Economic Theory and Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 4332</td>
<td>Energy and Natural Resource Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 3377</td>
<td>Urban Planning and Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEC 4301</td>
<td>Political Economy of Industrialized Countries</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEC 4305</td>
<td>Topics in Science, Technology and Institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEC 4309</td>
<td>Urban Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEC 4384</td>
<td>Health and Environmental Policy: A Global Perspective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 3310</td>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 3326</td>
<td>Politics and Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 3323</td>
<td>American Federalism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 4305</td>
<td>Political Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 4307</td>
<td>Predicting Politics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCI 4382</td>
<td>Education Policy and the Politics of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 4386</td>
<td>Social Policy in Modern Societies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 4350</td>
<td>Public Agencies, Management and Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBP 4396*</td>
<td>Topics in Public Policy (can be repeated for credit)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBP 4V98*</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBP 4V96*</td>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBP 4V99*</td>
<td>Senior Honors in Public Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBP 4V91*</td>
<td>Undergraduate Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 3380</td>
<td>Organizations: Theory and Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 4351</td>
<td>Urban Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 4355</td>
<td>Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCH</td>
<td>Selected eight courses from above</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Faculty – Use these tables to provide information about Core and Support faculty. Add an asterisk (*) before the name of the individual who will have direct administrative responsibilities for the program. (Add and delete rows as needed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Core Faculty and Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree and Awarding Institution</th>
<th>Courses Assigned in Program</th>
<th>% Time Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

WAAR/New Program Request Form for Bachelor’s and Master’s Degrees/Webmasters - Updated 4/2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Support Faculty and Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree and Awarding Institution</th>
<th>Courses Assigned in Program</th>
<th>% Time Assigned To Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Robert</td>
<td>PhD in Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University</td>
<td>CRIM 4311</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketsler, Luba</td>
<td>Masters of Science, Economics, City University of New York - Hunter College</td>
<td>ECON 3330</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElroy, Susan</td>
<td>PhD in Economics of Education, Stanford University</td>
<td>ECON 4320</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Degree/University</td>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumas, Lloyd Jeff</td>
<td>PhD. In Economics, Columbia University</td>
<td>ECON 4336</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakulenko, Irina</td>
<td>PhD. In Geography, Moscow State Pedagogical University</td>
<td>GEOG 3377</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qiu, Fang</td>
<td>PhD. in Geographic Information System and Remote Sensing, University of South Carolina</td>
<td>GISC 4384</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunte, Jonas</td>
<td>PhD. in Political Science University of Minnesota</td>
<td>IPEC 4301</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott, Euel</td>
<td>PhD, Political Science Duke University</td>
<td>IPEC 4305</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Young-Joo</td>
<td>PhD in Public Administration and Policy, University of Georgia</td>
<td>PSCI 3310, PA 3380, PA 4355</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearry, Brian</td>
<td>PhD. In Political Science, University of North Texas</td>
<td>PSCI 3323</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho, Karl</td>
<td>PhD. In Political Science, University of North Texas</td>
<td>PSCI 4305</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandt, Patrick</td>
<td>PhD. in Political Science, Indiana University</td>
<td>PSCI 4307</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell, Sarah</td>
<td>PhD. in Public Policy, George Mason University</td>
<td>SOC 4386, PA 4350</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benavides, Teodoro</td>
<td>Master of Public Affairs, major in Public Administration, Southern Methodist University</td>
<td>PA 4351</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The program will have the same admission requirements as the University: “Assured Admission” can be obtained for students who take the Texas recommended high school curriculum and graduate in good standing with one of the following rankings or scores (top 10% of their class, a composite ACT score of 26 or greater, or a SAT score of 1200 or higher). The UT Dallas admissions committee reviews the students...
who do not meet the assured admission criteria; these students will need to complete a full, college-track high school curriculum and achieve a strong SAT score. Student recruitment, including underrepresented students, will be addressed through participation in university recruitment events such as Preview Week, Preview Friday (for transfer students), Scholar's Day, and Discover UT Dallas. Traditionally underrepresented student populations will be targeted through community college affiliations, particularly through the Dallas Community College District, Collin College, and high schools in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex.

With the public policy program, we will complement university wide retention efforts with program specific initiatives. Specifically, we will aggressively promote programs for minority students, especially the Public Policy and International Affairs program (PPIA) and their undergraduate Junior Summer Institutes (JSI).

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

Ellen Safley, Dean of McDermott Library at UT Dallas, provides the following assessment of library resources:

Overall, the collection available at the Eugene McDermott Library is adequate to begin the proposed public policy program.

The librarian reviewed the top journals in political science and public policy and found that 5 titles should be added with the approval of the degree. The annual cost is $5,300 or $26,500 over five years (at 2015 dollars).

The library purchases an adequate number of books/ebooks, films, and databases to begin the program.

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

Students have access to the computing faculties in the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences and the University's computer labs. The school has four computing laboratories which house 24-30 computers each that are network linked and equipped with major social science software packages, including EViews, R, RATS, SPSS and Stata. A geographic information system, the LexisNexis database, and Westlaw are also available for student use. The University's computer labs provide personal computers and UNIX workstations. Many important data and reference materials are also available online via the library and the school's memberships in numerous organizations.

There will be no other facility and equipment improvements/additions to support this new degree.
G. **Accreditation** – If the discipline has a national accrediting body, describe plans to obtain accreditation or provide a rationale for not pursuing accreditation.

The affiliated professional organization is APPAM (Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management). However, APPAM does not have a formal accreditation process.

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

The program will perform an annual assessment process to determine if courses are meeting the goals and intended learning objectives. This process includes developing detailed assessment reports for public policy core courses, which will be prepared by coordinating course faculty and the data collected by the program. As deficiencies in courses or the program are identified in the annual assessment process, the Program Head and faculty will be responsible for corrective action.

Graduating seniors will be asked to complete an exit survey. The exit survey will include questions regarding how individual courses and the program in general have met the learning objectives and goals. The survey will also work to evaluate courses in terms of their usefulness to students in fulfilling their personal career goals and will provide an opportunity for students to provide feedback for course and program improvement.

The program will create a student advisory board. This group will meet with the program head and associate program head at least once a semester to gain insight into the program, both in terms of curriculum and implementation.

The School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences, as well as the university, as part of the accreditation process, assesses every program within the School. The procedures to be used for institutional evaluation of the proposed program, as well as for all existing programs, have been established by the University of Texas at Dallas and are described in UTDPP1013 (Academic Program Review), which governs the periodic review of academic programs and charges the review team to provide an “assessment of the goals, plans, staffing, resources, existing and potential strengths etc. of the unit, and those areas needing improvement.” The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost maintains the schedule of reviews and works with the Program Review Committee (PRC) and the unit under review to facilitate the review process. The process is peer review oriented and includes a team that incorporates both internal and external members. In addition, there will be periodic internal evaluations, which will encompass job offerings, initial salary, institutional wide assessments, and supervisor satisfaction. UT Dallas has a rigorous process of program review and assessment that ensures that expected outcomes are clearly defined and measurable and are used for improving education. Each assessment degree program as well as academic certificate program at UT Dallas is assessed annually using UT Dallas’ assessment process.

### III. Costs and Funding

---

1 Please use the “Program Funding Estimation Tool” found on the CB website to correctly estimate state funding.
Five-Year Costs and Funding Sources - Use this table to show five-year costs and sources of funding for the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Year Costs</th>
<th>Five-Year Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel¹</td>
<td>$836,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library, Supplies, and Materials</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other²</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$863,202</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reallocated Funds                | $836,702                           |
| Anticipated New Formula Funding³ | $71,653                            |
| Special Item Funding             | $0                                 |
| Other⁴                          | $0                                 |
| **Total Funding**                | **$908,355**                       |

1. Report costs for new faculty hires, graduate assistants, and technical support personnel. For new faculty, prorate individual salaries as a percentage of the time assigned to the program. If existing faculty will contribute to program, include costs necessary to maintain existing programs (e.g., cost of adjunct to cover courses previously taught by faculty who would teach in new program).

2. Specify other costs here (e.g., administrative costs, travel).

3. Indicate formula funding for students new to the institution because of the program; formula funding should be included only for years three through five of the program and should reflect enrollment projections for years three through five.

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

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

   I certify that my institution has notified all public institutions within 50 miles of the teaching site of our intention to offer the program at least 30 days prior to submitting this request. I also certify that if any objections were received, those objections were resolved prior to the submission of this request.

   __________________________  _______________________
   Chief Executive Officer/Chief Academic Officer        Date

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

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

   __________________________  _______________________
   Board of Regents (Designee)        Date of Approval
Official Academic Transcript Notation – Policy # (TBD)

The official academic transcript is a student’s complete academic record. If the student enrolled at The University of Texas at Dallas as both an undergraduate and graduate student, then the undergraduate and graduate transcripts are issued together.

Academic review and approval of any new program or revision of an existing program (degree, major, minor, concentration, designation, and academic certificate) must be secured through the governance process as notated within the following policies, UTDPP1001 Academic Certificate Programs, UTDPP1008 Council of Undergraduate Education, UTDPP1023 Committee on Educational Policy, and UTDPP1053 Council on Graduate Council, and the Academic Senate. Upon final approval, the new or revised programs will be published in the academic catalog. Depending on the student’s undeclared or declared major status, the program plan (major and as applicable, minor, concentration, designation, and/or academic certificate) will be recorded on the official transcript.

The Office of the Registrar retains a listing of approved items recorded on the official transcript. At the minimum, the official transcript includes the student’s legal name, the student’s identification number, transfer credit summary, credits earned by examination, term by term course history including earned units and grade point average (GPA), cumulative earned units and GPA, and degrees awarded by The University of Texas at Dallas including majors, concentrations, minors, designations, academic certificates, and honors, as applicable.

Texas state law requires public institutions to include the following notations on the undergraduate official transcript: Texas Success Initiative status, Core Curriculum Completion notation and Six Drop notation.

In accordance with University policy, diplomas will show the official name of the degree and major and if applicable, academic honors. Diplomas will not display minors, concentrations, designations, and academic certificates.

The Responsible University Official (RUO) is the University Registrar.

Policy History

Issued: TBD
Undergraduate Catalog Policies

Concentration

Some academic units designate a set of courses or a concentration that focus on an in-depth study centering on a discipline or field of study. The term concentration is often used interchangeably with other similar terms, such as designation, specialization, or track. The concentration allows students to pursue a program of interdisciplinary specialization in addition to the major they are pursuing. Concentrations are available only to students enrolled in the major under which the concentration is listed.

The concentration’s requirements and the specific upper-division semester credit hours are established by the individual academic units. Undergraduate students should check with their undergraduate advisor about these requirements outlined within the undergraduate program (see http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2015/undergraduate/programs for additional information).

Suggestion: add the above paragraph to the web page, http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2015/undergraduate/curriculum after the Minors paragraph within the Major and Related Areas of Study section

Transcripts

The Office of the Registrar retains a listing of approved items recorded on the official transcript.

Texas state law requires public institutions to include the following notations on the undergraduate official transcript: Texas Success Initiative status, Core Curriculum Completion notation and Six Drop notation.

The official academic transcript will list the degree and major, and if applicable, second major or double degree, minors, concentrations, designations, academic certificates, and academic honors. Only concentrations whose requirements are published in the catalog will be identified on the transcript. Majors with concentrations are designated on the official transcript when the degree is awarded. Minors, concentrations, designations, and academic certificates are not printed on the diploma in accordance with University policy.

Suggestion: This entry should be added as “Transcripts” under “Other Policies” category on the “List of Academic Policies and Procedures” at http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2015/undergraduate/policies
Graduate Catalog Policies

Concentration

Some academic units designate a set of courses or a concentration that focus on an in-depth study centering on a discipline or a program of studies. The term concentration is often used interchangeably with other similar terms, such as designation, specialization, or track. The concentration allows students to pursue a program of interdisciplinary specialization in addition to the program of studies they are pursuing. Concentrations are available only to students enrolled in the program of studies under which the concentration is listed. Graduate students should check with their graduate advisor about course applicability and restrictions.

Suggestion: add the above paragraph to the web page, http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2015/graduate/policies/policy#program-of-studies-degree-plan as the second paragraph within the Program of Studies /Degree Plan section.

Transcripts

The Office of the Registrar retains a listing of approved items recorded on the official transcript.

The official academic transcript will list the degree, and if applicable, concentrations, designations, and certificates. Only concentrations whose requirements are published in the catalog will be identified on the transcript. Concentrations, designations, and academic certificates are not printed on the diploma in accordance with University policy.

Suggestion: This entry should be added “Transcripts” as under “Other Policies” category on the “List of Registration and Enrollment Requirements” at http://catalog.utdallas.edu/2015/graduate/policies/list-of-registration-requirements
AMENDED
New Undergraduate Courses
To be offered in 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status/School</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBSC</th>
<th>ENCS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New courses added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the spring 2016 schedule, ENCS would like to add 1 additional course and ATEC, EPPS, and JSOM would each like to add two more courses.

AMENDED – 9/23/15 – Per CUE, the following changes were made:

- MKT 3v90 replaced with MKT 3390
  - No longer variable
  - No longer repeatable

- ECSC 2100 – Updated to include the following:
  - Max repeat SCH raised to unlimited
  - Repeat phrase add to description
  - Repeat reason expanded

Repeatable Courses:
- ATEC 3370
- EPPS 3301
- ECSCC 2100
School of Arts, Technology, and Emerging Communication (ATEC)
Courses to be offered in spring 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-open</td>
<td>add *</td>
<td>atec3370 (r1)</td>
<td>ATEC 3370 Topics in Art and Technology (3 semester credit hours) Study of principles and techniques of the arts and technology. Sections may be devoted exclusively to a single aspect of technology and the arts or to a multiplicity of subjects related to the field. May be repeated for credit as topics vary (9 semester credit hours maximum). Prerequisite: Upper-division standing or department consent required. (0-3) R</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>ps info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atec3370.2</td>
<td>requested by Monica Evans on 2015-09-02 15:55:18 via eForm and course to be offered in Spring.</td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>2015-09-08 11:05:43</td>
<td>orion info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td>ATEC 3370 [This is a new blank course - edit it to build your course. The permanent course prefix Topics in Art and number will Technology (3 semester credit hours) Study of principles and techniques of the arts and technology. Sections may be assigned after approval from devoted exclusively to a single aspect of technology and the arts or to a multiplicity of subjects related to the registrars office. ] field. May be repeated for credit as topics vary (9 semester credit hours maximum). Prerequisite: Upper-division standing or department consent required. (0-3) R</td>
<td>audit: 7</td>
<td>50.0702.00.03</td>
<td>overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>series_head</td>
<td>Topics vary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>change process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**show fields: atec3370.2**

- cat_repeat_units: 9
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: yes_subtitles

---

http://coursebook.utdallas.edu/catbookreport/49eecc0553895537f7ead8eac4313a0e7/makepdf
### Catalog Course Description

ATEC 4318 Pre-Production Design II (3 semester credit hours) This course focuses on the creation of story reels and animatics for an animation production. Topics will include creation of character artwork, set and prop designs, color keys, and other pre-production elements. Emphasis will be placed on creating production ready assets able to be used by production artists. Prerequisites: ATEC 3318 and instructor consent. (0-3) T

**Request Notes**

Requested by Monica Evans on 2015-09-02 15:58:46 via eForm and course to be offered in Spring 2016.

### Diff Previous Request: atec4318.1

ATEC 4318 Pre-Production Design II (3 semester credit hours) This course focuses on the creation of story reels and animatics for an animation production. Topics will include creation of character artwork, set and prop designs, color keys, and other pre-production elements. Emphasis will be assigned after approval from the registrar's office. placed on creating production ready assets able to be used by production artists. Prerequisites: ATEC 3318 and instructor consent. (0-3) T

### Show Fields: atec4318.2

- **cat_repeat_units**: 3
- **cat_delivery_method**: delivery_method_100
- **cat_core**:
- **cat_subtitles**: no_subtitles

---

[Update Request Group](http://coursebook.utdallas.edu/catbookreport/49eec0553895537f7ead8eac4313a0e7/makepdf)
School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences (EPPS)
Courses to be offered in spring 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-open</td>
<td></td>
<td>add *</td>
<td>epps3301 (r1)</td>
<td>epps3301.4</td>
<td>EPPS 3301 Special Topics In Economic, Political and Policy Sciences (3 semester credit hours) Explores current topics in Economic, Political and Policy Sciences. May be repeated for credit as topics vary (9 semester credit hours maximum). Instructor consent required. (3-0) R</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130 2015-09-16 14:27:37</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>NOLINK 45.0702.00 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requested by Del Prisock on 2015-07-20 through Eform and course should be offered in the spring. Changed to general topics course per Dr. Elliott 9/16/15</td>
<td>audit: 12</td>
<td>audit: -2.4 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diff previous req: epps3301.3 EPPS 3301 Special Topics In Economic, Political and Policy Sciences (3 semester credit hours) Explores current topics in Economic, Political and Policy Sciences. May be repeated for credit as topics vary (9 semester credit hours maximum). Instructor consent required. (3-0) R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>repeat reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topics vary by semester.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>show fields: epps3301.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |     |          |        |        | • cat_repeat_units: 3  
• cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100  
• cat_core:  
• cat_subtitles: yes_subtitles  |               |                 |         |
PSCI 4363 International Law (3 semester credit hours)
This course analyzes the concepts and bases of public international law. The first part of the course explores the operating system components of international law, namely how the law sets the general procedures and institutions for the conduct of international relations. In effect, international law provides the mechanisms for establishing rules, outlines the parameters of interaction, and provides the procedures and forums for resolving disputes among the relevant actors in international interactions. Topics in this section of the course include sources, actors, and institutions of international law. The second part of the course focuses on international law as a normative system. This signifies the specific standards and rules by which international relations are supposed to be conducted. If the operating system designates the structures (in a loose sense) that help define the global governance system, then the normative element provides the specific laws or policies that are the subjects or products of those structures. Topics in this section of the course include the use of force, human rights, and environmental protection. Instructor consent required. (3-0) R

---

**request notes**

Requested by Del Prisock and 2015-07-20 through Eform and course to be offered in spring.

**diff previous req: psci4363.1**

PSCI 4363 [This is a new blank] International Law (3 semester credit hours) This course - edit it to build your course. analyzes the concepts and bases of public international law. The first part of the course explores the operating system components of international law, namely how the law sets the general procedures and institutions for the conduct of international relations. In effect, international law provides the mechanisms for establishing rules, outlines the parameters of interaction, and provides the procedures and forums for resolving disputes among the relevant actors in international interactions. Topics in this section of the course include sources, actors, and institutions of international law. The permanent second part of the course prefix focuses on international law as a normative system. This signifies the specific standards and number will rules by which international relations are supposed to be assigned after approval from the registrars office.] (\{\} \{\}) conducted. If the operating system designates the structures (in a loose sense) that help define the global governance system, then the normative element provides the specific laws or policies that are the subjects or products of those structures. Topics in this section of the course include the use of force, human rights, and environmental protection. Instructor consent required. (3-0) R

---

**show fields: psci4363.3**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start end</th>
<th>req type course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100 &lt;br&gt;cat_core: &lt;br&gt;cat_subtitles: no_subtitles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

update req group
Erik Jonsson School of Engineering and Computer Science (ENCS)
Course to be offered in spring 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-open</td>
<td></td>
<td>add *</td>
<td>ecsc2100 (r1)</td>
<td>ECSC 2100 Engineering Project in Community Service (1 semester credit hour) This is a design course in which multidisciplinary teams will solve engineering-based problems for the local community. Students will learn the complete design process, awareness of the customer in engineering design, active use of rapid prototyping tools, leadership and project management skills, communication skills, and more. This course will include lectures and instruction in UTDesign Studio. May be repeated for credit. (1-1)</td>
<td>phase: check</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>update req group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>status: group1</td>
<td>2015-09-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: 15</td>
<td>14:55:01</td>
<td>orion info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.1502.00.06</td>
<td>change process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>index: -1.4 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

09/21/15 - Requested by Andrea Turcatti on 2015-09-18 16:41:12 via eForm and course to be offered in spring. 09/23/15 - Updated to include unlimited repeat phrase in description, updating Max SCH to 99, and notation of it being an elective course to repeat rationale.

**diff previous req: ecsc2100.2**

ECSC 2100 Engineering Project in Community Service (1 semester credit hour) This is a design course in which multidisciplinary teams will solve engineering-based problems for the local community. Students will learn the complete design process, awareness of the customer in engineering design, active use of rapid prototyping tools, leadership and project management skills, communication skills, and more. This course will include lectures and instruction in UTDesign Studio. May be repeated for credit. (1-1)

**repeat reason**

Elective course with multi-semester projects. Project may span for more than 2 semesters.

**show fields: ecsc2100.3**

- cat_repeat_units: 99
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core: 
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
Naveen Jindal School of Management (JSOM)
Courses to be offered in spring 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request</th>
<th>request</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-open</td>
<td>add *</td>
<td>hmg4392</td>
<td>hmg4392.2</td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td>catalog course description</td>
<td>note: phase: approve, status: approving, audit: 12</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HMGT 4392 International Healthcare Management and Leadership (3 semester credit hours)**

This course is designed to further develop healthcare management and leadership knowledge through appropriate developmental work experiences in real healthcare environments. In preparation for an experiential student learning experience in a host country, students are required to identify and submit specific learning objectives (goals) at the beginning of the semester regarding the host country's healthcare system. Course instruction will focus on the differences between the U.S. and the host country's healthcare delivery, processes, and systems. At the end of the semester students must prepare and present an oral and written presentation on key healthcare management processes and systems that compare and contrast with U.S. healthcare delivery systems. Prerequisites: HMGT 3301 and OPRE 3310. (3-0) R

**Request notes**

Requested by Marilyn Kaplan and 2015-08-07 through Eform and course to be offered in summer.

**Diff previous req: hmg4392.1**

HMGT 4392 [This International Healthcare Management and Leadership (3 semester credit hours)]

This course is designed to further develop healthcare management and leadership knowledge through appropriate developmental work experiences in real healthcare environments. In preparation for an experiential student learning experience in a new blank course - edit it, the host country, students are required to build your course. The permanent course prefix identify and number submit specific learning objectives (goals) at the beginning of the semester regarding the host country's healthcare system. Course instruction will be assigned after approval from the registrars office.]

focus on the differences between the U.S. and the host country's healthcare delivery, processes, and systems. At the end of the semester students must prepare and present an oral and written presentation on key healthcare management processes and systems that compare and contrast with U.S. healthcare delivery systems. Prerequisites: HMGT 3301 and OPRE 3310. (3-0) R

**Show fields: hmg4392.2**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: yes_subtitles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>req course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-open</td>
<td>add *</td>
<td>mkt3390 (r1)</td>
<td>mkt3390.2</td>
<td>MKT 3390 Regional Marketing Studies (3 semester credit hours) This course familiarizes students with the historical, social, economic, and political background of nations in a specified region. Students will learn about the marketing environment of the area and participate in seminars on firms that operate in and have a marketing impact in the area. Prerequisites: MKT 3300 and instructor consent required. (3-0) R</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130 2015-09-23 14:33:04</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

08/10/15 - Course MKT 3V90 requested by Marilyn Kaplan and 2015/08/07 through Eform and course to be offered in spring. 09/23/15 - Updated to MKT 3390 since course is no longer variable credit or repeatable.

**diff previous req: mkt3390.1**

MKT 3390 [This is a new blank course - edit it to build your course. The permanent] Regional Marketing Studies (3 semester credit hours) This course prefix familiarizes students with the historical, social, economic, and number political background of nations in a specified region. Students will be assigned after approval from the registrars office.} ([}][}] area and participate in seminars on firms that operate in and have a marketing impact in the area. Prerequisites: MKT 3300 and instructor consent required. (3-0) R

**show fields: mkt3390.2**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
Item 10:
FY 15 Annual Committee Reports
To:   Academic Faculty Senate

From: Academic Calendar Committee

Date: October 6, 2015

Re:   Annual Report 2014-15

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

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

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

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

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

Tuesday, Feb 10, 2015 – 2:00PM
- Welcome New Members
- Development of the 2016 & 2017 Academic Calendar
- Fall Break Discussion
- Discussion on Principles for the Development of the Academic Calendar
Committee on Effective Teaching, 2014-2015
Annual Report

Pursuant to its charge, the Senate’s Committee on Effective Teaching met seven times during the academic year (September 26, October 24, November 21, January 30, March 6, March 27, April 24). During these meetings we addressed the agenda items that had been selected in our first meeting in September. Below you will find the agenda items and a description of the committee’s activity regarding each one.

1. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness
The UT Regents require assessment of teaching effectiveness, and schools vary in how they conduct these assessments. The committee will advise schools in the implementation of the new evaluation procedures.

a. School evaluations
The committee will request reports from each school’s Committee on Effective Teaching, and, on the basis of these reports, evaluate and decide how to facilitate the work of the School committees. The Committee will forward the individual School reports and a summary evaluation report to the Provost. Because the new Regents’ guidelines require evaluation of graduate teaching assistants and part-time lecturers, these will be included as well.

- Each school has some form of a Teaching Effectiveness Committee. These committees vary in the methods and frequency with which they conduct teaching observations. On March 6, 2015, Dr. Inga Musselman met with the committee to discuss what currently is required by the UT Regents regarding peer evaluations of teaching and what changes to these requirements are expected in the near future. The current model is that observations of teaching are conducted mainly for the purposes of tenure review. The result is that timing of observations, as well as who is to be observed, is decided in reaction to the need for information rather than proactively as a way to improve teaching. The committee generally agreed that observation for the purposes of evaluation for tenure and promotion should be separated from observation for the purposes of improving teaching. Thus, we should develop our own set of recommendations for a non-evaluative, supportive, and voluntary peer observation and mentoring process. Over the summer, we will develop a set of guidelines for establishing such a process that each school can consider and adapt to their needs.

b. Student evaluations
Continue to monitor and evaluate, with the help of the Provost’s technical team, ongoing issues regarding student completion of online teaching evaluations. Concerns include the relationship between faculty ratings and student grades, low student response rate, and numbers of and statistical trends in course evaluations over time. The committee will develop a timeline and set of procedures to be followed for publicizing the evaluation procedures to students, including specific recommendations for instructors regarding ways to increase student participation rates. The email that is sent to students with the link for completing evaluations will be sent earlier in
the semester so that professors who wish to do so will be able to have students complete evaluations in class.

- A key concern of committee members has been the timing of communications emailed to students regarding completion on online course evaluations. Faculty who wished to exercise the option of making time for students to complete the evaluations during a class session toward the end of the semester had trouble doing so last year because students did not receive their individual course links in time. In November the committee made a formal request to the Senate that the direct links be sent to students no later than Monday, December 1, 2014 and Monday, April 20, 2015. The request was approved and the Provost’s Technology Group did send the links before these dates.
- A set of guidelines for maximizing the likelihood that students will complete evaluations and that they will give useful feedback also has been posted in the Faculty Forum in eLearning. Some faculty concerns about student evaluations of teaching have been shared and addressed on the anonymous discussion board in the Faculty Forum.

2. Classrooms & Technology
Upgrades of classroom technology are continuing across campus. Training in the use of new technology is already available to individual faculty on request. The committee will consider any new suggestions for school-specific or new teaching methods made possible by these upgrades, as well as any needs for new equipment, software, etc.

- Dr. Darren Crone, of Educational Technology Services, has been attending all of our meetings to keep us apprised of classroom updates and to stay informed of issues that his team may be able to help address. Because ETS has upgrades well in hand, no particular problems were introduced or addressed this year.

3. Promotion of Teaching Effectiveness
a. Request funding from the Provost’s office to invite a renowned speaker to give a teaching seminar on campus.

- On February 27, 2015, the committee hosted the Excellence in Teaching Lecture and Panel Discussion, which was sponsored by the Provost. Dr. Mike Wesch joined us from Kansas State University to present “Teaching as Soul-Making: The end of wonder in the digital age.” Dr. Marion Underwood was primarily responsible for inviting the speaker, and organizing and planning the event. We had 167 responses to our request for RSVP, and in spite of the severe weather, had nearly complete turnout by faculty, doctoral students, and others. We plan to request funding to continue the lecture series every fall and spring. On April 24, at our last meeting of the year, we decided to look into inviting Dr. George Gopen to give writing workshops for faculty and graduate students in the fall. We also discussed inviting Dr. Stephen Chew of Samford University for the second Excellence in Teaching lecture in the spring.

b. Evaluate, publicize, and maintain the eLearning Faculty Forum & Resources.
In September 2014, I sent a message to the Associate Deans of Undergraduate Education asking them to help publicize to faculty the eLearning Faculty Forum & Resources as a sort of virtual teaching center. Aside from Dr. Melanie Spence, I do not know whether or not any did so. In February, I made a brief presentation to the Senate to demonstrate the eLearning Faculty Forum and explain its current configuration and potential uses. The Forum is a work in progress and depends on faculty input to grow and adapt to their needs. Use of the forum by faculty continues to be sparse, and I do not know whether or not those who have logged in have found it useful. In August, the committee will submit a request to the Office of Communication to send a direct email to all faculty informing them about the forum and soliciting their input. I have continued to add and update resources throughout the year.

c. Develop detailed recommendations regarding the establishment of a University-wide Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

On March 27, Dr. Jessica Murphy met with the committee to discuss what she has learned from her investigations of Teaching and Learning Centers at comparable universities and from attending a recent conference of the Professional and Organization Development (POD) network in Higher Education. The value of having a center is irrefutable, not only for the obvious benefits of improving teaching across the university and improving the training of graduate students to make them more competitive in the job market, but for satisfying accreditation requirements. A center provides a physical marker of the university’s commitment to teaching. The committee approved of Dr. Murphy’s plan to present to the Provost a job description and request for hiring a director to develop a teaching and learning center.

d. In recognition of the idea that teaching occurs both inside and outside of classrooms, the committee will consider ways to promote faculty awareness of and opportunities for mentoring undergraduates.

Currently, there are no workshops or seminars on the UTD campus that faculty can sign up for on how to mentor undergraduate students for research. On April 24, we discussed creating a workshop for faculty and/or graduate students on student mentoring. On this campus, we already have faculty who are providing outstanding mentoring for students in their labs, and even have a formal award for recognizing these faculty. One possibility for a workshop is to invite award recipients to share what works. Andy Blanchard has offered to recruit Bruce Gnade to work with the committee this summer to develop a plan.

e. Recognize and promote innovative teaching techniques. Identify faculty who are using particularly effective and nontraditional techniques such as flipped classrooms or inquiry-based learning. Develop ways for these faculty members to share their experiences.

Educational Technology Services already provides some excellent presentations in this area, especially with regard to techniques that involve technology. However, more can be done. One possibility that the committee can explore in the coming year is to conduct a Qualtrics survey of faculty across schools to gather data on what teaching
strategies and methods are currently being used. The Teaching Practices Inventory developed by Carl Wieman could give us a good starting point on this.
Auxiliary Services Advisory Committee


June 16, 2015

2014-2015 Auxiliary Services Committee Members:

RUO: AVP for Auxiliary Services: Bob Fishbein
Faculty: Jennifer Murphy, Banks Miller
Staff: Jayar Medlock
Ex Officio: Dean of Students, Asst Dir of Food Svs, Dir of Food Svs, Dir of Student Union,
UTD Bookstore manager
Students: Brooke Knudtson, Nancy Fairbank, Tim Sullivan, Chidi Echebiri

The Auxiliary Services Advisory Committee is charged with advising the AVP of Auxiliary Services on policies, procedures, and rules which will enhance and optimize the overall operations of Food Services, Bookstore, Techstore, Parking & Transportation, and Copy/Print & Logistics. The Committee will cover and address physical operations, facilities, and other matters relating to these services that the Committee shall deem appropriate to consider.

Auxiliary Services Advisory Committee met several times throughout the academic year. Topics discussed in the meetings included:

- New food concepts
- New Bookstore concepts
- New Vending concepts, including additional vending locations to include Scantron machines
- New Parking & Transportation concepts
- New Copy Center concepts
- Food service performance by venue
- Hosted Iron Chef Competition
- Hosted Catering Fair
- Coordinating for meal service of police and FM staff during weather closings
- Held Bookstore fashion show
- Dining Hall West construction updates
- Einstein’s construction updates
- Auxiliary offices construction updates
• Parking Lot Restriping
• New Luke Machine design, and new Comet Cab design in P&T department
• New Catering policies, outside vendors, and split catered events
• Catering updates to website to include traditional and retail
• Updates on Jason’s Deli
• Updates on IHOP
• Updates on Papa John’s and C Store
• Refresh updates on the Grab-N-Go
• CrEATe updates
• Introduced and launched the first Dining Dollar Discount program
• New Bookstore Website
• New bookstore merchandise
• Introduced new HUD Partner: Journey Ed to take over running the Techstore
• Tech store remodel also introduced interactive website
• Tech store introduced more retail options, 3-D printing, training classes, tech support
• Texas Chef Association Chili Festival, UTD took 1st place People’s Choice Award
• Updated an interactive map locator for convenient vending options.
• Eship Global machine added to Print & Copy store
• Salvage bike sale
• Salvage furniture sale
• Student Union Dining Hall updates on refresh project
• Added additional staff members
• Updated Food truck menu, and introduced Happy Hour at the Pub
• Introduced new healthy eating program, Comet Choice Program
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Richard Scotch and Robert Kieschnick
RE: Annual Report or Advisory Committee on the University Budget
DATE: July 6, 2015

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

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

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

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

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

Members of the Advisory Committee on the University Budget:

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

RUO: Executive Vice President & Provost

Rebecca Files (M) (8/31/2017)
D.T. Huynh (EC) (8/31/2016)
Duncan Macfarlane (ECS) (8/31/17)
Ramachandran Natarajan (M) (8/31/2017)
Robert Serf ling (N) (8/31/2015)
Since becoming chair of the committee in 2013, I have actively met with both Dr. Hobson Wildenthal (Provost) and Dr. Calvin Jamison (VP for Administration) regularly to report on progress for several projects I initiated and to seek their counsel on how best to facilitate this committee as it reemerged after several years of inactivity. In spring of 2014, I requested changes to the committee structure to add and remove personnel, administrators, and critical staff across the university. I made these requests after meeting with both Dr. Wildenthal and Dr. Jamison. These changes were approved and the new committee appointments were sent out in August 2014 that mirror the current committee structure (see attached). Several of these appointments are set to expire for two faculty and one administrator as of August 15, 2015). These members may be replaced with alternate faculty and administrator selections that are available to serve, as I do not have any preferences or recommendations to suggest. The committee held its first full meeting on December 8, 2014 and had approximately a dozen people in attendance.

I set three preliminary goals as chair as the Campus Facilities Committee. First, I sought to update and expand the facilities emergency contact list that is critical for response to after-hour issues that arise on the UT Dallas campus. I contacted all the deans, residential life administrators, and independent centers and expanded the contacts for labs to include after-hours contact information. This updated list was then forwarded to Rick Dempsey’s office in Facilities and was shared with the Police Department. This list is updated as needed throughout the year. It would be helpful if new faculty might be told during orientation that any new labs that have special needs or hazmat considerations must notify Facilities once these areas are online so that contact information is updated and added to keep this list current. In the past, administrators would sometimes not report changes in personnel, locations, or contact information, so much of the information on the charts was outdated or incorrect. A reminder to our academic units and deans across the university to update this information at the beginning of the academic year and whenever staff changes are made would also be helpful to ensure that these lists are maintained current.

Secondly, I sought out information to learn about the reporting systems in place for facilities, classroom, or other miscellaneous issues across campus by meeting with Facilities. In particular, the committee had received some complaints from faculty that they had ongoing facilities issues that were not being addressed. Reports to facilities come in a number of ways, including via phone messages, via email to their general email report address, and online via reports through administrative channels. These systems are quite comprehensive, but occasionally issues are slipping through the cracks. It would be helpful to remind faculty about the proper procedures to report issues, as well as follow-up procedures with Facilities if their reports are not addressed within a reasonable amount of time. There is a system in place for administrative support staff to provide detailed information on issues that are logged and tracked. If it would be helpful, I am happy to address the Faculty Senate and bring in Dr. Jamison and/or Facilities personnel to talk about the proper channels to report problems or issues.

Thirdly, I wanted to increase the visibility of the committee on campus and raise the level of outreach about our long-term campus growth and planning that impacts our faculty, administrators, staff, and students. Working with Dr. Jamison’s office, I initiated a new awareness campaign slogan that was launched during Welcome Week of the Fall 2015 semester with the theme “One Campus, Our Campus.” We had giveaways such as sunglasses, water bottles, and information with this slogan printed on it to encourage students to get involved, engaged, and invested in their campus. These items were handed out at several of the information tents placed across campus with direction on parking, classroom location and maps. We also began to do outreach with student leaders across the university community to seek their input, advice, and hear their suggestions for improvements from their perspective. In July and August of
2014, Dr. Jamison and I met with 15 student leaders across campus to seek their input on the activities of the committee in FY 2014-2015. We met with students leaders in housing, Greek life, student government, and student organizations and got some excellent feedback on student concerns and areas we might educate students on related to our accelerated growth on the campus as well as future planning. Toward this end, we planned a “Spring Fling” event in the Faculty Dining Room on campus that gave a presentation to students by Dr. Jamison and I regarding the improvements, growth, and future plans to UT Dallas in the recent past and into the future. This event was advertised across campus and had about 40 students in attendance. Future events might be better attended by getting the word out to student organizations well in advance and holding the event in an outside space with large numbers of traffic flowing through the site (such as the Plinth). We hope to hold another education/awareness event in the coming year to educate our students on the progress and vision for our campus in the coming months and years. I would also like to conduct a UT Dallas community-wide assessment of satisfaction regarding improvements, facilities, and related issues that would be sent to students, staff, administrators and faculty in the 2015-2016 year. As many faculty as also unaware about the various projects going on across the campus, as well as how they are funded or how they tie into future plans, it might be helpful for Dr. Jamison and I to also address the Faculty Senate to let them know about the details on these issues.

2015-2016 is my last year as chair of this committee and I look forward to another productive year. I thank Dr. Wildenthal and Dr. Jamison for their ongoing support of the committee’s activities.

Sincerely yours,

Denise Paquette Boots
Associate Professor of Criminology
July 21, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Academic Council
FROM: Judy L. Barnes, Director of University Events

1. Membership

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

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

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

2. Meetings

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

The second meeting of the Committee was held on February 15, 2015 to discuss Fall, 2014 results and in preparation for the Spring, 2015 commencement ceremonies. [Meeting agenda and minutes are attached.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>9/20/2014</th>
<th>2/5/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Director of University Events (Chair)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>Dean of Undergraduate Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>Crone</td>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Dampsey</td>
<td>Associate VP for Facilities Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Dougherty</td>
<td>Alumni Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Fitch</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>University Registrar and Director of Academic Records</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Lauraine</td>
<td>O'Neil</td>
<td>Office of Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Willhoft x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Rena</td>
<td>Piper</td>
<td>Event Planner - Office of the President</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Redman</td>
<td>Speaker of the Faculty (Vice Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Murray Leaf x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Weiskopf</td>
<td>Bookstore Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Zacharias</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Faculty Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Faculty Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Kudtson</td>
<td>Student Government President</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>Staas</td>
<td>UG-ECS</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I. Welcome
   a. New Committee Members

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

e. Miscellaneous —

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

• Darren requested a minimum of 3 days for set-up of media services for commencement. Judy requested a set-up flow chart from them. Rena will follow-up with Darren on exact set-up dates.
Commencement Committee Meeting  
February 5, 2015  
Agenda

I. Welcome

II. Review of Fall 2014 Commencement  
a. 6 Ceremonies
   b. Returned to after finals
   c. RSVP at Time of Application—first for Fall as we started in Spring
   d. Speaker videos before selection
   e. ETC...regalia orders, omitted Alumni speech, orators, MOM weather

III. Spring 2015 Commencement  
a. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers
   b. Ceremonies – 9 ... 2 Thurs., 4 Fri., 3 Sat. [or 8?]
   c. Countdown to Commencement—February

IV. Discussion  
a. Student Speakers—Deadline March 25
   b. Summer Graduate Walk Policy—process for approving exceptions
   c. Revisit Student Survey
   d. Miscellaneous
Commencement Committee Meeting
February 5, 2015
Agenda

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. Spring 2015 Commencement

a. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers

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

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

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

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

   c. Revisit Student Survey

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

July 1, 2015

Members of the Committee:

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


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

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

Meeting schedule, operating procedures, and workload:

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

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

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

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

Observations and suggestions for improvements:

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

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

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

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

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

A final comment concerns the participation of Dr. Inga Musselman, who represents the Provost’s office at CQ meetings. She is not a voting member of the committee, and she does not participate in discussions, except to clarify matters of policy. Nonetheless, she has had an impact on the quality of reviews within UTD. She provides instructions to ad hoc committee chairs and candidates for promotion, with the result of higher quality information from both. She is knowledgeable about CQ deliberations. It is felt that the conscientious efforts of Dr. Inga Musselman over the years have improved the review process by her acting as an intermediary between the candidates for promotion, the ad hoc committees, and CQ. We understand that with her expanded administrative role as Acting Provost, time constraints may make it too difficult for her to continue her participation at CQ meetings. However, it is hoped that a way could be found so that CQ could continue benefiting from her vast experience, knowledge and dedication on CQ matters.
June 24th, 2015

TO: Tim Redman, Speaker of the Faculty Senate  
FROM: Mark Thouin, Chair, Distance Learning Committee  
RE: Distance Learning Committee Annual Report 2014-15

CHARGE: [http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1021](http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1021)

MEMBERS:
- Mark Thouin (JSOM) **Chair**
- Linda Keith (EPPS) **Vice Chair**
- Dan Bochsler (JSOM)
- Larry Chasteen (JSOM)
- Chris Ryan (AH)
- Mary Urquhart (NSM)
- Carol Oshel, Library Representative

RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICIAL
Executive Vice President and Provost

EX-OFFICIO (with vote)
- Vice President, Chief Information Officer
- Dean of School of Engineering and Computer Science
- Vice President for Student Affairs
- Dean of School of Management
- Vice Provost

MEETINGS
- October 1st, 2014
- November 5th, 2014
- December 3rd, 2014
- January 28th, 2015
- March 25th, 2015
- April 29th, 2015

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS
During the 2014-2015 academic year, the Committee on Distance Learning met once a month for 90 minutes to discuss distance-learning topics of interest to university stakeholders. The meetings focused on (1) a discussion of current events and recent developments surrounding distance learning topics and (2) planning specific Committee work activities and deliverables. The meetings promoted an exchange of knowledge and best practices concerning distance learning among Committee members. In addition to the knowledge sharing benefits, the Committee identified two primary work activities.
For the initial primary work activity, Committee members interviewed senior university administrators to better understand their needs and requirements concerning distance learning. Accordingly, the Deans of each college were interviewed along with the Provost.

The second primary work activity was undertaken as a direct result of feedback obtained during interviews with senior academic administrators. Based on feedback received, the Committee decided to initiate a program to raise awareness among faculty of University distance learning capabilities and resources. The University has a wide array of distance learning capabilities and resources that may be used to enhance instruction. Significant benefits may result if faculty awareness of distance learning resources and capabilities increases. Accordingly, the committee developed a communication plan to disseminate information via e-mail to UT Dallas faculty listing the direct benefits of distance learning resources.

The following is a copy of the e-mail that was distributed to all UT Dallas faculty.

Fellow Faculty:

The Distance Learning Committee would like for you to know that there are tools in eLearning that may help you in significant ways.

Did you know that eLearning can help you to...

- Collaborate with others via Web Conferencing? You can give a class-lecture, conduct virtual office hours, or meet with a colleague using voice, video, and screen-sharing. (Click on Web Conferencing for more information.)
- Ensure course continuity? Should UTD close due to inclement weather or a communicable disease, eLearning can help keep you and your students from falling behind on your course schedule. (Click on Using eLearning for more information.)
- Annotate assignments without even downloading students’ submissions? You can make comments and track changes that give students feedback. (Click on Inline grading for more information.)
- Be FERPA compliant when grading, and communicating with students? eLearning is a secure system that can help prevent unnecessary and unlawful exposure of student information. (Click on FERPA Compliance for more information.)

These are just a few of the many ways in which eLearning can help you. For information on these and many other ways that eLearning can help you, contact elearning@utdallas.edu.

Sincerely,

The UTD Distance Learning Committee
Mark Thouin, Chair
Linda Keith, Vice Chair
Dan Bochsler
Larry Chasteen
Carol Oshel
Chris Ryan
Mary Urquhart
The following matters should be addressed in 2015 – 2016.

1. Continue to explore and implement programs to raise awareness and utilization of distance learning technologies.
2. Establish best practices for instruction utilizing a blended learning approach whereby some portion of a course is taught utilizing distance learning resources and capabilities. Blended learning has the potential to improve educational outcomes and reduce costs.
Date: July 15, 2015

To: David M. Cordell, Secretary, Academic Senate

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

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

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

This experience leads me to make the following suggestions:

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

Third, in order to prepare for a possible grievance panel I read the remainder of the policy, and the best word I can use to describe it is “ugly.” The procedures are incredibly detailed and convoluted, and some of the provisions strike me as questionable. For example, should assistant professors really be required to serve on a grievance panel on a case where the Provost’s decision during the informal grievance process is being challenged? The only grounds for being excused under the current rules are “extreme hardship or for conflict of interest.” (Sections 5.1.1, 5.1.4) I don’t have a specific recommendation, and it occurs to me that the current procedures are so forbidding they may actually create a significant incentive to settle grievances either informally or through mediation! Nonetheless, I recommend that next year’s Committee should review this policy early in the year and consider whether they want to propose amendments.
July 22, 2015

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: L.T. Thompson, Chair, Institutional Animal Care & Use Committee

I. Membership and Scope:
Voting scientific members of the IACUC consisted of L.T. Thompson, Ph.D. (Chair, BBS), Leonidas Bleris, Ph.D. (Vice Chair, ECM), Gail Breen, Ph.D. (NSM), and Li Zang, Ph.D. (NSM). Voting attending veterinarian was Dr. Eugene Daniels, D.V.M., assisted by Dr. Tony Meyers, D.V.M. Voting non-scientific members were Matthew Brown, Ph.D. (A&H), Larry Zacharias (UTD Chief of Police), Kelly Kinnard (UTD Director for Physical Plant Services), and Bill Alsup (City of Richardson Director of Animal Services, Community member). Non-voting members Kathan McCallister (Assistant Director, Laboratory Animal Research Center) and Cynthia Tralmer (IACUC Coordinator, Office of Research Compliance) also attended all meetings and maintained official federal records. One additional scientific member, Christa McIntyre, Ph.D. (BBS) resigned in January, and was replaced by Ted Price, Ph.D. (BBS), who had prior IACUC experience at the University of Arizona. Sanaz Okhovat (Assistant Vice President for Research Compliance, Office of Research Integrity) provides oversight from the office of the Vice President for Research.

A complete record of all Animal Use Protocols submitted, revised and approved is available from the IACUC Coordinator.

This report covers the period from July 2014 through July 2015.

II. IACUC training:
Since additional scientific and non-scientific members joined the IACUC this year, and since the Research Office has directed that UTD seek AAALAC certification (see below), a formal IACUC training workshop was arranged on April 15, provided by Molly Green, an AAALAC certified trainer from Michigan State University. The chair and most voting and non-voting members of the IACUC attended this 4 hour workshop, and continue to implement best practices discussed.

III. Meeting summaries:
The IACUC met the statutorily required three times this past year, in fall, spring, and summer.

• Fall meeting: Sept 24, 2014. Committee reviewed status of animal use protocols, and discussed upcoming push by the Research Office to attain Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC) certification for animal research programs here at UT Dallas. Our programs had previously been deemed too small to require such certification, but growth has led to this push for verification of the highest standards of care and oversight. Dr. Marcel Perret-Gentil, D.V.M., attending veterinarian at UTSA Health Sciences Center, presented and discussed a program relating the requirements for certification and the steps involved in the process, providing useful feedback about his own experience as both an AAALAC committee member and from his viewpoint as a vet who shepherded his own university’s programs through the process. Dr. Daniels provided additional insight from his experiences at the UNT Health Sciences Center in Ft. Worth. [Dr. Perret-Gentil conducts several sessions of Rodent Surgery & Biotechnology Workshops annually for UTD faculty, students and staff to ensure proper
procedures are followed and best practices maintained.] The IACUC meeting concluded by conducting a walk through inspection of the animal facilities and vivarium as required.

• **Spring meeting: Feb 11, 2015.** Committee reviewed status of animal use protocols, and discussed the Program Description prepared by Kathan McCallister required for AAALAC certification. IACUC approved changes to breeding procedures to limit production to numbers consistent with the physical resources available in our facility, and updated protocol forms accordingly. Chair advised that Laboratory Animal Research Center director recommend that Deans organize a town-hall meeting of animal users to discuss the process of gaining AAALAC certification. Plans were finalized for IACUC training workshop for April 2015. The IACUC meeting concluded by conducting a walk through inspection of the animal facilities and vivarium as required.

• **Summer meeting: Jul 22, 2015.** Committee reviewed status of animal use protocols, approved one new protocol after discussion as a full board and requested revision of another, and approved amendments to the process of submission of required third-year renewals of existing protocols to facilitate gathering of more accurate data while reducing administrative burden on principal investigators. The Program Description for AAALAC certification was discussed further, and Kathan McCallister called for additional input via email discussion. Plans for integration of activities in the BioSciences building (due to open in the coming year) and for the town-hall meeting with principal investigators (which had been proposed in the spring) were discussed. The IACUC meeting concluded by conducting a walk through inspection of the animal facilities and vivarium as required.
The Institutional Biosafety and Chemical Safety Committee (IBCC) met three times during the academic year and once in the summer. Some of the activities and accomplishments are as follows:

- Reviewed and codified administrative and operational procedures of the Committee
- Added an IBCC coordinator from the Office of Research Compliance
- Approved a procedure for adapting a new IBC manual and guidelines for faculty, staff and administrators—to be completed Fall 2015
- Inducted a community health leader into IBCC as a replacement for outgoing member
- Reviewed and approved four faculty research protocols for general laboratory use and grant applications
- Advised entire faculty on research design and protocol implementation involving recombinant DNA
- Began work on revising the UTD Institutional Biosafety Manual—to be completed Fall 2015
- Implemented new training materials on biosafety and biosecurity using the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative—to be completed Fall 2015

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Bulla
Chairman, IBCC
Information Security Advisory Committee
Report on Committee Activities during 2014-2015 Academic Year

September 1, 2015

To: Tim Redman, Speaker of the Faculty Senate
From: Ravi Prakash, Chair, Information Security Advisory Committee

The Information Security Advisory Committee (ISAC) was composed of the following:

Faculty:
- Ravi Prakash (ECS): Chair
- Tres Thompson (BBS): Vice Chair
- Joe Izen (NSM)
- Fang Qiu (EPPS)
- Kevin Hamlen (ECS)
- Dinesh Bhatia (ECS)

Staff Council:
- Daniel Calhoun (University Police Department)

Student Government:
- Daniel Zinni

Ex-Officio:
- University Attorney (Tim Shaw)
- Chief Information Security Officer (Nate Howe)

Outside the University:
- Eric Matthews (City of Richardson)

In addition, Deputy Speaker Murray Leaf (EPPS) and the then Chief Information Officer Dr. Andrew Blanchard attended multiple meetings and provided valuable feedback.

ISAC was constituted by the Academic Senate in 2012 to advise the University of Texas at Dallas Chief Information Security Officer in planning and testing measures to provide security of university information resources in such a way as to comply with UT System security requirements for university information.

ISAC met four times during the year on the following dates: 9/26/2014, 10/24/2014, 2/27/2015 and 3/27/2015.
ISAC’s interaction with the University CISO has been very cordial and productive. The Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) has actively sought faculty input on information security issues, has been extremely forthcoming in answering the committee’s queries, and has promptly shared information about security breaches and mitigation efforts.

Issues discussed by the committee include the following: vulnerability scanning and resolution, two-factor authentication options to protect high-value transactions, server room walkthroughs, server registry, replacement of Absolute Manage software, identity and access management, CAR forms processing issues and related security concerns, linking of websites to the university webpage, Windows Domain permissions, determination of “university data,” procedures to determine presence of such data on personal machines, use of cloud services for data storage and collaboration (specifically Box.com), and security concerns about migrating faculty and staff email accounts to Microsoft.

In addition, ISAC reviewed the Information Security Policy Draft and suggested modifications that were incorporated into the revised draft by the CISO and the University Attorney before it was presented to the Faculty Senate.

In addition, the CISO also shared drafts of the University Security Policy document for ISAC members to comment on.

ISAC was able to perform its advisory role thanks to the excellent working relationship with the CISO. Daniel Calhoun, the Staff Council representative, and Eric Matthews, Deputy CIO of the City of Richardson and a UTD alumnus, also provided valuable insights. The only area of concern was the non-participation by the Student Government representative who neither attended any meeting, nor responded to any email.
June 4, 2015

Core Curriculum Committee Annual Report 2014-2015

Chair: Marilyn Kaplan, JSOM

Dennis Miller, Vice-Chair

Members: Shelly Lane, A&H; Melanie Spence, BBS; Tonja Wissinger, IS; Dennis Miller, NS&M; Simeon Ntafos, ECS; Euell Elliott, EPPS

RUO: Andrew Blanchard

The committee met approximately twice per month during the long semesters. Now that the new core had been implemented, we spent our time on two areas:

- Minor corrections to the core courses to total changes for 5 courses for 2015-2016.
  - Added three new courses (MATH, MUSI, AHRM)
  - Reinstated one (SOC 2300)
  - Added a CAO designation in addition to its existing 010 designation for another course (COMM 1311),

- Assessment of the core learning outcomes
  - We redesigned the freshman experience course with new learning objectives that incorporates the initial CLA+ results and prepares the students for the core by explaining the reasons for a core curriculum, and the concept of assessing them before and after core completion.
Academic Senate  
c/o Chris McGowan

FROM: George McMechan (Chair, Academic Program Review Committee)  

DATE: 8/21/15

RE: Report of the 2014-15 Academic Program Review Committee

ACTIVITIES AND SCHEDULE

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) first met on September 22, 2014 to receive the charge to the committee from James Marquardt, Serenity King and Cinde Gauntt of the Provost's Office. Most of the subsequent communications were conducted by e-mail.

Some of the APRC members participated in a training session in the 'Academic Analytics' data base software on Sept. 26, 2014.

All of the scheduling of the site visits by the external Review Teams (including selection of participants, travel reservations, etc.) were performed by the Provost's office; this function should continue to be done this centralized way, to ensure proper coordination.

Review Teams for the site visits included (as active participants) one APRC member, and two other UTD faculty members, in addition to the external participants.

Five academic programs were reviewed; the dates and APRC participants were as follows:

October 29-30  Applied Sociology  George Fair
January 27-29  Computer Science  George McMechan
February 16-18 Mathematics  James Bartlett
March 2-3  Physics - Applied Physics  Hasan Pirkul
April 13-15  Software Engineering  Linda Thibodeau

Exit interviews were conducted by each of the Review Teams with both the Programs and the Provost.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Timing is of crucial importance as it is is so short.

   a) The APRC appointment letters were delivered last year (and again this year) in late August, which gives very little time for the committee to have an inaugural organizational meeting before the first Review occurs.
b) The Self-Study reports by the Programs being reviewed should be completed and delivered to the APRC member of the review committee as early as possible. These take substantial time to read carefully. A MINIMUM of 2 weeks please.

B. The Provost's Office has indicated a desire for the APRC to have more interaction with them. One possible avenue is for the APRC to recommend names of the UTD faculty to participate in each of the Review Teams.

a) Since the programs to be reviewed in the following academic year are already known in the spring, the APRC committee could provide input on the (non-APRC) faculty participants of each Review Team at the end of the spring (at the same time as the other external members are solicited).

C. It is noted that the Policy Charge document delivered with the 2015-16 appointment letters states that membership is now for one-year renewable terms.

The main commitments and responsibilities of APRC members are two-fold; first to actively participate in one (or more) of the external reviews, and second to provide liaison between that external committee and the Provost's office.

There are typically only 4-5 programs reviewed each year, and 10 APRC members, so if the appointments are for only one year, only half of the APRC members will ever actually serve on a Review Team. It is recommended that the normal appointment be for two years, with the expectation that each APRC member will participate in at least one review during those two years (so the workload is even).

This also impacts the timing issues in item A above. If a returning APRC member has committed to a specific review already in the spring, he/she could receive the corresponding self study to read even before the first fall meeting. That is not possible with one-year appointments.

D. The key person in the review process is the chairman of each Review Team. As the site visit is very short, and the report is mainly written by the chairman, the visit time needs to be tightly structured, and the Chairman needs to stick to getting the answers to the relevant questions. I have not heard any complaints this time, but I just want to emphasize that the most important decision that is made in planning the reviews is the selection of the Chairmen.
Faculty Mentoring Committee


The Faculty Mentoring Committee oversees the Faculty Mentoring Program at UT-Dallas, whose purpose is to provide new faculty, especially assistant professors, with the information and support they need to succeed and obtain tenure and promotion at UT-Dallas.

Vice Provost Emily Tobey and Assistant Provost Elizabeth Rugg’s respective offices were very helpful to me as Chair in surveying program participants in order to identify optimum times to hold workshops based on faculty schedules, and promoting the workshops once they were scheduled. Dr. Tobey’s office also provided lunches as part of each workshop, which gave new faculty members a chance to meet and talk with one another each month before the workshop began.

The Committee met on Tuesday, October 21, 2014. The Committee agreed that their role was to contact new assistant professors in their respective programs and Schools to promote the program and encourage new assistants to apply. The Committee discussed the schedule that was set up in 2013-2014, and agreed that we should continue inviting faculty to apply during their first fall semester, to attend workshops beginning in September of their first semester at UT-Dallas, and to identify and obtain mentors in the spring semester of their first year. Committee members contacted program participants in Spring, 2015 to offer assistance and advice on finding a senior faculty mentor at UT-Dallas.

Attendance at workshops significantly improved from 2013-2014 to 2014-2015. Workshop attendance this year ranged from 8 to 12 new faculty. Members of the Faculty Mentoring Committee also attended regularly and participated on the workshop panels. All Committee members agreed that the senior faculty who made up the panels for each workshop offered excellent presentations and advice.

As chair of the committee, my responsibility was to invite new assistant professors to participate in the program and answer their questions, to identify senior faculty willing and able to serve on workshop panels and to schedule those workshops, to educate assistant professors on how best to utilize their senior mentors, and to contact senior mentors and request their participation. I also educated senior mentors on the roles identified for them by the Program. For new faculty joining small programs, it was sometimes challenging to find
appropriate mentors, and I worked with them and faculty in related areas to find mentors.

As will be apparent from the tables below, some participating faculty never communicated with me that they had found a mentor, nor did they respond to my emails when I offered to help them.
# Participants

**Faculty Mentoring Program, 2013-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Entry Date</th>
<th>UTD Senior Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akbar</td>
<td>Mohammad</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>5/17/2013</td>
<td>Todd Sandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunte</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Public Policy &amp; Political Economy Program</td>
<td>8/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>Lunjin</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>8/15/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>Xingang</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>OSIM</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>Seunghyun Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du</td>
<td>Heng</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Molecular &amp; Cell Biology</td>
<td>6/1/2013</td>
<td>Santosh D’Mello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gassensmith</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorina</td>
<td>Evgenia</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Public Affairs &amp; Sociology</td>
<td>8/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
<td>Steve Yurkovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Public Affairs &amp; Sociology Program</td>
<td>8/1/2013</td>
<td>Doug Kiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayenga</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>8/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honhon</td>
<td>Dorothee</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>OM</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyndman</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung</td>
<td>Myoungsoo</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>Georgios Makris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesden</td>
<td>Michael H.</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Jung-whan</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Molecular &amp; Cell Biology</td>
<td>5/1/2013</td>
<td>Ravi Prakash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>Cong</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>Zhiang Lin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez-Kidwell</td>
<td>Virginie</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>OSIM</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td>Yiorgos Makris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearingen</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>ATEC</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearingen</td>
<td>Kyoung Lee</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>ATEC</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vargas</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Public Affairs and Sociology Program</td>
<td>8/1/2013</td>
<td>Sheryl Skaggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wig</td>
<td>Gagan</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Cognitive Neuroscience</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkler</td>
<td>Duane D.</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Molecular &amp; Cell Biology</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yehuda</td>
<td>Nir</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao</td>
<td>Xiaofei</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>7/1/2013</td>
<td>Feng Zhao</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participants

**Faculty Mentoring Program 2014-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Entry date</th>
<th>UTD Senior Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Filbey, Francesca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Schmidtke, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delk</td>
<td>Nikki</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Spiro, Stephen; Julia Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Tae Hoon</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshi-Imre</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>Center for Engineering Innovations</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Prof. Ken O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner</td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Murphy, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Geospatial Info Services</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Qiu, Fang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou</td>
<td>Yifei</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Lewis, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Lu, Hong Bing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majewicz</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Minkoff, Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerio</td>
<td>Giacomo</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Rotea, Mario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhenpeng</td>
<td>Qin</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>Fan</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Lee, Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levine</td>
<td>Sheen S</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Lee and Chuanwei Zhang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Drathen</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td>Kieschnick, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadagno</td>
<td>Roseanna</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Fall, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FMP Workshop Panelists 2014 - 2015

2014
FMP Orientation / Kickoff Luncheon (Feb. 7, 2014 12:45 PM)
Emily Tobey & Karen Prager
(Participants: Mentees and Committee Members)

- Tenure & Promotion (Feb. 26, 2014 12:00-1:30PM)
  Inga Musselman (NSM) (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs)
  Robert Lowry (EPPS)
  Prof. Lawrence Reitzer (NSM) (Chair, CQ)

- Research & Publication (March 26, 11:30-1:00 PM)
  Candice Mills (BBS)
  Kenneth Balkus (NSM)

- Balancing Your Professional and Personal Life (April 17, 12:00-2:00PM)
  Minn Hlaing (ECS)
  Nicole Piquero (EPPS)
  Robert Kieschnick (JSM)
  Pam Gossin (AH)

- Show Me the Money: Grant Workshop (May 14, 11:30-1:00 PM)
  Michael Kilgard (BBS)
  Emily Tobey (BBS)

- Writing Workshop (July 11, 11:00-1:00PM)
  Beth Keithly (Office of Research)

- In the Classroom: Teaching Workshop (Sept. 13, 12:30-2:00 PM)
  Marion Underwood (BBS)
  John Sibert (NSM)
  Jennifer Holmes (EPPS)
  Karen Huxtable-Jester (BBS)

- Promoting Your Brand: Networking and Publicity Workshop (October 24, 3:00-4:00 PM)
  John Hansen (ECS)
  Sumit Sarkar (JSM)

- Having Difficult Conversations: Scary Situations, Departmental Politics, and Negotiation Workshop (November 3, 12:00-1:30 PM)
  Varghese S. Jacob (JSM, Senior Associate Dean)
  Shelley Lane (AH)
  Karen Prager (IS)

- Year End Closing Party (December 5, 4:30-6:30 PM)
  o Cancelled

2015
FMP Orientation / Kickoff Luncheon (January 22, 2015; 1-2:30 p.m.)
Karen Prager
(Participants: Mentees and Committee Members)
• **Research & Publication** (Feb. 17, 11:30 AM-1:00 PM)
  Candice Mills (BBS)
  Rod Heelis (NSM)

• **Tenure & Promotion** (March 10, 2014 11:30 AM -1:00 PM)
  Inga Musselman (NSM) (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs)
  Robert Lowry (EPPS)
  Prof. Lawrence Reitzer (NSM) (Chair, CQ)

• **Balancing Your Professional and Personal Life** (April 17, 12:00-2:00PM)
  Minn Hlaing (ECS)
  Nicole Piquero (EPPS)
  Robert Kieschnick (JOSM)
  Pam Gossin (AH)

• **Show Me the Money: Grant Workshop** (May 14, 11:30-1:00 PM)
  Michael Kilgard (BBS)
  Emily Tobey (BBS)

• **Writing Workshop** (July 11, 11:00-1:00PM)
  Beth Keithly (Office of Research)

• **In the Classroom: Teaching Workshop** (Sept. 13, 12:30-2:00 PM)
  Tres Thompson (BBS)
  John Sibert (NSM)
  Jennifer Holmes (EPPS)
  Karen Huxtable-Jester (BBS)

To be organized by the 2015-2016 FMP chair, Homer Montgomery:

• **Promoting Your Brand: Networking and Publicity Workshop**
• **Having Difficult Conversations: Scary Situations, Departmental Politics, and Negotiation Workshop**
• **Year End Closing Party**
Parking and Transportation Committee
Report on Committee Activities during FY15

October 1st, 2015

To: Tim Redman, Speaker of the Faculty Senate

From: Cris Aquino on behalf of Dr. Calvin Jamison, VP for Administration

Parking and Transportation Committee Members:

Faculty:
- Thomas Brunel
- John Wiorkowski

Staff Council:
- Paula Austell

Student Government:
- Brooke Knutson
- Nancy Fairbank

Staff:
- Kent Mecklenburg

Ex-Officio
- Chief of Police
- Associate VP for Facilities Management
- Director of Disability Services
- Safety Officer
- Parking and Transportation Manager
- Associate VP for Budget and Resource Planning

RUO and Chair:
- Dr. Calvin Jamison, VP for Administration

Description: The Parking and Transportation (P&T) Committee meets quarterly to discuss campus matters related to parking and transportation.

Topics discussed:
- Introduction of a campus wide bike share program
- Parking lot maintenance
New parking configuration
Next fiscal year parking permit rates
Retiree permits
Parking lot and garage safety – how to control speed limits at garages
GPS technology on buses (883 route)
Get ready for Fall – Preparation for Fall semester
Grace period parking
Enforcement of key areas such as fire lanes and disabled spaces
New parking lots (library lot, Lot T overflow, Lot U extension and Lot U overflow)
Sale of Toll Tags at UTD
Zip Car transition to P&T
Construction of new parking structure (PS4)
Disabled comet cab
Metered parking
Comet Cruiser ridership (883)
Comet cab routes
Transportation for graduation
883 DART agreement
LUKE meter parking
Transportation for Career Expo
Disabled Veteran parking

Action Taken:

All topics discussed were reviewed and implemented during fiscal year 2015. The committee will resume quarterly participation on October 14, 2015.

Recommendation for Following Year:

Continue to monitor parking spaces on campus to ensure sufficient parking is available to students, faculty, and staff.
Work with DART to identify additional funding opportunities to provide additional service hours.
October 2, 2015

To: The Academic Senate

From: The UT Dallas Wellness Committee
Karen Garcia on behalf of Dr. Calvin D. Jamison

Subject: FY 2015 University Committee Annual Report – Wellness Committee

I. Membership

The Committee is composed of no fewer than nine voting members appointed by the President and shall include three staff members, three faculty members, and three students. Staff members will be nominated by the Staff Council. Faculty members will be nominated by the Academic Senate. Student members will be nominated by Student Government and will serve for one year terms, which are renewable. The Vice President for Administration shall serve as the Responsible University Official.

Appointed voting members for 2014 – 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monica Rankin</td>
<td>Michele Brown</td>
<td>Andrei Rosu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadine Connell</td>
<td>Nancy Bryant</td>
<td>Vedika Hgrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla Holub</td>
<td>Karen Garcia</td>
<td>Sukaina Syed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-voting members provide administrative and other on-going support to the Wellness Committee. The Coordinator, currently the Benefits Specialist/Wellness Coordinator, is responsible for coordinating the UT System Wellness Initiatives.

Voluntary non-voting members for 2014 – 2015:

- Marita Yancey
- Nora Pena
- Vanessa Balderrama
- Tysh Coleman
- Amanda Smith
- Rachel Clark
- Sara Asberry
- Chris McAlpine
- Paula Austell
- Nicole Harrington
- Theresa Diaz
- Tiffany Peart
- Rachel Clark

II. Meetings

The committee have scheduled monthly meetings on the 2nd Tuesday of every month from 11:00 am to 12:00 pm in the Lone Star conference room located in the Administration building, room 3.104.
III. Actions Taken

The purpose of the Wellness Committee is to create a culture and environment that support and promote the value of individual well-being by education and the provision of appropriate physical facilities. The Committee will implement the UT System wellness program on the UT Dallas campus and provide additional programs, tools, and resources that will enable participants to take charge of their own physical, mental and spiritual health.

Wellness Events and Initiatives for 2014 – 2015:
- UT Physical Challenge
- Corporate Challenge
- Live Healthy North Texas 10-Week Challenge
- Free Group Exercises
- Monthly Lunch and Learns
  - Heart Health
  - Living Well
  - EAP’s "How to Be Resilient"
  - Disaster Preparedness
  - Dental Hygiene
  - American Diabetes
  - Wellness Retirement Fair
  - Health Screenings
  - Flu Clinics
  - Mammography Screenings

IV. Recommendations for Following Year

- Increase effectiveness and participation of initiatives by collaborating and partnering with the Activity Center, Student Wellness Center, and the Galerstein Women’s Center.
- Advertise the SPN Wellness Center to Faculty and Staff.
- Promote services of the new Employee Health Program Manager to Faculty and Staff.

V. Notes

The Wellness Committee aims to meet the ever-changing needs and interests of the campus community by providing quality and comprehensive wellness programs, services, and facilities that are inclusive and accessible. We create environments and opportunities that promote physical fitness, healthy habits, and balanced behaviors to improve the overall wellness of UT Dallas community by creating and leading innovative programs; partnering with organizations; supporting individual and group leaders; and utilizing resources to provide the most health advantage and effectiveness.
TO: Tim Redman, Speaker of the Academic Senate
     David Cudell, Secretary of the Academic Senate

FROM: Sanaz Okhovat, Assistant Vice President for Research Compliance
      Aage Moller, Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (Institutional Review Board)

DATE: October 1, 2015

Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, 2014-2015
Annual Report

Pursuant to its charge, the Senate’s Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, Dr. Moller met with the Assistant Vice President for Research Compliance and Institutional Review Board (IRB) Manager on a weekly basis during the academic year. During these meetings, research protocols were reviewed and suitably distributed to other Committee members for review. Please note, because of the volume of protocols and the IRB’s commitment to timely approval, the Committee conducts its charge by email. The following data represents the Committee’s activities during this academic year:

- Expedited Review: 149 protocols
- Continuing Review (Annual Reports): 252 protocols
- Modifications: 186 protocols
- Minimal Review (Exempt): 729 protocols

IRB staff provided 23 classroom IRB presentations for undergraduate and graduate students. Furthermore, the IRB staff has developed a Protocol Assistance Workshop, to continue providing education and assistance for students and faculty conducting human subjects research.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have further questions or concerns, you may reach me by phone at 972-883-4579 or email at sanaz.okhovat@utdallas.edu.

Best Regards,

Sanaz Okhovat
LMS Committee Meeting Report for 2014-2015 (by Richard Golden)

Participants: Karl Hoo, Gene, Yuli (Math), Katrina (Elearning), Richard Golden (chair), Darren Crone (Elearning)

Initial Comment: It is crucial that Darren Crone (Director of Elearning) attend all meetings of the LMS Committee

ELEARNING SYSTEM OPERATIONS
The committee discussed the status of the ELEARNING system from an operational perspective. That is, not from a usability perspective but rather is the current ELEARNING system functioning properly and not "breaking down". Based upon these discussions we concluded it was in good shape but that it would be helpful to design some sort of survey to assess usability for faculty. Karl in particular suggested that a Qualtrix faculty survey might be very informative.

MOOCs
The issue of MOOCs was also discussed and it was noted that the transition from materials developed in an ELEARNING environment to a MOOC environment can be straightforward. Nevertheless, the problem remains that most of the leaders in the UT Community who are behind MOOCs are not clear among themselves what are the goals of a MOOC. For example, should it be money, should it be to deliver quality education in an altruistic manner, should it be to provide "brand recognition" for the UT system. In the real world, the answer most likely is a complex combination of all of these factors but few academic leaders have a clear vision of even an approximate qualitative weighting of these factors. This is fundamentally important not just from an administrative position or from a faculty position. This issue is fundamentally important from a technical position regarding how resources in ELEARNING should be strategically allocated to support MOOC development. Clearer guidance from administrative officials is required here. Another related issue regarding MOOCs is why do they cost so much?

ELEARNING
Issues of ELEARNING were also discussed. Communication issues such as video conferencing and clickers were discussed. In addition, the topic of how can ELEARNING methods be used to assess "deep understanding"?

AGENDA FOR FUTURE MEETINGS
(1) Survey to obtain faculty input on ELEARNING Environment implemented using Qualtrix
(2) Examples of using ELEARNING to assess "deep understanding" in an automated manner.
10/1/2015

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Lawrence Overzet
Chair, Safety and Security Council


I. Membership
   The membership of the Safety and Security Council consists of: Lawrence Overzet, Chief Zacharias, Richard Dempsey, Chad Thomas, Gene Fitch, Sandra Mitchell, John Worrall, Kathy White, Mark Pace, James Wright, Wallace Martin, and Carol Cokely.

II. Meetings
   October 6, 2014, 3:00 PM NSERL 3.204
   December 1, 2014 3:00 PM NSERL 3.204
   April 6, 2015 2:00 PM NSERL 3.744

III. Actions Taken
   See attached minutes

IV. Recommendations for Following Year
   See attached minutes

V. Minutes
Safety and Security Council Meeting
Meeting Minutes - October 6, 2014

I. Call to order
Larry Overzet called to order the regular meeting of the Safety and Security Council Meeting at 3:05 p.m. on October 6, 2014 in the NSERL Building, room 3.204.

II. Roll call
The following persons were present: Lawrence Overzet, Tim Dorsey (for Chief Zacharias), Sam Eicke (for Richard Dempsey), Chad Thomas, Gene Fitch, Sandra Mitchell, John Worrall, Kathy White, Mark Pace, Mariah Armitage (for James Wright), Wallace Martin, and Carol Cokely.

III. Administrative
a) Introductions were made and the meeting was called to order.
b) Chad Thomas was introduced as the Vice Chair.
c) The charge of our committee was read and discussed.
d) The question was asked of how often we should meet? Everyone agreed that we should meet at least every other month.
e) Dates of our regular meetings should be publicized to the entire campus.

IV. Reports from Committees/Safety Issues
a) Tim Dorsey on behalf of Larry Zacharias, Chief of Police:
   • The lighting surveys are on-going as we add new buildings. With the construction we have had to disconnect lights at times. NSERL is the least lit of the buildings on campus.
   • The funding has been received to add cameras and videos to the parking structures. They have already been added to Parking Structure I. When all are installed, there will be 300 cameras which will place 30 – 40 cameras in each structure.
   • The Clery Act has been completed.
   • Lighting has gone up at Callier South. Carol Cokely commented on females walking to class in the sketchy area. Although no crimes have been reported, it is a concern because the closest building is at least 100 yards from the parking area. The students and staff are given a break before dark so they can move their cars closer in. Brush and vegetation have been cleared out and the Dallas Police Department should be getting rid of the tents/homeless. With those things and the addition of more lighting we hope to make it much safer.

b) Wallace Martin, Associate Director of Research:
   • The intersection at Synergy and Rutford is still an issue. They have added a blinking light for now and the City of Richardson is putting together plans to add a temporary traffic light. Hopefully in 2 – 3 years the road will belong to UTD and not be a public roadway any longer.

c) Mariah Armitage, Director of Emergency Management:
   • We just finished up with National Preparedness Month with the annual Emergency Preparedness Fair held here on campus.
   • We have attended numerous Lunch and Learns.
   • We have a booth set up outside the food courts once a month to meet and greet with the students and answer any questions they might have regarding our department.
   • We have renewed the Storm Ready program.
• We have purchased weather radios for various departments on campus and if you are interested in a radio please contact me by email or phone.
• We are conducting Safe Leader trainings to help with the evacuation of incapacitated persons from buildings that need to be cleared.

d) Kathy White, Safety Manager of Research:
• The university’s radioactive material license has been renewed.
• Radiation inventory is being changed over to Safety.
• Researchers are asking to use radioactive materials on rats and we are trying to discourage that.
• The Radiation Safety Committee will be meeting soon.
• The Bio-Safety Chemical Committee met last March but there are plans in place to meet more often.

e) Sam Eicke, Asst. Director of Facilities Management:
• Reported on the construction areas here on campus. There is no end in sight to the ongoing construction.
• He was asked to report on ADA and he stated that Kerry Tate is the campus spokesperson for ADA issues involving students and that H.R. is responsible for staff/faculty ADA. He suggested that we invite them to join the committee for ADA reporting.
• He also suggested we invite Cris Aquino to the meeting to report on Parking and Transportation.
• They are taking out sidewalks on Drive A so there is no need to repair those areas until the construction of that area is complete.

f) Sandra Mitchell, WCI Representative and Risk Management:
• There have been 16 WCI claims made already and we are only into the 2nd month of the new fiscal year. Perhaps the added amount of construction has added to this unusually high number.

V. New Business:
  a) Suggested goals to pursue for the upcoming year. (Poll to determine which to choose.)
• Pan cameras added to parking structures.
• Continue vigilance at Callier. (possibly patrol from 5 p.m. – 9 p.m.)
• Suggestions for the traffic and pedestrian issues at Rutford and Synergy.
• Appoint each building on campus a unique address rather than have all buildings use 800 W. Campbell Road.
  b) Suggestion that the SSC report directly to the President after the meetings.
  c) Identify the safety plan for the university. (Mariah Armitage will do the research)

The next scheduled meeting for SSC will be Monday, December 1, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. in RL 3.204

Meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.
I. **Call to order**

Larry Overzet called to order the regular meeting of the Safety and Security Council Meeting at 3:07 p.m. on December 1, 2014 in the NSERL Building, room 3.204.

II. **Roll call**

The following persons were present:

1. Larry Overzet
2. Michael Hankin
3. Sam Eicke
4. Chad Thomas
5. Brent Tourangeau
6. Larry Zacharias
7. Sandra Mitchell
8. Marco Mendoza
9. Kathy White
10. Kerry Tate
11. Mariah Armitage
12. Wallace Martin
13. Carol Cokely
14. Robert Wallace
15. Shane Solis
16. Rick Dempsey

III. **Administrative**

a) Larry Overzet asked for any changes to the October minutes. There were none so Chief Zacharias made a motion to approve the minutes and Carol Cokely seconded the motion. The council voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

b) Michael Hankin was introduced as a new student member to the council.

c) Mr. Overzet announced that the Comprehensive Safety Plan required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) – which previously had been presumed missing from UT Dallas’ Handbook of Operating Procedures – is in fact in use and known as the “University Safety Manual”. The manual has since been renamed The University’s Comprehensive Safety Plan in order to comply with SACS requirements.

IV. **Reports from Committees/Safety Issues**

a) **Larry Zacharias, Chief of Police:**

- Regarding the pedestrian safety at Synergy and Rutford, there are flashing message boards currently in place at this intersection. The City of Richardson has plans to put up a temporary 4 way traffic light. It is temporary because with the coming of Comet Town in the future, traffic will be re-directed at that time.

- The pan zoom camera project is in process. It started with Lot T where there are 4 cameras. The Parking Garages have cameras and there was a $150,000 upgrade on Parking Structure I.

- They are in the process of upgrading lighting surveys. Dr. Jamison has asked that more cameras be added also, and there is a discussion of whether to upgrade the exterior lighting in-house or call in a consultant. The Safety and Security Council should report back to Dr. Daniel that we support the cameras being added as well as the additional lighting even though it is going to be a very expensive project.
Discussion of assigning physical addresses to the buildings on campus began 5 years ago and we purchased software to enter the addresses into AT & T and to the City of Richardson. One issue that we have with assigning physical addresses is that it is critical that all deliveries be made through Central Receiving for a screening process.

Alcohol and drug crimes have increased due to the increase of tenants to our campus. There are 5,000 people living on the UTD campus this semester. The biggest problem is bicycle theft and there has been a recent arrest of an offender.

There is no increase in assaults or sexual assaults.

b) Wallace Martin, Associate Director of Research:
- Expressed concern regarding a student that spilled 2-Mercaptoethanol. There were 200 ml in a 500 ml container. She came down to his office after it happened and had it on her shoes. She went back to the lab and cleaned it off with wipes. Kathy White said there is training scheduled in the near future to educate the lab workers on how to handle these type of incidents.
- Asked about the safety and security of entering NSERL and the new Bioengineering and Sciences Building once the two are opened and joined. Rick Dempsey said there will be a 1st level covered walkway to the new building and a main door on the southeast corner. There will also be an entrance on the southwest corner for building occupants. The NSERL badges will work on both buildings.

c) Mariah Armitage, Director of Emergency Management:
- We will be conducting the indoor and outdoor warning system testing on December 3rd. We have asked the building liaisons to report back to Emergency Management if there are any issues and to also let us know if it worked well.
- We are adding 10 hand sanitizers around campus. They will be placed in high traffic areas.
- We are working to prepare everyone for winter weather awareness.
- The annual fire inspections of the campus started today.
- There are 2 open positions in EHS currently that we are in the process of filling.

d) Shane Solis, Assistant Director of Research:
- Kathy White has transferred from EHS to NSERL where her main focus will be NSERL and BSB. For the time being, Radiation Safety and Biosafety will fall under NSERL’s watch and Kathy will be assisting EHS until they can fill the empty positions.

e) Sam Eicke, Asst. Director of Facilities Management:
- Facilities will be asphalting the sidewalks outside of NSERL this week on an as needed basis. We have asked Parking and Transportation to fund some of the sidewalk safety issues.

f) Rick Dempsey:
There was a crane accident on campus that required minor first aid and both drivers were removed from the site.

Construction on the North Mall is going well from a safety standpoint.

g) **Sandra Mitchell, WCI Representative and Risk Management:**
- There was only 1 WCI claim to report.

h) **Marco Mendoza, Director of Human Resources:**
- Introduced as the Director of Employee Relations and Title IX. There is another office being created to fulfill the role of the Title IX and perhaps hiring 2 additional people.
- There was an ADA website implemented 6 months ago. Visitors can go to the website and request the services they need. There is also a place to report issues on campus that would hinder people with disabilities.
- Working with Parking and Transportation to get a comet cab to transport people with disabilities around campus, especially with all the construction. Per Cris Aquino comet cabs are not equipped for ADA transport. They are not insured for wheel chairs and we do not loan out wheelchairs.
- Currently working on a form for employees to contact HR for requests.
- RA’s and TA’s contact HR for ADA and Students contact Kerry Tate.

**Action Items:**
1) Form a subcommittee of 3 (Carol Cokely, Kerry Tate, and Marco Mendoza) to address pedestrian safety regarding ADA.
2) Form a subcommittee of 5 (Kathy White, Mariah Armitage, Shane Solis, Wallace Martin, and Bob Wallace) to address lab safety.
3) Draft a letter of support to look into pan zoom cameras.

**New Business:**
1) Focus on ADA and traffic/construction.
2) Adding locks to classroom doors. Is this possible? What areas can be locked? The areas that can be locked would be best served by using thumb bolt locks, like those used in hotels. The university campus is not like elementary or high schools and cannot be on constant lockdown.
3) Focus more on lab safety.
4) A faculty member is concerned about behavioral problems and how can we assure they are being addressed. Kerry Tate will send Larry Overzet a list of resources so he can report back to the faculty member. Some of the resources include BAIT, the Student Counseling Center, the Women’s Center and EAP.

The next scheduled meeting for SSC will be Monday, February 2nd, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. Meeting site to be determined.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.
Safety and Security Council Meeting Minutes
April 6, 2015

I. Call to order
Larry Overzet called to order the regular meeting of the Safety and Security Council Meeting at 2:05 p.m. on April 6, 2015 in the NSERL Building, room 3.744

II. Roll call
The following persons were present:
1. Larry Overzet
2. Sam Eicke
3. Sandra Mitchell
4. Wallace Martin
5. Carol Cokely
6. Larry Zacharias
7. Kerry Tate
8. Angela Dees
9. Joanne Dotson
10. Cris Aquino
11. Teresa Johnston
12. Shane Solis
13. Marco Mendoza
14. Rick Dempsey

III. Administrative
The meeting was called to order. Minutes were approved.

IV. Reports from Committees/Safety Issues

Larry Zacharias, Chief of Police:
- Not much to report on the lighting survey other than it is being improved as we work through landscaping and construction.
- Lot T cameras are up and to be connected soon.
- We have had our first bid of 18k to install pixel cameras in Lot J.
- The Police Department has been temporarily moved out of their building due to positive black mold testing. They are located in the WSTC and EHS buildings.

Angela Dees, Office of Emergency Management:
- The Office of Emergency Mgt is continuing to monitor the weather. Hopefully the winter weather is over and we are now preparing for Spring and tornado season by various preparedness activities.
Wallace Martin, Associate Director of Research
- UT Dallas does not have a policy in place for ladies that are pregnant and working in labs. What are the risks of exposure to organic fumes and birth defects? This subject should be placed under new business or continuing business to resolve these concerns.

Shane Solis, Asst. Director of Research:
- The Bio-Safety Committee will be meeting at the end of March. They will be losing an outside member of the committee.
- The chemical waste pickup and removal is being handled by Veolia. They are scheduled to pick up twice a week.
- Working with Teresa Johnston to identify chemicals and space inventory. This helps our first responders to identify the contents of all labs.

Sam Eicke, Asst. Director of Facilities Management:
- There are 3 additional construction fences going up at the south side of Callier and the Administration dock area up to the Physics building and over to Jonsson.
- The Loop Road is being wrapped up.
- Lots A and B will be closed for paving. Parking will available in Parking Structure 3 while this is going on.
- Chief Zacharias added that they are trying to make parking safer by redirecting the spaces.
- The windows and doors in Berkner are being done now.
- The sidewalks on the west side of Rutford will lead to west of Synergy for additional safety.

Sandra Mitchell, WCI Representative and Risk Management:
- There have been a total of 8 additional workers’ comp claims since our last meeting.
- Busy processing numerous camps and clinics that are being held in the spring and summer.

Chris Aquino, Director of Office of Administration:
- Adding a panic button at Parking Structure 3 for student workers that work late at night.
- Putting a plan together to add some additional purple parking spaces.
- During the construction to Lots A and B the top level of Parking Structure 3 will be open for additional parking spaces.
- Plans are being reviewed to begin Parking Structure 4 which is slated to begin in the fall.
Marco Mendoza, Director of Human Resources:
- Facilities is addressing the issues of doors and elevators for easier access.
- James Dockery, the Asst. VP for Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance began his position today. His area will be responsible for Title IX, insuring that the affirmative action plan and audit dealing with employees is being complied with, and issues regarding sexual harassment are being addressed appropriately.
- Addressing the usual barriers across campus.

Kerry Tate, Director of Student AccessAbility:
- There is a situation with a blind student working a phone bank for alumni, trying to cross the street at the 4 way stop near NSERL. The City of Richardson is working on a way to assist her to be able to pass and cross. Chief Zacharias says this stop may not be a permanent crossing pending construction of Comet Town.
- Discussion of using a Comet Cab to transport people with disabilities around campus. UT Tyler has a golf cart equipped to transport wheelchairs and San Diego State has a program where a person with a disability can call ahead and request to be picked up. The need is increasing for this type of program.
- The ADA policy has been published and is now available on the policy Navigator on the UTD website.

New Business:
- Pregnancy and Lab work. Is this something that the Safety and Security Committee should develop? A subcommittee will be formed with Marco Mendoza, James Dockery, Kerry Tate, and Shane Solis.

The next scheduled meeting for SSC will be Monday, June 1 at 3:00 p.m. in RL 3.744

Meeting was adjourned at 3:06 p.m.
Student Affairs
Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs

October 1, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Academic Senate

FROM: Gene Fitch, Vice President for Student Affairs  
RUO, Student Fee Advisory Committee


I. Membership
The membership of the Student Fee Advisory Committee included the following:

Students: Nancy Fairbank, Elected Chair Zac Evans, Charlie Hannigan, Brooke Knudtson, Katy Truesdale.
Staff Members: Lynn Butler, Melissa Wyder
Faculty Member: Jared Pickens
Ex-Officio Members: Darrelene Rachavong, Sue Sherbet, Liz Ramirez, Gene Fitch, Kimberly Laird

II. Meetings
January 23, 2015; January 30, 2015; February 13, 2015; February 20, 2015

III. Actions Taken
The Committee considered budget requests presented by various departments and programs that receive funding from one of six student fees and approved allocations for FY2015-2016. (See attached)

Committee recommendations were presented to Dr. David Daniel and the Cabinet during the annual budget hearings and later approved for the FY16 budget year.
# FY2016 Student Fee-Funded Budget Allocations

As Recommended by the Student Fee Advisory Committee

## Athletic Program Fee ($45 per student per semester)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Center</th>
<th>FY2016 Recommended Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Operations (61040008)</td>
<td>1,320,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball (61040009)</td>
<td>92,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball (Men's) (61040010)</td>
<td>81,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball (Women's) (61040011)</td>
<td>82,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country (61040012)</td>
<td>29,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf (61040013)</td>
<td>46,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Men's) (61040014)</td>
<td>90,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Women's) (61040015)</td>
<td>90,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (61040016)</td>
<td>97,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis (61040017)</td>
<td>48,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (61040018)</td>
<td>59,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Fringe Benefits (43040001)</td>
<td>352,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Pool Reserve @3%</td>
<td>31,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FY2016 Athletic Program Fee Allocation</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,423,314</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Medical Services Fee ($34.30 per student per semester)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Center</th>
<th>FY2016 Recommended Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Counseling Center (61040006)</td>
<td>567,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Center (61040007)</td>
<td>1,149,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Fringe Benefits (43040009)</td>
<td>378,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Pool Reserve @3%</td>
<td>35,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FY2016 Medical Services Fee Allocation</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,130,890</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Recreation Facility Fee ($65 per student per semester)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Center</th>
<th>FY2016 Recommended Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Center (61040033)</td>
<td>685,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Utilities &amp; Debt Service (60040011)</td>
<td>2,009,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Maintenance (61040031)</td>
<td>217,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Fringe Benefits (43040011)</td>
<td>147,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Pool Reserve @3%</td>
<td>29,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FY2016 Recreation Facility Fee Allocation</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,089,777</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Services Building Fee** ($71 per student per semester)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Center</th>
<th>FY2016 Recommended Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance (61040056)</td>
<td>779,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Utilities &amp; Debt Service (60040004)</td>
<td>1,697,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Fringe Benefits (43040005)</td>
<td>19,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Pool Reserve @3%</td>
<td>3,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FY2016 Student Services Building Fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,500,303</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Services Fee** ($20.08 per SCH/$250 per semester maximum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Center</th>
<th>FY2016 Recommended Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H-Pep Band (31040001)</td>
<td>20,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H-Reunion (31040002)</td>
<td>12,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Operations (Supplement)</td>
<td>162,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callier Center (35740001)</td>
<td>10,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Center (61040004)</td>
<td>1,003,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students (61040038)</td>
<td>457,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students-Child Care (61040060)</td>
<td>33,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Services (61040034)</td>
<td>146,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Learning Communities Program (61140008)</td>
<td>239,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Administration-Student Affairs (61140011)</td>
<td>206,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Center (17040001)</td>
<td>454,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost-Debate (21040003)</td>
<td>78,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost-Destination Imagination (21040004)</td>
<td>53,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost-Model UN (21040002)</td>
<td>62,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Sports Program (61040032)</td>
<td>1,217,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student AccessAbility (61040055)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Counseling Center (61040005)</td>
<td>770,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Counseling Center for Students in Recovery (61040063)</td>
<td>100,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development-Spirit Program (61040044)</td>
<td>160,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development-Student Government (61040037)</td>
<td>235,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development-Student Leadership Programs (61040039)</td>
<td>107,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement-Campus Events (61040042)</td>
<td>199,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement-Fraternity &amp; Sorority Life (61040046)</td>
<td>225,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement-Meteor Theatre (61040043)</td>
<td>44,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement-Student Organizations (SOF) (61040047)</td>
<td>317,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement-SUAAB (61040045)</td>
<td>442,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Insurance (61040057)</td>
<td>49,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Media-Administration (61040053)</td>
<td>168,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Center</td>
<td>FY2016 Recommended Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union Administration (61040002)</td>
<td>1,412,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu Union Utilities &amp; Debt Service (60040015)</td>
<td>998,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Fringe Benefits (43040013)</td>
<td>90,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Pool Reserve @3%</td>
<td>15,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FY2016 Student Union Fee Allocation</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,517,036</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainability Committee Voting Membership:
Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Chair
Doug Goodman, Vice-Chair
Babak Fahimi, Faculty Member
Craig Lewis, Staff Representative
Katie Truesdale, Student Rep
Caitlyn Fortner, Student Rep

Committee Campus Partners:
Kevin Kwiatowski, Student Affairs / Housing
Mackenzie Hunter, Student Affairs / Volunteerism
John McCaskill, EPPS
Allison Jenkins, Chartwells/Dining Services
Becky Jin, Sustainability Club
Mariana Garay Romero, Sustainability Club
Maya Khemsara, Sustainability Club
Sabrina Jordan, Facilities Management

Committee Ex-Officio Members:
Calvin Jamison, VP Administration
Rick Dempsey, AVP Facilities Management
John Walls, AVP Communications

Supported by: Thea Junt, Sustainability Manager

Areas of Activities:
- **Communications**—Website development and social media interactions across campus; develop kiosks explaining sustainability efforts; participate in freshmen orientations. Conduct an Anti-litter campaign. Conduct a campus wide-survey regarding sustainability.
- **Infrastructure**—continue adding water bottle filling stations in buildings. Work to improve recycling and access to recycling across campus. Work to build a network of recycling liaisons in each building / department to improve recycling awareness and access.
- **Habitat**—Create sustainable landscapes such as wildflower fields and a milkweed pasture; provide education and awareness for these endeavors.
- **Academics**—Provide educational opportunities to the committee members. Develop curriculum development for courses in sustainability, especially in the area of environmental policy.
- **Students**—Provide information on recycling to student groups. Continue to partner with the Sustainability Club throughout the year. Expand planning and programming for Earth Week to include committee members.
- **Committee**—Improve participation and attendance at committee meetings by ex-officio members.
Summary of Presentations, Discussions, and Events for 2014-2015:
The State of Recycling—UT Dallas Facilities Management
Transition to Single Stream Recycling—UT Dallas Facilities Management
Expanded Green Courses at UT Dallas—John McCaskill, UT Dallas EPPS
Students & Sustainability—The Sustainability Club @ UT Dallas
Living Building Challenge—Tricia Loe, USGBC North Texas Chapter
Campus Construction—UT Dallas Facilities Management
Earth Week—Hosted by Office of Student Volunteerism and Facilities Management
UT Dallas Monarch Waystation

UT Dallas’ 4th Annual Earth Week was a success! There were lots of student participation and a variety of events across campus. Below is a summary of events from the week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Event</td>
<td>VOICE: Veggie Fest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer Event</td>
<td>Volunteer Event</td>
<td>Volunteer Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Event</td>
<td>Documentary: Honey Bee-Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>USGBC Leed Tour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio UTD: CD Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing Education Credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow us on Twitter @utdrecycling
Follow us on Instagram utdfacilities
Facebook.com/UTDallasFacilities
Item 11:
Consensual
Relationship
Policy
1. Title

Consensual Relationships

2. Rule and Regulation

Sec. 1 General. The University of Texas System institutions and the University of Texas System Administration shall adopt policies addressing consensual relationships.

Sec. 2 Policy Requirements. The policies shall comply in all substantive respects with a model developed by the Office of General Counsel, shall be published in the institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures, and shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

2.1 A consensual sexual relationship, romantic relationship, or dating between a university supervisor and supervisee (as defined below and includes such a relationship between a faculty member and a student), regardless of whether the supervisory relationship is direct or indirect, is prohibited unless the relationship has been reported in advance and a plan to manage the conflict inherent in the relationship has been approved and documented. Such relationships are prohibited even if only a single event. If managing the conflict is not possible, the relationship is prohibited.

2.2 Any management plan must be documented in writing.

2.3 U. T. System Administration and institutions may develop and adopt more stringent consensual relationship policies or adopt more stringent policies for specific units where it is not possible to manage the conflict inherent in the relationship.

2.4 Athletic departments shall develop and implement stringent consensual relationship policies that prohibit all sexual relationships, romantic relationships, and dating between any member of the coaching or athletics administrative staff and any student athlete or student assigned to or associated with the athletic department, such as interns and student employees, unless approved by the President or designee.
2.5 If there is a complaint of sexual harassment about a relationship covered by Sec. 2.1, above, and the relationship has not been disclosed and a management plan implemented, the burden shall be on the supervisor to explain the failure to comply with this policy and such failure will be a factor in determining whether the relationship was consensual and free of sexual harassment. In any event, failure to disclose the relationship and document (Sec. 2.2) and follow a management plan shall constitute a violation of this policy. If sexual harassment is established, it shall constitute a policy violation in addition to a violation of the consensual relationships policy.

2.6 The policy shall include procedures for promptly reviewing allegations of violations of this policy, providing the individual alleged to have violated the policy with an opportunity to respond, and disciplining that individual if deemed appropriate after taking into account the known facts.

Sec. 3 Counseling and Other Services. One or more offices shall be designated as offices where students, faculty, and employees can obtain advice about sexual harassment, sexual assault, and consensual relationship concerns. In addition, U. T. System Administration and each institution will inform the university community about services available to obtain confidential counseling without System Administration or an institution being required to file a formal report or begin an investigation over the objection of the individual.

Sec. 4 Training and Education. U. T. System Administration and each institution shall develop robust information and training programs for all faculty, staff, and students. The respective Executive Vice Chancellor’s Office will review the programs annually.

Sec. 5 Office of General Counsel Review. The Office of General Counsel shall annually review institution and System administration compliance with this policy and provide a report to the Chancellor.
3. Definitions

Direct authority – The authority vested in an individual as a result of his/her immediate position of power over another. Examples include, but are not limited to: supervisor - supervised employee; faculty - enrolled student; faculty committee member - student submitting thesis; faculty mentor – student mentee; coach - coached athlete; Dean - supervised faculty.

Indirect Authority – Authority derived from an informal or indirect relationship which allows for determinations or evaluations affecting the terms and conditions of employment or student status. Examples include, but are not limited to: a student majoring in a particular field who would still be indirectly under the control or influence of a senior professor or individual in the department or school; an employee in the same organizational unit who is under the indirect control of all more senior individuals in the department; a graduate teaching assistant and a non-supervising department faculty member.

Management Plan – A written plan developed as provided in this policy that manages the conflict and is acknowledged and signed by both parties.

Supervisor – A University faculty member or employee who has direct or indirect supervisory, teaching, evaluation or advisory authority over an employee or student.

Supervisee – Any person whose terms and conditions of employment or student status are directly or indirectly controlled or affected by a supervisor.

4. Relevant Federal and State Statutes


Texas Penal Code Ann. § 39.03 – Official Oppression
5. Relevant System Policies, Procedures, and Forms

Regents' Rule 30105: Sexual Harassment and Misconduct and Inappropriate Consensual Relationships

Sexual Harassment and Sexual Misconduct, UT System Office of General Counsel Model Policy

6. System Administration Office(s) Responsible for Rule

Office of Academic Affairs
Office of Health Affairs
Office of General Counsel
Office of Employee Services

7. Dates Approved or Amended

August 22, 2014
April 6, 2015

8. Contract Information

Questions or comments regarding this Policy should be directed to:

- bor@utsystem.edu
CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS POLICY

1. Purpose

The University of Texas [insert institution name] is committed to maintaining learning and work environments as free as possible from conflicts of interest and favoritism. The University recognizes that two consenting adults should be free to conduct a personal relationship if they so wish when the relationship does not interfere with the goals and policies of the University; some romantic, dating and/or sexual relationships, although consensual, do create conflicts of interests. This policy addresses those consensual relationships.

2. Persons Affected

This policy applies to all University administrators, faculty, staff, and students. This policy is applicable regardless of the gender of the University employee with supervisory teaching, evaluation or advisory authority and/or the gender of the employee, student or student employee who is directly or indirectly supervised, taught, evaluated, or advised by the supervisory employee.

3. Policy

3.1 Prohibited Consensual Relationships. The following consensual relationships, even if a single event, are prohibited:

(a) A consensual relationship between a supervisor (as defined below and is defined as including faculty members) and supervisee regardless of whether the supervisory relationship is direct or indirect, unless the supervisor discloses the relationship in advance and a management plan is in effect;

(b) A consensual relationship between a coach or athletic staff and any student athlete or student assigned to or associated with the athletics department, such as interns and student employees, unless waived by the President or his or her designee for good cause.

3.2 Reporting Requirements.
(a) The supervisor must report a consensual relationship as described in 3.1. to the Dean/Director level administrator or if there is not such an administrator, the appropriate Vice President and the Vice President for Human Resources. The supervisor must make the report prior to entering into the relationship or if the relationship exists, with as much advance notice as possible prior to the supervisor accepting supervisory authority.

(b) The individuals receiving the report must immediately collaborate to attempt to manage the conflict of interest. If management of the conflict is not possible, the relationship is prohibited.

3.3 Management plan.

(a) If the conflict can be managed, The Vice President for Human Resources will provide a management plan to the supervisor within [insert number of days from between five (5) to seven (7) business days] of the report unless there are reasonable grounds for additional time. A consensual relationship may not exist until the management plan is in effect.

(b) A management plan will:

(1) provide an alternative means for the supervision, teaching, advising, evaluation of the supervisee or otherwise mitigate the conflict;

(2) give priority to the interest of the subordinate individual;

(3) be written;

(4) be acknowledged and signed by the parties to the relationship; and

(5) be maintained by the Office of Human Resources

3.4 Reporting Alleged Violations.

(a) Violations of this policy should be reported to the Vice President for Human Resources.

(b) An individual in a supervisory role over a supervisor who is notified of or becomes aware of an alleged violation of this policy must immediately report the information to the Vice President for Human Resources.

3.5 Investigation and Discipline.

(a) The matter will be investigated and if a policy violation occurred, the University may take disciplinary action, which may include termination.
If there is a complaint of sexual harassment about a relationship covered by Sec. 3.1, above, and the relationship has not been disclosed and a management plan implemented, the burden shall be on the supervisor to explain the failure to comply with this policy and such failure will be a factor in determining whether the relationship was consensual and free of sexual harassment.

(b) Disciplinary action will be handled under the University’s policies for discipline and dismissal of faculty or employees depending on the supervisor’s status.

3.6 Campus Culture. The Vice President of Human Resources is responsible for the following:

(a) Disseminating the University Consensual Relationship Policy; developing annual workshops or presentations for faculty members, employees, and students that educate the campus community about this Policy;

(b) The Provost and the Vice President of Human Resources are responsible for the following:

(1) appointing respected faculty and staff members to promote the institutional stance against inappropriate employee/student relationships and to lead the University's effort to maintain this culture;

(2) organizing meetings of campus administrators, faculty leadership and student leadership to discuss the importance of establishing a climate in which consensual relationships between employees and students are unacceptable;

(3) providing instruction to students during orientation to reinforce:

   (i.) the student's responsibility in avoiding consensual relationships, and

   (ii.) helping students understand the collateral damage that can result when such relationships occur.

3.7 Retaliation Prohibited. Retaliation of any kind against anyone for reporting a consensual relationship or for participating in any proceeding pursuant to this Policy is prohibited.

3.8 Counseling. Confidential counseling services are available to employees through the Employee Assistance Program [insert contact information] and to students through the [insert confidential counseling service available to students at institution].

4. Definitions
Consensual Relationship – a romantic, dating, and/or sexual relationship agreed to by the parties involved.

Direct authority – The authority vested in an individual as a result of his/her immediate position of power over another. Examples include, but are not limited to: supervisor - supervised employee; faculty - enrolled student; faculty committee member - student submitting thesis; faculty mentor – student mentee; coach - coached athlete; Dean - supervised faculty.

Indirect Authority – Authority derived from an informal or indirect relationship which allows for determinations or evaluations affecting the terms and conditions of employment or student status. Examples include, but are not limited to: a student majoring in a particular field who would still be indirectly under the control or influence of a senior professor or individual in the department or school; an employee in the same organizational unit who is under the indirect control of all more senior individuals in the department; a graduate teaching assistant and a non-supervising department faculty member.

Management plan – A written plan developed as provided in this policy that mitigates the conflict and is acknowledged and signed by both parties.

Supervisor – A University faculty member or employee who has direct or indirect supervisory, teaching, evaluation or advisory authority over an employee or student.

Supervisee – Any person whose terms and conditions of employment or student status are directly or indirectly controlled or affected by a supervisor.

5. **Relevant Federal and/or State Statute(s), Board of Regents’ Rule(s), UTS Policy(ies), and/or Coordinating Board Rule(s)**

   University of Texas System Systemwide Policy, UTS 184 Consensual Relationships

   University of Texas System Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 30105

1. **Purpose**

The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to maintaining learning and work environments as free as possible from conflicts of interest and favoritism. The University recognizes that two consenting adults should be free to conduct a personal relationship if they so wish when the relationship does not interfere with the goals and policies of the University; some romantic, dating and/or sexual relationships, although consensual, do create conflicts of interests. This policy addresses those consensual relationships.

2. **Persons Affected**

This policy applies to all University administrators, faculty, staff, and students. This policy is applicable regardless of the gender of the University employee with supervisory teaching, evaluation or advisory authority and/or the gender of the employee, student or student employee who is directly or indirectly supervised, taught, evaluated, or advised by the supervisory employee.

3. **Policy**

3.1 **Prohibited Consensual Relationships.** The following consensual relationships, even if a single event, are prohibited:

   (a) A consensual relationship between a supervisor (as defined below and is defined as including faculty members) and supervisee regardless of whether the supervisory relationship is direct or indirect, unless the supervisor discloses the relationship in advance and a management plan is in effect;

   (b) A consensual relationship between a coach or athletic staff and any student athlete or student assigned to or associated with the athletics department, such as interns and student employees, including any coach or student associated with an intellectual competition team, unless waived by the President or his or her designee for good cause.

   This prohibition does not apply to a student assistant coach who serves on a voluntary basis unless the student assistant coach has direct or indirect authority, including the appearance of such authority, over a student or student athlete assigned to or associated with the athletics department.

   If the prohibition is waived, a management plan must be submitted.

3.2 **Reporting Requirements.**

   (a) The supervisor must report a consensual relationship as described in 3.1. to the Dean/Vice President/Executive-level administrator and the Chief Human Resource Officer (CHRO). The supervisor must make the report prior to entering into the relationship or if the relationship exists, with as much advance notice as possible prior to the supervisor accepting supervisory authority.

   If the prohibition is waived, a management plan must be submitted.
(b) The individuals receiving the report must immediately collaborate to attempt to manage the conflict of interest. If management of the conflict is not possible, the relationship is prohibited.

3.3 Management plan.

(a) If the conflict can be managed, the CHROChief Human Resource Officer will provide a management plan to the supervisor within seven (7) business days of the report unless there are reasonable grounds for additional time. A consensual relationship may not exist until the management plan is in effect.

(b) A management plan will:

(1) provide an alternative means for the supervision, teaching, advising, evaluation of the supervisee or otherwise mitigate the conflict;
(2) give priority to the interest of the subordinate individual;
(3) be written;
(4) be acknowledged and signed by the parties to the relationship; and
(5) be maintained by the Office of Human Resources

3.4 Reporting Alleged Violations.

(a) Violations of this policy should be reported to the CHROChief Human Resource Officer.

(b) An individual in a supervisory role over a supervisor who is notified of or becomes aware of an alleged violation of this policy must immediately report the information to the CHROChief Human Resource Officer.

3.5 Investigation and Discipline.

(a) The matter will be investigated and if a policy violation occurred, the University may take disciplinary action, which may include termination.

If there is a complaint of sexual harassment about a relationship covered by Sec. 3.1, above, and the relationship has not been disclosed and a management plan implemented, the burden shall be on the supervisor to explain the failure to comply with this policy and such failure will be a factor in determining whether the relationship was consensual and free of sexual harassment. Allegations of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct (and any associated retaliation) may also be subject to investigation in accordance with applicable University policy.
(b) Disciplinary action will be handled under the University’s policies for discipline and dismissal of faculty or employees depending on the supervisor’s status.

3.6 Campus Culture. The CHROChief Human Resource Officer is responsible for the following:

(a) Disseminating the University Consensual Relationship Policy; developing annual workshops or presentations for faculty members, employees, and students that educate the campus community about this Policy;

(b) The Provost and the CHROChief Human Resource Officer are responsible for the following:

(1) appointing respected faculty and staff members to promote the institutional stance against inappropriate employee/student relationships and to lead the University’s effort to maintain this culture;

(2) organizing meetings of campus administrators, faculty leadership and student leadership to discuss the importance of establishing a climate in which consensual relationships between employees and students are unacceptable;

(3) providing instruction to students during orientation to reinforce:

(i.) the student’s responsibility in avoiding consensual relationships, and

(ii.) helping students understand the collateral damage that can result when such relationships occur.

3.7 Retaliation Prohibited. Retaliation of any kind against anyone for reporting a consensual relationship or for participating in any proceeding pursuant to this Policy is prohibited.

3.8 Counseling. Confidential counseling services are available to employees through the Employee Assistance Program provided by UT Southwestern and may be reached by calling 800-386-9156 or 214-648-5330 or by email at eap@utsouthwestern.edu. Counseling services are available to students through the Student Counseling Center located in the Student Services Building suite 4,600. The 24 hour phone line is 972-883-2575 and the website is http://www.utdallas.edu/counseling/.

4. Definitions

Consensual Relationship – a romantic, dating, and/or sexual relationship agreed to by the parties involved.

Direct authority – The authority vested in an individual as a result of his/her immediate position of power over another. Examples include, but are not limited to: supervisor - supervised employee; faculty - enrolled student; faculty committee member - student submitting thesis; faculty mentor – student mentee; coach - coached athlete; Dean - supervised faculty.

Indirect Authority – Authority derived from an informal or indirect relationship which allows for determinations or evaluations affecting the terms and conditions of employment or student status.
Examples include, but are not limited to: a student majoring in a particular field who would still be indirectly under the control or influence of a senior professor or individual in the department or school; an employee in the same organizational unit who is under the indirect control of all more senior individuals in the department; a graduate teaching assistant and a non-supervising department faculty member.

Management plan – A written plan developed as provided in this policy that mitigates the conflict and is acknowledged and signed by both parties.

Supervisor – A University faculty member or employee who has direct or indirect supervisory, teaching, evaluation or advisory authority over an employee or student.

Supervisee – Any person whose terms and conditions of employment or student status are directly or indirectly controlled or affected by a supervisor.

5. Relevant Federal and/or State Statute(s), Board of Regents’ Rule(s), UTS Policy(ies), and/or Coordinating Board Rule(s)/UT Dallas Policies

- University of Texas System Systemwide Policy, UTS 184 Consensual Relationships
- University of Texas System Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 30105


UT Dallas Nondiscrimination Policy - UTDBP3090
UT Dallas Sexual Harassment Policy - UTDBP3048
UT Dallas Human Resources Section - UTDBP3044

6. Resources:
Questions regarding this policy should be directed to the Chief Human Resource Officer.
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CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS POLICY

1. Purpose

The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to maintaining learning and work environments as free as possible from conflicts of interest and favoritism. The University recognizes that two consenting adults should be free to conduct a personal relationship if they so wish when the relationship does not interfere with the goals and policies of the University; some romantic, dating and/or sexual relationships, although consensual, do create conflicts of interests. This policy addresses those consensual relationships.

2. Persons Affected

This policy applies to all University administrators, faculty, staff, and students. This policy is applicable regardless of the gender of the University employee with supervisory teaching, evaluation or advisory authority and/or the gender of the employee, student or student employee who is directly or indirectly supervised, taught, evaluated, or advised by the supervisory employee.

3. Policy

3.1 Prohibited Consensual Relationships. The following consensual relationships, even if a single event, are prohibited:

(a) A consensual relationship between a supervisor (as defined below and is defined as including faculty members) and supervisee regardless of whether the supervisory relationship is direct or indirect, unless the supervisor discloses the relationship in advance and a management plan is in effect;

(b) A consensual relationship between a coach or athletic staff and any student athlete or student assigned to or associated with the athletics department, such as interns and student employees, including any coach or student associated with an intellectual competition team, unless waived by the President or his or her designee for good cause. This prohibition does not apply to a student assistant coach who serves on a voluntary basis unless the student assistant coach has direct or indirect authority, including the appearance of such authority, over a student or student athlete assigned to or associated with the athletics department.

If the prohibition is waived, a management plan must be submitted.

3.2 Reporting Requirements.

(a) The supervisor must report a consensual relationship as described in 3.1. to the Dean/Vice President/Executive-level administrator and the Chief Human Resource Officer (CHRO). The supervisor must make the report prior to entering into the relationship or if the relationship exists, with as much advance notice as possible prior to the supervisor accepting supervisory authority.
(b) The individuals receiving the report must immediately collaborate to attempt to manage the conflict of interest. If management of the conflict is not possible, the relationship is prohibited.

3.3 Management plan.

(a) If the conflict can be managed, the CHRO will provide a management plan to the supervisor within seven (7) business days of the report unless there are reasonable grounds for additional time. A consensual relationship may not exist until the management plan is in effect.

(b) A management plan will:

1. provide an alternative means for the supervision, teaching, advising, evaluation of the supervisee or otherwise mitigate the conflict;

2. give priority to the interest of the subordinate individual;

3. be written;

4. be acknowledged and signed by the parties to the relationship; and

5. be maintained by the Office of Human Resources

3.4 Reporting Alleged Violations.

(a) Violations of this policy should be reported to the CHRO.

(b) An individual in a supervisory role over a supervisor who is notified of or becomes aware of an alleged violation of this policy must immediately report the information to the CHRO.

3.5 Investigation and Discipline.

(a) The matter will be investigated and if a policy violation occurred, the University may take disciplinary action, which may include termination.

If there is a complaint of sexual harassment about a relationship covered by Sec. 3.1, above, and the relationship has not been disclosed and a management plan implemented, the burden shall be on the supervisor to explain the failure to comply with this policy and such failure will be a factor in determining whether the relationship was consensual and free of sexual harassment. Allegations of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct (and any associated retaliation) may also be subject to investigation in accordance with applicable University policy.

(b) Disciplinary action will be handled under the University’s policies for discipline and dismissal of faculty or employees depending on the supervisor’s status.

3.6 Campus Culture. The CHRO is responsible for the following:
(a) Disseminating the University Consensual Relationship Policy; developing annual workshops or presentations for faculty members, employees, and students that educate the campus community about this Policy;

(b) The Provost and the CHRO are responsible for the following:

(1) appointing respected faculty and staff members to promote the institutional stance against inappropriate employee/student relationships and to lead the University's effort to maintain this culture;

(2) organizing meetings of campus administrators, faculty leadership and student leadership to discuss the importance of establishing a climate in which consensual relationships between employees and students are unacceptable;

(3) providing instruction to students during orientation to reinforce:

   (i.) the student's responsibility in avoiding consensual relationships, and

   (ii.) helping students understand the collateral damage that can result when such relationships occur.

3.7 Retaliation Prohibited. Retaliation of any kind against anyone for reporting a consensual relationship or for participating in any proceeding pursuant to this Policy is prohibited.

3.8 Counseling. Confidential counseling services are available to employees through the Employee Assistance Program provided by UT Southwestern and may be reached by calling 800-386-9156 or 214-648-5330 or by email at eap@utsouthwestern.edu. Counseling services are available to students through the Student Counseling Center located in the Student Services Building suite 4.600. The 24 hour phone line is 972-883-2575 and the website is http://www.utdallas.edu/counseling/.

4. Definitions

Consensual Relationship – a romantic, dating, and/or sexual relationship agreed to by the parties involved.

Direct authority – The authority vested in an individual as a result of his/her immediate position of power over another. Examples include, but are not limited to: supervisor - supervised employee; faculty - enrolled student; faculty committee member - student submitting thesis; faculty mentor – student mentee; coach - coached athlete; Dean - supervised faculty.

Indirect Authority – Authority derived from an informal or indirect relationship which allows for determinations or evaluations affecting the terms and conditions of employment or student status. Examples include, but are not limited to: a student majoring in a particular field who would still be indirectly under the control or influence of a senior professor or individual in the department or school; an employee in the same organizational unit who is under the indirect control of all more senior individuals in the department; a graduate teaching assistant and a non-supervising department faculty member.
Management plan – A written plan developed as provided in this policy that mitigates the conflict and is acknowledged and signed by both parties.

Supervisor – A University faculty member or employee who has direct or indirect supervisory, teaching, evaluation or advisory authority over an employee or student.

Supervisee – Any person whose terms and conditions of employment or student status are directly or indirectly controlled or affected by a supervisor.

5. Relevant Federal and/or State Statute(s), Board of Regents’ Rule(s), UTS Policy(ies), and/or Coordinating Board Rule(s)/UT Dallas Policies

- University of Texas System Systemwide Policy, UTS 184 Consensual Relationships
- University of Texas System Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 30105
- UT Dallas Nondiscrimination Policy - UTDBP3090
- UT Dallas Sexual Harassment Policy - UTDBP3048
- UT Dallas Human Resources Section - UTDBP3044

6. Resources:
Questions regarding this policy should be directed to the Chief Human Resource Officer.

Policy History:
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Findings and Recommendations
The University of Texas System
Task Force on Employee/Student Relationships

I. Introduction

Sexual misconduct at colleges and universities has garnered a great deal of attention over the past few years, from the media, the federal government, concerned citizens and the schools themselves. The U.S. Department of Education Dear Colleague letter in 2011, which announced new requirements for colleges and universities related to allegations of sexual harassment and sexual violence, precipitated much dialogue and change to institutional policies. The University of Texas System responded at the time with improved reporting guidelines and more stringent model policies. Further, after the sexual assaults and subsequent reporting failures at Pennsylvania State University, U. T. System implemented new reporting mechanisms for all significant events. Indeed, the issues of sexual assault and sexual harassment have been a driving force for policy changes and opening dialogue on these critical matters on campuses across the country. While this Task Force has found several areas for change and improvement, it recognized that attention should be paid to another challenging type of relationships—those that are, either initially or by appearance, consensual.

Intense personal relationships develop in the university environment, often grounded in unequal power, age differentials, and students’ desire for approval. What may begin as a seemingly consensual relationship can quickly transform into a sexual harassment complaint from the student. Consider the following:

- A 2001 survey of undergraduate students found that 40% of women and 28% of men had perceived that they had been sexually harassed by a college professor or instructor.
- Women in the traditional college-age range are four times more likely to be sexually assaulted or sexually coerced than those in any other age group, and women in college are at greater risk than their non-college-bound peers.

---

1 The U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights “Dear Colleague” letter on Title IX and Sexual Violence, April 4, 2011
2 See University of Texas System Policy 178
Since sexually coercive relationships are often about power dynamics, historically disempowered groups such as ethnic minorities and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) populations may be particularly vulnerable to these types of relationships and less likely to report them as well.

Short and long term effects of sexually coercive relationships include depression, anxiety, alcohol and drug abuse, and post-traumatic stress disorder.  

These cases are unfortunate, sometimes tragic, as individual careers and lives are impacted. Most certainly, these cases adversely influence the learning environment, not only for those directly involved, but for all members of the university community.

Professional organizations all have recommendations cautioning and/or prohibiting relationships between their members and students, and it is important for the institutions to be vigilant in protecting students and the learning environment. To that end, The University of Texas System is leading an effort to develop rules and procedures that are fair to all involved and, ultimately, that protect students and the university community.

As a result, in March 2013, The University of Texas Board of Regents initiated a task force, chaired by Vice Chairman Paul Foster, to examine policies and processes related to employee/student relationships across the U. T. System and to make recommendations for needed changes at the System and campus level.

Task Force Charge

"Board of Regents Vice Chairman Paul Foster will lead a committee to review and make recommendations to the Chancellor and Board of Regents on the issues surrounding inappropriate relationships between U. T. employees and students across all 15 institutions. The review group is charged to look at all existing programs directed at preventing such inappropriate relationships and shall include the issues of preventing and addressing sexual abuse, sexual harassment, sexual misconduct and other inappropriate relationships to ensure a safe, healthy environment for students.

This committee should address current campus practices and attitudes surrounding these topics and identify ways to create a culture of no tolerance for inappropriate relationships with students or staff. It should review policies and practices across the 15 institutions of the U. T. System, including how allegations of sexual misconduct between employees and students - specifically between faculty and students and between athletic professionals (including coaches) and student-athletes, student volunteers or student employees - have been handled over the past five years.

---

The committee will look at best practices across the country and work to define prohibited behavior in a clear and unambiguous way as necessary to create meaningful and well-designed model policies. The committee may involve national experts in the related fields to help understand the full range of issues and problems related to such conduct and its impact on student health and safety.

Inclusive in this task will be a review of best educational efforts for both students and employees. As keys to prevention, such things as awareness, training, support, and annual acknowledgments and commitments to the highest integrity should be considered.

Finally, the committee will look to enforcement practices, which might include mechanisms to require, encourage and ensure reporting, how investigations are conducted, compliance with policies, and, ultimately, how appropriate disciplinary actions are best determined and imposed.

The committee has been asked to provide an interim report in May 2013 with a goal to provide final report and policy recommendations to the Board in August 2013.”

After preliminary discussion, the consensus of the task force membership was to develop a policy and educational program that can be a model, pro-active guide for other institutions across the country.

Task Force Membership

The Task Force membership covered a range of campuses and included student and faculty representatives, administrators from both academic and health institutions, along with the U. T. System campus presidents, athletics representatives, and experts from outside the U. T. System:

**Paul L. Foster, Task Force Chairman**
Vice Chairman
The University of Texas Board of Regents

**Ashley Purgason, Student Regent (2012-13)**
The University of Texas Board of Regents

**Dr. Kirk Calhoun, President**
U. T. Health Science Center - Tyler

**Dr. Robert S. Nelsen, President**
U. T. Pan American

**J. Tullos Wells, Attorney**
Bracewell & Giuliani
Elizabeth Heise, Assistant Professor  
The University of Texas at Brownsville

Ms. Lynn Hickey, Director of Athletics  
The University of Texas - San Antonio

Dr. Gage Paine, Vice President for Student Affairs  
The University of Texas at Austin

Jacqueline Rochelle, Manager, Equal Employment Opportunity  
The University of Texas M. D. Anderson Cancer Center

Dr. James Wagner, Associate Dean for Student Affairs  
The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center

Ms. Helen Bright, Managing Attorney  
The University of Texas System

Dr. Wanda Mercer, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs  
The University of Texas System

Ms. Kristy Orr, Assistant General Counsel to the Board of Regents  
The University of Texas System

Mr. Dan Sharphorn, General Counsel (ad interim)  
The University of Texas System

Dr. Francisco Cigarroa, Chancellor  
The University of Texas System

Process

The Task Force met four times for three hours from April through August 2013, along with meetings of several subgroups.

Task Force members were provided extensive background materials including current U. T. System OGC model policies, U. T. institution policies, federal government directives including the Dear Colleague letter, Clery Act documents and SaVE Act documents, sample policies from other universities, the Yale Campus Climate Report, and the NCAA Guidelines and Model Policy. Many of these documents were reviewed and referenced in the early work of the Task Force.
The U. T. System solicited feedback from the U. T. System Student Advisory Council, Faculty Advisory Council, senior student affairs officers at U. T. System institutions, and EEO officers. Their concerns and perspective were presented at the initial meeting of the Task Force.

The Task Force invited experts to present issues and recommendations to the group:

- Melinda Grier, an attorney and nationally recognized expert in sexual harassment and sexual misconduct, who led a discussion on changing policies and attitudes related to consensual relationships.

- Janet Duckerich, Professor, McCombs School of Business, presented ideas to change institutional organizational culture.

- Gage Paine, Vice President for Student Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin, presented models of coordinating conduct issues between athletics’ offices and student conduct offices.

The task force also reviewed facts surrounding recent UT System cases to determine the magnitude and nature of typical complaints on a week-to-week basis.

Finally, the task force extensively discussed the background information, the feedback and the expert testimony in order to develop the recommendations included in this report.

II. Recommendations for Policy Change

1. Recommendation: A careful review of sexual harassment and assault policies should be conducted to ensure full institutional compliance.

Scrutiny on sexual harassment and assault policies and the subsequent treatment of victims by colleges has recently increased. Complaints have sparked investigations at several universities by the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights.

As noted earlier, U. T. System has already taken strides to create a safer environment for students, faculty, and staff by tightening up policies related to sexual assault and harassment. However, a systematic review of U. T. System institutional policies has not been conducted since the Office of General Counsel published new model sexual harassment policies and procedures in 2012 in response to the 2011 Office of Civil Rights Dear Colleague Letter and other emerging legal issues, including the proper handling of allegations of sexual assault. The Task Force therefore recommends that the Office of the General Counsel undertake a review of compliance with these provisions as well as with any new policies adopted in response to this report and provide a report to the Chancellor no later than March, 2014.
2. **Recommendation:** The central elements of the consensual relationships policy at each U.T. institution, including the definition of what is prohibited, should be the same for all institutions.

There is no single consensual sexual relationships policy across U.T. System institutions. In fact, the Task Force found that the types of policies and definitions of key terms are quite varied. Additionally, while several institutions acknowledge the potential complications that may arise from a consensual relationship in the workplace, many have no clear prohibitions against such relationships.

To ensure adherence to System expectations, and to enhance the ability to change culture in the area, this Task Force finds that the key elements of the policy and central definition of what is prohibited should be the same System-wide. Some variation in procedures will be appropriate, and, as discussed in greater detail later, certain units within an institution may require more stringent policies. Further, each policy should be included in the institution’s Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOPs) after thorough review by the U.T. System Office of General Counsel to ensure compliance with System rules, standards, and state and federal law, and approval by the appropriate Executive Vice Chancellor.

3. **Recommendation:** A consensual relationships policy should not merely discourage inappropriate relationships, it should prohibit them, unless they are disclosed and the conflict can be mitigated.

The Task Force has identified three basic types of policies across academe:

(1) A consensual sexual relationship between a faculty member and a student or between a supervisor and a supervisee is discouraged, usually strongly discouraged.
(2) Any consensual sexual relationship between a faculty member and a student or between a supervisor and a supervisee is prohibited; and
(3) A consensual sexual relationship between a faculty member and a student or between a supervisor and a supervisee is prohibited unless it has been disclosed and any conflict mitigated.

The Task Force finds that the first type of policy, in which relationships are merely discouraged, even strongly discouraged, is inconsistent with U.T. System values and insufficient to attain the goals of creating a safe environment for students and staff and should not be adopted.

A blanket prohibition across a university is not deemed reasonable. It is not inappropriate for a faculty member or supervisor to have a relationship, even a familial one, with a student or subordinate employee who is in no way under the supervision or control of the faculty member or supervisor.

The Task Force recommends a policy that prohibits a consensual sexual relationship between a faculty member and a student or between a supervisor and a supervisee, unless
the relationship has been disclosed and any conflict mitigated, if possible. This is consistent with U.T. System rules on nepotism (Regents’ Rule 30106). If mitigation is not possible, the relationship must be prohibited.

5. **Recommendation: The consensual relationships policy should permit institutions to develop and adopt more stringent policies for units and programs where mitigation is not possible.**

There may be certain contexts where disclosing the relationship and mitigation of the disclosed relationship is not appropriate or not possible. For example, one of the parties changing offices can, in some circumstances, mitigate a supervisor-supervisee relationship. A faculty member changing to a class other than the one the student is in may mitigate a faculty member-student relationship. There may, however, be situations where a teaching assignment or mentor-mentee relationship or a supervisor-supervisee relationship cannot be changed in a way that the conflict can be managed. An example of this can be found in athletics when a head coach of an athletic team in a relationship with one of the athletes on the team is virtually impossible to mitigate. This might also be the case with a faculty member and a graduate or professional school student who is wholly dependent on the faculty member for his or her graduate research. In such cases, the relationship must be prohibited, as no notice or management plan can cure it.

This Task Force also emphasizes the critical and primary concern of protecting the student at all times. Remedies, including mitigation, should look first to the best interests of the student. Mitigation should only be implemented when it does not cause further harm to a student.

6. **Recommendation: The consensual relationships policy should require mitigation plans to be documented.**

The Task Force believes it is important that any mitigation plan be reduced to writing by the university official with overall supervisory responsibility for individuals involved and by both parties. It must be clear that the agreement is fully understood by all parties.

7. **Recommendation: The consensual relationships policy should address the impact of “indirect authority” on these imbalanced relationships.**

After review of different types of consensual relationship policies, it is clear that a common practice has been to ban only relationships where there is a direct reporting or supervising relationship, as in the “direct” supervision of an employee, a mentee, or a student. This Task Force has found that such a policy does not address relationships that should be of concern in creating an appropriate and safe environment. For example, such a policy does not address a student majoring in a particular field who would still be indirectly under the control or influence of a senior professor in the department or school, or an employee in the same organizational unit who is under the indirect control of all more senior individuals in the unit. Thus, the prohibition and mitigation requirements must be
expanded to cover these “indirect authority” relationships, as well as the direct ones and the policy should include definitions and examples of “direct” and “indirect” authority.

8. **Recommendation:** The concept of “consensual sexual relationships” in the consensual relationships policy should be expanded to include “romance and dating.”

In reviewing U.T. System policies and experiences, as well as policies elsewhere, the Task Force concluded that limiting the “consensual sexual relationships” policy to “sexual” relationships did not cover the full range of concerns. It was found, for example, that the NCAA model policy employs the definition “Amorous Relationship: Any sexual, romantic, or dating relationship.” (Staying in Bounds. An NCAA Model Policy to Prevent Inappropriate Relationships Between Student-Athletes and Athletics Department Personnel" Deborah L. Brake, J.D. and Mariah Burton Nelson, MPH, CAE, page 36.) Similar language has been found at a few other universities. In terms of the concerns attendant to consensual relationships between supervisors and supervisees or faculty and students, e.g. conflicts of interest, favoritism, and abuse of power, the relationship need not be sexual for the concern to be present. Thus, the policy should be expanded to include such relationships.

9. **Recommendation:** The U.T. System Office of General Counsel should provide guidance and monitor the handling of and any sanctions imposed for violations of consensual relations policies or sexual harassment policies to ensure reasonable consistency across System institutions.

While acknowledging and respecting differences among U. T. System institutions, the Task Force believes that it is important for there to be reasonable consistency in how cases of sexual harassment or inappropriate relationships between faculty and students or supervisors and supervisees are treated. Therefore, the General Counsel should be tasked with responsibility for providing guidance and monitoring the handling of these cases.

10. **Recommendation:** Athletic Departments should be required to adopt more stringent consensual relationships policies.

It is the Task Force’s view that the nature of the coach-athlete relationship, as well as other relationships between student athletes and athletic department staff, can be and usually is closer and more intense than other faculty-student or supervisor-supervisee relationships. And it will always be the case that there is no means for the student-athlete to avoid that relationship short of leaving the team. To address this concern, the Task Force recommends that the Office of General Counsel, working with student affairs offices and athletic directors, develop a model policy for athletic departments that is more stringent than the general policy. While the Task Force recognizes that small differences and some flexibility for change may be necessary, the group has identified the NCAA policy as an appropriate model for all campuses, which includes, for example, the expanded definition of sexual relationships to amorous relationships mentioned above and a strict prohibition against such relationships anywhere within an athletic department.
11. Recommendation: The consensual relationships policy should place the burden on the supervisor or faculty member if he or she was having an inappropriate relationship with a supervisee or student and the supervisee or student alleges sexual harassment.

This recommendation stems from the not uncommon occurrence wherein a student or employee complains about a relationship that is currently, or was previously, claimed to be consensual by either or both parties. In numerous identified instances, a student or supervisee becomes uncomfortable with what has happened, and comes to believe that the relationship was not actually consensual. There may have been pressure, indirect or otherwise, to enter or continue the relationship. In such cases, both the sexual harassment policy and consensual relations policy may be invoked. With respect to a sexual harassment charge, some policies explicitly state that the university will be unsympathetic to a defense that the relationship was consensual if the student or supervisee alleges it was not consensual and files a sexual harassment complaint. The Task Force recommends that, in such cases, unless the supervisor had disclosed the relationship and a management plan implemented, the burden will be on the supervisor or faculty member to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the relationship was consensual.

12. Recommendation: A procedure should be developed for allowing the suspension of individuals during investigations of alleged violations of the consensual relationships or sexual harassment policy.

There are instances in which an individual accused of an inappropriate relationship or sexual harassment should be suspended during investigation and adjudication of the allegation. The general standard for such suspension is imminent threat to person or property. After reviewing different fact scenarios, the Task Force concluded that automatic suspension in all cases is not appropriate. Thus, it is recommended that the procedures for handling inappropriate relationship and sexual harassment cases include a process for promptly reviewing an allegation, providing the accused with required due process, taking into account the impact on all parties, and making a decision as to whether the individual should be suspended pending completion of the investigation and final adjudication.

13. Recommendation: Guidelines should be provided to ensure robust reference checking and hiring practices.

The Task Force was apprised of the too common problem in academe where a faculty, staff member or coach who engaged in sexual harassment, or other misconduct, leaves one university and is able to find a job at another. At one end of this move, reference and background checking is inadequate. At the other end, institutions are often advised by their attorneys to be cautious when responding to reference requests so that the institution is not sued for defamation or tortious interference with an employment opportunity. This can be a particular problem when the individual resigns before the institution’s investigation and adjudication process is complete, because then there is no formal record of the misconduct.
The Task Force recommends that guidance be given to institutions to ensure that thorough background checks are completed on all job candidates, particularly faculty, coaches and senior staff. Consideration should be given to requiring that such candidates request their current, and any significant former, employers provide certification that there have been no established incidents of misconduct and no discipline for any behavior, and that there are no unresolved allegations of misconduct.

The Task Force further recommends that when a faculty member, coach, or senior staff leaves the university after a finding of misconduct or while an allegation of misconduct is open, the university’s official employment record so indicate and that the university makes it clear that such record will be shared with any future employer who requests it.

14. **Recommendation:** Student discipline policies and procedures should make it clear that all allegations of misconduct by student athletes are to be reported through the appropriate channels within each institution, as well as to the athletic department.

Student athletes are members of multiple communities. They are members of their teams, but also of the larger academic community and the community beyond their university. They also may be members of other communities within the university, such as a residence hall. Misconduct, be it sexual harassment or other misconduct, may subject a student athlete to discipline by all communities to which he or she belongs, depending on the behavior and its nexus to each community. Thus, a violation of a team rule, such as missing a practice, may only implicate the student athlete’s membership on the team and may very well only lead to discipline by the athletic department, while other misconduct, including conduct off campus, may lead to discipline by the athletic department, but also by the appropriate office responsible for all student discipline matters, and even by the criminal justice system in some cases.

15. **Recommendation:** Ensure the availability of counseling services for individuals concerned about inappropriate consensual relationships or sexual harassment.

It is widely recognized that it is important for students and faculty/employees to have a place where they can get advice about sexual harassment, sexual assault, and consensual relationship concerns without triggering an institutional response, such as an investigation. On the other hand, institutional officials may have a duty to take action, if only to forward to the appropriate offices, any report of a violation of relevant policies or laws. The Task Force recommends that steps be taken to ensure each institution has widely known, readily available, and well-trained officials who can provide faculty/employees, and particularly students, confidential advice on sexual harassment, sexual assault, and consensual sexual relations concerns and the policies and procedures that apply to such concerns. This should include reviewing the confidentiality of various institutional ombudsmen offices, and proposing policy changes where necessary.
III. **Recommendations for Culture Change**

1. **Recommendation: Change the status quo and start with leadership.**

This Task Force heard from several experts, and read numerous studies that all lead to the same conclusion: in order to change the campus culture it is important to create discomfort with the status quo. Creating this discomfort involves targeting specific groups with a clear message, creating a context with specific cases and stories, and appropriately supporting those who make reports with quick and focused action. In the campus environment, changing the climate involves influencing the attitudes, beliefs, and actions of four specific, but related, groups: faculty, staff, and students, along with those in all three categories who are part of athletics. We have identified specific recommendations for each below, but first recognize that culture change must start with leadership.

It is extremely important to initiate the support of campus presidents and provosts to support a strong policy that severely restricts consensual relationships between employees and students and that creates a culture where these behaviors are unacceptable. Provosts should exercise their leadership with academic deans. Also, a clear message must be sent that consensual relationships are generally unacceptable and faculty members will be held accountable for inappropriate relationships. This message should be communicated in a variety of settings throughout the year so it is understood as a priority.

2. **Recommendation: Identify campus champion(s) and seek support of campus opinion leaders.**

Faculty members are the most influential members of a campus community. Not only do they hold significant power over students, these individuals are often revered for their ability and knowledge and the prestige they bring to the institution from their teaching, writing, and research. Some are even “stars”. In order to change the campus climate related to consensual relationships between employees and students, faculty members must support the initiative.

A campus champion is an articulate and respected faculty member who feels passionately about the institutional stance against inappropriate employee/student relationships and who can lead the campus effort, especially among the faculty.

Campus opinion leaders are an excellent resource in developing initiatives specific to the campus and suggesting support mechanisms to support the change in campus attitude. By position and by persona, these faculty members can provide tremendous assistance in developing understanding of the issue and the legitimacy of the institution’s stance in opposition.

3. **Recommendation: Engage the Faculty Advisory Council.**

Campus leaders should meet early and often with the campus faculty groups to help these representatives understand the importance and priority of establishing a climate in which
consensual relationships between employees and students are unacceptable. It is important to initiate the input of these faculty members in how to impact specific departments and programs and how to make reporting acceptable and less complicated.

System leadership should request support from the U. T. System Faculty Advisory Council in emphasizing the importance of discouraging inappropriate employee/student relationships as a priority and developing recommendations that might assist the campus in gaining support for policy and campus climate change.

4. **Recommendation: Develop a workshop or presentation for faculty members that:**

   1. Emphasizes the campus’ core values.
   2. Is persuasive and factual.
   3. Provides individual stories and cases which demonstrate the damage that can result to student and faculty members alike.
   4. Provides data that illustrates the frequency of reported cases.
   5. Provides policy information.
   6. Emphasizes collateral damage to faculty members and students.
   7. Allows open and frank discussion.

5. **Recommendation: Change student culture by reinforcing student responsibility and by helping students understand collateral damage.**

   It is especially important for students to understand the values of the institution that they have entered and campuses should make extraordinary effort to communicate these values to beginning and transfer students, and to reinforce them for students at all levels. In communicating these values, it is an ideal time to address the issue of consensual employee/student relationships. Therefore, campuses should selectively use the variety of opportunities available as undergraduate and graduate students are welcomed, oriented and introduced to the campus to reinforce (1) the student’s responsibility in avoiding these relationships, along with (2) helping students understand the collateral damage that can result when such relationships occur. These two concepts are at the heart of helping students to see their important role in eliminating these inappropriate relationships.

6. **Recommendation: Raise awareness with students through presentations and workshops.**

   As with faculty, it is extremely helpful to have a presentation or workshop that could be employed to develop a discussion with all variety of student groups, formal and informal: residence hall students, Greeks, academic organizations and honor societies, ROTC, band, intramurals, student athletes, and student governments, as examples. These presentations can educate, raise awareness and provide a context for the importance of the policies. They also help to create personal responsibility among student participants, so that an environment of no tolerance is created.
7. **Recommendation: Engage student leadership and upperclassmen.**

It is very important to employ student leaders in efforts to understand and publicize the policy, develop initiatives to reinforce it among students, and to determine mechanisms for student reporting. Certainly, these student leaders should represent a broad spectrum of student groups from across the university.

With beginning students, upperclassmen can be a positive and powerful influence. If support and adherence to this no tolerance policy is important to their upperclass peers, those new to the campus are much more likely to adopt these values.

Consistent effort should be made to acquaint transfer students with the campus values, the institutional stance regarding employee/student consensual relationships, and the student’s role in avoiding and reporting them.

8. **Recommendation: Develop a clear message and reinforce it.**

Students, in conjunction with faculty and staff, should consider creating an honor pledge, which reinforces integrity in every aspect of campus life. Honor pledges are extremely valuable, as they are posted, repeated and acknowledged, and can serve in an important value-laden guide to behavior at the campus.

A consistent and constant message, whether it is an honor pledge or a simple slogan, should employ all campus media, especially social media.

Also, institutions should develop a readily accessible webpage specific to the campus which provides the policy, processes, resources, key personnel, frequently asked questions, and other information students may need. Institutions should use social networking to reinforce the message and reference this information.

In order to fully initiate the media campaign to students, campus officials should identify a staff member who will be responsible for this initiative. It is important to understand that these communications and strategies are not a one-time initiative, but involve repeated and varied messages and mechanisms throughout the year. Attention at this level is unlikely unless it is someone's assigned responsibility.

9. **Recommendation: Engage the Student Advisory Council.**

Institutions should request the assistance of the U. T. System Student Advisory Council to reinforce, as a priority, a culture of no tolerance of sexual harassment or consensual relationships between employees and student. University officials should seek the students’ guidance on messaging, initiatives and culture change on the campuses.

10. **Recommendation: Engage all staff members at the institutions.**
Campus staff members frequently form close relationships with students they supervise and students often approach individual staff members to lodge complaints, to confide about problems, or to seek advice. It is very important to engage staff members to understand and support the campus approach of no tolerance for sexual harassment or consensual relationships between employees and students. Staff members must be keenly involved in helping to educate students and in overseeing the important messaging that needs to be implemented.

The presentation and/or workshop to be developed will be equally useful in educating staff members across the university. It is particularly difficult for a staff member to report a person of greater perceived power, so understanding the priority of this new policy initiative will be important in gaining staff support. In addition, staff members are sometimes in a powerful role and can become involved in relationships with students, as well, so the campus position and the consequences need to be very clear.

It would be advisable to identify a campus champion among the staff members who could work in conjunction with the faculty champion on marketing and initiatives. This type of solidarity can be very helpful in reinforcing the important priority of the campus no tolerance policy.

11. Recommendation: Engage each campus’s Staff Council and Student Governments.

It is important to initiate the support of the campus’ Staff Council and student governments, so that these key administrators know and understand the consensual relationship policy and implications. Again, these key staff members can help in increasing awareness across the institution and in engaging the support of colleagues.

12. Recommendation: Recognize the unique sets of challenges in campus athletic departments, and adjust policy and culture initiatives accordingly.

Because of the nature of relationships in the Athletic Department and because of the students’ increased vulnerability in the power relationship, the Task Force has recommended a stricter policy for students and employees of any athletic program. As a result, special attention is required in training, processes and support systems related to consensual employee/student relationships in Athletics.

Ideally, the strategic plan in the Athletic Department includes values of importance in the program and any conversation with prospective athletes or coaches should be grounded in those values. The integrity of any program should include references that prohibit employee/student relationships and that should be clear from the initial contact.

Coaches’ contracts should include language that specifically prohibits consensual relationships with any athlete with the consequence of termination noted as the likely result. This standard can be repeated in meetings or in-service programs or speakers to the coaches and reinforced as presentations are provided for student athletes.
The policy prohibiting consensual relationships between employees and students should be clearly stated in the Athlete’s Handbook along with resource people, processes and references to web-based materials.

A campus resource person, outside the Athletic Department, should be available for coaches and athletes to respond to any concerns, including policy, process and interpretation. This person’s name should be included on student athlete reference cards or materials.

IV. Moving Forward

Once implemented, the recommendations developed by this Task Force and set forth in this report will create a safer environment for students and employees across U. T. System. Ongoing support at all levels is crucial to the success, however, and this group recommends that follow-up should be done on an annual basis at the System level to ensure change in both policy and culture.
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Policy Statement

Preamble

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

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

Standards of Evaluation

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

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

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

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

Procedures

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Review of Files**

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

**Right to View Files**

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

**Opportunities**

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

**Grievance and Appeal**

Faculty grievance procedures which apply to tenure-system and nontenure-system faculty are specified at [http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdp1050](http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdp1050).
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Policy Statement

Preamble

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

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

Standards of Evaluation

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

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

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

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

Procedures

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

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

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

5. Teaching Evaluation. Each School should establish or designate a committee to review and provide advice on the teaching performance of nontenure-system faculty. This evaluation may be assigned to the School Committee on Effective Teaching. For this purpose, the committee should include an appropriate number of nontenure-system faculty members, depending on their number in the School. A School Committee on Effective Teaching is mandated by POLICY MEMORANDUM 96 III 21 70, which requires in part:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Review of Files**

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

**Right to View Files**

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

**Opportunities**

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

**Grievance and Appeal**

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

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

**Policy History**

- Issued: June 9, 2008

**Policy Links**

- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1062
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1062
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1062
Item 13:
Legislative Session
Summary
84th Legislative Summary

As a System, we analyzed over 2,600 bills, creating over 10,000 analyses. At UT Dallas, we analyzed over 360 higher-education related bills, creating over 1,200 analyses.

**State**
General Appropriations Act authorized a 3.6% increase over the previous biennium for a total of $209.4 billion. 51% is general revenue (GR).
Supplemental Appropriations bill appropriates $12.7 million (GR) in special item funding for UT System institutions. No rainy day fund used for this biennium.

**Higher Education**
$14.7 billion in GR. This figure includes amounts for employee benefits. This is an increase of $1.4 billion in GR or 10.6% increase from the previous biennium.

**UT System**
$3.6 billion in GR. This is an increase of 7.8% over the previous biennium. $1.7B is for the general academic institutions.

**UT Dallas**
$3.2 million increase in GR, but an overall $31 million increase in all funds for the biennium.

**Formula Funding**
Rate per weighted semester credit hour increased from $54.86 to $55.39 for instruction and operations.
Rate per predicted square foot increased from $5.56 to $5.62 for the infrastructure formula.

**Tuition Revenue Bonds**
Authorized capital construction projects at 64 campuses, including $70M toward UT Dallas’ $110M engineering building.

**Texas Research Incentive Program (TRIP)**
$138.1 million is appropriated for emerging research institutions for the Texas Research Incentive Program of which $40 million will come to UT Dallas to match private donations for research already received. This was a $68.1M increase over funds allocated last Session.

**Research Funding**
New classification of research funds into three distinct funds; $117.1m for core research support fund in which UT Dallas is included. Represented a $1M increase in core research funding to UT Dallas.

**Governor's University Research Initiative**
$40M appropriations to attract Nobel Laureates and National Academy Members to Texas public universities.
**National Research University Fund (NRUF)**

$61.1M appropriations. UT Dallas must meet certain benchmarks before participating in this fund. Expected participation in FY 2018.

**Special Item Funding**

UT Dallas received an additional special item funding of $1M/biennium for the Academic Bridge Program

**Hazlewood, TEOG, Vetoes**

**Bills:**

**Admissions:**

**SB 1543:** Students with nontraditional secondary education (including home school and nonaccredited private school) are admitted based on the same standards as students who graduated from a public high school, *including specific standardized testing requirements*. This applies to students for the fall 2016 semester.

**Financial Aid:**

**HB 700:** Abolishes Texas B-on-Time loan. Renewals will be awarded until fall 2020. (Loan forgiveness if graduated in 4 years or 5 for engineering and maintained other eligibility requirements)

**SB 686:** Repeals language that the legislature could not appropriate GR to the fund; makes changes to eligibility for math and science scholars loan repayment program

**SB 1066:** T-STEM Challenge Scholarship Program, removes the requirements that recipients of the scholarship either be employed by a STEM-related business or enrolled in upper-level STEM courses. Recipients now just must be employed and in a STEM program, including certificate or associate degrees.

**Curricula and Programs**

**HB 505:** Removes restrictions on dual credit including student status and limitations on the number of hours

**HB 1054:** Adds a definition of “basic academic skills education” (non-course competency-based developmental education programs and interventions designed for students whose performance falls significantly below college readiness standards) to the Texas Success Initiative and requires that institutions offer developmental coursework for basic academic skills education. The THECB will determine the cut scores.

**HB 1992:** In establishing minimum required scores on AP exams, an institution may not require a score of more than three unless the institution’s CAO determines, based on evidence, that a higher score on the exam is necessary to indicate preparation to be successful in a related, more advanced course for which the lower-division course is a prerequisite. A study is due to the THECB by 2019 of performance (GPA’s), retention rates, and graduation rates for students who complete a lower division course and students who received credit with a score, and the data must be disaggregated by score.
SB 453: Allows for a scaled score of 50 (rather than 60) or higher on an exam administered through the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) for students in grades 6-12
SB 674: Educator certification that requires bachelors’ degrees will now require training and instruction regarding mental health, substance abuse, and youth suicide.
SB 1750: Bill increases to at least 20% the number of work study positions that must be located off-campus. UT Dallas’ career center is confident this is not an issue for us.
SB 1470: Authorizes the THECB to execute a state authorization reciprocity agreement (SARA) for distance education.
HB 18: Requires institutions that administer TSI to report information to the high school

Administration and Governance
HB 699: Requires sexual assault policy that is to be approved by the Board of Regents prior to adoption; Regents Rules (20201) delegates HOP approvals to Executive Vice Chancellor and OGC, so Regents Rule may require a revision. Policy must include definitions of prohibited behavior, sanctions for violations, and protocol for reporting and responding to reports of campus sexual assault. The policy must be included in the institution’s student handbook, and a webpage must be dedicated solely to this policy. Bill requires each undergraduate transfer to attend an orientation on the sexual assault policy before or during the first term. Each institution shall review the policy each biennium, and with Board of Regent’s approval, revise the policy as necessary.
HB 197: Requires a dedicated webpage regarding mental health resources including the address of the nearest local mental health authority
SB 1624: Requires that each entering full-time undergraduate and graduate student have information about available mental health and suicide prevention services offered by the institution and about early warning signs/appropriate interventions
HB 910: Open carry: still prohibited in institutional buildings and on any public or private driveway, street, sidewalk or walkway, parking lot, parking garage, or other parking area of an institution.
SB 11: Concealed carry: includes college campuses but does allow institution’s to set rules, regulations, and other provisions regarding the carrying provided that these rules do not generally prohibit or have the effect of generally prohibiting license holders from carrying concealed handguns on the campus. UT System is working on this; Dr. Alex Piquero is UT Dallas’ campus carry liaison to System.
HB 1295: Section 1: Requires a faculty member to disclose the identity of each sponsor of the research in all public communications where the content of the public communication is based on the results of sponsored research. “Public communication” is defined to mean “oral or written communication intended for public consumption or distribution, including: (a) testimony in a public administrative, legislative, regulatory, or judicial proceeding, (b) printed matters including a magazine, journal, newsletter, newspaper, pamphlet, or report; or (c) posting of information on a website or similar internet host for information. Additional sections of this bill but apply to research and procurement.
SB 20: State agency contracts: analysis on-going.
SB 24: Requires training for members of governing boards of institutions. Any new regent who has not completed the training is prohibited from voting on budgetary or personnel matters until he/she completes the training.

Resources:
Legislative Summaries UT System: http://www.utsystem.edu/offices/governmental-relations/legislative-summaries
Legislative Summaries THECB: http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/Summary%20of%20Higher%20Education%20Legislation
Texas Legislature Online: http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/
UT Dallas Vice President for Public Affairs Amanda Rockow (arockow@utdallas.edu; x2107)
University Attorney Tim Shaw (tim.shaw@utdallas.edu; x5291)
Assistant Provost Serenity King (serenity.king@utdallas.edu; x6749)
Item 14: Assessment Committee Charge
Assessment Committee Charge Draft

The University Assessment Committee (UAC) is a University-wide Standing Committee.

The UAC serves as the primary agency in coordinating the assessment of student learning. The UAC monitors, updates, and conducts periodic reviews of assessment efforts within the colleges, schools, and other units on campus. It serves as a resource for areas seeking to enhance their assessment efforts. It makes recommendations regarding institutional data collection and analysis, technological interfaces that support assessment, and support for faculty to translate their educational goals into teaching practice to improve student learning. Each year, the UAC will set committee goals in keeping with its primary duties.

The Committee is charged to perform the following duties:

1. To encourage the creation and maintenance of an assessment climate that promotes the meaningful use of assessment data;
2. To review and disseminate information to faculty on best practices for student learning outcomes assessment;
3. To serve as a vehicle for communication and facilitate information sharing across units; and,
4. To promote the improvement of processes and celebration of successes of assessment across campus.

The voting members will include one faculty member from each of the eight schools; three members from any of the administration units (Student Affairs, Information Resources, Facilities, Library, Budget, Advancement, Institutional Research, Honors College, Diversity, and Public Affairs); one undergraduate student; and one graduate student.
Non-voting ex-officio members will include the Director of Assessment, and one member from the Committee on Effective Teaching.
Item 15: Textbook Adoption Process
Key Point – Adoptions: Why getting them in early is important

- Higher Education Opportunity Act compliance
- Sourcing books, breaking apart packages
- Addressing Old Edition / Out-of-Print
  o Options to get out-of-print books
- Late adoptions likely out of stock with publishers

Key Point – Adoptions: Why getting them in early is important

- Saves the student money through:
  o Buyback opportunities
  o Time to get local rentals
  o Sourcing used books
- Example of savings when adoption process is fixed

Key Point – Adoption process

- Breakdown in process experienced
- New process – consistent, simple
  o adoptions@utdallas.edu
  o No need to service more than one source. Outside sellers can be given adoption data from the Campus Store.
- “Same as last semester” issues

Key Point – Desk Copies

- New process for handling, easier access
- Hand out publisher specific instructions
- Will sell to department at our cost and refund when publisher provides

Key Point – Looking forward

- Follett Discover
- Student Savings Initiatives
  o Digital
  o Rental
  o Component identification
  o Price Match Guarantee
Item 16: Amendments to Committee Charges
Auxiliary Services Advisory Committee - UTDPP1015

Policy Charge

Auxiliary Services

Policy Statement

The Auxiliary Services Advisory Committee is a University-wide Standing Committee not reporting to the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas.

The Committee is charged to advise the Assistant Vice President for Procurement Management on policies, procedures, and rules, which will optimize the overall operation of Food Services, the UTD Bookstore, and Vending Operations. The scope of the Committee's purview shall include such areas as physical operations, facilities, and all other matters relating to these services that the Committee shall deem it appropriate to consider, including matters referred to it by the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students and/or the Student Government Association. In addition, the Committee shall make recommendations to the Vice President for Administration, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Executive Vice President and Provost regarding the interests and concerns of all auxiliary services customers.

The Committee membership shall consist of seven (7) voting members. They shall include 4 students and 3 members to be appointed by the President or the President's designee from faculty and staff. The student members shall be appointed in accordance with procedures established in Article II, Subarticle A, of the Constitution of the Student Association of The University of Texas at Dallas. The student members shall be representative of all students enrolled at the university. Faculty members are appointed from the membership of the General Faculty as defined in Title III, Chapter 21, Section 1.B.1. of The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures UTDPP 1088. The Dean of Students, the Director of Food Services, Resident District Manager, the Auxiliary Services Manager, Assistant Director of Food and Retail Services, the UTD Bookstore Manager, and the Director of the Student Union shall serve as non-voting ex officio members.

The Assistant Vice President for Procurement Management, Assistant Vice President for Auxiliary Services serves as the Responsible University Official and shall convene the first meeting of the Committee each year for the purpose of selecting the Chair and Vice Chair. Each member will serve for a one-year term starting September 1 and continuing to August 31. If for any reason a committee member cannot serve, the President or designee shall appoint a replacement to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

Policy History
Campus Wellness Committee - UTDPP1017
Policy Charge
Campus Wellness Committee

Policy Statement
The Campus Wellness Committee is a University-wide Standing Committee appointed by the President not reporting to the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas.

The purpose of the Wellness Committee is to create a culture and environment that support and promote the value of individual well-being by education and the provision of appropriate physical facilities. The Committee will implement the U. T. System wellness program on the U. T. Dallas campus and provide additional programs, tools, and resources that will enable employees to take charge of their own physical, mental and spiritual health. Programs can include but are not limited to Brown Bag Lunches addressing various Wellness and Nutrition topics, Walking Trails, Monthly Health Tips, the Mammogram Van, and the City of Richardson Corporate Challenge program. The Committee will also maintain an internet site and, through it, will seek to promote resources that are available to all members of the university community.

The Committee shall be composed of no fewer than nine voting members appointed by the President and shall include three staff members, three faculty members, and three students. Staff members will be nominated by the Staff Council. Faculty members will be nominated by the Academic Senate. Student members will be nominated by Student Government and serve for one year terms, which are renewable. The Vice President for Administration shall serve as the Responsible University Official. The Vice-Chair will be appointed by Staff Council.

To ensure continuity, appointments of staff and faculty Committee members will be for staggered terms so that one third of the appointments expire August 31 of each academic year. Terms are renewable. The Chair of the Committee shall be appointed by the President annually.

Policy History
- Issued: February 10, 2009
- Editorial Amendments: September 1, 2010
- Editorial Amendments: March 7, 2012

Policy Links
- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1017
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1017
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1017
Committee on Committees - UTDPP1019

Policy Charge:
Committee on Committees

Policy Statement

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

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

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

The Committee is composed of seven members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty (as defined in UTDPP 1080/Title III, Chapter 21, Subchapter B., Section 1.B.1. of The University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures), consisting of one person appointed to represent each of the six Schools, excluding the School of Interdisciplinary Studies, and the Speaker of the Faculty and President of Student Government as ex officio (with vote). The Executive Vice President and Provost serves as the Responsible University Official.

The term of office for appointed committee members shall be effective June 1 to May 31, and members may be reappointed by the President for additional terms upon nomination of the Academic Council. The terms for appointed members shall be staggered so that no more than one-half of the terms expire in any one year. If for any reason a Committee member resigns, the President, upon nomination of the Academic Council, shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

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

Policy History

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

Policy Links

- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1019
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1019
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1019
Chancellor's Council/President's Outstanding Teaching Awards Committee - UTDPP1039

Policy Charge
Teaching Awards

Policy Statement

The Chancellor's Council/President’s Outstanding Teaching Awards Committee is a Concurrent Action Committee of the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas. The Committee is charged to solicit, evaluate, select, and recommend a tenured or tenure track faculty member for the Chancellor’s Council Award, a non-tenure track instructor for a President’s Award, and a teaching assistant for a President’s Award. Awards are accompanied by appropriate prizes.

Under the leadership of the Committee, the Office of Undergraduate Education solicits nominations for the teaching awards during each long semester of the academic year. Information supporting the nomination is acquired from nominators, faculty, students, administrators, teaching evaluations, and other sources sanctioned by the Committee. In the spring semester, the Committee selects its finalists, solicits further information, and recommends recipients to the President. The President announces the winners as part of the Honors Convocation for spring graduation. The Committee shall determine the timetable for nominations and selections with the goal of allowing consideration of classes taught in both the spring and fall semesters within a calendar year. The Office of Undergraduate Education is responsible for administrative support to the Committee and serves an archival function for Committee records.

The Committee is composed of five voting members and shall include the three previous tenured or tenure track award winners as well as the Dean of Undergraduate Education and the President of the Student Government, who serve as ex officio with vote. Members shall serve three-year terms and be replaced as new winners are announced. The Chair is the longest standing faculty member on the Committee. The President may reappoint members for additional terms upon nomination of the Academic Council. If a Committee vacancy occurs for any reason, the President, upon nomination of the Academic Council, shall appoint another eligible individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term. No member of the Committee is eligible for the award while serving.

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

Policy History
- Issued: December 15, 2000
- Revised: April 18, 2006

Policy Links
- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1039
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1039
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1039
Item 17:
RR 31008-
Termination of a Faculty Member
2015-2016
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>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. John Fonseka (ECS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon Ntafos (ECS)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poras Balsara (ECS)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Sudborough (ECS)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andras Farago (ECS)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euel Elliott (EPPS)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Dumas (EPPS)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Stewart (EPPS) - Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herve Abdi (BBS)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Prager (BBS)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Tobey (BBS)- Vice Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suresh Radhakrishnan (SOM) - Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ram Rao (SOM) - Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suresh Sethi (SOM)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George McMechan (NSM) -Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Marsh (NSM)- Senior Lecturer III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Sherry (NSM)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Gray (NSM)- <strong>Retired</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Buhrmester (BBS)- Deceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Rabe (AH)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Edmunds (AH)- Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Murat Kantarcioeglou (ECS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Mario Rotea (ECS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Ovidiu Daescu (ECS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Euel Elliott (EPPS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. May Yuan (EPPS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Bruce Jacobs (EPPS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Peter Assmann (BBS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Karen Prager (BBS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Anne van Kleeck (BBS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Suresh Radhakrishnan (SOM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Ram Rao (SOM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Suresh Sethi (SOM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. George McMechan (NSM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Rod Heelis (NSM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Dean Sherry (NSM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Roger Malina (ATEC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Paul Fishwick (ATEC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. Milton Cohen (AH)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. Marilyn Waligore (AH)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nasser Kehtaravaz has been nominated for ECS as well.**
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 18:
Criminal Background Checks
1. Title

Criminal Background Checks: Criminal, Employment Misconduct and Sexual Misconduct

2. Policy

Sec. 1  Purpose. The University of Texas System is committed to promoting a safe and secure environment at all of its institutions. To that end, this policy sets forth requirements for background checks on criminal and employment misconduct, including sexual misconduct, background checks.

The U.T. System Administration (U.T. System) and each U.T. System institution (U.T. institution) shall adopt and include in its Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP) a policy and related procedures for the administration of background checks on criminal and employment misconduct, including sexual misconduct, background checks.

Sec. 2. Criminal Background Check Required. U.T. System and U.T. institutions must obtain criminal background checks1, at a minimum, in the following situations2.

2.1 Statutorily Required Criminal Background Check. Where if state or federal law requires that a position/individual be subject to a criminal background check using a specific source of criminal background check information and/or certain procedures, the U.T. System and its institutions will comply with such laws. To the extent if such laws impose criminal background check requirements that are more extensive or substantially similar, the U.T. System and U.T. institutions may rely on the statute those laws to satisfy the requirements of this policy.

Similarly, U.T. System a and U.T. institutions may rely on the background check conducted by an federal government agency of the federal government, if the U.T.

---

1 This policy addresses background checks only on criminal and employment misconduct, including sexual misconduct, background checks only, and does not limit the University's authority to conduct other background checks as permitted by law.

2 Note: Use of non-public criminal background check sites may require additional notice and other prerequisites. Institutions must consult with legal counsel before using.
System or the U.T. institution receives documentation from that federal agency showing that the federal agency a conducted a background check, including a criminal background check with a sex offender registration check, has been conducted by the federal agency.

2.2 Applicants for Employment. A criminal background check must be conducted on any applicant, internal or external, who is under final consideration, following normal screening and selection processes, for employment, whether for a full-time, part-time, regular, temporary or student position of employment with the U.T. System or a U.T. institution. U.T. System and U.T. institutions may rely on a criminal background check conducted at that institution within the past twelve (12) months, if there is not a break in service of more than six (6) months and the criminal background check relied on is appropriate for the position sought. For student applicants to holding a position requiring student status, the institution may rely on a criminal background check performed at that institution within the past sixty (60) months as long as the student has maintained continuous enrollment during the long semesters, the student is employed in the same job or one with the same criminal background check requirements, and the student is required to report any charges or convictions (and whether including current or upcoming registered as a sex offender or will be required to register as a sex offender), excluding misdemeanor offenses punishable only by fine.

The institution must receive an authorization form signed by the applicant before the institution requests the check. The format of the authorization form must be specified in the institution's HOP and must conform to applicable state and federal law. (See Item 5, below, for sample form.)

Any or all of the following background check sources may be used, as appropriate, on applicants for employment:

(a) The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Crime Records Service – Secure and/or Public Site.

(b) A private vendor that offers national criminal background check services. (See Sec. 6, below.)

(c) Other state, national, and international sites.
The criminal background check must include a sex offender registration check.

2.3 Current Employees. A criminal background check must be conducted on:

(a) a current employee who is under consideration for a promotion that requires a criminal background check based on the institution policy in its HOP;

(b) a current employee, if the institution has not previously obtained a criminal background check on the employee; and

(c) a current employee, when the president, or his or her designee, determines it is necessary to further the goals of the institution.

Any or all of the following background check sources may be used, as appropriate, on current employees:

(a) The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Crime Records Service – Public Site.

(b) Other public state, national, and international sites.

(c) A private vendor that offers national criminal background check services. (See Sec. 6, below.)

The criminal background check must include a sex offender registration check.

2.4 Without Salary Faculty Appointees. A criminal background check must be conducted on individuals prior to their receiving a without salary appointment to a position with a faculty academic title authorized under Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 31001. Any or all of the following background check sources may be used as appropriate:

(a) The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Crime Records Service – Public Site.

(b) Other public state, national, and international sites.

(c) A private vendor that offers national criminal background check services. (See Sec. 6, below.)
The criminal background check must include a sex offender registration check.

2.5 Child-Care Centers and Youth Camps. In addition to fully complying with all applicable state and federal laws relating to criminal background checks, the following provisions apply to all child-care centers and youth camps operated by, on the property of, or in the facilities of U.T. System or a U.T. institution.

(a) Child-Care Centers Fingerprint Checks. Child-care centers shall ensure that criminal background checks are conducted prior to permitting the individual to work or spend time at the center and at least every two years thereafter for:

- employees;
- final applicants;
- professionals;
- each person 14 years of age or older, other than a client in care who is 1) counted in child-to-caregiver ratios or 2) has unsupervised access to children in care at the operation;
- interns; and
- each person 14 years of age or older, other than a client in care, who will regularly or frequently be staying or working at the center, if the person has 1) lived in another state any time during the previous 5 years, or 2) there is reason to suspect criminal history in another state. The check required under this section applies even if the individual has only supervised access to the children.

The center will process the check so that the following criminal background check sources are used as appropriate:
(i) Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) name and Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint-based criminal background check;

(ii) A Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) central registry check;

(iii) A sex offender registration check; and

(iv) An international check for any foreign national who the Director has reason to believe lived outside the United States after the age of 14, unless the person’s visa issuance or renewal occurred after implementation of the U.S. Patriot Act on October 24, 2011. (Reasonable efforts will be used to obtain such check, and it need only be conducted initially if the individual does not live outside the United States since last checked.)

(b) Child-Care Centers Name Checks. Child-care centers shall ensure that criminal background checks are conducted prior to permitting the individual to work or spend time at the center and at least every two years thereafter for all people 14 years or older, excluding clients in care, who are 1) not required to have fingerprinting, and 2) who will regularly or frequently be present at the center while children are in care. This applies to, but is not limited to volunteers, including parent volunteers, and student observers.

The center will process the check so that the following criminal background check sources are used as appropriate:

(i) A DPS name-based check;

(ii) A DFPS central registry check;

(iii) A sex offender registration check;

(iv) An international check for any foreign national who the Director has reason to believe lived outside the United States after the age of 14, unless the person’s visa issuance or renewal
occurred after implementation of the U.S. Patriot Act on October 24, 2011. (Reasonable efforts will be used to obtain such check, and it need only be conducted initially if the individual does not live outside the United States since last checked.); and

(v) An appropriate out-of-state check for anyone who has lived outside the state of Texas since the age of 17.

(c) Youth camps. Youth camps shall ensure that for all employees and final applicants who will work at the camp, and all volunteers and student observers, who will regularly or frequently be at the camp are subject to a criminal background check each year. The check shall be conducted prior to permitting an individual to work, volunteer or be present. Further, volunteers and student observers who are not subject to a check must not have unsupervised access to campers. The following background check sources may be used as appropriate:

(i) The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Crime Records Service Secure or Public Site check;

(ii) A sex offender registration check;

(iii) An appropriate out-of-state check; and

(iv) An international check for any foreign national who the Camp Director has reason to believe lived outside the United States after the age of 14, unless the person’s visa issuance or renewal occurred after implementation of the U.S. Patriot Act on October 24, 2011. (Reasonable efforts will be used to obtain such check, and it need only be conducted initially if the individual does not live outside the United States during the year.).

2.6 Volunteers in Health Care Facilities. A criminal background check must be conducted on volunteers, who will regularly or frequently be at the hospital, prior to permitting such individual to volunteer in UT System health care facilities,
including a student health center. Further, any volunteer who has not been subject to a check must not be allowed unsupervised access to patients. Any or all of the following background check sources, as appropriate, may be used:

(a) The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Crime Records Service – Public Site.

(b) Other public state, national, and international sites.

(c) A private vendor that offers national criminal background check services. (See Sec. 6, below.)

The criminal background check must include a sex offender registration check.

2.7 Students. A criminal background check, including a sex offender registration check, must be conducted on a student in an educational program that includes assignment to a clinical health care facility or whose assignment may require work with patients.

Each U.T. institution shall adopt and include in its HOP a student criminal background check policy requiring an appropriate criminal background check, notice to a student who is subject to the check of the use of the information to deny program participation, and the secure maintenance and disposition of records. (A model can be found at the OGC website, see link at Item 5, below.)

Sec. 3 No Automatic Disqualification for Criminal Background.

3.1(a) Except as outlined in 3.2, an individual with a criminal record will not automatically be disqualified from employment, appointment or privileges; however, U.T. System and U.T. institution policies and procedures must require that a case-by-case analysis be conducted.

3.2(b) U.T. System and UT institutions will not hire, continue to employ, appoint or assign an individual if information is obtained that the individual has been convicted or placed on deferred adjudication for an offense that would require:
i. the individual to register as a sex offender under Chapter 62, Code of Criminal Procedure, which includes, but is not limited to, such offenses as Continuous Sexual Abuse of Young Child; Sexual Assault; Aggravated Sexual Assault; or

ii. an offense under the laws of another state or federal law that is equivalent to an offense requiring such registration, unless the hiring/appointing official, as appropriate, articulates a compelling justification, the Director of Human Resources and the Chief of Police concur, the President concurs, and the individual has no higher than a level one (low) risk as determined by the risk assessment screening tool implemented pursuant to Chapter 62, Code of Criminal Procedure. If no such risk level is assigned, then the risk level cannot exceed a low risk as determined by the U.T. institution’s Chief of Police.

3.3(c) Institutional criminal background check procedures must include a review of the criminal background information by both the Director of Human Resources and the Chief of Police to determine whether there is a disqualifying offense under this section.

Sec. 42.9 Notice Requirement. An institution receiving a report indicating that an applicant for employment or a current employee has a criminal record will notify the individual that such a report has been received, provide the individual with a copy of the report, except as provided by law or DPS policy, and notify the individual of the right to challenge the accuracy and completeness of the report and to submit additional information relating to the criminal record and why it should not affect an employment decision.

Sec. 52.10 Opportunity to Respond to Adverse Action.

5.1(a) External Applicants for Employment and Volunteers.

The decision of the U.T. institution is final and may not be appealed.
5.2(b) Current Employees. If the individual is a current employee subject to a criminal background check, standard employee grievance procedures are available to challenge the decision. If the criminal record leads to termination, the applicable employee discipline and discharge procedures will be used.

Sec. 62.11 Use of Private Vendors. If a U.T. institution elects to use a third-party vendor credit reporting agency to conduct criminal record checks, the resulting report is considered a “consumer report” under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), and the institution must comply with all applicable FCRA disclosure and notice requirements.

Sec. 72.112 Self Reporting.

7.4(a) Applicants for Employment. Applicants must report in writing any charges or convictions (and whether registered as a sex offender or will be required to register as a sex offender), excluding misdemeanor offenses punishable only by fine, occurring after the date of application.

7.2(b) Current Employees. U.T. institution employees must report to their supervisor in writing, within five business days, any criminal complaint, information, indictment, no contest plea, guilty plea or criminal convictions (and whether registered as a sex offender or will be required to register as a sex offender), excluding misdemeanor offenses punishable only by fine.

7.3(c) Department Head Obligation. The U.T. institution official receiving a self-report as required under this section must provide the information to HR and the Chief of Police and consult about the individual’s suitability for the position.

7.4(d) Falsification or Omission of Criminal Record Information. Subject to standard grievance and disciplinary procedures as applicable, falsification or omission of records or failure to report as required by this
policy or law is a violation of policy and will lead to disciplinary action.

Sec. 82.123 Contractors Other Than Child-Care and Youth Camp Contractors For Whom The Above Provisions Apply. U.T. institution policies will include a procedure for reviewing proposed contracts to determine whether the contract should include a criminal background check requirement for individuals or employees of the company or entity being contracted. The policies and procedures must require that the following be considered in determining which contracts will have a criminal background check requirement: where the service will be performed (i.e., on or off-campus; access to the university community); and the nature of the services provided (i.e., access to university information resources; access to confidential information; access to currency; access to pharmaceuticals, select agents or controlled substances; responsibility for care of patients or vulnerable populations).

Sec. 92.134 Criminal Background Check Records. Criminal background check records shall be handled and retained in compliance with applicable state and federal laws.

Sec. 3 Employment Misconduct, Including Sexual Misconduct, Background Check. In addition to required criminal background checks and robust general background and reference checks, U.T. System and U.T. institutions should conduct specific employment misconduct, including sexual misconduct, background checks for all applicants for employment.

3.1 Misconduct Checks. The checks require a written statement be obtained that indicates whether or not the individual, during his or her the entire tenure of his or her time with the organization, has been found responsible by the organization for, left employment while under investigation or in lieu of disciplinary action for, or has any outstanding allegations of:

(a) misconduct involving violence or threat of violence;

To assess experiences with allow time to develop procedures to implement this policy and to enable consultation with U.T. institutions, the specifics enumerated here this provision will not be considered as a requirement before until June, 2016.
(b) any form of sexual harassment (as defined by federal law, the employer’s, and/or the school’s policies), including sexual assault, sexual exploitation, dating violence, domestic violence or stalking (as defined under applicable state and/or federal laws); or

(c) misconduct involving theft of funds or property.

3.2 Scope of Check. The written statement must be obtained from:

(a) All places of employment in the past four years.; and

(b) The statement shall be obtained from the organization’s Title IX coordinator, if there is one, from the human relations or equivalent personnel office, or from another appropriate source within the organization.

3.3 Release. To facilitate receipt of the above statement and any related records from the subject organizations, applicants may be required to provide a written release to said organizations.

Sec. 4 Use of Private Vendors. If a U.T. institution elects to use a third-party vendor credit reporting agency to conduct background checks pursuant to this policy, the resulting report is considered a "consumer report" under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), and the institution must comply with all applicable FCRA disclosure and notice requirements.

3. Definitions

Appropriate: Using a database(s) that is authorized, takes into consideration the nature of the position, information obtained from the US government in connection with the Visa process as well as one that includes data for permanent, temporary and educational residences for anyone who has lived outside the State of Texas since the age of 17.

Frequently present: More than two non-continuous visits at the center in a 30-day period.
Non-continuous visit: Being physically present at an operation for a period of time of less than 24 hours. Multiple or periodic visits to an operation within the same day is one visit.

Professional: Individuals such as doctors, psychologists, and Early Childhood Intervention workers who are at the child-care operation in an official capacity.

Regularly: On a scheduled basis.

Unsupervised access: The person is allowed to be with children without the presence of a qualified caregiver.

Youth Camp: A program that:

(a) is operated by or on the campus;

(b) offers recreational, athletic, or educational activities for at least 5 campers who:
   • are not enrolled at the institution;
   • attend or temporarily reside at the camp for all or part of at least four days; and

(c) is not a day camp or youth camp required to be licensed by the Department of Family and Protective Services.

4. Relevant Federal and State Statutes

Texas Education Code Section 51.215 – Access to Police Records of Employment Applicants

Texas Government Code Section 411.081 et seq. – Criminal History Clearinghouse

Texas Government Code Section 411.094 – Access to Criminal History Record Information: Institution of Higher Education

Texas Government Code Section 411.135 – Access to Certain Information by Public


Texas Human Resources Code Sections – Chapter 42 – Regulation of Child Care Services
5. Relevant System Policies, Procedures, and Forms

Sample Criminal Background Check Form
Sample FRCA Disclosure and Authorization
Model Student Background Check

6. Who Should Know

Applicants
Employees
Students

7. System Administration Office(s) Responsible for Policy

Office of Business Affairs
Office of Academic Affairs
Office of Health Affairs
Office of General Counsel

8. Dates Approved or Amended

November 26, 2002
Amended August 31, 2010
Editorially Amended September 20, 2010
Amended October 28, 2010
Amended March 26, 2012
Amended September 4, 2013
Amended XXX, 2015

9. Contact Information

Questions or comments about this policy should be directed to:

- OGC_Intake@utsystem.edu
- bor@utsystem.edu
1. Title

Criminal Background Checks

2. Policy

Sec. 1  Purpose. The University of Texas System is committed to promoting a safe and secure environment at all of its institutions. To that end, this policy sets forth requirements for criminal background checks.

The U.T. System Administration (U.T. System) and each U.T. System institution (U.T. institution) shall adopt and include in its Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP) a policy and related procedures for the administration of criminal background checks.

Sec. 2.  Criminal Background Check Required. U.T. System and U.T. institutions must obtain criminal background checks\(^1\), at a minimum, in the following situations\(^2\).

2.1 Statutorily Required Criminal Background Check. If state or federal law requires that a position/individual be subject to a criminal background check using a specific source of criminal background check information and/or certain procedures, U.T. System and its institutions will comply with such laws. If such laws impose criminal background check requirements that are more extensive or substantially similar, U.T. System and U.T. institutions may rely on compliance with those laws to satisfy the requirements of this policy.

Similarly, U.T. System and U.T. institutions may rely on a criminal background check conducted by a federal government agency to satisfy the requirements of this policy for an individual on assignment from a federal agency, if U.T. System or the U.T. institution receives documentation from that federal agency showing that the federal agency conducted a background check, including a criminal background check with a sex offender registration check.

2.2 Applicants for Employment. A criminal background check must be conducted on any applicant, internal or external, who is under final consideration, following normal screening

---

\(^1\) This policy addresses criminal background checks only and does not limit the University’s authority to conduct other background checks permitted by law.

\(^2\) Note: Use of non-public criminal background check sites may require additional notice and other prerequisites. Institutions must consult with legal counsel before using.
and selection processes, for employment, whether for a full-time, part-time, regular, temporary or student position of employment with the U.T. System or a U.T. institution. U.T. System and U.T. institutions may rely on a criminal background check conducted at that institution within the past twelve (12) months, if there is not a break in service of more than six (6) months and the criminal background check relied on is appropriate for the position sought. For student applicants to a position requiring student status, the institution may rely on a criminal background check performed at that institution within the past sixty (60) months as long as the student has maintained continuous enrollment during the long semesters, the student is employed in the same job or one with the same criminal background check requirements, and the student is required to report any charges or convictions (including current or upcoming registry as a sex offender), excluding misdemeanor offenses punishable only by fine.

The institution must receive an authorization form signed by the applicant before the institution requests the check. The format of the authorization form must be specified in the institution's HOP and must conform to applicable state and federal law. (See Item 5, below, for sample form.)

Any or all of the following background check sources may be used, as appropriate, on applicants for employment:

(a) The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Crime Records Service – Secure and/or Public Site.

(b) A private vendor that offers national criminal background check services. (See Sec. 6, below.)

(c) Other state, national, and international sites.

The criminal background check must include a sex offender registration check.

2.3 Current Employees. A criminal background check must be conducted on:

(a) a current employee who is under consideration for a promotion that requires a criminal background check based on the institution policy;
(b) a current employee, if the institution has not previously obtained a criminal background check on the employee; and

(c) a current employee, when the president, or his or her designee, determines it is necessary to further the goals of the institution.

Any or all of the following background check sources may be used, as appropriate, on current employees:

(a) The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Crime Records Service – Public Site.

(b) Other public state, national, and international sites.

(c) A private vendor that offers national criminal background check services. (See Sec. 6, below.)

The criminal background check must include a sex offender registration check.

2.4 Without Salary Faculty Appointees. A criminal background check must be conducted on individuals prior to their receiving a without salary appointment to a position with a faculty academic title authorized under Regents' Rules and Regulations, Rule 31001. Any or all of the following background check sources may be used as appropriate:

(a) The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Crime Records Service – Public Site.

(b) Other public state, national, and international sites.

(c) A private vendor that offers national criminal background check services. (See Sec. 6, below.)

The criminal background check must include a sex offender registration check.

2.5 Child-Care Centers and Youth Camps. In addition to fully complying with all applicable state and federal laws relating to criminal background checks, the following provisions apply to all child-care centers and youth camps operated by, on the property of, or in the facilities of U.T. System or a U.T. institution.
(a) Child-Care Centers Fingerprint Checks. Child-care centers shall ensure that criminal background checks are conducted prior to permitting the individual to work or spend time at the center and at least every two years thereafter for:

- employees;
- final applicants;
- professionals;
- each person 14 years of age or older, other than a client in care who is 1) counted in child-to-caregiver ratios or 2) has unsupervised access to children in care at the operation;
- interns; and
- each person 14 years of age or older, other than a client in care, who will regularly or frequently be staying or working at the center, if the person has 1) lived in another state any time during the previous 5 years, or 2) there is reason to suspect criminal history in another state. The check required under this section applies even if the individual has only supervised access to the children.

The center will process the check so that the following criminal background check sources are used as appropriate:

(i) Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) name and Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint-based criminal background check;

(ii) A Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) central registry check;

(iii) A sex offender registration check; and

(iv) An international check for any foreign national who the Director has reason to believe lived outside the United States after the age of 14, unless the person’s visa issuance or renewal
occurred after implementation of the U.S. Patriot Act on October 24, 2011. (Reasonable efforts will be used to obtain such check, and it need only be conducted initially if the individual does not live outside the United States since last checked.).

(b) Child-Care Centers Name Checks. Child-care centers shall ensure that criminal background checks are conducted prior to permitting the individual to work or spend time at the center and at least every two years thereafter for all people 14 years or older, excluding clients in care, who are 1) not required to have fingerprinting, and 2) who will regularly or frequently be present at the center while children are in care. This applies to, but is not limited to volunteers, including parent volunteers, and student observers.

The center will process the check so that the following criminal background check sources are used as appropriate:

(i) A DPS name-based check;

(ii) A DFPS central registry check;

(iii) A sex offender registration check;

(iv) An international check for any foreign national who the Director has reason to believe lived outside the United States after the age of 14, unless the person’s visa issuance or renewal occurred after implementation of the U.S. Patriot Act on October 24, 2011. (Reasonable efforts will be used to obtain such check, and it need only be conducted initially if the individual does not live outside the United States since last checked.); and

(v) An appropriate out-of-state check for anyone who has lived outside the state of Texas since the age of 17.

(c) Youth camps. Youth camps shall ensure that for all employees and final applicants who will work at the camp, and all volunteers and student observers, who will
regularly or frequently be at the camp are subject to a criminal background check each year. The check shall be conducted prior to permitting an individual to work, volunteer or be present. Further, volunteers and student observers who are not subject to a check must not have unsupervised access to campers. The following background check sources may be used as appropriate:

(i) The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Crime Records Service Secure or Public Site check;

(ii) A sex offender registration check;

(iii) An appropriate out-of-state check; and

(iv) An international check for any foreign national who the Camp Director has reason to believe lived outside the United States after the age of 14, unless the person’s visa issuance or renewal occurred after implementation of the U.S. Patriot Act on October 24, 2011. (Reasonable efforts will be used to obtain such check, and it need only be conducted initially if the individual does not live outside the United States during the year.).

2.6 Volunteers in Health Care Facilities. A criminal background check must be conducted on volunteers, who will regularly or frequently be at the hospital, prior to permitting such individual to volunteer in UT System health care facilities, including a student health center. Further, any volunteer who has not been subject to a check must not be allowed unsupervised access to patients. Any or all of the following background check sources, as appropriate, may be used:

(a) The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) Crime Records Service – Public Site.

(b) Other public state, national, and international sites.

(c) A private vendor that offers national criminal background check services. (See Sec. 6, below.)

The criminal background check must include a sex offender registration check.
2.7 Students. A criminal background check, including a sex offender registration check, must be conducted on a student in an educational program that includes assignment to a clinical health care facility or whose assignment may require work with patients.

Each U.T. institution shall adopt and include in its HOP a student criminal background check policy requiring an appropriate criminal background check, notice to a student who is subject to the check of the use of the information to deny program participation, and the secure maintenance and disposition of records. (A model can be found at the OGC website, see link at Item 5, below.)

Sec. 3 No Automatic Disqualification for Criminal Background.

3.1 Except as outlined in 3.2, an individual with a criminal record will not automatically be disqualified from employment, appointment or privileges; however, U.T. System and U.T. institution policies and procedures must require that a case-by-case analysis be conducted.

3.2 U.T. System and UT institutions will not hire, continue to employ, appoint or assign an individual if information is obtained that the individual has been convicted or placed on deferred adjudication for an offense that would require:

i. the individual to register as a sex offender under Chapter 62, Code of Criminal Procedure, which includes, but is not limited to, such offenses as Continuous Sexual Abuse of Young Child; Sexual Assault; Aggravated Sexual Assault; or

ii. an offense under the laws of another state or federal law that is equivalent to an offense requiring such registration, unless the hiring/appointing official, as appropriate, articulates a compelling justification, the Director of Human Resources and the Chief of Police concur, the President concurs, and the individual has no higher than a level one (low) risk as determined by the risk assessment screening tool implemented pursuant to Chapter 62, Code of Criminal Procedure. If no such risk level is assigned, then the risk level
cannot exceed a low risk as determined by the U.T. institution’s Chief of Police.

3.3 Institutional criminal background check procedures must include a review of the criminal background information by both the Director of Human Resources and the Chief of Police to determine whether there is a disqualifying offense under this section.

Sec. 4 Notice Requirement. An institution receiving a report indicating that an applicant for employment or a current employee has a criminal record will notify the individual that such a report has been received, provide the individual with a copy of the report, except as provided by law or DPS policy, and notify the individual of the right to challenge the accuracy and completeness of the report and to submit additional information relating to the criminal record and why it should not affect an employment decision.

Sec. 5 Opportunity to Respond to Adverse Action.

5.1 External Applicants for Employment and Volunteers. The decision of the U.T. institution is final and may not be appealed.

5.2 Current Employees. If the individual is a current employee subject to a criminal background check, standard employee grievance procedures are available to challenge the decision. If the criminal record leads to termination, the applicable employee discipline and discharge procedures will be used.

Sec. 6 Use of Private Vendors. If a U.T. institution elects to use a third-party vendor credit reporting agency to conduct criminal record checks, the resulting report is considered a “consumer report” under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), and the institution must comply with all applicable FCRA disclosure and notice requirements.

Sec. 7 Self Reporting.

7.1 Applicants for Employment. Applicants must report in writing any charges or convictions (and whether registered as a sex offender or will be required to register as a sex offender), excluding misdemeanor offenses punishable only by fine, occurring after the date of application.
7.2 Current Employees. U.T. institution employees must report to their supervisor in writing, within five business days, any criminal complaint, information, indictment, no contest plea, guilty plea or criminal convictions (and whether registered as a sex offender or will be required to register as a sex offender), excluding misdemeanor offenses punishable only by fine.

7.3 Department Head Obligation. The U.T. institution official receiving a self-report as required under this section must provide the information to HR and the Chief of Police and consult about the individual’s suitability for the position.

7.4 Falsification or Omission of Criminal Record Information. Subject to standard grievance and disciplinary procedures as applicable, falsification or omission of records or failure to report as required by this policy or law is a violation of policy and will lead to disciplinary action.

Sec. 8 Contractors Other Than Child-Care and Youth Camp Contractors For Whom The Above Provisions Apply. U.T. institution policies will include a procedure for reviewing proposed contracts to determine whether the contract should include a criminal background check requirement for individuals or employees of the company or entity being contracted. The policies and procedures must require that the following be considered in determining which contracts will have a criminal background check requirement: where the service will be performed (i.e., on or off-campus; access to the university community); and the nature of the services provided (i.e., access to university information resources; access to confidential information; access to currency; access to pharmaceuticals, select agents or controlled substances; responsibility for care of patients or vulnerable populations).

Sec. 9 Criminal Background Check Records. Criminal background check records shall be handled and retained in compliance with applicable state and federal laws.

3. Definitions

Appropriate: Using a database(s) that is authorized, takes into consideration the nature of the position, information obtained from the US government in connection with the Visa process as well as one that includes data for permanent, temporary and educational residences for anyone who has lived outside the State of Texas since the age of 17.
**Frequently present:** More than two non-continuous visits at the center in a 30-day period.

**Non-continuous visit:** Being physically present at an operation for a period of time of less than 24 hours. Multiple or periodic visits to an operation within the same day is one visit.

**Professional:** Individuals such as doctors, psychologists, and Early Childhood Intervention workers who are at the child-care operation in an official capacity.

**Regularly:** On a scheduled basis.

**Unsupervised access:** The person is allowed to be with children without the presence of a qualified caregiver.

**Youth Camp:** A program that:

(a) is operated by or on the campus;

(b) offers recreational, athletic, or educational activities for at least 5 campers who:

- are not enrolled at the institution;
- attend or temporarily reside at the camp for all or part of at least four days; and

(c) is not a day camp or youth camp required to be licensed by the Department of Family and Protective Services.

### 4. Relevant Federal and State Statutes

Texas Education Code Section 51.215 – Access to Police Records of Employment Applicants

Texas Government Code Section 411.081 et seq. – Criminal History Clearinghouse

Texas Government Code Section 411.094 – Access to Criminal History Record Information: Institution of Higher Education

Texas Government Code Section 411.135 – Access to Certain Information by Public
5. Relevant System Policies, Procedures, and Forms

Sample Criminal Background Check Form

Sample FRCA Disclosure and Authorization

Model Student Background Check

6. Who Should Know

Applicants
Employees
Students

7. System Administration Office(s) Responsible for Policy

Office of Business Affairs
Office of Academic Affairs
Office of Health Affairs
Office of General Counsel

8. Dates Approved or Amended

November 26, 2002
Amended August 31, 2010
Editorially Amended September 20, 2010
Amended October 28, 2010
Amended March 26, 2012
Amended September 4, 2013
Amended June 10, 2015

9. Contact Information
Questions or comments about this policy should be directed to:

- OGC_Intake@utsystem.edu
- bor@utsystem.edu
Sec. 3 Sexual Misconduct Background Check. In addition to required criminal background checks and robust general background and reference checks, U.T. institutions should conduct specific sexual misconduct background checks for all applicants for employment in the following categories:

(a) Faculty;
(b) Athletic coaches;
(c) Regular (not student) student housing staff; and
(d) Any other employees designated by the president who have regular, direct, one-on-one contact with students.

3.1 Misconduct Checks. The checks require a written statement be obtained that indicates whether or not the individual, during the last four years of his or her last employment, has been found responsible by the organization(s) for, left employment while under investigation or in lieu of disciplinary action for, or has any outstanding allegations of any form of sexual harassment as defined by federal law, including sexual assault, sexual exploitation, dating violence, domestic violence or stalking.

3.2 Source of Check. The written statement must be obtained from the former employer’s Title IX coordinator if there is one, from the human relations or equivalent personnel office, or from another appropriate source within the organization.

3.3 Release. To facilitate receipt of the above statement and any related records from a former employer, applicants may be asked to provide a written release to their former employer(s) permitting the employer to release the records and indicating that the employer will be held harmless.
Sec. 3 Employment Misconduct, Including Sexual Misconduct, Background Check.

3.1 Self Reporting. U.T. System institutions will require at a minimum all applicants for regular employment to disclose in the application (with a certification that the information provided is truthful), whether or not the individual has been found responsible for, disciplined for, left employment while under investigation or in lieu of disciplinary action for, or has any outstanding allegations of:

(a) misconduct involving violence or threat of violence;

(b) any form of sexual harassment as defined by federal law, the employer's, and/or the school's policies, including sexual assault, sexual exploitation, dating violence, domestic violence or stalking (as defined under applicable state and/or federal laws); or

(c) misconduct involving theft of funds or property.

3.2 Procedures for Checks. For these positions, in addition to required criminal background checks, U.T. System and U.T. institutions will conduct general background or reference checks of a finalist(s) which, in addition to work performance, will include inquiry into employment misconduct, including sexual misconduct. U.T. System and U.T. System institutions policies will include procedures for conducting the inquiry which at a minimum will:

(a) identify the office or position that will be responsible for conducting the checks;

(b) require training of the individual(s) conducting the checks;

(c) require that some immediate supervisors of the applicant be contacted;

(d) require documentation of the efforts in conducting the checks; and

(e) require a procedure for evaluating the results of the check.

3.3 Release. To facilitate the above checks and obtaining any related records from applicants' employers, applicants may be required to provide a written release.