MEMORANDUM  
February 5, 2014

TO: Academic Council*

COPY TO:  
David Daniel  Denis Dean  
Hobson Wildenthal  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, FEBRUARY 5, 2014** at 2:00 p.m. in the Osborne Conference Room, ECSS 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>2013-2014 ACADEMIC COUNCIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gail Breen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Chandrasekaran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cordell**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Leaf*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi Prakash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Redman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Salter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Scotch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tres Thompson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Liza Liberman, Student Government President* 

*Speaker  
**Secretary
AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
February 5, 2014
Osborne Conference Room, ECSS 3.503

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS           Dr. Daniel
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA                                    Dr. Leaf
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES                                       Dr. Leaf
   December 4, 2013 Meeting
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT                                            Dr. Leaf
5. FAC REPORT                                                 Dr. Leaf
6. Resolution for the creation of a committee to research salary compression Dr. Leaf
7. Resolution for the creation of a committee to investigate breeches in school bylaws Dr. Leaf
8. UTS 175/180 hybrid policy                                  Dr. Okjovat
9. MOOC Overview and Recommendations                          Dr. Leaf
10. ADJOURNMENT                                               Dr. Daniel
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
DECEMBER 4, 2013

PRESENT:  David Daniel, Hobson Wildenthal, Gail Breen, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Murray Leaf, Ravi Prakash, Liz Salter, Richard Scotch, Tim Redman, Tres Thompson

ABSENT:  None

VISITORS:  Abby Kratz

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions
   President Daniel called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. President Daniel had no announcements. The Administration was concerned about the inclement weather that threatened the Doctoral Hooding ceremony for December 5 and the commencement ceremonies on December 6 and 7.

   President Daniel opened the floor to questions. A concern was raised as to why there were classes still going on while commencement was being performed. The Committee on the Academic Calendar recognized two years ago that if commencement was held following finals this would push the ceremonies to December 20 and 21. This was too close to the Winter Break. The committee looked at Austin for their solution and decided to have commencement ceremonies in early December. This made it less expensive for out of town visitors to travel to the ceremonies, and allowed faculty to leave soon as their final grades were posted.

   Currently the university is doing three ceremonies per day. For fall 2013 there will be five commencement ceremonies. Spring 2014 there will be seven, and there is an estimate that the university will need to do eight ceremonies for spring 2015. With so many ceremonies there is a risk of staff ‘burn out’. The faculty are free to make comments and suggestions to the president on this topic.

   Members of the Council were also concerned regarding parking for spring. Two more parking lots will be closed starting December 19 2013. There are back up plans in place to take cover student parking. It has been discovered that contractors have been parking in purple and other prime parking spots. They have been directed to park behind the old HP building and down by the tennis courts.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   Tim Redman moved to approve the Agenda. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

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

4. Speaker’s Report
1. CEP is expecting to have items approved before the January Senate meeting, but it will not be anything the Council will have seen. A place will be held on the Senate agenda, and the material circulated prior to the meeting so that it can be thoroughly reviewed by everyone.

2. Some of the newly approve policies are not on the Provost website. There is a regents rules that policies cannot be posted until system approves. This often creates unnecessary difficulties. Speaker Leaf will work with Abby Kratz to find out how policies can be posted pending approval.

5. Faculty Advisory Council Report
   There is no activity to report

6. CEP Proposals
   There were no items to present. Tim Redman moved that should the CEP committee approve of any items at their January 7 2014 meeting, they will be distributed before the January 15, 2014 senate meeting in order to allow for thorough review, as well as added to the January Senate agenda. R. Chandrasekaran seconded. The motion carried.

7. Amendment to UTDPP1025- Campus Facilities Committee Charge
   The minor amendments suggested at the November Senate meeting have been made. Richard Scotch moved to place the amended policy on the senate agenda. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

8. Update to UTDPP 1007- Faculty Senate By laws
   The minor amendments suggested at the November Senate meeting have been made. Tim Redman moved to place the amended policy on the senate agenda. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

9. Update to UTDPP1088-Faculty Governance
   Richard Scotch moved to accept the amendments, and add to the Senate agenda. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

10. Annual Report for the Faculty Mentoring Committee
    Liz Salter moved to place it on the senate agenda. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

11. New Business
    Classes are getting bigger and bigger. The bigger they become the more difficult it is for faculty to get their grades in on time. Due to the consequences of the grades posted decision regarding financial aid and other considerations must be made. It was suggested that the registrar be invited to speak with the Academic council regarding getting grades in on time. President Daniel recommended that the registrar be informed of the questions rose during the discussion, and be invited to the February Academic Council meeting.

    Speaker Leaf noted that he had a power point presentation he would like to present to the senate regarding the number of degrees awarded since 1900. Bachelor degrees have gone up. PhD’s have continued to be at 5% of total degrees awarded. Associate degrees and master’s degrees have been the highest; especially master’s degrees in non-research fields. This has driven a demand for faculty. Recently, a figure has been circulating that 75% of faculty are now non-tenure track. This figure is very misleading, for several reasons. One of the reasons lies in the kinds of degrees being sought--hence the
find of faculty being hired. Essentially, a large part of this demand is for programs that are not important in research universities, where the main rationale for tenure applies. The Council recommended that the best way to introduce the information would be in an essay form, with the slides included.

12. Senate Agenda for January 15, 2014:
   1. CEP Proposals- Pending approvals
   2. UTDPP 1007
   3. UTDPP 1088
   4. Annual Report for the Faculty Mentoring Committee

There being no further business President Daniel adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED: ______________________________ DATE: ______________________________
Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Senate
DRAFT
The Academic Council recommends that the University of Texas at Dallas establish an ad hoc committee on Salary compression and inversion. The charge of the committee should be to collect further information on apparent inequities in the faculty salaries in the university and make recommendations to remove them.

The committee shall have seven members. Three shall be members of the Faculty Advisory Committee on the Budget, recommended by the Chair of that Committee. Three shall be deans, recommended by the Provost. One shall be a representative of the Budget and Planning office.

The Committee should be charged to report its findings and recommendations by April 1, 2014.
Committee on School and Department Bylaws Compliance (Version II)

The purpose of the Committee on School and Department Procedures is to hear and resolve complaints regarding departures from school and departmental bylaws.

Membership: The Committee shall consist of the Provost of the University and the Speaker of Faculty or his/her designee.

Principle:

As a matter of general principle, bylaws of schools and departments describe internal operating procedures, so disputes regarding their meaning should be resolved by the unit whose bylaws they are. Sometime, however, this cannot be arranged. In such cases, the disagreement or allegation should be presented to the University Committee on School and Department Bylaws.

Procedures:

Complaints may originate either from administrators or from faculty. Complaints should not be made without first seeking to discuss the conduct complained of with the person engaging in it.

If an administrator in a school refuses to follow the bylaws of the school, the refusal should be referred to the dean of the school. If the dean cannot resolve the disagreement or in turn refuses to support the bylaws, the disagreement should be referred to the University Committee on School and Department Bylaws.

If a faculty body within the school refuses to follow the bylaws of the school and the dean cannot bring about compliance, and if the faculty as a whole also cannot resolve the problem, the disagreement should be referred to the University Committee on School and Department Bylaws.

Allegations regarding failure to follow bylaws should be in writing, directed to the Chair of the Committee on School and Department Bylaws. The chair will arrange for a meeting within thirty days, but not before fourteen days, to allow the person who is the object of the complaint to respond. The response should also be in writing.

The committee will meet with the complainant(s) and the person or people who are the object of the complaint at the appointed time and place. The meeting shall be chaired by the chair of the Committee. Notes may be taken but a verbatim minutes will not be. The complainant will explain their complaint. The respondent will respond. The committee may then question the complainant and respondent. They may also question each other, and respond. The committee will try to bring about agreement between the complainant and the respondent on a solution, provided that what they agree to is consistent with the bylaws and general university policy. If a solution cannot be agreed on, the Committee will deliberate in closed session and write a recommendation to the University President.
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT FOR FACULTY AND RESEARCHERS

TITLE

Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Researchers

POLICY STATEMENT

It is the policy of the University of Texas at Dallas that an employee’s performance of his or her Institutional Responsibilities, including research, shall not be biased or impaired by Conflicts of Interest or Commitment.

RATIONALE

This policy intends to protect the integrity of the research and scholarship conducted at UT Dallas from the negative impact of a situation involving an actual conflict of interest or commitment. The policy also serves to protect the individual reputations of faculty and researchers and the institutional reputation of UT Dallas. It is not the intent of the policy to eliminate or prohibit faculty and researchers from participating in situations involving potential conflicts.

This policy intends to maintain the professional autonomy of faculty members and researchers inherent in the self-regulation of scholarship and research. The policy provides a framework for faculty and researchers to identify situations that create the possibility for a conflict of interest or commitment, or the appearance thereof, and to work with UT Dallas to manage or avoid those situations. An integral part of the policy is a disclosure and approval mechanism whereby employees regularly review their activities.

SCOPE

This policy governs the disclosure, management and reporting of significant financial interests and approval of outside commitments by faculty, research staff and other employees subject to UT Systemwide Policy 175 at UT Dallas. This policy applies broadly to research performed at UT Dallas, without regard to whether the research has external funding and, if externally funded, regardless of the funding source.

This policy provides requirements for the disclosure of financial interests that comply with the disclosure requirements of federal regulations of the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the HHS Public Health Service. This policy also ensures institutional compliance with the requirements of U.T. Systemwide Policy 175 (Disclosure of Significant Financial Interests and Management and Reporting of Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research) and The Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System Rule 30104 (Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, and Outside Activities).

This policy applies in addition to general institutional policies, such as policies on standards of conduct, as well as other policies governing conflict of interest. If a specific federal law or regulation provides different requirements than this policy, the more stringent requirement applies.

Primary Responsibility

The primary responsibility of an employee of the University of Texas System or the University of Texas at Dallas is the performance of institutional responsibilities assigned to his or her position of appointment.

Outside Commitments

Employment by UT Dallas involves the commitment of the employee’s professional time, energy, and loyalty to the University. Outside commitments must not impair or interfere with the employee's performance of his or her institutional responsibilities to UT Dallas.

The University recognizes that there is value in allowing employees to participate in certain activities outside of UT Dallas. Such activities often contribute to the mission of the institution and can provide important elements of employee development. An employee may accept outside employment or provide consultative or professional
services with requisite prior approval by the appropriate UT Dallas authority.

Financial Interests

The University’s growing interaction with industry and for-profit enterprises has created new possibilities for the occurrence of conflicts of interest. These conflicts arise when there are opportunities for employees to benefit either from the outcome of research or from expertise or know-how gained in the course of their institutional responsibilities as a University employee. The University’s position is that with clear guidelines and principles, in conjunction with appropriate supervision and monitoring, it is possible for interaction between industry and UT Dallas to take place in a manner that is consistent with the highest traditions of scientific research and in a way that energizes scientific creativity.

DEFINITIONS

**Animal Research** is defined as any live, vertebrate animal used or intended for use in research, training, experimentation, teaching, exhibition, biological testing, or for related purposes. (Note: Animal Research requires review and approval by the University’s Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee.)

**Business Entity** is defined as any entity recognized by law through which business for profit is conducted, including a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint stock company, receivership or trust. For the purposes of this policy, business entities are categorized as either publicly traded or non-publicly traded.

**Conflict of Commitment** is defined as a situation in which an outside commitment directly and significantly interferes with the covered individual’s performance of his or her institutional responsibilities, or a situation in which the covered individual uses UT Dallas, U.T. System or State of Texas property without authority or approval in connection with the covered individual’s outside commitment.

**Conflict of Interest** is defined as a situation in which a significant financial interest could directly and significantly affect the performance of the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities.

**Conflict of Interest and Commitment Disclosure** (“disclosure”) refers to the process the University has implemented for covered individuals to disclose significant financial interests and outside commitments.

**Covered Family Member** is defined, for the purposes of this policy, as a covered individual’s:

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

**Covered Individual** is defined as:

1.  An individual who must file and update a disclosure under this policy, as determined by the Institutional Official, based on the following:
   a.  A faculty employee as defined in UTDPP1057, UTDPP1068, and UTDPP1046.
   b.  An administrative and professional employee with research responsibilities, as defined by UTD Personnel Policy D2.
2. An individual who, regardless of title or position, is responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of research, including a principal investigator, co-investigator, or project director.

3. An individual who has a significant financial interest or outside commitment in a business or other entity in which the University conducts research or scholarship-related business.

4. A student enrolled at UT Dallas who is responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of research is considered to be a covered individual under this policy only if the student has a potential conflict of interest related to the student’s research. A student who is in doubt about whether the student is a covered individual must request a determination by the institutional official.

**Equity Interest** is defined as any stock, stock option, warrant, or other ownership interest, as determined through reference to public prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value.

**Financial Interest** is defined as anything of monetary value, whether or not the value is readily ascertainable.

**Human Subjects Research** is defined as research that involves obtaining data from a living individual through intervention or interaction with the individual, or obtaining data that is identifiable private information. This policy does not apply to human subjects research that has been determined by the University’s IRB to be exempt. (Note: Both exempt and non-exempt Human Subjects Research requires review by the University’s Institutional Review Board.)

**Institution, University, UT Dallas, and UTD** mean The University of Texas at Dallas.

**Institutional Official** is the individual designated as responsible for ensuring compliance with federal and state regulations pertaining to conflict of interest and commitment. The institutional official is responsible for the delegation of authority for the establishment and enforcement of relevant UT Dallas policies and procedures including solicitation of disclosures, review and determination of conflicts of interest and commitment, management of identified conflicts of interest and commitment, and reporting of conflicts of interest as required by federal regulations. The President, or his or her designee, is the Institutional Official for the conflict of interest and commitment program at UT Dallas.

**Institutional Responsibilities** means any of the responsibilities the covered individual is appointed or assigned to perform on behalf of UT Dallas, including research, research consultation, professional practice, teaching, educational activities, administrative duties, institutional committee membership, or service on an institutional panel such as an Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Data and Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB).

**Non-profit entity** is defined as a corporation formed to serve a purpose of public or mutual benefit other than the pursuit or accumulation of profits, such religious, artistic, literary, charitable, scientific, educational or public safety purposes. Non-profit entities include charitable organizations, social welfare organizations, agricultural/horticultural organizations, labor organizations, and business leagues or trade associations.

**Outside Board** is defined as the board, council, or other governing body of a business, civic, professional, social, or religious organization, whether for-profit or non-profit.

**Outside Commitment** is defined as the following:

1. A compensated activity performed by a covered individual outside of the scope of his or her appointment or institutional responsibilities at UT Dallas, including, but not limited to, the following:
   a. **Outside Employment**: the engagement with an entity other than UT Dallas to provide labor, services or expertise in exchange for remuneration or other financial interest;
b. **Self-employment:** the establishment or management of a business entity that makes the covered individual's expertise or services available to others outside UT Dallas;

c. **Consulting and professional services:** to give expert advice or services to a business or other entity outside UT Dallas under a contract that does not involve the traditional relationship of employer and employee;

d. **Advisory Board:** a recommending body that does not involve decision and/or policy making for the business entity concerned;

e. **Member of an outside board;**

f. **Officer, Executive, or Other Fiduciary Position:** a position which a business or other entity has authorized to manage and protect property, money, and other assets;

g. **Speaking Engagement:** the presentation of material or work on behalf of a business entity;

h. **Seminar or Lecture Engagement:** an occasional or temporary presentation of scholarly work or research results for an academic institution other than UT Dallas; and,

i. **Teaching Engagement:** the assumption of teaching duties in an academic institution other than UT Dallas.

2. Uncompensated service as a member of an outside board that is related to the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities or is of direct benefit to UT Dallas or UT System. An outside commitment is of direct benefit to UT Dallas of UT System if the commitment enhances the mission of UT Dallas or provides important elements of faculty or staff development related to the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities.

3. An activity that is related to a significant financial interest that appears to create a conflict of interest.

4. The term *outside commitment does not include* the following types of activities:

   a. activities regarding service on advisory committees or review panels for a Federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education as defined at 20 U.S.C. 1001(a), an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an institution of higher education;

   b. personal activities, including service on an outside board, that is not related a covered individual’s institutional responsibilities, without regard to compensation, including for organizations of the following nature: municipality; local religious congregation; neighborhood association; public, private, or parochial school; political organization; social advocacy organization; youth sports or recreation league; affinity group such as the local orchid society; and other similar boards;

   c. scholarly activities related to a covered individual’s institutional responsibilities, including serving as a committee member, an officer, or board member of a professional or scholarly society; and,

   d. uncompensated activities that are not related to a covered individual’s institutional responsibilities; and,
e. activities performed by academic employees appointed on a 9-month basis during those months in which the covered individual is not appointed, unless the outside commitment is related to a significant financial interest that appears to create or creates a conflict of interest.

**PHS** means the Public Health Service of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and any components of the PHS to which the authority involved may be delegated, including the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

**Remuneration** is defined as salary or any payment for services not otherwise identified as salary (*e.g.*, consulting fees, honoraria, paid authorship).

**Request for Approval of Outside Commitment** refers to the University’s outside commitment approval process.

**Research** means any systematic investigation, study, or experiment designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. The term includes basic and applied research and product development.

**Significant Financial Interest** is defined as the following:

1. A financial interest consisting of one or more of the following interests of the covered individual (and those of any covered family members) that is related to the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities:

   a. **Remuneration:** A covered individual must report remuneration received from a business, non-profit, or government entity in the twelve (12) months preceding the disclosure that if total remuneration from that entity exceeds $5,000.

   b. **Equity Interest:** A covered individual must report an equity interest held in or received from a business entity in the twelve (12) months preceding the disclosure, including:
      i. Any equity interest in a non-publicly traded business entity;
      ii. A controlling interest;
      iii. Ownership of more than ten (10) percent of the voting interest;
      iv. Ownership of more than $5,000 of the fair market value of the entity; or,
      v. A direct or indirect participating interest in more than ten (10) percent of the profits, proceeds, or capital gains.

   c. **Intellectual Property:** A covered individual must report a description of intellectual property rights held (*e.g.*, patents, licenses, copyrights) and any agreements to share in royalties related to those rights. The covered individual must report the amount and source of royalty income that the covered individual or covered family member received or had the right to receive in the preceding twelve (12) months.

   d. **Reimbursed or Sponsored Travel:** A covered individual must report the occurrence of any reimbursed or sponsored travel in the twelve (12) months preceding the disclosure in which the value (aggregated per entity that reimburses or sponsors the travel) exceeds $5,000.

   e. **Gifts:** A covered individual must report the value and source of a single gift that the covered individual received in the preceding twelve (12) months that exceeds $250 in value, or multiple gifts, from a single entity that in the aggregate, exceed $250 in value, other than gifts from a covered family member.

2. A fiduciary interest related to the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities the covered individual held in a for-profit or non-profit entity in the preceding twelve (12) months, including responsibilities arising from positions as a member of an outside board, an officer, or other executive or management position.

3. The term **significant financial interest does not include** the following types of financial interests:
a. salary, royalties, or other remuneration paid by UT Dallas to the covered individual if the covered individual is currently employed or otherwise appointed by UT Dallas, including intellectual property rights assigned to UT Dallas and agreements to share in royalties related to such rights; 

b. income from investment vehicles, such as mutual funds and retirement accounts, as long as the covered individual does not directly control the investment decisions made in these vehicles; and, 

c. travel that is reimbursed or sponsored by UT Dallas, a Federal, state, or local government agency, an Institution of higher education as defined at 20 U.S.C. 1001(a), an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an Institution of higher education.

**Sponsored Research** is defined as any research proposal submitted to or awarded by a sponsor for extramural funding, or any gift designated for research received by UT Dallas. Sponsored research (both awards and gifts) can include research, training, and instructional projects involving funds, materials, or other compensation from external sources.

**POLICY STANDARDS**

I. Disclosure of Significant Financial Interests

A. When to Disclose and Period Covered by Disclosure

1. Initial Disclosure

   a. **Covered Individuals conducting PHS-sponsored research, Non-Exempt Human Subject Research, or Animal Research:** Covered individuals must submit or have a current disclosure on file no later than the time of application for sponsorship or at the time of research protocol submission (i.e., submission to the Institutional Review Board or the Institutional Animal Care & Use Committee).

   b. **Covered Individuals conducting research not included in part 1 above:** Covered individuals must submit or have a current disclosure on file prior to the expenditure of sponsor funds.

   c. **Covered Individuals not conducting sponsored research:** Covered individuals must submit or have a current disclosure on file annually not later than March 1.

   d. **New Covered Individuals:** When an individual becomes a Covered individual (e.g., is added to an ongoing sponsored research project or a human/animal subject protocol), the covered individual must submit or have a current disclosure on file before engaging in the project.

   e. **New Employees:** A covered individual who is new to the University must submit a disclosure no later than the 30th day of initial employment, covering the 12 months preceding the date of disclosure.

2. Subsequent Disclosures

   a. Following initial disclosure, covered individuals must submit an updated disclosure at least annually, or within 30 days of discovering or acquiring a new reportable significant financial interest.

   b. The president of the University or the institutional official may require a covered individual to submit additional disclosures.

B. Content of Disclosure

1. Acknowledgement

   Each covered individual must acknowledge at least annually, via the disclosure, that the individual is aware of and has read this policy, and is aware of a covered individual’s responsibilities regarding disclosure of significant financial interests, and of applicable federal regulations.

2. Extent of Disclosure
a. A covered individual shall complete or update a disclosure that:
   i. Identifies all sponsored research in which the covered individual is engaged at the time of disclosure;
   ii. Identifies the covered individual’s other institutional responsibilities; and,
   iii. Discloses each significant financial interest of the covered individual and of any covered family members.

b. Disclosure updates (annual or more frequently) shall include any significant financial interest that was not disclosed previously, and shall include current information regarding any previously disclosed significant financial interest (e.g., the current value of a previously disclosed equity interest).

c. In determining whether a significant financial interest should be disclosed, the covered individual should resolve the doubt in favor of disclosure.

3. Nature of Disclosure
   a. General Requirements
      i. When describing the source of a significant financial interest, the covered individual shall provide the name, principal address and industry for the source. The covered individual shall also describe, to his or her knowledge, any business conducted between UT Dallas and the source of the significant financial interest, including the following:
         1) Sponsored, collaborative, or subcontracted research
         2) Research gifts
         3) Gifts of funds or property (including equipment)
         4) Financial support for trainees (including graduate students and postdoctoral fellows)
         5) License of intellectual property
         6) Materials Transfer Agreement
         7) Sole-source provider of materials or services
         8) Products (excluding textbooks) or devices that are used in teaching
         9) Support for continuing education activities or online education programs
      ii. The covered individual shall distinguish among information pertaining to the covered individual and covered family members whose significant financial interests are also disclosed by the covered individual. If the covered individual is in doubt as to whether an individual is a covered family member, the covered individual should resolve the doubt in favor of disclosure.

   b. Significant Financial Interests
      i. In making disclosures under this policy, the covered individual shall disclose the value of a significant financial interest within the following ranges:
         1) $0 - $4,999;
         2) $5,000 - $9,999;
         3) $10,000 - $19,999;
         4) amounts between $20,000 - $100,000 by increments of $20,000; or,
         5) amounts above $100,000 by increments of $50,000.
      ii. The institutional official may request further information about a covered individual’s travel, including the monetary value of the travel, in order to determine whether the travel constitutes a conflict of interest.
      iii. In disclosing significant financial interests, the interest of any legal entity, including a foundation or a trust, that is controlled or directed by the covered individual or by the covered individual and covered family members, is considered to be the interest of the covered individual or covered family member as if the separate legal entity did not exist.
      iv. If a covered individual discloses remuneration, equity interests, intellectual property interests, or royalties, the covered individual must permit review of any related agreement, contract, offer letter, or other documentation on request of:
         1) the president of the University;
         2) the institutional official; or
any other person or entity with administrative responsibility in regard to reviewing the covered individual’s Disclosure or approving a related management plan.

II. Disclosure Review and Determination of Conflict of Interest

A. Disclosure Review

1. The institutional official, or his or her designee, shall review each disclosure and make a determination as to whether a significant financial interest disclosed by the covered individual is related to his or her institutional responsibilities not later than the 60th day after the filing of the disclosure.

2. A significant financial interest is related to a covered individual’s institutional responsibilities if the institutional official determines the significant financial interest:
   a. appears to be affected by the performance of his or her institutional responsibilities; or,
   b. is in a business entity whose financial interest appears to be affected by the performance of the employee’s institutional responsibilities.
   c. A significant financial interest could affect the performance of the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities if the significant financial interest:
      i. might tend to influence the way the covered individual performs his or her institutional responsibilities;
      ii. is or has been offered with the intent to influence the covered individual’s conduct or decisions;
      or,
      iii. could reasonably be expected to impair the covered individual’s judgment in performing his or her institutional responsibilities.

B. Determination of Conflict of Interest

If the institutional official determines the covered individual’s significant financial interest is related to his or her institutional responsibilities, the institutional official then makes a determination as to whether the possibility for a conflict of interest exists.

C. Untimely Disclosure and Review of Significant Financial Interests

If the institutional official learns of a significant financial interest that was not timely disclosed or was not timely reviewed, the institutional official shall, not later than the 60th day after learning of the interest:

1. determine whether the significant financial interest creates the possibility for a conflict of interest; and,

2. if the possibility for a conflict of interest exists, implement interim measures to ensure the performance of the institutional responsibility.

D. Appeals

A covered individual who disagrees with the determination of the Institutional Official regarding the possibility for or existence of a conflict of interest may appeal that determination to the Research Integrity Committee. In such cases, the Research Integrity Committee shall review all of the materials relating to the determination in question, shall discuss the determination with the covered individual and the Institutional Official and shall make a final decision as to the determination.

III. Conflicts of Interest

A. Management of Conflicts of Interest
1. If the Institutional Official or his or her designee determines that a covered individual has disclosed a situation that creates the possibility for a conflict of interest, the official, in cooperation with the covered individual and other appropriate designees, shall develop a management plan governing that conflict of interest.

2. If the institutional official determines that a new covered individual has disclosed a significant financial interest related to an ongoing institutional responsibility, or that any other covered individual has disclosed a new significant financial interest related to an ongoing institutional responsibility, the institutional official shall, not later than the 60th day after the review of the disclosure, implement a management plan or other appropriate measures to ensure the performance of the institutional responsibility.

B. Untimely Identification or Management of Conflicts of Interest

1. If a conflict of interest was not timely identified or managed, or if a covered individual fails to comply with a management plan, the institutional official shall, not later than the 120th day after determining noncompliance:
   a. complete and document a retrospective review and determination as to whether the institutional responsibility conducted during the period of noncompliance was affected by the significant financial interest, including a determination as whether research conducted during the period of noncompliance was biased in its design, conduct, or reporting; and,
   b. implement any measures necessary with regard to the covered individual’s performance of the institutional responsibility, including research, between the date that the noncompliance is identified and the date the retrospective review is completed.

2. For PHS-covered research projects, the retrospective review shall cover key elements as specified by federal regulations and may result in updating the Financial Conflict of Interest Report, notifying the PHS, and submitting a mitigation report as required by federal regulation.

IV. Management Plans

A. Content of Management Plans

1. A management plan may impose conditions and prescribe actions necessary to avoid or manage a conflict of interest, including an action reducing or eliminating the conflict of appearance of bias or interference. Examples of conditions or actions that may be prescribed include:
   a. public disclosure of the conflict management in presentations and publications;
   b. for human subjects research, direct disclosure of the conflict of interest to research participants;
   c. appointment of an independent monitor with authority to take measures to protect the design, conduct, and reporting of research against bias, or the appearance of bias, resulting from the conflict of interest;
   d. modification of the research plan;
   e. change of personnel or personnel responsibilities, or disqualification of personnel from participation in all or a portion of the impaired institutional responsibility;
   f. divestiture or reduction of the financial interest or outside commitment; or,
   g. severance of relationships that create an actual or potential conflict of interest.

2. A management plan must be in the form of a written agreement and must:
   a. provide that the covered individual acknowledges receipt of the agreement and understands the requirements of this policy and understands and agrees to comply with the required actions and other terms of the plan, including the time frames for required actions; and,
   b. clearly identify each specific person responsible for monitoring compliance with the management plan.
B. Institutional Review and Approval of Management Plans

If the institutional official determines a management plan is needed to govern a conflict of interest, the institutional official will convene a subcommittee of the Research Integrity Committee to review the conflict with the covered individual and recommend appropriate action to manage, reduce or eliminate the conflict. Once the subcommittee and covered individual has agreed to the terms of the management plan, the institutional official shall request approval of the management plan by the University President and the U.T. System Office of General Counsel, in compliance with the Procedure for Obtaining Approval of the Plan to Manage Conflicts of Interest.

V. Requests for Approval of Outside Commitments

A. Submission of Requests for Approval of Outside Commitments

1. A covered individual seeking to engage in an outside commitment shall receive prior approval for the outside commitment by submitting a Request for Approval of Outside Commitment to his or her appropriate Dean or Department Head.

2. In the case of requests for service in a non-elective office or position of honor, trust, or profit with the State of Texas or the United States, the approved form is forwarded to the Vice President for Administration for inclusion in the next institutional docket.

3. The assumption of full-time teaching duties in an academic institution other than the University requires specific approval by the Executive Vice President and Provost.

4. Requests for Approval of Commitments Involving Confidential Information

If a covered individual wishes to engage in an activity for which some or all of the relevant information is confidential (such as commitments involving third party proprietary information, classified government work, and other information made confidential by law), the covered individual shall provide the appropriate Dean or Department Head a compelling reason to treat the information confidentially and certify that the commitment is fully compliant with this policy and all other applicable laws and UT Dallas and U. T. System policies. With agreement of the appropriate Dean or Department Head, the covered individual shall provide only such information from the section “Nature and Extent of Request for Approval” (V.C.2) as permissible under the governing non-disclosure agreement, memorandum of understanding, or contract. The covered individual shall provide a copy of the governing non-disclosure agreement, memorandum of understanding, or contract with the request for approval.

B. When to Request Approval for an Outside Commitment

1. During periods of regular employment by the University, a covered individual, with prior approval, may engage in appropriate outside commitments. No covered individual shall be engaged in an outside commitment until the nature and extent of the commitment has been disclosed and prior approval granted.

2. If there is any likelihood of interference with the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities to the University, the covered individual should not engage in the outside commitment or should request a leave of absence from, or a part-time employment agreement with, the University.

3. This approval process does not apply to activities performed by covered individuals appointed on a 9-month basis during those months in which the covered individual is not appointed, unless the outside commitment is related to a significant financial interest that appears to create a conflict of interest.

4. Retrospective Request for Approval
Certain outside commitments by their nature cannot be specifically approved before the work must begin, such as consulting on an emergency or other urgent need. In such cases, the covered individual shall receive retrospective approval by submitting a Request for Approval of Outside Commitment within 30 days of the covered individual’s initial engagement in the outside commitment.

C. Content of Request for Approval of Outside Commitment

1. Acknowledgement

Each covered individual must acknowledge, at least annually, via the Request for Approval, that the individual is aware of and has read this policy, and is aware of a covered individual’s responsibilities regarding the approval of outside commitments.

2. Nature and Extent of Request for Approval
   a. A covered individual shall complete or update a Request for Approval that describes the nature and extent of the outside commitment, including the following:
      i. Name, principal address and industry for the source of the outside commitment;
      ii. Description of duties, and their relation to institutional responsibilities;
      iii. Time commitment, and duration thereof;
      iv. Compensation; and,
      v. Relation to existing University intellectual property.
   b. Requests for Approval that update an existing outside commitment shall include current information regarding the nature and extent of the outside commitment (e.g., the new amount time committed to the activity).
   c. In determining whether approval should be sought for an outside commitment, the covered individual should resolve the doubt in favor of requesting approval.

VI. Review of Requests for Approval and Determination of Conflict of Commitment

A. Review of Requests for Approval

1. The covered individual’s appropriate Dean or Department Head shall review each Request for Approval of Outside Commitment and make a determination as to whether the outside commitment for which approval is requested could interfere or appear to interfere with the covered individual’s performance of his or her institutional responsibilities.

2. If a new covered individual requests approval for an outside commitment or any other covered individual requests approval for a new outside commitment interest, the appropriate Dean or Department Head shall review the request for approval not later than the 30th day after the filing of the request.

3. The appropriate Dean or Department Head shall consider the cumulative effect of the covered individual’s outside commitments on his or her institutional responsibilities.

B. Standards for Approval of Outside Commitments

1. The portion of time covered individuals can devote to outside commitments are at the discretion of the covered individual’s supervisor, or appropriate Dean or Department Head. The covered individual may be permitted to engage in outside commitments no more than one day per week, averaged over the semester(s) of the covered individual’s appointment. Time not used in one semester may not be carried over into another during which the individual is employed by the University.

2. Outside commitments in the context of regular, on-going routine duties, as distinct from temporary, episodic or intermittent commitments, will be subject to much closer scrutiny in terms of its interference with a covered individual's performance of his or her institutional responsibilities.
3. An outside commitment could be reasonably determined to interfere with the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities if:

   a. The covered individual is not available to conduct his or her institutional responsibilities as expected under the terms of his or her appointment, and upon request of his or her immediate supervisors;
   b. The covered individual spends time conducting the outside commitment as a part of, rather than in addition to, the normal effort expected by the University; or,
   c. The covered individual makes use of University, U.T. System or State of Texas property without authority or approval in connection with the covered individual’s outside commitment. Advance permission must be obtained from the President and provision be made for compensation to the System or the University. Where University facilities are required to fulfill any task relating to activities outside the University, a contractual relationship with the University is the proper mechanism to use rather than a consulting agreement with an employee of the University.

C. Determination of Conflict of Commitment

If the covered individual’s appropriate Dean or Department Head determines the covered individual’s outside commitment could interfere or appear to interfere with the performance of the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities, the covered individual’s appropriate Dean or Department Head then makes a determination as to whether the conflict of commitment can be managed through reduction or elimination of the outside commitment.

D. Untimely Request for Approval and Review of Outside Commitments

If the appropriate Dean or Department learns of an outside commitment for which approval that was not timely requested or the request for which was not timely approved, the Dean or Department Head shall:

1. determine whether the outside commitment creates the possibility for a conflict of commitment; and,
2. if the possibility for a conflict of commitment exists, request the covered individual reduce or eliminate the outside commitment to ensure the performance of the covered individual’s performance of his or her institutional responsibilities.

E. Appeals

A covered individual whose request for approval of outside commitment is denied by the appropriate Dean or Department Head may request that the appropriate Dean or Department Head reconsider the decision and provide an explanation in writing. If the individual remains unsatisfied with the decision, he or she may access standard grievance procedures to the extent that they are otherwise applicable.

F. Rescinding of Approval

The covered individual’s appropriate Dean or Department Head may rescind approval for an outside commitment upon receipt of information indicating that the outside commitment presents a conflict of commitment, or because the commitment is not consistent with any applicable law or U.T. System policy. The covered individual shall be given notice of the information and an opportunity to respond.

VII. Management of Conflicts of Commitment

A. Conflicts of commitment by their nature cannot be managed in the same manner as conflicts of interest. As defined under this policy, conflicts of commitment will be managed through the reduction or elimination of outside commitments.
B. If the appropriate Dean or Department Head determines that a new covered individual has requested approval for an outside commitment that creates the possibility for a conflict of commitment, or that any other covered individual has requested approval for a new outside commitment that creates the possibility for a conflict of commitment, the Dean or Department Head shall, not later than the 30th day after the review of the request for approval, request the covered individual reduce or eliminate the outside commitment to ensure the performance of the covered individual’s performance of his or her institutional responsibilities.

VIII. Monitoring and Compliance

Each covered individual fulfilling his or her institutional responsibilities under a management plan shall comply fully and promptly with the plan, and each person identified in the management plan as having responsibility for monitoring compliance with the plan shall carefully and fully monitor that compliance.

IX. Accessibility

A. Web Posting of this Policy

This policy and each update of this policy must be publicly accessible through the Internet.

B. Availability of Information Regarding Specific Research Conflicts of Interest

1. For each managed conflict of interest related to sponsored research that is found to exist by the institutional official, the University will centrally retain and make the following information available to the public, upon request under the Texas Public Information Act (Chapter 552, Government Code), in regard to each covered individual who contributes to the scientific development or execution of the research project in a substantive, measureable way, including a covered individual who is the project director or principal investigator:
   d. the covered individual’s name;
   e. the covered individual’s title and role with respect to the research;
   f. the name of the entity in which the significant financial interest is held;
   g. the nature of the significant financial interest that constitutes a conflict of interest; and,
   h. the approximate value of the significant financial interest by range or, if the dollar value cannot be determined by reference to public prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value, a statement to that effect.

2. The approximate dollar value of the significant financial interest shall be provided within the following ranges if it can be determined by reference to public prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value:
   a. $0 - $4,999;
   b. $5,000 - $9,999;
   c. $10,000 - $19,999;
   d. amounts between $20,000 - $100,000 by increments of $20,000; or,
   e. amounts above $100,000 by increments of $50,000.

3. The University will update the information required by this section annually. In addition, for any managed conflict of interest of a covered individual whose information must be available under this section and for which the information was not previously available, the University will make the information required by this section available after the implementation of a management plan for the conflict of interest in accordance with the deadlines provided by the Texas Public Information Act.

4. The information required by this section must remain available for three years after its most recent update.

5. For PHS-funded research, in regard to project directors, principal investigators, and other senior or key
personnel, this information must be available before expending PHS funds.

C. U.T. System Electronic Database

1. Disclosures and Documentation to be Included in Database

Disclosures of significant financial interests and documentation of requests for approval shall be maintained for covered individuals in an electronic database that will include the following elements:
   a. a description of the nature and extent of all financial interests and outside commitments that are related to a managed conflict of interest or commitment;
   b. the range of total annual compensation received for all significant financial interests and outside commitments that are related to a managed conflict of interest or commitment; and,
   c. a description of the nature and extent of outside board service.

2. Public Display of Information

The following information will be publically accessible and searchable on the U.T. System Electronic Database:
   a. the nature and extent of the significant financial interest or outside commitment, including the range of compensation, for all managed conflicts of interests, unless deemed confidential following the procedures set forth in this policy; and,
   b. instructions for gaining access to a copy of a conflict of interest management plan.

X. No Expenditure of Funds Prior to Review and Determination

Neither the University nor a covered individual may expend research funds unless the institutional official has determined that no conflict of interest exists or that any conflict of interest is manageable in accordance with the terms of a management plan that has been adopted and implemented in accordance with this policy.

XI. Cooperation with Institutional Committees

The institutional official and the appropriate Institutional Review Board, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, Institutional Biosafety Committee, and other relevant committees shall cooperate in the consideration of whether a covered individual has a conflict of interest or commitment in regard to his or her institutional responsibilities and in the development and implementation of a management plan for that conflict of interest or commitment.

XII. Collaborators and Contractors

If research is carried out in cooperation with another entity through formal agreement with UT Dallas (such as a subcontractor or collaborator), the written agreement with the contracting party will provide legally enforceable terms that establish whether this policy or the conflict of interest and commitment policy of the contracting party applies to the investigators of the contracting party:

A. If the policy of the contracting party applies to its investigators, the contracting party must certify that its policy is consistent with the requirements of any applicable federal regulations, and the agreement must specify the time periods for the contracting party to report identified conflicts of interest to UT Dallas.

B. If the policy of UT Dallas applies to the investigators of the contracting party, the agreement must state that the researchers are subject to this policy as covered individuals for disclosing significant financial interests that are directly related to the investigator’s work at UT Dallas. In addition, the agreement must specify the time periods for the investigators to submit a disclosure to UT Dallas.
C. In research for which a proposal is submitted to or awarded by PHS, UT Dallas will provide reports to the PHS awarding component of all conflicts of interest prior to the expenditure of funds and within 60 days of any subsequently identified conflict of interest.

XIII. Education

A. A covered individual must complete training in regard to this policy and applicable policies, regulations, and laws before engaging in research at the University and at least annually.

B. A covered individual who is new to the University must complete the training before engaging in research and no later than the 30th day of initial employment.

C. A covered individual must complete the training immediately if the institution finds that the individual is not in compliance with this policy or the individual’s management plan, or if the institution revises this policy in a manner that affects the requirements of covered individuals, or as otherwise determined by the Institutional Official.

D. An individual responsible for the review of disclosures, the approval of requests for outside commitment, or the review and approval of management plans must complete training in regard to this policy and applicable policies, regulations, and laws at least annually.

XIV. Certification and Reports to PHS

Federal regulations require that each application for funding to the PHS include specific certifications, agreements, and reports in regard to this policy and conflicts of interest. Before the expenditure of any funds under a PHS-funded research project, the appropriate institutional officials will make the Financial Conflict of Interest Report to the PHS awarding component in compliance with 42 CFR Part 50, Subpart F, and 45 CFR Part 94. In general, those regulations require a Financial Conflict of Interest Report regarding those interests that the University determines are financial conflicts of interest, including financial conflicts of interest of sub-recipients. The reporting will include specified information sufficient to enable the awarding component to understand the nature and extent of the financial conflict and to assess the appropriateness of the management plan related to the conflict of interest. The federal regulations require reporting within a specified period of financial conflicts of interest identified subsequent to an earlier report and require annual updating of reports regarding previously disclosed financial conflicts of interest.

XV. Enforcement

A. Disclosure is a Condition of Employment or Relationship to University

1. Timely, complete, and accurate disclosure of significant financial interests and outside commitments consistent with this policy is a condition of employment at the University, and a covered individual who does not comply with this policy is subject to discipline, including termination of employment.

2. For a covered individual who is not an employee of the University, compliance with this policy is a condition of participating with the University in the capacity that qualifies the person as a covered individual. The University may require the individual to execute a document certifying that the individual knows that compliance with this policy is a condition of participation.

B. Federal Enforcement

1. Federal regulations, 42 CFR Part 50, Subpart F, and 45 CFR Part 94, require the University to notify the PHS of instances in which the failure of a covered individual to comply with this policy or a management plan appears to have biased the design, conduct, or reporting of PHS-funded research. The PHS awarding component may take enforcement action or require the University to take action...
appropriate to maintaining objectivity in the research. The University must make information available to HHS or the PHS awarding component as required by federal regulation.

2. If the HHS determines clinical research funded by PHS to evaluate the safety or effectiveness of a drug, medical device, or treatment has been designed, conducted, or reported by a covered individual with a financial conflict of interest that was not managed or reported by the University as required by federal regulation, the University will require the covered individual involved to disclose the financial conflict of interest in each public presentation of the results of the research and to request an addendum to previously published presentations.

XVI. Administration of Policy

A. Oversight and Authority

The president or his or her designee shall appoint an institutional official who is responsible for overseeing implementation of this policy and who may provide additional procedures and supplementary forms, as appropriate, consistent with this policy and applicable sponsor regulations.

B. Records

1. Records regarding the disclosure of financial interests and outside commitments, and the management of a conflict of interest or avoidance of a conflict of commitment, including disclosure statements and requests for approval, a reviewing official's determinations, and other records of institutional actions, shall be retained for the longer of at least three years after:

   a. the date of creation;
   b. the date of termination or completion of a research award or contract, or the submission of the final expenditures report, for research identified in a disclosure statement; or,
   c. the date of final resolution of any investigation, audit, or similar action involving the records.

2. The University will provide for a centralized repository for disclosure statements, requests for approval, management plans, and related records.

3. The institutional official, or another person designated by the president, shall provide the chancellor of The University of Texas System with copies of all guidelines, procedures, and forms used by the University relating to conflicts of interest and commitment and shall ensure that the chancellor receives copies of any revised guidelines, procedures, and forms simultaneously with the implementation of the revision.

XVII. Audits

The University will provide for regular audits of disclosure statements to determine individual and institutional compliance with this policy.

RELEVANT FEDERAL AND STATE STATUTES

- PHS Federal Regulations (42 CFR Part 50 Subpart F, 45 CFR Part 94)
- Texas Government Code Chapter 574 – Dual Office Holding
- Texas Constitution, Article 16, Section 40 - Holding More Than One Office
- Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR Part 46, 21 CFR Part 50)
- Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (PHS Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, Animal Welfare Act)
RELEVANT UT SYSTEM POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND FORMS

- UT System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations: 30103 (Standards of Conduct), 30104 (Conflict of Interest), 60306 (Use of University Resources), Series 90000 (Rules for Intellectual Property)
- UT Systemwide Policy 175: Disclosure of Significant Financial Interests and Management and Reporting of Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research
- UT Dallas Intellectual Property Policy
- UT Dallas Policy on Records Management and Retention
- UT Dallas Statement of Principles and Policies Regarding Human Subjects in Research
What is the intent of the policy “Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Researchers”?

The policy is intended to protect the integrity of the research and scholarship conducted at UT Dallas from the negative impact of a situation involving an actual conflict of interest or commitment. The policy also serves to protect the individual reputations of faculty and researchers and the institutional reputation of UT Dallas.

It is not the intent of the policy to eliminate or prohibit faculty and researchers from participating in situations involving potential conflicts. The policy provides a framework for faculty and researchers to identify situations that create the possibility for a conflict of interest or commitment, or the appearance thereof, and to work with UT Dallas to manage or avoid those situations.

Who is expected to comply with the policy?

The policy applies to all faculty and to any staff member or student who is responsible for the design, conduct or reporting of research at UT Dallas. If you are unsure you need to comply, please contact the Office of Research Compliance.

How am I expected to comply with the policy?

The primary responsibility of faculty and researchers under the policy is the disclosure of financial interests and outside commitments that are related to their institutional responsibilities to UT Dallas. Faculty and researchers are entrusted to determine whether a financial interest or outside commitment is “related” and thus requires disclosure under the policy. The Office of Research Compliance administers an online tool whereby faculty and researchers can submit a single disclosure statement to satisfy federal, state and UT System requirements.

How do I know if an activity or financial interest is related to my responsibilities at UT Dallas?

A financial interest is considered “related” if your performance of your institutional responsibilities, e.g., research, teaching, administration, at UT Dallas appears to directly and significantly affect either your financial interest in an entity other than UT Dallas, or the financial interest of such an entity. The following examples may help clarify this statement:

- **No Disclosure:** A UTD economics professor collects stamps as a personal hobby. Even though the collection has a value in the tens of thousands, the professor does not disclose the financial interest because the activity is personal in nature and is outside his area of expertise at UT Dallas.

- **Partial Disclosure:** A UTD materials science professor serves on the board of directors of the Materials Research Society and on the scientific advisory board for a company that uses technology similar to her research at UT Dallas. She does not disclose her position as board member for MRS because the position is a scholarly activity that directly benefits UT Dallas. However, she discloses her position as scientific advisor because she is compensated for her expertise by a company that could directly benefit from the results her research at UT Dallas.

- **Full Disclosure:** A UTD biology professor founded a start-up company to commercialize technology he invented, and wants to conduct research at UT Dallas to further develop the technology. He should disclose his ownership stake and position at the company because he and the company have a direct and significant financial interest in the results of his research at UT Dallas.

Where can I find more information?

Please contact Conor Wakeman in the Office of Research Compliance by phone (972-883-4718) or email (conor.wakeman@utdallas.edu) with any questions. You can also visit the Conflict of Interest program online, at http://www.utdallas.edu/research/orc/conflict_of_interest/.
Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Researchers

UT Dallas eLearning Training Modules
What is the intent of conflict of interest and commitment policy at UT Dallas?

• To protect the integrity of the research and scholarship conducted at UT Dallas

• To prevent the negative impact of an actual conflict of interest or commitment situation on:
  – the reputation and credibility of UT Dallas
  – the ability of UT Dallas faculty and staff to attract funding and new faculty and students

• To ensure compliance with federal regulations and UT System Regents Rules and policies
What is a Conflict of Interest?

UT Dallas defines a **Conflict of Interest** as a situation in which a significant financial interest could **directly and significantly** affect the performance of an employee’s institutional responsibilities.

**Institutional Responsibilities** are the work you perform for UT Dallas, including research, research consultation, professional practice, teaching, educational activities, administrative duties, and committee membership.
What is a Conflict of Commitment?

UT Dallas defines a **Conflict of Commitment** as a situation in which:

– An outside commitment could directly and significantly interfere with the performance of an employee’s institutional responsibilities; or,

– An employee uses UT Dallas, U.T. System or State of Texas property without authority or approval in connection with an outside commitment.
Who is expected to comply with the policy?

The policy applies to all UT Dallas faculty and any staff member or student at UT Dallas who is responsible for the design, conduct or reporting of research, including:

- Research staff and postdoctoral trainees
- Doctoral candidates and graduate students

If you are unsure whether you need to comply, please contact the Office of Research Compliance.
How am I expected to comply with the policy?

• You are expected to disclose financial interests and request prior approval for outside commitments that are related to your institutional responsibilities to UT Dallas.

• You are entrusted to determine whether a financial interest or outside commitment is “related” and thus requires disclosure or approval under the policy.

• The Office of Research Compliance offers an online tool whereby faculty and researchers can submit a single disclosure statement to comply with the policy.
What financial interests should I expect to disclose?

You are expected to disclose related financial interests that meet the value thresholds in the table below. You are also expected to disclose related fiduciary interests you hold in for-profit and non-profit entities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Financial Interest</th>
<th>Is Disclosure Required?</th>
<th>Is Prior Approval Required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>Yes, if the financial interest received is more than $5,000.</td>
<td>Prior approval is required for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>• A professional commitment for which you are compensated or that is related to a conflict of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Service on an outside board that directly benefits UT Dallas, whether compensated or uncompensated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Interest</td>
<td>Yes, if the interest represents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &gt; $5,000 fair market value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Controlling interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &gt; 10% voting or participating interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any interest (&gt; 0%) in a privately held business entity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>Yes, if the gift represents more than $250 in value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What financial interests **should I not expect** to disclose?

- Compensation or reimbursements you receive from UT Dallas.
- Interests held in investment vehicles, such as mutual funds and retirement accounts.
- Gifts received from family members.
- Travel reimbursements you receive from a government agency, higher education institution or affiliated research institute.
What outside commitments need prior approval?

You are expected to **request prior approval for outside commitments** as delineated in the table below. Faculty members and researchers are permitted to **engage in outside commitments no more than one day per week**, averaged over the current semester. If you are unsure whether an activity requires prior approval, please contact the Office of Research Compliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Outside Commitment</th>
<th>I am compensated for my service.</th>
<th>I am not compensated for my service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Prior approval is required.</td>
<td>Prior approval is required only if the commitment is related to a conflict of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitments that directly benefit UT Dallas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Board Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior approval is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior approval is not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior approval is not required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What commitments do not need prior approval?

• Activities performed by faculty members appointed on a 9-month basis during those months in which they are not working for UT Dallas, unless the activity is related to a significant financial interest that appears to create a conflict of interest.

• Personal activities for local municipal, social and religious organizations.

• Scholarly activities such as activities for professional journals and societies, colloquia and conferences, and advisory committees and review panels.

• Uncompensated activities that are not related to your institutional responsibilities.
What happens to my disclosure?

- Your **financial disclosure** is reviewed by a Conflict of Interest Specialist to ensure your disclosure is complete and accurate.
- Most disclosures do not present the possibility for a conflict of interest.

- Your **requests for prior approval** are reviewed by your organizational or department head.
- Most requests do not present the possibility for a conflict of commitment and are approved.
Applicable Rules and Regulations

- US Public Health Service (including the National Institutes of Health) ([42 CFR Part 50 Subpart F, 45 CFR Part 94](#))
- National Science Foundation
- UT Systemwide Policy 175
- UT Board of Regents Rules 30104
What if I have questions?

Please direct all questions to the Conflict of Interest program in the Office of Research Compliance:

Sanaz Okhovat, Senior Director
972-883-4579
sanaz.okhovat@utdallas.edu

Conor Wakeman, Conflict of Interest Specialist
972-883-4718
conor.wakeman@utdallas.edu
Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) Overview and Recommendations

By

UT Dallas Distance Learning Committee

January 2014
Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to summarize the Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) marketplace for the UT Dallas Academic Council to support the Council’s efforts to make strategic decisions regarding the appropriate role of MOOCs with respect to the mission, vision, and goals of UT Dallas. The report provides an overview of the MOOC marketplace, summarizes MOOC activity within the UT System, answers frequently asked questions regarding MOOCs, and presents a concise set of recommendations for the Academic Council to consider based on existing MOOC marketplace conditions. Primary recommendations include (1) defining the strategic role of MOOCs within UT Dallas, (2) establishing policy for the transfer of MOOC courses, and (3) appointing a responsible university official to actively monitor the MOOC marketplace. In response to this request, the UT Dallas Distance Learning Committee recommends that if adequate resources are available, the University works with the MOOC committee in the UT System to create one or more MOOCs in one or more strategically selected subject areas, as presence in the marketplace will enhance UT Dallas’ reputation and directly benefit the University in terms of faculty recruiting, student recruiting, and mission impact.

This report was prepared by the UT Dallas Distance Learning Committee at the request of the UT Dallas Academic Council.
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I. Report Objective

The purpose of this report is to provide UT Dallas Senior Leadership with a concise overview of the Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) industry; summarize MOOC activity in the UT System; and identify areas of the UT Dallas mission, vision, and goals impacted by MOOCs.

II. MOOC Marketplace Overview

Summary

- MOOCs, while growing in size and offering, are primarily done so through one of three organizations: Udacity, Coursera, and edX.
- MOOCs primarily provide certificates of completions and are rarely offered for credit.
- University participation is growing and there is some movement toward credit but it is currently a very small component.
- Recommendations for credit by the American Council of Education have been quite limited and are simply a recommendation that universities should grant credit.
- There is some movement toward independent university MOOC offerings, but there are not many independent of the top three organizations.
- Senior academic leaders have significant doubts regarding the long-term sustainability of MOOC offerings.

Details

Udacity

Udacity is a for-profit educational organization. It was born out of a Stanford University experiment in which Sebastian Thrun and Peter Norvig offered their "Introduction to Artificial Intelligence" course online to anyone for free. Over 160,000 students in more than 190 countries enrolled and shortly thereafter, Udacity was born. Udacity had students in 203 countries in the summer of 2012, with the greatest number of students in the United States (42%), India (7%), Britain (5%), and Germany (4%).

Udacity offers 26 courses, and Udacity's CS101—“Introduction to Computer Science”—with an enrollment of over 300,000 students, is the largest MOOC to date. Udacity students for CS101 range from 13-year-old to 80-year-old participants. Advanced 13-year-olds are able to complete multiple, higher-level computer science courses.
Udacity has a foundation of over $15 million and offers courses for “certificates of completion” and some for credit, as well (see below). Upon completing a course, students receive a certificate of completion that indicates their levels of achievement, signed by the instructors, at no cost.

In addition, beginning 24 August 2012, through a partnership with electronic testing company Pearson VUE, students of CS101 can elect to take an additional proctored 75-minute final exam for a fee of $89 in an effort to allow Udacity classes to "count towards a credential that is recognized by employers." Further plans announced for certification options would include a "secured online examination" as a less expensive alternative to the in-person proctored exams.

Through Udacity, students can earn college credit with San Jose State.

Colorado State University's Global Campus began offering transfer credit for CS101 for Udacity students that take the final exam through a secure testing facility.

In May 2013, the company announced the first entirely MOOC-based master's degree—a collaboration between Udacity, AT&T, and Georgia Institute of Technology—that costs $7,000, a fraction of normal tuition.

As of August 2012, students can enroll for one or more course any time the course is open.

Each course consists of several units comprised of video lectures with closed captioning, in conjunction with integrated quizzes to help students understand concepts and reinforce ideas, as well as follow-up homework, which promotes a "learn by doing" model.

**Coursera**

Coursera is an educational technology company offering MOOCs founded by computer science professors Andrew Ng and Daphne Koller from Stanford University. Coursera works with universities to make some of their courses available online and offers courses in engineering, humanities, medicine, biology, social sciences, mathematics, business, computer science, and other areas. More than 100 courses were offered in Fall 2012.

Coursera has university partnerships with the University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Stanford University and The University of Michigan. Total number of partnerships now exceeds 107.

In May 2013, Coursera announced free e-books for some courses in partnership with Chegg, an online textbook-rental company. Students use Chegg's e-reader, which limits copying and printing and allows students to use the book only while enrolled in the class.

During its first 13 months of operation (ending March 2013), Coursera offered about 325 courses, with 30% in the sciences, 28% in arts and humanities, 23% in information technology, 13% in business, and 6% in mathematics.

The contract between Coursera and participating universities contains a "brainstorming" list of ways to generate revenue, including certification fees, career assistance to introduce students to potential employers and recruiters (with student consent), tutoring, sponsorships, and tuition fees.
In September 2013, Coursera announced it had earned $1 million in revenue through verified certificates that authenticate successful course completion.

In January 2013, Coursera announced that the American Council on Education had approved five courses for college credit. As the journalist Steve Kolowich noted, "whether colleges take the council's advice, however, is an open question." The courses that were recommended to degree-granting institutions for college credit are

- **Algebra** from the University of California, Irvine
- **Pre-Calculus**, from the University of California, Irvine
- **Introduction to Genetics** and **Evolution** from Duke University
- **Bioelectricity: A Quantitative Approach** from Duke University
- **Calculus: Single Variable** from the University of Pennsylvania

Coursera will offer proctored exams at the end of these courses through ProctorU, an online proctoring service that connects proctors and students via webcam. The service will cost $60–$90.

**edX/Open edX**

This MOOC platform was founded by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University in May 2012 to host online university-level courses in a wide range of disciplines to a worldwide audience at no charge and to conduct research into learning. The two institutions have each contributed $30 million of resources to the nonprofit project. EdX has 1.2 million users.

MIT created the not-for-profit MITx. The inaugural course, 6.002x, launched in March 2012. Harvard joined MITx, renamed edX in Spring 2012, and University of California—Berkeley joined in Summer 2012. The initiative then added The University of Texas System, Wellesley College and Georgetown University, Rice University and others for a total of 13 U.S. universities at recent count.

In September 2013, edX announced a partnership with Google to develop Open edX, an open-source platform, and its MOOC.org, a site for non-consortium groups to build and host courses. Google will work on the core platform development with edX partners. In addition, Google and edX will collaborate on research into how students learn and how technology can transform learning and teaching. MOOC.org will adopt Google's infrastructure.

The platform uses online learning software that uses interactive experiences. Each week, a new learning sequence is released in an edX course. The learning sequence is composed of short (an average of 10 minutes each) videos interspersed with active learning exercises where students can immediately practice the concepts from the videos.

Through the learning sequence design, the professor delivers the course material. They can include illustrations, often on a tablet or slide.
The interface hosts a sidebar that shows the course text; the student can follow the text and scroll up or down it. The courses also often include tutorial videos that are similar to small-group on-campus discussion groups, an inline textbook and an online discussion forum where students can post and review questions and comments to each other and teaching assistants.

EdX offers certificates of successful completion at no cost, but does not offer course credit. Whether or not a college or university offers credit for an online course is within the sole discretion of the school.

**Other MOOC Providers**

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill—In June 2013, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill launched SkyNet University, which offers MOOCs on introductory astronomy. Participants gain access to the university’s global network of robotic telescopes, including those in the Chilean Andes and Australia. It incorporates YouTube, Facebook and Twitter.

University of Miami—In November 2012, the University of Miami launched first high school MOOC as part of Global Academy, its online high school. The course became available for high school students preparing for the SAT Subject Test in biology.

Ball State University—"Gender through Comic Books" was a course taught by Ball State University’s Christina Blanch on Instructure’s Canvas Network, a MOOC platform launched in November 2012. The course used examples from comic books to teach academic concepts about gender and perceptions.

CourSolve—In March 2013, CourSolve piloted a crowd-sourced business strategy course for 100 organizations with the University of Virginia. A data science MOOC began in May 2013.

MOOC List—The website MOOC List provides a complete list of MOOCs being offered and under development.

### III. The UT System MOOC Activity

According to UT news releases on 11 February 2013 and 1 April 2013, students around the world can participate in eight MOOCs to be offered by UT Austin during the 2013–2014 academic year. The courses will be deployed on the edX platform. In October 2012, The University of Texas System became the fourth partner in the edX consortium. Other members include Harvard, MIT, and University of California—Berkeley.

UT Austin plans to deploy four MOOCs in Fall 2013, followed by an additional four in Spring 2014. So far, no other UT System universities have announced plans to develop and implement MOOCs, but the 1 April 2013 news release said some were expected during the year. The UT Austin courses are
Fall 2013 Launch
(as of 1 April 2013, 15,000 students had registered)

- Ideas of the Twentieth Century
- Introduction to Globalization
- Introduction to Drug Development and the Commercialization Process
- Energy Technology & Policy (most students—5,000 by new release date)

Spring 2014 Launch

- Jazz Appreciation
- Mathematics and Effective Thinking
- Introduction to Embedded Systems
- Linear Algebra: Theory and Computation

Note: The flexibility of MOOCs allows for a beginning and end date not bound by the traditional academic calendar year, which encourages a global classroom where anyone in the world can register and participate.

IV. Impact of MOOCs on UT Dallas’ Mission, Vision and Goals

UT Arlington hosted an international conference Dec. 5–6, 2013 where scholars focused on MOOCs brought their most up-to-date research and connected with policy makers and consumers ($495).

What is a MOOC?

A MOOC is massive—i.e., the enrollment is typically unlimited, which differs from a face-to-face course that limits the registration for the class to a particular number of students. The course is open in that it allows anyone to register and participate in the MOOC classroom. The course is online, so anyone who has access to the Internet and the cyberspace that makes up the MOOC’s classroom can participate. And the MOOC is a course—i.e., the content includes multiple units, instruction, assessment to measure students’ learning, and record of students’ completion. (A course is not a singular unit of learning but a collection of multiple lessons.)
May MOOCs be taken for university credit?

A MOOC is similar to a university course but rarely offers university credit, although some universities may offer certificates for MOOC completion.

In November 2012, The Chronicle of Higher Education reported that the American Council on Education had agreed to review courses by several universities to consider giving college credit to students who completed MOOCs from these universities. (To give credit, these MOOCs would require students to provide “authentication of identity”—proof that students were who they claimed to be—among other changes that would formalize a students’ participation in the MOOC.)

Currently, the MOOC2Degree Initiative through Academic Partnerships (AP) in Dallas, TX, offers links to six universities—

- The University of Texas at Arlington College of Nursing
- University of Cincinnati
- Cleveland State University
- Lamar University
- University of Arkansas System
- University of West Florida

—that are participating by offering MOOCs that offer credit toward a college degree. AP announced in January 2013 that the organization is working with 40 universities to convert online degree programs to MOOCs.

The major concern regarding MOOCs for college credit centers on issues related to quality; while quality of content exists because traditional and online courses are being translated to MOOCs, “quality of design, accountable instructional delivery, or sufficient resources to help the vast majority of students achieve a course’s intended learning outcomes” are of concern, according to Inside Higher Ed. Thus, universities that are seeking to invest in MOOCs are focusing on how to establish quality as well as gain recognition and accreditation for those classes. However, experts anticipate that this will take time to develop. Others anticipate that MOOCs will not succeed as for-credit courses because they lack the benefits that result in a course when the instructor and student can interact.

What courses are currently available as MOOCs?

A comprehensive list of MOOCs available is maintained in an online database. The database lists 292 universities (including two schools in The University of Texas System—Austin and Arlington) offering courses that last 1 week to 52 weeks or are majors, minors, or self-paced with various amounts of effort for the courses (self-study or 1 hour each week to 20 hours each week). Courses use a variety of initiatives (35 listed in this resource), with current number of offerings (currently 1141 courses) in these most frequently used interfaces:
• Open2Study (39 MOOCs)
• Canvas.net (94 MOOCs)
• Coursera (374 MOOCs)
• EdX (80 MOOCs)
• Saylor.org (281 MOOCs)

Course topics include economics, photography, English, politics, teaching, justice, Web design, management, computer science, pharmaceuticals, biotechnology and thermodynamics of almost 200 topics.

Can MOOCs be used to reduce the cost of delivering education at UT Dallas?

Georgia Tech is offering a Masters Degree in Computer Science for approximately one seventh the cost of its traditional classroom based masters degree. The MOOC based degree cost is $6,600 while the cost for out-of-state students for the classroom-based program is approximately $45,000. As a new program, it remains to be seen if the business model surrounding the MOOC offering will be successful.

What hybrid offerings are possible with MOOCs?

MOOCs have tremendous potential for use in hybrid form. Western Governors University is promoting a competency-based model whereby students learn on their own and earn credit based on their ability to pass exams testing what they know. In this model, MOOCs are a resource students may use to acquire knowledge and prepare for competency-based exams administered by WGU. Similar to textbooks, MOOCs may be viewed as a learning resource for use in any classroom setting.

What are some of the copyright issues associated with developing and/or delivering MOOCs?

MOOCs create two major copyright issues—the copyright of the creator of the course and copyrights related to content.

First, in creating a MOOC, the instructor and university own the copyright on the course. However, because the information is published in an open cyberspace, the course content is accessible to others and thus exists unprotected on the Internet. While the instructor may mark all content under copyright, that marking does not ensure that anyone can take and use the content. Instructors and universities may choose to apply Creative Commons licensure to course content; however, that decreases the university’s ability to protect the content and thus use it for certification in that specific program. (This may affect the university’s ability to certify students who complete the coursework through the MOOC.)

Second, while instructors are able, per the defense of fair use, to use limited amounts of copyright data as educational material in the classroom, the copyright law does not allow for mass reproduction (without limit) of copyrighted information. While instructors may justify providing copyrighted intellectual property per the educational purpose of the MOOC, copyright holders may not agree to the unlimited access that students and Internet users may have of copyrighted data.
What policies need to be in place at the UT System and UT Dallas level to address a number of large-scale considerations that MOOCs inherently imply?

While policy recommendations both at a UT System and UT Dallas level are not within the scope of this report, several aspects related to policy have been identified and are suggested for consideration.

Scope

What types of courses should be directed toward MOOC and which should not? Given the differing nature of courses across a wide spectrum of subject and degree areas, not all courses are alike in their content and intent. Therefore, a more deliberate (rather than random) selection of courses to promote/consider in a MOOC setting is likely warranted.

Scale

Consideration of the impact on existing registration systems and process bandwidth is suggested. The actual or envisioned larger class sizes associated with MOOC’s (10,100, or even 1000x) will stress existing systems, both online capacities, as well as the usual exception types of workloads associated with things like advising, course changes, degree plan compliance with program requirements, course prerequisite review and correction of errors. The human element in the scaling process will likely be the first to be impacted by MOOC load factors.

Delivery

This note relates not to process, but rather the question of who should do MOOCs when you consider UT System and the many campuses. For example, is it efficient and effective use of human and financial resources to allow all UT System campuses to expend effort to create, prepare and deliver the same types of courses (especially if they are transferrable to other System institutions)? The perspective here is that one large MOOC course on a particular topic could encompass all of the students currently enrolled in that course across all UT System campuses today. Should a System like UT consider avoiding duplication of offerings, and rather work to coordinate assigned topic areas and offerings based on individual institution strengths, and other considerations?

How and to what extent would MOOCs and current online offerings compare, contrast, and converge/combine in terms of logistics and administration from a student perspective?

At a functional level, MOOCs and current online offerings are in concept comparably the same. The contrasts include both the obvious scale differences (100s online or less; 1000s or 10,000s or more as MOOC), as well as critical issues like: amount of student interaction with faculty and other teaching elements, that are often obvious but also implied in order to enable the course results and outcomes to meet student, parent, program, school, university, and accreditation requirements. Convergence/combining of online offerings into MOOCs, and vice versa, will have both similar and
differing characteristics, particularly in terms of logistics and administration, in preparation by faculty and development staff, and in course evaluations, grading and how the integrity of learning is managed.

**Would MOOCs in general drive a greater demand for competency-based considerations within courses, programs, and university application acceptance criteria and transfer credits?**

The considerations here involve both experiential learning and credit granting. For courses that have a significant element of experiential learning delivery and assessments, with such large MOOC numbers, what changes in evaluation processes would be required to handle the large numbers of students as compared to conventional online experiences? Would more and different types of assessments need to be developed/implemented to ensure learning criteria are both measured effectively as well as processes to correct deficiencies? Would MOOCs also drive a greater external demand for inclusion of more waivers, “testing out”, equivalence exams, “life experience” acceptance against official credit? Impacts on current competency, student assessments, and student reputation from institution policies in place today could be influenced by these external pressures.

**Where might resistance to MOOCs (as an online offering) come from?**

Our initial report thoughts here center around two areas. First, some parents and students want an in-class experience for personal preferences and the perception that you can learn more deeply from interpersonal interaction in an in-class setting. This does occur, and the external perception of MOOCs by these parties could degrade the appeal of an existing course, program or school at an institution. Second, another area that has ramifications from local, state and federal levels is the ability of MOOCs in general, and specific MOOC offerings in particular, to meet the explicit and implicit requirements to accommodate different student learning styles and student accommodations (learning and other disabilities, extended exam times, etc.). Are current processes that provide these accommodations today, given the assumed smaller scale environments we are used to, flexible enough and scalable in order to continue meeting MOOC implementation impacts?

**V. Recommendations**

MOOCs have the potential to disrupt the entire higher education marketplace given the possibility for MOOCs to deliver high quality education at a low cost. It is the recommendation of this committee that the UT Dallas Academic Council consider the following recommendations.
Define the Strategic Role of MOOCs within the University

The strategic role of MOOCs within the university should be clearly defined. Based on the preceding analysis of the MOOC marketplace, the following options should be considered.

- Create one or more MOOCs to build a leadership position in one or more strategically selected subject areas.
- Create one or more MOOCs to try and lower the cost of delivering education.
- Wait and see.

Creating one or more MOOCs to build a leadership position in the MOOC marketplace has the potential to enhance the reputation of the university globally and build MOOC market share. Reputation enhancing activities have direct benefit to the University in terms of faculty recruiting, student recruiting, and mission impact. In addition, while not a significant source of revenue today, MOOC market share may have significant value in the future. This approach is the approach most top universities are taking today (e.g., Harvard, MIT, Stanford, UT Austin, etc.).

Strategically selecting a handful of for-credit courses and/or programs for delivery via a MOOC has the potential to cost less when compared to traditional classroom based instruction. Georgia Tech and Western Governors University are following this approach, albeit using slightly different approaches. To the best of our knowledge, it appears the UT System will not mandate use of MOOCs as a cost savings measure anytime in the near future. Furthermore, given the significant impact to student experience, the potential for resistance from faculty and alumni, it is not recommended to create one or more MOOCs for cost savings purposes.

If adequate resources are available, it is the recommendation of this committee that the University works with the MOOC committee in the UT System to create one or more MOOCs as presence in this marketplace will enhance a leadership position in one or more strategically selected subject areas. So far, most universities are taking an ad-hoc approach to MOOC development creating a wide variety of differing courses. An opportunity exists to build a collection of courses in a particular subject area thereby becoming known as a “MOOC Leader” in the chosen subject area.

If adequate resources for creating MOOCs are unavailable, a wait and see approach is recommended.

Define Policy Regarding the Transfer of MOOC Courses

As the popularity of MOOC courses increases, UT Dallas must establish policy regarding the transfer of MOOC courses. Specifically, guidelines for the transfer and waiver of courses must be established.

Actively Monitor the MOOC Marketplace

Identify a responsible party for monitoring the MOOC marketplace and require the responsible party to provide an annual report on the MOOC marketplace to UT Dallas Senior Leadership.