August 14, 2019

TO: Academic Senate Members

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

RE: Academic Senate Meeting

The Academic Senate will meet on **Wednesday, August 21, 2019 at 1:00 p.m. in the TI Auditorium, ECS South 2.102.**

Please bring the agenda packet with you to this meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at x4791.

xc: Richard Benson
Hobson Wildenthal
Inga Musselman
Jessica Murphy

Juan Gonzalez
Calvin Jamison
Larry Redlinger
Gene Fitch

Serenity King
Abby Kratz
John Wiorkowski
Deans

Naomi Emmett, SC President
Ayoub Mohammed, SG President
Chief Larry Zacharias

---

2019-2020 ACADEMIC SENATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ackerman, Robert</th>
<th>Gelb, Lev</th>
<th>Ramakrishna, Viswanath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anjum, Zafar</td>
<td>Greer, Erin</td>
<td>Rebbello, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beron, Kurt</td>
<td>Gupta, Gopal</td>
<td>Reichert, Carolyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutia, Dinesh</td>
<td>Hefley, William**</td>
<td>Sadka, Gil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boats, Denise</td>
<td>Hibbs, Shelby</td>
<td>Schich, Maximilian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Hooshyar, M. Ali</td>
<td>Schlobohm, Maribeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury, Judd</td>
<td>Huynhm Dang T</td>
<td>Scotch, Richard ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandt, Patrick</td>
<td>Islam, Naser</td>
<td>Spiro, Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Matthew</td>
<td>Izen, Joe</td>
<td>Thompson, Lucien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case, Allison</td>
<td>Janakiraman, Surya</td>
<td>Vakareel, Victor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, Adam</td>
<td>Leaf, Murray ***</td>
<td>Veras de Souza, Christine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrasekaran, R.</td>
<td>Menon, Syam</td>
<td>Warner-Czyz, Andrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daeasen, Ovidin</td>
<td>Meyer, Clark</td>
<td>Warren, Shiyb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des, Greg</td>
<td>Natarabnam, Ramachandra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowling, Walter</td>
<td>Nourani, Mehrdad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragovic, Vladimir</td>
<td>Prakash, Ravi *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duquaine-Watson, Jill</td>
<td>Prasad, Shalini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferraris, John</td>
<td>Radhakrishnan, Suresh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumagalli, Andrea</td>
<td>Piquero, Nicole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Speaker
**Secretary
***Vice-Speaker
1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS           Ravi Prakash
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA                                   Ravi Prakash
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES                                      Ravi Prakash
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT                                         Ravi Prakash
5. THECB/SACSCOC Legislative Updates                        Serenity King
6. TXCFS/FAC REPORT                                         Murray Leaf and Bill Hefley
7. Student Government Report                                Ayoub Mohammed
8. Staff Council Report                                      Naomi Emmet

9. Results of Summer Voting                                  Bill Hefley
   A. Summing 2019 Graduates
   B. Approval of Committee on Committee Recommendations

10. Revisions to UTDPP1007-Bylaws of the Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas- 2nd vote Ravi Prakash

11. New Item - Informational : Resolution from the University Assessment Committee Ravi Prakash

12. Adjournment                                               Richard Benson
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ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
May 22, 2019

1. Call to Order for the Academic Senate Meeting and Announcements – Ravi Prakash

Ravi Prakash called the meeting to order at 1:01 PM. President Benson and Provost Musselman were at the May Board of Regents meeting. Dr. Prakash remarked on the retirement of Andrew Blanchard.

“Andy came to UTD in 2001. Since then, in addition to being a member of the faculty, he has held several administrative positions including Senior Associate Dean of the Erik Jonsson School of Engineering and Computer Science, Vice Provost, Vice President for Information Technology & CIO, and, mostly recently, Dean of Undergraduate Studies. He also played an important role in the founding of the Mechanical Engineering Department here at UTD, teaching some of the earliest courses in that major.

Andy has effortlessly transitioned between his roles as a mainline faculty member and an administrator. In doing so he exemplifies the best of shared governance. When the faculty and administration work in harmony towards a shared goal, which is to build the best university that we can build, usually good things happen.

Most of you know of Andy as a renowned scholar in the field of antennas and signal propagation. I am not sure if many of you know that he also builds and rebuilds his own sports cars: whether a German Porsche or an American Mustang. And then you should admire his artistry when it comes to woodworking. Andy is truly a renaissance man.
On a personal note, I have always looked upon Andy as one of my mentors. I have come to rely heavily upon his sage advice and constant support. On more occasions than I can remember, when I have been very upset about something at work I have emailed Andy expressing my frustration. Every time he has responded with a message that is usually two words long: “Let’s talk.” So, I would knock on his door and enter his office. He would always greet me with that glorious smile of his. That smile is therapeutic. Andy is not one to indulge me in my self-loathing or offer perfunctory commiseration. He is a problem-solver. The conversation always starts with, “Ravi, you have a problem. Let’s see how we can solve it.” And, he has always helped me find a fair solution.

I don’t know about the rest of you. But, I have so much to grow and learn before I can even aspire to become a person like Andy: a great scholar, and excellent teacher, and above all a caring human being.

Andy, we your colleagues at UTD, will always remember your service to the university. On behalf of this Senate, and the entire faculty at this fine university, let me thank you for your service.”

Dr. Blanchard received a standing ovation in recognition of all his good works during his time at UTD. Dinesh Bhatia presented a gift to Dr. Blanchard in recognition of his retirement from UTD.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Richard Scotch moved to move the Staff Council, Student Counseling Center presentation, and report from Academic Integrity following the Speakers Report, and approve the amended agenda. Joe Izen seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. Approval of the Minutes

Matt Brown moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Bill Hefley seconded the motion. The motion carried.

4. Speaker’s Report – Ravi Prakash

- The final interviews for the Executive Vice President and Chief of Staff were on May 29, 2019. Speaker Prakash noted that the he and the Vice Speakers with attended and will report back to the Academic Senate.
- All other items that I have been working on are on the agenda.

5. Staff Council Report – Naomi Emmet

6 CARE awards were handed out at the April 23, 2019 ceremony. The staff scholarship deadline for the fall semester is September 15, 2019. Staff Council has been working on their bylaws, and they will be going to the Handbook of Operating Procedures Committee in the next couple months. The Coffee with the President is filled and there is a waiting list for the June 6, 2019 event. The Staff Appreciation event will be June 11, 2019.

6. Presentation by the Student Counseling Center - Kimberly Burdine

Ms. Burdine gave brief overview of what the counseling center does, and how faculty can help the students. The handout provided for the faculty is included in Appendix A. The center provides
resources which include referrals off campus, so that no student waited more than three weeks for an appointment in the spring semester. If a student is in crisis they are often seen the same day. The center is looking into a satellite office, and walk-ins for one time session. Questions were raised about the center's budget and growth. It was noted that their budget was never approved by the Student Budget Fees committee.

7. **Report from the Committee on Academic Integrity- Erin Smith**
   The wording for the student code of conduct was added to the syllabus template. This will now include social media. The committee approved the wording with the digital platform instead of social media. It was approved unanimously. Bill Hefley seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

8. **SACSCOC/ The Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) Updates – Serenity King**
   Serenity King advised the Senate of the implementation plan for the Field of Studies. One item of note was that transfer students couple be required to take a lower division course if it is a school wide or university wide course. Advisors cannot require a transfer student to take a lower division course, but they can advise transfer students as why it would be a good idea to that those courses, especially if they want to attend grad school. A copy of the implementation plan is enclosed as Appendix B.

   The Health Studies Field of Study approved in the previous two weeks. It was noted that this FOS will seriously impact the university. Most of UTD’s lower division courses will not fit into the Field of Study. The university will respond back with feedback by June 10, 2019. This committee was the same that did the Health Care Studies and Health Care Management. The representatives for the Chemistry FOS have been selected and will be going to Austin soon. THECB his holding FOS committees over the summer, but there has been pushback from faculty as they typically do their research during the summer months.

   The transfer bill that was passed during the legislative session was the version that our university worked upon. The Higher Education is up for renewal at the federal level. A copy of SACSCOC President’s comments on this topic is included in Appendix C. The primary point of concern is that the Department of Education is taking away peer review on accreditation.

9. **FAC/TXCFS Report – Ravi Prakash and Bill Hefley**
   Nothing to Report

10. **Student Government Report – Ayoub Mohammed**
    FY20 Student Government is updating their bylaws to reflect current practices. The first meeting of the FY20 new Student Government will be September 20, 2019. Student Government has made finding appointees for university committees a high priority this summer.

11. **CEP Recommendations – Charles Hatfield**
    A. **Undergraduate & Graduate Course Inventory**
       Charles Hatfield moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the Undergraduate and Graduate Course Inventory. The motion carried.
    B. **MS in Cybersecurity**
Charles Hatfield moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the new MS in Cybersecurity. The motion carried.

C. MA in Interdisapline Studies
Charles Hatfield moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the MA in Interdisapline Studies. The motion carried.

D. Changes in Undergraduate and Graduate Programs
Charles Hatfield moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the changes in Undergraduate and Graduate Programs. The motion carried.

E. Catalog Update- Changes to Master’s Thesis requirements
Charles Hatfield moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the changes to the Masters thesis. The motion carried.

F. Catalog Update- EPPS Honors
Charles Hatfield moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the changes to the catalog language for EPPS Honors. The motion carried.

G. Catalog Update- Core Assessment Changes
Charles Hatfield moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the changes to the catalog language for Core Assessment. The motion carried.

H. Revision to UTDPP1075-Supplemental Employment of Graduate Students
Charles Hatfield moved on the behalf of CEP to approve revisions to UTDPP1075. The motion carried.

I. Revisions to UTDPP1052- Procedures for Completing a Graduate Degree
Charles Hatfield moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the revisions to UTDPP1052. The motion carried. A copy of the revision is included in Appendix D.

J. Informational: Undergraduate Admission Priority Deadline changes
Charles Hatfield advised the senate that the deadlines for Admissions has been updated.

12. FY2020 Committee on Committee Appointments- Ravi Prakash
Speaker Prakash reminded the Senate that the Committee on Committees will meet on June 11, 2019. He encouraged the senators to volunteer for committees.

13. Email Vote to Approve the Summer Graduates and Faculty Appointments to Committees – Ravi Prakash
Bill Hefley moved to approve the email vote for summer graduates. Nicole Piquero seconded. The motion carried.

Murray Leaf moved to approve the revisions to UTDPP1055. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried. A copy of the revision is included in Appendix D.

15. Hearing Tribunal Appointments. – Ravi Prakash
Murray Leaf moved to approve the Hearing Tribunal appointments. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried. A copy of the Senate and President Benson’s recommendation are included in Appendix E.

16. Revisions to UTDPP 1035: Committee on research involving human subjects (IRB Committee)- Ravi Prakash
The Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects updated their charge to be more in line with the university’s needs and updated federal policies. The committee moved to approve the revision.

17. Revisions to UTDPP 1077- Bylaws of the Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas - Ravi Prakash
Nicole Piquero moved to approve the bylaws. Gopal Gupta seconded. The motion carried. Changes made to the bylaws must have two approvals. The item will be on the August agenda for a second vote.

18. Revisions to UTDPP1050, UTDPP1061, UTDPP 1062, UTDPP1081, UTDPP1085, UTDPP1088 - Serenity King
The policies were updated to reflect the changes to tiles per the updated Regents Rules. Murray Leaf moved to approve the revised policies. Dinesh Bhatia seconded. The motion carried.

19. Revisions to UTDPP1107-International Education Development Committee - Serenity King
The committee updated their charge to reflect that they want the Dean of Undergraduate education and Dean of Graduate Education to switch off chair and vice-chair for the committee. Murray Leaf moved to approve the revised policy. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.

20. Informational: Update on OSA Accommodations for Testing Issue – Bill Hefley
A subcommittee of the University Accessibility Committee is piloting new mechanisms, and has again recommended a door for the testing center, however the status of the door has not been updated.

21. Adjournment
There being no further business, President Benson adjourned the meeting 2:45 PM.

APPROVED: ____________________________  DATE: _____________

Ravi Prakash
Speaker of the Faculty
Identifying students in distress:

Look for **social behaviors** that might indicate distress (i.e. avoiding participation, dominating discussions, excessive anxiety, disruptive behavior, exaggerated emotional responses *that are inappropriate to situation*, and/or sudden changes in social/classroom behavior).

Look for **unusual behaviors or appearance** (i.e. depressed mood, hyperactivity or rapid speech, unexplained crying, irritability, or angry outburst, change in personal hygiene or dress, dramatic weight loss or gain, and/or strange/bizarre behavior indicating loss of contact with reality).

Take all **references to suicide, homicide, or death** seriously (i.e. expressing thoughts of hopelessness or helplessness, overt references to suicide, and/or homicidal threats).

Responding to students in distress:

**Initiate** a private conversation, give **undivided attention**, and do so with a **caring attitude**.

**Do not promise confidentiality in event of suicidal/homicidal thoughts.** Promise privacy and support. *Gossip is a sure way to increase a person’s distress; don’t gossip about a person who’s confided in you.*

Express your concern in behavioral (specific), **non-judgmental** terms. Then, most importantly, **listen** to how the person responds.

**Repeat back** the essentials of what you hear, with special **emphasis on the emotions**. Let the conversation continue in this cycle, and **applaud the person’s willingness** to discuss.
Seek additional support:

If at any point you feel the problem is more serious than either of you feel comfortable or safe in handling.

If you think that your personal feelings about the person might interfere with your ability to be objective.

If the person admits that there is a problem but they don’t want to speak with you about it.

If the person asks for information or help that you are unable to provide.

Referring for additional support:

State your concerns clearly and directly to the person.

Remind them of your promise for privacy and support, and let them know that you think getting some additional support is necessary. *Blame it on this workshop!*  

Introduce the counseling center, give the contact information, and/or offer to go over with or sit with the person as they call the center. If a crisis and after hours, call campus police and/or the counseling center’s 24hr crisis line, 9/2.UTD.TALK (9/2.883.8255).

Wondering if you are at risk for a mental health concern? Get a screening at the counseling center website or at www.mentalhealthscreening.org. If you’re a staff member or faculty managing/concerned about your own mental health, you might find the UT Dallas Employee Assistance Program useful, www.utdallas.edu/counseling/personalhelp/ or call 214-648-5330.

For more information about this resource or general information about the counseling center, email Shelly Turner, LPC-S at sdt140730@utdallas.edu or Dr. Kimberly Burdine at kimberly.burdine@utdallas.edu.
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Agency Mission
The mission of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) is to provide leadership and coordination for Texas higher education and to promote access, affordability, quality, success, and cost efficiency through 60x30TX, resulting in a globally competitive workforce that positions Texas as an international leader.

Agency Vision
The THECB will be recognized as an international leader in developing and implementing innovative higher education policy to accomplish our mission.

Agency Philosophy
The THECB will promote access to and success in quality higher education across the state with the conviction that access and success without quality is mediocrity and that quality without access and success is unacceptable.

The Coordinating Board’s core values are:
- **Accountability**: We hold ourselves responsible for our actions and welcome every opportunity to educate stakeholders about our policies, decisions, and aspirations.
- **Efficiency**: We accomplish our work using resources in the most effective manner.
- **Collaboration**: We develop partnerships that result in student success and a highly qualified, globally competent workforce.
- **Excellence**: We strive for excellence in all our endeavors.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age or disability in employment or the provision of services.

Please cite this report as follows: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (2019). Implementing Fields of Study. Austin, TX.
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Executive Summary

Fields of Study (FOS) are sets of lower-division courses that are guaranteed by state law to transfer across all Texas public institutions of higher education and apply to degree programs.

FOS contribute to the goals of the state's 60x30TX strategic plan for higher education. Each FOS is designed by faculty committees to include the necessary coursework for success in the major, no matter to which public institutions of higher education in Texas students transfer. Also, because every course in an FOS is guaranteed by state law to transfer and apply to the appropriate degree program, students can minimize the risk of taking unnecessary courses and incurring the extra expenses that come with them. Students who complete an FOS are finished with their lower-division major requirements for the applicable degree program. Students who do not complete an FOS must still have the courses they completed transfer and apply to the degree program.

FOS help advance each of the four goals in the state's 60x30TX strategic plan for Texas higher education, particularly the goal of not having student loan debt exceed 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions by 2030. Because every course in a complete or incomplete FOS is guaranteed by state law to transfer and apply to the relevant degree program, students can eliminate the extra time and expense of taking unnecessary courses.

Each FOS is determined by advisory committees consisting of up to 24 faculty with expertise in the field, drawn equally from two- and four-year institutions. Committees may create multiple tracks within the FOS, depending upon discipline specialties or licensing requirements. If necessary, committees can create new courses or revise existing ones in the Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual. All FOS are posted in the Texas Register for a 30-day public comment period before they are approved by the Board of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

All institutional personnel can assist with FOS implementation.

- Executive Administration can assist with the implementation of FOS by distributing relevant information to faculty and staff, regularly nominating faculty for FOS advisory committees, and reviewing transfer policies to remove barriers.
- Registrars have a key role to play in identifying FOS courses on transcripts and promoting efficient and consistent course equivalencies in transfer.
- Deans and department chairs need to work with faculty to make sure there are enough course offerings and to see if FOS courses can also be used as core curriculum component options.
- Faculty and advisors can make sure students know about FOS courses early in their degree plans to minimize time and money spent on unnecessary courses.

Fields of Study will not help students if public institutions of higher education throughout Texas are not complying with the statute, not offering the courses, or inconsistently applying the regulations. This guide offers recommendations to institutions on how to effectively implement the Field of Study curricula to maximize student benefits while minimizing administrative conflicts.
Background Information on Fields of Study

The Texas higher education 60x30TX strategic plan prioritizes the creation of effective pathways from the first semester of higher education, through graduation with a manageable amount of student debt, and into the workforce with an identifiable set of marketable skills. There are many pathway projects, from secondary schools to graduate programs, at the local and state level. For example, pathway initiatives and tools approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (Coordinating Board or THECB) in recent years include a core curriculum that is guaranteed by state law to transfer between all public institutions of higher education; the Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual which lists all of the courses that can receive state funding at community colleges and are guaranteed to transfer across institutions; the Texas Common Course Numbering System, which lets students know what courses are equivalent across institutions despite possible course title differences; and required advising for optimum course selection once a student completes 30 semester credit hours (SCH) to prevent students from taking unnecessary courses.

Other pathway initiatives are the individual articulation agreements between colleges and their university transfer partners. Faculty from the same discipline at both institutions meet to discuss coursework, student needs, and common learning objectives. When the student transfers from the college, the university agrees to accept the transfer credits toward the degree program. The 75th Texas Legislature enacted legislation that requires the state’s public universities to accept lower-division coursework for bachelor’s degree programs in specific academic areas. FOS function as statewide articulation agreements; they are valid across all public institutions of higher education in the state and are backed up by state law (Texas Education Code, Chapter 61, Section 61.823; see Appendix A).

What is a Field of Study?

An FOS is the grouping of lower-division courses that are guaranteed by state law to transfer and apply to a degree program. Just as when students complete the core curriculum at public institutions and are considered core complete when they transfer to any other public institution (even if the receiving institution offers a different selection of core courses), students who complete an FOS curriculum at any public institution have completed the lower-division requirements for their degree program when they transfer to any other public institution (even if the receiving institution offers a different selection of lower-division requirements).¹

Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Chapter 4, Subchapter B, Rule 4.32(b), states: “If a student successfully completes a field of study curriculum developed by the Board, that block of courses must be substituted in transfer to a general academic teaching institution for that institution’s lower-division requirements for the degree program for the field of study into which the student transfers, and the student must receive full academic credit toward the degree program for the block of courses transferred.” The word “substituted” means that the completed FOS transfers

¹ The Coordinating Board also has a related initiative called Programs of Study, which do for workforce certificates and associate of applied science degree programs what FOS do for academic programs. Advisory committees consisting of secondary school faculty, higher education faculty, and industry representatives design sets of courses that give students guidance on what courses from high school onward are guaranteed to transfer and ensure preparation for specific workforce careers.
in as the completed lower-division major requirements at the receiving institution, and the
receiving institution cannot require any additional lower-division major coursework for the
degree. The receiving institution can continue to set its own lower-division course requirements
for its native students in degree programs.

Also, according to Rule 4.32(c), institutions can require additional lower-division courses outside
the FOS if a student transfers with an incomplete FOS: "A student who transfers from one
institution of higher education to another without completing the field of study curriculum of the
sending institution must receive academic credit in the field of study curriculum of the receiving
institution for each of the courses that the student has successfully completed in the field of
study curriculum of the sending institution. Following receipt of credit for these courses, the
student may be required to satisfy the remaining course requirements in the field of study
curriculum of the receiving institution, or to complete additional requirements in the receiving
institution’s program, as long as those requirements do not duplicate course content already
completed through the field of study curriculum.”

Community colleges can award an associate degree to students who complete an approved FOS
but only a portion of the 42 SCH core curriculum, if the total for both would exceed 60 SCH.
This is helpful for degree programs such as Architecture, Engineering, or Music, where students
need to begin taking program courses as soon as possible and stay on track with extensive
degree requirements at the lower division (TAC, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 9, Subchapter J, Rule
9.183).

How do Fields of Study work with the core curriculum?
Courses in the FOS can “double dip” with the core curriculum. For example, Calculus I (MATH
2413) is a part of the Mathematics FOS, but it can also fulfill the 3 SCH requirement for the
Mathematics component area of the core.

If an FOS course is also used as a core course, the receiving institution cannot add an extra
lower-division degree program requirement in its place. The FOS transfers in as the total set of
lower-division requirements for the degree program (unless there are also lower-division
courses required of all students in the university or college regardless of major).

Appendix H is a shareable infographic about how the FOS integrates with the core curriculum.

How does the Coordinating Board develop and approve Fields of Study?
Advisory committees: The process of creating an FOS begins with Coordinating Board rules
authorizing the creation of an FOS advisory committee. Texts of the proposed rules are
published in the Texas Register for a 30-day public comment period.

After the rules are approved by the Committee on Academic and Workforce Success (CAWS)
and the full Board of the THECB, a call for nominations goes out via GovDelivery to presidents,
chancellors, chief academic officers (CAOs), chief instructional officers (CIOs), and Coordinating
Board liaisons at all public general academic institutions, community colleges, and public and
state technical colleges in Texas. By nominating an individual for an advisory committee, each
institution pledges to pay the nominee’s expenses for the meetings in Austin.
Once nominations are received, Coordinating Board staff select up to 24 faculty members, drawn equally from two- and four-year institutions. For example, if there were 12 nominations from one type of institution but only 8 nominations from the other type of institution, then there would be 16 total members on the FOS advisory committee.

Whenever possible, FOS advisory committee members are selected to provide fair representation of Texas institutions and faculty. Coordinating Board staff aim for balance between the sizes of institutions, accountability peer groups, regions of the state, university systems, community college districts, faculty of all levels, and gender.

The FOS advisory committees are polled for their preference of meeting dates, and then a two-day meeting is held at the Coordinating Board offices in Austin. All meetings are broadcast live and stored on YouTube for full transparency. The first day provides an overview of what FOS are, how they work, and what regulations are in place. Two co-chairs are elected, one from a two-year institution and one from a four-year institution.

Faculty discuss the general needs of the major at the lower division, review the degree requirements at universities, review what courses are available in the Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual, and review Coordinating Board data on which courses are most frequently offered and have the highest enrollments. When they are ready to select the specific courses for the FOS, committee members may create more than one track within the FOS if necessary, depending upon discipline specialties or licensing requirements for career paths. Only if it is essential for including crucial content for success in upper-division courses, the committee can create new courses or revise existing ones in the Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual.

Public comment: Once the advisory committee has drafted a recommended FOS curriculum, it is distributed to the Texas Register, CAOs, CIOs, and Coordinating Board liaisons for a 30-day public comment period to provide further opportunities for faculty input. Every comment is considered by the committee. The committee’s responses to the public comments are summarized in the public agenda item pages when the FOS curriculum is up for final approval by the Board of the THECB.

Advisory committees will review each FOS every five years, or sooner if needed, to ensure that the curriculum is meeting the needs of the discipline and the job market.

**How do Fields of Study contribute to the state’s higher education goals?**

FOS help advance each of the four goals in the state’s 60x30TX strategic plan for Texas higher education.

**Goal 1:** By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a certificate or degree.

**Goal 2:** By 2030, at least 550,000 students in that year will complete a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from an institution of higher education in Texas.

By completing an FOS at any public institution of higher education, no matter where they transfer, students can progress with confidence in two essential elements of a pathway to graduation: 1) the courses they take are guaranteed by state law to transfer for credit and
apply toward a major, and 2) the pre-selected coursework in the FOS has been reviewed by a panel of faculty to ensure that students will have the knowledge and skills necessary for success in upper-division coursework.

**Goal 3:** All graduates from Texas public institutions of higher education will have completed programs with identified marketable skills.

FOS curricula are designed by advisory committees consisting of community college and university faculty from across the state with practical teaching and research experience in the discipline. The committees consider each course carefully for how it prepares students for success in the major and the careers to which those majors lead. Each FOS is revisited periodically to ensure that it reflects the current state of the discipline and the needs of the related job markets.

**Goal 4:** By 2030, undergraduate student loan debt will not exceed 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions.

Because every course in an FOS is guaranteed by state law to transfer and apply to a degree program (even when the total FOS is not completed), students can eliminate the extra time and expense of unnecessary courses. Some FOS courses may also be available as dual credit options, allowing students to begin their degree plan in high school with the certainty that their courses will count toward their baccalaureate degree no matter what public institution they decide to attend.

Even small changes in the number of attempted SCH can have a significant impact on student debt, and by extension, student persistence and graduation rates. Students may end up paying twice for each course that is taken at a community college that is not accepted for credit toward the degree program at a transfer university (Table 1). For example, a community college student may take two courses (6 SCH) in Criminal Justice that the student assumes will count toward a Criminal Justice major after transferring to a university. If the university does not accept those courses toward requirements for the major, and if the student has already used up the lower-division free elective credits (if any) and core curriculum selections, then the student will have paid for the two courses at the college and will have to pay again for the two required university Criminal Justice courses that will count in their stead.

**Table 1.** Average student costs of excess college SCH (based on 2017 statewide average academic charges).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One Course (3 SCH)</th>
<th>Two Courses (6 SCH)</th>
<th>Three Courses (9 SCH)</th>
<th>Four Courses (12 SCH)</th>
<th>Seven Courses (21 SCH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Costs</td>
<td>$301.80</td>
<td>$603.60</td>
<td>$905.40</td>
<td>$1,207.20</td>
<td>$2,112.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Costs</td>
<td>$904.20</td>
<td>$1,808.40</td>
<td>$2,712.60</td>
<td>$3,616.80</td>
<td>$6,329.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>$1,206</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,412</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,618</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,824</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,442</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Coordinating Board

FOS minimize this financial risk to students. Students who plan to major in a field with a THECB board-approved FOS will know exactly what courses to take, and by omission what courses not to take, as soon as they enroll or begin taking dual-credit courses in high school.
Implementation Information for Administrators

Distribute Information and Oversee Compliance

Administrators can be most helpful to the success of FOS by ensuring that relevant information and communication from the Coordinating Board is distributed to the appropriate people on campus. This includes making sure that deans and registrars understand the legal requirements for compliance, distributing requests for faculty nominations to the appropriate department chairs, and keeping staff updated with information about FOS in the quarterly update memos that follow each Board meeting. It may be helpful to identify an administrator to oversee FOS participation on campus, collect data for compliance reports, and serve as the liaison for FOS issues between the faculty and administration. Coordinating Board staff are available to work with institutional staff to address questions and provide guidance and information.

Encourage Faculty Participation

Administrators should promote and support nominations to FOS advisory committees. It is important to have voices in the room from a cross-section of institutions when decisions are made about what the lower-division requirements will be for degree programs at every public institution in Texas. Faculty participation also assumes financial support from institutions to support the member's transportation, lodging, and expenses for the meeting dates in Austin. The THECB is aware that this sometimes means a substantial financial commitment from institutions, particularly small institutions in regions far from central Texas, but we hope that administrators will recognize the importance of the committee's work and offer faculty members the opportunity to participate in the committee process.

After an advisory committee proposes an FOS, it goes out for a 30-day public comment period. The proposed FOS is sent out as a memo to all presidents, chancellors, chief academic officers, chief instructional officers, and Coordinating Board liaisons at all Texas public institutions of higher education. Administrators should let relevant deans and department chairs know when an FOS is proposed for one of their degree programs, encourage departments to discuss the proposed FOS at faculty meetings, and send the Coordinating Board any responses and recommendations. The advisory committees consider all responses received, and if changes are made to the proposed FOS, it goes out for a second 30-day comment period.

Review Transfer Policies

Administrators can promote the success of FOS by proactively reconsidering any policies that create barriers to successful transfer, including any policies that prevent lower-division courses from transferring in as the equivalent of upper-division courses with similar course content. Barriers can take many forms (see, for example, the Coordinating Board’s annual Texas General Academic Institutions: Increasing Successful Community College Transfer report for survey results). For FOS, it is important that department chairs and curriculum committees establish course equivalencies in transfer for courses that their programs may not offer at the lower division.

Transfer Dispute Resolution

If there are any disputes about how transfer credits are applied to programs, the two institutions and the student must first attempt to reach a consensus according to Coordinating Board rules (Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 4, Subchapter B, Rule 4.27). Failing that, either institution
may notify the Commissioner of Higher Education in writing for a transfer dispute resolution. The Commissioner’s determination is final.

**Implementation Information for Registrars and Institutional Researchers**

Registrars can play an important role in making sure that staff who handle transfer issues are aware of what FOS are and how they work. Most importantly, registrars need to make it clear to the staff who apply credit for transferred-in courses that the courses from a completed FOS are not optional or to be handled on a course-by-course basis, but instead are a block of courses that are required by state law to transfer and fulfill the lower-division major degree requirements for the applicable degree program. If a student has not completed the full FOS and transfers from one institution of higher education to another, the student must receive academic credit for each of the courses that the student has successfully completed and have these courses applied to the major.

Institutional reporting officials are responsible for reporting FOSC completion on the CBM009, the report that captures graduation and other completion outcomes. It is important to document completed FOSC each year, even if a student has also completed the core curriculum or a degree at the same time.

Registrars are responsible for implementing the statutory requirement that FOS courses be identified on a student’s transcript. Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Title 19, Chapter 4, Subchapter B, Rule 4.32(e) states that “Each institution must note field of study curriculum courses on student transcripts as recommended by the Texas Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (TACRAO).” The Coordinating Board is currently working with TACRAO to develop a common transcription process for FOS.

To assist receiving institutions, college registrars are encouraged to indicate on a student’s transcript if a student has completed an FOS. Registrars also are encouraged to identify FOS courses in the undergraduate catalog and sample degree plans, including explanations of how the FOS works. It is especially important for community college students to understand FOS as soon as possible after identifying a planned major so they can select the appropriate courses and minimize the risk of taking unnecessary SCH.

**Implementation Information for Deans and Department Chairs at Universities**

One of the most commonly asked questions the Coordinating Board receives is whether a university can add additional lower-division courses on top of what is in the FOS. It is important for deans and department chairs to understand, and communicate to their faculty, that the answer is no—a completed FOS transfers in as a full substitute for the receiving institution’s lower-division requirements for the degree program. For example, if an institution’s Criminal Justice major requires native students to take a lower-division Statistics for Social Sciences course, a transfer student who comes in with the completed FOS in Criminal Justice (which does not include a comparable course) cannot be required to take it, even if the Statistics course is a prerequisite for later upper-division courses.
Here are the possible exceptions:

- If the transfer student comes in with an incomplete core curriculum, the receiving institution could advise the student to take the Statistics course to fulfill the relevant component area of the core.

- An institution can still require lower-division courses that are not specific to the degree program, such as Learning Frameworks, Math, or Language courses that are required of all students at the institution, college, or school, regardless of their major. Non-credit courses such as Introduction to University Studies that are required of all students can also be required, as can developmental education courses that do not count toward the degree program.

- If a student transfers in with an incomplete FOS, the student must be given credit toward the major for the FOS courses that are completed. After that, the student can be treated as a native student and be required to take additional lower-division courses not specified in the FOS, so long as the additional courses do not substantially repeat the content from completed FOS courses.

The Coordinating Board encourages deans and department chairs to work closely with the departments’ curriculum planning committees and undergraduate studies committees to help align lower-division curriculum with the FOS. This can be done in several ways:

- Offer enough sections of the courses included in the FOS.

- When FOS courses are not yet available on your campus, identify how the FOS courses will transfer in as course equivalents. It will increase both efficiency and consistency. Communicate the equivalencies to your transfer partner institutions.

- Add FOS courses to the institution’s core curriculum component area options. If a course can count toward both the core curriculum and the FOS, it may enable more program flexibility for applying courses to the overall 120-SCH degree program.

- Revisit the upper-division curricula and the possible prerequisites to align the curriculum with the learning outcomes reflected in the FOS.

**Implementation Information for Deans and Department Chairs of Community and Technical Colleges**

It can be an effective recruitment tool to let students know that the institution offers a full slate of courses that are guaranteed by state law to transfer and apply to degree programs at any public university in Texas. Institutions are encouraged to offer every course in each FOS curriculum with enough sections to accommodate student demand.

Institutions are encouraged to embed the FOS into the relevant associate degree programs, providing students with the opportunity to have a completed FOS if they later decide to transfer to a four-year institution. Developing guided pathways and model degree maps may be a good mechanism for reviewing how FOS courses can be incorporated into degree plans and flagged for students.

Work with members of your partner transfer institutions to identify course equivalencies if the university does not offer the same FOS courses. The specific course content taught in the FOS
courses may influence how the receiving university chooses to use its electives and shape its upper-division offerings.

This may require changes in staffing and teaching assignments, and in some cases, it may mean that enrollments may fall in Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual courses that are not included in the FOS. Please communicate to your faculty that the long-term benefits to students will justify the difficult choices to be made on campus. For example, see Table 1 (pg. 4) for the cost savings to students by not taking courses that do not apply to their degrees. If a student takes just three unnecessary courses that do not apply toward their major after transfer, and if the student then must take three additional courses to replace them at the university, that student will be losing an average of $3,618 and possibly a full additional semester of time to complete the degree.

Implementation Information for Faculty and Advisors

Faculty and advisors can have a powerful impact on students’ educations by making sure they know about the FOS curriculum as soon as they identify their intended degree program. FOS can take a burden off advisors who no longer need to produce multiple transfer guides for multiple institutions or work with individual students to identify what courses will and will not count for credit in degree programs at various universities across the state. The FOS curriculum can be made available in sample degree maps, course selection guides, and course catalogs. If your institution offers FOS courses for dual credit or has outreach programs to area high schools, there are opportunities to publicize the FOS curriculum. The sooner students know about FOS curricula, the less chance there is of them using time and money to take unnecessary courses for their degree programs.

Take opportunities to communicate with the faculty at transfer partner institutions to discuss the content of shared FOS courses. The goal is to not have students unnecessarily duplicating content in courses with different names at different levels. Because FOS courses are fully transferrable and applicable to the degree program, the courses and their applicable fields have the potential to open spaces for faculty to bridge the content of their courses and promote student engagement and degree completion. They may also present new opportunities for collaboration between college and university faculty members.
Appendix A

Texas Education Code, Chapter 61, Section 61.823: Field of Study Curriculum

(a) The board, with the assistance of advisory committees composed of representatives of institutions of higher education, shall develop field of study curricula. Each advisory committee shall be equitably composed of representatives of institutions of higher education. Each university system or institution of higher education which offers a degree program for which a field of study curriculum is proposed shall be offered participation on the advisory committee for that particular field of study. At least a majority of the members of any advisory committee named under this section shall be faculty members of an institution of higher education. An institution shall consult with the faculty of the institution before nominating or recommending a person to the board as the institution’s representative on an advisory committee.

(b) If a student successfully completes a field of study curriculum developed by the board, that block of courses may be transferred to a general academic teaching institution and must be substituted for that institution’s lower division requirements for the degree program for the field of study into which the student transfers, and the student shall receive full academic credit toward the degree program for the block of courses transferred.

(c) A student who transfers from one institution of higher education to another without completing the field of study curriculum of the sending institution shall receive academic credit from the receiving institution for each of the courses that the student has successfully completed in the field of study curriculum of the sending institution. Following receipt of credit for these courses, the student may be required to satisfy further course requirements in the field of study curriculum of the receiving institution.

(d) In developing field of study curricula, the board shall pursue a management strategy that maximizes efficiency, including a management strategy that provides for the decentralization of advisory committees to enable concurrent development of curricula for different fields of study.

(e) The board, with the assistance of an appropriate advisory committee, shall periodically review each field of study curriculum to ensure alignment with student interest and academic and industry needs.

(f) Repealed by Acts 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., Ch. 1083, Sec. 25(21), eff. June 17, 2011.
Appendix B

Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 4, Subchapter B, Rule 4.32: Field of Study Curricula

(a) In accordance with Texas Education Code, §61.823, the Board approves field of study curricula for certain fields of study/academic disciplines. Field of study curricula shall be developed with the assistance of advisory committees whose membership includes at least a majority of members who are teaching faculty (as defined by §4.23(8) of this title, relating to Definitions for Core Curriculum and Field of Study Curricula) within the field of study under consideration.

(b) If a student successfully completes a field of study curriculum developed by the Board, that block of courses must be substituted in transfer to a general academic teaching institution for that institution’s lower-division requirements for the degree program for the field of study into which the student transfers, and the student must receive full academic credit toward the degree program for the block of courses transferred.

(c) A student who transfers from one institution of higher education to another without completing the field of study curriculum of the sending institution must receive academic credit in the field of study curriculum of the receiving institution for each of the courses that the student has successfully completed in the field of study curriculum of the sending institution. Following receipt of credit for these courses, the student may be required to satisfy the remaining course requirements in the field of study curriculum of the receiving institution, or to complete additional requirements in the receiving institution’s program, as long as those requirements do not duplicate course content already completed through the field of study curriculum.

(d) A student concurrently enrolled at more than one institution of higher education shall follow the field of study curriculum requirements of the institution at which the student is classified as a degree-seeking student.

(e) Each institution must note field of study curriculum courses on student transcripts as recommended by the Texas Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (TACRAO).

(f) Each institution must review and evaluate its procedures for complying with field of study curricula at intervals specified by the Board and shall report the results of that review to the Board. These reports shall be submitted following the same timetable as the regular reports of core curriculum evaluations.
Appendix C

Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 4, Subchapter B, Rule 4.33: Criteria for Evaluation of Field of Study Curricula

(a) Every five years, each public institution of higher education shall review and evaluate its policies and practices regarding the acceptance and application of credit earned as part of a Board-approved field of study curriculum, and reports the results of that evaluation to the Board. The evaluation should include:
   (1) the extent to which the institution's compliance with the acceptance of transfer credit through field of study curricula is being achieved;
   (2) the extent to which the institution's application to the appropriate degree program of credit earned as part of a Board-approved field of study curriculum facilitates academic success;
   (3) the effectiveness of field of study curricula in the retention and graduation of transfer students in those degree programs that have Board-approved field of study curricula.

(b) Each institution's evaluation report must contain at least the following:
   (1) a listing of the institution's degree programs that have Board-approved field of study curricula;
   (2) a description of the institution's policies and practices regarding applicable Board-approved field of study curricula, including admission-point evaluation of transfer credit, advising practices (including catalogue and website information on existing field of study curricula and advising/counseling practices for enrolled students), and transcripting practices to show field of study participation and completion;
   (3) a chart or table showing the number of total transfer students for each degree program that has a Board-approved field of study curriculum, for each of the last five years; the chart should indicate year-by-year the percentage of students who transferred having completed the applicable field of study curriculum, the percentage of students who transferred without having completed the applicable field of study curriculum, and any information about progress toward graduation or graduation rates that can compare transfer student performance with non-transfer student performance during the evaluation period.
Appendix D

Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 4, Subchapter B, Rule 4.34: Revision of Existing Approved Field of Study Curricula

(a) The Board shall have the authority to modify or revise a Board-approved field of study curriculum when a need for such a revision is identified, as specified in current Board policy and procedures.

(b) The need for a revision or modification to a Board-approved field of study curriculum may be identified by one the following methods, or by other methods that are similarly appropriate:
   (1) notice of a change in licensure, certification, or accreditation standards that would affect the field of study curriculum and lower-division requirements for a field of study or academic discipline;
   (2) notice of a change in curricular structure or content that is part of a pervasive change in the academic discipline served by the field of study curriculum, as documented by national or regional professional organizations, faculty organizations, or other indicators of best practices in the discipline;
   (3) receipt of a request from at least three public institutions of higher education that are affected by the field of study curriculum under consideration for modification, including at least one two-year and one four-year academic-degree-granting institution. The request and justifications for the request should be made by the chief academic officers of the institutions, in a joint memorandum sent to the Commissioner.

(c) Any proposed modification or revision to a Board-approved field of study curriculum should be evaluated by an advisory committee convened under the conditions cited in §4.30(a) of this title (relating to Criteria for Evaluation of Core Curricula). Recommendations for modifications or revisions to a Board-approved field of study curriculum should reflect the advice and wisdom of an advisory committee made up primarily of teaching faculty from the academic discipline(s) affected by the field of study curriculum under consideration.
Appendix E

Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 1, Subchapter A, Rule 1.6: Advisory Committees

(a) The Board may appoint advisory committees from outside the Board's membership to advise the Board as it may deem necessary.

(b) The use of advisory committees by the Board shall be in compliance with the provisions of Texas Government Code, Chapter 2110 regarding the composition and duration of committees, the reimbursement of committee member's expenses, the evaluation of committees, and the reporting to the Legislative Budget Board.

(c) An advisory committee is automatically abolished on the fourth anniversary of the date of its creation unless it has a specific duration prescribed by statute or the Board reestablishes the committee. A written statement shall be prepared by the Commissioner or his or her designee for each advisory committee setting forth the purpose of the committee, the task of the committee, the manner in which the committee will report to the Board, the date on which the committee is created, and the date on which the committee will automatically be abolished. The written statements shall be maintained on file in the Board offices.

(d) Purpose and Duties of Advisory Committees. The purpose of an advisory committee shall be to give the Board the benefit of the members' collective technical expertise and experience with respect to matters within the Board's jurisdiction. An advisory committee's sole duty is to advise the Board. An advisory committee has no executive or administrative powers or duties with respect to the operation of the Board, and all such powers and duties rest solely with the Board. The specific purposes and tasks of an advisory committee subject to this subchapter shall be identified in Board rules.

(e) Composition of Advisory Committees.
   (1) The composition of advisory committees created by the Board, including subcommittees or workgroups with non-advisory committee members, shall contain no more than 24 members in compliance with the requirements of Texas Government Code, Chapter 2110.
   (2) The Board shall make reasonable attempts to provide balanced, geographic representation, consonant with Texas Government Code, Chapter 2110, on all advisory committees. A rule or other action may not be challenged because of the composition of an advisory committee.
   (3) This section does not apply to an advisory committee to the extent that:
      (A) another state law specifically states that Texas Government Code, Chapter 2110 does not apply; or
      (B) a federal law or regulation:
         (i) imposes an unconditional requirement that irreconcilably conflicts with the requirements of Texas Government Code, Chapter 2110; or
         (ii) imposes a condition on the state's eligibility to receive money from the federal government that irreconcilably conflicts with Texas Government Code, Chapter 2110.

(f) Membership Terms. Except as otherwise provided by law, advisory committee members shall serve terms as determined by the Board.
(g) Membership. The Board shall solicit nominations and make appointments from such nominations for membership on advisory committees from presidents and chancellors, or the respective designee. For advisory committees that include members not associated with an institution of higher education, the Board shall solicit nominations from appropriate entities, such as stakeholder organizations whose membership consists of the type of representative the advisory committee is seeking. Except as otherwise provided by law, all members of advisory committees are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Board. Board members may not serve on advisory committees. If an advisory committee member resigns, is no longer associated with the nominating institution or entity, dies, becomes incapacitated, is removed by the Board, otherwise vacates his or her position, or becomes ineligible prior to the end of his or her term, the Board may appoint a replacement who shall serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

(h) Attendance. A record of attendance at each meeting of advisory committees shall be made. Except as otherwise provided by law, if a member of an advisory committee misses three consecutive regularly scheduled meetings or more than half of all the regularly scheduled meetings in a one-year period, without approval by a majority vote of the Board, that member automatically vacates his or her position on the advisory committee and the Board may make an appointment to fill the remainder of the unexpired term of the vacancy.

(i) Reimbursement. Members of advisory committees shall not be reimbursed for expenses unless the Board expressly authorizes reimbursement. The Board may also, in its discretion, reimburse the expenses of members of any duly authorized subcommittee of an advisory committee.

(j) Presiding Officer. Except as otherwise provided by law, each advisory committee shall select from its members a presiding officer, who shall report the committee's recommendations to the Board. The Board may, at its discretion, appoint other officers of advisory committees or allow committee members to elect other officers at their pleasure.

(k) Manner of Reporting. Advisory committees shall report any recommendations directly to the Board at a Board meeting determined in consultation with agency staff, including the Commissioner of Higher Education. Advisory committees shall also provide an annual or biennial report to the Board to allow the Board to properly evaluate the committee's work, usefulness, and the costs related to the committee's existence, including the cost of agency staff time spent in support of the committee's activities.

(l) Subcommittees or Workgroups. Advisory committees may organize themselves into subcommittees or workgroups. One member of each subcommittee or workgroup shall serve as the chairperson. Subcommittee or workgroup chairs shall make written reports regarding their work to the presiding officer of the advisory committee. A subcommittee or workgroup of an advisory committee may include members who are not members of the advisory committee, but must include at least one member of the advisory committee.

(m) Meetings. Advisory committees shall meet at the call of the presiding officer or the Board. All advisory committee and subcommittee meetings shall be open to the public and broadcasted via the web, unless prevented by technical difficulties.
(n) Monitoring of Advisory Committees and Records.
(1) The Board shall monitor the activities of advisory committees.
(2) Agency staff shall record and maintain the minutes of each advisory committee and subcommittee meeting. The staff shall maintain a record of actions taken and shall distribute copies of approved minutes and other committee documents to the Board and to advisory committee members on a timely basis.
(3) Minutes kept for advisory committee meetings and reports required under subsection (k) of this section shall be maintained in a form and location that is easily accessible to the public, including making the information available on the Board's website.
Appendix F

Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 9, Subchapter J, Rule 9.185: Academic Certificates

A college may award an academic certificate to a student who completes:

(1) the college's approved core curriculum; or
(2) a Board-approved field of study curriculum; or
(3) fifty percent of the courses specified in a voluntary statewide transfer compact.
Appendix G

Current and Upcoming FOS

The list of approved and currently active FOS is available at this website:

www.thecb.state.tx.us/fos
Appendix H

Infographic on Integration of FOS and Core Curriculum

(see following pages)
Fields of Study Curriculum: Improving Transfer and Minimizing Credit Loss in Texas

In Texas, Field of Study Curriculum (FOSC) is one of the most important policies to support efficient upward transfer with minimal loss of credit. FOSC is a set of courses that fulfill lower-division requirements for a specific major or degree plan. Combined with the Core Curriculum, FOSC can help a student reach an associate degree and/or be prepared for efficient transfer to another institution. Courses within FOSC are guaranteed to transfer to any public college or university in Texas and are guaranteed to apply to the appropriate bachelor’s-level degree plan. No exceptions. A student who transfers without completing the entire FOSC shall receive credit for each of the courses the student successfully completed in the FOSC.

In Practice, the Total Number of Credits Earned through the Field of Study Curriculum Varies by Major

In practice, the total number of credits students will earn through FOSC and the core curriculum will vary based on the number of semester credit hours included in the FOSC. The number and content of courses contained in each FOSC are identified by faculty committees representing two-year and four-year institutions who determine the knowledge and courses necessary to prepare students for upper-division coursework in a particular major.
Field of Study Curricula, by Semester Credit Hour Requirements

The graphic above displays two possible scenarios combining FOSC of different sizes with the core curriculum. The core curriculum contains 42 semester credit hours in each scenario. There is often some degree of overlap between the FOSC and the core.

1. **Small FOSC**: Several FOSC require students to complete 18 SCH or fewer major-specific lower division courses. One example is communications with 12 SCH. Students pursuing these majors must take other non-major degree requirement courses to earn a 60 SCH associate degree or may wish to transfer with their guaranteed FOSC and core hours.

2. **Large FOSC**: Other FOSC contain more than 18 SCH, such as business (24 SCH), electrical engineering (30 SCH), and nursing (34 SCH). In cases where an FOSC contains more than 18 hours, credits earned to satisfy lower division major requirements in the FOSC will also satisfy lower division general education requirements in the core curriculum.

- Communications (12)
- Criminal Justice (15)
- English Language & Literature (12)
- Political Science (12)
- Social Work (15)
- Sociology (12)
- Mexican American Studies (18)
- Psychology (18)

- Architecture (36)
- Business Administration and Management (24)
- Chemical Engineering (35)
- Civil Engineering (39)
- Electrical Engineering (30)
- Mechanical Engineering (36)
- Engineering Technology (37)
- Music (31)
- Nursing (34)
Appendix I

Frequently Asked Questions

The frequently asked question document is available at this website:

www.thecb.state.tx.us/fos

What is a Field of Study?

A Field of Study (FOS) is a selection of lower-division courses that are guaranteed by state law to transfer and apply to a degree program. Usually an FOS is somewhere between four and eight introductory-level classes, selected to provide students with a solid introduction to the field and prepare them for success in upper-division courses. If a student takes all the courses in an FOS and then transfers to another Texas public institution of higher education, the FOS is guaranteed to transfer as a block and be applied to the appropriate major. If a student has completed (1) the Texas common core curriculum; (2) the university or college courses required of all students regardless of major, if any; and (3) the FOS, then the student is finished with all the lower-division courses for the degree program. This is true even if the institution to which the student transfers requires a different selection of lower-division courses for their own freshmen or sophomores, and even if the institution has prerequisites for their upper-division courses that are not included in the FOS.

What courses can be in an FOS?

An FOS can consist of any courses from the Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual. In rare cases, new courses can be created for the Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual to serve the needs of an FOS. An FOS may draw from several disciplines and may include courses outside of the main field of the major. For example, the Business Administration and Management FOS includes courses in Math, Economics, Accounting, and Business Computer Information Systems as well as courses from Business.

Can a course “double dip” and count toward both the core curriculum and an FOS?

Yes, the same course can count toward the core curriculum and an FOS. For example, if a student plans to transfer from a community college to a university and major in Psychology, the student can take General Psychology (PSYC 1301) and have the same 3 semester credit hours (SCH) count toward both the Social & Behavioral Sciences component area of the statewide core curriculum and the Psychology FOS.

What if students take fewer, or more, lower-division courses than the ones included in the FOS before they transfer?

If students take fewer courses than the complete FOS, then each FOS course the students did take is guaranteed to transfer and apply. If students do not transfer the complete FOS as a block, the receiving institution can require them to take additional lower-division, non-FOS courses and prerequisites up to the maximum number of SCH for the degree program.
If students take more lower-division courses than are required for the FOS, the students and their advisors may want to look at the degree plans at the institutions to which the students want to transfer and consider what additional courses they may need to prepare for upper-division courses. Some lower-division courses may transfer in as electives. Most universities will transfer in a maximum of around 60 SCH, so students will need to choose any extra courses wisely.

**What is the advantage of completing an FOS rather than a student self-selecting the courses needed before transferring?**

Coordinating Board data show that it takes Texas transfer students an average of 7.6 years to graduate, with 11.4 semesters and 142 SCH attempted. The most efficient and least expensive way to graduate is to take 4 years, with 8 semesters and 120 SCH. The data reveal that most transfer students are taking far too many courses that do not apply to a degree program. Prior to the development of an FOS in a degree field, community college students would have to rely on advisors and university catalogs to determine what courses are most likely to transfer to the university to which they planned to apply. If a student did not get admitted to that targeted university, or if the student changed plans, then the student may have taken several unnecessary courses and may have to take several additional requirements at the new university. All of these courses take valuable time and money. With an FOS, a student can be certain that the block of courses will transfer and apply toward the degree with no additional lower-division major requirements at any public institution.

**What if a student can’t complete the full FOS and the full core curriculum in two years (60 SCH) before the student transfers?**

There are several FOS—such as Architecture, Music, and Engineering programs—that have over 18 SCH. These cannot be completed alongside the entire 42 SCH core curriculum in the 60 SCH before transfer from a two-year institution. If students complete the FOS and then transfer the courses as a block to a university, students can complete the core curriculum in their third and fourth years at the university while taking the upper-division requirements for the major.

**Does the transfer of an FOS work just from a two-year to a four-year institution?**

FOS courses are guaranteed to transfer and apply to degree programs at all Texas public institutions of higher education, including community colleges, state and technical colleges, universities, and health-related institutions. This means the courses will transfer and apply from a two-year to a four-year institution, from a two-year to a two-year institution, from a four-year to a two-year institution, and from a four-year to a four-year institution. Students who are enrolled at more than one institution simultaneously, or who attend several institutions on their path toward a baccalaureate degree, can now work on their lower-division degree requirements with confidence that every course will apply to a degree.
Do FOS Advisory Committees violate Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) standards?

SACS accreditation requires faculty input on program development. Each FOS is developed by a committee of faculty actively teaching in the discipline, the same way that degree plans are assembled at individual institutions. Additional faculty committees are assembled by the Coordinating Board to regularly review and update the courses in the Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual, the listing of approved community colleges courses that are used to create FOS curricula. Faculty members at Texas public institutions are the only ones who determine the courses in the Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual or in any FOS curriculum.

How are the courses chosen for the FOS? What do I do if I have a suggestion?

FOS courses are selected by an advisory committee of up to 24 faculty in the discipline with an equal number of community college and university representatives, drawn from a spectrum of public institutions across the state. They have an open meeting at the Coordinating Board offices in Austin which is broadcast live and preserved on YouTube. The courses they select then go out for a 30-day public comment period. The committee members then consider every recommendation, and if changes are made to the FOS, it goes out for another 30-day public comment period until the committee has determined that the proposed FOS represents the best selection of courses for the needs of students and institutions. Advisory committees will meet periodically to reconsider existing FOS and keep them up to date.

If you have any complaints or suggestions about an FOS, please send them to fos.contact@thecb.state.tx.us.

Where can I get more information?

Updated information about current FOS is available on the Coordinating Board website:
www.thecb.state.tx.us/fos

Information about FOS Advisory Committees is available here:
http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/fosadvisorycomms

If you have any questions about FOS, please send a message to fos.contact@thecb.state.tx.us, or call Allen Michie, Program Director, at (512) 427-6518.
The list of approved and currently active FOS is available at this website: www.thecb.state.tx.us/fos

This document is available on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board website.

**Contact Information**

Please contact Coordinating Board staff if there is anything we can do to help your campus effectively and efficiently implement FOS.

Rex Peebles  
Assistant Commissioner for Workforce  
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board  
P.O. Box 12788  
Austin, TX 78711  
rex.peebles@thecb.state.tx.us  
(512) 749-6520

Allen Michie  
Program Director  
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board  
P.O. Box 12788  
Austin, TX 78711  
allen.michie@thecb.state.tx.us  
(512) 427-6518
For nearly 15 years, I have served as President of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), one of seven recognized regional accrediting agencies in the nation.

I will provide an overview on how SACSCOC functions as a gatekeeper to federal funds and how our accredited institutions are held accountable for academic quality which in turn protects the investments of students, parents and taxpayers. SACSCOC’s role in the “triad” is to oversee and ensure the quality of education at each of the institutions we accredit. Process in short: Once eligible for consideration to be accredited, an institution must apply for candidacy, which involves demonstrating through a compliance certification to the Commission they meet each of our standards. If an institution makes it through this stage and becomes accredited, they continue to be held accountable – for e.g. if the Commission has reason to believe an institution is no longer meeting standards (consistent with those required under HEA), the institution is asked to demonstrate how it plans to come into compliance through a monitoring report. If after two such reports compliance is not demonstrated, they are placed on either Warning or Probation, or have its accreditation withdrawn (more in full remarks).

It has been proposed by some that as part of the next reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, the Federal government, either directly or through accreditors, should impose “bright lines” for institutional outcomes. Unfortunately, it is not that simple. Last year, The Council of Regional Accrediting Commission (C-RAC), in which SACSCOC is a member, issued a one- year review of the Graduation Rate project which had been initiated the prior year. A key finding was that 75 percent of these “low-grad” institutions had at least a majority of their students not reflected in the federal data given they did not enter the institutions as first-term, full-time students. The point here is not just that federal graduation rates are often incomplete (an issue Congress is working to tackle), but also the fact that “bright line” graduation rates would invariably not capture the many ways graduation rates can be approached.

Although I oppose the concept of federal bright lines for accountability, I strongly believe accreditors can and must hold institutions accountable for outcomes, such as graduation rates. In fact, that is exactly the direction all regional accreditors, including SACSCOC, are headed:

- SACSCOC takes a close look at institutional outcome metrics including – enrollment, completion rates, cohort default rates, retention/withdrawal rates, transfer-out rates, loan repayment rates, as well as median earnings.
- Under SACSCOC’s newly adopted standards, we require every institution to identify a key student completion indicator from the following completion metrics to serve as their “baseline performance level”: (1) “Traditional” IPEDS overall graduation rate (within 150% time); (2) “New” IPEDS Outcome Measure (8-year award rate), or (3) National Student Clearinghouse “total” completion rate (6 years).
- SACSCOC asks each of our institutions to select institutions they considered to be their peers and provide them with outcomes data from these peers, so they are able to better evaluate their performance against similarly situated institutions.
- SACSCOC requires every institution to develop a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and SACSCOC standards also hold institutions accountable for collecting and using evaluation data to inform planning and improvement efforts.
Chairman Alexander, Ranking Member Murray, and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to present testimony today on the important issue of accountability in higher education.

My name is Belle Wheelan, and for nearly 15 years, I have served as President of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), one of seven recognized regional accrediting agencies in the nation. SACSCOC represents the common denominator of shared values and practices among more than 794 institutions across 11 southern states, consisting of 480 public, 305 private, and nine for-profit institutions. Our institutions are diverse and encompass research universities, state colleges, liberal arts colleges, community and technical colleges, Historically Black Colleges, Hispanic Serving Institutions as well as faith-based institutions.

SACSCOC-accredited institutions enroll nearly 4.5 million students, 41% of whom receive Pell Grants and 39% of whom receive federal loans. Taken altogether, these institutions have a Title IV federal student aid volume of over $30 billion annually.

I’m here today to provide an overview on how our agency functions as a gatekeeper to these federal funds and how our accredited institutions are held accountable for academic quality, which in turn protects the investments of students, parents and taxpayers.

The process of accountability includes the requirement that eligible institutions be authorized by the states in which they operate and approved by the U.S. Department of Education. While states focus largely on consumer protections for students, the Department is responsible for ensuring compliance with federal rules and regulations tied to student aid.

SACSCOC’s role of what is commonly referred to as the “triad” is to oversee and ensure the quality of education at each of the institutions we accredit.

Once eligible for consideration to be accredited, an institution must apply for candidacy, a process that involves demonstrating through a compliance certification to the Commission that they meet each of our rigorous standards in areas such as student achievement and fiscal capacity. Our Board of Trustees, comprised of 77 members elected by the membership, relies on the work of over 5,000 volunteer peer reviewers to help inform decisions around final accreditation approvals.
If an institution becomes accredited, it will be subject to ongoing review and robust oversight by our Commission, including undergoing a comprehensive evaluation every 10 years, submitting a formal report at the fifth year, and providing annual reports that include financial information and completion data. In addition, if an institution does not demonstrate compliance with our standards at any time during the decennial process, we are obligated to assess the reasons for non-compliance and may leverage a sanction on the institution.

Some have proposed that, as part of the next reauthorization of the *Higher Education Act*, the federal government, either directly or through accreditors, should impose “bright lines” for institutions that would result in the loss of accreditation and the ability to participate in federal student aid programs if institutions do not meet certain outcomes.

I understand why some would be interested in such an idea. It seems simple, takes away most subjectivity, and would presumably remove “bad actors,” thereby protecting students. Unfortunately, it’s simply not that simple.

I will use graduation rates as an example since it’s most often the suggested metric for which a bright line could be applied.

Last year, the Council of Regional Accrediting Commission, of which SACSCOC is a member, issued a one-year review of the Graduation Rate project that had been initiated the prior year.

One of our goals of this project was to take a deeper look at federal graduation rates. At times, accreditors are asked —“why do you accredit some institutions that have extremely low graduation rates?” It was and continues to be a fair question, and one we felt needed to be answered.

As part of the project, we examined both 2-year and 4-year institutions with a federal IPEDS graduation rate below 25 percent, or half the national average. We found that at 75 percent of these “low-grad” institutions, a majority of students (and often a vast majority) were not reflected in the federal data because they did not enter the institutions as first-time, full-time students. An inaccurate representation of an institution’s student body will clearly have a significant impact on the institution’s graduation rate and outcomes.

As cited in our report, “The Western Association Senior Colleges (WASC) analyzed 23 California State University institutions and found that the federal IPEDS Student Right to Know graduation rate dramatically underreported graduation rates by 3 to 32 percentage points, largely because the data did not include large groups of students (including non-first-time, non-full-time students) enrolled.”

In our own region, we looked at the impact of using data from the National Student Clearinghouse, which tracks far more students and uses a longer period of time for when student graduate (particularly relevant for part-time and non-traditional students). Not surprisingly, the graduation rates of the
community colleges we examined doubled from 21 percent to 40 percent.

The point here is not just that federal graduation rates are often incomplete (an issue I know Congress is working to tackle), but also the fact that “bright line” graduation rates would invariably fail to capture the many different ways in which graduation rates can be approached. Nor would bright lines, in and of themselves, account for the significant differences between our institutions - ranging from highly selective universities to community colleges that have open door admission policies and enroll students of widely varied academic abilities.

However, I want to be very clear: although I oppose the concept of federal “bright lines” for accountability, I strongly believe we as accreditors can and must hold institutions accountable for student outcomes, such as graduation rates.

In fact, that is exactly the direction all regional accreditors, including SACSCOC, are headed.

As part of the reviews I mentioned above, SACSCOC takes a close look at institutional outcome metrics including enrollment, completion rates, cohort default rates, retention/withdrawal rates, transfer-out rates, loan repayment rates, and median earnings. These reviews are sometimes done at the institutional level and at times drive down to the program level, depending on information provided by the institution.

At SACSCOC, we pay particular attention to graduation rates – however, we recognize that there is more than one way to define “graduation rate.” But we didn’t let that prevent us from holding institutions accountable for this important outcome. Under our newly-adopted standards, we require every institution to identify a key student completion indicator from the following completion metrics to serve as their “baseline performance level”:

1) “Traditional” IPEDS overall graduation rate (within 150% time);
2) “New” IPEDS Outcome Measure (8-year award rate); or
3) National Student Clearinghouse “total” completion rate (6 years).

Subsequent performances are then compared to baseline levels. Peer evaluation committees are expected to use this information as contextual reference points to inform their reviews of institutional cases for compliance.

We also ask each of our institutions to identify peer institutions and evaluate their performance and outcomes data against similarly-situated institutions. We do this as a way to encourage institutions to consider how they could learn and adopt strategies from high-performing peers. This work has also included, for example, polling all of our institutions for effective strategies to increase graduation rates. We received over 5,000 comments that have enabled institutions to learn about best practices to address this issue.
We also require every institution to develop a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). These plans must focus on how the institution intends to improve specific student learning outcomes and/or student success. Institutions must also commit resources to initiate, implement, and complete their plans.

The QEP is an example of intentional and focused use of institutional evaluation data to identify and address a specific and significant area for improving student achievement.

Our standards also hold institutions accountable for collecting and using evaluation data to inform planning and improvement efforts. Many institutions struggle with this necessary requirement. During the first (off-site) stage of the peer review process, about a quarter of institutions in the 2018 class were found to be in non-compliance with this standard. However, by the time the entire process is completed, all but 4% of the same institutions had demonstrated compliance.

Since we perceive the reaffirmation of accreditation process to be a continuous improvement process, institutions are able to provide additional information after each stage of the review process, often yielding more positive results and, subsequently, greater compliance with the standards.

Since completion data is submitted annually, staff is able to work with institutions that are making little or no progress with related compliance issues.

When the Commission has reason to believe that an institution is no longer meeting one of our standards (which are consistent with those standards required under HEA), it will ask the institution to demonstrate how it plans to come into compliance through a monitoring report. If after two monitoring reports an institution is not able to demonstrate compliance, it is placed on either Warning or Probation, or its accreditation is withdrawn altogether. The withdrawal of membership or loss of accreditation can be appealed on procedural grounds. During that process, if it is determined that the reason for the drop was strictly financial, there is a provision for new evidence that, if found to be material and significant, can lead the Commission to reconsider its decision.

I hope that my testimony here today has helped provide a better understanding of how accreditors such as SACSCOC strive each and every day to help not only improve institutions but also to protect students, parents and taxpayers.

As you consider changes to the Higher Education Act, I welcome the opportunity to work with each of you on ways to ensure we are living up to this responsibility.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify and I welcome any questions you may have.
Senator Doug Jones’ Questions:

1. There are 101 accredited Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) in our country who have historically been accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Unfortunately, if you speak with the Presidents of these institutions, they will tell you stories of perceived additional barriers to maintain accreditation compared to their higher-resourced, non-HBCU peers. For instances, you might hear one of the following:

   • The peer review process allows too many personal biases to enter the process and have negative impacts, especially for small, low-resourced institutions.
   • True “peers” that reflect an institution’s size, locale, sector, resources and outcomes generally do not comprise the majority of a campus review team, compromising the accuracy and integrity of the review team’s findings.
   • Standards are applied without consideration of institutional size, scope, programmatic offerings, resources, endowments, etc. requiring institutions with minimal resources to be evaluated using the same criteria as some of the best endowed institutions in the country. Weighting of standards should be employed to provide equity for lower-resourced institutions.
   • Accreditors tend to shift what is required of institutions on sanction, much like what happened to Bennett College, leading to a belief that when institutions reach a state of extreme difficulty in meeting the standards, the accreditor would rather remove them from membership instead of providing them with any additional opportunity to rectify their problems.
   • The degrees of progress are not taken into account when an institution has been on sanction for two years. For example, an institution can go from 10
sanctions to one in two years, demonstrating substantial progress, yet that one lone sanction can be enough to remove them from membership and rescind their ability to award federal financial aid without another accreditor in place.

Given this information, can you please share your views of SACSCOC relationship with HBCUs and how the agency considers the under-resourced nature of these institutions when making accrediting decision? Does SACSCOC apply the exact same standard to all institutions accredited by the organizations and approach every institution the same or does it take various approaches depending on institutional size and endowment levels?

RESPONSE:

SACSCOC has one set of Principles of Accreditation or standards that are approved by the membership and used to evaluate quality at all of its 794-member institutions; however, each institution is evaluated according to its mission and purpose irrespective of institutional size or level of endowment. When an institution has been non-compliant with standards and enters a monitoring period, they must then become compliant within two years. Many times, this monitoring is accompanied by a sanction for being out of compliance with certain standards, many of them financial. Once an institution’s monitoring period has expired, federal laws require that we must drop them from membership. Every institution we have dropped has had at least three years notice that it is in danger of being dropped from SACSCOC membership. Each correspondence to the institution includes an explanation of the possible ramifications of continued non-compliance. Not one of them were caught off guard about this possibility.

Since I became President of SACSCOC almost 15 years ago, we have instituted training and education sessions for small and private institutions and all HBCUs. Prior to my arrival, very few of the HBCU presidents or their staff members were involved in the peer review process or as members of the SACSCOC Board, so they were not familiar with the interpretation of the standards by peer reviewers. Nor were they familiar with ways in which to demonstrate compliance. Since my arrival, however, we have assisted many of our institutions, including HBCUs, from losing membership, helped them reduce the amount of time they were on sanction, and increased the number of Board members from HBCUs on our governing board.
In the case of Bennett College, they were dropped from membership because they could not demonstrate financial stability and, even after raising $10 million dollars did not demonstrate how they were going to be able to meet their financial obligations past the current fiscal year. Additionally, this was not the first time they had been in this situation with us.

HBCUs, particularly private ones, have several challenges that impact their finances; (1) they have an extremely high tuition discount rate which leaves them extremely dependent on student enrollment and Pell grant revenue; (2) the number of African American students between 18 and 21 years of age is dwindling, making their enrollments decline; (3) they have small or no endowments on which to cushion financial setbacks; and (4) they are resistant to ‘right-sizing’ their institutions by laying off staff and culling academic programs. You can’t continue to do business the same today as you did previously when you had a captured market, and yet, many are still trying to do so.

We have no standard that dictates how much money or how many programs an institution must maintain. We do expect them to live within their means; whatever that means for their particular institution. When they can’t or won’t do that, they are likely to lose their accreditation.

Accrediting agencies work hard and are quite successful at balancing the need to apply standards and policies equitably to all institutions, as well as the need to care for and protect students while also caring for a given institution’s mission, identity, context and future. These are sometimes competing goals; however, peer evaluators, staff and Commissioners work carefully to accomplish all three. While there is subjectivity and discernment in all evaluation work, our evaluators and Commissioners do an excellent job of attempting to maintain appropriate objectivity while attending to mission, identity and context.

It is simply untrue that our preference would be to remove a challenged institution from membership than to work with them for quality improvement. Frankly, it has been Congress, DOE and NACIQI that has pressured accreditors to have more bite and to impose more severe sanctions on struggling institutions. This has been done in an attempt to design a “one-size-fits-all” set of regulations to address issues in other areas of higher education.
Senator Bernard Sanders’ Questions:

1. As you know, Secretary DeVos has delayed implementation of the Obama Administration’s accountability regulations to provide additional transparency, protect student borrowers and taxpayers and establish a more robust system to measure the success of students attending institutions of higher education. Specifically, the “gainful employment” rule was supposed to ensure that for-profit colleges and universities provide students with the education skills required to be successful in the workplace. In the meantime, students continue to spend money and time on education/training programs that do not lead to “gainful employment” or a valuable degree or certificate. Based on your experience as an accreditor and in the field of higher education, what else can Congress do to help you better regulate the practices of for-profit institutions to protect students from predatory tactics?

RESPONSE

- We believe we have very rigorous processes by which to evaluate all of our institutions and our for-profit institutions have been able to demonstrate compliance with our standards.

- You and other members have also pushed for expanding the current “90-10” rule so that these institutions would be required to demonstrate that an even higher amount of funds are coming from non-federal sources and that such sources also begin to include those derived from Veterans GI education benefits. Such approaches are worthy of consideration.

2. Inequities continue to exist in nearly every aspect of our nation’s higher education system. More often than not, students who are least likely to complete a college program after enrolling are often given the least amount of support and resources. What else can Congress do to help you create a better accountability system that extends beyond standardized performance-based funding and one that also considers racial and ethnic diversity, income stratification, family history and varying institutional missions? More specifically, how can we recraft federal accountability policies to ensure that schools are dedicating federal resources and funds to students (and schools) who require the most assistance?
RESPONSE

- Some ideas that come to mind include: Increasing the amount of Pell grants so that fewer loans would be needed and continue to allow them to be used year round; and tweak federal work-study so more on-campus programs can be funded at institutions that serve high risk students and in the students’ program of study.

Senator Tim Scott’s Questions:

1. When we talk about accountability in higher education, I think it’s important to say, from the outset, that we all recognize and agree that there are certain bad actors in every sector—and that some institutions, regardless of mission or tax status—are not serving their students well. At the same time, when I look at South Carolina, I also see incredible institutions across sectors— institutions that are constantly innovating and doing all that they can to meet the needs of students from all walks of life. And I think my skepticism of a top-down, one-size-fits-all accountability framework comes partially from the fact that any time Washington tries to impose rigid metrics and attaches penalties to them, the “solution” tends to be worse than the problem. And in this case, the students who suffer are more than likely to be folks from underserved backgrounds, and people of color, and people looking for a second chance.

   a. From my perspective, we should be expanding access and options—not limiting them. And I don’t think we, as Congress, are particularly equipped to define what a valuable program is, and what isn’t. Rather than penalizing institutions for—frankly—enrolling a disproportionate share of lower-income students, we need to do more on the front-end to help these students access high-quality opportunities. That’s why I joined Sen. Cassidy and two of our Democratic colleagues in leading the College Transparency Act—a bill that will make students and families more informed and empowered consumers, who can better identify which educational opportunities are the best fit for them. Along those lines, for the whole panel, where do you see the biggest gaps in data and information on student outcomes and program quality.
right now—and what steps could Congress take to best fill those gaps?

RESPONSE:

Without question, the biggest gap on data is graduation rates, for reasons with which you are well aware. Your legislation, if enacted, would help address this issue by ensuring data on the College Scorecard and other federal websites paint a far more accurate picture of this critical measure, especially taking into account the mobility of students from one institution to another.

2. Now, let’s say that we do develop and publish better data—how do we make sure this information gets in the hands of the students and families who need it—and in a meaningful way?

RESPONSE:

Many prospective students are already accessing federal data on the College Scorecard, as well as through third-party college and career software programs used in many schools. In addition, if you look up an institution on Google (where most 18-year olds are most likely to get their information!) three data points show up: cost, graduation rate, and acceptance rate—all data from the U.S. Department of Education, and at least with respect to graduation rates, data that all too often paints an inaccurate picture of an institution’s quality.

I believe getting data into the hands of students is less of a challenge than ensuring students know how to use the data and are able to interpret the data in order to make sensible choices as to which institution or program they should enroll. While many proposed changes to the Higher Education Act have addressed the importance of students receiving sufficient counseling related to their student loans, there has been very little discussion around the counseling students need to interpret data to make the types of decisions that will actually help them pay off their loans.

More work needs to be done to bring in high schools and groups representing secondary education, such as chief state school officers, superintendents, principals, counselor groups as well as parents and teacher groups,
all of which have a role to play in making sure that prospective students know how to leverage this data to make smart and informed decisions.

**Senator Elizabeth Warren’s Questions:**

1. What are the weaknesses in America's system of higher education accreditation?

**RESPONSE:**

No system is perfect, and our nation’s system of accreditation is no exception. However, I believe that there are far more perceived weaknesses in accreditation than actual weaknesses. For example, some perceive our peer review process as the “fox watching the hen house,” while in fact, peers are best suited for recognizing when an institution is not meeting quality standards and are diligent in holding their peers accountable.

Our system is not perfect in part because of the realities inherent in our complex system of high education which often forces us to continually balance issues such as allowing for innovation while not allowing institutions to expose undo risk to students, or the trade-off of stepping in at the right time to prevent a fragile institution from collapsing versus protecting students.

If there is a better way to eliminate these challenges as part of an alternative system of accreditation, I have yet to hear about it. While not perfect, I do believe our current accreditation system is best suited to handle the many trade-offs that are inherent in our nation’s postsecondary education system.

2. Is higher education accreditation serving students and taxpayers? If yes, how so? If no, what could be done better?

**RESPONSE:**

Higher education accreditation does serve students and taxpayers as, in the words of the Higher Education Act, a reliable authority as to the quality of education. The United States arguably has the most robust, mission-sensitive quality assurance system in the world. Mission sensitivity, along with understanding the student body of the institution is essential, given that the U.S. also has the most diverse, trustworthy set of institutions in the world.
3. You testified that you do not believe accreditors should be compelled to implement "bright line" outcomes metrics to maintain accreditation because the data on metrics like graduation rate are flawed.
   o Do you support the College Transparency Act, which would remedy the flawed data you mentioned in your testimony?

**RESPONSE:**

I do support the College Transparency Act, though I am concerned about the privacy of students’ information.

   o Assuming Congress passed legislation (like the College Transparency Act) to fully remedy the data issues you cited in your testimony, why would "bright line" outcomes metrics based on those data not then be appropriate to impose on colleges and universities seeking to maintain accreditation?

**RESPONSE:**

Having data that better reflects the true outcomes of institutions and ideally, programs, is essential but not enough to justify ‘bright lines.’ There are simply too many factors that play into this data being able to paint a full picture of the overall quality of an institution. But this data can and must be used to send a strong signal to institutions.

4. In your view, is there a graduation rate that is too low to maintain accreditation (assuming the rate is accurate)? If so, what is that rate?

**RESPONSE:**

This is a fair question and an issue which SACSCOC and the other regional accreditors have spent a great deal of time examining. In particular, last year, we released a report in which we examined all of the institutions within our respective regions which had an IPEDS graduation rate of less than half the national average in order to learn more about these institutions including whom they were serving and how the data reflected their overall quality.

What we found is that in fact, a single data point such as a graduation rate is never sufficient to determine the overall quality of an institution. Some institutions which are facing serious issues may actually have a graduation rate that, on the
surface, is fine, while other high performing institutions may have a graduation rate that is extremely low, but upon future examination, such rate fails to include a vast majority of the institution’s student population because they are not first-time, full-time students and, therefore, not included in IPEDS data. There are also institutions where a high percentage of students transfer into other institutions and, therefore, show up as a failure in terms of graduate rates to the institution from which they transferred.

Accreditors are and must be more nuanced in how they look at institutions; however, that is not to say that we shouldn’t look at an institution that has a low graduation rate, or for that matter, any institution that is experiencing a sudden growth or decline in enrollment, or other factors that can trigger a need for us to take a closer look at the institution.

5. In a 2015 WSJ article, when asked if a college with a 10% graduation rate can do a good job, you said: “It can be a good school for those 10% who graduate.” Do you still believe this is true? Should a school with a 10% graduation rate maintain accreditation and access to Title IV funding, retaining the ability to put students into debt?

RESPONSE:

As noted above, it is possible that a school with a very low graduation rate has a very high transfer rate or a rate that fails to reflect a vast majority of the students it serves. So, yes, it is possible that an institution with a 10% graduation rate can do a good job based upon other factors.

6. Should the Department of Education publish aggregate outcomes data, such as graduation rates or cohort default rates, by accreditor?

RESPONSE:

Under the prior administration, NACIQI developed a ‘dash board’ report for each accreditor which included aggregated outcome data (See https://www.ed.gov/accreditation). In large part, particularly with respect to regional accreditors, the data reflected the types of institution accredited as opposed to the relative quality of institutions. For example, ACCJC, which accredits two-year institutions, has a vastly different set of outcomes thanWSCUC which accredits four-year institutions.
It is worth noting that the Department publishes annual data, broken down by accrider, on dozens of factors ranging from graduation rate to percentage of student receiving Pell grants. These data may be found at https://www.ed.gov/accreditation.

7. In light of accreditation's failures to hold predatory institutions accountable, why should Congress continue to allow accrediting agencies to be gatekeepers to federal student aid dollars?

RESPONSE:
Accreditors play an invaluable role in serving as gatekeepers to federal student aid and should continue to serve in this function. Predatory institutions should not be eligible to participate in federal student aid programs period; however, Congress is best suited to define what constitutes such institutions along the lines of the current definition of ‘diploma mill’ under the Higher Education Act.

8. In your view, what is the difference between institutions that can't improve without additional resources and institutions that won't improve?

RESPONSE:
I believe the peer review system of accreditation is one of the only ways to really make this distinction on a case-by-case basis and to recognize when there is an institution that simply will not improve. These are the types of institutions most likely to face sanctions and ultimately, have their accreditation withdrawn.

I also believe there are very few institutions which don’t try each and every day to improve the educational outcomes for their students; however, it is clear that some institutions face far more barriers, such as old facilities, outdated programs, and boards and alumni groups that don’t want to change, and are unlikely to improve dramatically without additional resources.

Oftentimes, these institutions serve students who are already struggling to keep up with the cost of attending college, so increasing tuition is rarely an option to meet these resource needs. These institutions often rely on the limited funds available from the State or programs under the Higher Education Act which are aimed at strengthening institutions. Any reauthorization of HEA should look at the extent to which these programs are meeting the needs of all institutions they are intended to serve.
UTDPP1055 - Hearing Tribunal Selection Procedures

Policy Statement

The Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents, in Rule 31008, Section 4 (http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules.htm#A4) provide for the use and appointment of a special faculty hearing tribunal in cases where the President has determined that allegations against a tenured faculty member or of a faculty member before the expiration of his or her appointment are supported by evidence that constitutes good cause for termination. Rule 31008, Section 6 further provides that tenure-track faculty whose appointments are not renewed or who are not granted tenure and are therefore given a one year terminal appointment as required by Rule 31007, Section 5 may be granted the right to have the decision reviewed by a special faculty hearing tribunal to determine whether the decision was made for reasons that are unlawful under the laws or Constitution of Texas or the United States. Procedures for the selection of a special hearing tribunal at U.T. Dallas are specified below.

The special hearing tribunal will consist of three members of the tenured faculty selected from a standing pool of tenured faculty chosen by the President and by the Academic Senate. The pool should reflect the diverse nature of the University and, to ensure fairness, should include members from all schools. Twenty members of the pool are to be selected by the Academic Senate via open nominations and a secret ballot no later than during its last meeting of each academic year. Twenty additional members are to be appointed by the President to the pool by June of each year. The names of the faculty members selected for the pool (both those chosen by the Academic Senate and the President) will be published in the Academic Senate's June minutes. The names of the additional faculty members appointed by the President will be published in the Academic Senate’s minutes of the meeting during which the Academic Senate is informed of the appointment.

In a case where a special hearing tribunal is required by the Regents’ Rules and Regulations cited above, the President, in consultation with the Academic Council, will appoint three faculty members from the pool to serve on the special hearing tribunal. A minimum of one member must be selected from members of the pool selected by the Academic Senate.

Policy History

- Issued: 1999-05-04
- Editorial Amendments: 2000-09-01
- Editorial Amendments: 2006-04-06

Policy Links

- Permalink for this policy: http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdpp1055
- Link to PDF version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/pdf/utdpp1055
- Link to printable version: http://policy.utdallas.edu/print/utdpp1055
Committee Name: Academic Tribunal Pool

Charge: Policy Regents Rules 31008

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

Members Whose Terms are Continuing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replacements Needed</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fonseka (ECS)</td>
<td>1. John Fonseka (ECS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murat Kantarcioğlu (ECS)</td>
<td>2. Murat Kantarcioğlu (ECS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Rotea (ECS)</td>
<td>3. Mario Rotea (ECS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovidiu Daescu (ECS)</td>
<td>4. Ovidiu Daescu (ECS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euel Elliott (EPPS)</td>
<td>5. Euel Elliott (EPPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Yuan (EPPS)</td>
<td>6. May Yuan (EPPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Jacobs (EPPS)</td>
<td>7. Bruce Jacobs (EPPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Assmann (BBS)</td>
<td>8. Peter Assmann (BBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Prager (IS)</td>
<td>9. Karen Prager (IS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne van Kleeck (BBS)</td>
<td>10. Ross Roesser (BBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Dess (SOM)</td>
<td>11. Greg Dess (SOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Liebowiz (SOM)</td>
<td>12. Stanley Liebowiz (SOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijay Mookerje (SOM)</td>
<td>13. Vijay Mookerje (SOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George McMechan (NSM)</td>
<td>14. John Geissman (NSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Heelis (NSM)</td>
<td>15. Rod Heelis (NSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Sherry (NSM)</td>
<td>16. Dean Sherry (NSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Malina (ATEC)</td>
<td>17. Roger Malina (ATEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fishwick (ATEC)</td>
<td>18. Paul Fishwick (ATEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Cohen (AH)</td>
<td>19. Charles Bambach (AH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Waligore (AH)</td>
<td>20. Marilyn Waligore (AH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. THECB
   A. **Board Meeting** on July 25, 2019 (embedded URL)
      1. Advisory Committee Appointments
         a. Graduate Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) – Dr. Juan González
         b. Chemistry Field of Advisory Committee (FOSAC) – Dr. Gregg Dieckmann
         c. Communication Disorders FOSAC – Janice Lougeay
      2. Selected Handouts (enclosed PDF)
         a. Agenda Item IV-A: Major Policy Discussion (Identifying Critical Fields)
         c. Agenda Item IX-F: Overview of Outcomes of the 86th Texas Legislative Session
         d. Agenda Item XI-C: Consideration of adopting the Committee’s recommendation to the Board relating to the certification of gifts that are fundable through the Texas Research Incentive Program (TRIP) for the Emerging Research Universities
      3. Other Items of Interest
         a. Agenda Item V-A: Recognition of Excellence (Dr. Jim Allison)
         b. Agenda Item IX-C: Consideration of adopting the Committee’s recommendation to the Board relating to approval of the 60x30TX progress report
         c. Agenda Item IX-G: Texas Grant Program
         d. Agenda Item X-H: Autism Grant Program: Annual Progress
   B. **SB 25 Transfer Bill Implementation Updates**
      2. TCCAO and TACRAO July 2019 meetings
      3. UT System Transfer Advisory Group
   C. **Negotiated Rulemaking** – September 23-25, 2019
      1. **HB 449 Discipline on transcripts**
      2. **SB 212 Sexual assault reporting**
      3. **SB 25 portion for advising/degree plan audits for dual credit**
   D. Core Curriculum Response (enclosed PDF)
   E. Recently approved & posted Computer Science & Information Technology Field of Study Curricula (effective Sept. 2020)
   F. Learning Technology Advisory Committee (LTAC) – August 9, 2019
2. **UT System’s Office of Academic Affairs**
   A. Created a new webpage for Blended and Online Education with web links to the system-wide Online Education Task Force (Drs. Paul Diehl and Darren Crone are members) and THECB’s Distance Education Program Search
3. **SACSCOC**
   A. Annual Meeting, Houston, Texas, December 7-10, 2019
   B. Update and Information Email from President Belle Wheelan (enclosed PDF)
   C. **Fifth-Year Interim Reports Dates**
      1. Receive Notification Letter: April 25, 2023
      2. Fifth-Year Interim Report Submission Date: March 15, 2024 with decision made in June 2024
4. **Lead UTD Updates**
The Ongoing Challenge of Identifying Critical Fields

Major Policy Discussion
July 25, 2019

The 60x30TX plan preamble emphasizes the importance of higher education for society.

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

The impact of higher education is immeasurable.
Higher education adds value to society in many ways; workforce preparation is a critical one

- One important higher education function is to prepare students for the workforce and provide employers and the state with workers who are prepared for the jobs of today and tomorrow
- Identifying critical fields can help ensure higher education efforts are aligned with state and regional needs
- Ensuring that a state and regional workforce needs are met and that higher education supports those efforts is a complex subject

Major Policy Discussion Panelists will present a Regional, State, and National Perspective

Introduction of Panelists:
- Mr. Peter Beard
  Senior Vice President, Regional Workforce Development
  Greater Houston Partnership
- Ms. Mariana Vega,
  Director, Labor Market and Career Information,
  Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)
- Dr. Charles Goldman,
  Senior Economist and Professor of Economics
  Rand Corporation
Question 1

How do we identify what occupational fields, both established and emerging, are critical to the state or regional economy today and what may become a critical field in the future? (What indicators should be considered such as supply, demand, wages, state needs, and linkages to regional planning goals)

Question 2

What strategies and policies could support alignment between the programs of higher education institutions and these critical field needs?
Most TX computer systems analysts have a BS or higher

Computer systems analysts by education, 2009–2011

- Less than high school: 1%
- High school or GED: 5%
- Some college, no degree: 18%
- AA: 8%
- BA: 45%
- Graduate degree beyond BA: 22%

Source: RAND analysis of American Community Survey
But many degree types contribute to this labor force

Computer systems analysts by field of BS, 2009–2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Degree</th>
<th>Percentage of BS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management and Administration</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and Information Systems—General</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Engineering</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Information Systems and Statistics</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sciences</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RAND analysis of American Community Survey
The Future of Work
An Overview of National Policy Discussions

Ginger Gossman, Ph.D.
Senior Director
Innovation and Policy Development

July 25, 2019

The five W’s and H of the Future of Work

**Who** will be impacted by the Future of Work? **Everyone**

**What** is the Future of Work?

**When** will it be here?

**Where** are these discussions happening?

**Why** is there a focus on policy?

**How** can we support stakeholders in these discussions?
What is “the Future of Work” (FOW)?


From the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, https://innovate.ieee.org/innovation-spotlight-ieee-fueling-fourth-industrial-revolution/.
Focus on the **future** by revisiting the past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will machines devour man?</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Automation might end most unskilled jobs in 10 years</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World ills laid to machines</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>PM to counter “chips” that kill jobs</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does machine displace men in the long run?</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>A robot is after your job</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers see “Robot Revolution” depriving them of jobs</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Technology is heightening job worries</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From “Robots have been about to take all the jobs for more than 200 years” (Anskow 2016)
**When** will FOW be here?

“The future is already here – it’s just not very evenly distributed.”

~ William Gibson,
Science Fiction author and essayist

“[This technology] will create forgetfulness in the learners’ souls…”

~ Socrates
Founder of Western philosophy and ethics
Describing the written word

---

**Where** are FOW conversations?

Source: Google Chrome Search for “State Future of Work,” first page of results.
## National and international discussions of FOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Institute</td>
<td>Future of Work Initiative</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National League of Cities</td>
<td>Future of Work in Cities</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. House Coalition</td>
<td>Future of Work Task Force</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Economic Forum</td>
<td>Fourth Industrial Revolution</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>Future of Work</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
<td>Transition Agenda</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>The Future of Work</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>The Changing Nature of Work</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Why a focus on policy?

![Word Cloud: Reality](image)
Design bias is a **major topic** in FOW


IDE is a **priority** in FOW discussions

How can we support stakeholders?

 Marketable Skills Goal

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

What skills will be needed?

- **T-Shaped**
  - specialty + wide breadth of experience with other skills

- **Comb-Shaped**
  - Multiple areas of expertise + broad interest base
Activities that support the FOW in Texas

- Study by Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
- Leadership Conference Theme
- Marketable Skills Task Force
- Marketable Skills Conference 2020
- Critical Fields
- Tri-Agency
- Career Readiness Handbook (for students)
- Internship Toolkit (for employers)
- Texas WORKS

Take-a-ways for this presentation

1. THECB is engaged in conversations about FOW
2. FOW ↔ Fourth Industrial Revolution (cyber-physical systems)
3. Design matters
4. Policy matters
5. Marketable skills goal puts Texas ahead of the curve
Questions
Outcomes of the 86th Texas Legislature

John Wyatt
Director of External Relations
Status of the 86th Legislature

- 86th Texas Legislature ended its Regular Session on May 27

- A total of 101 bills (out of 522 bills analyzed by the agency) were passed and signed by the Governor

- No special session is expected
Budgetary Outcomes:  
Summary

• Higher education overall received a $904 million (or 7.3%) increase in General Revenue over FY2018-19 funding levels

• The THECB received a $237 million (or 17%) increase over FY18-19 levels

• The Legislature funded seven of the agency’s 15 Exceptional Item Requests at a total of $141.4 million
Budget Outcomes – Exceptional Item Requests

• $60 million increase for Graduate Medical Education Expansion Grants (total of $157 million)
  • Maintains the 1.1 to 1 ratio of first-year residency positions for each Texas medical school graduate

• $80 million increase for TEXAS Grants (total of $866 million)
  • Continues to serve 70% of all initially-eligible students at the current $5,000 target award amount
Budget Outcomes – Exceptional Item Requests

• $230,000 for National Student Clearinghouse Data
  • Allows the agency to track educational outcomes of students who move out-of-state

• $520,000 and 1 FTE for IT Application Portfolio Modernization
  • Implements a modern architecture and consolidate the agency’s 150 applications, lowering support costs and improving efficiency and security

• $150,000 for Facilities Contract Lease Extension
  • Covers the additional cost of a shorter-term building lease due to the agency’s potential move to the Capitol Complex

• $250,000 for an Open Educational Resource Repository
  • Provides access to high-quality OER materials that reduce the cost of educational materials for students

• $300,000 for Texas Success Initiative Assessment Enhancement
  • Supports a new online system for students to retrieve and send test results
Budget Outcomes – Other Increases

Commissioner’s Salary

• Legislature increased the Commissioner’s salary to be more competitive with comparable positions and help attract high-quality applicants for the position.
• Increases the Commissioner's salary from $212,135 to $299,813, the maximum allowable in the position’s salary group
• $175,000 in general revenue appropriated to support the Commissioner’s salary

Texas Armed Services Scholarship

• Increases funding to $6.8 million, allowing the program to restore award amounts to the historical maximum of $10,000 (TASSP awards are currently a maximum of $4,000).
Professional Nursing Shortage Reduction (PNSRP)

• Requires the THECB, in consultation with nursing programs, to set individual targets for enrollment increases in the “Over 70” program

• Requires the THECB to study the effectiveness of PNSRP in addressing the nursing shortage in coordinating with a work group composed of stakeholders
Budget Outcomes – Contingency Riders

Contingency for SB 11

• Sets terms for allocating $99 million appropriated for the Texas Child Mental Health Care Consortium
• THECB to serve as a “pass through” agent for funds as directed by the Consortium

Contingency for SB 16

• Appropriates $4.2 million and 2 FTE positions for making awards and administration of the newly created Peace Officers Loan Repayment Program

Contingency for HB 2261

• Appropriates an additional $4.9 million to the Physician Education Loan Repayment Program to increase maximum annual loan repayments by $5,000
Budget Outcomes – TEA Riders

Interstate Educational Compacts

• Includes $320,000 per year for interstate educational compact fees, including SREB
• Allows Texas to continue to participate in NC-SARA, Academic Common Market and other programs

Open Education Resource Materials

• Requires TEA to prioritize courses commonly offered for dual credit in making grants to develop OER materials
• Requires Commissioner of Education to collaborate with Commissioner of Higher Education to ensure materials meet college standards of rigor
Budget Outcomes – Formula Funding

• Formula funding across all sectors increased by $915 million of GR over FY18-19 levels

• Legislature met or exceeded Board recommendations for most formula categories, including increases in:
  • University I&O formula rate from $55.82 to $56.97 (Board recommended $56.79)
  • Community college Student Success Points from $172 to $214.7 per point (Board recommended $215)
  • TSTC Returned Value percentage from 27 to 36 percent (Board recommended 35 percent)
  • HRI GME formula funding from $5,824 to $5,992 per resident (Board recommended $5,925)
Facilitate efficient student transfer

- SB 25 by West/Turner includes several changes intended to ensure students’ courses transfer and count toward their major

- New requirement that institutions identify transferred courses that do not apply toward the major, and to explain why they did not

- Requires earlier filing of a degree plan and advisement, and for institutions to develop recommended course sequences for their programs

- Allows dual credit courses in Fields of Study or Programs of Study to be formula funded

- Charges the THECB to convene an advisory committee of 2-year and 4-year institutions to examine the feasibility of splitting the core curriculum between a general core and “meta major” curricula as vehicle for more efficient transfer
Policy Outcomes – CB Recommendations

Texas WORKS Paid Internship Program

• HB 3808 by Walle/Powell includes the agency’s recommendation to create a centralized paid internship program at the Coordinating Board using existing Texas College Work-Study (TCWS) funding

• Builds on Governor’s Tri-Agency Workforce Initiative proposal to increase the availability of paid internships in the state

• Removes current off-campus requirements under TCWS that institutions found difficult to administer

• THECB will work with employers statewide to offer meaningful, paid internships to students in higher education

• By leveraging private sector funding to help students earn while they learn, will directly impact 60x30TX goals for marketable skills and student debt
Policy Outcomes – CB Recommendations

Graduation Supplement

• Legislature did not enact the Board’s recommendation to allocate a portion of university formula funding on the basis of undergraduate completions

• Based on legislative feedback, the agency pursued an alternate approach of using unused funds in the B-on-Time (BOT) Account to increase institutions’ graduation success with academically and financially at-risk students

• SB 1504 requires institutions to spend any proceeds from BOT on initiatives such as intrusive advising, academic support and other methods that increase the number of at-risk students completing an undergraduate degree at the institution
Policy Outcomes – CB Recommendations

Student Loan Program

- The Legislature adopted critical legislation impacting the operations of the agency’s $1.3 billion Hinson-Hazlewood Student Loan Program

- SB 1474 amends existing statutes regarding the allocation, project limitations and timing of the state’s Private Activity Bonds that fund the loan program

- Under SB 1474, the agency secured the necessary capacity to fund demand in the loan programs for the foreseeable future

- The greater efficiency created by the bill will save the loan program $4 million per year in unnecessary interest payments, allowing the agency to keep interest rates on student loans low

- The Legislature also passed HB 4465 which cleans up outdated statutes impacting the loan program and brings them in line with current practice
Filing a Degree Plan

• The Legislature passed bills that require dual credit students file a degree plan to ensure that they are adequately advised and are taking coursework relevant to their intended major.

• This was a key recommendation aligning with the findings of the AIR study on dual credit education in Texas.

• SB 25 and SB 1324 require that all dual credit students file a degree plan no later than the second semester after they complete 15 semester credit hours.

• Additionally, university students are required to file a degree plan after completing 30 SCH (down from 45 SCH).

Unnecessary Reports

• SB 241 repealed two reports identified by the Coordinating Board through a negotiated rulemaking process with the institutions of higher education.
Policy Outcomes – CB
Recommendations

Recommendations Not Finally Passed

• Coordinating Board authority to review and approve new off campus sites

• Requirement to report allegations of waste, fraud and abuse

• Incorporating undergraduate success into doctoral program review

• Modifications to the TEXAS Grant and TEOG programs

• Requiring a common electronic format for the Texas Records Exchange (TREx)
Agency Operations During Session

• External Relations monitored and coordinated the analysis of 522 bills. Of those, 101 were signed into law.

• Dozens of individuals from across the agency contributed to bill analysis and recommendations, fiscal impact estimates, expert testimony, and other efforts in support of the legislative session.

• With their support, the External Relations team worked with bill authors and committee members to improve bills and advance legislation that will positively impact 60x30TX.
SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM XI-C

Consideration of adopting the Committee’s recommendation to the Board relating to the certification of gifts that are fundable through the Texas Research Incentive Program (TRIP) for the Emerging Research Universities

RECOMMENDATION: Approval

Background Information:

The 81st Texas Legislature in 2009 created the Texas Research Incentive Program (TRIP), establishing a research matching fund for the emerging research universities.

The legislation requires the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to certify that the gifts or endowments received by each emerging research university were donated for the purpose of enhancing research activities at the institution, such as endowed chairs, professorships, research facilities, research equipment, program costs, or graduate research stipends or fellowships. Once the gifts are certified, the percentage matched is statutorily mandated, leaving no discretion in the amount of matching funds that the institutions receive, subject to the amount appropriated.

The amounts are being certified so the Legislature will have a basis for determining the amounts to appropriate for the 2022-23 biennium. Due to the timing of the certification process, this agenda item was not ready in time for the Committee on Affordability, Accountability and Planning. Therefore, it is being brought to the Agency Operations Committee for consideration prior to the full Board meeting.

Dr. Julie Eklund, Assistant Commissioner for Strategic Planning and Funding, will provide a brief presentation and be available to answer questions.
Below are certified TRIP gifts and the amount of the state match by institution. State matches are subject to the availability of funds appropriated for this purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Gifts Recommended for Certification - Cycles 19-2</th>
<th>Gifts Waiting for State Funding That Were Previously Certified by the Board</th>
<th>Total Gifts Waiting for State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>$ 900,000.00</td>
<td>$ 8,899,604.59</td>
<td>$ 9,799,604.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>1,482,670.00</td>
<td>67,970,299.93</td>
<td>69,452,969.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>175,000.00</td>
<td>3,912,271.50</td>
<td>4,087,271.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>1,612,197.00</td>
<td>12,394,408.80</td>
<td>14,006,605.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>2,460,532.00</td>
<td>49,297,375.83</td>
<td>51,757,907.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>654,563.00</td>
<td>14,464,356.16</td>
<td>15,118,919.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>6,047,230.14</td>
<td>34,479,046.40</td>
<td>40,526,276.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University</td>
<td>4,255,000.00</td>
<td>10,462,758.62</td>
<td>14,717,758.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Certified Gifts</strong></td>
<td>$ 17,587,192.14</td>
<td>$ 201,880,121.83</td>
<td>$ 219,467,313.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>State Match</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>$ 450,000.00</td>
<td>$ 5,720,439.42</td>
<td>$ 6,170,439.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>991,335.00</td>
<td>40,889,129.06</td>
<td>41,880,464.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>87,500.00</td>
<td>2,206,135.75</td>
<td>2,293,635.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>806,098.50</td>
<td>7,369,541.90</td>
<td>8,175,640.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>1,480,266.00</td>
<td>42,481,786.09</td>
<td>43,962,052.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>327,281.50</td>
<td>9,555,570.52</td>
<td>9,882,852.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>5,523,615.07</td>
<td>27,844,439.95</td>
<td>33,368,055.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University</td>
<td>3,652,500.00</td>
<td>7,798,879.32</td>
<td>11,451,379.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$ 13,318,596.07</td>
<td>$ 143,865,922.01</td>
<td>$ 157,184,518.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Data as of: 07/23/19

Total Counts 43 327 370
Component III. Denied Courses:

The following courses were evaluated and did not align with the description of the Foundational Component Area and/or did not incorporate the appropriate Core Objectives. These courses are not approved and may not be included in your 2019 Core Curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>TCCNS</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>010 Communication</td>
<td>ATCM  2340</td>
<td>VISUAL COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>3.00 New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030 Life and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>PHIL  2304</td>
<td>UNDERSTAND SCIENTIFIC INQUIRY</td>
<td>3.00 New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040 Language, Philosophy and Culture</td>
<td>ATCM  2300</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO TECHNOCULTURE</td>
<td>3.00 New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080 Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>BA  1310</td>
<td>MAKING CHOICES IN FREE MKT SYS</td>
<td>3.00 New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECS  2361</td>
<td>SOC ISSUES &amp; ETHICS SCI &amp; TECH</td>
<td>3.00 New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090 Component Area Option</td>
<td>ATCM  2300</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO TECHNOCULTURE</td>
<td>3.00 New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATCM  2340</td>
<td>VISUAL COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>3.00 New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA  1310</td>
<td>MAKING CHOICES IN FREE MKT SYS</td>
<td>3.00 New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

The course ATCM 2340, Visual Communication, was not approved. The core objective Personal Responsibility is said to be incorporated through “Attendance and Participation” and “Lab Assignments.” Attendance and participation is part of any college course requirement and not part of the core objective. There is no information about the lab assignments and how they would incorporated the core objective. Similarly, the teaching of oral communication and aural skills are not explicitly stated and can only indirectly be deduced through the very short description of the Collaborative Project. -- The course PHIL 2304, Understanding Scientific Inquiry, was not approved. The focus of the course is the history and theory of science inquiry. While this is an important topic, it is not suitable for a general education course that should lay a foundation for the describing, explaining, and predicting of natural phenomena. This foundation would be required at a minimum for any critical theory of science discussion. -- The course ATCM 2300, Introduction to TechnoCulture, was not approved. The course topic is too narrow and the course is not suitable for a general education course. The course is predominantly a major course for Art, Technology and Communication degree programs. -- The course BA 1310, Making Choices in Free Market Systems, was not approved because there is no documentation how the required Core Curriculum core objectives would be incorporated into the course. -- The course ECS 2361, Social Issues & Ethics in Science & Technology, was not approved. The course has a focus on professional standards of ethics rather than on ethics as analysis of human character and moral concepts and values. -- The following courses in the CAO, Option A, are not new but had been previously approved in their respective FCAs: RHET 1302, HUMA 1301, LIT 2331, PHIL 1301, PHIL 2316, PHIL 2317, AHST 1303, AHST 1304, AHST 2331, ARTS 1301, DANC 1310, FILM 2332, MUSI 1306, THEA 1310, HIST 1301, HIST 1302, HIST 2301, and HIST 2330. -- The intermediate language courses are approved for the Option B of the Component Area Option. The courses do not address a rigorous alignment with the Language, Philosophy
& Culture FCA that would require a focus on aesthetic and intellectual creations (literature, film, music, drama, philosophy) but they focus on culture-relevant topics and life situations.
Greetings, Colleagues. I hope this note finds you well and having had or planning to have a slow and restful summer. Here is a summary of actions taken by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees at its June meeting. Let me know if you have any questions.

I. Differentiated Review Process—The Board approved an alternate reaffirmation review process for institutions that are determined to be eligible to participate. You will receive details about the process in early fall and be asked to approve it in December at the SACSCOC Annual Meeting of the Membership. If approved by the Membership, the new Differentiated Review Process will be implemented with the Class of 2023.

II. The FY 2020 Budget was approved and included a 3% raise for SACSCOC staff. An increase in the registration fee for the SACSCOC Annual Meeting for attendees who are not at member institutions (e.g., System’s Office personnel, consultants, etc.) was also approved.

III. The SACSCOC Stamp of Approval is being considered by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. We had to secure approval from the SACS Board of Trustees to submit it. Once it is approved, the SACS Board will approve our use of it.

IV. Several policies were revised:

A. “Interpretation of Core Requirement 9.3 (General education requirements),”

Revised wording to this requirement was provided to the Executive Council and approved by the Board. It now reads, “Courses in basic composition that do not contain a significant literature component, courses in oral communication, and introductory foreign language courses are skill courses and not pure humanities courses. Therefore, for purposes of meeting this standard, none of the above may be the one course designated to fulfill the humanities/fine arts requirement in CR 9.3. The institution is responsible for making a persuasive case that at least one of the courses it requires to meet the humanities/fine arts area does not “narrowly focus” on skills.”

B. “Full-Time Faculty (Core Requirement 6.1 and Standard 6.2.b) Guideline”
Proposed changes to this policy included changing the name of the document from “Guideline on Core Requirement 2.8 (Faculty)” to “Full-Time Faculty (Core Requirement 6.1 and Standard 6.2.b) Guideline.” The changes were made to bring the document into compliance with the 2018 Principles of Accreditation. The changes were reviewed by the Executive Council in March and approved by the Board in June.

C. “Reports Submitted for SACSCOC Review” Policy Statement

A revision to this policy was presented to the Executive Council that included adding “Documentation for an Interim Off-Campus Instructional Sites Committee Review” and related language to the document, and modifying the title of the Fifth-Year Follow-Up Report to Follow-Up Report with related language throughout the document. The Council reviewed and the Board approved the proposed changes.

V. Update on Technology Issues

A. New Data Management System – The Commission has now migrated its data to Salesforce (the Commission’s new Database).

1. Meetings Portal – The Commission has been developing the Meetings portion of our new Data Management System which will allow automated tracking of actions taken by the Committees on Compliance and Reports, the Executive Council, and the SACSCOC Board of Trustees.
   Implementation date: June 2019 SACSCOC Board of Trustees Meeting

2. Volunteer Portal – The Volunteer Portal will allow evaluators and SACSCOC Board of Trustees members to access their information directly in Salesforce to update their contact information, note conflicts of interest, etc. A limited group of volunteers will be asked to test the portal before it is made available to the membership.
   Implementation date: fall 2019

3. Substantive Change Screening Form – Staff have begun processing substantive change submissions in Salesforce. Implementation of the Substantive Change Screening Form will walk Institutional Accreditation Liaisons through the process of submitting a Substantive Change and determining if it is actually a Substantive Change. The Screening Form is designed to reduce the amount of
Substantive Change submissions that are not truly Substantive Changes. Implementation date of when institutions will be able to submit documents directly into Salesforce: summer/fall 2019

4. **Collection of Annual Financial Profiles** – The annual Financial Profiles were developed in Salesforce and the information was successfully input by institutions directly into Salesforce. Implementation date: summer 2019

5. **Institutional Portal - Phase 1** – Phase 1 of the Institutional Portal will allow institutions to input and review institutional information, and upload select institutional documents into Box/Salesforce. Implementation date: fall 2019/winter 2020

6. **Institutional Portal – Phase 2** – Phase 2 of the Institutional Portal will allow institutions to submit their Compliance Certification and other documents directly into Box/Salesforce. Implementation date: fall 2020

**B. Technology Updates**

1. **Webpage** – The SACSCOC webpage is being redesigned and will be integrated with Salesforce data. Implementation date: summer/fall 2019

2. **Microsoft Office 365** – The Commission will be migrating to Office 365 which will better integrate with the Salesforce system, reduce server requirements and costs, and consolidate functionalities/Vendors. Implementation date: summer 2019

3. **Back-up Capabilities** – The Commission has moved to a backup system which includes a Cloud Based Disaster Recovery system.

4. **Box** – The Commission will be transitioning current Network Shares to Box which will reduce Server requirements/costs and provide greater accessibility of information for staff. Institutions will be able to submit selected documents to staff through Salesforce via Box. Partial Implementation date: summer 2019
VI. Legislative Update—There is still no proposed Higher Education Bill from Congress. We continue to monitor hearsay that comes to us. I will keep you posted as developments occur.

I hope each of you has the opportunity for a little down time this summer and I look forward to seeing you all in Houston in December at the SACSCOC Annual Meeting. THANKS!

Belle Wheelan

Belle S. Wheelan, Ph.D.
President
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
1866 Southern Lane
Decatur, GA 30033
(404) 679-4512
(404) 994-6592 (FAX)
bwheelan@sacscoc.org
Bylaws of the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas - UTDPP1007

Policy Statement

I. Preamble

The Academic Senate is a representative body, formed from the General Faculty of The University of Texas at Dallas, in which faculty develop their concerns and proposals in exercising their major roles in faculty governance. The Academic Senate is aided in its work by the Academic Council, a smaller body formed from the Academic Senate which meets regularly with the President and Chief Academic Officer and by the Faculty Committees. As the regular primary faculty governance body, the Academic Senate is expected to coordinate faculty exercise of faculty governance responsibilities in the interests of academic excellence at The University of Texas at Dallas.

II. Authority

These Bylaws supplement UTDPP1088 - Faculty Governance of the Handbook of Operating Procedures of The University of Texas at Dallas. Nothing in these Bylaws shall be construed to conflict with the Handbook of Operating Procedures, the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System, or state law.

III. Organization

1. Membership in the Academic Senate
   1. Only members of the Voting Faculty are eligible for membership in the Academic Senate. Members of the Voting faculty are limited to the following, as defined in UTDPP1088, Section I.B.1.a:
      1. Faculty appointed half-time or more to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Regental Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor.
      2. Faculty appointed half-time or more to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Instructor.
      3. Faculty appointed full-time to The University of Texas at Dallas who hold the rank of Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, or of Senior Lecturer 1, 2, or 3, Professor of Instruction, Associate Professor of Instruction, Assistant Professor of Instruction, Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, or Assistant Professor of Practice.
   2. As specified in UTDPP1088, Sec. II.B.1, "The elected members of the Academic Senate shall consist of no fewer than twenty-three and no more than fifty-one voting members of the
General Faculty, with intermediate numbers computed so as to be as close to 10% of the
voting membership of the General Faculty as possible."

3. Each School in the University shall be represented in the Senate.

4. A minimum of 50% of Senate positions shall be held by tenure-system faculty and a minimum
of 10% of Senate positions shall be held by non-tenure-system faculty.

5. All members elected or appointed to the Academic Senate according to these Bylaws, and
only those members, shall be voting members of the Academic Senate.

6. Non-voting participants
1. The President and Vice President of the Student Government Association, or their
assignees, shall be invited to attend meetings of the Academic Senate as non-voting
participants, except when the Academic Senate is in executive session.

2. The Chair of the Staff Council shall be invited to attend the Academic Senate meetings
as a non-voting participant, except when the Academic Senate is in executive session.

2. Elections for Academic Senate
1. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be in charge of the election, although he or she may
designate other faculty and staff members to assist.

2. The nomination and election procedures, including a calendar, shall be distributed no later
than February 1. Nomination and election procedures may be online or may utilize paper
petitions and ballots. The election procedures, beginning with the nomination process and
ending with election of a Speaker of the Faculty-Elect and Secretary of the Faculty-Elect, shall
begin no later than March 15 and end no later than April 14. At least two weeks shall be
allowed for submission of Academic Senate nominating petitions, and one week for ballots in
the Academic Senate election.

3. Nominating petitions are collected by the Office of Academic Governance. For an individual to
be placed on the election ballot, two nominating petitions must be submitted on his or her
behalf. Any member of the Voting Faculty may submit a nominating petition for any other
member of the Voting Faculty, or for himself or herself. No one may submit more than two
nominating petitions, and no one may submit more than one nominating petition for any one
individual.

4. The Secretary of the Faculty shall ascertain the willingness of each nominee to serve if
elected. The names of those who do not wish to serve will not be placed on the ballot.

5. If the number of nominees is below 23 (the minimum number of Senate positions as specified
in UTDPP1088, Sec. II.B.1), the nominating period shall be extended, and the Secretary of the
Faculty shall make additional efforts to encourage nominations.

6. If the number of nominees exceeds the minimum of 23, but does not exceed the maximum of
51, all nominees shall be deemed elected, and there shall be no formal election.

7. The Secretary of the Faculty shall make ballots available by the date designated in the
election calendar.

8. Ballots shall be secret and must be submitted in accordance with the election procedures to
be valid.

9. Each member of the Voting Faculty may vote for as many five nominees and will indicate his
or her first choice, second choice, and so on to a maximum of five. All such votes shall be
counted, and the order of choice will only be used for tie-breaking.

10. As explained in III.A.2 above, based on the current size of the General Faculty and projected
growth, the number of Senators will be 51. To ensure that 1) all schools are represented
(III.A.3 above), 2) at least 50% of Senate positions are allocated to tenure-system faculty
(III.A.4 above), and 3) at least 10% of Senate positions are allocated to non-tenure system
faculty (III.A.4 above), the following procedures shall be used to determine the results of the election.

1. The number of Senate positions will be multiplied by 50%, rounded upward if necessary. That number of positions will be allocated to the top tenure-system vote recipients. Thus, based on 51 Senate positions, the top 26 tenure system vote recipients will be deemed elected. Ties will be broken by counting the number of "first choices" received. If there is still a tie, the number of "second choices" will be counted, and so on.

2. The number of Senate positions will be multiplied by 10%, rounded upward if necessary. That number of positions will be allocated to the top non-tenure-system vote recipients. Based on 51 Senate positions, the top 6 non-tenure-system vote recipients will be deemed elected. Ties will be broken by counting the number of "first choices" received. If there is still a tie, the number of "second choices" will be counted, and so on.

3. If any School within the University is not represented in 1 and 2 above, the top vote recipient from that school will be deemed elected.

4. To fill the remaining positions, all remaining nominees, whether tenure-system or non-tenure system, will be pooled and ranked by number of votes received. Ties will be broken by counting the number of "first choices" received. If there is still a tie, the number of "second choices" will be counted, and so on.

5. If there are fewer nominees in either of the two faculty categories (tenure system and non-tenure system) than the number of Senate positions calculated by the 50% or 10% factor, respectively, all nominees in that category will be deemed elected and the minimum percentage will not apply.

11. The Secretary of the Faculty shall notify successful candidates of their election and of the date of the Senate-Elect Caucus, and shall notify the General Faculty of the election results.

3. Vacancies and Appointments

1. If a member of the Academic Senate resigns his or her seat or leaves The University of Texas at Dallas for a period expected to exceed four months, that seat shall be filled by the unelected candidate who received the most votes in the prior election, bearing in mind the minimum number of required tenure-system, non-tenure-system, and school faculty for Academic Senate.

2. If enough seats are vacated such that the original nomination list is exhausted, the Academic Senate shall fill vacancies by majority vote of all members of the Academic Senate.

3. In the event a sitting member of the Academic Senate is appointed to the position of Dean, that individual is no longer eligible for Academic Senate membership. That seat will be vacated, and the Academic Senate shall fill the vacancy in accordance with III.C.1 and III.C.2 above.

4. If a member of the Academic Senate misses two consecutive Senate meetings, the Senator will be contacted by the Secretary of the Faculty to ascertain whether he or she still wishes to serve. If not, the Senator will be immediately replaced by the procedures of Sections III.C.1 and III.C.2 above.

5. If a member of the Academic Senate misses three meetings during September-May, the Academic Senate may, by a majority vote of those present, declare the seat vacant. The seat will then be filled by the procedures of Section III.C.1 and III.C.2 above.

4. Officers

1. Roster and Duties
1. Speaker of the Faculty: The Speaker of the Faculty is the principal elected officer of the General Faculty, of the Academic Senate, and the Academic Council. The Speaker shall:
   1. preside as described in the Handbook of Operating Procedures, UTDPP1088;
   2. chair the Executive Committee, if any, of the Academic Senate in its coordination of the work of the General Faculty, Academic Senate, Academic Council, and Concurrent Committees in order to improve the academic welfare and standing of The University of Texas at Dallas;
   3. assist in formulating faculty views as motions to be placed before the Academic Council or Senate for discussion and resolution; and
   4. together with the Secretary of the Faculty, review drafts of the minutes and authorize their circulation for formal approval.
   5. Sign the official copy of the approved minutes of the Academic Council and the Academic Senate.

2. Secretary of the Faculty: The Secretary of the Faculty shall:
   1. serve as Secretary for meetings of the General Faculty, the Academic Senate, and the Academic Council;
   2. see that minutes are kept, made available to any faculty member, and filed in the Office of the President and, through that office, with the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of The University of Texas System, and with the Library of The University of Texas at Dallas;
   3. together with the Speaker of the Faculty, review drafts of the minutes and authorize their circulation for formal approval;
   4. provide a report on Academic Senate and Academic Council activities to the General Faculty at least once a year;
   5. in case of the absence of the Speaker from a meeting of Academic Council or Academic Senate, sign the official copy of the approved minutes of the Academic Council and Academic Senate for transmittal to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of The University of Texas System; and
   6. maintain a list of all recommendations that the Academic Senate and/or Academic Council has made to the administration so that the President may be requested to comment on these items at the beginning of each meeting.

3. Vice Speaker: The Speaker may appoint one or two members of the Senate to serve as Vice Speaker(s) and assist in carrying out the Speaker's official and unofficial duties. Vice Speaker(s) will serve for a term of one year, and will become ex officio voting members of the Academic Council if not already elected to the Council by the Senate.

4. Other Offices: The Academic Senate may, through its Resolution of Operating Procedures, create, provide for election or appointment, and provide duties for other offices of the Academic Senate and the Academic Council.

2. Election of Officers
   1. The Academic Senate-Elect shall, in a caucus announced to and open to the voting members of the General Faculty and presided over by the Speaker of the Faculty, and under Robert's Rules of Order (current edition) elect its Speaker by a majority vote. The individual elected shall be known as the Speaker-Elect of the Faculty until June 1. The term of the Speaker of the Faculty shall be for two years.
   2. The Academic Senate-Elect shall, in a caucus announced to and open to the voting members of the General Faculty and presided over by the Speaker-Elect of the Faculty, and under Robert's Rules of Order (current edition) elect its Secretary of the Faculty, who shall be known as the Secretary-Elect of the Faculty until June 1.
3. Until the election of the Secretary-Elect of the Faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty shall perform the routine functions of Secretary for the Academic Senate-Elect.

5. Academic Council
1. Relation to Academic Senate: The Academic Senate should, through its Resolution of Operating Procedures, specify at least the following:
   1. the powers delegated to the Academic Council;
   2. the extent to which the Academic Council is to function as an executive committee for the Academic Senate;
   3. the extent to which the Academic Council is to function as an agenda committee for the Academic Senate; and
   4. the communications required between the Academic Council and the Academic Senate, and between the Academic Council, Academic Senate and the Voting Faculty, including the appropriate form for the Minutes of the Academic Council and the Academic Senate.

2. Election, Removal, and Vacancies
1. After the election of the Speaker-Elect and Secretary-Elect of the Faculty, the Academic Senate-Elect shall, in a caucus announced to and open to the voting members of the General Faculty and presided over by the Speaker-Elect of the Faculty, and under Robert's Rules of Order (current edition), elect the remaining members of the Academic Council. Members in addition to six may be appointed by the Speaker with approval of the Council. Election shall be by simple plurality vote, with each member of the Senate voting for a number of candidates up to the number of positions to be filled.

2. These members, along with the Speaker-Elect of the Faculty and the Secretary-Elect of the Faculty, shall be known as the Academic Council-Elect until June 1.

3. The Academic Senate, in a caucus session, may accept resignations of members of the Academic Council, remove any members of the Academic Council except the Speaker of the Faculty or the Secretary of the Faculty, and vote on replacements to the Academic Council.

4. When a member of the Academic Council must be absent from a meeting, the member may designate, through the Secretary of the Faculty, a Senator to represent him or her at that meeting as a member of the Academic Council.

5. The President of the Student Government Association or designee shall be a non-voting participant in the Academic Council during the Council's non-executive sessions.

6. If appointed by the Speaker to serve as Vice Speaker, Senators will serve as ex officio voting members of the Academic Council for the duration of their term.

IV. Procedures
1. The Academic Senate shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order (current edition) unless procedures described in the Handbook of Operating Procedures, UTDPP1088 - Faculty Governance or these Bylaws make exception to Robert's Rules of Order.

2. Actions of the Academic Senate
1. Actions During the Spring and Summer
   1. At the first meeting of the Academic Council, which shall be called by the Speaker-Elect of the Faculty to take place as soon after May 31 as practical, the Council shall prepare a calendar of regular meetings for the Academic Council and for the Academic Senate and shall set the date of the annual General Faculty meeting. The calendar shall be published as early in the academic year as possible.
2. As soon as possible after the new Academic Council is elected, it shall appoint the Committee on Committees so that it may begin composing slates of nominees for the University, Concurrent, and Academic Senate committees for which it is charged. The membership of the Committee on Committees shall be approved by a majority vote.

2. Submissions of Items for Debate
   1. The Agenda Packet for the Academic Senate normally will be sent to the Senate one week prior to a meeting of the Academic Senate.
   2. The Agenda Committee for the Academic Senate, consisting of the President, the Secretary, and the Speaker normally will confer five days prior to the submission of the Agenda Packet to the Academic Senate.
   3. Items for debate that are not on the Academic Senate Agenda normally will be deferred to a later Academic Senate meeting.
   4. The Agenda Committee for the Academic Senate will attempt to bring all items submitted to it to the Academic Senate, although it may recommend that particular items be sent to committee and/or to the Academic Council prior to Academic Senate debate. Any memorandum submitted by any General Faculty member of the University to the Academic Senate or to the Speaker of the Faculty that requests action by the Academic Senate or Academic Council must be reported to the Academic Senate by the Agenda Committee of the Academic Senate.

3. Debate and Passage
   1. If the President and Provost are not available to chair meetings of the Senate at which legislation is enacted, the Speaker shall chair. In the absence of the Speaker, a Vice Speaker shall chair. In the absence of a Vice Speaker, the Secretary shall chair. In the absence of the Secretary, the meeting may be chaired by any member of the Senate designated by the Speaker.
   2. The chair of a meeting of the Academic Senate may participate in the debate but shall exercise particular care to preside in a manner which is fair to all points of view in the debate.
   3. The President and/or the Speaker of the Faculty may invite to meetings of the Academic Senate those persons believed to be necessary to assist the Academic Senate in the conduct of its business.
   4. Except when the Academic Senate is in executive session, meetings of the Academic Senate are open to the General Faculty, who may request the privilege of participation in the debate.
   5. A simple majority of the voting membership of the Senate constitutes a quorum. If a quorum is not present, business that would otherwise have been conducted may be discussed, but votes shall not be taken.
   6. Members of the Academic Senate who anticipate making lengthy or complicated amendments to legislation should bring sufficient written copies to distribute to the entire Academic Senate.
   7. Passage of legislation or resolutions shall require a simple majority of those voting members present. Votes shall be recorded by hand count: ayes, nays, abstain. Role call votes shall be taken if three or more members request.
   8. The Secretary of the Faculty is responsible for sending copies of motions passed to the parties addressed.

3. Actions of the Academic Council
   1. Submission of Items for Debate and Passage

If the President and Provost are not available to chair meetings of the Council at which Senate
agenda items are discussed, the Speaker shall chair. In the absence of the Speaker, a Vice Speaker shall chair.

1. The Agenda Committee for the Academic Council, consisting of the President, the Secretary, and the Speaker, normally will confer by email at least five days before each Academic Council meeting. Items to be included on an agenda must be submitted prior to that time.

2. Items for the Agenda of the Academic Council will normally originate with the President and with the Academic Senate, its Executive Committee, or the Speaker of the Faculty.

2. Transmissions from Academic Council to Academic Senate
The Academic Council shall formulate its recommendations to the Academic Senate and transmit them to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Senate. It shall generally transmit all items submitted to it to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Senate.

4. Records and Communications

1. Actions required by motions of the Academic Senate or Academic Council, as described in the minutes, will be conveyed to those concerned, or will be taken by the Academic Governance Secretary only after approval of the minutes for circulation, but without waiting for the formal approval of the minutes at the subsequent meeting of the Academic Senate or Academic Council.

2. The general policy on composition and contents of records including minutes is the same for both the Academic Council and Academic Senate, and is as follows:
   1. Consistent with Robert's Rules of Order, the approved minutes constitute the only official record of the actions of the Academic Council and Academic Senate;
   2. The minutes are intended to allow members of the General Faculty to follow the debates and actions within their representative bodies, the Academic Senate, and within the Academic Council;
   3. The Secretary of the Faculty or the Academic Governance Secretary may make recordings of the Academic Council and Academic Senate meetings. Tapes of meetings shall not, however, be considered official documents, and will be kept only until the minutes of the meeting recorded are officially approved, after which the recordings may be destroyed in accordance with the University's Records Management Retention Policy and records retention schedule;
   4. Unapproved minutes of Academic Council and Academic Senate meetings shall be distributed to the Academic Senate expeditiously, if possible within two weeks after the meeting;
   5. Minutes are numbered serially each year, including special meetings;
   6. Attendance for minutes includes both those present and absent of the voting membership, ex officio members, and student observers. Invited guests are also listed;
   7. Minutes of the Academic Council and Academic Senate are distributed to all members of the Academic Senate, and made available at the authorized locations for Regents' Rules and Regulations, and are also sent to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of The University of Texas System; and
   8. The minutes of the last meetings of the Academic Senate and Academic Council will be approved by the incoming Academic Senate or Academic Council, respectively.

3. The Academic Senate shall establish procedures, in its Resolution of Operating Procedures, to disseminate information about its debates and actions to the General Faculty effectively and expeditiously.

5. Resolution of Operating Procedures: The Academic Senate may, by adoption or revision of its Resolution of Operating Procedures, modify the following portions of its procedures without having to amend these Bylaws:
1. delegation of duties and powers to the Academic Council;
2. designation and powers of the Agenda Committee;
3. designation and powers of the Executive Committee, if any; and
4. instructions to the Secretary of the Faculty regarding the character of action or discussion
   minutes to be taken.

6. Amendment of Bylaws
   1. These Bylaws may be amended by a majority vote of the Senate members, provided that the
      proposed amendment passes, at two consecutive meetings of the Academic Senate
      separated by at least two weeks.
   2. The Secretary of the Faculty shall transmit a copy of the amended Bylaws to the President for
      review. All amendments must be approved by the President and by the institution's chief legal
      officer or the Vice Chancellor and General Counsel for inclusion in the UT Dallas Handbook of
      Operating Procedures pursuant to Rule 20201, section 4.9.
   3. The amended Bylaws shall become effective immediately.
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University Assessment Committee at UT Dallas
Resolution Against Mandatory Assessment of Marketable Skills

Whereas the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) has stated the goal that all graduates from Texas public institutions of higher education will have completed programs with identified marketable skills, as part of the state’s 60x30TX strategic plan;

Whereas many Texas public institutions of higher education have included student learning outcomes in their academic programs and these programs must now include marketable skills as mandated by the THECB’s 60x30TX marketable skills goal by 2020;

Whereas all UT Dallas academic programs have published student learning outcomes and ways to assess these outcomes;

Whereas the purpose of assessment is to assess degree program student learning outcomes;

Whereas the THECB 60x30TX marketable skills goal currently does not require a separate assessment of marketable skills;

Therefore, let it be resolved that the University Assessment Committee at UT Dallas strongly opposes any additional assessment of marketable skills.