February 7, 2014

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, February 19, 2014 at 2:00 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.
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---

**2013-2014 ACADEMIC SENATE**

- Ackerman, Robert
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- Namgoong, Won
- Al-Dhahir, Naofal
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- Nielsen, Steve
- Alborz, Shawn
- Ferguson, John
- Ntafos, Simeon
- Assmann, Peter
- Gans, Nicholas
- Prakash, Ravi
- Balsara, Paras
- Geissman, John
- Ramakrishna, Viswanath
- Beron, Kurt
- Gelb, Lev
- Rebello, Michael
- Bhatia, Dinesh
- Hagge, Tobias
- Redman, Tim
- Bradbury, Judd
- Holmes, Jennifer
- Rodrigues, Fabiano
- Breen, Gail
- Huynh, Dung
- Salamasick, Mark
- Brown, Matthew
- Ishak-Boushaki, M.
- Salter, Liz
- Burnham, Gerald
- Kiasaleh, Kamran
- Scotch, Richard
- Burr, John
- *Leaf, Murray
- Serfling, Robert
- Chandrasekaran, R
- Linsteadt, Chris
- Thompson, Tres
- Choudhary, Pankaj
- Liu, Jin
- Venkatesan, Subbarayan
- **Cordell, David
- Manton, William
- Zheng, Si
- Daescum Ovidiu
- Menon, Syam
- Zheng, Zhiqiang
- Dai, Zhonglan
- Miller, Dennis
- Dieckmann, Gregg

*Speaker
**Secretary

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
February 19, 2014

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions   Dr. Daniel
2. Approval of the Agenda                      Dr. Leaf
3. Approval of Minutes                         Dr. Leaf
   January 15, 2014 Meeting
4. UTS175/180 Hybrid Policy                   Rafael Martin
5. Speaker’s Report                            Dr. Leaf
6. FAC Report                                  Dr. Leaf
7. Student Government Liaison Report          
8. Resolution to create a Committee to Research Salary Compression Dr. Leaf
9. MOOC Overview and Recommendations         Dr. Leaf
10. Announcement of 2014-2015 Senate Election Dr. Cordell
11. Adjournment                                Dr. Daniel
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Senate. They have not been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are not the official minutes.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
January 15, 2014

Present: Hobson Wildenthal, Shawn Alborz, Peter Assmann, Judd Bradbury, Matthew Brown, Gerald Burnham, John Burr, R. Chandrasekaran, Pankaj Choudhary, David Cordell, Ovidiu Daescu, Simon Fass, John Ferguson, Lev Gelb, Jennifer Holmes, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Kamran Kiasaleh, Murray Leaf, Jin Liu, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Michael Rebello, Fabiano Rodrigues, Richard Scotch, Robert Serfling,


Visitors: Andrew Blanchard, Calvin Jamison, Abby Kratz, Mary Jo Venetis,

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
The meeting was called to order at 2:06 PM by Provost Wildenthal. There was a major ice storm in early December that caused commencement to be canceled. The university provided condensed commencement ceremonies the following weekend. Provost Wildenthal noted that thanks to social media the communication of the cancelations and rescheduling could be done quickly. Construction on the new landscaping began over the winter break. Entrances to Green and Johnson have been blocked, and the recommendation is to take sky bridges to cross that area.

UT System received the University’s recommendation for a tuition rating increase over the break as well. The fate of that recommendation is eagerly awaited. The 50th year symposium on astrophysics occurred over the break. The Provost offered his thanks to the Physics department on its great success. The original symposium 50 years ago had been a destination of President Kennedy on the day he was assassinated.

On January 22nd the first lecture in the ATEC series will be presented in the new O’Donnell Hall. There are expected to be 1200 people in attendance. The Provost opened the floor to questions.
Jennifer Holmes is concerned that the lighting to the parking lots on the east side of Green has been lost due to the construction. She requested that lighting be returned to that area as it is a safety concern without it.

Viswanath Ramakrishna requested follow up on the proposal made at the September Senate meeting on the establishment of a body to address violations of school bylaws. The new guidelines were sent to schools, but there was no provision for what should be done if they are violated. The general consensus what that one was to speak with the school dean, and then the provost. Otherwise it should be referred to the Academic Council which the President and Provost are members. R. Chandrasekaran requested that a resolution be put on the next Academic Council regarding this concern. Speaker Leaf noted that a memo of understanding had been created under Former President Jennifer regarding committee issues. Speaker Leaf volunteered to draft a new memo to lay out a similar process for the by-laws.

Ravi Prakash wished to express his public thanks to everyone who assisted with the power outages in the residence halls. The matter was dealt with quickly and effectively.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   Richard Scotch moved to accept the agenda. Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
   Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes. Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki seconded. The motion carried.

4. Speaker’s Report – Murray Leaf
   There is no activity to report.

5. FAC Report
   The FAC will meet in January. The executive committee met on December 13, 2013.
   1. Regents Rule 90903 on Intellectual Property rights of faculty is currently considered unsatisfactory due to the reasons discussed in the notice on the university’s intellectual properties right in relations to encryption. There have been hypothetical challenges to faculty’s ability to own what they create. This has raised concerns over what guarantees what faculty’s rights are. Up until 1976 it was common law right; in the 1976 copyright act they became federal rights. The Copyright act say it preserves all the rights, it eliminated no rights, any rights that faculty had before, they still do. Before 1976 there wasn’t much that had to do with electronic media, specifically online media material. The Regents rules are unclear on that, and on patents. In patents, they claim that the university owns what faculty patents. They claim the university owns what faculty copyright but they give it back to the faculty. The intellectual Property rights of courses are somewhere between those two.
2. The Executive committee of the FAC approached Dan Sharphorn, the director of the Office of General Counsel, about revising the Regents Rules. His response was that it was a good time to make the revisions. On his recommendation Speaker Leaf drafted suggestions for revisions for the wording for the Regents Rules intellectual Property rights, related both to copyright and patents. In regards to copyrights, the opinion is ‘If you create it, you own it.’ The same should apply to patents except faculty do not create things alone, (i.e. federal grant, university equipment) a qualification must be made for that. Speaker Leaf would like volunteers to review the drafts so that he has some feedback before the January 23rd FAC meeting.

Most universities have policies that follow the traditional rules regarding copyrights and patents. UT's policy is a little less supporting of traditionally recognized rights. This difference was exacerbated due to the encryption discussion. The attorney who wrote the university's statement on grounds for encryption claimed that everything mission related belonged to the University. This is the most important issue facing the FAC.

3. Encryption. Speaker Leaf had sent around a list of categories relating to encryption. That list will be cut down further in line with the new policy announcement by the chancellor. The new policy is that the only things that will make a computer require encryption are items protected by FERPA, HIPPA, or required by contract. The university’s current rules do not yet follow this policy, and neither does system's. The FAC will begin the process of saying how the new policy will be implemented, since it is not being done by system.

4. Peer Observation. There has been a continuing discussion, some of which has already been shared with the Senate. The Regents have been pressing to have faculty evaluate each other in order to make teaching more effective. David Cordell has been on system wide committee that reviewed it. This has not been going very well. The committee recommended peer evaluation to improve teaching, not for evaluation. System continues to press for using it for evaluation for merit increases. Dr. Cordell will send out a draft of a proposed updated policy. He will request comment within a week before the next FAC meeting (January 23).

6. CEP Proposals- Suresh Radhakrishnan
   Undergraduate Course Catalog
   All undergraduate courses had to be updated due to the new semester credit hour policy. The overview covered the changes made to the courses. They do not include the core classes, as they were approved in November 2013. The last four courses listed in the document were approved January 7 by the Committee on Undergraduate Education. Behavior and Brain Science had previously removed a course but found that during the transitional period there are students that still required the course. It has been re-added, and re-numbered. A similar situation occurred in Economic, Political & Policy Sciences. Originally a course was core but it was replaced by two separate courses. There are students who will require the course during the transitional period; therefore, it was added back into the undergraduate catalog. To prevent students from registering for the incorrect course the phrase “required by student entering the program prior to Fall of
2014” has been added. There were 106 new courses added, and 5 courses deleted. CEP considered the document and moved to approve. Peter Assmann seconded. The motion carried.

7. Student Government Liaison Report
   No report was given.

8. Updating UTDPP1007-Faculty Senate Bylaws & UTDPP1088- Faculty Governance
   Per the bylaws any changes must be approved twice by the Senate. The minor amendments suggested at the November Senate meeting were made to both UTDPP1007 and 1088 (Appendix A & B). Abby Kratz made one recommendation to remove a redundant statement. Richard Scotch moved to approve the amendments. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

There being no further business, Jennifer Holmes moved to adjourn the meeting. Simon Fass seconded. The motion carried.

APPROVED: ___________________________  DATE: _____________

Murray J. Leaf
Speaker of the Academic Senate
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 Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost) 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 Chapter 21 "Faculty Governance" in Title III, "Academic Affairs" 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. Election, Vacancies, and Appointment of Academic Senate

   1. The election procedures, including an election calendar, shall be distributed no later than February 1. Election procedures may be online or may utilize paper petitions and ballots. The election procedures, beginning with the nomination of members of the Senate 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 the last day of final examinations in the Spring semester. At least two weeks will be allowed for completion of Academic Senate nominating petitions, and one week for ballots in the Academic Senate election.

   2. 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.

   3. Any two voting members of the General Faculty, as defined in Title III, Chapter 24 UTDPP 1088, Section I.B.1, may nominate by petition to membership in the Senate any one voting member of the General Faculty, except that no one may sign more than two petitions.
4. Nominating petitions are collected by the Office of Academic Governance. The Secretary of the Faculty will 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. Ballots, including all those nominated who are willing to serve, are to be distributed to the voting members of the General Faculty by the Secretary of the Faculty by the date designated in the election calendar. Ballots cast by voting members of different Schools will be colored differently or otherwise kept separate.

6. Each eligible voter will indicate with a "1" his or her first choice for a representative, with a "2" as second choice, with a "3" as third choice, and so on for as many choices as desired up to a maximum of 5 people choices. Ballots are to be returned in accordance with the election procedures. Ballots shall be secret.

7. Ballots from each of the Schools in the University shall first be counted separately by the Plurality System (as defined in III.A.17 below), ignoring all choices for any candidates from other Schools, to determine the candidate from the School, if any, most favored by the voting members of the General Faculty of that School.

8. All ballots will be combined and counted by the Plurality System ignoring choices for the candidate already elected from each School, to select the remaining candidates to be elected.

9. The Secretary of the Faculty and an ad hoc election committee appointed by the Academic Senate shall implement procedures that will ensure the identity of the voter casting a specific ballot is secret and the counting of the ballots is accurate.

10. The Secretary of the Faculty shall notify successful candidates of their election and of the date of the Senate-Elect Caucus.

11. If, by the date designated for the closing of nominations, the number of valid nominations does not exceed the minimum membership of the Academic Senate, as computed per Sec. II.B.1 of Chapter 21 UTDP 1088- Faculty Governance of the Handbook of Operating Procedures, all candidates shall be declared to be elected.

12. 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 most favored unelected candidate in the last election.

13. Once the original nomination list is exhausted, the Academic Senate shall fill vacancies by majority vote of all members of the Academic Senate.

14. In the event a sitting member of the Academic Senate is appointed to the position of Dean, the member shall offer to resign from the Senate. If the resignation is accepted, the Academic Senate shall fill the vacancy in accordance with Sections 12 and 13 above.

15. 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 12 and 13 above. If a member of the Academic Senate misses three meetings during September-May, at the third meeting 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 12 and 13 above.
16. All members elected or appointed to the Academic Senate under Section III.A.1.-18. of these Bylaws, and only those members, shall be voting members of the Academic Senate.

17. Except as specified in III.A.18, for the purpose of elections held under these Bylaws, a Plurality System as described below will be used: The results are tallied for each candidate by indicating the number of first-place votes received by the candidate, the number of second-place votes received by the candidate, etc. The candidates are then ranked by first-place votes with the most preferred candidate having the most first-place votes, etc. In the case of two or more candidates receiving the same number of first-place votes, the second-place votes of these candidates will determine their rank order. If necessary, third-, fourth-, etc. place votes will be used to determine the rank order of candidates having the same number of first-place votes. In the unlikely event that the rank order of two or more candidates with the same number of first-place votes cannot be determined by the use of a randomization device which gives each of the tied candidates the same chances of having any rank as any other of the tied candidates (i.e., a random permutation). If M is the number of offices to be filled, the first M-ranked candidates shall be declared elected. Vacancies that may occur during the course of the year will be filled as provided in Sections 12 and 13 above.

18. An additional number of voting members of the Senate shall be elected from among the Senior Lecturers. This number shall not exceed 10% of the total number of Senate seats for which Voting Faculty are eligible. The term of office is one year. If a Senior Lecturer resigns his or her seat on the Academic Senate or a Senior Lecturer seat becomes vacant for other reasons, a replacement shall be appointed from a ranked list of those Senior Lecturers who were nominated and who received votes. In the case that there is an insufficient number of candidates who received votes, the Speaker shall convene a Senior Lecturer caucus to elect the necessary number of representatives to serve on the Academic Senate. Ballots for Senior Lecturers will be distributed to all Senior Lecturers without differentiation by school, and will be tallied without differentiation by school. For purposes of election to the Senate the term “Senior Lecturer” here means all those with the title of Senior Lecturer or Clinical Professor who are employed full-time and are subject to UTDPP1062 GENERAL STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF NONTENURE-SYSTEM FACULTY. It does not include Research Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor or other positions in which there is understood to be a fixed and limited term of employment without the possibility of renewal. 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 nontenure-system faculty, implemented as follows. 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 as described in III.A.17. The number of Senate positions will be multiplied by 10%, rounded upward if necessary. That number of positions will be allocated to the top nontenure-system vote recipients as described in III.A.17. All remaining nominees, both tenure-system and nontenure system, will then be pooled and ranked as described in III.A.17 to fill the remaining positions. If there are fewer nominees in one of the respective faculty categories than the number calculated by the 50% or 10% factor, respectively, all nominees in that category will be deemed elected and the minimum percentages will not apply. All remaining nominees, both tenure system and nontenure system, will then be pooled and ranked to fill the remaining positions.

19. From a list of five students submitted to the President by the President of the Student Government Association, the President and the Academic Senate annually shall agree on two non-voting participants who may attend meetings of the Academic Senate, except when the Academic Senate is in executive session.

20. The Chair of the Staff Council shall be invited to attend the Academic Senate meetings as a non-voting participant.

2. Officers
   
   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, Title III, Chapter 21;
      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.
   
   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 each semester of the long term;
5. 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.

3.4. 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.

3. 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 using the plurality system as described in III.A.17. 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 shall be a non-voting participant in the Academic Council during the Council's non-executive sessions.

5.6. 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.

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, Title III, Chapter 21, UTDPP1088, Faculty Governance or these Bylaws make exception to Robert's Rules of Order.

2. Actions of the Academic Senate
   1. Actions During the Summer
      1. At the first meeting of the Academic Senate, which shall be called by the Speaker-Elect of the Faculty to take place as soon after June 1 as practical, the Academic Senate 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 June 1, the Academic Senate 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 will normally be sent to the Senate one week prior to a meeting of the Academic Senate.
   2. The Agenda Committee for the Academic Senate will normally meet 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 will normally be deferred to a later Academic Senate meeting, unless two-thirds of the members present vote to consider the items.
   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, 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
      1. The Agenda Committee for the Academic Council meets 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;
      4. Unapproved minutes of Academic Council and Academic Senate meetings shall be distributed to the Academic Senate expeditiously, if possible within one week 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, without an intervening negative vote, at two 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 and approval and submission to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and approval for inclusion in the U. T. Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures.
   3. The amended Bylaws shall become effective immediately on approval for inclusion in the Handbook of Operating Procedures.
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Faculty Governance - UTDPP1088

Policy Statement

Section I. General Faculty

Excerpt

The following excerpt is from the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System (hereafter referred to as the Regents’ Rules and Regulations), Rule 40101, Faculty Role in Educational Policy Formulation:

"Sec. 1 Board Commitment. The Board of Regents will devote its best efforts to making all of the institutions of The University of Texas System of the "first class," as the Texas Constitution directs in Article VII, Section 10. The Board will be guided in general by the best practices of the top universities in the United States and abroad, especially by the best practices of state universities in the United States.

Sec. 2 Advice on Board Policies. The Board of Regents will ordinarily seek the advice of the faculty on important matters of academic policy.

Sec. 3 General Authority. Subject to the authority of the Board of Regents and subject further to the authority that the Board has vested in the various administrative officers and subdivisions of the System, the faculties of the institutions regularly offering instruction shall have a major role in the governance of their respective institutions in the following areas:

- 3.1 General academic policies and welfare.
- 3.2 Student life and activities.
- 3.3 Requirements of admission and graduation.
- 3.4 Honors and scholastic performance.
- 3.5 Approval of candidates for degrees.
- 3.6 Faculty rules of procedure.

Sec. 4 Necessity of Approval by Regents. Legislation recommended by an institutional faculty, or legislative body thereof, requiring approval of the Board of Regents, shall not be effective unless and until approved by the Board. Such legislation by a college or school faculty shall not be presented to the Board until it has been approved by the institutional faculty, either directly or through its legislative body, and has received the consideration and recommendation of the institutional president, the appropriate Executive Vice Chancellor, and the Chancellor. The faculty affected will be notified by the Board, through administrative channels, of its action on recommended faculty legislation.

Sec. 5 Approval of Degree Candidates. It shall be the duty of the several institutional faculties to recommend approval or disapproval of all candidates for degrees. This duty may be delegated by
affirmative vote of the institutional faculty, or its legislative body, to the respective deans or other appropriate official. Should this duty not be delegated, the institutional registrar, or his or her equivalent, shall furnish to the members of the institutional faculty a complete list of the degree candidates for recommendation.

Sec. 6 List of Degree Candidates. The institutional registrar, as soon as possible after each commencement, shall provide the secretary of his or her institutional faculty, or its legislative body, with a complete list of all successful degree candidates."

A. Authority and General Functions

The areas of authority of the General Faculty are listed above. The General Faculty, however, has delegated the detailed exercise of its powers to the Academic Senate (see Section II of this chapter). The General Faculty, however, retains the following powers:

1. Establishment of rules of membership and procedure for itself and for school and disciplinary faculties.
2. Election of the Academic Senate.
3. Review, amendment, and/or repeal of all legislative actions of the Academic Senate.
4. Summons to call the General Faculty into Special Session.

B. Membership and Privileges

1. Membership
   1. Voting members of the General Faculty shall consist of the following:
      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, and who hold appointments of half-time or more.
      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 Senior Lecturer,

2. Non-voting members of the General Faculty shall consist of the following:
   1. All persons who, pursuant to the Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 31001, hold the following titles at The University of Texas at Dallas: Clinical or Visiting Professor, Clinical or Visiting Associate Professor, and Clinical or Visiting Assistant Professor; Clinical Instructor, and Instructor (less than half-time appointments); Lecturer and Senior Lecturer; Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Assistant Professor; Professor Emeritus and Associate Professor Emeritus; and Research Scientists and Research Associates holding appointments outside the classified pay plan of the University.
2. The President and Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost) of The University of Texas at Dallas, if they do not qualify for voting membership in the General Faculty under Subsection 1.a. above, shall be ex officio non-voting members of the General Faculty.

3. Because of the common qualifications to be required for faculty called upon for graduate and undergraduate instruction at The University of Texas at Dallas, separate graduate and undergraduate divisions of the General Faculty or other legislative bodies will not be established.

2. Privileges
   1. Those faculty members designated in Subsection 1 above shall retain their voting status while on approved leave.
   2. Each voting member, of whatever rank, shall be entitled to one vote.
   3. Nonvoting members have the privilege of attending meetings with the right to speak but without the right to vote.

C. Meetings

1. The President of the University convenes the university community, faculty, and staff, for a "State of the University Report" each year in October. The meeting of the Senate following the State of the University Report shall begin with a meeting of the General Faculty, at which the General Faculty may consider and vote on Resolutions of the General Faculty.
2. If there is no State of the University Address, the Senate meeting for October of each year shall also be a meeting of the General Faculty.
3. Special meetings of the General Faculty shall be held at the call of the President or the Speaker of the Faculty or at the request of at least twenty percent of the voting members of the General Faculty, as listed on the most recent faculty roster certified by the Secretary of the Faculty, to the Speaker of the Faculty. A minimum notice of one week is required.

D. Organization

1. The President shall be Chair ex officio of the General Faculty.
2. In the absence of the President, the Provost shall preside.
3. In the absence of both the President and the Provost, the Speaker of the Faculty shall preside.
4. The Speaker of the Faculty and the Secretary of the Faculty shall be elected according to procedures described in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate. The President, to the extent possible, shall reduce the teaching load of the Speaker of the Faculty and of the Secretary of the Faculty by one course in each of the Fall and Spring semesters.

E. Legislation

1. Definition - Legislation is any motion which:
   1. requests or recommends actions on the part of the academic administration of The University of Texas at Dallas or of The University of Texas System,
2. establishes rules or procedures under the general authority of the faculty, as described in Rule 40101 of the Regents' Rules and Regulations, or
3. certifies compliance with those rules and procedures.

2. Responses and Approvals
   1. The academic administration shall respond, in due course, to all legislation directed to it.
   2. The Faculty Senate has the responsibility for suggesting, reviewing, and commenting on any revisions to the University's Handbook of Operating Procedures pertaining to general academic policies and welfare and faculty rules of procedure on a timely basis before they are approved by the President and sent to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for recommendation to the Board of Regents.
   3. All actions of the General Faculty which require the approval of the Board of Regents shall be transmitted to the Board by the President and the Chancellor, University of Texas System, in the form passed by the General Faculty, together with such recommendations as the President or Chancellor, University of Texas System, may choose to make. At each meeting of the Academic Senate, the President shall report on all actions of the Senate or General Faculty transmitted to the Board and the action, if any, of the Board on each. If final action of the Board differs from the General Faculty's recommendation, the President shall communicate these differences to the Academic Senate.
   4. The Board of Regents will notify the General Faculty of its actions on faculty legislation.

F. Rules of Procedure
   1. The General Faculty meetings shall be conducted under Robert's Rules of Order (current edition), except insofar as they may be modified by the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.
   2. At a regular or special meeting, a quorum shall consist of twenty percent of the voting members of the General Faculty. If a quorum is not present at a regular meeting, business that would otherwise have been conducted at that meeting may be discussed; the Academic Senate may decide whether the meeting constituted a valid meeting of the General Faculty. Any business conducted at a special meeting requires a quorum to be present.

Section II. Academic Senate

A. Authority and General Functions
   1. The Academic Senate, subject to review by the General Faculty, shall exercise the powers vested in the General Faculty except as retained in Section I.A., and specifically shall have the authority to consider the following:
      1. All matters of educational policy. The Academic Senate shall set up the necessary machinery and procedures for enlisting the aid of faculty in developing educational policies for the entire University.
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2. Regulations dealing with student activities.
3. Requirements for admission, honors, or degrees.
4. Approval of degree candidates.
5. Catalog changes requiring approval of the Board of Regents.
6. Reports of special and standing committees, including Committees of the General Faculty.

2. The Academic Senate shall advise the President of The University of Texas at Dallas in regard to policy and operations in any matter affecting the general academic welfare of the University.
3. The Academic Senate shall conduct or organize such studies as it requires to initiate legislation and may act upon any recommendations presented to it.
4. Academic Senate may create ad hoc and standing committees of its own. All members of the General Faculty shall be eligible for appointment whether members of the Senate or not.
5. The Academic Senate may refer any matter to a committee, or to a school or disciplinary faculty, or to the Academic Council for appropriate consideration.
6. The Academic Senate may review, approve, or remand to the faculty of the school academic policies and procedures established by the faculties of the several schools.
7. The list of successful degree candidates, with honors as appropriate, shall be part of the minutes of the Academic Senate.
8. The Academic Senate may not delegate any portion of the powers listed under Section II.A.1. of this document to the Academic Council. It may, however, designate appropriate committees or officers to carry out policies which it establishes pursuant to these powers.
9. The Academic Senate may approve the minutes of meetings of the General Faculty.
10. The Academic Senate may meet in regular session or in caucus.
   1. At regular sessions, the President or the Provost may preside and legislation as defined in Section I.E.1. may be brought to a formal vote.
   2. At caucus sessions, the Speaker of the Faculty, or other officers designated by the Academic Senate, shall preside. Legislation approved at a caucus session shall not be transmitted to the academic administration for action unless it is subsequently passed at a regular session of the Senate.
11. The Academic Senate shall approve procedures for elections in all faculty governance bodies at The University of Texas at Dallas as described in Section V. The procedures shall provide for secret ballots, accurate tallies of votes, and reasonably equal representation of all voting members of the faculty governance body, except that in elections for the Academic Senate, the procedure shall guarantee each School from which there are candidates at least one member of the Academic Senate.
12. The Academic Senate may establish an executive committee which shall, at least, coordinate the actions of its committees.

B. Membership

1. The elected members of the Academic Senate shall consist of not less than twenty-three nor 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, except that faculty members having administrative appointments at the level of Dean or higher are not eligible to serve on the Academic Senate.

2. The elections shall be conducted according to procedures described in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.

3. In addition to the representatives of the General Faculty, the Senate shall include Senior Lecturers of a number not to exceed 10% of the total number of Senators in accord with the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.

4. The Academic Senate may fill vacancies according to procedures described in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.

5. The President and Provost are ex officio members of the Academic Senate. They are non-voting members.

C. Term of Office

The term of office of members of the Academic Senate shall run from the June 1 immediately following elections to May 31 of the following year.

D. Meetings

1. The Academic Senate shall establish a calendar of meetings, which shall include no fewer than four meetings each academic year.

2. The President, or the Speaker of the Faculty, or one-fifth of the voting membership of the Academic Senate by notice to the Speaker of the Faculty may call a meeting of the Academic Senate. A minimum of three days notice is required.

E. Organization

1. The Academic Senate shall adopt Bylaws of the Academic Senate which shall govern its function.

2. Amendment of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, except through modification of the Resolution of Operating Procedures, shall require approval at two separate meetings of the Academic Senate.

F. Procedures for Certification of Degree Candidates

Each semester the Academic Senate receives lists of candidates for degrees in the University and certifies these candidates for receipt of the degrees. The procedures are as follows:

1. Submission of Names of Candidates for Degrees: Two weeks prior to the Academic Senate meeting of the month immediately preceding graduation, the Provost shall submit to the Academic Senate the names of candidates for degrees and candidates for degrees with honors.

   1. The submission for undergraduate degrees may use the following suggested wording: "These students have applied for graduation and have been reviewed by the Office of Records. The Office of Records declares that all of these students will be eligible for graduation upon completion of the current semester's work at
the necessary levels. I request, therefore, that the Faculty Senate certify these students to graduate upon receipt of final grades, and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades are consistent with the standards for graduation prescribed by this University. I also request that the Faculty Senate certify those students designated as eligible to graduate with honors upon completion of coursework and requirements consistent with the standards for honors at the levels offered by this University."

2. The following is suggested wording for submission of candidates for graduate degrees: "These students have applied for graduate degrees and have been reviewed by the Graduate Dean. The Graduate Dean certifies that all these students will be eligible for the degrees indicated upon satisfactory completion of the current semester's work. I request, therefore, that the Faculty Senate certify these students to receive the degrees as indicated upon receipt of final grades and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades received are consistent with the standards for credit prescribed by this University."

2. Placement on Academic Senate Agenda: The list of names of candidates for degrees are automatically placed on the agenda of the Academic Senate as soon as they are received.

3. Report to the Academic Senate of Corrections in the List of Candidates. As soon as they are available, corrections to the list of candidates for degrees and the list of candidates for degrees with honors should be submitted to the Academic Governance Office and reported to the Academic Senate. Additions to the lists of requests to raise levels of honors above those approved require Academic Senate approval. Deletions will be noted by the Senate, and the record will be attached to the minutes of the meeting at which graduation and/or honors were approved.

Section III. Academic Council

A. Authority and General Functions

1. The Academic Council shall facilitate communications between the Academic Senate and its Committees and between the Senate and the Administration.

2. The Academic Council shall have the authority delegated to it by the Academic Senate, pursuant to Section II.A.8. of this document, and as provided for in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate and the Resolution of Operating Procedures.

3. The President of The University of Texas at Dallas shall keep the Academic Council informed as far as practicable on all matters of general interest to The University of Texas at Dallas.

B. Membership

1. The Academic Senate shall elect no more than one-third and no fewer than six of its voting membership to the Academic Council according to procedures established in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.
2. The Speaker of the Faculty and the Secretary of the Faculty are ex officio voting members of the Academic Council.
3. The President and Provost are ex officio non-voting members of the Academic Council.

C. Meetings

1. The Academic Council shall meet monthly unless the members of the Agenda Committee of the Academic Council, as defined in Section III.D.3. below, agree that a different schedule is appropriate.
2. The President or the Speaker of the Faculty may call special meetings of the Academic Council.

D. Organization

1. The President shall be Chair ex officio of the Academic Council.
2. In the absence of the President, the Provost shall preside.
3. In the absence of the President and the Provost, the Speaker shall preside.
4. The Agenda Committee of the Academic Council shall consist of the President or the President's designee, the Speaker of the Faculty, and the Secretary of the Faculty. It shall not withhold items from the agenda but rather shall arrange them for effective discussion. The Agenda Committee may conduct business on votes of 2-1.
5. In matters not specified by the Academic Senate, the Academic Council may establish its own bylaws.
6. The Academic Council and Academic Council-elect shall conduct a joint meeting within three weeks of the election of the Council-elect.

Section IV. Committees of the General Faculty

A. Nomenclature and Classification

1. By Appointment and Confirmation
   1. University committees are appointed by the President and do not require confirmation by the Academic Council, the Academic Senate, or the General Faculty.
   2. Concurrent committees are appointed by the President from nominations submitted by the Committee on Committees and confirmed by the Academic Senate.
   3. General Faculty, Academic Senate, or Academic Council committees are appointed by those bodies, respectively, and are not subject to confirmation by the President.
2. By Duration of Charge
   1. Standing committees are committees whose charge is continuing.
2. Special or ad hoc committees are committees whose charge is limited to a special
time or task and which are discharged by the appointer at the end of that time or at
the completion of that task. Ad hoc committees of the Senate are distinct from ad
hoc review committees for promotion and tenure.

3. By Function
1. Action committees are those whose charge requires them to act on behalf of the
Senate and in a manner consistent with Senate policy, returning to the Senate, if
necessary if that policy may be unclear. Only concurrent committees, or other
bodies specifically mentioned in this document, can be action committees.
2. Advisory committees are those whose charges are strictly investigatory and/or
advisory in nature, requiring return of recommendations to the Senate for action.

B. Concurrent Committees

1. Formation and Dissolution
   1. The formation of Concurrent Committees and their membership, procedures, and
      Chair must be approved by the President and the Academic Senate.
   2. The Academic Senate shall, consistent with state and federal laws, Regents' Rules
      and Regulations, and The University of Texas System policy, establish the charge
      for each Concurrent Committee including description of the membership.
      Charges, which require approval by 2/3 of the total voting membership of the
      Academic Senate and by the President, shall be published as Serial Policy
      Memoranda issued by the President.
   3. At least the following shall be Standing Concurrent Action Committees at The
      University of Texas at Dallas:
      1. the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel;
      2. the Committee on Educational Policy;
      3. the Library Committee;
      4. the Committee on Student Life;
      5. the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct; and
      6. the Core Curriculum Committee.
   4. Any deletion from the list in Section IV.B.1.c. requires a 2/3 vote of the total
      voting membership of the Academic Senate and concurrence of the President.

2. Appointments: The President will not appoint anyone to a faculty position on a Senate
committee whom the Senate has not nominated. If the President declines to appoint a
Senate nominee, the Senate will select a new nominee in the same manner as used for the
initial appointment unless specified otherwise in the charge of the concerned committee.
For Concurrent University Committees, Senate approval is considered advisory to the
President. The President may appoint faculty not recommended by the Senate. If
appointments to Concurrent University Committees are declined, the Senate will not seek
a replacement unless asked to do so by the Committee's RUO (the Provost).

3. Replacing Committee Members: If a member of a Concurrent Committee misses two
consecutive committee meetings, the member will be contacted by the Chair of the
committee to ascertain whether he or she still wishes to serve. If the chair determines a
replacement is needed he/she will notify the Chair of the Committee on Committees.

4. Committee on Committees
1. As soon as possible after June 1, the Speaker of the Faculty shall convene the Academic Council to appoint the Committee on Committees.
2. The Committee on Committees should develop expeditiously the nomination lists for each of the Concurrent Committees, including nominations for Chair and Vice Chair, and should transmit them to the Academic Senate prior to September 1.

5. Other Committees
1. Concurrent committees, Academic Senate Committees, and the Academic Council may establish subcommittees, which may not be action committees.
2. The Council for Undergraduate Education shall act on behalf of the Senate in establishing procedures for review and evaluation of degree plans of candidates for undergraduate degrees at The University of Texas at Dallas, and in implementing Academic Senate policy in regard to standards of conduct and performance for such degrees.

Section V. School and Disciplinary Legislative Bodies

A. Schools

1. Faculties of the Schools and Departments of the University shall organize themselves for purposes of establishing academic and curricular policy for that School or Department, consistent with the policies of the Academic Senate and the General Faculty.
2. Faculties of the Schools and Departments shall determine their own voting membership but may not exclude any voting member of the General Faculty administratively assigned to that School or Department and teaching courses for which it is responsible.
3. The Bylaws of each School or Department shall be subject to procedural review and approval by the Academic Senate and the President.

B. Other Groups: Other groups within the University, such as disciplines, which desire recognition as a faculty governance body must do so in accordance with procedures established through joint agreement of the President and the Academic Senate.

Section VI. Academic Governance Support

A. Publication of Bylaws

Each legislative body may establish bylaws which, after review as to compliance with the Handbook of Operating Procedures and approval as required by the Regents' Rules and Regulations, shall be published as part of the Handbook of Operating Procedures.

B. Academic Governance Office
1. The academic administration shall provide an Academic Governance Office and staff support in the form of an Academic Governance Secretary, and assistants as necessary.

2. The Academic Governance Secretary shall:
   1. maintain a file of items to be submitted to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Council;
   2. inform the Speaker of the Faculty and the President simultaneously of requested agenda items to be considered for Academic Council meetings;
   3. maintain a calendar for Academic Governance;
   4. publish in advance the times and places of Academic Senate meetings in campus publications of general circulation, and will establish a permanent room semester by semester with 40 extra chairs for visitors to the meetings;
   5. distribute Academic Council and Academic Senate minutes to the Academic Council and Academic Senate, official depositories, and to those faculty members who indicate to the Academic Governance that they wish to receive copies;
   6. prepare the letters of appointment for University and Concurrent Committees;
   7. seek names of candidates from designated officers for student places on University and Concurrent Committees which require student appointees;
   8. distribute a University and Concurrent Committee membership list two times a year, September 1 and January 1 to all Deans, Associate Deans, Department Heads, and members of the Academic Senate;
   9. provide the incoming Chair of each University and Concurrent Committee with that committee's approved charge and advise him or her of the material to be filed for the committee in the Academic Governance Office;
   10. maintain the files of University and Concurrent Committees;
   11. maintain a file of operating procedures of University and Concurrent Committees; and
   12. maintain a history of the role and scope and of the membership for the preceding five years of each University and Concurrent Committee.

3. The duties of the Academic Governance Secretary may be amended by agreement of the President and the Academic Senate.
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This addresses two possibilities. One is a motion to not approve the draft. The other is to amend it and approve as amended but still reject UTSP 175.

Possibility 1:

The Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas does not approve the draft policy titled "Conflict of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Researchers." The Senate further recommends that the UT System and UT Regents rescind the revised policy UT System Policy 175 (UTSP 175).

The Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas recognizes that the draft policy is required in order to implement UTSP 175. The Senate further recognizes that it has been constrained by a requirement that the standards and procedures imposed by the National Institutes of Health on research that they fund should be imposed on all research whatever, funded or unfunded. We understand that this requirement originated with the UT Regents.

The Academic Senate considers this requirement impractical and illegal. Regents have neither the authority nor the expertise to override the federal regulations.

The theory justifying the Regents' demand is that the difference between NIH requirements and other requirements is only a matter of degree. The NIH requirements are "more strict." If this were so, it would follow that in meeting NIH requirements the university would also be meeting all other requirements. This is false for three main reasons.

First, it is inconsistent with missions of these funding agencies, and all others. The purpose of the NSF is not only to fund research; it is to encourage it. The purpose of the NIH is parallel. The purposes of other funding agencies are similar. The manifest consequence of the Regental requirement is to discourage research and encumber the university's efforts to support it.

Second, the regulations are designed for different contexts. NIH requirements must guard against their funds being used to support research for very large and wealthy international corporations, including tobacco companies, pharmaceutical companies, and producers of medical technology. There are fewer or no such interests to guard against in fields supported by other agencies, public and private. Applying NIH regulations in non-biomedical fields distorts their meaning in all fields.

Third, applying the policy to unfunded research amounts to applying it to thinking as such. Federal regulations do not apply to unfunded research because it would be clearly unconstitutional to attempt to regulate it. It is equally illegal and unconstitutional for the Regents, or the UT System, to attempt to do so.

The Senate further recommends that:
1. Conflict of interest policies for research should apply only to funded research.
2. Conflict of interest in research should be addressed only under UTSP 175.
2. Research conflict of interest policies should be consistent with the requirements of the funding agencies.
3. Conflict of commitment questions should be addressed only under UTSP 180.
4. University policies implementing UTSP 175 and UTSP 180 should be separate, although the disclosures may be done through a single website.

Possibility 2:

Another possibility is to amend the draft and approve as amended, but still recommend that 175 be rescinded. Possible amendments to draft document would be:

Under Standard VI, section C should be excluded. It is covered in Conflict of Commitment.

Under Standard IX A 3 b. Significant Financial Interests (to be disclosed), exclude income range 1), $0-4,999. It is inconsistent with the definition of Significant Financial Interests under definitions, which excludes income or value under $5,000. In addition, if a "significant financial interest" can have no value, and if the policy applies to unfunded research, it seems to require disclosing and getting permission for everything.

Under IX B. This section should be removed or reworded to say that the information will be made available in accordance with the TPIA. Not just "upon request under." Faculty are not listed as public officials in the act and research is not listed as public business. (Neither is teaching or academic service.)

Under IX C. Remove sub section 2 Display of Information. If it does not contradict 180, it is redundant. If does contradict 180, 180 is consistent with recognized rights to privacy. This is not. 180 requires the management plan to be made available, not all information on the person's financial interests relevant to it.

Section X, No expenditure of funds. Since this policy says it applies to unfunded research as well as funded research, it means that no one can spend their own money on their own interests without approval. This is would be prior censorship, if not peonage.
What is the intent of conflict of interest and commitment policy at UT Dallas?

UT Dallas has instituted conflict of interest and commitment policy to comply with federal regulations regarding the conduct of research, and UT System Regents Rules and Regulations. The policy provides a framework for faculty and researchers to identify situations that create the possibility for a conflict of interest or commitment, and to work with UT Dallas to manage or avoid those situations.

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

Who is expected to comply with the policy?

The policy applies to all faculty and to any staff member or student who is responsible for the design, conduct or reporting of research at UT Dallas. If you are unsure you need to comply, please contact the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) by phone (972-883-4718) or email (conor.wakeman@utdallas.edu).

How am I expected to comply with the policy?

You must disclose financial interests and outside commitments that reasonably appear to be related to your institutional responsibilities. You are entrusted to determine whether an interest or commitment is “related”. The ORC will administer annual compliance training to help you determine whether you have interests and commitments that require disclosure. If you receive extramural research funding or research gifts, or have an interest or commitment you need to disclose, the ORC will also administer an online tool that you can use to satisfy federal and UT System requirements.

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

A financial interest or outside commitment reasonably appears to be “related” to your institutional responsibilities, e.g., research, teaching, administration, if your performance of those responsibilities at UT Dallas appears to directly and significantly affect either your financial interest in an outside entity, or the financial interest of such an entity. The following examples will help explain this statement:

- **No Disclosure**: A UTD economics professor collects stamps as a personal hobby. Even though the collection has a value in the tens of thousands, the professor does not disclose the financial interest because it is outside his area of expertise at UT Dallas. He does not request approval for the time commitment the activity requires because it is personal in nature. The professor also serves as a committee member for the American Economic Association, and does not receive compensation except for reimbursement of travel expenses. Because AEA is a non-profit professional society and the professor volunteers for the position, he does not disclose the travel reimbursement and does not request approval for the commitment.

- **Disclosure**: A UTD materials science professor co-owns and serves as Chief Technology Officer for a company she founded to commercialize technology she invented. The company sponsors research at UT Dallas to further develop the technology. The professor discloses her ownership stake in and consulting fees from the company because the company could directly benefit from the results of her research at UT Dallas. Because she is compensated for her time at the company, she also requests prior approval for her commitment as CTO.

Where can I find more information?

If you have any questions, please contact Conor Wakeman in the Office of Research Compliance by phone (972-883-4718) or email (conor.wakeman@utdallas.edu). You can also visit the Conflict of Interest program online, at http://www.utdallas.edu/research/orc/conflict_of_interest/.
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT FOR FACULTY AND RESEARCHERS

TITLE

Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Researchers

POLICY STATEMENT

It is the policy of the University of Texas at Dallas that an employee’s performance of his or her institutional responsibilities, including research, shall not be biased or impaired by conflicts of interest or commitment.

RATIONALE

UT Dallas has instituted conflict of interest and commitment policy to comply with federal regulations regarding the conduct of research, and UT System Regents Rules and Regulations. The policy provides a framework for faculty and researchers to identify situations that create the possibility for a conflict of interest or commitment, or the appearance thereof, and to work with UT Dallas to manage or avoid those situations. An integral part of the policy is a disclosure and approval mechanism whereby employees regularly review their activities.

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

SCOPE

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

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

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

Primary Responsibility

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

Outside Commitments

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

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

Financial Interests

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

DEFINITIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Covered Individual** is defined as:

1. An individual who must file and update a disclosure under this policy, as determined by the Institutional Official, based on the following:
   a. A faculty employee as defined in UTDPP1057, UTDPP1068, and UTDPP1046.
b. An administrative and professional employee with research responsibilities, as defined by UTD Personnel Policy D2.

2. An individual who, regardless of title or position, is responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of research, including a principal investigator, co-investigator, or project director.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. A compensated activity performed by a covered individual outside of the scope of his or her appointment or institutional responsibilities at UT Dallas, including, but not limited to, the following:
a. **Outside Employment**: the engagement with an entity other than UT Dallas to provide labor, services or expertise in exchange for remuneration or other financial interest;

b. **Self-employment**: the establishment or management of a business entity that makes the covered individual's expertise or services available to others outside UT Dallas;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   c. activities conducted as part of scholarly work, including acting in an editorial capacity for a professional journal; reviewing journal or book manuscripts; attending and presenting talks at scholarly colloquia and conferences; developing scholarly communications in the form of books or journal articles, reviews, movies, television productions, and similar works, and serving as a committee member, an officer, or board member of a professional or scholarly society;
d. uncompensated activities that are not related to a covered individual’s institutional responsibilities; and,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   e. **Gifts:** A covered individual must report the value and source of a single gift that the covered individual received in the preceding twelve (12) months that exceeds $250 in value, or multiple gifts, from a single entity that in the aggregate, exceed $250 in value, other than gifts from a covered family member.
2. A fiduciary interest related to the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities the covered individual held in a for-profit or non-profit entity in the preceding twelve (12) months, including responsibilities arising from positions as a member of an outside board, an officer, or other executive or management position.

3. The term significant financial interest does not include the following types of financial interests:

   a. salary, royalties, or other remuneration paid by UT Dallas to the covered individual if the covered individual is currently employed or otherwise appointed by UT Dallas, including intellectual property rights assigned to UT Dallas and agreements to share in royalties related to such rights;

   b. interests, and income from such interests, held in investment vehicles, such as mutual funds and retirement accounts;

   c. Gifts received from covered family members; and,

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

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

POLICY STANDARDS

I. Disclosure of Significant Financial Interests

A. When to Disclose and Period Covered by Disclosure

1. Initial Disclosure
   a. Covered Individuals conducting PHS-sponsored research, Non-Exempt Human Subject Research, or Animal Research: Covered individuals must submit or have a current disclosure on file no later than the time of application for sponsorship or at the time of research protocol submission (i.e., submission to the Institutional Review Board or the Institutional Animal Care & Use Committee).
   b. Covered Individuals conducting research not included in part 1 above: Covered individuals must submit or have a current disclosure on file prior to the expenditure of sponsor funds.
   c. Covered Individuals not conducting sponsored research: Covered individuals must submit or have a current disclosure on file annually not later than March 1.
   d. New Covered Individuals: When an individual becomes a Covered individual (e.g., is added to an ongoing sponsored research project or a human/animal subject protocol), the covered individual must submit or have a current disclosure on file before engaging in the project.
   e. New Employees: A covered individual who is new to the University must submit a disclosure no later than the 30th day of initial employment, covering the 12 months preceding the date of disclosure.

2. Subsequent Disclosures
   a. Following initial disclosure, covered individuals must submit an updated disclosure at least annually, or within 30 days of discovering or acquiring a new reportable significant financial interest.
   b. The president of the University or the institutional official may require a covered individual to submit additional disclosures.

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

2. **Extent of Disclosure**
   a. A covered individual shall complete or update a disclosure that:
      i. Identifies all sponsored research in which the covered individual is engaged at the time of disclosure;
      ii. Identifies the covered individual’s other institutional responsibilities; and,
      iii. Discloses each significant financial interest of the covered individual and of any covered family members.
   b. Disclosure updates (annual or more frequently) shall include any significant financial interest that was not disclosed previously, and shall include current information regarding any previously disclosed significant financial interest (e.g., the current value of a previously disclosed equity interest).
   c. In determining whether a significant financial interest should be disclosed, the covered individual should resolve the doubt in favor of disclosure.

3. **Nature of Disclosure**
   a. **General Requirements**
      i. When describing the source of a significant financial interest, the covered individual shall provide the name, principal address and industry for the source. The covered individual shall also describe, to his or her knowledge, any business conducted between UT Dallas and the source of the significant financial interest, including the following:
         1) Sponsored, collaborative, or subcontracted research
         2) Research gifts
         3) Gifts of funds or property (including equipment)
         4) Financial support for trainees (including graduate students and postdoctoral fellows)
         5) License of intellectual property
         6) Materials Transfer Agreement
         7) Sole-source provider of materials or services
         8) Products (excluding textbooks) or devices that are used in teaching
         9) Support for continuing education activities or online education programs
      ii. The covered individual shall distinguish among information pertaining to the covered individual and covered family members whose significant financial interests are also disclosed by the covered individual. If the covered individual is in doubt as to whether an individual is a covered family member, the covered individual should resolve the doubt in favor of disclosure.
   b. **Significant Financial Interests**
      i. In making disclosures under this policy, the covered individual shall describe the value of a significant financial interest by using the following ranges:
         1) $0 - $4,999;
         2) $5,000 - $9,999;
         3) $10,000 - $19,999;
         4) amounts between $20,000 - $100,000 by increments of $20,000; or,
         5) amounts above $100,000 by increments of $50,000.
      ii. The institutional official may request further information about a covered individual’s travel, including the monetary value of the travel, in order to determine whether the travel constitutes a conflict of interest.
      iii. In disclosing significant financial interests, the interest of any legal entity, including a foundation or a trust, that is controlled or directed by the covered individual or by the
covered individual and covered family members, is considered to be the interest of the covered individual or covered family member as if the separate legal entity did not exist.

iv. If a covered individual discloses remuneration, equity interests, intellectual property interests, or royalties, the covered individual must permit review of any related agreement, contract, offer letter, or other documentation on request of:
   1) the president of the University;
   2) the institutional official; or
   3) any other person or entity with administrative responsibility in regard to reviewing the covered individual’s Disclosure or approving a related management plan.

II. Disclosure Review and Determination of Conflict of Interest

A. Disclosure Review

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

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

B. Determination of Conflict of Interest

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

C. Untimely Disclosure and Review of Significant Financial Interests

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

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

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

D. Appeals

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

III. Conflicts of Interest

A. Management of Conflicts of Interest

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

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

B. Untimely Identification or Management of Conflicts of Interest

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

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

IV. Management Plans

A. Content of Management Plans

1. A management plan may impose conditions and prescribe actions necessary to avoid or manage a conflict
of interest, including an action reducing or eliminating the conflict of appearance of bias or interference.
Examples of conditions or actions that may be prescribed include:
   a. public disclosure of the conflict management in presentations and publications;
   b. for human subjects research, direct disclosure of the conflict of interest to research participants;
   c. appointment of an independent monitor with authority to take measures to protect the design,
      conduct, and reporting of research against bias, or the appearance of bias, resulting from the conflict
      of interest;
   d. modification of the research plan;
   e. change of personnel or personnel responsibilities, or disqualification of personnel from
      participation in all or a portion of the impaired institutional responsibility;
   f. divestiture or reduction of the financial interest or outside commitment; or,
   g. severance of relationships that create an actual or potential conflict of interest.
2. A management plan must be in the form of a written agreement and must:
   a. provide that the covered individual acknowledges receipt of the agreement and understands the requirements of this policy and understands and agrees to comply with the required actions and other terms of the plan, including the time frames for required actions; and,
   b. clearly identify each specific person responsible for monitoring compliance with the management plan.

B. Institutional Review and Approval of Management Plans

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

V. Requests for Approval of Outside Commitments

A. Submission of Requests for Approval of Outside Commitments

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

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

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

4. Requests for Approval of Commitments Involving Confidential Information

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

B. When to Request Approval for an Outside Commitment

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

2. If there is any likelihood of interference with the covered individual’s institutional responsibilities to the University, the covered individual should not engage in the outside commitment or should request a leave of absence from, or a part-time employment agreement with, the University.
3. This approval process does not apply to activities performed by covered individuals appointed on a 9-month basis during those months in which the covered individual is not appointed, unless the outside commitment is related to a significant financial interest that appears to create a conflict of interest.

4. **Retrospective Request for Approval**

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

C. **Content of Request for Approval of Outside Commitment**

1. **Acknowledgement**

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

2. **Nature and Extent of Request for Approval**

a. A covered individual shall complete or update a Request for Approval that describes of the nature and extent of the outside commitment, including the following:
   i. Name, principal address and industry for the source of the outside commitment;
   ii. Description of duties, and their relation to institutional responsibilities;
   iii. Time commitment, and duration thereof;
   iv. Compensation; and,
   v. Relation to existing University intellectual property.

b. Requests for Approval that update an existing outside commitment shall include current information regarding the nature and extent of the outside commitment (e.g., the new amount time committed to the activity).

c. In determining whether approval should be sought for an outside commitment, the covered individual should resolve the doubt in favor of requesting approval.

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

A. **Review of Requests for Approval**

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

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

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

B. **Standards for Approval of Outside Commitments**

1. The covered individual may be permitted to engage in outside commitments no more than one day per week, averaged over the semester(s) of the covered individual’s appointment. Time not used in one
semester may not be carried over into another during which the individual is employed by the University. Exceptions to exceed this standard may be granted only with a management plan expressly approved by the President.

2. Outside commitments in the context of regular, on-going routine duties, as distinct from temporary, episodic or intermittent commitments, will be subject to much closer scrutiny in terms of its interference with a covered individual’s performance of his or her institutional responsibilities.

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

C. Determination of Conflict of Commitment

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

D. Untimely Request for Approval and Review of Outside Commitments

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

1. determine whether the outside commitment creates the possibility for a conflict of commitment; and,

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

E. Appeals

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

F. Rescinding of Approval

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

A. Conflicts of commitment by their nature cannot be managed in the same manner as conflicts of interest. As defined under this policy, conflicts of commitment will be managed through the reduction or elimination of outside commitments.

B. If the appropriate Dean or Department Head determines that a new covered individual has requested approval for an outside commitment that creates the possibility for a conflict of commitment, or that any other covered individual has requested approval for a new outside commitment that creates the possibility for a conflict of commitment, the Dean or Department Head shall, not later than the 30th day after the review of the request for approval, request the covered individual reduce or eliminate the outside commitment to ensure the performance of the covered individual’s performance of his or her institutional responsibilities.

VIII. Monitoring and Compliance

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

IX. Accessibility

A. Web Posting of this Policy

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

B. Availability of Information Regarding Specific Research Conflicts of Interest

1. For each managed conflict of interest related to sponsored research that is found to exist by the institutional official, the University will centrally retain and make the following information available to the public, upon request under the Texas Public Information Act (Chapter 552, Government Code), in regard to each covered individual who contributes to the scientific development or execution of the research project in a substantive, measureable way, including a covered individual who is the project director or principal investigator:

   d. the covered individual’s name;
   e. the covered individual’s title and role with respect to the research;
   f. the name of the entity in which the significant financial interest is held;
   g. the nature of the significant financial interest that constitutes a conflict of interest; and,
   h. the approximate value of the significant financial interest by range or, if the dollar value cannot be determined by reference to public prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value, a statement to that effect.

2. The approximate dollar value of the significant financial interest shall be provided within the following ranges if it can be determined by reference to public prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value:

   a. $0 - $4,999;
   b. $5,000 - $9,999;
   c. $10,000 - $19,999;
   d. amounts between $20,000 - $100,000 by increments of $20,000; or,
   e. amounts above $100,000 by increments of $50,000.

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

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

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

C. U.T. System Electronic Database

1. Disclosures and Documentation to be Included in Database

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

2. Public Display of Information

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

X. No Expenditure of Funds Prior to Review and Determination

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

XI. Cooperation with Institutional Committees

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

XII. Collaborators and Contractors

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

A. If the policy of the contracting party applies to its investigators, the contracting party must certify that its policy is consistent with the requirements of any applicable federal regulations, and the agreement must specify the time periods for the contracting party to report identified conflicts of interest to UT Dallas.
B. If the policy of UT Dallas applies to the investigators of the contracting party, the agreement must state that the researchers are subject to this policy as covered individuals for disclosing significant financial interests that are directly related to the investigator’s work at UT Dallas. In addition, the agreement must specify the time periods for the investigators to submit a disclosure to UT Dallas.

C. In research for which a proposal is submitted to or awarded by PHS, UT Dallas will provide reports to the PHS awarding component of all conflicts of interest prior to the expenditure of funds and within 60 days of any subsequently identified conflict of interest.

XIII. **Education**

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

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

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

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

XIV. **Certification and Reports to PHS**

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

XV. **Enforcement**

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

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

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

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

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

XVI. Administration of Policy

A. Oversight and Authority

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

B. Records

1. Records regarding the disclosure of financial interests and outside commitments, and the management of a conflict of interest or avoidance of a conflict of commitment, including disclosure statements and requests for approval, a reviewing official's determinations, and other records of institutional actions, shall be retained for the longer of at least three years after:
   a. the date of creation;
   b. the date of termination or completion of a research award or contract, or the submission of the final expenditures report, for research identified in a disclosure statement; or,
   c. the date of final resolution of any investigation, audit, or similar action involving the records.

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

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

XVII. Audits

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

RELEVANT FEDERAL AND STATE STATUTES

- PHS Federal Regulations (42 CFR Part 50 Subpart F, 45 CFR Part 94)
Texas Government Code Chapter 574 – Dual Office Holding
Texas Constitution, Article 16, Section 40 - Holding More Than One Office
Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (PHS Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, Animal Welfare Act)

RELEVANT UT SYSTEM POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND FORMS

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

UT Dallas Compliance Training Modules
Policy Terms

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

• What is a **Conflict of Commitment**?
  – UT Dallas defines a Conflict of Commitment as a situation in which:
    • An outside commitment could directly and significantly interfere with the performance of an employee’s institutional responsibilities; or,
    • An employee uses UT Dallas resources without authority or approval in connection with an outside commitment.

• What are **Institutional Responsibilities**?
  – Institutional Responsibilities are the work you perform for UT Dallas, including research, research consultation, professional practice, teaching, educational activities, administrative duties, and committee membership.
What is the intent of conflict of interest and commitment policy at UT Dallas?

• To ensure compliance with federal regulations and UT System Regents Rules and Regulations;
• To protect the integrity of research and scholarship conducted at UT Dallas; and,
• To prevent the negative impact of perceived or actual conflicts on:
  – the reputation and credibility of UT Dallas; and,
  – the ability of UT Dallas faculty and staff to attract funding and new faculty and students.
Who is expected to comply with the policy?

The policy applies to:

- all UT Dallas faculty; and,
- any staff member or student at UT Dallas who is responsible for the design, conduct or reporting of research, including but not limited to:
  - research staff;
  - postdoctoral trainees; and,
  - graduate students.

If you are unsure whether you need to comply, please contact the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) by phone (972-883-4718) or email (conor.wakeman@utdallas.edu).
Will this training help me determine if I have anything to disclose?

- This training module will inform you of the policy requirements and help you determine if you have a financial interest or outside commitment that needs to be disclosed.
- If at the end of this training module you determine you have nothing to disclose, you will certify this fact, and this certification will meet your annual disclosure requirement.
- If you determine you have financial interests or outside commitments that require disclosure, you will be directed to an online disclosure tool where you can provide details of potential conflicts.
How do I comply with the policy?

• You can comply using an online disclosure tool provided by the ORC.
  – You must disclose financial interests and outside commitments that reasonably appear to be related to your institutional responsibilities.
  – You are entrusted to determine whether an interest or commitment is related.

• What is related?
  – An interest or commitment is related if your performance of your institutional responsibilities at UT Dallas appears to directly and significantly affect either your financial interest in an outside entity, or the financial interest of such an entity.
Do all related financial interests require a disclosure?

• No. A disclosure is triggered by related financial interests that fall into the following categories:
  – Compensation of more than $5,000 per year from a single entity;
  – Equity interests that represent more than $5,000 fair market value;
  – Equity interests held in private companies; or,
  – Gift of more than $250 in value.

• A disclosure is also needed for related fiduciary interests you hold in for-profit and non-profit entities.
  – A fiduciary interest is a position which an entity has authorized to manage and protect property, money, and other assets.
Are there any exclusions?

Yes. The following financial interests **do not** trigger the need for a disclosure:

- Compensation or reimbursements you receive from UT Dallas, UT System, or another UT institution.
- Interests in and income from investment vehicles, such as mutual funds and retirement accounts.
- Gifts received from family members.
- Travel reimbursements you receive from a government agency, higher education institution or affiliated research institute.
- Assets (e.g., rental properties) that do not reasonably appear to be related to your institutional responsibilities.
Do all outside commitments need prior approval?

• No. You are expected to request prior approval for certain outside commitments. These include:
  – Compensated commitments with business entities that are related to your institutional responsibilities (e.g. consulting in your field of expertise).
  – Uncompensated commitments with business entities that are related to a conflict of interest.
  – Uncompensated commitments on a board of directors that are related to your institutional responsibilities.

• Outside commitments may not exceed more than one day per week, averaged over the current semester.
Are there any exclusions?

- Commitments performed by faculty members appointed on a 9-month basis during those months in which they are not working for UT Dallas, unless the commitment is related to a conflict of interest.

- Commitments performed for local municipal, social and religious organizations that are not related to your institutional responsibilities.

- Commitments for professional journals and societies, colloquia and conferences, and advisory committees and review panels.
What happens to my disclosure?

• Financial Interests
  – Your **financial interests** are reviewed by a Conflict of Interest Specialist in the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) to ensure your disclosure is complete and accurate.
  – If it is determined that a potential conflict of interest exists, ORC will work with you to develop a Conflict of Interest Management Plan.
  – Most disclosures do not present the possibility for a conflict of interest.

• Outside Commitments
  – Your **requests for prior approval** are reviewed by your organizational or department head or dean, as determined by your school.
  – Most requests do not present the possibility for a conflict of commitment and are approved.
Public Accessibility

• **UT Dallas**
  – In accordance with federal and state law, UT Dallas is obligated to make public specific information regarding managed conflicts of interest related to sponsored research conducted at UT Dallas.
  – UT Dallas will provide information required upon request under the Texas Public Information Act.

• **UT System**
  – UT System has developed an electronic database that will make publicly available information regarding managed conflicts of interest at all UT System branches.
  – UT Dallas will provide information regarding managed conflicts of interest on an annual basis for the UT System database.
Applicable Rules and Regulations

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

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

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

Conor Wakeman, Conflict of Interest Specialist
972-883-4718
conor.wakeman@utdallas.edu
Case Study #1

- **Dr. Green, assistant professor of Economics**
- **Philately**
  - Dr. Green collects and studies stamps as a personal hobby. His collection has a value in the tens of thousands.
  - Dr. Green spends several weekends each year organizing and expanding his stamp collection, including attending events of the American Philatelic Society.
- **American Economic Association**
  - Dr. Green serves as a committee member for the AEA, and he travels several times each year to Nashville to participate in AEA committee meetings and conferences.
  - Dr. Green receives reimbursement of travel expenses from the AEA.
Response to Case Study #1

• Dr. Green, assistant professor of Economics

• Philately
  – Even though Dr. Green’s collection has a value in the tens of thousands, he does not disclose the financial interest because it is not related to his institutional responsibilities.
  – Dr. Green does not request approval for the time he spends on his stamp collection because the activity is personal in nature and not related to his institutional responsibilities.

• American Economic Association
  – Because the AEA is a non-profit, professional society and Dr. Green volunteers for the position, he does not disclose the travel reimbursement and does not request approval for the time commitment.
Quiz for Case Study #1

• Question #1: TBD
• Question #2: TBD
• Question #3: TBD
Case Study #2

• Dr. Orange, senior lecturer and research scientist, Chemistry
• Middle County Community College
  – Dr. Orange teaches a summer course on organic chemistry for MCCC.
  – Dr. Orange has a 9-month appointment at UT Dallas, and he teaches the course during the summer months when he is not on UT Dallas payroll.
• Super Chemical Products Corporation
  – Dr. Orange provides technical advice for Super Chemical on the development of products that use technology similar to Dr. Orange’s research at UT Dallas.
  – Dr. Orange plans to commit 16 days per semester of his appointment to his consulting work for Super Chemical.
Response to Case Study #2

- Dr. Orange, senior lecturer and research scientist, Chemistry
- Middle County Community College
  - Because Dr. Orange has a 9-month appointment, he does not request prior approval for his commitment to MCCC because he teaches the course when he is not on UT Dallas payroll.
  - Dr. Orange discloses his compensation from MCCC because he is compensated more than $5,000 for the course.
- Super Chemical Products Corporation
  - Dr. Orange requests prior approval for his time commitment to Super Chemical because he is being compensated by a company that manufactures products in the same area as his research at UT Dallas.
  - Dr. Orange discloses his consulting fee from Super Chemical because he receives more than $5,000.
Quiz for Case Study #2

- Question #1: TBD
- Question #2: TBD
- Question #3: TBD
Case Study #3

- **Dr. Comet, professor of Materials Science and Engineering**
- **National Science Foundation**
  - Dr. Comet reviews grant proposals for the National Science Foundation, and she travels to Washington, D.C. three days per year to participate in the review panel.
  - The NSF sponsors Dr. Comet’s travel expenses for the panel.
- **Harmonic Materials, LLC**
  - Dr. Comet co-owns and serves as Chief Technology Officer for Harmonic Materials, which she founded to commercialize technology she invented. The company sponsors Dr. Comet’s research at UT Dallas to further develop the technology.
  - Dr. Comet plans to commit 17 days per semester of her appointment to Harmonic Materials.
Response to Case Study #3

- **Dr. Comet, professor of Materials Science and Engineering**
- **National Science Foundation**
  - Because the NSF is a government agency, and Dr. Comet volunteers for the position, she does not disclose the travel reimbursement and does not request approval for the time commitment.

- **Harmonic Materials, LLC**
  - Dr. Comet requests prior approval for her time commitment to Harmonic Materials because she is being compensated by, and owns part of, a company that could benefit from the results of her research at UT Dallas.
  - Dr. Comet discloses her ownership stake in Harmonic Materials because the company is privately held. She discloses her salary from Harmonic Materials because she receives more than $5,000 per year. She discloses the fiduciary interest she holds in Harmonic Materials as CTO.
Quiz for Case Study #3

- Question #1: TBD
- Question #2: TBD
- Question #3: TBD
- Question #4: TBD
DRAFT
The Academic Council recommends that the University of Texas at Dallas establish an ad hoc committee on Salary compression and inversion. The charge of the committee should be to collect further information on apparent inequities in the faculty salaries in the university and make recommendations to remove them.

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

The Committee should be charged to report its findings and recommendations by April 1, 2014.
Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) Overview and Recommendations

By

UT Dallas Distance Learning Committee

January 2014
Executive Summary

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

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

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

II. MOOC Marketplace Overview

Summary

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

Details

Udacity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Coursera

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**edX/Open edX**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Other MOOC Providers**

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

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

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

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

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

---

**III. The UT System MOOC Activity**

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

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

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

Spring 2014 Launch

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

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

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

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

What is a MOOC?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What courses are currently available as MOOCs?

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

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

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

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

What hybrid offerings are possible with MOOCs?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Scope

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

Scale

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

Delivery

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**V. Recommendations**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Define Policy Regarding the Transfer of MOOC Courses

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

Actively Monitor the MOOC Marketplace

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