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AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
May 20, 2015

1. Call to Order, Announcements & Questions Dr. Daniel
2. Approval of the Agenda Dr. Scotch
3. Approval of Minutes Dr. Scotch
   April 15, 2015 Meeting
4. Speaker’s Report Dr. Scotch
5. OneCard System Overview	Christy Baxter and Jené Janich
6. FAC / TXCFS Report Dr. Leaf
7. Student Government Liaison Report
8. CEP Proposals Dr. Prakash
   A. Supplemental Courses – Undergraduate
   B. Supplemental Courses- Graduate
   C. Informational: Posting of Syllabus
   D. Informational: Draft of Statewide Strategic Plan
9. Pending: Senate representation of Presidential Search Committee Dr. Scotch
10. Appointment of Committee on Committee members Dr. Scotch
11. Update from the 3+3+3 Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Dr. Scotch
12. 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
April 15, 2015

Present: David Daniel, Naofal Al-Dhair, Kurt Beron, Judd Bradbury, Gail Breen, Matthew Brown, John Burr, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Gregg Dieckmann, John Ferguson, Andrea Fumagalli, Lev Gelb, Jennifer Holmes, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Joe Izen, Carie Lambert, Murray Leaf, Michele Lockhart, Jason McAfee, Ravi Prakash, Matthew Polze, Tim Redman, Christopher Ryan, Mark Salamasick, Liz Salter, Betsy Schlobohm, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Tonia Wissinger,

Absent: Hobson Wildenthal, Frank Anderson, Zalman Balanov, Poras Balsara, Karen Baynham, George Decourcy, Eugene Deluke, Vladimir Dragovic, Nicholas Gans, Yulia Gel, M. Ali Hooshyar, Wieslaw Krawcewicz, Vance Lewis, Dennis Miller, Emire Muslu, Jinkyong Na, Jared Pickens, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Scott Rippel, Michael Tiefelsdorf, Murat Torlak, Alejandro Zentner

Visitors: Andrew Blanchard, Abby Kratz, Jennifer McDowell, Inga Musselman, Suresh Radhankrishnan, Mary Jo Venetis

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
   President Daniel called the meeting to order at 2:01 PM. There were no announcements. The President has been focused on the state legislature the past few months. The legislation coming down from the House has been favorable. The next month will be key. President Daniel opened the floor to questions.

   R. Chandrasekaran asked for the projected increase in students for fall 2015. The current best guess would be between 4-5% growth. The university has been more selective for fall 2015 undergraduate admissions. Just as lab space has been a concern recently, student housing has now become a concern for 3-4 years down the road. Additional space is being built on the other side of ROC building for engineering. There is a new building in the planning stages to replace the visual arts building with in two years. A goal of the university is to expand the university quickly, but keep the quality of faculty high.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   Pete Bond notified Speaker Redman before the meeting that the One Card System Overview will need to be postponed until May due to the presenter being unable to attend at the last minute. Murray Leaf moved to approve the amended agenda. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
   Murray Leaf moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.
4. **Speaker's Report – Tim Redman**
   1. The continuing priority for the Speaker is for the deans and central administration to treat non-system tenured faculty with the same degree of professionalism as the tenured/tenure track faculty. There is a 3+3+3 committee investigating the topic. Nothing has been finalized but a report is expected to come out in May 2015.
   2. Speaker Redman commended Nate Howe on how he spoke with staff, council, and senate. Took their feedback, and came to a consensus on the updated information security policy. He wanted it noted that this was a job well done.
   3. The Speaker was disappointed he could not do more with committees this year.
   4. Speaker Redman noted that while he is the speaker, he is more of a listener for the faculty. He has collected a listing of topics that faculty wish to address. He will be inviting more people to senate for presentations.
   5. A final assessment of the year will occur in August 2015.
   6. Everything was on the agenda.

5. **Office 365 Email Conversion- R. David Crain**
   David Crain noted the Faculty had requested an annual update on what was happening in his office. As he was new to the university he gave a brief overview of his background before he presented the PowerPoint presentation. Copies of the PowerPoint slides can be found in appendix A. He opened the floor to questions.

6. **OneCard System Overview- Christy Baxter and Jene Janich**
   The presentation was tabled until the May Senate meeting due to the presenters unable to attend at the last minute.

7. **FAC/ TXCFS Report- Murray Leaf**
   The next FAC meeting was to be April 16-17, 2015. Following the meeting, Dr. Leaf will return with a report.

8. **Student Government Liaison Report**
   No report was given.

9. **CEP Proposals- Clint Peinhardt**
   The Vice-Chair of the Committee, Clint Peinhardt, presented the following committee report
   A. Undergraduate first 40 policies
      There were three major changes to the document, Undergraduate Admission policies, repeatable course policy, and the updated Fast Track polices. These policies have been approved through the committee and senate. The submitted polices listed are the catalog copy. There were other policy changes that clarified the language and/or procedures.
   B. 2015 undergraduate degree programs
      Each school reviewed their degree programs. Approval was received from each associate dean. There were significant changes. This was attributed to the split between ATEC and A&H to allow for the separating of their programs. There is a new double major from the School of Management and EPPS in Global Business and International Political Economy. The Bachelor of Science in Telecommunication Engineering will be phased out once all
approvals have taken place. The catalog copy for the BS in Healthcare management has been added to JSOM. A double major BS in for Business Administration and Biology and double major in BS in Business Administration and Molecular Biology were renamed to the BS in Healthcare Management and Biology and Molecular Biology. Both will be administered jointly between JSOM and NS&M.

A new minor in Dance will be added to A&H. The current Drama/Dance minor will be retained for one more academic year. Two new minors were added to JSOM, Energy Management and Insurance. The minor for Enterprise Systems and Organizational Behavior was renamed to Information Technology and Systems and Organizational Behavior/Human Recourses Management respectively. It was noted by Serenity King that starting FY16 all addition/deletions of minors will need to be approved by CEP before they can be added to the catalog.

With the addition of the ATEC school the prefixes ATEM and ISAE were added. With the addition of the Honors College the department was changed from OUE to HONS. The ITSS prefix was added, and the MIS prefix was removed from the JSOM listings.

The Teacher Certification Program had been revised significantly. The changes came from Dean Fair’s office. The most noted change is that the secondary subject certificates are now grades 7-12 instead of 8 through 12. UTEACH was streamlined and removed from the primary degrees. The UTEACH course will be standalone courses, but they have to work with the primary degrees but that is up to the advisor and individual programs.

C. Undergraduate new/ revised courses

4 A&H courses were revised, and three courses were amended to the prefixes ATEM, and ISAE to reflect that they were created for the new ATEC school. ATEM is stands for Arts, Technology, and Emerging Communications, while ISAE indicates Interdisciplinary Studies-Arts, Technology, and Emerging Communications. Additionally the ATEC School created two new courses, and revised two more ATEC courses tiles to indicate the correct courses sequence.

Murray Leaf moved to approve the changes to the undergraduate catalog. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried.

D. Graduate first 40 policies

Similar to the Undergraduate catalog the repeatable courses and fast track updated polices were included, as was the updated admissions policy. Dean Cunningham’s office reviewed the policies and did make some changes to make them clearer.

E. 2015 graduate degree programs

Similarly to the undergraduate catalog significant changes were made to reflect the split between ATEC and A&H. The MA, MFA, and PhD degree programs in ATEC and the MA in EMAC were relocated to the new ATEC school entry. The MS in Energy Management that was approved in fall 2015 was added to JSOM.
The prefixes of ATEC and EMAC were relocated to the ATEC school. The prefixes BUAN and ENGY were added to JSOM. During the review of the catalog Dr. Stillman requested that HCS be renamed from Human Development and Communication Development because the name the prefix belonged to a program that no longer exists. The new name will be Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

F. Graduate revised courses

Dr. Harpham requested two titles be revised to being them into alignment with Memorandum of Understanding between the Archer Center and UT Dallas/EPPS. The courses were updated accordingly.

Murray Leaf moved to approve amendments to the Graduate Catalog. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.

A formal thank you was given to Mary Jo Venetis for all her hard work.

10. Approval of Candidates for Graduation

David Cordell moved that:

These students have applied for graduation and have been reviewed by the Office of Records. The Office of Records has declared that all of these students will be eligible for graduation upon the 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. Jason McAfee seconded. The motion carried.

David Cordell moved that:

These students have applied for graduate degrees and have been reviewed by the Graduate Dean. The Graduate Dean certifies that all of these students will be eligible for the degrees indicated upon satisfactory completion of the current semester’s work. I request, therefore, that the Academic 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. Jason McAfee seconded. The motion carried.

Vice Speaker Leaf raised a concern about the listing of students with requests to not distribute directory information. The listing of these students will be distributed to senate members via email as they have a legitimate educational purpose. Their names and information will not be included in the public searchable public documents.

11. Non-Substantive Changes to Committee Charges

Speaker Redman noted Chris McGowan has reviewed the committee charges and found charges requiring updates. These updates are due to the creation of the new ATEC School. Council has
reviewed and updated the charges. They attempted to remove numbers and keep the charges vague; however some were missed.

Additional amendments were made to UTDPP 1018- Charge for the Committee on Core Curriculum. “The Committee is composed of seven voting members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty…” It was amended to, “The Committee is composed of eight voting members…”

Additional amendments were made to UTDPP 1024- Charge for the Committee on Effective Teaching, “The Committee is composed of eleven voting members and shall include one faculty member from each school appointed from the membership of the General Faculty…” It was amended to, “The Committee is composed of voting members that include one faculty member from each school…”

Additional amendments were made to UTDPP 1028- Charge for the Committee on Learning Management Systems, “Of the initial six Committee members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty, three shall be appointed to one year terms and three shall be appointed for two year terms.” It was amended to, “Of the initial eight Committee members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty, four shall be appointed to one year terms and four shall be appointed for two year terms.”

Matt Brown moved to approve amended committee charges. Betsy Schlobohm seconded. The motion carried.

12. Second vote for Senate By-Laws part 2
   Betsy Schlobohm moved to approve. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried.

13. Email vote for Summer Graduates
   As there will not be any June or July Senate meetings, a request for a summer email vote to approve the summer graduates was presented. Richard Scotch moved to have an email vote for Summer Graduates. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried.

14. New Business
   The President reminded the Faculty of the ground breaking for Northside. Northside will include Apartments, restaurants, and entertainment venues. The land for the proposed dart rail will be kept open should the rail be created. The President noted that the university is in negotiations to have a child care provided in that location.

15. Adjournment
   There being no further business, President Daniels adjourned the meeting at 3:00 PM.

APPROVED: _______________________________ DATE: ______________

Tim Redman
Speaker of the Faculty
David Crain
Quick Facts
– Became Vice President & Chief Information Officer at UT-Dallas on 3/26/2015
– 20 years in IT management
– 6 years as a Chief Information Officer
  • Missouri House of Representatives
  • Southern Illinois University
– 5+ additional years as a Chief Technology Officer
  • University of Missouri (over 9 years total service)
– 12.5 years in Higher Education IT leadership
– Education
  • BS in Computer Science & Political Science
  • MS in Information Systems

Email Project Background

Zimbra Mail Being Retired
• Lack of storage
• Outdated hardware
• Outdated software
• Expensive to maintain
• Lots of outages

Moving to Microsoft Office 365
• 50 gb for email inboxes
• Unlimited archiving
• Unlimited One Drive storage
• Microsoft Office on up to 5 devices
• Cost already included in the campus agreement

Email Project Details
Migrating 44,000 student email accounts

Have migrated 37,030 to date (approximately 80% complete)

Scheduled to be complete by May 25th

Details: http://www.utdallas.edu/ir/office365/

Frequently Asked Questions

Q: Will faculty & staff be migrated to O365?
A: No, Information Resources is keeping faculty & staff email on premises.

Q: Why did IR do this during the semester?
A: Originally it was discussed conducting this migration over the summer, though it would have been more difficult to communicate with students if they were not on campus. Information Resources wanted to be accessible to students as issues arose.

Q: How many accounts get migrated?
A: 800 accounts are migrated nightly

Q: How did this project get communicated?
A: Multiple notifications were sent to students Zmail account notifying them of the upcoming migration. They get individual emails 14 days, 7 days, and then 1 day before their migration. There were also digital signage announcements in the student union and an insert in the Mercury.

Q: Is it secure?
A: Yes, UTD signed a HIPAA BAA with Microsoft & Microsoft is FERPA compliant

Q: Why didn’t UTD migrate sooner?
A: The cost was not as competitive as it is today (they used to charge), Microsoft was originally not able to meet our compliance obligations, and until recently there was no true hybrid solution to leave faculty and staff on campus.

Q: Is UTD the only school doing this?
A: No, UT Austin, UT Arlington, UT El Paso, UTRGV have or are also migrating to Office 365 as have my two former schools (University of Missouri and Southern Illinois University)

Q: Why aren’t we moving Faculty & Staff as well
A: Faculty & Staff email is an added cost with Office 365 and it is much more cost effective to keep them on premise. Additionally, many schools have been reluctant to move Faculty & Staff due to their compliance responsibilities, integration with campus systems, etc...

Q: Is this a common decision with our peers
A: According to the 2014 Educause Core Data Survey (recently released):
-82% of public doctoral institutions are outsourcing student email to the cloud
-46% of public doctoral institutions are outsourcing faculty & staff email to the cloud

Questions?
The meeting began Thursday, April 16. Murray Leaf and David Cordell attended for UTD.

The meeting was convened at 10 AM by Elizabeth Heise, as Chair. Dr. Heise reviewed the last Regents’ meeting. Members introduced themselves. The group broke up into committees.

11:00 am. Steve Collins, Assoc. Vice Chancellor and Special Counsel for Governmental Relations reviewed the legislative session so far. It has gone better than most expected. The FAC was concerned about legislation requiring campuses to allow concealed weapons. The bill has more sponsors than it needs to pass. All university figures have spoken against it but the legislature is not paying attention to them. He also noted, however, that the legislative process usually operates according to number of well-known laws of nature, beginning with Murphy’s Law and Epstein's corollary. Murphy's Law is that whatever can go wrong will. Epstein's corollary is that if you think the problem is bad, just wait until you see the solution.

12:00 Pedro Reyes, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dan Sharphorn, Vice Chancellor and General Counsel. Members of the faculty advisory Council recently learned Dr. Reyes Will be leaving his position. We expressed appreciation for the way he has promoted shared governance. Dr. Reyes noted that the Board of Regents has agreed to the FAC’s request that we have a member from a health campus and from an academic campus present at all meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee, with privilege of the floor. We think this will be lead to a substantial improvement in communication with the Board.

1 pm. Stephanie Huie, Executive Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives, discussed the UT implementation of SciVal in influent. This grows out of Chancellor Cigarroa’s effort to create a “dashboard” reflecting UT faculty activities. The idea is to make available information to assist faculty finding each other and cooperating more effectively. It should also help outside agencies or interested parties find faculty whose expertise they needed. Working with the offices of institutional research on each campus, Stephanie has created common website format. This also uses a common form for the URL. For UT Dallas the URL is a http://utdallas.influuent.utsystem.edu. She demonstrated how the site works. It is very nicely done, pulling out keywords to group faculty research and allowing searches across all the faculty of each institution. The limitations are the limitations of SciVal itself, which are serious. Among other things, it only takes data from STEM journals and the data only goes back to about 1990. The only way it recognizes a book is if it was reviewed in one of the journals. Humanities journals and works of art like sculpture or paintings are not captured. Faculty can access the database and add information on their own. Young faculty might find this worthwhile. In my own case, for example, the database showed six publications. I would guess that this
is about 2% of what I have actually published, in pages. We discussed such possibilities as uploading *curricula vitae* or the annual report information on our campuses. It may be possible in the future. But of course the main concern is that either the Regents on their own or administrators on our respective campuses we'll use this to make their own assessments of faculty value, bypassing and thereby undermining peer review. From what many of the members of the FAC said it this is a serious problem many campuses already. The FAC concluded that governance leaders should advise everyone on their campuses to look themselves up on this website and provide feedback.

2:00 – 3:00 pm Laura Chambers, Director of Employee Benefits discussed employee benefits and International travel policy. Several members of the FAC have been told by administrators on their campus that it was System policy that they could not expend their own funds for travel without university permission and without going through University travel arrangements. The FAC was assured that there was no such system policy, but it was a good idea to buy trip insurance through the university and register your itinerary.

**Friday:**

9:00 The FAC met with Paul L. Foster, Chairman, Board of Regents. Foster noted the new arrangement for having the FAC represented at meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board, and assured the FAC of the Board’s interest and being responsive to the needs of faculty. We had some discussion of the FAC’s interest in rewriting the Regents rules on intellectual property. Evidently the Board is not aware of the faculty point of view or of the way that courts have applied the principle that the creation belongs to the creator in the relation to faculty employment. He asked for my preference, which I stated. He noted that he considered it fair that the university should own what is created with university resources, but agreed to look into it further with the Board. He noted that the Regents now had a task force working on revising the rules and said faculty should be involved. He evidently was not aware that we had been told we would be, but had so far not been asked to send anyone. We reiterated our interest in being in the discussions. Meanwhile, there appears to be no objection to the FAC going ahead and trying to articulate its own position more clearly.

10:00 The FAC met with Chancellor William McRaven. Many of the members had met with Chancellor McRaven in his campus tours, but this was his first meeting with the Faculty Advisory Council as such. Chancellor McRaven laid out his sense of priorities for the future. There was nothing notable that the FAC disagreed with, such as enhanced graduation rates and doing more and better research, but from the FAC’s point of view the main point was not the priorities themselves but the Chancellor’s recognition that improvements are likely to require organizational changes or additional resources, and he considered himself obligated to try to get them. The Chancellor made a point of speaking of all the UT campuses, not just UT Austin.
Marni Baker, Chief Innovation Officer – Discussed Competency Based Learning. This means the online degree programs that the system has been designing. The main one at this point appears to be biostatistics in faculty who have been involved are pleased with the results. It is an innovative cross-disciplinary program that meets genuine needs and that is apparently intellectually rigorous. A few other similar programs in less advanced stages were also described. There is no sense that this will become anything like an online college or that it will offer ordinary liberal arts type degrees. "Competency based" is evidently not being understood as an idea that applies to all education but rather as education tightly focused on conveying certain technical skills. The FAC generally accepted the value of such programs. There was no discussion of cost except implicitly. Evidently, it is expensive but the hope is that the cost will be recovered on something like a per student basis with increasing scale, and as the modules that are being developed can would be reapplied to additional degrees.

Elections: Antoinette Sol (UTSA) was elected Secretary. Catherine Ross (UT Arlington) was elected President-Elect.

Resolutions:

The governance committee offered a revised version of Reagan's rules 90101 and 90102 dealing with intellectual property. The revisions were consistent with the principal that the creation belongs to the creator and with the purpose a facilitating commercialization of inventions by clarifying rights of possession. The revision was not offered for resolution at this time because the FAC wanted to wait for a seat for a seat on the intellectual property task force. Meanwhile, the members were asked to read and discuss the revision and respond. Dr. Leaf asked if there were any objections to the draft. There were no objections.

The Academic Affairs and Quality Committee, with concurrence of the Governance Committee, presented a resolution describing the PeopleSoft implementation as “seriously hindering our ability to advise, retain, and graduate students.”

The Academic Affairs and Quality Committee also presented a long resolution title “Best Practices: Policies and Procedures for Assessment of Service.” The reason was that the chair of the Coordinating Board has expressed an interest in recognizing the importance of service, and in providing metrics for assessing it. The FAC wanted to state a position for them and others to consider that avoided destructive oversimplification. Campus governance organizations and administrations will receive the wording.

The third resolution reflected the persistent problem that administrations on some campuses ignore Regents Rules and System policies that the FAC supports:

In the University of Texas System a trend has developed of failure to adhere to operating procedures – particularly those pertaining to curriculum and academic programs - as laid out in institutional HOPs/HOOPs as well as in Regents Rules (See Regents Rules 40101 and 40307 inter alia). The Faculty Advisory Council maintains
that the operating procedures of the system provide the governing structure for UT System Campuses rather than representing mere best practice suggestions. Anything less lends itself to capricious and unpredictable governance. On academic, curricular, clinical, and faculty affairs faculty shall always play a central role in developing and maintaining policy. HOP/HOOP policy must be in line with current practices, and where policy and practice do not align policies must be adjusted with full faculty oversight and input, especially in academic/curricular/health care provision/faculty affairs matters.

Addendum:
See:
Regents Rule 40101 “Faculty Role in Educational Policy Formulation” and 40307 “Academic Program Approval Standards”

The health affairs committee offered a resolution asking the regions to provide additional funding but the rationale for the funding was not sufficiently clear for the FAC to support the resolution. The FAC recognizes that the Regents cannot simply fill the gap being left by the reduction of federal funding.
New Undergraduate Course
To be offered in 2015-2016

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

Dr. Homer Montgomery requested the addition of NATS 3301 to be offered in fall 2015. This course is not a repeatable course although the title is “Current Topics in Marine Science.”

Pending approval, May 2015
School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM)
Course to be offered in fall 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-open</td>
<td>add</td>
<td><em>nats3301</em> (r1)</td>
<td>nats3301.4</td>
<td>NATS 3301 Current Topics in Marine Science (3 semester credit hours) Contemporary issues in marine science with a focus on the circum-Gulf of Mexico. Case studies are explored utilizing research literature, remote sensing, core analysis, and other means. Topics include estuarine ecology, sedimentary dynamics of barrier islands, relative sea level change, human influence, and major events such as hurricanes. The course includes grounding in the fundamentals of general theory and principles of marine science. Short lectures, demonstrations, group work and reports, and laboratory activities are the norm. (3-0) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130 2015-05-01 08:22:05 audit: 13</td>
<td>ps info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Request notes**

Requested by Homer Montgomery on 2015-03-20 15:01:07 through Eform and course to be offered in Fall 2015. Although the title is "Current Topics in..." this is not a repeatable course.

**Peoplesoft diff:**

NATS 3301 Current Topics in Marine Science (3 semester credit hours) Contemporary issues in marine science with a focus on the circum-Gulf of Mexico. Case studies are explored utilizing research literature, remote sensing, core analysis, and other means. Topics include estuarine ecology, sedimentary dynamics of barrier islands, relative sea level change, human influence, and major events such as hurricanes. The course includes grounding in the fundamentals of general theory and principles of marine science. Short lectures, demonstrations, group work and reports, and laboratory activities are the norm. (3-0) Y

**Show fields: nats3301.4**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
AMENDED

New Graduate Courses
To be offered in 2015-2016

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

ENCS and EPPS would like to add two more courses respectively to the fall 2015 schedule.

NOTE: ECON 5397 is a repeatable course.

AMENDED on 5-1-15, 5:20 pm by adding JSOM’s request for OPRE 7051 which is also a repeatable course.

AMENDED on 5-5-15, 2:10 pm – with revised changes noted below:

- BMEN 7387 – on hold for further revisions
- EESC 6389 – Replaced the word “class” with the word “lecture” in the first sentence of description.
- OPRE 7051 – Added “Pass/Fail only. May be repeated for credit (18 semester credit hours maximum),” to the description.
- ECON 5326 – Unchanged
- ECON 5397 – Unchanged

Approved by Graduate Council, 5-5-15
Approved by CEP with amendments, 5-5-15

AMENDED on 5-13-15, 9:24am – revisions noted below:

- OPRE 7051 –
  - Repeatability phrase was updated due to zero semester credit hours status of course. Course is now repeatable in conjunction to OPRE 7351 rather than the maximum number of semester credit hours attainable.
  - Maximum SCH (cat_repeat_units) was reduced to zero to reflect that the course is worth zero semester credit hours so it cannot be repeated for any number larger.
Naveen Jindal School of Management (JSOM)
Course to be offered in fall 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>course_head</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opre7051</td>
<td></td>
<td>OPRE 7051 Seminar in Operations Management (0 semester credit hours) The seminar covers topics of current research in the area of Operations Management. Research papers on a variety of topics are presented including supply chain management, inventory models, production planning and control, decision and risk analysis and behavioral operations management. Pass/Fail only. May be repeated for credit as topics may vary in coordination with OPRE7351. (3-0) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>ps info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requested by Shawn Alborz on 2015-05-01 15:06:34 through Eform and course to be offered in fall.</td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>2015-05-13 09:25:32</td>
<td>orion info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each year, speakers from academia and industry visit the OM group and give research seminars on cutting-edge research. In this course, students are required to attend these research seminars and study the corresponding papers. Since the seminars differ each year, this is a repeatable course (3-18 semester credit hours maximum).</td>
<td>audit: 10</td>
<td>NOLINK</td>
<td>overview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**repeat reason**

Each year, speakers from academia and industry visit the OM group and give research seminars on cutting-edge research. In this course, students are required to attend these research seminars and study the corresponding papers. Since the seminars differ each year, this is a repeatable course (3-18 semester credit hours maximum).

**show fields: opre7051.5**

- cat_repeat_units: 0
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: yes_subtitles
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Executive Summary

Introduction
Since the last higher education plan was adopted in 2000, Texas has become increasingly engaged in a global economy dependent on skilled and knowledgeable workers. Many of those workers must come from the state’s institutions of higher education. Although higher education in Texas must continue to pursue greater learning, in general, as well as continually push toward higher standards of excellence in teaching, research, and innovation, universities and colleges also must work toward achieving the objective many students have in mind when they attend college: to get a better job and achieve a better life through higher education.

For Texas to solve problems and address public concerns now and in the future, the state must have a large workforce with the insight, skills, and knowledge to push it forward. This workforce must be educated and able to adapt and compete at the highest levels to maintain a strong state economy. All forms of postsecondary attainment will be critical to the state’s success.

The Goals of this Plan
By 2030, Texas will need approximately 60 percent of its 25- to 34-year-old workforce to hold a postsecondary credential. Centered around students, the 60x30TX higher education strategic plan is designed to achieve this goal and help Texas remain competitive and prosperous. However, the state’s 25-34 year olds are increasingly Hispanic, and the inclusion of underrepresented student populations, such Hispanics and African Americans, in higher education will be critical to this plan’s success.
The first goal of this plan, the 60x30 goal, is overarching and aims to raise the percentage of the Texas younger adult population with postsecondary educational attainment. Because Texas has seen a relative decline in educational attainment by the younger population, this goal focuses on 25-34 year olds: By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a postsecondary credential or degree. Although ambitious, given the current level of educational attainment, this goal is achievable through focused effort.

The second goal contributes to the first by supplying graduates from Texas institutions: By 2030, at least 550,000 students in that year will complete a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from a Texas public, independent, or for-profit college or university. To reach this goal, Texas will need to maintain the strong degree production increases it has experienced in recent years, with large increases needed among targeted groups.

The third goal emphasizes the value of higher education relative to the workforce: By 2030, all graduates from Texas public institutions of higher education will have completed programs with identified marketable skills. Students need to be aware of the marketable skills affiliated with their programs. This goal ensures institutions document, update, and communicate the skills students acquire in their programs.

The final goal is intended to help students who graduate with debt complete their programs with reasonable debt: By 2030, undergraduate student loan debt will not exceed 60 percent of first-year wage for graduates of Texas public institutions. This goal is designed to balance the levels of student loan debt with a graduate’s earning potential during the first year after college.

Conclusion

By charting a student-centered course and prioritizing higher education completion and workforce readiness, this plan enables the state, institutions of higher education, and the private sector to set Texas on a path toward continued prosperity. To compete and remain relevant in the future, Texas workers need to complete quality postsecondary credentials, and exit their programs with skills that employers need. Furthermore, if graduates are to provide the state with sufficient revenue and have the means to pursue personal goals, they must exit their programs with no debt or reasonable debt, given their incomes.

This plan addresses students’ desire for a better life, employers’ desires to remain competitive, and the state’s need for a robust economy. This plan also strengthens the mission of excellence and quality in Texas higher education by setting goals that cannot be postponed without postponing the progress of Texas.
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Since the last higher education plan was adopted in 2000, Texas has become increasingly engaged in a global economy dependent on skilled and knowledgeable workers. Many of those workers must come from the state’s institutions of higher education. Although higher education in Texas must continue to pursue greater learning in general, as well as continually push toward higher standards of excellence in teaching, research, and innovation, universities and colleges also must work toward achieving the objective many students have in mind when they attend college: to get a better job and achieve a better life through higher education.

Given the mission of higher education, the needs of the community, the expectations of students, and the reality of a global marketplace, the question is how Texas institutions of higher education can achieve their missions and educate students to supply the necessary workforce needed to compete in a global market. The 60x30TX higher education plan for Texas lays out ambitious goals for educational attainment, completion, marketable skills, and student debt. The aim is to help students achieve their educational goals and help the state remain globally competitive for years to come. At the same time, this plan provides institutions with the latitude to pursue the greater purposes of higher learning.

Skills Deficits, Attainment, and Completion

In 2012, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which globally promotes policies to improve economic and social well-being, listed Texas as one of several states experiencing skills deficits. Some sectors of the state’s economy could not hire enough workers with the required skillsets to meet workforce demand, resulting in lost revenue for the state. Although Texas saw a large immigration of workers and met most of the goals and targets set in the previous higher education plan, only 35 percent of the 25- to 34-year-old population had an associate or higher degree in 2013, far less than many other states and nations. Adding certificates earned by this age group only increased the number of graduates with a postsecondary credential to about 38 percent.²

Those percentages suggest a link between the number of Texans holding a certificate or degree and the state’s deficit in skilled and knowledgeable workers. Certainly, Texas made enormous strides during the years of the previous higher education plan, Closing the Gaps by 2015. At the outset of this plan’s Success goal in 2000, only about 100,000 students had completed an associate, bachelor’s, or certificate. By 2011, the state had reached the Success goal – awarding 210,000 postsecondary credentials by 2015 – four years early, and by Fiscal Year 2014, the state had reached nearly 251,000 total undergraduate awards.³

Yet despite the state’s successes, the demand for skilled and knowledgeable workers continues to outpace workforce supply in Texas. For Texas to remain competitive and prosperous, it will need approximately 60 percent of its 25-34 year olds to hold a quality postsecondary credential by 2030. (Some experts believe that Texas will need to reach this goal even sooner.)

Reaching a goal of this magnitude will require solutions from both public and private sectors. Although ambitious, this goal is achievable, provided a wide and representative range of Texans, including traditional and nontraditional students, economically disadvantaged students, and students from many ethnic backgrounds are able to attain a postsecondary education.

Greater Representation, Demographic Shifts

Appealing to a wide range of Texans will be particularly important in light of the state’s enormous growth among Hispanics,
who accounted for 65 percent of the state’s population increase during the 2010 census. Other minority populations grew significantly, too, while the white population numbers remained relatively flat. These demographic changes underscore the need to push for greater educational attainment in Texas among all populations.

Social Mobility and Affordability
Preparing students to enter community colleges and universities and supporting students through the completion of certificates and degrees will mean demonstrating that postsecondary attainment is still the best path toward greater social and economic mobility. Supporting students through completion will also mean addressing college affordability and making the workplace skills and knowledge learned in programs transparent.

Student-Centered
The 60x30TX Plan focuses on the critical role of both public and private stakeholders and lays out a comprehensive approach that focuses heavily on the needs of students. Students, after all, are the ones who will decide to pursue higher education. Their decisions will influence the future prosperity of Texas greatly and affect the state’s ability to meet its needs for educated and skilled workers.

The 60x30TX Plan
The intention of the goals and targets described in this plan are to help students, institutions of higher education, employers, and the state succeed and flourish using a shared vision of excellence for higher education in Texas. Developed with input from school administrators, higher education leaders, community leaders, private industry, elected officials, and others, the 60x30TX plan establishes ideals for higher education in Texas that will help secure the state’s place in a global economy.

Like its predecessor, this plan seeks to create qualitative results built on quantitative foundations and is a living document that will be used to track the state’s progress toward its higher education goals. Also like its predecessor, this plan includes four goals; however, the goals in this plan are different and focus more heavily on the alignment of higher education and students with the workforce.

Texas Higher Education: You Are Here
The current higher education landscape provides the clues and data that lead to a better understanding of the benefits of increased higher education attainment. According to the Social Mobility Index, which focuses on higher education policy related to economic disparities among students, the U.S. now provides the least economic mobility among developed nations. Among states, Texas fares no better. The pipeline to the state’s higher education starts with a K-12 public school population in which 60 percent of students qualify for free or reduced lunches.

Economic Disadvantage, Demographics, and the Workforce
Among the poorest eighth grade students in Texas, only roughly 10 percent attain a postsecondary credential when tracked for 11 years. Without focused action and attention to these economically disadvantaged students, Texas cannot remain...
competitive. Even beyond ethnicity, economic disadvantage is the greatest indicator in determining an individual's chance of attaining education past high school. If the state is to remain competitive in a constantly changing world, higher education in Texas will need to make huge efforts to reach out to a range of students.

According to Anthony Carnevale, Director and Research Professor of the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, a majority of future jobs in the nation and in the state will require a postsecondary credential. He asserts that as early as 2020, “fewer jobs will be available to people with less than high school or only a high school diploma.”

This is particularly important because of the demographic shift in Texas to a largely Hispanic population, projected to comprise 70 percent of the net growth through 2050. Although the state has made some strides among this population, poverty has increased among those with lower levels of income and education. Without bold action, this trend is expected to continue.

Texas must continue to build aggressively upon its successes in implementing changes in higher education. Otherwise, workers possessing only high school education or below will likely increase from 48 percent in 2010 to 53 percent in 2050. As noted by experts, this less educated population likely will lead to more pronounced and long-term workforce shortages.

**Decrease in Global Ranking**

The population and geographic size of Texas is greater than that of many countries. Placing the state's educational attainment in this context highlights the relative decline over time. Texans who were 55 to 64 in 2013 achieved associate and higher degrees in numbers that placed them between the 3rd and 4th highest-ranking OECD nations. Although 25- to 34-year-old Texans attained associate and higher degrees at increased rates during 2013, they did not keep pace with the rest of the world. As a result, this age group fell between the 23rd and 24th highest-ranking OECD nations in educational attainment—a relative and notable decline in the state. Demographic shifts and the underrepresentation of minorities and economically disadvantaged students in the state’s higher education system—in proportion to the population—contributed to Texas losing ground globally.

**Re-imagining College**

To address this situation, bold action will be required. Texas must continue to re-imagine “college” and “college going” in broader terms to meet the state’s workforce needs, ensure the economic viability of its future, and remain competitive in a global marketplace. Increasingly, college will mean much more than attaining a four-year baccalaureate.

For some students, “college” will mean earning a certificate in a yearlong program. For other students, college will mean earning an associate or bachelor’s degree by attending traditional classes or by participating in competency-based programs. For others still, college may mean earning an associate degree.
through dual credit or early college high school programs.

College may take place on a brick-and-mortar campus or on a device in a student’s living room. Regardless of the credential or method used to attain it, however, a “college” education translates into greater prosperity for individuals, which in turn translates into greater economic prosperity for the state.

**Some Benefits of Higher Education**

Despite negative headlines about student loan debt that often fail to acknowledge the skills gained in college, higher education is a boon for the state’s economy. Texas, in fact, has seen a boost from the previous higher education plan. A report by the group Economic Modeling Specialists International (EMSI) for Fiscal Year 2013 found that money spent by institutions and students on higher education in Texas boosted the state’s economy in a one-year period equal to $143.9 billion or 11 percent of the gross state product. This dollar amount equates to the creation of 2,258,077 jobs.¹¹

While these numbers confirm the recent achievements of higher education in the state, much more needs to be done to reduce reliance on the state budget for public expenditures such as Medicaid and corrections. Higher education, by its nature, increases knowledge and skills and results in greater individual marketability, wealth, and self-reliance, as well as reduces dependence on public programs.

**Individual Return on Investment**

The individual return on investment from higher education is well documented. Experts from the Brookings Institution’s Hamilton Project contend, “on average, the benefits of a four-year degree are equivalent to an investment that returns 15.2 percent per year.”¹² The EMSI report supports this claim and asserts that higher lifetime incomes resulting from Texas students attaining degrees will account for $524.9 billion in added income during their working lives.¹³

---


¹² Source: Hamilton Project (2015)

¹³ Source: National Association of State Budget Officers (2016)
Savings in public assistance and corrections means more money for the state and ultimately, for Texas citizens. The nationally focused College Board report *Education Pays* found that 12 percent of high school graduates lived in households that relied on SNAP (Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program) benefits in 2011, compared to only 2 percent of bachelor’s graduates. Higher education benefits the state, the individual, and society in measurable and specific ways that must be encouraged and strengthened.

To Higher Education and Through Completion

The overarching goal of this plan targets 25-34 year olds in Texas as the population to achieve 60 percent postsecondary attainment by 2030. Tracking their completion rates and educational attainment will provide an indicator of the state’s economic future and possible workforce deficits for areas requiring postsecondary training over the next several decades.

Texas community and technical colleges, public and independent colleges and universities, health-related institutions, and private career colleges will play a crucial role in meeting the 60x30 overarching goal. Aligning postsecondary programs with the state’s workforce needs will require a thoughtful process that not only acknowledges the value of workforce demands, but that also acknowledges the creativity, diversity, and varied strengths of students. Many of those workforce skills will include soft skills and knowledge not easily aligned to a specific job or industry. Liberal arts studies, for example, often hone these skills and over time create flexibility and resourcefulness for individuals, allowing them to adapt nimbly to the jobs of the future while meeting current needs.

Matching Credentials to Workforce Needs

When matching credentials to workforce needs, the role of higher education is essential, as is coordinating efforts with businesses and communities. Jeff Strohl, Director of Research for Georgetown University’s Center on Education and the Workforce, states that, “Without this [collaboration], increased education can just mean increased unemployment and higher levels of mismatch.”

To achieve workforce success for students, institutions in the state will need to reconnect with the reason that most students go to college. In a recent UCLA study, 88 percent of surveyed students identified “getting a better job” as the most important reason for attending college. This statement is not to suggest that institutions hold the only key to workforce success in Texas, but they will play a critical role. Some workforce success will depend on external factors, such as a strong economy to retain graduates from Texas institutions and to attract graduates from other states.

K-12, Two-year, and Four-year Alignment

The state will achieve its goals for higher education through many strategies, and several factors will influence students to complete certificates and degrees.

Figure 5. Many Components Influence Student Completion.

Higher levels of cooperation among higher education, K-12 education, and workforce leadership will be required to
create pathways to careers and high-demand jobs. Two-year and four-year institutions will need to collaborate and align lower-division curricula so that students receive a coherent and rigorous general education, while being assured that their courses will transfer and count toward degrees. Texas will need more online education and more innovation, such as applied baccalaureates offered through community colleges, as well as competency-based programs. Institutions of higher education will need to work together more closely on such issues as teacher training, professional development, and college readiness. All of these strategies will combine to hit the targets of this plan and produce the best outcome for Texas and its students.
Vision

Draft Vision for the 60x30TX Higher Education Strategic Plan
Higher education is attainable for all Texans through challenging and diverse learning environments that foster individual potential and maximize the societal and economic contributions of graduates.

The 2030 Higher Education Goals for Texas

This section contains the goals, targets, and strategies of the next Texas higher education plan. The goals contain broad language to provide latitude in achieving them. Although measurable, each goal’s design allows institutions to respond according to their needs and environment. The result of many meetings and discussions, the goals of this plan rest on the careful assessment of the possible.18

The plan’s targets are key to achieving each goal. Additional targets might have been included in the plan, but input from many stakeholders deemed the ones that appear critical for the state’s future workforce needs and prosperity. One plan cannot respond to every educational aspiration in the state, but it can drive success through focused goals and targets. If the state and its institutions of higher education implement successful strategies to reach each target, the state will reach each goal.

Implementing strategies for reaching each target will require both top-down and bottom-up approaches at institutions of higher education and both public and private partnerships. Institutions should collaborate with state agencies such as the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Texas Workforce Commission, and Texas Education Agency, as well as with local, regional, state, and national companies that extend far beyond the institutions themselves. The challenge will be to develop fluid solutions that produce changes over time. The strategies in this plan represent only some of the solutions that will help institutions reach the targets and overall goals for higher education in Texas and educate the necessary workforce to remain globally competitive and economically diverse.
Overarching Goal

60x30
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a postsecondary credential or degree.

This goal takes into account not only graduates of Texas institutions but also the in-migration of new residents who hold postsecondary credentials. Achieving this ambitious goal means improving at a higher rate of attainment than Texas has done during the average of the five best years since 1998. Retaining graduates from Texas institutions also will be necessary to reach this goal, as will attracting graduates from other states.

Big State, Bold Numbers
To reach this goal, 2.7 million Texans ages 25-34 will need to have attained a postsecondary credential by 2030. According to 2013 data, only an estimated 1.3 million residents in this age group had attained a postsecondary credential. The same data show that Texans ages 25-34 lag the U.S. average in attainment of associate and bachelor's degrees by 234,004 completers. The outcome of continuing this trend will be a poorer and significantly less competitive state. Achieving the 60x30 goal is critical for Texas to remain globally competitive.

Strategies to Achieve This Goal
To achieve 60 percent attainment among 25 to 34 year olds, community and technical colleges, which tend to focus more closely on local school districts and local or regional government, will need to continue strengthening connections and partnerships with school districts. Four-year institutions, which tend to focus more on state and national issues, may need to build and strengthen their connections to local or regional independent school districts. P-16 councils, adult education learning programs, dual-credit programs, early college high school programs, and affordable baccalaureates – to name a few – will help to connect institutions to local and regional communities and support educational attainment in Texas. Two-year and four-year institutions working together can also support each other in reaching this goal.

Matching the 60x30 Goal to Demographics
Educational attainment for Hispanics and African Americans will have a major impact on the state's future economic development and competitiveness. Already these two populations make up more than 60 percent of the K-12 pipeline for higher education in Texas - cause for
government, institutions, community organizations, and business leaders to rally around the common cause of ensuring all Texans have access to higher education and the means to pursue it.

Encouraging and supporting economically disadvantaged students also will play a tremendous role in helping the state reach its 60x30 goal. More than 60 percent of high school graduates in Texas are economically disadvantaged, so the state cannot hope to reach this goal without them. Positively affecting the life of one economically disadvantaged student through higher education can improve the prospects for an entire family. The attainment of higher education for those individuals through degree and credential attainment translates into stronger communities and greater capacity for workforce success – the key to the continued prosperity of the state and its residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal and Interim Benchmarks</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percent of Texans ages 25-34 with a postsecondary credential to at least ...</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These benchmarks ensures progressive improvement of state educational attainment throughout the plan years.*

**Possible Strategies**
1. Provide high-quality adult education programs to improve educational attainment for educationally underserved adults.
2. Increase efforts to promote college attainment to students and parents prior to high school, including collaboration with existing organizations to ensure consistent messaging.
3. Improve opportunities for students to pursue and complete higher education, including developing practices to encourage stop-outs with more than 50 semester credit hours to return and complete a degree or certificate.
Unlike the 60x30 goal, this goal pertains solely to credentials produced at Texas institutions of higher education. To meet the future workforce needs of Texas, the state’s public colleges and universities will need 550,000 completions by students in the year 2030, a significant increase in the number of postsecondary awards. All total, during the 15 years this goal is measured, Texas will award 6.4 million certificates and degrees by reaching this goal.

**The Target Populations for This Goal**

These numbers take into account a growth rate of roughly 4 percent for certificate and degree completions. This rate of growth may not seem very aggressive until the targets for this goal are examined; this goal calls for significant increases among African Americans, Hispanics, males from these and other groups, and economically disadvantaged students. The aim of this goal is not only to achieve a large number of completers from Texas institutions, but also to achieve parity for underrepresented populations in Texas higher education. Viewed through this lens, this goal is bold and very Texan.

In addition to the populations mentioned in this goal’s targets, institutions will need to target female STEM students, veterans, adults who have completed and left but never completed their degrees, and students in adult basic education programs, among others. Reaching this goal also will require greater numbers of college-ready high school graduates and will mean directing more participants in the state GED and adult basic education programs toward certification and other postsecondary programs. Reaching, enrolling, and graduating students who are at risk of foregoing or “stopping out” of higher education without a degree because of economic factors will be particularly important and may be addressed through institutional innovation. Although overlaps exists for the targets that will help to achieve this goal (e.g., a student may be both Hispanic and economically disadvantaged), all of the targets will make a difference in the state’s future and move Texas toward greater prosperity.

**Time-to-Degree Factors**

Substantial evidence suggests that institutions need to be more prescriptive in their efforts to help students narrow their choices as they navigate higher education. An analysis of students who had “stopped out” of higher education between 2008 and 2012, for example, revealed 48,000 university students had stopped out with 90 or more semester credit hours, and 161,000 two-year college students had stopped out with 55 or more semester credit hours.21
Since 2000, Texas has made measurable progress in improving graduation rates, but it must sustain and strengthen these efforts for the state to compete successfully with other states and countries. As of 2014, the state’s six-year graduation rate was 60.5 percent for public, four-year institutions, but if the two most selective public universities in the state are extracted from the data, the state’s overall graduation rate falls to around 53 percent. For two-year institutions, the current six-year graduation rate for associate degrees is about 28 percent.22

**Strategies to Achieve This Goal**

To reach the Completion goal, institutions of higher education in Texas will need to support students early to help them persist in their higher education pursuits. This may include expanding co-requisite class opportunities for developmental education students, which allow students to take credit-bearing courses at the same time they are taking courses to improve their skills. Institutions also may need to consider competency-based programs that allow adult students to move through blocks of classes based on what they know for a fixed semester cost, regardless of the number of courses a student is able to complete successfully in one semester.

Using assessments, such as the Texas Success Initiative Assessment, will enable institutions to accurately determine students’ strengths and weaknesses and give advisors the ability to provide better counseling to students based on this information. Electronic degree plans that allow students to type in majors and receive a list of the required courses needed to complete a specific degree in four years could greatly help students. They could avoid taking classes unnecessarily and avoid prolonging the time to a degree. Studies show that achieving 30 semester credit hours (SCH) in Texas during the first year of college is critical for students to persist and complete. Achieving 30 SCH in the first year might happen in a number of ways, including (1) by students taking two semesters of 15 SCH during the traditional academic year, or (2) by students taking two semesters of 12 SCH during the traditional academic year and one session of 6 SCH during the summer. Reducing the time to a degree will help students persist in completing postsecondary credentials, which will increase the number of graduates and help reach this goal.

Inherent in this goal also will be strengthening guided pathways between two- and four-year institutions and aligning lower-division curricula across institutions and degree programs so that students receive a coherent and rigorous education that will transfer between colleges and count toward degrees.

**How the Completion and 60x30 Goals Differ**

This goal closely relates to, but differs from, the 60x30 goal. The Completion goal tracks annual awards earned; the 60x30 goal tracks the level of education of the state’s 25- to 34-year-old population. The Completion goal contains targets that build toward 550,000 degrees awarded solely by Texas institutions in 2030 with the understanding that growth in degree production will be critical to reach 60 percent in the 60x30 goal. The Completion goal helps ensure that growing numbers of Texans, and the state as a whole, reap the personal and societal benefits that come from completing high-quality degrees and certificates.
Goal and Interim Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of students completing a certificate, associate, bachelor’s, or master’s from a Texas public, independent, or for-profit college or university to at least ...</td>
<td>376,000</td>
<td>455,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first four targets are directly related to the Completion goal. To reach this goal, Texas will need to maintain the strong degree production increases that it has experienced in recent years.

Targets to Reach the Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of Hispanic students completing a certificate or degree to at least ...</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This target and the next one will help increase parity across completers for groups that have traditionally been underrepresented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of African American students completing a certificate or degree to at least ...</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of male students completing a certificate or degree to at least ...</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of women enrolled in and graduating from higher education institutions has grown and men are not keeping pace. This target provides a means to monitor progress toward gender parity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of economically disadvantaged undergraduate students (PELL Recipients) completing a certificate or degree to at least ...</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>246,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economically disadvantaged students are less likely to succeed in higher education than their non-economically disadvantaged peers. This target emphasizes the importance of improving completion rates for this subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of all Texas public high school graduates enrolling in a Texas public, independent, or for-profit college or university by the first fall after their high school graduation to at least ...</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who enroll directly from high school into college are much more likely to be college ready. This target helps to ensure high school graduates enroll in higher education at rates that support the Completion goal.
Possible Strategies

Support the completion pipeline by ensuring student access “to” higher education
1. Scale up and share practices that support academic preparation of students for postsecondary education.
2. Scale up and share practices that guide students to higher education (for example, encourage a college-going culture, improve advising, and simplify the enrollment process).
3. Increase participation by economically disadvantaged high school students in dual credit and other college-level courses.

Increase completion by improving student progress “through” higher education
4. Use innovative approaches for content delivery and assessment to improve completion and reduce student cost, e.g., guided pathways, prior learning assessments, and competency-based education models.
5. Employ High-Impact Practices (HIPs) such as first-year seminars and experiences, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing-intensive courses, collaborative assignments and projects, undergraduate research, diversity/global learning, service and community-based learning, internships, and capstone courses and projects.
6. Increase use of predictive analytics to identify and assist students at risk of not completing.
7. Scale up and share practices that support underprepared students to increase persistence and completion and reduce time-to-degree. These practices may include pathways to English proficiency for second language learners and the use of co-requisite courses.
8. Structure programs and support services in a manner that reflects an understanding of student populations, including economically disadvantaged students.
MARKETABLE SKILLS

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

This higher education plan defines marketable skills as “those valued by employers that can be applied in a variety of work settings, including interpersonal, cognitive, and applied skill areas. These skills can be either primary or complementary to a major and are acquired by students through education, including curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities.”

In this era of global competitiveness, questions sometimes arise about how best to meet workforce needs, e.g., “Are colleges and universities graduating too many English and philosophy majors for the job market?” The assumption is that some programs of study lead to graduates who lack marketable skills. In 2014, more than 90 percent of employers who participated in a national survey identified the following skills and abilities as important for new hires:

- Capacity to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve complex problems
- Ability to demonstrate ethical judgment and integrity
- Intercultural skills
- Capacity for continued new learning

This list makes it clear that liberal arts and other majors have much to contribute to the workforce, but regardless of the major, students acquire marketable skills within their programs. So how can the state ensure that all graduates not only gain marketable skills but also can articulate them? This goal addresses this question by enabling institutions to think more explicitly about the programs they offer.

Thinking Explicitly about Skills

The programs at many Texas institutions already include learning outcomes within the framework of their courses. This goal goes a step further and asks institutions to think explicitly about the job skills students learn within programs. This goal also asks institutions to consider the educational experiences within each program they offer and the functional value of those experiences in the workplace. In other words, this goal asks institutions to think about how students succeed in the workplace.

This change in thinking will result in students being able to articulate their acquired skills to potential employers on a résumé or in a job interview. The capacity to articulate acquired skills will help students to succeed in greater numbers in the marketplace and will help Texas meet its workforce needs. This goal may incentivize students to complete their degrees as they take courses and help them see how their programs connect to the workplace. In this way, this goal complements the Completion goal and helps supply the skilled workforce implied by the 60x30 goal.

 Marketable Skills for All Programs, All Types of Degrees

Identifying marketable skills for each program of study might seem daunting, but this task strikes at the heart of why many students pursue higher education. As mentioned earlier in
this plan, 88 percent of surveyed students in a 2012 study said a better job was the motivation for going to college. Given the desires of students to gain a better job and the desires of employers to hire the best workers, identifying marketable skills gained through higher education is essential for both students and employers.

For this goal, all program types will undergo the process of creating, identifying, and updating marketable skills. This goal also recognizes the complex and diverse nature of the state’s workforce. As such, the list of marketable skills that institutions of higher education develop for their programs will be varied and extensive and may require frequent updates.

Reaching the 60x30 goal of 60 percent, however, will be a great achievement only if the skills attained by students meet the demands of the state’s workforce. If most students, for example, hold an associate, but the available jobs require bachelor’s degrees, Texas won’t meet market demand. For this reason, the types of awards held by Texans will be monitored to ensure that the supply of degrees aligns with workforce demand.

**Benefits for Institutions, Students, Employers**

Mapping marketable skills within individual programs of study is central to this goal. This process will help students be aware of the skills and knowledge they are learning. It will help institutions identify the skills and knowledge that accompany programmatic learning outcomes. It will help employers understand how those skills align with prospective jobs. To achieve this goal, Texas institutions of higher education will need to forge and maintain close partnerships with the business community to get feedback about the skills needed in specific fields by prospective employers.

**Strategies to Achieve This Goal**

Institutions also will need to implement strategies such as building a network of paid internships that count as college credit for students. Additionally, institutions may need to consult chambers of commerce, workforce development boards, and other workforce-related organizations to identify marketable skills for particular jobs and industries.

**Connection to the 60x30 Goal**

This goal connects to the overarching goal of educational attainment because aligning higher education with workforce needs will give students a clearer picture of the jobs for which they qualify after graduation and will encourage them to persist toward degree completion. In addition, the goal will create new lines of communication between institutions and employers that will open doors to student opportunity and employer satisfaction and innovation, while also creating greater institutional awareness of unique program offerings and opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets to Reach the Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 2020, institutions will have created and implemented a process to identify and regularly update marketable skills for each of their programs, in collaboration with business and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>100% Implemented</td>
<td>Continuously Updated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students need to be aware of the marketable skills affiliated with their programs. The targets above ensure that institutions document, update, and communicate to students the skills acquired in their programs so that students can communicate those skills to potential employers.**

**Target years can be modified to accommodate institutional program review cycles.**
Maintain the percentage of students who are found working or enrolled within one year of earning a degree or certificate.  

It is important to the state that a substantial portion of Texas completers remain in the state and are employed or pursuing additional education.

Possible Strategies

1. **Convene a statewide advisory group** to identify general characteristics of institutional and program quality. This advisory group should include representatives from institutions, industry, and other relevant stakeholders.

2. Establish **collaborations** among institutions, state, regional, and local employers to define desirable skills, and identify programs and courses in demand that offer those skills.

3. Increase the quality and availability of information targeted to students about the transition from **higher education to the workforce**, including information about the transferability and alignment of skills. This information should be available through **academic and career advising** strategies.

4. Ensure marketable skills are integrated into curricula such that there are established mechanisms for students to **demonstrate those skills**.

5. **Leverage existing efforts** to ensure that marketable skills are addressed in every program, such as Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) and Degree Qualification Profile (DQP).
College affordability impacts student debt load, and unchecked student debt impacts life choices such as buying a house, raising a family, and saving for retirement. The health of Texas depends on a population that is economically healthy and has discretionary income. As with other states, most of the Texas budget comes from taxes, and between 20 and 30 percent of the state’s revenue originates from sales taxes. The more discretionary income that is available to an individual, the greater the individual’s purchasing power and the greater the state’s potential revenues from sales taxes. Individual purchasing power also affects local governments that heavily depend on property taxes for their operating budgets. A population that can contribute to these tax bases is vital to the economic health of Texas, and students saddled with unreasonable loan debt cannot contribute to the state’s revenue stream.

**Texas Student Debt on the Rise**

Although Texas student debt has not reached national levels, it is on the rise at a rate of 8 to 9 percent annually. At this pace, student debt will become a deterrent to much larger numbers of Texans making decisions about pursuing higher education. To help students avoid debilitating debt after graduation, Texas public institutions of higher education will need to examine the affordability of attaining postsecondary credentials. The less affordable a higher education is, the more debt students will accrue and the more access will be denied for those with the greatest financial need. This goal focuses on student loan debt in relation to first-year earnings with the understanding that college affordability is critical to achieving this goal and the other higher education goals in this plan.

**Students with Debt but No Degree**

This goal also considers default rates in maintaining a health balance between debt levels and earning power. Data from Texas Guaranteed, which are included in the *State of Student Aid and Higher Education in Texas* report, indicate default rates have risen in the last 10 years and that a larger share of students with small loans default when compared to students with large loans. For students who borrow and do not complete their degrees, the average default rate is higher. About one-quarter of Texas student borrowers borrow less than $5,000 and leave college without a degree; of those, one in four defaults.

This issue highlights the connection between the Student Debt and Completion goals in this plan. Because loan debt jeopardizes financial stability, it can undermine the perceived return on investment in higher education. This issue, in turn, affects the decisions of potential students about pursuing a postsecondary credential, which has long-term repercussions for students’ earning power and the state’s workforce needs. Given the higher income and tax base associated with education past high school, the state’s revenues will suffer if some students perceive that higher education is an option reserved only for some Texans.

**Strategies to Achieve This Goal**

To achieve this goal, institutions will need to steer students toward degree plans early in their postsecondary careers. Evidence suggests that institutions of higher education need to be
more prescriptive in helping students narrow their choices when navigating through higher education. Emphasis in this area will help students avoid taking excessive SCH, which lead to greater costs and more debt in pursuit of an associate or bachelor’s degree. As of 2014, students in Texas averaged 98 SCH to complete a two-year degree and 145 SCH to complete a four-year degree, while most programs of study require only 60 and 120 SCH, respectively. Excessive semester credit hours for degree completion in Texas contribute to student debt and less than timely completions.

Continued institutional emphasis on on-time completion will be integral to helping students avoid the higher costs associated with attending college for a fifth or sixth year in pursuit of a degree. Many studies have shown that the costs associated with the fifth and sixth years of study among six-year graduates are much higher than the first four years and produce much greater student debt. Returning to an expectation that students graduate in four years will help to reduce student debt.

Student Choices Based on Talent, Interests

Another intention of this goal is to balance costs relative to areas of study so that students can choose programs based on their talents and aspirations and not solely based on the needs of the job market or the starting salary for a particular field. Loan debt, for example, might discourage some students from pursuing a career in K-12 teaching because teachers’ starting salaries are generally lower than the mean for all starting salaries of four-year graduates. The same is true for social workers, journalists, artists, and community workers. As a result, the state could experience greater shortages in important fields, such as teaching and social work, if student loan debt spikes to the point where a majority of students choose programs based entirely on their potential income.

Roles of Student, Institutions, and State in Making College Affordable

College affordability is key, and three groups directly influence college affordability:

- Students can make an impact by maintaining the lowest possible debt levels and making good decisions about their time and finances during and after college, by maintaining an affordable college lifestyle, and by understanding the total cost of borrowing money.
- Colleges and universities can affect affordability by striving to reduce expenses, while maintaining quality and ensuring that students know what they are buying and where their educational choices will lead them after college.
- The state can influence affordability by adequately funding higher education.

Connection to the 60x30 Goal

These actions increase access and persistence, expand students’ options for majors and careers after graduation, and advance other life choices. Helping students complete credentials and balance debt levels will help the state reach the 60x30 goal in this plan and will lead to healthier individual finances and a stronger state economy.
Goal and Interim Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal and Interim Benchmarks</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain undergraduate student loan debt at or below 60 percent of first-year wage for graduates of Texas public institutions.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These benchmarks ensure student loan debt levels stay in balance with the earning potential of the credential.

Targets to Reach the Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets to Reach the Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the excess semester credit hours (SCH) that students attempt when completing an associate or a bachelor's degree.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This target focuses on decreasing the total SCH to degree to reduce costs and debt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets to Reach the Goal</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work to limit debt so that no more than half of all students who earn an undergraduate degree or certificate will have debt.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This target focuses on decreasing the overall number of students who have student loan debt.

Possible Strategies

1. Fundamentally redesign higher education funding for the betterment of students.

2. Convene a statewide advisory group to determine ways to better advise students and parents on financial aid options and impacts before and during their college careers.

3. Make higher education more affordable and accessible to students by optimizing state and other funding sources and fully funding grants for eligible students.

4. Support experiments for more affordable baccalaureate initiatives.
The Challenge for Higher Education in Texas

The purpose of the 60x30TX plan is to set goals for higher education in Texas for the next 15 years to help the state meet the needs of its workforce, communities, and citizens. To compete and remain relevant in the future, Texas workers must attain quality postsecondary credentials, and they must complete those credentials and exit their programs with skills employers need. If those workers are to provide the state with sufficient revenue, they also must exit their programs with no debt or reasonable debt, given their incomes. This plan addresses each of these areas through higher education goals aimed at the continued progress of Texas.

By design, this plan is Texas-bold because it is Texas-achievable. As President John F. Kennedy once said about going to the moon, “We choose to go to the moon ... and do other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard, because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win.”

(For more information about how this plan was developed, see Appendix A.)
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Appendix A: History of the Texas Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee for the 60x30TX Plan

On Dec. 9, 2013, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) staff distributed a memorandum requesting nominations for advisory committee members to all the chancellors and presidents of Texas institutions of higher education. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) sought (1) former governing board members of Texas institutions of higher education, or (2) former presidents and chancellors of higher education institutions. THECB staff also sent requests to the business community and asked for nominations of business representatives who would be willing and able to contribute meaningfully to the work of the committee. The deadline for all nominations was Jan. 10, 2014.

After THECB staff received nominations, they reviewed them to ensure statewide coverage and even representation for all stakeholders. THECB staff then verified nominees were willing to serve and recruited members from unrepresented areas.

On Jan. 6, 2014, the 30-day from comment period for the new rules concerning the establishment of the Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee ended with no comments received.

At the quarterly meeting of the THECB on Jan. 23, 2014, the THECB: (1) adopted the rules for the Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee (TxHESPC) and (2) voted to authorize the Board Chair and the Chair of the Board Committee on Affordability, Accountability and Planning to approve the membership of the Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee.

Final membership of the Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee was approved in late Feb. 2014, with formal invitation letters sent to Strategic Planning Committee members on Feb. 21.

With the exception of July and December, members of the 2014-15 TxHESPC met monthly from March 2014 through June 2015. The election of the chair and vice chair and charge to the committee occurred at the first meeting. Every meeting included presentations by one or two guest speakers and THECB staff, followed by substantial committee discussion. Speakers included both regional and national experts on topics related to the goals. These discussions led to the goals, targets, and strategies of this plan.

Characteristics of the 60x30TX Plan

The TxHESPC focused on these characteristics for the next long-range higher education plan for Texas. It needed to:

- Be concise and focused
- Contain two to five goals
- Set measurable targets
- Contain broad strategies
- Respond to statewide needs
- Respond to regional needs
- Stimulate creativity and adaptability

| Members of the 2014-15 Texas Higher Education Strategic Planning Committee |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Woody Hunt, Chair           | Larry R. Faulkner, Ph.D., Vice Chair |
| James R. Anderson, Ph.D.    | Martin Basaldua, M.D.       | Jerry Bawcom, Ph.D.          |
| James Dickerson             | Ramon Dovalina, Ph.D.       | Bernie Francis              |
| E. D. “Doug” Hodo, Ph.D.    | Wright Lassiter, Jr., Ph.D. | Steve Lyle                  |
| Jerry Massey                | Cathy Obriotti Green        | Shirley (Neeley) Richardson, Ed.D. |
| Terry Seufert               | Lionel Sosa                 | Jerry Turner                |
| Steve Murdock, Ph.D., Special Advisor for Demographics |
Appendix B: Definitions

**Adult degree completer**: Any student who has several years of life and/or work experience and previous college coursework who returns to an institution of higher education and completes a postsecondary credential.

**Affordable baccalaureate**: The Texas Affordable Baccalaureate (TAB) program is a lower-cost affordable degree. As of 2015, the TAB program offers one program of study, Organizational Leadership. Tuition for this degree is $750 per term. Students are able to accelerate through as many courses per term as possible, provided they demonstrate mastery of the subjects. A student entering the program with no prior college credit should be able to complete the degree in three years for between $13,000 and $15,000.

**Competency-based education**: Competency-based education is a flexible way for students to get credit for what they know; build on their knowledge and skills by learning more at their own pace; and earn high-quality degrees, certificates, and other credentials that help them in their lives and careers. Students in these programs show what they know and how well they know it through multiple ways of evaluating their learning. This is another choice for learning offered at some institutions, through a variety of programs, with full support to help students when needed.

**Co-requisite courses**: Courses required to be taken at the same time

**Economically disadvantaged**: High school students are identified as economically disadvantaged if they receive free or reduced lunch while attending high school. College students are identified as economically disadvantaged if they receive PELL at any time while earning their degree.

**Guided pathways**: A structured plan that clearly delineates the requirements and sequence of a program of study.

**Marketable skills** (as used in this plan): Those [skills] valued by employers that can be applied in a variety of work settings, including interpersonal, cognitive, and applied skill areas. These skills can be either primary or complementary to a major and are acquired by students through education, including curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities.
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