October 11, 2017

TO: Academic Senate Members

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

RE: Academic Senate Meeting

The Academic Senate will depart from their usual meeting schedule. On Wednesday, October 18, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. in the TI Auditorium, ECS South 2.102.

Please bring the agenda packet with you to this meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at x4791.
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Larry Redlinger
Gene Fitch
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Naomi Emmett, SC President
JW Van Der Schans, SG
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AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
October 18, 2017

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

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   Murray Leaf

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 16, 2017 Meeting
   Murray Leaf

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT
   Murray Leaf

5. Presentation: Campus Update
   Calvin Jamison

6. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates
   Serenity King

7. TXCFS/FAC REPORT
   Drs. Leaf & Cordell

8. Student Government Report

9. CEP Recommendations
   Clint Peinhardt
   A. 2017 Course Inventory- Undergraduate
   B. 2017 Course Inventory- Graduate
   C. Re-Entry or Re-Application for Master Students
   D. Additional Information about Repeating Graduate Courses
   E. Revision to UTDPP 1052
   F. Admissions Consideration for Applicants with Three-Year Undergraduate Degrees

10. Interim Report from the Steering Committee for the Strategic Plan
    Richard Scotch

11. FY 17 Annual Committee Reports
    David Cordell

12. Updates to Committee on Committee Recommendations
    Murray Leaf

13. Adjournment
    Dr. Benson
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 CAUCUS & SENATE MEETING
September 20, 2017

Present: Richard Benson, Hobson Wildenthal, Inga Musselman, Robert Ackerman, Elizabeth Bell, Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia, Andrew Blanchard, Patrick Brandt, Thomas Brikowski, Mathew Brown, Monica Brussolo, Jonas Bunte, R. Chandrasekaran, Nadine Connell, David Cordell, Chris Davis, Greg Dess, Vladimir Dragovic, Eric Farrar, Todd Fechter, Andrea Fumagalli, Lev Gelb, Gopal Gupta, Michele Hanlon, Julie Haworth, William Hefley, Jennifer Holmes, Joe Izen, Dohyeong Kim, Murray Leaf, Mehrdad Nourani, Simeon Ntafos, Catherine Parsoneault, Alexis Piquero, Ravi Prakash, Suresh Ramakrishna, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Christopher Ryan, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson, Murat Torlak, Andrea Warner-Czyz, Tonja Wissinger, Alejandro Zentner


Visitors: Colleen Dutton, Kim Hill, Serenity King, Jennifer McDowell, J. W. Van Der Schans, May Jo Venetis

1. Call to Order for September Academic Senate Caucus Meeting
Vice Speaker Murray Leaf called the meeting to order at 1:01 PM. He explained the reasons for the Caucus. Speaker Redman has submitted his resignation.

2. Consideration of the Resignation of Speaker Tim Redman
Richard Scotch moved to accept the resignation of Speaker Tim Redman. Andrew Blanchard seconded. The motion carried.

3. Vote on the Interim Speaker of the Faculty
David Cordell nominated Murray Leaf as Interim Speaker of the Faculty, to complete the term of Speaker Redman. Greg Dess seconded. Murray Leaf accepted the nomination. There were no further nominations. David Cordell moved to approve Murray Leaf by acclamation. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.

4. Objectives for 2017- Murray Leaf
Speaker Leaf stated that he would assure that the Academic Senate will become more involved in the strategic plan process. Speaker Leaf would also like the Academic Senate to address issues relating to intellectual property and institutional conflict of interest.

5. Adjournment of the September Academic Senate Caucus Meeting
There being no further business, Speaker Leaf adjourned the meeting at 1:08 PM.
6. **Call to Order for September 2017 Academic Senate Meeting**
   President Benson called the meeting to order at 1:20 PM. He opened the floor to questions. A question was raised regarding when the final offer letters would be available. President Benson responded that finances continue to be a concern on campus. As stated previously, there is a significant shortfall in both tuition and formula funding from the state, but a 2% raise pool was created. He turned the floor over to Colleen Dutton.

   Colleen Dutton provided an update on the provost search, which has attracted 100 applicants. The search committee reviewed 40 applications, from which 14 were selected for airport interviews. Next month four finalists will be brought in for final interviews. The search committee for the Vice President of Research has not met yet, but will meet within the next week. The committee has received 70 applications, among which 26 were deemed to represent reasonable candidates. So far there are 82 applicants for the ECS Dean position, and 30 are deemed to represent reasonable candidates.

7. **Approval of the Agenda**
   Richard Scotch moved to approve the agenda with the following amendments: 1) move ‘Item 15 – Senate Nominees to Interview Provost Candidates’ to follow the Student Government report, 2) add a short presentation on Green zone training following the presentation on the Hoax Bomb Threat, 3) add authorization of an email vote to approve the resolution commending former Speaker Tim Redman’s work with the Academic Senate. R. Chandrasekaran seconded the motion. The motion carried.

8. **Approval of the August 16, 2017, Minutes**
   Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes with the following amendments: 1) in Item 13 the statement “Bill Hefley approved the charge with a minor editorial amendments,” was corrected to “Bill Hefley moved to approve the charge with a minor editorial amendments,” and 2) the attendance record was corrected to indicate that Murray Leaf was in attendance. Bill Hefley seconded. The motion carried.

9. **Speaker’s Report – Murray Leaf**
   1. Murray Leaf was voted as the Interim Speaker of the Faculty during the Senate Caucus.
   2. Murray Leaf appointed Ravi Prakash as Vice Speaker.
   3. All other item are on the agenda.

10. **Presentation: Hoax Bomb Threat – Chief Larry Zacharias**
    Chief Larry Zacharias gave a presentation on the details and follow up on the Hoax Bomb Threat that occurred on the campus this summer. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation is in Appendix A.

11. **Presentation: Green Zone Training – Archie Nettles**
    Archie Nettles, the Student Program Coordinator for the Military and Veteran Center, gave a presentation to the Academic Senate on upcoming Green Zone Training. Flyers were distributed to those in attendance.
12. Presentation: How are Classrooms Assigned– Jennifer Holmes
Registrar Jennifer McDowell gave a presentation on the process and procedures that the Registrar’s office goes through to assign rooms for each semester’s classes. A copy of her PowerPoint presentation is in Appendix B.

13. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Updates – Serenity King
Serenity King gave a presentation on where the university was in the recertification process, and the submitted recertification report. She congratulated the faculty for having all the documentation they requested readily available to her office.

14. Texas Council of Faculty Senates and UT System Faculty Advisory Council Reports- David Cordell
There have been no TXCFS or FAC meetings since the last Senate meeting. TXCFS and FAC will meet separately in October.

15. Student Government Report
No representative was in attendance and no report was forwarded.

16. Senate Nominees to Interview Provost Candidates- Murray Leaf
Murray Leaf, Alex Piquero, Richard Scotch, Ramaswamy Chandrasekaran, and Viswanath Ramakrishna were recommended as faculty representatives to interview Provost candidates.

17. CEP Recommendations
   A. Undergraduates taking Graduate Courses
      There are three options for undergraduate students taking graduate courses, including the following maximum numbers of hours: 1) 12 hours that can be taken for undergraduate credit only, 2) 12 hours that undergraduate students can reserve toward a graduate degree, and 3) 15 hours that may be taken in a fast track program that can be applied to both graduate and undergraduate programs. Fifteen semester graduate level credit hours has been a hard limit for undergraduate students, but the previous policy’s language did not clearly state that the options could not be stacked. The language has been updated to prevent undergraduate students from taking more than fifteen credit hours at the graduate level. Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the amendments. The motion carried.

   B. Revisions to UTDPP1001- Academic Certificates
      The revisions only affect Academic Certificates. The revisions change the reporting requirements to the Registrar’s Office for undergraduate students, and to the Office of Graduate Studies for graduate students. The revisions remove the schools from certifying that students have completed the courses. This will also assist the university in accurately reporting to the Department of Education and SACSCOC. Clint Peinhardt moved on the behalf of CEP to approve the revisions to UTDPP1001. The motion carried.

   C. Informational: Spring FY 18 Pilot Program for Tuberculosis Testing for International Students
      The university expects 350 new international students for the spring 2018 semester, and there is a timing issue for required tuberculosis testing. The university will reopen from winter break on January 3, 2018, and classes will begin on January 8, 2018. This is a problem because reporting of test results takes four business days, and there are not four business days from
the school opening to the first day of classes. CEP recommended that a pilot program be instituted in which students will be allowed to register, but if they test positive, they will not be allowed to attend class. Student Affairs will intervene if there are any positive results. Following this pilot program, the procedure will be reviewed for fall 2018. The Senate concurred without a formal motion.

18. Resolution on the revised Regent’s Rule 31006: Academic Workload – Murray Leaf
   Richard Scotch moved to approve the resolution commending the Regents' initiative, see appendix C. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.

19. FY17 Annual Committee Reports – David Cordell
   David Cordell moved to accept the submitted annual reports in appendix D. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried.

20. Updates to Committee on Committee Recommendations – Murray Leaf
   Bill Hefley was recommended to replace Sean Cotter on the Student Fee Advisory as a member. Julie Haworth was recommended to replace Jessica Murphy as a member of the Committee on Faculty Mentoring. Li Zhang was recommend to replace Robert Wallace as a member of the Program Review Committee. Dohyeong Kim was recommended to replace Robert Wallace as Vice-Chair of the Program Review Committee. Michael Burton was recommended to replace Lee Bulla on the Institutional Biosafety & Chemical Safety Committee as a member. Pia Jakobsson was recommended to replace Josef Nguyen as chair of the Library Committee. Richard Scotch was recommended to replace Kenneth Brewer as a member of the Academic Calendar Committee. Robert Ackerman moved to approved all the Committee on Committees’ recommendations. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried.

21. Student Disciplinary Pool – Murray Leaf
   Joe Izen moved to approve the addition of Bill Hefley, Carie King, and Michele Lockhart to the Student Disciplinary Committee Pool. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

22. Email Vote on a Resolution of Appreciation for Former Speaker Tim Redman
   Richard Scotch offered to draft a resolution of thanks and appreciation for Speaker Redman's service. Robert Ackerman moved to approve an email vote on the resolution. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.

23. Adjournment
   There being no further business, Richard Scotch moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:00 PM. David Cordell seconded. The motion carried.

APPROVED: ___________________________  DATE: _____________

Murray Leaf,
Speaker of the Faculty
Hoax Bomb Threat – June 27, 2017

• Call received by police dispatch nonemergency number at 2:01 p.m.
  • Caller advised there were bombs placed around campus
  • Spoke with an accent and identified himself as Akmed
  • Demanded $10,000
  • Stated the bombs would explode in 30 minutes
  • When pressed for more details by the police dispatcher, the caller hung up

• Dispatcher immediately notified her supervisor who in turn contacted
  Lt. Karl Zuber and Lt. Ken MacKenzie

• Lt. MacKenzie listened to the recording of the call and began efforts
to contact VP Dr. Jamison
Hoax Bomb Threat – June 27, 2017

• 2:12 p.m. All officers and public safety officers were instructed to conduct building checks
• Dr. Jamison contacted Lt. MacKenzie by phone and was briefed on the situation.
• Dr. Jamison contacted Dr. Benson and established a three way conference call.
• Dr. Benson made the decision to err on the side of caution and ordered an evacuation.
• 2:35 p.m. UTDALEKRT was sent
• 3:16 p.m. The “All Clear” text was sent.

Additional Activity

• Richardson Police Department was notified
• Richardson Fire Department was notified
• The DART Police Chief dispatched two bomb dogs to UT Dallas
  • Chief Zach disregarded the dogs prior to their arrival
• Representatives from Administration and the Office of Communications reported to the police department to better coordinate decisions and actions.
• Dallas FBI contacted and initiated a trace on the phone number
  • Were able to trace it to California, but all indications were that a spoofing application was used
• Chief received an email from the North Texas Fusion Center offering assistance
“Emergency on UTD campus. Avoid area, evacuate campus OR GO TO UTD PARKING LOTS AWAY FROM BUILDINGS DO NOT GO TO PARKING GARAGES. When safely away, check utdallas.edu for details. 2:33pm 6/27/17”

This is what we heard

• The text message was unclear and confusing
  • Do I leave my building or do I leave campus
  • Don’t go to the parking garages, but my car is there and I need to evacuate
• We thought it was a test
• We thought it was weather related and went to the basement
• It didn’t tell us what was going on, why evacuate?
• Traffic was horrible and no one was helping.
• An officer told me it was ok to go back into JSOM, but we did not get an “all clear”
This is what we heard

- Why didn’t you state it was a bomb threat?
- We were told that ROC and WSTC are not part of the main campus.
- The fire alarms were not activated.

Self Assessment of the Event – Lessons Learned

- The UTDALEERT was confusing and not succinct and clear
- Officers were in buildings with little evidence of what to look for
- Officers should have assisted with pedestrian and vehicular traffic
- Additional information should have been sent via UTDALEERT as well as utilization of the building speakers.
- Need additional information at several levels in the organization on bomb threat assessment
- Campus-wide evacuations cause major disruptions which require further action assessments to be more effective in any future event.
Articulated Changes for Future Events

- Better threat assessment utilizing known protocols
  - Handout
- Clarity in message
  - “This is an emergency. Evacuate all buildings. Evacuate immediately.”
- Repeat this message using the Fire Alarm speakers.
- Issue additional text messages with additional or updated information
  - “The university has received a bomb threat by telephone, continue evacuations from buildings.”
- Officers and PSO’s will assist with crowd and traffic control. (Traffic could be less of problem if the message is more direct)
- Fire Alarms?
How Classrooms are Assigned

Jennifer McDowell
University Registrar

Classroom Facts

• # Lecture Classrooms (110)
  □127
• # Labs (210,220)
  □67
• # Buildings on Campus with Classrooms
  □29
Numbers

- 9.5% increase in number of 110 rooms since 2016
- Fun exercise
  - If we ran 127 classrooms for the hours of 8am-10pm M-F, we would have approximately 8,900 hours of available classroom space.
  - This fall we had approximately 2,300 lecture sections with rooms assigned.
  - Assume all at 3 credit hours, UTD would need approximately 6,900 hours of classroom space
  - Leaving approximately 2,000 hours of available classroom time
- Not that simple!
  - Seating capacity
  - Room layout
  - Instructor preference
  - Meeting patterns
  - Pedagogy
  - Degree requirement conflicts

Classroom Utilization Software

- Ad Astra
- 21 Years in Business
- Leading software for classroom utilization
  - Algorithm considering many factors
  - Ability to assign priorities
    - Appropriate instructor preferences
    - Appropriate classroom preferences
    - Seat fill
- Other Texas schools
  - UTA, UTT, UofH, Texas Tech, UTEP
- The more preference information that we can input into the software regarding rooms the better the utilization will be.
- Access given to key departmental faculty and personnel. Access available on request.
Classroom Utilization

• THECB Reporting
  - 75% Seat Utilization of enrollment total for fall term
  - 38 hours of instruction per week
• Labs
  - Assigned by departments
  - 25 hours of instruction per week

Classroom Scheduling Process

• All class scheduling dates are shared with departmental scheduling contacts and available publicly on registrar intranet.
• Schedule of Classes is rolled from like term
  - Lab rooms are rolled
  - Some lecture rooms are rolled by request
    - Must meet 75% utilization
• Draft schedules are sent to departments for review
  - Departments can request for “early optimization” to assign rooms designated departmental priority
• Once final drafts are complete, classroom optimization occurs.
UT Dallas Classroom Optimization

- Lecture classrooms
  - 96 priority assignment to departments
  - 31 general use
- Optimization process
  - Optimize into school’s region with projected 75% seat fill for enrollment
  - Optimize into open lecture rooms with projected 75% seat fill for enrollment
  - Optimize into open lecture rooms while lowering percentage of seat fill
  - Manual review and placement by Office of Registrar
- At the end of optimization, approximately 100 classes that do not have rooms. Request departments move class day or time.

Fall 2017 Review

- Includes both Lecture and Lab scheduled hours
- Wednesday highest scheduled day, Friday least scheduled
- 52.75 hours scheduled on Saturday
- TR meeting pattern most popular
Resolution on Regents Rule 31006 Academic Workload Requirements

Whereas the current University of Texas System Regents’ Rule 31006 Academic Workload Requirements is overly prescriptive and does not adequately reflect the varying academic missions of UT System institutions; and

Whereas the Amendments to that Regents Rule that have been proposed by Faculty Workload Task Force and distributed on August 31, 2017 by the University of Texas System Office of Academic Affairs would provide greater flexibility to UT System institutions to develop workload policies more aligned with their missions and programs and more reflective of the diverse programs and professional standards within each campus;

The Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas hereby enthusiastically endorses the adoption by the Board of Regents of the Proposed Amendments as drafted, and is committed to working with the University’s leadership to develop a specific UT Dallas policy should the proposed revisions be adopted.

9-13-17
May 22, 2017

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Edward J. Harpham
Chair, Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Annual Report of Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee 2016-17

I. Membership
The membership of the [Committee Name] consists of:
Edward J. Harpham (chair),
Elizabeth Boyd,
Young Ryu
Bart Ryprla
Carl Sechen
Michael Tiefelsdorf
Mark Spong
Toni Stephens
Kim Laird
Sanaz Okhovat
Dennis Guten
Raviteja Lingineni
Kevin Parag Desai
Nate Howe, ex officio with vote
Frank Feagans, RUO

In addition, the following individuals have regularly attended and participated in the meetings of the committee as reflected in the minutes:

II. Meetings
November 11, 2016
December 2, 2016
February 24, 2017
March 24, 2017
May 22, 2017
**Actions Taken**

Until last year, this committee has been largely inactive for a number of years. There are a number of reasons for this inactivity. Harpham was appointed chair in January 2016 to fill a position that had been empty for some time. The Senate mandate for the committee was outdated, not reflecting the separating out of the offices for information security and information resources. Leadership in the office of OIT also was undergoing transition for a 15 month period.

Last spring the committee began regular meeting again, sorting out its roles, duties and responsibilities. Chair Harpham went to the Senate securing a new policy charge for the committee reflecting the new institutional structure affecting Information Technology at the university.

This year the committee focused attention upon establishing lines of communication with the Office of Information Technology that would provide input into the development and implementation of policies regarding information technology development at the university. Regular reports from leadership in OIT (including the newly appointed OIT vice president Frank Feagans) have put the committee in a position to assist and advise OIT in planning and policy matters. Information regarding information technology problems and bottlenecks was gathered from members of the committee and passed along to appropriate OIT.

**III. Recommendations for Following Year**

1) Expand and formalize activities as a conduit between the faculty, professional staff, and OIT regarding IT matters present and future at the university as demanded by the committee’s new charge. The committee sees itself playing a central role in informing OIT as to pressing concerns and problems relating to OIT throughout the university.

2) Schedule 3 meetings for each semester next year.

3) Provide advice to OIT for long-term planning purposes, particularly in light of new strategic planning being formulated by the president.

4) The Committee believes that OIT should formally report to the Academic Senate regarding the present problems facing the development of information technology at UT Dallas in light of the new strategic plan being developed by the president.

**IV. Supporting Documents: attached are the minutes from the committee’s meetings.**
Addendum: Additional Committee Suggestions for Annual Report 2016-17

- Integration of dining options around campus in a dedicated smartphone app that gave info like menus, hours, specials, locations (apart from the website)
- Adding parking space sensors to surface lots
- Improved wifi coverage in campus outdoor gathering spaces
- Develop training facilities, perhaps within the individual schools, and the soft- and hardware infrastructure to design professional blended and full-online courses (JSOM is leading here, but they do it only within their school).
- Provide sufficient training and information opportunities to the UTD community to keep up with technological developments on campus and its related policy revisions.
- Fully document the legal ramifications and protections of using UTD’s email accounts for university business and private correspondence. E.g., FERPA, open records request, requests by law enforcement and border security to view email accounts etc.
- Explore the possibility of developing a campus-wide parking spaces management system for vehicles entering the campus (the garages already provide some information, however, it is not on the level that is available, for instance, at DFW airport).
- Increase use of Duo 2-factor protection to include high-risk PeopleSoft pages and Outlook Web Access email portal.
- Facilitate the installation of system and application patch updates, which often directly reduce vulnerabilities
- Take over operations and development for Shibboleth federated identity management.
- Replace legacy identity management software supported by Oracle with replacement system; Microsoft Identity Manager has been selected as the replacement system.
- Ensure that backups occur and are verified to work.
- Greater network segmentation to isolate valuable systems to only necessary connections.
- Produce and maintain current network diagram(s).
- Implement Virtual Desktop Infrastructure model to replace traditional desktop workstations.
- Develop a mobile app which all people on campus will want to use for various benefits.
- On-campus Help Desk presence.
- Allow faculty, in consultation with their department’s tech support staff, to quickly and efficiently order the precise laptop and desktop configurations that their research demands. Faculty need access to the full catalog of options, including (ideally) from more than one vendor.
- Computing inventory must be revamped. Upon purchasing receiving a computing item, the purchaser must be permanently recorded as the inventory holder in a database. The purchaser can later request that items be removed from the database if they are sold (with the new owner so recorded), rendered obsolete, and so forth.
Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes

November 11, 2016

Present: Edward Harpham (H & Dean), Elizabeth Boyd (ATEC), Young Ryu (JSOM), Bart Rypma (BBS), Carl Sechen (ECS), Michael Tiefelsdorf (EP), Mark Spong (EC & Dean), Toni Stephens (Audit), Kim Laird (Administration), Sanaz Okhovat (Research and Compliance), Jay Silver (Staff Council), Raviteja Lingineni (Student), Kevin Desai (Student), Gabe Cavasos (Office of Research)

Next meeting: December 2, 2016, 1:30 pm to 2:30 pm, Cecil and Ida Green Center Conference Room 2.216D

1. Announcements

Dr. Harpham discussed what this meeting is for and what the focus is. He discussed the name of the committee and the decision has been made to remove the “Security” from the title of the committee hence forward the name is now the Information Technology and Planning and Policy Committee. He discussed that the purpose of the committee is gather representatives from every area of the university to collaborate and network about topics, problems, and ideas that can be further communicated to upper level management that will align with their strategic plans as they make Information Technology decisions. He expects the reps to be open and express their concerns and issues so that he may push the topic up to the provost office for them to know what is going on in the community.

2. Discussion

Brian Dourty, Interim Information Technology Officer discussed four main issue areas regarding information technology planning; Organization, FY17 Budget, Projects, and Challenges. Below you will find a brief summary of the categories.

- Organization

First round of interviews for a new CIO went well, and they are targeting to make an offer no later than winter break. Also AVP Scott Willet has submitted his resignation; he has accepted a position at UT SIS. Shannon Cepica was named interim AVP. The search for a new AVP will begin after appointing a new CIO for UTD. Also there were 4 Associate directors added to OIT roster. 2 in EAS for PeopleSoft related activity, and 2 under system and operations. The 2 for system will be used for network infrastructure and admin teams and the other will be used for adding more responsibility for Information Security as they progress with the position. Part of the OIT team was moved to the Admin building to assist in departmental requests concerning desktop issues as they occur throughout the university.

OIT has 7 positions open, plus the 140 employees currently working and 60 student workers. As the university grows they will be needing their positions filled and as one position vacates they will reevaluate that position to make sure that they are utilizing it to the best of its abilities to help suite the operations of OIT. Decentralizing the position to create two or more positions to help with the volume of the work load is one of his examples for position
before an offer is made. OIT headcount has diminished because they have lost a lot of people to UT SIS. Resource planning will be important in this area.

The OIT operations and Capital budget is searching for sustainability.

Workloads has created a backlog and they are trying to prioritize the backlog and get back up to speed with some areas. Finishing upgrades has created a difficulty. They are thinking what they can do to finish upgrades. Should they hire temps?

Howe has also discussed university wide communication has been a challenge but they are moving forward because they are now allowed to send out communication emails for outages and problems that have emerged.

3. General Discussion

Overall across the room, the committee has discussed how important this meeting was because they were unaware of some of the challenges OIT has been facing. Dr. Harpham has urged OIT to create a wish list and prioritize it based on its importance so they can formulate their findings to discuss with new CIO and President as they plan to make decisions. Dr. Harpham has offered a new meeting time for December 2nd 2017 at 1:00 – 2:30 pm. He has told the committee to put together their concerns, projects, and wish lists so that they can create a strategy to align it with President’s and CIO’s mission.
Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes
December 2, 2016

Present: Edward Harpham (Dean of Honors College), Elizabeth Boyd (ATEC), Young Ryu (JSOM), Bart Ryhma (BBS), Carl Sechen (ECS), Michael Tiefelsdorfi (EPPS), Toni Stephens (Audit), Kim Laird (Administration), Sanaz Okhovat (Research and Compliance), Jay Silver (Staff Council), Raviteja Lingineni (Student), Kevin Desai (Student), Gabe Cavazos (Director Office of Research Information Systems), Nate Howe (Director of Information Security), Stephenie Edwards (Awareness and Outreach Manager), Josiah Summerville (Accountant of Honors College)

Next meeting: TBD, Cecil and Ida Green Center Conference Room 2.216D

1. Announcements

Previous minutes were given to the committee to make adjustments if needed. Dr. Harpham would like the meetings to be a “proposal idea circle” that will aggregate the University’s short-term and long-term objectives and align it with the CIO’s and President’s objectives.

2. Discussion

- Nate Howe, Director of Information Security
  - Howe has requested to create a centralized Help Desk for Faculty and Staff by creating a help desk window staffed with knowledge-based customer service agents who can help resolve university-wide desktop issues. Once created, he wants to have the help desk’s location announced campus wide so employees are informed.
  - His concern is how to take everyone’s requests, combine them, and create a letter of proposed priorities that the university has agreed upon that will address problem areas in order to support students, faculty and staff.
  - In response to Nate’s concerns, Brian Dourty wants to ensure that the proposal aligns with the President’s plans to ensure the process runs smoothly.

- Brian Dourty, Interim VP and Chief Information Officer, discussed two initiatives his office is working on.
  - OIT is in the middle of implementing Zabbix, enterprise-level software designed for server status monitoring. This software will be used to stay up to date on server status and create a dashboard for any area that is operating slowly or having trouble. Zabbix will create operational reports such as network incident statuses, overall internet usage, and building-to-building internet usage.
  - Second initiative is to implement a software called Pager Duty. This software will be used as a notification system that will monitor infrastructure health and incident response. It will enable OIT to resolve outages for optimal service performance. Pager Duty will also discover any patterns or anomalies that can disrupt the server. The two initiatives are a safety net to notify employees quickly of server errors and to quickly eliminate server attacks if any occur in the future.
bus routes for students to reference. He has requested the app to include dining menus and any announcements that will pertain to the student body.

- Desai has identified multiple orphan domains of the University’s websites that may be out of date. Orphan domains can create a vulnerability in the system if the website is not secure enough. Dourty will reach out to web development to resolve the issue.

3. General Discussion

- Dr. Harpham discussed the agenda for the next meeting. Departments should discuss and request immediate needs for their area. The needs discussed in areas will be accumulated to make a formal request to the Senate to push political pressure to the president. Direct suggestions were made to the speakers of the committee in order to move forward in resolving their issues. The suggestions are listed below:
  - Nate Hove should define the functions of the requested centralized “Help Desk”. What will make the help desk expand and upgrade its qualities?
  - Cavazos will need to summarize his department’s issues and requests, and then email it to Summerville for him to incorporate these into the meeting minutes.
  - The committee will need to find the procurement policy that narrows the selections of devices to purchase, and submit a letter to the senate emphasizing how it is restricting the faculty’s functions and capabilities. High-end devices are important for Computer Science and Electrical Engineering.
  - Dourty should contact web development to discuss the inconsistencies in the orphan websites. The websites can have stale content and security vulnerability.
  - Last, Dr. Harpham has stated that he wants all departments to form an immediate wish list. The wish list will be collaborated into one agreed letter that will be sent to the University’s Senate.
Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes

February 24, 2017

Present: Edward Harpham (Dean of Hobson Wildenthal Honors College), Peggy Attari (OIT Associate Director), Shivani Narain (OIT Technical Team Lead), Gabe Cavazos (Office of Research Information Systems Director), Brian Dourty (OIT Interim CIO), Stephenie Edwards (Awareness and Outreach Manager of Information Security), Nate Howe (Director of Information Security), Brian McElroy (Security Engineering Manager of Information Security), Jean Vik (Associate Library Director for Systems), Michael Tiefelsdorf (EPPS Faculty), Chris Milazzo (Library Systems Analyst), Dennis Guten (BBS Systems Analyst), Ali Subhani (IT Audit Manager of Audit), Elizabeth Boyd (Lecturer ATEC), John McConnell (Systems Specialist ECS), Carl Sechen (ECS Faculty)

Next meeting: March 24, 2017, 3 p.m.– 4 p.m., Cecil and Ida Green Center Conference Room 2.216D

1. Announcements

   • Committee received previous meeting minutes to review, adjust, and approve. Committee has approved minutes. Dr. Harpham referenced how important it is to have the most relevant representatives available at the committee and/or council meetings. He would like to continue to have departmental issues discussed in meeting and flowing up to the Senate as much as possible.

   • Updates concerning new Chief Information Officer is coming soon. The potential candidates were able to have a public forum for university to engage and ask questions.

2. Discussion

   • Gabe Cavazos, Director of Office of Research Information Systems, updated the committee on his department's progress.

       o Office of Research has created data management plans, and they are in the process of creating quotes with third parties to resolve server infrastructure and data storage issues.

       o Mobile Device Management is making progress on IPad Mobile Device plans. Their goal is to secure all mobile devices across departments and divisions.

   • Nate Howe, Director of Information Security, had an update on the help desk topic.

       o On behalf of the users, Howe wants to have a point of contact that the university can reach out to resolve desktop issues. He wants the new CIO to make the decision on who the point of contact will be.

   • Carl Sechen (ECS) and John McConnell (ECSS) elaborated on their issues with procurement and Dell.

       o John McConnell (ECSS)
allow the user to reset their passwords without calling help desk. In addition, supervisors will not have to complete Sponsor Renewals every year. If we terminate the employee, the system will disable the employee’s access, and if the employee is new, the system will add the employee.

- This new update will reduce software support costs, administrative burden, and passwords resets. Verification process will be quicker, and it will interface with new employees’ applications.
  - IT will explore the option to use cell phones as a way to reset passwords in the system also.
  - When resetting the password the system will forward a verification code to your cell phone that will authenticate their identity.

- One of Dr. Harpham’s biggest worries is will the university be able to adapt to the upcoming changes? Will the process affect the privacy rights of the university employees’ email address? What will happen if the employees have only one email address?
  - OIT will be notifying every one of the massive change and will advise the university to add a personal email address to their comet account.
  - The help desk will continue to be open at normal business hours to resolve any password resets if there are people who have trouble with the new update.
  - If employees are using their UTD email to forward emails to their personal account, then it can be a FERPA issue, and if they are forwarding emails from their personal account to their UTD account, then it can a privacy issue for the employee. UTD expects its employees to keep their personal and business emails separate from each other.
  - OIT’s target date to implement the new change is March 15, during spring break. There will be a temporary system outage; it will give OIT enough time to implement the new changes, and go live.

3. General Discussion

- Peggy Attari (OIT Associate Director) expressed the idea of considering a Lean University Initiative.
  - A Lean University Initiative helps identify issues, develops plans to resolve issue, and implements resolution to improve efficiency and the needs of the university. UTD used this technique to resolve paper form checkouts. This resolution reduced time and labor for checkout approval and saved costs from using paper. Now checkout is electronic.

- Nate Howe notified the committee of the latest phishing attempt and reminded the committee to continue to be on the lookout for any phishing attempts.
  - He described a phishing email as having a non-official email address that employees cannot recognize. He said this phishing attempt was seasonal since it referenced W-2 during mid tax season.
Information Technology Planning and Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes

March 24, 2017

Present: Edward Harpham (Dean, Hobson Wildenthal Honors College), Gabe Cavazos (Director, Office of Research Information System), Brian Dourty (CTO, Office of Information Technology), Stephenie Edwards (Awareness and Outreach Manager, Information Security), Jean Vik (Associate Director, Library), Michael Tiefelsdorf (Faculty, EPPS), Chris Milazzo (Systems Analyst, Library), Dennis Guten (Web Developer BBS), Elizabeth Boyd (Senior Lecturer, ATEC), John McConnell (Systems Specialist, ECS), Carl Sechen (Faculty, ECS), Frank Feagans (CIO, Office of Information Technology), Sandy Farrar (Director, ATEC), Bart Rypma (Faculty, BBS), Raviteja Lingineni (Student, CS)

Next meeting: April 28, 2017, 3 p.m.–4 p.m., Cecil and Ida Green Center Conference Room 2.216D

Announcements

- Committee received previous meeting minutes to review, adjust, and approve. Minutes approved. Harpham referenced the importance of communicating across campus as the committee continues to move further into its initiative and agenda. He encouraged the representatives to spread the word if this committee applies to other offices.

- Harpham introduced the new CIO of Office of Information Technology, Frank Feagans, and transferred the attention to Feagans to introduce himself and share OIT’s priorities.

Discussion

- Frank Feagans, CIO for Office of Information Technology:
  - Feagans received his Bachelor’s Degree in Computer Engineering and Master’s Degree in Computer Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Before UTD, he worked at The University of Arizona as Director for Central IT Services. Before applying to the CIO position, Feagans was the AVP for Enterprise Applications.
  - Feagans saw the problems UTD was experiencing with the Oracle PeopleSoft System; he found it suitable and interesting to apply to the vacant CIO position.
  - Feagans priority is to stay aligned with UTD’s vision of having strong communication and contact with the university’s departments.
  - He expressed his five priorities to be Research Support, Digital Enterprise, Student Experience, Third-Party Licensing, and strong Core Services.
  - OIT will have the last budget meeting. Feagans has read over the committee’s previous meeting minutes and it looks like everyone is facing the same problems budgetary wise. It is very important to create a budget model that enables the significant areas as the university continues to grow.
feedback from the forums, and Dourty wants to know if there is any other areas of interest for OIT to explore. The Forums do not have to be very technical every session and the forums should be an all-inclusive experience for the audience.

- The Net-ID Management System update was partially successful. Feagans and Dourty discussed that there were some hurdles during the implementation and they had ran out of time while overcoming them. They did implement a new PeopleSoft bundle upgrade, but their main problem is having a testing environment that is not identical to their production environment. OIT will plan accordingly and communicate the new date to retry the implementation.

- Jean Vik (Associate Library Director of Systems) had concerns on the Net-ID system implementation.
  - Vik wanted to know if any changes would happen with Alumni Net-IDs. Will alumni accounts be a part of the migration?
  - Dourty has assured Vik that there will be no changes to Alumni and they are a part of the migration.  
  - Harpham emphasized how important it is to allow alumni relevant access to the system. Alumni play an important part in gifts for the university, and we will need ways to contact them.

- John McConnell briefly announced that the rollout of Last Pass was successful but their challenge is teaching the end-user how to use it for their benefit.
  - Dourty included his recent experience at an OIT event with a staff member who had trouble logging into the system because they did not know how to use DUO, an identity authentication software for Faculty and Staff.
  - Dourty and Feagans took note of adding a technological education training for Faculty. Feagans sparked the idea of using a mobile-front end on Web-Ex that will simplify the identity verification process for end-users.

**Conclusion**

- Harpham has issued a homework assignment for everyone to create a brief paragraph of his or her own department’s grievances. Harpham will summarize the minutes and grievances into a letter for the senate.
  - Since the committee does not make decisions or policies, we have to communicate to the senate in order for them to understand what we need.
  - Feagans advised the committee to quantify how a tweak to the system will save time and/or money. For example, the experience with Dell is unpleasant and in order to bring true attention to the problem, we have to quantify the issues that occur after working with the vendor. If we do not quantify how Dell costs us money, the Senate will view the grievances as “whining”.

May 12, 2017
To: The Academic Senate
From: Susan Chizeck
       Chair, Library committee


Membership:
In attendance: Susan P. Chizeck - IS (Chair), Ellen Safley (Dean of Libraries), Robert Ackerman - S, Jonas Ente - EPPS, Lawrence Chung - ECS, Richard Golden - S, Pia Akobsson - AH, Suriya Janakiraman - SOM, Lindsay King - NSM, Jessica Murphy - AH, Josef Nguyen - ATEC, Dmitry Rachinsky - NSM, Maximilian Schich - ATEC (co-chair), Amy Walker - ECS, Ben Wright - AH

Absent: Nina Baranchuck - SOM, Idean Salehyan - EPPS, Tyler Ortega (SOM student).

Meeting: February 3, 2017

Actions and Discussions

Clarify mission of the library committee: The mission of the library committee is to be a conduit of information between the library and the faculty and other constituencies. We bring issues up to the administration and advise on policy. We also bring Information back to the departments, explain policies and bring back feedback.

Director's Report, Dr. Ellen Safley, Dean of Libraries - Highlights

New chat service staffed by librarians open all library hours.

Students can check out laptops, calculators, and digital cameras, as well as books. Also equipment for the sight-impaired is available.

There is in-house use of textbooks for core undergraduate courses.

Interlibrary loan can generally deliver articles in less than 11 hours.

Dissertations are now only in digital format, from 2017 onward.

Collection Statistics
Usage of print resources holds steady and online sources expanding. Electronic format is more expensive and may not be permanent. Subscribe to over 70,000 electronic journals. New can be added, first put on wish list to see demand. Moving to streaming media, and few requests for DVDs. Libraries cannot get Netflix or Hulu. Can make requests online or through library liaison.
Renovation Activities:
- Library is extremely noisy, so a quiet study room has been added. People use library as social space.
- Have an advisory group of students, the McDermott Student Advisory Group.

Space Concerns
- Study space has high demand, especially for electrical plugs. Students often sit on floor to be near a plug. Rewiring old building difficult.
- Desperately need to expand shelving space, as 6000 print volumes added each year. Inadequate storage and space for collections.
- Mechanical Engineering has taken over large space on third floor, for several years.
- Possibility of relocating some special collections and archives to SPN.
- Current group study rooms booked 100% of the time (11 a.m. to 11 p.m) by students.

Staffing Concerns
- Library has several open positions. Hiring library professionals is difficult due to our salary scale. Current professionals spread thinly to cover high demand for services.

Library Instruction Activities
- In addition to teaching library research techniques for many course assignments, this department now teaches 3 online courses (undergraduate library research skills, graduate library research skills, and Health Informatics) through the School of Interdisciplinary Studies.
- Students know much less about information resources than they think. Courses requiring library research should schedule information sessions. Loreen Henry is the liaison. [Note: my students were quite unfamiliar with resources in the physical library as well as online.]

Impact of Expanded Hours
- A year ago, the library added 24:5 and weekend hours, resulting in 51,000 people exiting the building between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m., a very high usage. A valid Comet Card is needed to enter the building after 11 p.m.

Faculty Author Reception
- Held each year to celebrate new book publications, so contact the library to be included. Reception this year is April 13 at 4 p.m. in the McDermott Suite.

Other Discussion topics
- Very important: Concept of the moving wall: People do not understand that electronic access to journals and other materials is time-limited and even though we have paid for a given year, it disappears in a few years and can only be accessed if archives are repurchased. What is
available to users for free depends on large UTD and UT System payments. Academic material is not easily available on a cellphone.

**Recommendations for Following Year**

Put in bookdrops near NSERL area to facilitate return of library books.

To support a Tier One university, library needs more space, particularly controlled climate storage space. - possibility of archive space for rare books in SPN area

Educate users about library holdings, which change due to digital holdings

Educate users as to the payment structure for holdings, which are ephemeral unless on paper

Requests for books, journals and databases can be made to Dean Safley or departmental library liaison

Access: active students, faculty and staff have both on site and remote access

Alumni and community users can come to the library to use materials
May 31, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Academic Council

FROM: Judy L. Barnes, Director of University Events


1. Membership

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

The voting members of the Commencement Committee included two members of the faculty, Kathryn Evans (School of Arts and Humanities) and Francesca Filbey (School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences); and two student representatives including the President of Student Government Akshitha Padigela, and Undergraduate Student, Nancy Fairbank (UG-EPPS).

Non-voting members included: Director of University Events, Judy Barnes (Chair); Speaker of the Faculty, Tim Redman (Vice Chair); University Registrar and Director of Academic Records, Jennifer McDowell; Associate Vice President for Business Affairs, Rick Dempsey; Dean of Undergraduate Education, Andy Blanchard; Dean of Graduate Studies, Marion Underwood; Chief of Police, Larry Zacharias; Bookstore Manager, Rawn Johnson; Dean of Students, Amanda Smith; Media Services Representative, Darren Crone; Alumni Relations Representative, Melinda Mendoza, Office of Communications, John Walls (replaced Kamrhan Farwell) and Rena Piper, Event Manager from the University Events. [Attendance report attached.]

2. Meetings

Two meetings of the Commencement Committee were conducted during the 2016-2017 academic year. A meeting held on September 23, 2016 where we discussed the Spring, 2016 ceremonies results and upcoming Fall, 2016 ceremonies. [Meeting agenda and minutes are attached.]

The second meeting of the Committee was held on January 26, 2017 to discuss Fall, 2016 results and in preparation for the Spring, 2017 commencement ceremonies. [Meeting agenda and minutes are attached.]
AGENDA

I. Welcome
   a. New Committee Members

II. Review of Spring 2016 Commencement
   a. 7 Ceremonies
   b. New: entry way, orator, gonfalons on top stage, registrar hand diploma cover

III. Fall 2016 Commencement
   a. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers
   b. 7 Ceremonies – 4 Friday and 3 Saturday
   c. Dates—December 16-17
   d. Countdown to Commencement—September 27

IV. Discussion
   a. Keepsake regalia—bachelor and masters
   b. Staging—ramp to side
   c. Student Speakers—Deadline October 31 (automated...eLearning)
   d. Challenges—parking, construction
   e. One Commencement and school-based ceremonies
   f. Miscellaneous
Commencement Committee
September 23, 2016

MINUTES

I. In attendance: Judy Barnes, Darren Crone, Kamrhan Farwell, Melinda Mendoza, Rena Piper, Kathryn Evans, Akshitha Padigela, and Nancy Fairbank

II. Welcome

   a. New Committee Members

III. Review of Spring 2016 Commencement

   a. 7 Ceremonies

   b. New: entry way, orator, gonfalons on top stage, registrar hand diploma cover

IV. Fall 2016 Commencement

   a. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers

   b. 7 Ceremonies – 4 Friday and 3 Saturday

   - With Hooding taking place Thursday evening.
   - Due to timing, schedule has been set and approved. All agreed with set schedule.

   c. Dates—December 16-17

   - All agreed on dates for ceremonies.

   d. Countdown to Commencement—September 27

V. Discussion

   a. Keepsake regalia—bachelor and masters
- New regalia will be phased in for the fall semester and moving to spring being the only approved regalia.
  
b. Staging—ramp to side
  
c. Student Speakers—Deadline October 31 (automated...eLearning)
  
d. Challenges—parking, construction
  
e. One Commencement and school-based ceremonies
  
- SG students still voice interest in having several commencements vs. one
  
f. Miscellaneous
  
- SG students requesting tossing of caps at the end of each commencement ceremony. Barnes will run idea by President for input/approval.
AGENDA

I. Welcome

II. Review of Fall 2016 Commencement
   a. 7 Ceremonies—statistics
   b. New: President, regalia, record faculty participation (A/H, ATEC, BBS), new carpet, military surprise.

III. Spring Commencement
   a. Dates—May 10-13
   b. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers
   c. 8 Ceremonies -- four recommendations
      • Hooding day/time—Wednesday at 1 pm
      • Honors day/time—
      • Ceremony days/times
   d. Propose to President and Provost
   e. Countdown to Commencement—February 14, 2017

IV. Discussion
   a. Student proposal—toss hats
   b. Regalia enforced
   c. Student Speakers—Deadline: March 24, 2017
   d. Miscellaneous
Commencement Committee
January 26, 2017

MINUTES

I. In attendance: Judy Barnes, Andy Blanchard, Darren Crone, Rick Dempsey, John Walls, Rawn Johnson, Jennifer McDowell, Amanda Smith, Marion Underwood, Larry Zacharias, Kathryn Evans, Francesca Filbey, Akshitha Padigela and guests Sai Saripella and Mareze Crone

II. Welcome

III. Review of Fall 2016 Commencement

   a. 7 Ceremonies--statistics

   b. New: President, regalia, record faculty participation (A/H, ATEC, BBS), new carpet, military surprise.

   Regalia sales went really well and the new regalia was well received. Dr. Blanchard inquired what the maximum on the stage is and Judy stated that 45 was pushing it, but 50 would be the absolute Max. Jennifer stated that it does not leave a lot room for people to move back that way.

   Wireless access did not work but Darren's team will work on it.

   Web trends. Visits (going to the website) and views (actually viewing the video) was up 30%.

   Do we still want to do CD's? Ron stated that they are not part of HighEd but they do get a lot of calls regarding the CD's. Darren's team will look at what they can do.

IV. Spring Commencement

   a. Dates—May 10-13

   b. Initial Application and RSVP Numbers
c. 8 Ceremonies -- four recommendations
  • Hooding day/time—Wednesday at 1 pm
  • Honors day/time—
  • Ceremony days/times

  - Dr. Underwood Inquired if we can do graduate and undergraduate ceremonies for ENCS. Judy will ask Dr. Spong and look at previous year’s statistics.
  - Dr. Underwood prefers option 1. It is more family friendly.
  - Dr. Blanchard likes that honors and hooding is on a separate day, it makes it more special.
  - Student government inquired if it would be more rushed. Judy and Dr. Underwood ensured that it is never rushed and would be the same as usual.
  - Student government inquired if we can check public school’s calendars. Judy noted that her observation is that attendance numbers are low for children. Dr. Underwood stated that she would recommend that people pull out their kids for such a special occasion. Amanda stated that she worked in a public school and they encouraged children to attend graduations.
  - Dr. Underwood stated that if honors is at 10am then it would be okay for hooding to be at 1pm, however, if honors move to 11am then hooding would need to be moved to 2pm.
  - Judy stated that no Saturday would benefit RO. Jennifer stated that either way, we will be there.
  - Dr. Blanchard stated that instead of convenience, we should look at tradition. With honors and hooding being isolated on one day, that makes it more special. He also like to look at the long term.
  - Kathryn stated that if the goal is to get more students to attend then looking at the statistics it seems as if attendance drops on Saturdays and the last one on Fridays. Earlier is better.

d. Propose to President and Provost

  - Judy want to propose two options. Agreed that the first two options without ceremonies on Saturdays will be presented.

e. Countdown to Commencement—February 14, 2017
V. Discussion

a. Student proposal—toss hats

- *Dr. Benson asked for time to think about it. Judy went through the dangers.*

b. Regalia enforced

- *We need to put language out there. Ron stated companies are targeting students and they are buying regalia they can’t use. He also stated that there will be a drawing to give away 2 sets of regalia.*

c. Student Speakers—Deadline: March 24, 2017

d. Miscellaneous
Spring 2017 Commencement Ceremony Options
Honors, Hooding +8 Ceremonies
(NOTE President selected highlighted option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am Honors</td>
<td>9am #1</td>
<td>9am #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30am #2</td>
<td>11:30am #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm Hooding</td>
<td>2pm #3</td>
<td>2pm #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30pm #4</td>
<td>4:30pm #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am Honors</td>
<td>9am #2</td>
<td>9am #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30am #3</td>
<td>11:30am #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm Hooding</td>
<td>2pm #4</td>
<td>2pm #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30pm #1</td>
<td>4:30pm #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am Honors</td>
<td>9am #1</td>
<td>9am #4</td>
<td>9am #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30am #2</td>
<td>11:30am #5</td>
<td>11:30am #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm Hooding</td>
<td>2pm #3</td>
<td>2pm #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am Honors</td>
<td>9am #3</td>
<td>9am #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30am #4</td>
<td>11:30am #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm Hooding</td>
<td>2pm #1</td>
<td>2pm #5</td>
<td>2pm #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30pm #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Director of University Events (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>Dean of Undergraduate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>Media Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Dempsey</td>
<td>Associate VP for Facilities Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Kamrhan</td>
<td>Farwell</td>
<td>Office of Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Office of Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Rawn</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Bookstore Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>University Registrar and Director of Academic Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Mendoza</td>
<td>Alumni Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Rena</td>
<td>Piper</td>
<td>Event Manager - University Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Redman</td>
<td>Speaker of the Faculty (Vice Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Interim Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Underwood</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Zacharias</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Faculty Appointment (A&amp;H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Francesca</td>
<td>Filbey</td>
<td>Faculty Appointment (BBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Ashitha</td>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>Student Representative (Sr. NSM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Akshitha</td>
<td>Padigela</td>
<td>Student Government President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Fairbank</td>
<td>in lieu of Ashitha Mathew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest</td>
<td>Sai</td>
<td>Saripella</td>
<td>in lieu of Nancy Fairbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest</td>
<td>Mareze</td>
<td>Crone</td>
<td>Office of the Registrar (in lieu of Rena Piper)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 20, 2017

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Rashaunda Henderson
Chair, Committee on the Support of Diversity and Equity


I. Membership
The membership of the Committee on the Support of Diversity and Equity consists of: [Rashaunda Henderson-Chair, Meghna Sabharwal-V. Chair, Kim Knight, Toyah Miller, Lloyd Dumas, Kimberly Hill, Orlando Richard, Rym Zalila-Wenkstern, S. Starnaman, Mandy Maguire, Jillian Round, Erin Smith, Abby Kratz, Sherry Marek, Eloise Square, Melissa Palmer, Carrilaine Schneckner, Daniel Hernandez, Letitia Andrews, Jane Shipman, Yue (Selina) Gu, Jazzmyn Wilson, Annette Rogers].

The following people would like to be removed from the committee. Some have recommended replacements.

Kim Knight - Josef Nguyen
Sherry Marek – no suggestion
Kimberly Hill – Manual Martinez
Eloise Square – no suggestion

II. Meetings
2016 – August 26, September 30, October 21, November 18, December 20 (meeting with President Benson)
2017 - March 24, April 21, April 28 (Town Hall), May 26

III. Highlighted Actions Taken

1. During the 2016-2017 calendar year we met with President Benson (December 2016) to introduce the committee and discuss the results of the 2015 Survey. 5 members of the committee involved in the analysis of the quantitative (Likert scales, etc.) and qualitative (open-ended questions) presented a summary of findings about the survey. We made President Benson aware of our intent to collect additional information by having a separate Town Hall meeting.
2. The website has been updated with the survey link (on Qualtrics) and presentation that was given to President Benson. Website: https://www.utdallas.edu/diversity/partners/SupportCommittee.html
3. We held a Town Hall meeting on April 28 during lunch-time and presented
results from the survey to interested attendees from faculty and staff. We had approximately 50 attendees and used an online tool (slido) to capture real-time questions and responses to two specific survey questions. We polled the audience on participation in a Fall Focused Session event and the top 5 priorities that the University should be facing as it relates to Diversity and Equity.

IV. Recommendations for Following Year

Our first meeting in Fall 2017 is scheduled for Friday 9/8/17.

We plan to have a focus group session on September 22, 2017.

We plan present results from the survey (Spring 2015), Town hall meeting (April 2017) and upcoming focused group meeting (September 2017) in October 2017 (either 10/2 or 10/16) to the President’s council/cabinet. Dean Fair (RUO) will advise us on this effort.

V. Supporting Documentation

Meeting agendas.
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
September 30, 2016, 11:00 a.m-1:00 p.m.
Arts & Technology Building – Conference Room (ATC) Bldg., Room 1.201

1. Opening remarks by Rashaunda Henderson
2. Introductions
3. Climate Survey Discussion
   a. Suggestions for current draft
   b. Timeline for survey report (Originally proposed dates to meet with President Benson – 10/21 or 10/28) - November 11th or 18th
   c. Recommend to shift dates after Inauguration
4. New Business
   a. Report to President Benson
   b. Future plans for committee
   c. Next meeting
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
October 21, 2016, 11:30 a.m-1:00 p.m.
Arts & Technology Building – Conference Room (ATC) Bldg., Room 1.201

1. Opening remarks by Dean Fair & Rashaunda Henderson

2. Introductions

3. Climate Survey
   a. Draft 5 discussion – Finalize by December 2/9
   b. Finalize date to meet President Benson
   c. Committee Report – RM Henderson

4. New Business
   a. Future plans for committee
   b. New Business
      i. Kim Knight - LEAP Committee has been working on a handout for LGBTQIA Diversity in the Classroom, Set up Webex at each meeting
      ii. Diversity in the Classroom Workshops – follow-up to Dr Stanley's talk
   c. Next Meeting November 18

Actions
- Erin (update to Actions)
- Meghna (update appendices to include gender and race)
- Rashaunda (draft of committee report)
- Dean Fair (to contact President Benson’s office for a meeting on 12/2 or 12/9)
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
November 18, 2016, 11:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
Arts & Technology Building – Conference Room (ATC) Bldg., Room 1.201

Actions

• Erin (update to Actions)
• Meghna (update appendices to include gender and race)
• Rashaunda (draft of committee report)
• Dean Fair (to contact President Benson’s office for a meeting on 12/2 or 12/9
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
March 24, 2017, 11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Synergy Park North Building (SPN) - Conference Room 1.111

1. Opening remarks by Dean Fair & Dr. Meghna Sabharwal

2. Approve minutes

3. Introductions

4. Old Business - Climate Survey
      i. 12/20/16 slides, Printed notes
   b. Plans for Survey Town Hall – We need help and subcommittee volunteers
      i. Logistics: Location for ~100 people, facilitator, order refreshments, proposed
dates: 4/28 (12-1:30pm).
      ii. Advertisements and invites: See attached invitation draft (similar to CTL or
event brite), send electronic invitation by 4/7
      InterCom - [Items must be submitted to the Intercom editor a week before the
Intercom distribution date, generally the second and fourth Wednesdays of
each month.]
      UT Dallas News Center - [If you have an idea for News Center coverage, contact
the Media Relations department.]
      iii. Content: Present 3 Big challenges from survey, Current Recommendations,
Progress towards survey comments (ERGs, Accessibility, etc.)
      iv. Sign-up sheets for future focus group
   c. Update survey website with content – We need help and volunteers to update webpage
with useful links from other universities, etc.
      i. Post presentation given to Dr. Benson as pdf by 3/30

5. New Business
   i. President Benson’s strategic plan – ST4: Diversity and Inclusion
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
April 21, 2017, 11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Synergy Park North Building (SPN) - Conference Room 1.111

1. Opening remarks by Dean Fair & Dr. Rashaunda Henderson

2. Approve minutes

3. Introductions

4. Old Business - Climate Survey
   a. Plans for Survey Town Hall – We need help and subcommittee volunteers
      i. Logistics: Location for ~100 people, facilitator, order refreshments, proposed dates: 4/28 (12:1-30pm – Founders North, Kusch Auditorium, Room 2.102 FN).
      ii. Advertisements and invites: Emails went out, Selina mentioned at Staff Council; Do we estimate a number for food/drinks, details, etc? Do we add flyers around campus?
      iii. Content: Present 3 Big challenges from survey, Current Recommendations, Progress towards survey comments (ERGs, Accessibility, etc.)
      iv. Polling – Letitia, Rym and Daniel; Sample questions
      v. Sign-up sheets for future focus group
   b. Update survey website with content ✔ – James Dockery and ODCE completed. Continue updating webpage with useful links from other universities, etc.

5. New Business
   i. Recent issues on campus - Do you know which office/committee receives reports of such incidents on our campus and maintains these records?


   ii. President Benson’s strategic plan – ST4: Diversity and Inclusion
AGENDA
Committee for the Support of Diversity and Equity
May 26, 2017, 11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Synergy Park North Building (SPN) - Conference Room 1.111

1. Opening remarks by Dean Fair
2. Approve minutes
3. Introductions
4. Old Business – Town Hall Discussion
   a. Update survey website with content
   b. Make plans for group focus session early fall
5. New Business
May 26, 2017

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Karen Huxtable
Chair, Committee on Effective Teaching


I. Membership
The membership of the Committee on Effective Teaching consists of:
Karen Huxtable Chair (BBS)
Vince Ng Vice-Chair (ECS)
Shelby Hibbs Committee Appointee (A&H)
Sean McComber Committee Appointee (ATEC)
Gregg Dieckmann Committee Appointee (NSM)
Galia Cohen Committee Appointee (EPPS)
Angela McNulty Committee Appointee (IS)
Rebecca Files Committee Appointee (JSOM)
Jonathan Schueler Student Appointee
Pramukh Sai Atluri Student Appointee
Simon Kane Technical Expert
Darren Crone Technical Expert

RUO
Paul Diehl Associate Provost

Ex-Officio members:
Andrew Blanchard Dean of Undergraduate Education (UG ED)
Marion Underwood Dean of Graduate Education
Natalie Ring Associate Dean UG ED (A&H)
Eric Farrar Associate Dean UG ED (ATEC)
Melanie Spence Associate Dean UG ED (BBS)
Simeon Ntafos Associate Dean UG ED (ECS)
Sarah Maxwell Associate Dean UG ED (EPPS)
Tonja Wissinger Associate Dean UG ED (IS)
Marilyn Kaplan Associate Dean UG ED (JSOM)
Dennis Miller Associate Dean UG ED (NSM)

II. Meetings
The committee met 6 times, on October 6, November 15, January 27, February 24, March 24, and April 28. The subcommittees for the Regents’ Outstanding Teaching Awards and the President’s Teaching Awards met separately in January and March.
III. Actions Taken

1. *The competitions for all University level teaching awards will be managed by the Committee. It will forward its recommendations for award winners to the President.*
   a. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) now manages the process of creating award categories (for President and Provost approval), soliciting award nominations, creating awards selection committees, identifying evidence of teaching effectiveness, and running committee meetings. CET was consulted for approval on these guidelines and procedures. CET members are encouraged to promote development of new teaching awards in their schools.
   
   b. A subcommittee of four members of CET served on the committees that solicited nominations and selected candidates who were put forward for the ROTA and five President’s faculty and TA Awards.

2. At our first planning meeting, committee members expressed concern about students’ general levels of preparedness for achieving course goals even in entry-level courses. Students come to campus unprepared for note-taking or identifying the main ideas in a passage of text, lacking life skills and ability to solve their own problems, and generally lacking a common culture. Addressing these deficits in the first year already seems too late.
   
   a. CET suggested that CTL develop a workshop to address these issues. In February, Dr. Cirulli Lanham presented a workshop for faculty and TAs called *They Get Younger Every Year! The challenges of teaching and reaching Millennials.*
   
   b. Jonathan Schueler suggested that CET develop a plan to promote informal faculty-student relationships/mentorships to help students feel connected. Various plans for matching volunteer faculty members with groups or lists of students were considered. Members of Student Government have agreed to take on this idea next year and will work with CET to develop a plan.

3. *The Committee will receive annual reports from each individual School Committee on Effective Teaching and will facilitate and evaluate the work of the School committees. The Committee will forward the individual School reports and its summary evaluation report annually to the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost).*
   
   a. CET worked with the Provost’s Technology Group to send reminders about best practices for end of semester student evaluations of teaching (SET) to all faculty. A number of faculty members responded with concerns about the validity and usefulness of SET. To address these concerns, CTL has received approval from the Provost for a Task Force on SETs for next year.
   
   b. We will follow the same procedure for requesting information from the deans as we did last year.

The questions we asked were as follows:
1. Does your school have a standing Teaching Effectiveness Committee? If yes,
   a. Who appoints the members?
   b. How often does it meet?
   c. What is the charge of the committee?
2. Which instructors are evaluated by your school’s Teaching Effectiveness Committee?
3. When are the evaluations conducted?
   a. How often are instructors evaluated if they have priority?
   b. Are instructors evaluated if they do not have priority (e.g., tenured faculty)? If so, what is the schedule for that?
   c. How is the evaluation included in or connected to the annual review, third year, and tenure evaluation process?
4. By what methods are instructors evaluated (i.e., which tools, measures, or methods of observation are used)?
   a. What course materials are examined (e.g., syllabus, exams, assignments, student artifacts)? Please specify.
5. Who conducts the evaluations? How are members of the evaluation committee selected?
6. How are evaluation results communicated to the instructor (i.e., what is the feedback process)? Please indicate timing of feedback and whether it is formative or summative.

Responses from the Deans or their designees are attached, as received throughout the spring semester (Appendix A). Replies were received from BBS, IS, JSOM, ATEC, EPPS, and NSM.

4. The Committee will create and refine procedures for the training of and monitoring of the teaching effectiveness of graduate teaching assistants.
   a. CET members agreed to suggest more intensive and targeted orientation sessions for graduate TAs in August within their schools. CTL will work closely with ATEC, AH, and NSM to develop their TA orientations and follow-up programming.

5. The Committee will receive complaints about and requests for improvements in the teaching environments on campus and pass on recommendations for improvements to the University administration.
   a. A complaint was made by Dr. Angela McNulty about Classroom Buildings 1 and 2. Ongoing problems with dead rodents and larger animals and the resulting smell has caused a sometimes overwhelming bad smell. This concern was immediately forwarded to the Academic Council and Senate.

6. The Committee will encourage and review the funding of projects in the use of new technology and new teaching methods, both on campus and by transmission to
remote sites. It will also advise the University administration and Academic Senate on ways to ease the transition to "the high tech classroom."

a. We have forwarded the existing rubric used for peer evaluation of online teaching to Dr. Darren Crone. His team will review the form and make recommendations, if needed, for modification or for how it may be used most effectively.

7. As part of the general requirement to improve awareness of new ideas and new technologies, the Committee will occasionally invite renowned speakers to give seminars on campus.

a. CET suggested that CTL invite cognitive psychologist Dr. Stephen Chew to offer faculty and TA workshops in February. These were very well received. Next year's speakers will include Robert Duke, Linda Hodges, Jay Howard, and Therese Huston.

8. Committee members expressed concern about providing greater support for Lecturers. Committee members suggested that UT Rio Grande Valley and Richland Community College both offer good models that we can examine for ideas. Similarly, we can look into providing greater support for faculty of all ranks who are new to UTD, and consider providing regular opportunities for interaction among faculty across schools.

a. A Lecturer Needs Survey will be created and distributed by CTL to identify what supportive programming lecturers would welcome as well as when and how it should be offered. An essential aspect of distributing this survey will be identifying and continually updating the names and schools of all part-time and full-time Lecturers. CET members agreed that this also will be handled by CTL.

IV. Recommendations for Following Year

1. Student participation in this committee is valued, but students appointed by SGA do not always attend CET meetings. Next year and in the future, CET will request replacement representatives if students' schedules interfere with their ability to participate.

2. Other CET members have expressed a desire to participate in all meetings, but scheduling sometimes interferes with classes and other obligations. This is the case for committee appointees and for associate deans. Now that CTL has meeting space in the library, CET will meet on the first Friday of every month from 12-1pm. Lunch will be provided by CTL.

V. Appendices

Responses from BBS, IS, JSOM, ATEC, NSM, and EPPS are appear below.

Responses were not received from ECS nor AH.
BBS

1. Does your school have a standing Teaching Effectiveness Committee? Yes
   a. Who appoints the members? As specified in the BBS Bylaws (approved 9/5/14) the Dean appoints the Chair of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee, and the Dean appoints the other members of the TEC in consultation with the Chair. Each year the Dean will appoint the Chair of the Teaching Effectiveness Committee, and members of the committee will be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Chair for one year terms, renewable.
   b. How often does it meet? Face-to-face meetings are scheduled as needed; in recent years the committee has agreed to conduct most of its meetings via email, to reduce the travel burden for members housed primarily in locations other than on the main campus in Richardson.
   c. What is the charge of the committee? The TEC is charged with conducting systematic evaluations of teaching to be communicated to the faculty member and relevant administrators. The TEC prioritizes evaluations to ensure that evaluations of T and TT faculty are available in the early fall of the year of their promotion review.

2. Which instructors are evaluated by your school’s Teaching Effectiveness Committee? Instructors at all levels can be and have been evaluated by the TEC, but evaluations of T and TT instructors have priority, as described below.

3. When are the evaluations conducted? The TEC schedules evaluations of T and TT faculty according to those who will be reviewed for promotion the following year to ensure that at least two teaching evaluations are available for inclusion in the candidate’s portfolio at the time of the promotion review.
   a. How often are instructors evaluated if they have priority? At least twice in the year prior to their review.
   b. Are instructors evaluated if they do not have priority (e.g., tenured faculty)? If so, what is the schedule for that? Review of tenured faculty is not conducted on a set schedule, but rather is contingent on the need for such reviews and the number of other priority reviews being conducted in a given year.
   c. How is the evaluation included in or connected to the annual review, third year, and tenure evaluation process? Evaluation reports (co-signed by the TEC member and the faculty member, who may add comments prior to signing the report) are disseminated to BBS associate deans and to the head of the faculty member’s BBS area; reports also
are included in the portfolios of T and TT candidates for review and/or promotion for consideration by the ad hoc promotion review committee.

4. By what methods are instructors evaluated (i.e., which tools, measures, or methods of observation are used)? In October of 2014, the TEC voted in favor of a proposal by its Chair at that time, Professor and Associate Dean Marion Underwood, to conduct classroom observations using one of two forms required by the UT System Regents; I’ve attached these (Example A: “Peer Observation for Formative Assessment of Teaching” and Example B: “Classroom Observation Form”). After completing the observation form the observer and instructor meet within a few weeks to discuss and co-sign the form (with additional comments from the instructor if requested).

a. What course materials are examined (e.g., syllabus, exams, assignments, student artifacts)? Please specify. Observers review syllabi posted on Coursebook and also request materials such as exams, assignments, and slides presented during class sessions.

5. Who conducts the evaluations? How are members of the evaluation committee selected? The Chair and members of the TEC consult to distribute an equal number of evaluation assignments to each member of the TEC, based on factors including availability, interest, and avoiding having more than one report by a single observer.

6. How are evaluation results communicated to the instructor (i.e., what is the feedback process)? Please indicate timing of feedback and whether it is formative or summative. Feedback is formative and is provided in a face-to-face meeting between the instructor and the evaluator. At this meeting they review the printed copy of the evaluation report and discuss or clarify the evaluator’s comments. The instructor then has the opportunity to add comments to the report, after which the instructor and the evaluator sign and date the report.
School of Interdisciplinary Studies Committee on Effective Teaching Report
4/19/17

Submitted by Erin Smith, Chair

The School of Interdisciplinary Studies (IS) has a standing Teaching Effectiveness Committee. It was convened in the fall of 2013 as the Peer Teaching Evaluation Committee to establish a system for annual peer observations / assessments of teaching. The 5 members (from IS and the Teacher Development Center) volunteered for service on the committee at a School faculty meeting. The committee was charged with researching systems of peer evaluation at other institutions, creating a program for peer observation/assessment, producing a training/orientation presentation about the assessment process, and piloting the program in the spring of 2014. The committee met four times in the fall of 2014, twice in the spring of 2014, and roughly once a year since then to maintain / assess the program. The program of annual observations continues, with changes to accommodate feedback from participants.

Evaluations involve every participating instructor being observed by a peer once a year and also serving as a peer observer for a colleague once a year. Most observations occur during the spring semester. This system spreads the work and time commitment necessary to do good assessment widely, rather than concentrating it in the hands of a few committee members. In addition, it gives all participating instructors a sense of ownership and investment in the process. Most observers report that they learn as much from the process as the instructor being observed. They also find that the time commitment to do one observation each year is reasonable.

Participation in the peer evaluation program is voluntary for everyone—tenured, tenure-track, and full-time non-tenure track. We put all instructors (that is, T and NTT) in the same pool because of the small number of faculty in IS. Assignments of peer observers are based on schedules, content areas, and disciplines (the approaches and methodologies of Interdisciplinary Studies instructors range widely). These assignments change each year. The committee chair informally accommodates instructors’ concerns about awkward collegial relationships (based on rank or friendships, for example). We cast these annual peer observations/assessments as one part of a larger teaching portfolio that might include student evaluations, self-evaluations, voluntary additional peer observations, videotaped classes, statements of teaching philosophy, etc.

The observations/assessments involve: (1) a brief pre-observation meeting the week before the mutually agreed-upon class to observe; (2) the classroom observation; and (3) a post-observation meeting to discuss the written report of the classroom observation. By mutual agreement, the pre- and post-observation meetings can be by phone or skype. Observers are required to use one of two University-approved forms (Form A or Form B), although many chose to add additional materials (most commonly a narrative of what they observed in the class).

At the pre-observation meeting, the instructor provides the syllabus, course readings and materials for that day of class, and discusses any pedagogic challenges or concerns. Observers do not assess student artifacts or exams, although they do have copies of all assignments and course materials for the class period observed.

Post-observation meetings involve a brief discussion of the written report of the class observation, which the instructor receives at least 24 hours before the meeting. These meetings occur in the week following the observation. Both instructor and observer sign
the report, and it is submitted to the Dean’s office. Instructors who wish to append a
response or additional materials are encouraged to do so. These reports and discussion
are largely formative—that is, feedback to guide improvement in teaching. However,
instructors can include these reports in their portfolios for promotion, where they serve a
more summative purpose as evidence of teaching excellence.
Peer observations/assessments were required in the spring of 2014 (12 IS instructors
participated), and participation was voluntary in subsequent years. 6 instructors
participated in 2016-17. Although participation is voluntary, lecturers who wish to apply
for promotion are required to submit peer observations from the prior two years as part of
their portfolios. Tenure-track and tenured faculty evaluations as part of third-year,
tenure, and promotion reviews are separate from this peer observation system, and are
undertaken by two members of the review/promotion committee (mostly tenured faculty
from Schools outside IS). Observation/assessment reports are reviewed by the Dean as
part of the annual review process.
At the urging of the Center for Teaching and Learning, Interdisciplinary Studies is setting
up an award for teaching excellence, to be awarded for the first time in the 2017-18
school year. A 4-person committee of volunteers was formed at a February faculty
meeting to establish the application process and criteria for the award. That committee
had its first meeting in April of 2017 and is circulating a proposal to the larger faculty
this spring.
1. Does your school have a standing Teaching Effectiveness Committee? Yes
   a. Who appoints the members?
      The Dean
   b. How often does it meet?
      Once or twice in fall and once in spring.
   c. What is the charge of the committee?
      This is a SOM standing faculty committee which reviews the quality of teaching in the School’s programs and makes recommendations for improvement. It is also responsible for the selection of the School's annual Teaching Excellence Award recipients.

2. Which instructors are evaluated by your school’s Teaching Effectiveness Committee?
   Faculty that are being evaluated for promotion and faculty that are nominated for teaching awards. Those nominated for teaching awards are recommended by the Area Coordinator and students.

3. When are the evaluations conducted?
   a. How often are instructors evaluated if they have priority?
      Candidates for promotion have classroom evaluations done twice by two different above rank faculty. All others are evaluated by the Area Coordinator and Dean during annual evaluations. Primary information used is student evaluations, class size and type of course taught.
   b. Are instructors evaluated if they do not have priority (e.g., tenured faculty)?
      If so, what is the schedule for that?
      Classroom evaluations are conducted as they are needed, i.e., if we identify issues with a particular instructor/course that require further attention. Evaluations are done annually using student evaluations, class size and type of course taught.
   c. How is the evaluation included in or connected to the annual review, third year, and tenure evaluation process?
      Classroom evaluations are considered in the evaluation of teaching in the third year, tenure and full professor promotion cases.

4. By what methods are instructors evaluated (i.e., which tools, measures, or methods of observation are used)?
   a. What course materials are examined (e.g., syllabus, exams, assignments, student artifacts)? Please specify.
      The committee evaluates teaching based on student evaluations and comments, course syllabi, diversity of courses taught and periodic classroom evaluations.

5. Who conducts the evaluations? How are members of the evaluation committee selected?
Above rank faculty conducts classroom observations and evaluations. Members of evaluation committee are selected by the chair of the committee in consultation with the area coordinator.

6. How are evaluation results communicated to the instructor (i.e., what is the feedback process)? Please indicate timing of feedback and whether it is formative or summative.

Classroom evaluations are communicated back to the instructor via the forms provided by the Provost’s office for documenting classroom evaluation. Annual evaluations of teaching are communicated back to the faculty again using the forms for annual evaluations.
ATEC

Hello Karen,

I’m trying to find answers to the questions. As you now, ATEC is a new school, and many policies and procedures are not yet in place or well established. I’ve asked on of the ATEC Associate Deans to fill in what ever information we have. I’m hoping by next year we will be able to borrow and implement some of the best practices that your committee identifies.

Anne Balsamo

NSM

Dear Karen,

I had thought I had already answered this email. Unfortunately, as it stands currently, we do not have a committee on teaching effectiveness. This will be rectified in the near future.

bruce
Bruce M. Novak, PhD
Dean, School of Natural Sciences & Math
The University of Texas at Dallas
Richardson, TX 75080--3021
bruce.novak@utdallas.edu
972-883-2416
1. At the moment we have no TEC. At the current time there is nothing in our bylaws that requires one, but we plan to change the bylaws to require such a committee. We did have a functioning TEC at one time from the late 1990s to about 2010, however as the faculty in EPPS expanded it became impossible for the members of the TEC to keep pace with evaluations. For that reason, the work of the committee was delegated to the program heads (see below). As we recognize the need to reestablish a TEC for EPPS, we will examine what we consider to be best practices of those Schools currently operating with a TEC and consult with them as necessary. However, in order to avoid similar problems as experienced in the past, we expect the program heads will continue to play a lead role.

2. NA

3. NA

4. Even though we do not have a TEC, we do conduct regular evaluations of faculty. These evaluations are done through the regular third year and promotion and tenure process whereby members of the third year and p and t committees evaluate the in-class performance of instructors through classroom visits, and assessment of teaching performance using subjective observational assessment. Similar assessments are performed by the individual program heads for selected instructors, including a mix of senior lecturer, tenure-track and tenured faculty done on a yearly basis as part of the annual performance review. The evaluations are conducted by at or above rank faculty of colleagues, with those conducting the evaluations selected by the program head in consultation with the associate program head and faculty. All results are communicated in writing and in person to the instructor or faculty member being reviewed.

5. See Number 4 above

6. See Number 4 above

Denis J. Dean, Ph.D.
Dean of the School of Economic, Political and Policy Science
Professor of Geography and Geospatial Information Science
TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Richard Scotch, Chair

RE: Annual Report for Advisory Committee on the University Budget

DATE: August 31, 2017

The Budget Advisory committee members (listed below) met on November 10, 2016 to discuss committee activities for the 2016-2017 academic year. It was agreed to build on the committee’s previous faculty salary studies with a review of salaries for non-tenure system faculty. The data were subsequently provided by Blair Flicker from the Provost’s Office, and an analysis was conducted by Committee Vice-Chair Serfling. Results of the analysis will be presented to the committee at its first meeting in the 2017-2018 academic year and subsequently reported to the Academic Senate.

The Committee invited Vice President for Budget and Finance Terry Pankratz to a meeting on December 8, 2016 to review the university’s budget process, as well as financial trends and issues for the coming year. Vice President Pankratz presented the committee with a thorough summary of the university’s budget and related budgetary trends, along with a description of the budgeting process.

The Committee met again on January 26 with Associate Provost Paul Diehl, who directs the UTD Center on Teaching and Learning (CTL), to discuss the budgetary implications of the recent CTL report on the teaching implications of enrollment growth, which include demands for additional classrooms and laboratories, larger class sizes, and the prospects for additional online and hybrid courses.

On February 10, the Committee met with UTD Vice-President for Public Affairs Amanda Rockow to discuss the budgetary issues and prospects for the 2017 Texas Legislative Session. Issues discussed included the likelihood for future tuition and fee increases and the prospects for tuition revenue bonds.

On March 9, 10, 16, 27, and 31, representatives of the committee (including Chair Scotch and Vice Chair Serfling) participated in the School and Division annual budget hearings with President Benson and his cabinet along with President designate Benson (via Skype).

The Committee held its final meeting on April 21 for a discussion on the hearings and budget issues. Some issues that were proposed for Committee consideration in 2017-18 were the salary analysis for fulltime non-tenure system faculty, the budgetary implications of online and hybrid instruction, the growing need for security and infrastructure support, and the university’s indirect cost policies.

Members of the Advisory Committee on the University Budget for 2016-2017:

Drs. Richard Scotch (Chair), Robert Serfling (Vice-Chair), Lisa Bell, Walter Dowling, Rebecca Files, Robert Glosser, D.T. Huynh, Ramachandran Natarajan, Larry Overzet, Mark Rosen. Two non-members from the faculty, Kurt Beron and Maribeth Schlobohm, also regularly attended committee meetings, which are open.
TO: The Academic Senate
From: Michele Hanlon
Chair, Campus Facilities Committee

Subject: Annual Report of Campus Facility Committee, 2016 – 2017

I. Membership
The membership of the Campus Facilities Committee consists of: Michele Hanlon, Chair, Christopher Camacho, Ernest Hanning, Lucien Thompson, Dean Dennis Kratz, Dean Mark Sprong, James Harrington, John Cruz (student), Matt Grief (ex-officio), Patrice Holt (ex-officio), Ellen Safley (ex-officio)
Other ex-officio: Executive Vice President, Provost, Senior Director of Research Compliance, Assistant Vice President of Environmental Health and Safety, Director of Media Services, Assistant Vice President of Auxiliary Services, Associate Vice President for Business Affairs.
RUO – Vice President for Administration

II. Meetings
May 5, 2017: Orientation and introduction of new members. We discussed updates for the past year with regard to university growth, building facilities, sustainability, and security.

July 2017 (TBD): Upcoming – discussion and planning for SEC event.

III. Actions Taken
The Committee agreed to take part in a Service Excellence Campaign (SEC), designed to inform and educate the university community regarding the work done by facilities related services. The Committee will partner with the Office of Administration and Student Life services during welcome week. Planning for this event will be finalized during the Campus Facilities July 2017 meeting.

IV. Recommendations for Following Year
Engage the committee membership in the work done by facilities by educational contact with various facilities component directors.

Develop outreach to students, staff, and faculty regarding campus improvement needs.

Develop outreach to students, staff, and faculty via information and education re facilities operations at UTD.

V. Notes, Commentary, Supporting Documentation
Agenda for meeting on May 5, 2017:

Campus Facilities Committee Meeting Agenda: “One Campus. Our Campus”
Friday, May 5, 2017 – Happy Cinco de Mayo!
3:00 – 4:00pm

I. Introductions
II. Campus Updates – Dr. Calvin Jamison
III. Sustainability – Thea Hunt
IV. Service Excellence Campaign – Michele Hanlon
V. Subsequent Meeting Dates
VI. Open Discussion
VII. Adjourn
CEP is charged with approving all new courses and programs, as well as all changes to courses and programs. Additionally, we examine changes in language in the catalog and other academic policy issues that are referred by the Academic Council and/or Senate. I would like to note for the record how our work depends in large part on the work of the Registrar’s office and of the Provost’s office. Their professionalism this last couple of years has been outstanding, and they have made CEP’s work much easier, so I just want to make sure they get some credit!

During this academic year, we created a set of official bylaws. The bylaws clarify the mission of the committee, the responsibilities of the Chair and Vice-Chair, and various procedures, including advanced receipt of agenda items. CEP approved the new bylaws in our December meeting, and they have served to refocus our monthly agendas around substantive categories of our mission. I’ll use those same categories in my listing below.

While the full details are available in our minutes and those of the Senate, here is a summary of the agenda items we addressed this year.

(1) New Programs
a. M.S. in Financial Engineering and Risk Management (Aug)
b. M.S. in Social Science Data Analytics and Research (Sept)
c. B.A. in Philosophy (Oct)
d. M.A. in Art History (Dec)
e. B.S. in Human Resources Management (Dec)
f. Minor in Film Studies (Feb)
g. Certificate in Research Accounting (Mar)
h. Concentration on Business Analytics (Mar)
i. M.S. in Leadership and Organizations Development (May)

(2) Changes to Existing Programs
a. Name change: MS in Healthcare Management to MS in Healthcare Leadership and Management (Aug)
b. ATEC undergraduate and graduate program consolidations (Feb)
c. M.S. in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology – new concentration
d. Approved numerous undergraduate degree changes (Mar and May)
e. Approved numerous graduate degree changes (Mar and May)
f. Name change: BA in Art & Performance to BA in Visual & Performing Arts (Apr)
g. New CORE assessment plan (May)
New or Changed Courses

a. Approved 1 of 1 new graduate classes (Aug)
b. Approved 1 new graduate and 2 new undergraduate courses for Spring catalog (Oct)
c. Approved 223 of 223 graduate course additions, removals, and changes (Oct)
d. Approved 235 of 239 undergraduate course additions, removals, and changes (Oct)
e. Approved 6 of 6 graduate course additions in mechanical engineering (Dec)
f. Approved 132 of 132 undergraduate course additions, removals, and changes (Feb)
g. Approved 236 of 236 graduate course additions, removals, and changes (Mar)
h. Added courses that qualify for the CORE curriculum (Mar)
i. Approved 250 of 250 undergraduate course additions, removals, and changes (Mar)
j. Approved 205 of 205 graduate course additions, removals, and changes (Mar)
k. Approved 18 of 18 undergraduate course additions, removals, and changes (May)

Policy changes

a. UTDPP1075: New category of graduate assistants (Aug)
b. Added campus carry language to syllabus template (Aug)
c. English language proficiency requirements (Sept)
d. Admission requirements for 3-year degrees from international institutions (Sept)
e. UTDPP 1052- Section 4.5.2: Requiring 3 Voting Members from the Academic Program on Dissertation (Dec)
f. UTDPP 1052- Section 7.1: One vs 3 Semester Credit Hours in the final examination semester (Dec)
g. Requiring change of Majors Approval (Dec)
h. In Absentia and Change of Catalogue Year Policies (Feb)
i. Fast Track language in the catalog (Feb)
j. 1st year admission changes (Feb)
k. Transfer admission changes (Feb)
l. New Catalog Language on no transfer credit for WCEM Courses (Mar)
m. Changes to the undergraduate and graduate “first 40” policies (Apr)
n. UTDPP 1052: changes to transfer credit (May)

Additionally, the committee regularly received updates regarding the SACSCOC Assessment process and relevant proceedings in the state legislature, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and the Board of Regents for the UT-System.
Committee on Qualifications Annual Report to the Senate, 2016-2017 Academic Year

Members of the Committee:

Abdi, Herve (BBS)  
Ali, Ashiq (SOM)  
Channell, David (A&H)

Dufour, Frank (ATEC)  
Haas, Zygmunt (ECS)  
Hart, John (BBS)

Hooshyar, Ali (NSM), Chair  
Li, Dong (EPPS)  
Lowry, Robert (EPPS)

Malina, Roger (ATEC/NSM)  
Makris, Georgios (ECS)  
Rebello, Mike (SOM)

Waligore, Marilyn (A&H), Vice-chair  
Zhang, Chuanwei (NSM)

Review Activity for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of review</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>2016-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third-year, mid-probationary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure review &amp;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Assoc Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc to Full Prof</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside hires with tenure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall workload increased by about 9%, mainly due to the increase in number of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor reviews.

Meeting schedule, operating procedures, and workload:

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

CQ met as a committee on seven Fridays mornings: January 6, 13, and 20, and February 3, 10, 17, and 24. The expectation was that all CQ members read all the cases. Each CQ member was assigned one case to summarize per session, and one case to take notes on the CQ discussion. It takes several days to prepare for each weekly meeting. The chair merged the summary and discussion for a final report, which were usually one to two pages long. CQ considered the following factors for cases with tenure: (1) sufficient documentation to support the
recommendation for or against promotion; (2) independent letters from at least five external evaluators (independence was defined as not having a self-interested association with the candidate for promotion); (3) clear articulation of the strengths and weaknesses of each case; (4) school-specific guidelines; and (5) consistency within individual schools. Out of CQ’s 54 recommendations, the President and the Interim Provost concurred with 52 of the recommendations. On March 31 the Interim Provost met with CQ to discuss the recommendations for the other two reviewed cases.

**External hires with tenure.** CQ evaluates all external hires with tenure. These evaluations are conducted mostly via email because they are often time-sensitive. The CQ has imposed a 48-hour turnover to complete evaluations for urgent cases. For external hires whose need for deliberation is less urgent (as determined by the Provost), CQ has imposed a 96-hour turnover. For hires at the same rank (e.g., an Associate Professor from another institution hired as an Associate Professor at UTD), our operating procedures allow the CQ Chair to determine how many CQ member responses are sufficient; after expiration of the turnover time. This process accommodates unusual times for the hires (e.g., summer). For hires that involve a promotion (e.g., an Associate Professor hire as a Full Professor), eight affirmative votes (a majority) are required. However, thanks to our dedicated CQ members and availability of Internet, almost all cases have been reviewed with 92%-100% of CQ members participating. The types of external hires are listed in the table below.

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

**Observations and suggestions for improvements:**

It is estimated that each case requires about one hour. Up to 12 cases per week may be considered, which can require at least two full days per week. The chair probably spends double the time. As the university expands, so will the number of cases reviewed. In the not distant future, assigning academic workload credit to CQ members may need to be taken into consideration.

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

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

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

Even so, the rules were not always met. CQ is mandated to not seek additional information beyond what is provided. We have the option of not voting, but standing on such a principle has not been considered productive, especially since many of these hires were time-sensitive. This lack of deference to the arms-length rule seems to have started to propagate to some ad hoc committees too. In one case we even had a Dean note that the candidate’s file did not contain sufficient number of arms-length external review letters. However the Dean still had submitted the case to the Provost Office and CQ for review. The CQ had to return the file to the ad hoc committee for its completion. Such unnecessary delays are not fair to CQ and the candidates, since it may cause considerable delays in their tenure/promotions.

The followings are the issues that CQ finds are in need of improvement and CQ members recommend their implementation:

1. A check list page be included in any tenure/promotion file for indicating presence of all the needed documents, including at least five arms-length external letters. This should assist the respective Dean to quickly check a file for completion before it is sent to the Provost Office and CQ for further processing, or to return it to the ad hoc/search committee to obtain and include the needed documents before the announced deadlines.

2. The Provost Faculty review website contains the statistical summary of teaching for candidates under review. In addition to reporting student evaluations for courses taught by the candidate, another column needs to be added to this teaching summary that reports average GPA for the listed courses. It is true that this information is available in another part of the review website, but inclusion of it in the statistical summary of teaching will be more informative and will make it easier not only for CQ but also the ad hoc committees to better evaluate teaching effectiveness of a candidate.
3. CQ members believe it is very beneficial to have more information about what tier one schools consider as “excellence” in teaching when evaluating a faculty for tenure, and what measures do they use to arrive at such a designation. It is suggested that the “center of teaching excellence,” collect and provide CQ with such information.

4. CQ recommends its membership’s demographic mirror that of UTD’s Full Professor population in terms of gender and race/ethnicity.

A final comment concerns the participation of Dr. Joseph Pancrazio, who represents the Provost’s office at CQ meetings. He is not a voting member of the committee, and he does not participate in discussions, except to clarify matters of policy. Nonetheless, he has had an excellent impact on the quality of reviews within UTD. Also, Dr. Inga Musselman (Interim Provost) has continued to provide instructions to ad hoc committee chairs and candidates for promotion, with the result of higher quality information from both. She is very knowledgeable about CQ deliberations and historical reasons for existing procedures. It is felt that the conscientious efforts of Dr. Inga Musselman over the years have improved the review process by acting as an intermediary between the candidates for promotion, the ad hoc committees, and CQ. As a result CQ members continues to benefit from her vast experience and knowledge on CQ matters.
May 8, 2017

TO:  David M. Cordell, PhD  
     Secretary, The Academic Senate

FROM:  Christine Dollaghan, PhD  
        Chair, Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct

SUBJECT:  Annual Report of Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct, 2016–2017

I. **Membership**  
The membership of the Committee on Faculty Standing and Conduct consisted of Roderick Heelis (Vice-Chair), Thomas Brunell, Si Zheng, and Ram Rao.

II. **Meetings**  
As no faculty grievances or faculty conduct issues were referred to the Committee during the 2016-2017 academic year, no meetings were held.

III. **Actions Taken**  
None.

IV. **Recommendations for Following Year**  
None.

V. **Special comments/Notes/Supporting Documentation**  
None.
TO: The Academic Senate  
FROM: Rafael Martin  
Chair, University Research Integrity Committee  

SUBJECT: Annual Report of University Research Integrity Committee, 2016–2017

I. Membership  
Vice President for Research (Chair, ex-officio), Paul Fishwick (Vice-Chair), Marion Underwood (ex-officio), Stuart Cogan, Christine Dollaghan, Vijay Mookerjee, Thomas Riccio, Todd Sandler, Allan Sherry, Jason Slinker. Joseph Pancrazio represents the Executive Vice President and Provost (RUO).

II. Meetings  
December 7, 2016: general meeting to discuss policies and procedures  
March 30, 2017: special meeting to discuss a specific conflict of interest  
June 20, 2017: quarterly meeting to discuss policies and procedures, review progress from March 30 special meeting

III. Actions Taken  
The committee’s primary action is the review and approval of conflict of interest management plans. These reviews are conducted through panels consisting of two URIC representatives, and the appropriate school dean. 8 management plans have been approved in the current fiscal year.

The panel also serves as a corrective body should a researcher violate their management plan. The primary purpose of the March and June 2017 meetings was to review the corrective actions recommended by a review panel for a particular conflict of interest situation.

The committee also advises the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) on procedures, forms, and other items used in the implementation of UTD’s conflict of interest policies. The committee advised ORC on new policy trainings and conflict management documents at the December 2016 and June 2017 meetings. The policy trainings are now implemented campus-wide, and ORC has implemented the conflict management documents based on committee recommendations.

IV. Recommendations for Following Year  
The committee and ORC will focus on COI education targeted at graduate students. ORC is developing educational materials and training, and will work with Graduate Studies to implement this program.

V. Supporting Documents  
1. Meeting Agenda, December 7, 2016  
2. Meeting Agenda, March 30, 2017  
3. Meeting Agenda, June, 20 2017
Members
Bruce Gnade, Ph.D. (Chair)  Vice President of Research
Paul Fishwick, Ph.D. (Vice Chair)  Arts and Technology
Stuart Cogan, Ph.D.  Engineering and Computer Science
Christine Dollaghan, Ph.D.  Behavioral and Brain Sciences
Vijay Mookerjee, Ph.D.  Management
Joseph Pancraziio, Ph.D.  Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
Thomas Riccio, Ph.D.  Arts and Humanities
Todd Sandler, Ph.D.  Economic, Political and Policy Sciences
A. Dean Sherry, Ph.D.  Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Jason Slinker, Ph.D.  Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Marion Underwood, Ph.D.  Dean of Graduate Studies

Guests
Rafael Martin  Associate Vice President  Office of Research
Sanaz Okhovat  Assistant Vice President  Office of Research Compliance
Conor Wakeman  Conflict of Interest Manager  Office of Research Compliance

Time Meeting Convened: 2:04
Time Meeting Adjourned: 3:00

I. Introduction  Rafael Martin

II. Update on UTD Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policies  Rafael Martin
   a. Research Conflict of Interest (UTDPP1029)
   b. Outside Activity Policy (UTDPP1102)
   c. Revisions to COIC Policies

III. Management Plan Updates  Conor Wakeman
    a. FY17 Q1 COI Compliance Report

IV. Policy Trainings  Conor Wakeman
    a. COIC Policy Training for Faculty and Researchers
    b. COI Policy Training for Reviewers

V. Conflict Review Documents  Conor Wakeman
    a. Checklist for Conflict Management Plan Review
    b. Review for Related Research

VI. Action Items
I. Introduction

II. Conflict of Interest Determination – Walter Voit
   a. Notice of Conflict of Interest Determination
   b. Revised Management Plan
   c. Supporting Documentation

III. Conflict Investigation and Enforcement

IV. Management Plan Updates
   a. FY17 Q2 COI Compliance Report

V. Quarterly Meetings

VI. Action Items
University Research Integrity Committee  
The University of Texas at Dallas  
10:30-11:30 AM  
June 20, 2017  
Lone Star Conference Room [AD 3.104]

Members
Rafael Martin (Chair)  Interim Vice President of Research  
Paul Fishwick, Ph.D. (Vice Chair)  Arts and Technology  
Stuart Cogan, Ph.D.  Engineering and Computer Science  
Christine Dollaghan, Ph.D.  Behavioral and Brain Sciences  
Vijay Mookerjee, Ph.D.  Management  
Joseph Pancrazio, Ph.D.  Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost  
Thomas Riccio, Ph.D.  Arts and Humanities  
Todd Sandler, Ph.D.  Economic, Political and Policy Sciences  
A. Dean Sherry, Ph.D.  Natural Sciences and Mathematics  
Jason Slinker, Ph.D.  Natural Sciences and Mathematics  
Marion Underwood, Ph.D.  Dean of Graduate Studies

Guests
Walter Voit, Ph.D.  Associate Professor  Engineering and Computer Science  
Sanaz Okhovat  Assistant Vice President  Office of Research Compliance  
Conor Wakeman  Conflict of Interest Manager  Office of Research Compliance

Time Meeting Convened: 10:32AM  
Time Meeting Adjourned: 11:37AM

I. Introduction  Rafael Martin

II. Conflict of Interest Determination – Walter Voit  Rafael Martin, Walter Voit
   a. Notice of Conflict of Interest Determination  
   b. Revised Management Plan – ORC comments May 9 2017

III. Proposed Amendment to UT Systemwide Policy 175  Rafael Martin
   a. UTS175 – Proposed Public Reporting Revisions

IV. Revisions to Research Personnel Disclosure Form  Conor Wakeman
   a. Research Personnel Disclosure

V. Management Plan Updates  Conor Wakeman
   a. FY17 Q3 Compliance Report for Conflict of Interest Management

VI. Interim Annual Report  Conor Wakeman
   a. Interim RIC Annual Report FY17

VII. Quarterly Meetings  Conor Wakeman

VIII. Action Items
June 12, 2017

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Lloyd L. Lumata
Chair, Institutional Biosafety and Chemical Safety Committee

SUBJECT: Annual Report of Institutional Biosafety and Chemical Safety Committee (IBCC), 2016–2017

I. Membership
The membership of the IBCC consists of: Lloyd Lumata (chair), Manuel Quevedo-Lopez (vice-chair), John Burr, Sheena D’Arcy, Jonathan Ploski, Heng Du, Roy Dimon (community member), and Bill Alsup (community member).

II. Meetings
The regularly scheduled monthly meetings of the IBCS Committee are the first Wednesdays of each month at 2pm, primarily at the 1st or 2nd floor conference room of the BSB building. In the present cycle, we have met 9 times, and our next meeting is scheduled for July 5, 2017.

III. Actions Taken
Our main task as a committee is to review and decide approval or rejection/revision of research protocols done by principal investigators (PIs) on campus that have potential biosafety and/or chemical safety concerns. The IBCC role is distinct from the roles of Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Animal Institutional Care and Use Committee (AICUC). Our panel is consisted of faculty members from biology, chemistry, physics, neuroscience, engineering, a medical doctor, a city health officer, and 3 staff members of UTD Office of Research Compliance. In addition, we have also formulated a handbook on bio- and chemical safety guidelines that will be distributed to research labs on campus.

From Sept 2016-June 2017 the committee has reviewed:
- 11 New Protocol Registrations;
- 9 Protocol Amendments;
- 4 Protocol Renewals;
- and addressed 10 Policy Issues

These protocols were submitted by research professors on campus mainly from NSM, BSB, and ECS.

IV. Recommendations for Following Year
The frequency of IBCC meetings (once per month) has so far been sufficient to accommodate the pace of research protocol submissions at UTD that have
potential bio- and chemical safety concerns. As UTD is growing in the number of researchers, the committee is prepared to meet twice per month if necessary if there is a substantial increase in protocol submissions. Our IBCC coordinator James Pharr manages these meetings very well.

V. [Any Special comments/Notes/Supporting Documentation]
The protocols that we have approved were rigorously evaluated by the various experts in our panel and it is our highest priority to examine every detail of research methodologies submitted to keep UTD with zero incident of bio- and chemical safety violation.
TO: The Academic Senate  
FROM: Rafael Martin  
Chair, University Research Integrity Committee  

SUBJECT: Interim Annual Report of University Research Integrity Committee, 2016 –2017  

I. Membership  
Vice President for Research (Chair, ex-officio), Paul Fishwick (Vice-Chair), Marion Underwood (ex-officio), Stuart Cogan, Christine Dollaghan, Vijay Mookerjee, Thomas Riccio, Todd Sandler, Allan Sherry, Jason Slinker. Joseph Pancrazio represents the Executive Vice President and Provost (RUO).  

II. Meetings  
December 7, 2016: general meeting to discuss policies and procedures  
March 30, 2017: special meeting to discuss a specific conflict of interest  
June 2017: planned special meeting to discuss a specific conflict of interest  

III. Actions Taken  
The committee’s primary action is the review and approval of conflict of interest management plans. These reviews are conducted through panels consisting of two URIC representatives, and the appropriate school dean. 6 management plans have been approved in the current fiscal year.  

The panel also serves as a corrective body should a researcher violate their management plan. The purpose of the March 2017 meeting was to review the corrective actions recommended by a review panel for a particular conflict of interest situation.  

The committee also advises the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) on procedures, forms, and other items used in the implementation of UTD’s conflict of interest policies. The committee advised ORC on new policy trainings and conflict management documents at the December 2016 meeting. The policy trainings are now implemented campus-wide, and ORC has implemented the conflict management documents based on committee recommendations.  

Note: The committee will submit a final report in August after completing upcoming actions. These actions include a June special meeting and completion of pending conflict management plan review panels.  

IV. Recommendations for Following Year  
The committee and ORC will focus on COI education targeted at graduate students. ORC is developing educational materials and training, and will work with Graduate Studies to implement this program.  

V. Supporting Documents  
1. Meeting Agenda, December 7, 2016  
2. Meeting Agenda, March 30, 2017  
3. Meeting Agenda, June 2017 [forthcoming]
I. Introduction

II. Update on UTD Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policies
   a. Research Conflict of Interest (UTDPP1029)
   b. Outside Activity Policy (UTDPP1102)
   c. Revisions to COIC Policies

III. Management Plan Updates
   a. FY17 Q1 COI Compliance Report

IV. Policy Trainings
   a. COIC Policy Training for Faculty and Researchers
   b. COI Policy Training for Reviewers

V. Conflict Review Documents
   a. Checklist for Conflict Management Plan Review
   b. Review for Related Research

VI. Action Items
University Research Integrity Committee
The University of Texas at Dallas
9:00-10:00 AM
March 30, 2017
Student Union Room 2.504

Members
Rafael Martin (Chair)    Interim Vice President of Research
Paul Fishwick, Ph.D. (Vice Chair)    Arts and Technology
Stuart Cogan, Ph.D.    Engineering and Computer Science
Christine Dollaghan, Ph.D.    Behavioral and Brain Sciences
Vijay Mookerjee, Ph.D.    Management
Joseph Pancrazio, Ph.D.    Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
Thomas Riccio, Ph.D.    Arts and Humanities
Todd Sandler, Ph.D.    Economic, Political and Policy Sciences
A. Dean Sherry, Ph.D.    Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Jason Slinker, Ph.D.    Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Marion Underwood, Ph.D.    Dean of Graduate Studies

Guests
Inga Musselman Interim Provost Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
John Hansen Associate Dean Engineering and Computer Science
Sanaz Okhovat Assistant Vice President Office of Research Compliance
Conor Wakeman Conflict of Interest Manager Office of Research Compliance

Time Meeting Convened: 9:02
Time Meeting Adjourned: 9:58

I. Introduction    Rafael Martin

II. Conflict of Interest Determination – Walter Voit    Rafael Martin
   a. Notice of Conflict of Interest Determination
   b. Revised Management Plan
   c. Supporting Documentation

III. Conflict Investigation and Enforcement    Conor Wakeman

IV. Management Plan Updates    Conor Wakeman
   a. FY17 Q2 COI Compliance Report

V. Quarterly Meetings

VI. Action Items
1. Meetings
   a. As a committee, we met monthly in December, January, February, March, April and May. As a new committee, we sought to define our role and discuss assessment processes.

2. Our charge and how we addressed this so far this semester:
   a. To encourage the creation and maintenance of an assessment climate that promotes the meaningful use of assessment data
      i. In response to the conversations, CTL and Office of Assessment are creating new workshops to address needs.
   b. To review and disseminate information to faculty on best practices for student learning outcomes assessment
      i. Resources shared include:
   c. To serve as a vehicle for communication and facilitate information sharing across units
      i. Shared how ECS uses eye charts and curriculum mapping
      ii. Circulated examples of logic maps and curriculum maps from Public Affairs
      iii. There was discussion about student evaluations and how to encourage more meaningful feedback. Suggestions include having mid-term evaluations/feedback.
      iv. Pre and post-tests in bioengineering were discussed. Bioengineering also has great faculty accountability and buy in.
   d. To promote the improvement of processes and celebrate successes of assessment across campus
      i. Presentations made from academic, non-academic, core, and Student Affairs assessment leaders on assessment processes
ii. Currently, UT Dallas uses an online database—Hyoka to collect assessment reports. The vision for this software is to share what students are learning/how programs are doing between departments. Anyone with a faculty/staff login can see this information. [https://provost.utdallas.edu/hyoka/](https://provost.utdallas.edu/hyoka/)

3. Committee action plan:
   a. CTL will have a discussion in the fall about student evaluations and is creating a task force (May 2017: approved by the Provost).
   b. Office of Assessment will continue to work on providing supplementary data for reports (especially after all the surveys given to students are centralized)
   c. Will continue to meet over the summer with those with 12 month appointments, focusing conversations on non-academic assessment
   d. Fall:
      i. How to create action items from assessment reports?
      ii. How to help others see assessment as useful?
      iii. Who are our stakeholders and how to communicate with them? (public engagement)

4. Recommendations for Senate:
   a. In the original charge for our committee, we suggest adding “and constituents” to the third duty, reading: To serve as a vehicle for communication and facilitate information sharing across units and constituents.
   b. We would like to recommend that the President and Provost of UT Dallas take a public stand and endorse assessment at convocation and other fall activities showing our commitment to assessment as a University.
   c. We suggest that our student liaison make a presentation to Student Government annually about what they have learned from being on our committee.

   i. Student reflection: “Before attending the University Assessment Committee meetings, I had never heard about university assessments. During the first meeting, I recall being confused as to what everyone was discussing. However, after just a few meetings, I now have a better understanding of the purpose of university assessments and the committee. I believe that by allowing students like myself to participate is valuable because it gives us a better understanding about what is going on at our school. One of the things that I learned from attending the meetings, which is important to a student, is why we are tested and assessed in such manners and how the assessments help the entire university and the public understand how and what students are learning. University assessment is something that I believe is important for the entire university to understand and work on together to improve the way students are evaluated. I hope that in the future, more students will be allowed to take part in the committee.”
SACSCOC Presentations for Annual Meeting*

Friday, October 20: 12 – 1 p.m. JSOM 1.502
“Engaging Students in Large-Scale Projects to Improve Student Learning”
~Jessica Murphy, Dean of Undergraduate Education & Ryan Dorman, Academic Affairs and Provost

During a session on the QEP in 2016, we were surprised to learn how few institutions have regular involvement of students in the QEP topic-selection, development, and implementation processes. In this session, we will share some of our experience engaging students across campus through the QEP topic selection, development, and implementation. We will also advocate for an approach that makes sure student voices are heard in any large-scale intervention to improve student learning.

Friday, October 27: 11:30 – 12:30 p.m. JSOM 1.117
“The Student Mentoring Experience – a Three Pronged Approach”
~Marilyn Kaplan, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs & Clinical Professor, JSOM & Tom Henderson, Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Programs & Senior Lecturer I, JSOM

At JSOM, our integrated approach to mentoring leverages experiences, practices and initiatives across distinct degree program areas. By leveraging best practices and building a more integrated approach to mentoring, we are supporting the learning needs of our students in addition to building an assessment process that enables program areas to “close the loop” by linking and measuring student success on the basis of our integrated curricular approach. This allows program areas to continuously improve and refine each program, preparing students for success after graduation as mentors and leaders. In our presentation, we will discuss our three-pronged approach to mentoring. We will share best practices based on different program experiences. We will discuss how course-level SLOs, and results from student mentoring experiences can be evaluated in a more integrated manner. We will also discuss strategies for building an integrated framework and rubric for mentoring success across degree programs.

Friday, November 3: 11:30 – 12:30 p.m. JO 3.516
“Developing Minority Scholar Programs Using Data and Setting New Metrics”
~Courtney Brecheen, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education & Kimberly Edwards, Assistant Director, Undergraduate Education

Presenters will share details on how to implement a successful scholars program to provide specialized programming for select underrepresented minority (URM) students. Specifically, the presentation will provide insights into how the Undergraduate Success Scholars Program maximizes a variety of data collection methods to assess and continuously improve the program as well as the program components, leadership
development opportunities, and forms of mentorship that allow the program to support all participants through curricular and co-curricular engagement.

**Friday, November 10: 12:30 – 1:30 p.m. GR 2.302**

“The ‘Why’ of the Story: Collaborative Learning and Intergenerational Life Review”

~Joanna K. Gentsch, Director of Student and Community Engagement, BBS

Service learning has been described as a transformative experience and identified as a high-impact practice in education (Kuh, 2008). Students engaged in service learning have demonstrated increases in self-esteem and self-concept, more positive attitudes toward school and education, greater interest in, commitment to, and sensitivity toward their communities and their needs, and stronger beliefs that one can make a difference in the world (Billig, Root & Jesse, 2005). This talk will focus on the objectives and outcomes of a pilot service learning class using intergenerational narrative story-telling in two community settings.

**Thursday, November 16: 12 – 1 p.m. JSOM 1.217**

“A Self-Sustaining Peer-to-Peer Mentoring Model for All Students”

~Courtney Brecheen, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education & Hillary Campbell, Assistant Director, Undergraduate Education

In its sixth year of implementation, the UT Dallas Freshman Mentor Program harnesses university resources and highly-engaged upperclassmen, in partnership towards facilitating a successful transition to the rigors of university life for incoming freshman students. The presentation will detail best practices including refined processes for recruitment, candidate evaluation and selection, pairing, leadership development, service learning, and analyzing program efficacy, which are core components of the UT Dallas Freshman Mentor Program that allow the program to maximize its outreach scope and self-sustain.

**Friday, November 17: 11:30 a.m. – 1 p.m. JO 3.516**

“Motivation is not Enough: Supporting Students in Developing the Skills for Success”

~Karen Huxtable-Jester, Associate Director, Center for Teaching and Learning & Senior Lecturer III, BBS & Gloria Shenoy, Director of Assessment, Office of Assessment, Academic Affairs and Provost

Students bring high hopes to their pursuit of an education, but too often, they also experience obstacles that can interfere with their success. In this 90-minute workshop we will identify typical obstacles and develop proactive strategies for faculty to help students through case studies. We can improve students’ academic resilience and self-regulation and create an atmosphere that promotes help-seeking and autonomy. Being compassionate does not require that we lower our standards. Rather, we can help students understand what it takes to learn effectively, develop the self-discipline to do
what it takes, and believe that their efforts will be successful to achieve learning outcomes.

*Audience members are welcome to bring their brown-bag lunch.
## Undergraduate Courses to be offered in 2017-2018

### Number of Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th>HONS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additions</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Removals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repeatable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Removed – 0 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: Tables below only contain courses that were added or edited. Removed courses are not counted.

### New – 5 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRWT 3330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GEOS 3122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC 4383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GEOS 3124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 4352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Repeatable – 1 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*CRWT 3330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Online – 0 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>HONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LEGEND**

- * New as repeatable
- # Update made to existing repeat
- - Renumber - no additional info required
- . Reinstate – no additional info required

Climer, Registrar’s Office, 09-27-17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>add *</td>
<td>crwt3330 (r1)</td>
<td>crwt3330.4</td>
<td>CRWT 3330 Translation Workshop (3 semester credit hours) A creative workshop on the art of literary translation which investigates the creative techniques and critical analyses involved in translation. Assignments may include monolingual translation exercises, translation theory, or studies of translators. Emphasis is on the actual translation of literary texts into English. May be repeated for credit as topics vary (9 semester credit hours maximum). Prerequisite: CRWT 2301. (3-0) S</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>ps info Orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>status: cue</td>
<td>2017-09-27 15:31:53 NOLINK 23.1302.00.01</td>
<td>index: -0.4 m match_fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

This has been a topic used under LIT 4348 three times and needs its own course number. Using the CRWT prefix because CRWT is now under the LIT track (rather than A&P) and the course aligns more with CRWT than LIT in content. Requested by Megan Herring on 2017-05-19 at 16:20:22 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 (DDC - 08.18.23). Added prereq per Dr. Gooch (DDC - 09.27.17).

**peoplesoft diff: NOLINK**

CRWT 3330 Translation Workshop (3 semester credit hours) A creative workshop on the art of literary translation which investigates the creative techniques and critical analyses involved in translation. Assignments may include monolingual translation exercises, translation theory, or studies of translators. Emphasis is on the actual translation of literary texts into English. May be repeated for credit as topics vary (9 semester credit hours maximum). Prerequisite: CRWT 2301. (3-0) S

**repeat reason**

May be repeated for credit as topics vary

**show fields: crwt3330.4**

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

**update req group**
1. Course Subject and Number

CRWT 3330

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

Major  Core  Elective
☐  ☐  ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

Yes  No
☐  ☑

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

☐  1  CRWT 3307
☐  2  LIT 3382
☐  3  LIT 4348
☐  None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

This course was previously used as a subtitle of LIT 4348, but has been maxed out of uses. This is the same content being requested as its own course.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Sean Cotter

7. This form submitted by:

Megan Gray Hering
<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>2017-open</td>
<td>reinstat</td>
<td>geos3122</td>
<td>geos3122.6</td>
<td>GEOS 3122 Coal in Our Society (1 semester credit hour) Coal plays an important role in the U.S. energy mix and a critical role in Texas society. Yet it may be the most misunderstood natural resource. It is the objective of this course to familiarize the students with the origin, properties, and uses of coal and examine how coal use may impact the environment and human health. This will be accomplished by exploring the facts and fallacies surrounding coal in our society. There will be a field trip to a coal mine and/or a coal-burning power plant. The course will last approximately 1 month during a semester. (1-0) Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

Reinstated at Dr. Finkleman's request (DDC - 07.07.17).

**peoplesoft diff:** 005569 2014-08-10 adp130030

GEOS 3122 Coal in Our Society (1 semester credit hour) Coal plays an important role in the U.S. energy mix and a critical role in Texas society. Yet it may be the most misunderstood natural resource. It is the objective of this course to familiarize the students with the origin, properties, and uses of coal and examine how coal use may impact the environment and human health. This will be accomplished by exploring the facts and fallacies surrounding coal in our society. There will be a field trip to a coal mine and/or a coal-burning power plant. The course will last approximately 1 month during a semester. (1-0) Y

**show fields:** geos3122.6

- cat_repeat_units: 1
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core: 
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles

---

https://coursebook.utdallas.edu/catbookreport/4fc1020307233e15618425aa32849fe4/makepdf
1. Course Subject and Number

GEOS 3122

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

Major  Core  Elective
☐  ☐  ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

Yes  No  ☑

3.5. Which course is being replaced?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

☐  1
☐  2
☐  3  None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Robert B. Finkelman

7. This form submitted by:

Robert B. Finkelman

Location Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</th>
<th>course</th>
<th>req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>edit *</td>
<td>geos3124</td>
<td>(r6)</td>
<td>geos3124.9</td>
<td>GEOS 3124 Energy, the Environment and Human Health (1 semester credit hour) This course will focus on the environmental and human health impacts of geologic materials and geologic processes with particular emphasis on fossil fuels. A balanced, fact-based discussion will be provided on both positive and negative effects of various energy sources on the natural environment and human health. Old and new myths about the environmental and health consequences of fossil fuels, especially coal, will be debunked. The course will cultivate an awareness of both the positive and negative aspects of energy production and use and enable informed decision making with respect to societal issues associated with energy and mineral resources. (1-0) Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>request notes</td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>2017-08-22 16:01:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added per Dr. Finkleman. Course previously existed but was renumbered to GEOS 2324 so this is technically a reinstate. GEOS 2324 will remain active until removed by department. (DDC - 07.10.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: 13</td>
<td>40.0601.00.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**peoplesoft diff: 2014-08-10 adp130030**

GEOS 3124 Energy, the Environment and Human Health (1 semester credit hour) This course will focus on the environmental and human health impacts of geologic materials and geologic processes with particular emphasis on fossil fuels. A balanced, fact-based discussion will be provided on both positive and negative effects of various energy sources on the natural environment and human health. Old and new myths about the environmental and health consequences of fossil fuels, especially coal, will be debunked. The course will cultivate an awareness of both the positive and negative aspects of energy production and use and enable informed decision making with respect to societal issues associated with energy and mineral resources. (1-0) Y

**show fields: geos3124.9**

- cat_repeat_units: 1
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

Geology and Human Health GEOS 3124

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

   Major  Core  Elective
   ☐    ☐    ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

   Yes  No
   ☐  ☑

3.5. Which course is being replaced?

   This question was not displayed to the respondent.

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

   ☐ 1
   ☐ 2
   ☑ 3
   ☑ None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc)?

   This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

   Robert B. Finkelman

7. This form submitted by:

   Robert B. Finkelman

Location Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start end</th>
<th>req type course req_id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open</td>
<td>add * nsc4383 (r1) nsc4383.3 group_head series_head</td>
<td>NSC 4383 Human Neurophysiology Lab (3 semester credit hours) This laboratory course provides hands-on experience with the use of electrophysiological techniques for the theory, collection, and analysis of neuroscience data. Students will gain hands-on experience learning professional data analysis techniques for human electrophysiology using applications of EEG and ERP software, and will cover critical elements of experimental design neuroscience. Prerequisites: NSC 3361 and NSC 4352 and CHEM 1311 and CHEM 1312 and BIOL 2311 and (MATH 2413 or MATH 2417). (1-2) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

Requested by Leah Nall on 2017-06-29 at 13:58:02 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017 (DDC - 08.18.17).

**peoplesoft diff:**

NSC 4383 Human Neurophysiology Lab (3 semester credit hours) This laboratory course provides hands-on experience with the use of electrophysiological techniques for the theory, collection, and analysis of neuroscience data. Students will gain hands-on experience learning professional data analysis techniques for human electrophysiology using applications of EEG and ERP software, and will cover critical elements of experimental design neuroscience. Prerequisites: NSC 3361 and NSC 4352 and CHEM 1311 and CHEM 1312 and BIOL 2311 and (MATH 2413 or MATH 2417). (1-2) Y

**show fields: nsc4383.3**

- **cat_repeat_units**: 3
- **cat_delivery_method**: deliverymethod_100
- **cat_core**: 
- **cat_subtitles**: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

NSC 4383

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

- Major
- Core
- Elective

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

- Yes
- No

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

- 1. NSC 4353
- 2. 
- 3. None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

This course has been offered for several years as a 4V90 Topics course. It is now part of the regular curriculum and needs a permanent #.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Dr. Theodore Price

7. This form submitted by:

Leah Barfield
<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>2017-open</td>
<td>reinstate *</td>
<td>psy4352</td>
<td>psy4352.6</td>
<td>PSY 4352 Emerging Adulthood Development (3 semester credit hours) Overview of the theories, findings, and research on the biopsychosocial and cultural perspective of the emerging adult, 18-29 years old. Students will develop an understanding of the influences of the external and internal process in development focused on self-concept, identity, and biology. Prerequisite: PSY 2301. (3-0) Y</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>ddc130130 2017-08-18 16:43:47 011178 42.2703.00.01 audit: -2 m index: -2 m match fail</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requested by Leah Nall on 2017-06-29 at 13:43:39 through Eform and course to be offered in spring 2018 (DDC - 08.18.17).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peoplesoft diff: 011178 2004-08-02 PSY 4352 Emerging Adulthood Development (3 semester credit hours) Overview of the theories, findings, and research on the biopsychosocial and cultural perspective of the emerging adult, 18-29 years old. Students will develop an understanding of the influences of the external and internal process in development focused on self-concept, identity, and biology. Prerequisite: PSY 2301. (3-0) Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

show fields: psy4352.6

- `cat_repeat_units`: 3
- `cat_delivery_method`: deliverymethod_100
- `cat_core`:
- `cat_subtitles`: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

PSY 4352

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

Major  Core  Elective
☐  ☐  ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

Yes  ☐  No  ☑

3.5. Which course is being replaced?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☑ None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, context, learning outcomes, etc.)?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Dr. Shayla Holub

7. This form submitted by:

Leah Barfield
Graduate Courses to be offered in 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeatable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New – 3 Courses</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUSL 6346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BMEN 6366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OPRE 7318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Removed – 0 Courses</th>
<th>ARHM</th>
<th>ATEC</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>EPPS</th>
<th>GENS</th>
<th>JSOM</th>
<th>NSMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Tables below only contain courses that were added or edited. Removed courses are not counted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repeatable – 0 Courses</th>
<th>Online – 0 Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

* New as repeatable
# Update made to existing repeat
- Renumber - no additional info required
. Reinstate - no additional info required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start end</th>
<th>req type course req id</th>
<th>catalog course description</th>
<th>request status</th>
<th>request metadata</th>
<th>actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-open edit * bmen6366 (r1) bmen6366.4 group_head series_head</td>
<td>BMEN 6366 Biomedical Image Processing (3 semester credit hours) This course covers basic digital image processing techniques used for the analysis of images. Topics include spatial and frequency domain filtering, image restoration, morphological operators (e.g., erosion and dilation) and their uses (e.g., boundary extraction, extraction of connected components), image segmentation, and pattern recognition. A percentage of the course grade is based on projects, which require students to program image processing techniques and apply them to images. (3-0) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve status: approving audit: 11</td>
<td>ddc130130 2017-08-22 15:56:34 14.0501.00.06 audit: -2412.8 m index: -0.4 m match_fail</td>
<td>ps info orion info overview change process modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

Requested by Lean Mathison on 2017-06-26 13:58:25 via eForm and to be offered Spring 2018 (DDC - 07.12.17).

**peoplesoft diff:**

BMEN 6366 Biomedical Image Processing (3 semester credit hours) This course covers basic digital image processing techniques used for the analysis of images. Topics include spatial and frequency domain filtering, image restoration, morphological operators (e.g., erosion and dilation) and their uses (e.g., boundary extraction, extraction of connected components), image segmentation, and pattern recognition. A percentage of the course grade is based on projects, which require students to program image processing techniques and apply them to images. (3-0) Y

**show fields: bmen6366.4**

- `cat_repeat_units`: 3
- `cat_delivery_method`: deliverymethod_100
- `cat_core`
- `cat_subtitles`: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

BMEN 6366

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

   Major  Core  Elective
   ☐  ☐  ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

   Yes  ☐  No  ☑

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

   ☑ 1 BMEN 6365
   ☐ 2
   ☐ 3
   ☐ None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

   Related topic - almost sequential in our curriculum, but the content is different

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

   Shashank Sirsi

7. This form submitted by:

   Leah Mathison


Location Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>start</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>req type</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>2017</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>add *</td>
<td>husl6346</td>
<td>HUSL 6346 American Renaissance (3 semester credit hours) Examines the authors whose work first defined 19th century American literary studies: Melville, Hawthorne, Whitman, Emerson, and Thoreau. Considers the challenges to that initial canon as well as the writers that the canon excluded (Stowe, Douglass, Jacobs, and others). (3-0) T</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>ps info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(r1)</td>
<td>husl6346.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>2017-08-21 13:09:33</td>
<td>overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: 11</td>
<td>23.1402.00.01</td>
<td>change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>series_head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>index: -2412.8 m</td>
<td>process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>match_fail</td>
<td>modify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

Requested by John Gooch on 2017-07-25 at 16:03:07 through Eform and course to be offered in spring 2018 (DDC - 08.21.2017)

**peoplesoft diff:**

HUSL 6346 American Renaissance (3 semester credit hours) Examines the authors whose work first defined 19th century American literary studies: Melville, Hawthorne, Whitman, Emerson, and Thoreau. Considers the challenges to that initial canon as well as the writers that the canon excluded (Stowe, Douglass, Jacobs, and others). (3-0) T

**show fields: husl6346.2**

- cat_repeat_units: 3
- cat_delivery_method: deliverymethod_100
- cat_core:
- cat_subtitles: no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

HUSL 6346

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

   Major    Core    Elective
   ☐        ☐      ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

   Yes ☐ No ☑

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

   ☑ 1 HUSL 6345 Early American Literature
   ☑ 2 HUSL 6350 Literature of the Nineteenth Century
   ☐ 3 None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

   The other two courses are "topics" courses under which various themes are taught. This new course is devoted to the subject "American Renaissance", which is a focused area of study in American literature.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

   John Gooch

7. This form submitted by:

   John Gooch
<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>2017-open</td>
<td>add *</td>
<td>opre7318</td>
<td>(r1)</td>
<td>OPRE 7318 Stochastic Dynamic Programming (3 semester credit hours) Stochastic Dynamic Programming (SDP) is a general methodology which plays an essential role in many areas of economics and management science. The course provides students with a solid background on SDP, the core theory and its evolution and applications. The course discusses many models, particularly in finance and operations management, as well as additional concepts such as principal-agent concepts for dynamic systems. Instructor consent required. (3-0) Y</td>
<td>phase: approve</td>
<td>ddc130130</td>
<td>2017-08-22 16:06:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>opre7318.3</td>
<td>group_head</td>
<td></td>
<td>status: approving</td>
<td>52.1301.00.16</td>
<td>audit: -2412.8 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>series_head</td>
<td></td>
<td>audit: 11</td>
<td>index: -2412.8 m</td>
<td>match_fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**request notes**

Requested by Shawn Alborz on 2017-07-19 at 16:38:17 through Eform and course to be offered in fall 2017.

**peoplesoft diff:**

OPRE 7318 Stochastic Dynamic Programing (3 semester credit hours) Stochastic Dynamic Programming (SDP) is a general methodology which plays an essential role in many areas of economics and management science. The course provides students with a solid background on SDP, the core theory and its evolution and applications. The course discusses many models, particularly in finance and operations management, as well as additional concepts such as principal-agent concepts for dynamic systems. Instructor consent required. (3-0) Y

**show fields: opre7318.3**

- **cat_repeat_units:** 3
- **cat_delivery_method:** deliverymethod_100
- **cat_core:**
- **cat_subtitles:** no_subtitles
1. Course Subject and Number

OPRE 7318

2. How does this course fit in the curriculum? (Can select more than one.)

Major  Core  Elective

☐  ☐  ☑

3. Does it replace a previously required course in that curriculum?

Yes  No

☐  ☑

3.5. Which course is being replaced?

This question was not displayed to the respondent.

4. Identify the courses (including in other schools) that are most closely related to the proposed course and list their course subjects and numbers below.

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ None

5. How does the proposed course differ from those identified in the last question (target audience, content, learning outcomes, etc.)?

This is a new course that covers stochastic dynamic programming for PhD students.

6. Faculty contact that requested this course be added to the inventory:

Milind Dawande

7. This form submitted by:

Shawn Alborz
Re-Entry or ReApplication for Masters Students

Re-Entry

Students who were in good academic standing when last enrolled, may be eligible to re-enter their academic degree program, under their original catalog without reapplying through the Office of Admission.

The following guidelines describe when a student may submit a re-entry form:

- A previous graduate degree-seeking, returning as graduate degree-seeking who is returning to the same program and same plan, and who was in academic good standing.
- A previous graduate degree-seeking, returning as graduate non-degree seeking who was in good academic standing.
- A previous graduate taking undergraduate courses (GRU), coming back as graduate taking undergraduate courses (GRU) who was in good academic standing.
- In all situations, a student must be returning within six years of the initial admission term; for example, a student admitted in fall 2017 must return prior to 2023. Within the six-year period, the student may reenter under the admission original catalog.

Re-entry requires the approval of the degree plan advisor in their school before submitting the form to the Office of the Registrar.

Reapplication

Returning students who are not eligible to complete a re-entry form will be required to re-apply to the program of their intended degree. The returning student’s new application will be reviewed according to current admissions standards. If accepted, the readmitted student will be bound by all conditions of the catalog in force at the time of readmission.

The following guidelines describe a student who must reapply:

- A previous graduate degree-seeking, returning as graduate degree-seeking student if returning to a different program and/or a different plan.
- A previous graduate non-degree seeking student, returning as graduate degree-seeking student.

Additional requirements for re-entry or reapplication

Students who are granted re-admission (re-entry or through a new application) may be advised that some prior coursework may not count toward their degree if it exceeds the time allowed for degree completion and are subject to the requirements set forth by legislative or regental action, and changes become effective on the date of enactment.
All returning students (through the re-entry process or the apply process) are required to submit official transcripts for all institutions of higher education he/she attended after leaving UT Dallas to the following address:

The Office of Registrar
The University of Texas at Dallas
800 West Campbell Road
ROC 13
Richardson, TX 75080-3021

If official transcripts are not received by Census Day, the student will be automatically dropped from any currently enrolled courses. The readmitted student may be required to submit bacterial meningitis vaccination necessary forms before being allowed to register.
Additional Information about Repeating Graduate Courses

A graduate student who wishes to repeat a course must submit a Repeated Course Adjustment form to the Graduate Dean.

Up to three graduate courses may be repeated. However, no graduate course may be repeated more than once. When a course is repeated, both grades will remain in the graduate student’s record and will be included in the graduate student’s transcript. The higher grade will be used in computing the GPA for purposes of graduation.

Courses six years or older may be repeated for credit with the approval of the Graduate Dean.
Difference between HOP policy and Graduate Catalog

Please review both statements. Which is the preferred highlighted section?

HOP Policy – UTDPP1052

Additional Master’s Degrees: Students wishing to earn additional Master’s degrees at U. T. Dallas must develop an approved Program of Studies through the Program offering that degree prior to enrolling in additional courses. The only limitation is that more than one-half of the semester credit hours for any master’s degree earned at UT Dallas must be satisfied by new coursework. The program can allow up to 15 semester credit hours earned in a previous degree program toward the additional degree. Additional credits may be accepted from the previous degree upon the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies. In no case will credits counted for a previous degree be allowed to exceed one-half the total hours required for the additional master’s degree program.

Catalog

Additional Master's Degrees

Students are encouraged to pursue additional master’s degrees at The University of Texas at Dallas. A student is required to develop an approved plan of studies through the department or program offering the master’s degree prior to enrolling in that degree. To the extent that the requirements of some master’s degrees overlap, some of the semester credit hours taken in pursuit of previously earned master’s degrees at UT Dallas may be counted toward an additional master’s degree. The only limitation is that more than one-half of the semester credit hours for any master’s degree earned at UT Dallas must be satisfied by new coursework. A student is required to develop an approved plan of studies through the department or program offering the master’s degree prior to enrolling in that degree. Similarly, a student wishing to earn two master’s degrees concurrently must develop an approved plan of studies through both relevant departments and programs. All coursework for any degree must meet the academic standards of that degree.
Policy on Procedures for Completing a Graduate Degree - UTDPP1052

Policy Statement

1. PROGRAM OF STUDIES: Each student admitted to a Graduate Program will have a specific program of studies, outlined in the current graduate catalog that is agreed to in consultation with the appropriate committee, graduate advisor or administrator for that degree program. Students enrolled in master's degree programs must have a completed "Program of Studies/Degree Plan" filed in and approved by the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies prior to the student's registration for his or her 19th semester credit hour in the degree program. The form will be completed and revised, if necessary, each semester under the guidance of the student's graduate advisor. For each student enrolled in a doctoral degree program, the academic advisor in consultation with the student, will prepare and submit a completed and updated "Milestones Agreement Form" annually to the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. The completed form will define academic milestones and timeline required to earn the doctoral degree and the progress being made by the student in meeting each requirement.

1. Exception: Common Master's Program: In those Graduate Programs where a common program of studies is prescribed for all Master's students, differing only in elective courses comprising less than one-third of the total required degree semester credit hours, the Graduate Program can file a model "Program of Studies" with the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. Any student wishing to deviate from that approved model Program of Studies must file an Individual Program of Studies developed and approved by the appropriate committee or administrator for that program prior to the student's registration for his or her 19th degree semester hour taken at U. T. Dallas.

2. Exception: Common Doctoral Core: In those Graduate Programs where a common doctoral core is prescribed for all students, differing only by the area of specialization chosen, the Graduate Program can file a model "Program of Studies" with the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. Any student wishing to deviate from that approved model Program of Studies must file an Individual Program of Studies developed and approved by the appropriate committee or administrator for that program prior to the student's registration for his or her 50th degree semester hour taken at U. T. Dallas.

3. Additional Master's Degrees: Students wishing to earn additional Master's degrees at U. T. Dallas must develop an approved Program of Studies through the Program offering that degree prior to enrolling in additional courses. The only limitation is that more than one-half of the semester credit hours for any master's degree earned at UT Dallas must be satisfied by new coursework. The program can allow up to 15 semester credit hours earned in a previous degree program.
toward the additional degree. Additional credits may be accepted from the previous degree upon the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies. In no case will credits counted for a previous degree be allowed to exceed one-half the total hours required for the additional master's degree program.

4. Graduation Under a Particular Catalog: Provided the requisite courses continue to be offered, the student is bound by the course work requirements of the catalog in force at the time of admission, within a six-year limit for the completion of the master's degree and ten years for the doctoral degree. With the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies the student may elect to be bound by the catalog in force at the time the student applies for graduation. This regulation applies to specific course work and the number of semester credit hours for the academic degrees set forth in the catalog. All other requirements will change or be continued with the issuance of new graduate catalogs.

2. TRANSFER CREDIT: To qualify for transfer credit, the grade earned in the course must be a B or better and the course must not be a correspondence, extension or pass/fail course. Petitions for transfer of credit must be prepared by the Graduate Program and submitted for approval by the program faculty and the School Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. Petitions may be approved at the time of the student's first enrollment; however, no actual acceptance of transfer credit will occur until after the student has completed 9 semester credit hours of courses at U. T. Dallas with a grade point average of at least 3.0. Petitions for transferring courses taken before enrolling as a graduate student at U. T. Dallas must be submitted prior to filing the Program of Studies. Petitions for transfer credit must be accompanied by a copy of the student's transcript showing the course(s) in question.

1. No more than 25% of the total requirement of a master’s degree may be transfer credits. Some degree programs have more restrictive transfer of credit requirements.

2. Doctoral Degree: A master's degree or its equivalent may be transferred from another university for up to 36 semester hours of credit towards a doctoral degree.

3. Non-Degree Students: No more than 15 semester credit hours taken as a Non-Degree Student may be subsequently transferred to a degree program at U. T. Dallas. No petition is necessary for any of this coursework to be included in a student's Program of Studies.

4. Exceptions: Exceptions to these transfer policies may be granted only on petition to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Such a petition could be for the program of an individual student or for the model Program of Studies (See "Exceptions" on page 1 of this policy).

3. DEGREE REQUIREMENTS: The student will complete the course work degree requirements when he or she completes the previously filed program of studies with acceptable grades.

1. Required Semester Credit Hours: The minimum required semester credit hours in a Program of Studies required for the degree will be those shown in the catalog applicable to the student at the time of his or her admission or readmission to the program. In no case will a student be allowed to graduate with less than 30 approved graduate semester credit hours (including approved graduate transfer credit hours) for the master's degree.
2. Required Grade Point Average: In order to qualify for graduation, students must maintain a 3.0 grade point average in their degree program’s core courses. However, individual programs may have more stringent grade point requirements in selected courses, which must be satisfied for graduation. The minimum acceptable University grade point average for graduation is 3.0 for all graduate courses taken in the student’s degree program at U. T. Dallas.

3. Research Involving Animal or Human Subjects
   1. Research Involving the Use of Animals (UTDPP1014): Any student who intends to conduct research, (whether funded or not funded) which would involve animals must obtain permission from the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). Permission to use an animal in research must be obtained prior to ordering, bringing to campus or housing on campus an animal. The required form to request approval may be obtained from the Office of Research Compliance.
   2. Research Involving Human Subjects (UTDPP1035): Any student who intends to conduct research, on or off campus, in partial or complete fulfillment of a course requirement, thesis or dissertation, which would involve human beings as subjects must obtain permission, prior to undertaking the research, from the University's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB). Any research activity, including but not limited to surveys, questionnaires, interviews, standardized and non-standardized tests, and/or simple research experiments, which include the participation of human beings, regardless of age of participant, must have approval from the IRB. The required forms to request approval may be obtained from the Office of Research Compliance.

4. Admission to Doctoral Candidacy: The research potential and ability of each doctoral student to both understand and integrate previous coursework will be evaluated before a student can be admitted formally to doctoral candidacy. The format of this evaluation, hereafter referred to as a qualifying examination, varies amongst the degree programs, and can be obtained from the student's Graduate Program Office. A student failing the Qualifying Examination is terminated as a doctoral student in that program unless a two-thirds majority of the examining committee vote that a second examination be permitted. All committee members should have all the evidence of the student's academic record and Qualifying Examination performance prior to this vote. The second must be taken no sooner than two months after the student receives the written results of the first examination, and no later than one year after the first examination. Students failing the second examination will not be allowed to pursue a doctoral degree in that program. **Under no circumstances will a third examination be allowed.** The student will have advanced to candidacy when the student has
   1. passed the qualifying examination,
   2. been assigned an approved Supervising Committee, and
   3. satisfied any other Program or School candidacy requirements.: Candidacy must be achieved before a student is eligible to enroll in dissertation courses.
4. THESIS AND DISSERTATION REQUIREMENT

1. Dissertation Proposal: Content: The Dissertation Proposal should be prepared by
the student in consultation with the student's Supervising Committee. The
proposal should include:
   1. A tentative title of the dissertation describing the topic as accurately and
   briefly as possible.
   2. The background of the research, the hypotheses to be tested or concepts to
   be explored, and the methodology to be employed. It should also address
   the relationship of the proposed work to existing work in the field, at U. T.
   Dallas or elsewhere, its intended outcome, and its contribution to the field.
   3. A schedule of the remaining research activities, including major
   completion milestones.
   4. A set of up to five "key words" to assist in establishing the Data Base on
   Theses and Dissertations.

2. Dissertation Proposal: Approval: The proposal should be prepared by the student
in consultation with the student's Supervising Professor, who will approve the
document before its submission to the appropriate committee or administrator for
that Department or Program. After its approval at the Department, Program,
School, or Interdisciplinary Degree Committee level, the proposal will then be
forwarded to the Dean of Graduate Studies, together with the Department’s or
Program's nominations for Supervising Professor and members of the Supervising
Committee and the anticipated time of completion. To allow the Supervising
Committee the opportunity to guide the development of the project, the
Dissertation Proposal must be approved in a semester prior to the one in which the
Final Oral Examination will be held.

3. Supervising Committee: General: The recommended Supervising Committee for
the student is submitted by the appropriate committee or administrator for that
Department or Program to the Dean of Graduate Studies for approval. Subsequent
changes in membership must also be subject to approval by the appropriate
committee or administrator for that Department or Program, and in, turn the Dean
of Graduate Studies. Individuals qualified for service on the Supervising
Committee will be voting members of the General Faculty (as defined by The
University of Texas at Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures), Adjunct
Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Distinguished Scholars in Residence, Emeritus Faculty,
Research Professors, Research Scientists, Senior Lecturers, or Visiting Faculty
who hold the highest earned degree in the field or fields concerned or exhibit an
equivalent record of accomplishment. In addition to the master’s and doctoral
degree membership composition as defined in sections D and E below, additional
members outside the General Faculty may serve with the special approval of the
Dean of Graduate Studies. Members of the Supervising Committee will also be
members of the Examining Committee. (*In the case of Adjunct Faculty, a
General Faculty member will be appointed to co-chair the Supervising
Committee).

4. Supervising Committee: Master's Degree with Thesis: Appointment of a Master’s
thesis Supervising Committee consisting of at least three members is a function of
the degree program expected to confer the student’s degree. Additional members
may be appointed. All appointments must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies. The appropriate committee or administrator of the program in consultation with the student, will nominate:

1. the Chair, who serves as the supervisor of the research, will ordinarily be a voting member of the General Faculty holding the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor. Adjunct Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Distinguished Scholars in Residence, Emeritus Faculty, Research Professors, Research Scientists, Senior Lecturers, or Visiting Faculty who hold the highest earned degree or exhibit an equivalent record of accomplishment in the field or fields of the research or aesthetics may be appointed as Chair if he/she receives a 2/3 majority recommendation of the Professors of the academic discipline and approval of the Academic Dean of the School offering the degree.

2. at least two voting members of the General Faculty from the graduate degree program expected to confer the student's degree; and

3. if necessary, a third representative appointed by the appropriate committee or administrator for that discipline.

Any school varying from the above procedures in constituting Supervising Committees must have had prior approval from the Dean of Graduate Studies.

5. Supervising Committee: Doctoral Degree: Appointment of a Doctoral dissertation Supervising Committee consisting of at least four members is a function of the degree program expected to confer the student’s degree. Additional members may be appointed. All appointments must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies. The appropriate committee or administrator of the program, in consultation with the student, will nominate:

1. the Chair, who serves as the supervisor of the research, will ordinarily be a voting member of the General Faculty holding the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor. Adjunct Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Distinguished Scholars in Residence, Emeritus Faculty, Research Professors, Research Scientists, Senior Lecturers, or Visiting Faculty who hold the highest earned degree or exhibit an equivalent record of accomplishment in the field or fields of the research or aesthetics may be appointed as Chair if he/she receives a 2/3 majority recommendation of the Professors of the academic discipline and approval of the Academic Dean of the School offering the degree.

2. not less than three voting members of the General Faculty, from the graduate degree program expected to confer the student's degree; and

3. if necessary, a fourth representative appointed by the appropriate committee or administrator for that discipline.

Schools varying from the above procedures in constituting Supervising Committees must have had prior approval from the Dean of Graduate Studies.
5. SUPERVISION: The Supervising Committee will meet with the candidate soon after the Dean of Graduate Studies has approved membership of the Committee. The intention of this initial meeting should be to discuss potential problem areas in the proposal and to establish a procedure that the Committee wishes to adopt to follow the research to a successful conclusion, e.g., the frequency and format of contact between candidate and Committee. The Supervising Committee must meet at least once annually, assess the student's progress, and send a report on that progress to the appropriate committee or administrator for that program and to the Dean of Graduate Studies. This report should describe any problems which have the potential to delay the research beyond its anticipated completion date. A copy of this report must also be sent to the student. The student can request a meeting of the Supervising Committee through a written request to the appropriate committee or administrator for that program. The appropriate committee or administrator for that program will be responsible for convening such a meeting, generally within two weeks of the student's request, unless this timing is impossible owing to the absence of the Supervising Professor. No more than one student-initiated meeting can be called within an academic year. Provision for coverage of leaves of absence of either students or committee members will have been discussed at the initial meeting of the Supervising Committee. Any arrangements for surrogate supervision or changes in the student's plans will be communicated to the appropriate committee or administrator for that program, in writing, with a copy to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Because of the relationship between the student and the Supervising Committee, committee members on leave of absence or who have left their positions with the university may be given permission to remain on the committee by the Dean of Graduate Studies. However, they must agree to be active participants in supervisory activities and to be present for the final examination. If this is not possible, the committee member must be replaced and a new member of the General Faculty must be submitted for approval.

1. Manuscript Preparation: Style and format requirements have been established for theses and dissertations prepared at U. T. Dallas. Prior to submitting manuscripts, candidates should consult the Guide for the Preparation of Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations which can be obtained from [http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/dgIndex.htm](http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/dgIndex.htm).

2. Committee Approval of the Manuscript: Approval of the thesis or dissertation to go forward for examination can only be given after the members have considered the entire manuscript. Members of the committee who do NOT agree that the manuscript is examinable, whether in the majority or not, should inform the Department Head or program administrator immediately, and in writing, so that such objections may be discussed with the Supervising Professor and the candidate.

3. Independent Research Competence: The dissertation must demonstrate an independent research competence on the part of the candidate that substantially adds to knowledge in the candidate's field with respect either to its intellectual substance or professional practice. The dissertation should be of such standard as to warrant publication in peer reviewed journals or scholarly books or monographs or equivalent.
4. Submission of the Final Draft of the Thesis or Dissertation: Once the candidate has, in the judgment of the Supervising Professor, prepared an examinable thesis/dissertation manuscript, it should be distributed to the other members of the Supervising Committee, allowing them a minimum of two weeks to review the document. After reading the document, a majority of the Supervising Committee members must agree that the document is ready to be defended before a request for a Final Oral Examination may be submitted and an examination date scheduled. The Final Oral Examination must be scheduled in at least one semester after the semester in which the Dissertation Proposal was approved. Committee members should ensure that the manuscript is complete, has been rigorously proofread (preferably by a professional proofreader), and meets scholarship standards for theses or dissertations. The student then submits a copy of the dissertation and the Request for Final Oral Examination form, signed with no more than one dissenting vote by the Supervising Committee members to the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, which shall approve the scheduling of the Final Oral Examination. Members of the committee who do NOT agree that the manuscript is examinable should inform the appropriate committee or administrator for that program immediately, and in writing, so that such objections may be discussed with the Supervising Professor and the candidate. The Final Oral Examination cannot be scheduled until a resolution has been reached with, at most, one dissenting vote.

5. Submission of Final Approved Thesis or Dissertation: Students must submit a final approved, electronic version of their dissertation/thesis to the Office of Graduate Studies. An electronic version of the dissertation/thesis will be held by the library and available to the public. An electronic copy must also be submitted to UMI/ProQuest who will make it publically available in hard copy and on the web. Information about required format and the submission process can be found at http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/graddean/dgIndex.htm.

6. FINAL ORAL EXAMINATION

1. Examining Committee: Upon the submission of the dissertation to the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean will appoint the Examining Committee. The membership of the Examining Committee will include all members of the Supervisory Committee plus a non-voting representative appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies. The representative serves as the Chair of the Examining Committee. An examiner external to the University may also be appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies on the recommendation of a member of the Supervising Committee or the candidate.

2. Conducting the Examination: Formal arrangements, such as time and place for the Final Oral Examination, are made by the appropriate committee or administrator for that program, in consultation with the candidate and the Examining Committee, and with the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies. All members of the Examining Committee must be present for the examination to be valid, unless a prior written exemption has been granted by the Dean of Graduate Studies. If a member of the Examining Committee is absent without the approval of the Dean, then the Chair of the Examining Committee shall not hold the defense. The defense shall be rescheduled by the Dean of Graduate Studies. In
any case, only one member may be absent without requiring a substitute. The 
examination will be conducted by the Chair in a manner appropriate to the 
material presented, and in accordance with current University regulations. The 
discussion will primarily focus on the candidate’s research, although aspects of 
the general field in which it was conducted may also be covered.

1. The final oral examination shall be conducted in three phases.

   1. Phase I. The candidate will make a formal public presentation of 
      the research. That presentation is open to the public, and members 
      of the audience may ask questions. The Supervising Professor will 
      chair this phase and supervise the questioning.

   2. Phase II. Following the public presentation, the candidate will be 
      examined by the members of the Examining Committee. This part 
      of the examination is not open to the public. Depending upon the 
      school’s policy, other members of the faculty may also attend that 
      part of the examination. This portion of the examination will be 
      chaired by the representative of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

   3. Phase III. After the completion of the oral examination, the 
      Examining Committee will vote on the results of the Final Oral 
      Examination. The committee will reach agreement on one of the 
      five possible outcomes listed below with no more than one 
      dissenting vote. If the committee cannot reach agreement on one of 
      the options, then the candidate will have failed the oral 
      examination and the manuscript will not be accepted.

      1. Passed the oral examination and manuscript accepted,
      2. Passed the oral examination and manuscript accepted 
         pending specified revisions,
      3. Second oral examination required, but manuscript accepted 
         or accepted with specified revisions,
      4. Major revisions of the manuscript and a second final oral 
         examination required,
      5. Oral examination failed, manuscript not accepted and the 
         committee recommends dismissal from the program.

   Following the vote of the Examining Committee, the 
Dean’s representative shall complete the Examination 
Report, to be forwarded to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

2. Procedures concerning Acceptance, Specified and Major revisions, and 
   Failure are as follows:

   1. Accepted - The committee agrees that the dissertation is acceptable 
      either without any revisions, or with minor revisions such as 
      corrections of typographical errors or changes of a minor editorial 
      nature. It is the Supervising Professor’s responsibility to ensure 
      that such corrections are made. The final corrected and approved 
      copies of the dissertation must be submitted to the Office of the 
      Dean of Graduate Studies within the same semester. If the final 
      approved copy is not submitted within the semester, the results of
the examination will be changed to Accepted Pending Specified Revisions and will be dealt with as specified under that result.

2. Accepted Pending Specified Revisions - The Committee agrees that the dissertation is acceptable pending changes, which may include insertions or deletions. Such changes would be of the kind which do not radically modify the development/argument of the dissertation but which go beyond minor revisions. The practical criterion will be that the committee is able to specify such changes with precision. It is the responsibility of the Supervising committee to certify that all such changes have been made. If the final approved copy is not submitted by the end of the semester following the examination, the results of the examination will be changed to Referred Pending Major Revisions and will be dealt with as specified under that result.

3. Referred Pending Major Revisions - The Committee agrees that the dissertation requires substantive changes in order for the dissertation to be acceptable. Detailed reasons for this decision must be supplied by the Chair of the Examining committee to the Dean of Graduate Studies, the appropriate committee or administrator for that program, and the candidate concerned. These recommendations on required changes must be approved by all members of the Committee. The committee reconvenes within a period not to exceed twelve months to conduct a second Final Oral Examination. This second attempt on the Final Oral Examination will be the final attempt by the student. If the Final Oral Examination and the written manuscript are not graded within the Accepted category, the student is dismissed from the program.

4. Failure - If the majority of the Examining Committee votes for failure of the oral and the non-acceptance of the manuscript, the student will be dismissed from the program. In no case will a third oral be given.

3. Registration During Manuscript Revision: Regardless of the revisions to be made, the student will be required to register for three credit hours and pay fees until the revisions are accepted by the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

4. Impact of revisions upon time limit for degree completion: The ten-year time limit for completion of the degree is still in effect while these revisions are being completed.

5. Intellectual property right protection: In order to protect patent or other intellectual property rights, the Dean of Graduate Studies may, upon request, delay for a period of one year the binding, distribution, and/or publication in microfilm of the dissertation.

7. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

1. Examinations or Proposal Presentation: A student must be registered for at least three semester credit hours of graduate course work during the semester in which any major degree examination, such as the Qualifying Examination or
comprehensive exam is taken, or during the semester in which the proposal is submitted for approval.

2. Procedures are outlined in the Graduate Catalog - Continuous Enrollment for Thesis or Dissertation: Once a student has enrolled in thesis or dissertation unless a leave of absence has been granted, that student must maintain continuous enrollment (not necessarily for thesis or dissertation) of at least three semester hours during consecutive long semesters until the final approved copy of the manuscript has been deposited in the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. If the approved copy of the manuscript has been deposited in the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies too late to permit graduation during that semester, but before the Census day of the Full-Term session (as defined in the academic calendar) of the subsequent semester, the student may register in absentia for his/her final semester of graduation.

3. Enrollment During the Semester of Graduation: With the exception of in absentia registration, doctoral students must be enrolled in at least 1 credit hour in the semester in which they graduate. Enrollment for 1 semester credit hour in the final semester is only allowed once. However, the individual degree program may require more than 1 credit hour be taken during the graduation semester.

8. TIME LIMITS: All requirements for a graduate degree, including transfer of credit must be completed within the specified time period. Students exceeding the specified time limit will not be eligible for their degree and will be dismissed from that graduate program. An approved leave of absence will not alter the time limits placed on graduate degrees.

   1. Master's Degree: All requirements for the Master's degree must be completed within one six-year period. Work over six years old, whether done at this University or elsewhere, will not count towards the Master's degree except through the petition process described in the "Time Limit: Exceptions" section.

   2. Doctoral Degree: All requirements for the Doctoral degree must be completed within one ten-year period. Work over ten years old, whether done at this University or elsewhere, will not count towards the Doctoral degree except through the petition process described in the "Time Limit: Exceptions" section. Students whose master’s degrees are accepted for full credit toward a Ph.D. must complete all requirements for the doctoral degree within one eight-year period. Work exceeding these limits, whether done at this university or elsewhere, will not count towards the degree.

3. Exceptions — Course Work: The time limits affecting course work taken early in a graduate program can be waived only when a student can demonstrate to the appropriate committee or administrator for that program that:

   1. the substantive material in the course is still relevant to the curriculum and,

   2. the student still retains a substantial grasp of the material taught in the course.

In such case, the acceptability of the course work in the student's Program of Studies must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies upon the recommendation of the appropriate committee or administrator for that program.
4. Exceptions — Research: The time limits can be waived only for research extending beyond the prescribed limits and only in exceptional cases where the student, Supervising Professor, and the appropriate committee or administrator for that program can demonstrate that:
   1. substantial progress has been made in the research effort and the student can successfully complete the thesis or dissertation within a two term extension, including the summer term, and
   2. a schedule to complete the research has been developed including major milestones of accomplishments. In such a case, the acceptability of the plan to finish the research must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies upon the recommendation of the appropriate committee or administrator for that program.

5. Procedures Prior to Graduation: An Application for Graduation must be filed during the semester of graduation on or before the date stipulated in the Academic Calendar.
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Admissions Consideration for Applicants with Three-Year Undergraduate Degrees

Applicants with three-year undergraduate degrees will be considered for admission into our master’s graduate programs. Their candidacy will be reviewed holistically considering all of the following variables: admission test scores, English proficiency scores if applicable, undergraduate grade point average, official transcripts from all previous institutions, undergraduate degree major and awarding institution, resume, recommendations and personal objective statement.
Item 11: FY17 Annual Committee Reports
August 1, 2017

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

I. Membership and Scope:
Voting scientific members of the IACUC consisted of L.T. Thompson, Ph.D. (Chair, BBS), Gail Breen, Ph.D. (Vice Chair, Bio). Additional scientific members: Kenneth Hoyt, Ph.D. (BioEng), Ted Price, Ph.D. (BBS) and Seth Hays, Ph.D. (BioEng). Voting attending veterinarian was Dr. Egeene Daniels, D.V.M., assisted by Dr. Tony Meyers, D.V.M. Voting non-scientific members were Douglas Dow, Ph.D. (Honors College), Kevin Masten (UTD Physical Plant), Larry Zacharias (UTD Chief of Police), and Bill Alsup (City of Richardson Director of Animal Services, Community member). Non-voting members Kathan McCallister (Assistant Director, Laboratory Animal Research Center) and Cynthia Tralmer (IACUC Coordinator, Office of Research Compliance) also attended all meetings and maintained official federal records. Sanaz Okhovat (Assistant Vice President for Research Compliance, Office of Research Integrity) and Rafael Martin (Office of Research) provide oversight for the office of the Vice President for Research.

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

This report covers the period from July 2016 through July 2017.

II. IACUC training:
As of this report, all but two current IACUC members (Dr. Hays, Dr. Dow) have completed AAALAC approved IACUC training. Dr. Dow has been acting ad interim for Dr. Brown (A&H) who was on developmental assignment this year, and is expected to return to the IACUC in the fall. IACUC training will be scheduled for Dr. Hays and any additional new members in the coming year.

III. Meeting summaries:
The IACUC met three times this past year, in fall, spring, and summer. Our upcoming fall meeting is scheduled for October 2, 2017.

• Fall meeting: 20 Oct 2016. The IACUC reviewed the status of animal use protocols (a total of 51 amendments, continuing reviews, and/or new protocols were approved since our March meeting. Dr. Marcel Perret-Gentil, D.V.M., attending veterinarian at UTSA Health Sciences Center, conducted additional research training seminar coursework this fall for upgrading skills for both undergraduate and graduate assistants in labs with approved IACUC protocols, including several sessions of his Rodent Surgery & Biomethodology Workshops, with more scheduled during the year. The IACUC also completed its FDA mandated program review. The IACUC meeting concluded by conducting a walk through inspection of the animal facilities and vivarium as required.

• Spring meeting: 27 Mar 2017. The committee reviewed and discussed the status of animal use protocols (a total of 24 amendments, continuing reviews, and/or new protocols were approved
since our October meeting), issues with regard to workload and designated member review (DMR) assignments, and issues with regards to record keeping and training. It was recommended to request (via the Senate and the Committee on Committees) that the membership (size) of the IACUC be increased by at least one more member to deal with the increasing number of protocol reviews required. The IACUC also completed its FDA mandated program review. The IACUC meeting concluded by conducting a walk through inspection of the animal facilities and vivariums as required. Scheduling for the fall IACUC meeting was also discussed.

• **Summer meeting: 26 Jul 2017.** The committee reviewed and discussed the current status of animal use protocols on campus (a total of 32 amendments, continuing reviews, and/or new protocols were approved since our March meeting). IACUC also completed its required program review. The IACUC meeting concluded by conducting a walk through inspection of the animal care and surgical facilities in both buildings as required. Scheduling for the fall 2017 meeting was discussed and approved.

A total of 107 active animal use protocol reviews [all assessed by the full IACUC, then reviewed in depth by DMR panels] were carried out and approved by the IACUC for active research work by UTD scientists. Once again, this is a significant increase in workload over the previous year, reflecting a steady growth in extramurally funded biomedical and basic science research activity at UT Dallas.
Item 12:
Committee Appointment Replacement
Replace David Channell from A&H on the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel as Member.
Recommended replacement would be Marilyn Waligore (AH).

Replace Margret Owens from A&H on the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel as Member.
Recommended replacement would be Linda Thibodeau (BBS).

Replace David Channell from A&H on the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel as Vice-Chair.
Recommended replacement would be Robert Lowry (EPPS).

Current Faculty members are:
Mohammad Ali Hooshyar (NSM) (8/31/2019) Chair
Zsuzsanna Ozsvath (AH) (8/31/2019)
Margaret T. Owen (BBS) (8/31/2019)
Paul Fishwick (ATEC) (8/31/2019)
Andrew Blanchard (ECS) (8/31/2019)
John Hart (BBS) (8/31/2018)
Sheryl Skaggs (EPPS) (8/31/2019)
Robert Lowry (EPPS) (8/31/2018)
Yiorgos Makris (ECS) (8/31/2018)
Roger Malina (ATEC) (8/31/2019)
Ozalp Ozer (SOM) (8/31/2018)
Elena Katok (JSOM) (8/31/2019)
Chuanwei Zhang (NSM) (8/31/2018)

Replace Pia Jakobsson from A&H on the Library Committee as Vice-Chair.
Recommended replacement would be Susan Chizeck (I).

Replace Elena Katok from JSOM on the Committee on Faculty Mentoring as Member.
Recommended replacement would be.

Walter Voit (ECS) (8/31/2018) Chair
Lowell Kiel (EPPS) (8/31/2018) Vice Chair
Nadine Connell (EPPS) (8/31/2019)
Vladimir Dragovic (NSM) (8/31/2019)
Todd Fechter (ATEC) (8/31/2019)
Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki (NSM) (8/31/2018)
Julie Haworth (AH) (8/31/2019)
Jackie Nelson (BBS) (8/31/2019)
Aria Nosratinia (ECS) (8/31/2018)
Karen Prager (I) (8/31/2019)
Kathryn Stecke (SOM) (8/31/2018)