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AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNIVERSITY
AGENDA
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
May 18, 2011

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS       DR. WILDENTHAL

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA                                  DR. LEAF

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   April 20, 2011 Meeting                                  DR. LEAF

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT                                       DR. LEAF

5. FAC REPORT                                             DR. LEAF

6. STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIAISON REPORT                     DR. CORDELL

7. REVISED ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY                    DR. KRATZ

8. CEP PROPOSALS                                          DR. CANTRELL
   A. PRODUCT MANAGEMENT CERTIFICATE
   B. MARKET RESEARCH & MARKETING ANALYTICS CERTIFICATE
   C. REVISED ACADEMIC APPEALS POLICY

9. REVISED A&H PROMOTION GUIDELINES                     DR. REDMAN

10. MOTION OF SUPPORT FOR CHANCELLOR CIGARROA            DR. LEAF

11. ADJOURNMENT                                          DR. WILDENTHAL
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 official minutes.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
APRIL 20, 2011

PRESENT:  Hobson Wildenthal, Indranil Bardhan, Kurt Beron, Dinesh Bhatia, John Burr, Cy Cantrell, R. Chandrasekaran, David Cordell, Gregg Dieckmann, Kelly Durbin, Simon Fass, D.T. Huynh, Ganesh Janakiraman, Kamran Kiasaleh, Murray Leaf, Dennis Miller, Jessica Murphy, Steven Nielsen, Simeon Ntafos, Ravi Prakash, Tim Redman, Liz Salter, Lucien Thompson, Zhenyu Xuan

ABSENT:  Dan Bochsler, Gail Breen, Gregory Dess, Tobias Hagge, John Hoffman, Mustapha Ishak-Boushaki, Linda Keith, Phillip Kisunzu, Syam Menon, Jessica Murphy, B.P.S. Murthi, Ramachandran Natarajan, Orlando Richard, Robert Stern, Mathukumalli Vidyasagar, Yexiao Xu, Harold Zhang

VISITORS:  Chris Parr, Lev Gelb

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS
Speaker Leaf called the meeting to order and announced that Dr. Wildenthal was at an off-campus event and would be late arriving.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Speaker Leaf asked to add one item to the agenda, which is the summer schedule for Senate meetings. Cy Cantrell moved to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was seconded and the agenda was approved as amended.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Cy Cantrell moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Simon Fass seconded. The minutes were approved.

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT
Speaker Leaf stated that because his report is so long, it has been included in the agenda packet. He announced that Rick O’Donnell, who had been hired as an adviser to the UT System Board of Regents, is no longer employed by the UT System. The two task forces that the Regents have set up are still in operation - one on blended learning and one on excellence and productivity. The latter is most likely to recommend things like new forms of faculty evaluation on the A&M model. Speaker Leaf also stated that his description of the background for the policy on student appeals was incorrect, and he corrected the description. The report as revised in the meeting therefore is:

1. CBC Policy. The HOP committee has met and we have advised the Office of the General Council that we have approved the CBC policy. The HOP committee will make some editorial changes, matters of punctuation and formatting to be consistent with the standard formatting the Provost’s office is trying to develop for all charges.
Since Speaker Leaf had not heard from the Council in response to the revised form, the HOP Committee is holding that until he can say the Council or Senate has approved it, as we agreed at the last Senate meeting.

2. **Criminal Background Check Form.** The HOP committee accepted the form as revised pending Academic Council agreement that the revisions are what the Senate required. The Council met after the HOP committee. The Council agreed that they were what the Senate required and that the form did not need to come back for Senate additional approval—but also suggested some minor expansions of wording (to reference our policy at the start of the second paragraph). Accordingly, we did not put it on the agenda. It is back with the HOP committee.

3. **Student Appeals.** Last fall, Dean Cunningham raised questions about the policy for students to appeal grades or anything else on their transcript that they think is an error or otherwise wish to contest. The process has four steps, beginning with the instructor and ending with the Undergraduate and Graduate Deans. There is a training module on this that probably all faculty have had to complete.

The policy did not originate in the Senate, and to my recollection actually has never been through the Senate. Among other things, it is inconsistent with our long-standing policy on appealing grades, which is not to do it unless there is a manifest error of some kind on the instructors’ part. Speaker Leaf suggested that he ask the Graduate Council to propose revisions. This did not happen, but appeals continue and the process continues to cause problems. Finally, I tried to see where the policy came from, thinking it might have been in response to a system requirement of some kind or perhaps in FERPA – something I might be able to discuss with the Office of General Counsel. It did not originate with System.

The Vice President for Student Affairs has no role in the curriculum or academic policies, but under Regent’s Rules the concern with student discipline does not distinguish academic discipline (and academic dishonesty) from other kinds of disciplinary responsibilities. Evidently, this appeal process was an extension of this authority, although the process appeal is not made through the VPSA channels but through academic channels. I then thought that it originated with the Vice President for Student Affairs. In fact, however, she has said very clearly that it did not. She would never put an academic policy or process in place. She thinks the policy originated with Michael Coleman, as Dean of Undergraduate Studies. This now seems to me to the best explanation, and greatly simplifies the situation. It means that we can handle the revision of the policy entirely as an academic matter.

Speaker Leaf has suggested to the Graduate Dean that he propose an appeal process consistent with our policy on grades, and possibly include things like comprehensive examinations or orals. He is now discussing a draft with the Dean for Undergraduate Studies and associate deans. Eventually, it will come to the CEP and to the Senate. When we have it in place we will be able to remove the present policy entirely. In my view, we should not have such an omnibus option for a student to appeal anything in their record. Appeals should be narrowly and tightly tailored to specific kinds of judgments and involve just enough additional faculty to assure that such judgments are not arbitrary or capricious. They should not allow students to calculate that such an appeal involves little or no trouble or loss for them but a great deal of trouble and cost in time and effort for the faculty and administration.

4. We circulated the UTD Criminal Background Check Policy as a general template during the FAC meeting. It seemed satisfactory. Although the FAC did not take formal action on it, no one indicated problems that we have not recognized here, and the solutions in the policy were accepted when they were understood.

5. Everything else that has been under discussion is on the agenda.
5. **UT System Faculty Advisory Council Report**

The UT System Faculty Advisory Council met on March 24th and 25th, in Austin. Speaker Leaf and Secretary Cordell attended for UTD.

1. **Regental reform efforts.** The meeting was dominated by the concern with the shift in attitude of the Board of Regents, reflecting the Regents’ increased willingness to impose “reforms” on the UT System similar to those that have garnered unfavorable national attention for Texas A & M, include a fairly clear statement from the President of the American Association of Universities that they might put A & M’s membership in that association at risk. The ideas for reform originate with Governor Perry’s “breakthrough solutions,” which in turn originate with the long-standing and often-repeated recommendations of Texas Public Policy Foundation.

In the last six months, three of the Regents who the FAC had felt were especially understanding of what higher education involved have resigned. The first of these was Regent James Huffines, who resigned last July. Regent Huffines had been first appointed by Governor Perry in 2003 and was reappointed in 2009. Terms are 6 years. He had been elected Chair of the Board first in 2004 serving to 2007, then again in 2009 and served until March 3, 2010, staying on as member. His resignation statement in July expressed the hope that the Board would “continually be united in elevating the University above any type of a partisan agenda.” (Ralph K. M. Haurwitz, Associated Press, in Lubbock Avalanche-Journal online, 1 August 2011). Regent Janiece Longoria and Regent Colleen McHugh left in February, 2011. (An Austin-American Statesman article says their terms were up). Longoria had been chair of the Academic Affairs Committee; McHugh had been elected Chair of the Board on March 3, 2010, replacing Regent Huffines. Regents Longoria and McHugh were replaced by Alex Cranberg and Wallace Hall.

When Regent Huffines left the Board, Regent Steve Hicks was appointed to fill the remainder of his term as member, until 2015. Brenda Pejovich was then appointed to fill the remainder of the term of the position that Steve Hicks had left, which expired in January 2011. Regent Pejovich was subsequently reappointed.

The new Chairman of the Board, elected by the Regents on February 8, 2011, is Gene Powell.

On February 25, the Austin American Statesman reported that the UT System had just announced the formation of two “advisory task forces” to collect information and make recommendations. One is on Excellence and Productivity, headed by Brenda Pejovich. The two other Regents on the Task Force are Cranberg and Stillwell. The other Task Force is on Blended and Online Learning, headed by Wallace L Hall, Jr. Brenda Pejovich is a CPA and is on the Board of Directors of the Texas Public Policy Foundation. Before her appointment to the UT Board of Regents she had been appointed to the Coordinating Board. Wallace Hall is involved with economic development projects related to the Trinity River levees and wetlands in the Dallas area and is a trustee of St. Marks School, in Dallas. Alex Cranberg is a UT graduate. He was a resident of Colorado at the time he was appointed but is now a resident of Texas. He is a petroleum engineer, an underwriter of the Horace Mann Scholarship Challenge in Denver, and an advocate of vouchers in higher education.

Around March 3, a widely quoted communication by Chair Powell to the Board compared education to cars. The gist was that UT gives a Cadillac education; in hard times, a Chevy Bel Air is good enough. On March 6 Powell qualified his remarks, saying they did not apply to UT Austin. On March 14, this and Powell’s other actions provoked a widely quoted open letter to Texas alumni and others from a prominent alumnus, Gordon Appleman, saying in part that UT Austin was in fact a “prime target” of the reforms and the Boards actions put the UT institutions “at risk of serious, long-term, perhaps irreversible degradation in academic stature” (Texas Tribune, March 16, 2011).
To assist the task forces Chairman Powell hired Rick O’Donnell. O’Donnell has written papers on higher education for the Texas Public Policy Foundation arguing that research adds no value to the university; it would be better left to private business. He also has argued against accreditation by accrediting bodies; he favors the legislature. O’Donnell’s title was “special assistant” to the Board. Although located in the office of the Chancellor, he reported directly to the Powell. His salary is $200,000 a year. O’Donnell holds a BA degree from Colorado College. Before coming to Texas, in 2007, O’Donnell ran in 2002 and 2006 for the House of Representatives from Colorado and served in several positions under Governor Bill Owens, including the Department of Regulatory Agencies and director of the Commission on Higher Education. In the latter capacity he supervised introduction of a system of vouchers allowing students in grades K through 12 to attend non-public schools at public expense. Cranberg was a strong supporter of his electoral campaign. In Texas, O’Donnell served as President of the Acton Foundation for Entrepreneurial Excellence (AFEE) from 2002 to 2007. The AFEE owns the curriculum of the Acton School of Business. This is a one year program that makes a point of having only actual businesspeople as teachers. It was founded at UT Austin by Jeff Sandefer and others, but Sandefer left UT in 2002 when they started hiring more academically qualified faculty. The program is now being offered in Austin through Hardin-Simmons University. They take in 50 students and charge $49,500 per year tuition. If the students pay for the first semester and earn As and Bs, a loan arrangement can be made for second semester. While O’Donnell was President of AFEE he was also senior research fellow at the TPPF. Sandefer is a Board member of the TPPF. He is also an associate of Alex Cranberg, through the oil business.

The FAC program for the weekend began with a meeting with Regent Hall and Regent Pejovich, along with Chancellor Cigarroa, VC Prior, and Dr. Pedro Reyes (Liaison to the Board). Chancellor Cigarroa began with a statement to the effect that he was pleased by the Board’s focus on quality, and saw this as a great opportunity. Regents Hall and Pejovich then also gave short statements, to the effect that they were just trying to collect information, had not reached any conclusions, and would welcome our suggestions. Mr. O’Donnell sat on the side of the room and was not introduced. The discussion was civil and constructive. There were about three major themes. First, members asked in many different ways what Hall and Pejovich thought the committees could accomplish: what was their idea of quality, accountability, or efficiency? Responses were along the lines of “we are here to listen and welcome your input.” Second, members tried to probe what Pejovich and Hall thought of research, and to suggest its centrality. Responses were generally statements of agreement and understanding. Third, there were concerns with the very short deadline for submitting information—initially one month. Although no one explicitly said so, the obvious inference was that the information was not going to be looked at carefully and the committees, or the Board, had already reached their conclusions. Part of the response to this was that the deadline had been extended. Another part was an expression of concern, especially by Regent Hall, that there should not be leaks to press, or speculation to the press, about the committees’ conclusions before the committees had officially stated them.

There were good reasons for Regent Hall’s concern, which the members of the FAC were aware of. The Texas Tribune (online), the Austin-American Statesman, and the Houston Chronicle have had very good coverage of what has been happening on the Board. On March 14, the Tribune carried an article by Reeve Hamilton titled “Special Advisor to UT System Sparks Concern” that described O’Donnell’s appointment, his salary, and his views on research and related them to the “reforms” that had been introduced at Governor Perry’s evident initiative at Texas A & M—and the response from the AAU. It also quoted Senator Judith Zaferini saying she was “shocked and dismayed” by O’Donnell’s salary and that it hurt the Board’s credibility. She also commented adversely on the fact that O’Donnell reported to Chairman Powell rather than to the Chancellor, and with respect what the committees might recommend, she said that if it
reflected an “anti-intellectual, anti-academic mind-set” it would give the impression to Dr. Berdahl, President of the AAU, that his concerns in regard to A & M were not isolated to one institution.

In another article in the Texas Tribune, published on March 16th, Hamilton described the interconnections between Perry, Cranberg, Sandefer, O’Donnell, and the TPPF. According to Hamilton, Sandefer was also the principal author of Perry’s “breakthrough solutions.”

On Monday, March 21, O’Donnell was the subject of a similar article in the Houston Chronicle titled “New UT adviser raising concerns in Austin: Lawmakers say Rick O'Donnell's views on research clash with state's goals.” The focus of the article, and of the concern of the legislators, was O’Donnell’s public statements (in addition to his papers) to the effect that universities should not be doing research. The main legislative spokesmen in opposition, according to the article, were Representative Dan Branch and Senator Zafferini, both of whom were authors of the Tier 1 initiative.

On March 24th, the President of the UT Alumni Association, the Texas Exes, wrote a “call to action” to all the members of the association describing the committees and warning that the “mission and core values” of the University were under threat. We (the FAC) understand that the response included a number of concerned and wealthy alumni communicating with several of the regents and plainly saying that they would not support the university if this happened. Numbers of dollars mentioned were in the millions.

While the discussion was going on with Pejovich and Hall during the FAC meeting, the Austin American Statesmen published another story that include the news that O’Donnell’s appointment would not be continued after August, 2011, and that he was reassigned from the office of the Chancellor to a position as “special assistant for research,” reporting to Scott Kelley, Executive Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs. The next day, Friday, Chairman Powell responded to the letter to the Texas Exes, saying they would not do what Texas A & M has done, that the exercise should not be misinterpreted as an attack on research.

The upshot of the discussion on the task forces was that we agreed to make an “electronic loose leaf binder” for each of them to try to show them what we do now to assure quality and efficiency, and try to convey more of a sense than they evidently have of why we do this in the way we do.

Later in the meeting, the FAC developed a list of the major documents that this binder will contain. We will try to get them from all the campuses. Vicki Carlisle and I will receive and compile them. We will forward them to Pedro Reyes, and he will make them available to the Regents on the System website.

2. Salaries and titles at health campuses. Another item that may have some importance far in the future concerns the health campuses. About five years ago, the UT system developed a template for “practice plans” for the health campuses. Although mainly for the income-producing, business sides, of the campus operations, they have implications for the academic sides because they sought to introduce some system wide consistency in terms used in contracts, titles, and the difference between a “base salary” that the campus would be responsible for as against what faculty were expected to make from grants. When we initially discussed this with Vice-Chancellor Shine, we all agreed that the effort might eventually lead to consideration of something like a system-wide salary policy and scale, like that of the University of California. Now the practice plans are in place, and V C Shine reported that they have had several audits. So we asked him if he could look over the results and see what this tells about the possibility. He has agreed to do so.

3. Legislative report: The report was entertaining and frightening as usual. The state budget is still unsettled but the appropriation bill was going to the floor very soon. The concealed handgun bill looks like it will pass. Those in favor see it as a second amendment issue. Those opposed see it as a campus autonomy and safety issue, but the Higher Education Committees were not involved in reviewing it. The “would you...
allow it in the legislature?” argument does not work because many proponents carry weapons already. The budget deficit looks like about 27 billion, but the Rainy Day fund will be used in part. So far, redistricting has not emerged as a preoccupation. Neither was voter id—which took up so much floor time in the last session that the gun bill was killed by a kind of procedural smothering. Dan Branch is chair of the House Higher Education Committee.

4. We circulated the UTD Criminal Background Check Policy as a general template. It seemed satisfactory. No one indicated problems that we have not recognized here, and the solutions in the policy were accepted when they were understood.

5. Resolutions
Finally, the FAC passed two resolutions:

1. Resolution for Representative Branch and Senator Zaffirini
   We, the members of the UT System Faculty Advisory Council, appreciate your public expression of support for the values of higher education and the creation of more research universities as reported recently in the Houston Chronicle (March 21). Research is essential to the teaching mission of every campus. Education, especially higher education, is not just a matter of transmittal of knowledge; it is an introduction to discovery, creation and critical thinking.

2. Resolution on UT Brownsville:
   Background: UT Brownsville, for the past 20 years, has been sharing their campus with a community college, Texas Southmost College. The community college has its own board of trustees. The University has the faculty. The community college has some of the buildings. In the last few months, the community college board has voted to separate from UTB. If they separate, UTB will have faculty who have been teaching non-academic, vocational/technical, courses but will not be able to offer such courses. The faculty lack the qualifications to teach academic courses. Yet in the current (joint) arrangement they are “tenured”—although they never would have been tenured on an academic campus. They do not want to work for the community college, and apparently the community college board does not want to hire them. Yet they have nowhere else to go, and of course the community college really has few to no other people to hire. This is a very painful situation. The Senate leadership at the FAC asked for a resolution in support. In the view of the FAC, the situation attracts the Regent’s Rule on closing programs for financial exigency. The UTB Senate had approved procedures to implement the rule, using the template we developed last year, but the UTB administration has not adopted them. Accordingly, the FAC passed the following:

   We, the members of the UT System FAC, affirm the values of tenure. We strongly recommend the financial exigency revisions proposed by the UT Brownsville Academic Senate be followed for any program closure. Moreover, involvement of faculty as required by Regents’ Rules should be construed as involving the Faculty Governance organization.

6. STUDENT GOVERNMENT LIASION REPORT:
   David Cordell reported that Student Government is sending a letter to State Legislators stating that they do not support the concealed handgun legislation.

   Student Government has put together a flyer highlighting some of their accomplishments in the past year. One item that Dr. Cordell called attention to was Student Government’s help in preparing a proposal to President Daniel to reform the academic dishonesty process.
7. **REVISED STUDENT MISCONDUCT POLICY**

Gene Fitch, Dean of Students, presented this information. Dr. Fitch stated when he was hired last August he was asked to get a group together to determine what their concerns are with the current academic dishonesty policy. Dr. Fitch put together a committee of faculty members and students and the results of their discussions are the revisions that are under consideration.

There are three substantive changes proposed. The first is getting students more involved in the process. The second change is the creation of a hearing panel composed of faculty and students to review cases rather than using a single individual to make a determination of academic misconduct. The individuals serving on the panel would come from a pool of faculty and students – probably around 12-15 individuals. The Senate would be responsible for deciding how the faculty members of the pool would be selected. For the first year, the student members of the pool would most likely be hand-picked and recruited to ensure that the program gets off to a good start. In subsequent years there would be an application and interview process for students wishing to be a part of the pool. This panel would be trained but would not only hear scholastic cases but other behavioral cases as well, such as theft, vandalism, sexual assault, etc. The third change allows faculty to have more involvement in the process, more specifically, who assigns the grade. Under the current policy, when a case is referred to Judicial Affairs for investigation and the student is ultimately found responsible, the Judicial Affairs office assigns the grade. Dean Fitch feels that this is an academic issue and the faculty should be determining what the grade should be. Under the new policy, when a faculty member sends a case to Judicial Affairs for review, they will also send what that student’s grade should be. This does raise the issue of consistency with grading. Dean Fitch emphasized that consistency in grading across campus is not important. However, what is important is that there is consistency within the class.

Dean Fitch assured the Senate that they will continue to have the ability to sit down with students and discuss the situation or accusations prior to sending it to Judicial Affairs or to say this seems like a misunderstanding and pull the case back and not send it forward. What the Committee does not want to happen is for the faculty and student to make what amounts to a “handshake agreement” with students who may have actually plagiarized because that presents problems in the future if the student fails to honor that agreement and the case ultimately is sent to Judicial Affairs.

Jessica Murphy asked if there was a provision in this policy that required faculty to report a student even if they felt the incident it was clearly an accident or a misunderstanding and there was no intent to plagiarize. Dean Fitch replied that this is not a requirement, and, in fact, he discourages doing this. Judicial Affairs should be brought in only when the faculty member feels that disciplinary action is warranted. Speaker Leaf emphasized that there is a difference in making a judgment that the student has not completed the assignment and that there has been dishonesty. Dishonesty is something for which a person would be punished, rather than just graded down. That initial decision must be made by the faculty member.

Tim Redman expressed his concern that the notification period given to the students was too short and should be more generous. Dean Fitch responded that there is already an accommodation built into the code that allows for differences in business days vs. school days, etc.

Dean Fitch was asked if there are guidelines in the policy that address what constitutes plagiarism. Is it forgetting to put and end note after a paragraph, an entire page of material, etc. Dean Fitch replied that this is the professor’s discretion and that this is where the meeting with the student would be very helpful.
In response to a question from Simon Fass, Dean Fitch pointed out that the Judicial Affairs office will still be available for consultation when the faculty member would like their advice in determining what the final grade should be.

Tim Redman requested that Section 49.14 be amended as follows:

Item (b) change three (3) weekdays notice to seven (7) and Item (d) change ten (10) days written notice to fourteen (14).

Dean Fitch stated that these issues are part of the Code of Conduct that should not be changed by the Senate. Liz Salter expressed her opinion that extending the notification period may not be helpful because it was in the best interest of the student to have cases like this resolved as quickly as possible.

Tim Redman wanted to make an amendment to the motion to include the changes he requested. However, at this time there was no motion on the floor to approve the policy presented by Dean Fitch. Kurt Beron moved to approve the revised policy as presented. Liz Salter seconded the motion. Tim Redman moved to amend Section 49.14 (b) and (d) as stated earlier. The motion to amend failed due to the lack of a second. The original motion carried.

8. CERTIFICATION OF SENATE ELECTION RESULTS
Speaker Leaf explained that this is a new item resulting from the electronic voting that the Senate used in the election this year. The Election Committee raised the question of what to do with the electronic ballots now that voting is completed. The Academic Council suggests certifying the election results as reported. Once this is done the electronic ballots can be erased, as in governmental elections. Cy Cantrell moved to certify the election of those named, as previously announced. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried. The election is certified.

David Cordell reported that the Senior Lecturers elected were: Shawn Alborz, Dan Bochsler, Judd Bradbury, David Cordell, and Mark Thouin. Speaker Leaf pointed out that these names have been reviewed by the ad hoc Election Committee. Cy Cantrell moved to certify the results of the Senior Lecturer elections. Dan Bochsler seconded. The election is certified.

9B. RESOLUTION ON INTERPRETATION OF BYLAWS (Item taken out of order)
The purpose of this motion is to construe the bylaws on elections for the special case of the School of Interdisciplinary Studies, which has too few members of the Voting Faculty to expect that such faculty should always be available to represent them on the Senate. Richard Scotch moved to approve the following resolution:

It is the sense of the Senate that the principle of assuring at least one person in the Senate from each school if at least one person runs and gets votes shall be interpreted for the School of Interdisciplinary studies as follows:

If there is no nominee for election to the Senate from among the voting faculty (tenure and tenure track) but there is one or more nominee from among the Senior Lecturers, and if none of the nominees from the School is among the Senators whom the Senior Lecturers elect, then the nominee from the school who receives the largest number of votes shall be deemed elected to the Senate in addition to those whom the Senior Lecturers elect.

Cy Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.
9A. APPOINTMENT OF DR. LIZ SALTER AS VOTING MEMBER OF THE SENATE
Speaker Leaf recommended to the Senate that they appoint Dr. Liz Salter as a voting member of the Senate from the School of Interdisciplinary Studies. Richard Scotch moved to approve this recommendation. Cy Cantrell seconded. The motion carried.

10. REVISION TO SENATE BYLAWS
Speaker Leaf stated that the electronic voting system used in the last Senate election as designed with the current bylaws in mind and the change being presented is a minor change in wording. The first change is in Section 1 and states that election procedures may be online or may utilize paper petitions and ballots.

The other part of the revision clarifies the answer to a question which has arisen several times in the past, specifically, whether the number of Senior Lecturers elected each year is 10% of those elected or 10% of the positions available. Since the elections are held simultaneously it can really only mean 10% of the positions available, but this has never been explicitly stated until now. Cy Cantrell moved to approve the revision to the bylaws. Dan Bochsler seconded. The motion carried. This revision will now go to the HOP Committee.

11. RESULTS OF SENATE-ELECT CAUCUS
Speaker Leaf announced that the members of the Academic Council for the 2011-2012 year will be:

- Cy Cantrell
- Tim Redman
- R. Chandrasekaran
- Richard Scotch
- Dennis Miller
- Tres Thompson

12. APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATION
Secretary Cordell presented the names of candidates for graduate degrees. These students have applied for graduate degrees and have been reviewed by the Graduate Dean. The Graduate Dean certifies that all of these students will be eligible for the degrees indicated upon satisfactory completion of the current semester’s work. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to receive the degrees as indicated upon receipt of final grades and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades received are consistent with the standards for credit prescribed by this University.

David Cordell moved to certify the list of graduate candidates for graduation. Kurt Beron seconded. The motion carried and the graduate degrees are certified.

Secretary Cordell presented the names of candidates for undergraduate degrees. These students have applied for graduation and have been reviewed by the Office of Records. The Office of Records declared that all of these students will be eligible for graduation upon the completion of the current semester’s work at the necessary levels. I request, therefore, that the Academic Senate certify these students to graduate upon receipt of final grades, and notification of completion of other requirements, provided that the grades are consistent with the standards for graduation prescribed by this University. I also request that the Academic Senate certify those students designated as eligible to graduate with honors upon completion of coursework and requirements consistent with the standards for honors at the levels offered by this University.

David Cordell moved to certify the list of undergraduate candidates for graduation. Liz Salter seconded. The motion carried and the undergraduate degrees are certified.

At this time Speaker Leaf asked Provost Wildenthal if he had any announcements. Dr. Wildenthal reported that the functions of the online learning that were once handled by the Office of Educational Enhancement have...
been moved to the School of Management. This is under the direction of Darren Crone. Provost Wildenthal anticipates that we will be investing more time and resources into blended learning in the future.

13. SUMMER SCHEDULE FOR SENATE
Speaker Leaf asked the Senate when during the summer they wished to meet. Richard Scotch moved to schedule a July meeting. The Academic Council will determine whether meetings in June and/or August are necessary. The regular meeting schedule will resume in September. Cy Cantrell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

There being no further business, Speaker Leaf adjourned the meeting.

APPROVED:____________________________________   DATE:______________________________
CHAPTER 49  STUDENT DISCIPLINE AND CONDUCT

SUBCHAPTER A.  GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 49.03 DEFINITIONS

(a) In this chapter, unless the context requires a different meaning,

1. "class day" means a day on which classes or reading periods before semester or summer session final examinations are regularly scheduled or on which semester or summer session final examinations are given;

2. "weekday" means Monday through Friday, excluding any day that is an official holiday of the university, or when regularly scheduled classes are suspended due to emergent situations;

3. "day" means a calendar day;

4. "dean" means the Dean of Students or a delegate of the Dean;

5. "vice president" means the Vice President for Student Affairs;

6. "president" means the President of The University of Texas at Dallas;

7. "student" means a person enrolled or formerly enrolled at the university or a person accepted for admission or readmission to the university;

8. "faculty" means any tenured or non-tenured, full or part-time instructor whose responsibility includes teaching;

9. "university" means The University of Texas at Dallas;

10. "System" means The University of Texas System;

11. "university rule" means a rule, a regulation or instruction contained in the university's Handbook of Operating Procedures or other official publication or document;

12. "Regent's Rule" means a rule or regulation contained in the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents, The University of Texas System;

13. "campus" consists of all real property, buildings, or facilities owned or controlled by UT Dallas;

14. "faculty" means any tenured or non-tenured, full or part-time instructor whose responsibility includes teaching;

15. "hearing advisor" means the individual who is responsible for oversight of administrative duties during or prior to the hearing;

16. "complainant" is defined by the University of Texas at Dallas or the person making a referral to the Judicial Affairs Office, Dean of Students;
(17) “respondent” is defined as the student or group alleged in an official complaint filed with the Judicial Affairs Office, Dean of Students;

(18) “sanction” is defined as the response to a violation of the university rules, policies or procedures

SUBCHAPTER B. ADMINISTRATION OF DISCIPLINE

SECTION 49.06 FACULTY ROLE IN SCHOLASTIC ACADEMIC VIOLATIONS

(a) Judgments of academic dishonesty are distinguished from academic judgments concerning whether a student has or has not completed an assignment as required. The former involve considerations of misconduct and punishment sanctioning and are the responsibility of the Dean of Students. Under authority delegated by the dean, a faculty member who has reason to suspect that a student has engaged in scholastic academic dishonesty may do either of the following:

(b) Conduct a conference with the student in compliance with the following procedures:

(1) if the cheating was directly witnessed by the faculty member or if the faculty member has clear documentary evidence, the case should be referred directly to the dean with the reasons and/or evidence for the charge and a recommendation for punishment. The dean shall proceed under Subchapter C; or

(2) if the cheating was not directly witnessed by the faculty member or if, in the case of plagiarism, the documentary evidence is ambiguous, the faculty member may meet with the
student(s) involved and discuss the alleged violation and the evidence that supports the charge. After conferring with the student, the faculty member may refer the allegations to the dean with a recommendation for a penalty, or choose not to refer the allegations to the dean if the faculty member determines that they are not supported by the evidence.

(c) Choose not to meet with the student and instead must forward the appropriate documentation to [Judicial Affairs](#) the [dean of students](#). The instructor should attempt to inform the student of the allegation and notify the student that the information has been forwarded to the Office of Judicial Affairs [dean of students](#) for investigation.

(b d) Upon receipt of the evidence [referral form](#) and recommendation supporting material/documentation from the faculty member, the dean shall proceed under Subchapter C. If the student is found in violation of the code of conduct, the dean will review the student’s prior disciplinary record and assess a penalty [sanctions](#) that is appropriate to the circumstances. The dean will then affirm the grade as submitted by the faculty and share this information with the student. In a course in which a failing grade has been assessed for scholastic [academic dishonesty](#), the student will not be allowed to withdraw as a way of preventing the grade from being entered on their record. The dean will inform the student and the faculty member of the decision.

In the event a student disputes the facts and/or allegations of academic dishonesty, and at the discretion of the Office of Judicial Affairs, a hearing before the Discipline Committee may be arranged. If the student is found responsible for the allegation(s) of academic dishonesty, sanction(s) as determined by the Office of Judicial Affairs will be imposed. In addition, the [grade](#) as provided by the faculty member, will be assessed. Should the student be absolved of the allegations of academic dishonesty by the Discipline Committee, the faculty member will reassess the student’s grade based on this finding.

Subchapter F. STUDENT STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

Section 49.36 Scholastic Dishonesty

(a) The university expects all students to maintain a high level of responsibility with respect to academic honesty. Because the value of an academic degree depends on the absolute integrity of the work done by the student for that degree, it is imperative that a student maintain a high standard of individual honor in his or her scholastic work.

(b) The dean may initiate disciplinary proceedings under Subchapter C against a student accused of scholastic dishonesty [academic dishonesty](#) upon complaint by a faculty member or a student.

(e) The student, pending disciplinary action, remains responsible for all academic exercises and syllabus requirements.

(f) The student may remain in class, if the student’s presence in the class does not interfere with the professor’s ability to teach the class or the ability of other class members to learn. (See Section 49.07 for additional information regarding the removal of a student from class)
SECTION 49.11 ADMINISTRATIVE DISPOSITION

(d) In the event a student disputes the facts and or allegations of academic dishonesty, and at the discretion of the dean of students, a hearing before the Discipline Committee may be arranged. If the student is found responsible for the allegation(s) of academic dishonesty, sanction(s) as determined by the dean of students will be imposed. In addition, the grade, as provided by the faculty member, will be assessed. Should the student be absolved of the allegations of academic dishonesty by the Discipline Committee, the faculty member will reassess the student’s grade based on this finding.

SECTION 49.12 APPOINTMENT OF HEARING OFFICERS

In those cases in which the accused student respondent disputes the facts and/or allegations upon which the charges allegations are based, such charges allegations shall be heard and determined by a fair and impartial hearing officer panel comprised of UTD faculty and students. The president shall appoint the hearing officer.

SECTION 49.13 HEARINGS

(a) Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures contained in this chapter which assure both the university and the accused student respondent the following rights:

(1) both parties will exchange lists of witnesses, a summary of witness testimony statements, and copies of documents to be introduced presented at the hearing at least five (5) days prior to hearing.

(2) each party shall have the right to appear, present testimony of witnesses and documentary evidence, cross-examine question witnesses and be assisted by an advisor of his/her choice. The advisor may be an attorney. If the accused student’s respondent’s advisor is an attorney, the dean's advisor may be an attorney from the Office of General Counsel of the System. If the student chooses an advisor who is an attorney, the student must give written notice of the name and address of the attorney to the dean at least three (3) week days before the time set for commencement of the hearing. An advisor may confer with and/or advise the dean or accused student respondent, but shall not be permitted to question witnesses, introduce evidence, make objections, or present arguments to the hearing officer panel.

(3) The dean may recommend a penalty sanction to be assessed by the hearing officer panel. The recommendation may be based upon past practice of the university for violations of a similar nature, the past disciplinary record of the student, or other factors deemed relevant by the dean. The accused student shall be entitled to respond to the recommendation recommended sanction(s) of the dean. In addition, the grade, as provided by the faculty member, will be assessed.

(4) The hearing will be video recorded. If either party desires to appeal the decision of the hearing officer panel, the official record will consist of the recording of the hearing,
the documents received in evidence and the decision of the hearing officer panel. At the request of the president, the recording of the hearing will be transcribed and all both parties will may will be furnished a copy of the transcript upon request.

(b) Such hearings shall be closed to all persons other than the student charged respondent, the dean, an advisor for each of them, the hearing officer panel members, witnesses while they are presenting evidence, and the person designated to record the hearing advisor.

SECTION 49.14 NOTICES

(a) The dean shall prepare notices as appropriate to the student charged.

(b) A student will be sent. Any student may will be summoned by be sent a written request notice of from the dean for requiring a meeting for purposes of the investigation and/or to discuss the allegations. The written request notice shall specify a place and time for the meeting, and a time at least three (3) weekdays after the date of the written request. If the request notice is sent regular mail, at least three (3) weekdays notice must be given, or at least two (2) weekdays after the date of the request if the request it is sent by e-mail or hand delivered. The written request notice may be mailed to the address appearing in the records of the registrar, e-mailed to the student at the student’s UTD e-mail address on record with UT Dallas, or may be hand delivered to the student.

(c) If a student fails to respond to a summons the written notice without good cause, as determined by the dean, the dean may withdraw bar or cancel the student’s enrollment or otherwise alter the status of the student’s enrollment until the student complies with the summons notice, or the dean may proceed to implement hearing procedures.

(d) Except in those cases where immediate interim disciplinary action has been taken, the dean shall initiate hearing procedures against a student charged the respondent by providing the student at least ten (10) days written notice of the date, time, and place of the hearing and the names of the hearing officer of those individuals who may participate on the panel. The notice letter shall provide a statement of the charge(s) accusation(s) and a summary statement of the evidence supporting such charge(s) the accusation(s).

(e) The notice of hearing shall be delivered in person to the student or mailed to the student at the address appearing in the registrar's records. A notice sent by mail will be considered to have been received on the third day after the mailing, excluding any intervening Sunday. The date for a hearing may be postponed by the hearing officer for good cause or by agreement of the student and dean of students.

(f) A summons or a written notice sent to the address listed in the registrar's records shall constitute full and adequate notice. The failure of a student to provide the registrar with a current address, or forwarding address, the refusal to accept delivery of the letter, or failure to read mail or e-mail shall not be a good cause for failure to respond to the summons or notice.

(g) If a student fails without good cause, as determined by the dean, to comply with a hearing notice sent under Subsection (d), the hearing will proceed as scheduled and the student will be notified of the decision of the hearing officer Discipline Committee in accordance with Section 49.17(c)(5) and(6).

SECTION 49.15 CHALLENGES TO THE HEARING-OFFICER PANEL DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE
(a) The accused student respondent may challenge the impartiality of the hearing officer panel Discipline Committee. The challenge must be in writing, stating the reasons for the challenge, and be submitted to the hearing officer panel Discipline Committee through the Office of the Dean of students at least three (3) days prior to the hearing.

(b) The hearing officer panel member Discipline Committee member(s), in consultation with the Dean of students or designee, shall be the sole judge of determine whether he or she can serve with fairness and objectivity. In the event the hearing officer disqualifies himself or herself, a substitute will be chosen by the president.

SECTION 49.16 PROCEDURE

The hearing officer panel Discipline Committee shall proceed, generally, as follows during the hearing:
(a) the Dean reads the charge(s) allegation(s);
(b) the hearing officer panel Discipline Committee informs the accused student respondent of his or her rights in accordance with Section 49.13;
(c) the Dean presents the university's case opening statements;
(d) the accused student respondent presents his or her defense opening statements;
(e) the Dean and the student present rebuttal evidence and argument witnesses and/or statements;
(f) the hearing officer deliberates in private to decide the issue of guilt or innocence and assess an appropriate penalty or penalties in the event of a finding of guilt.
(f) the Discipline Committee will have the opportunity to question all parties and witnesses involved;
(g) All parties will be excused and the Discipline Committee will determine whether or not the student is responsible.
(h) If the student is found responsible, the Discipline Committee will determine sanctions.

SECTION 49.17 CONDUCT OF HEARINGS

(a) The hearing officer panel Discipline Committee must rule upon objections that are made to the admissibility of evidence offered at the hearing. No evidence other than that admitted at the hearing shall be considered by the hearing officer panel Discipline Committee. In ruling upon the admissibility of evidence, the following criteria will be considered:
(1) in order to be admissible, documents and testimony of witnesses must be relevant to the issues to be decided by the hearing officer panel Discipline Committee. Generally, evidence is relevant if it tends to prove or disprove the facts at issue. There must be some logical connection between the evidence offered and the facts that are in dispute. Upon objection, evidence that is not relevant should be excluded.
(2) testimony statements of witnesses should be based upon the personal knowledge or observation of the witness. If such testimony is based upon what the witness has read or has been told by someone, it is hearsay and the hearing officer should give it little or no
consideration in deciding the issues. Hearsay does not rebut or contradict the testimony of a witness with direct knowledge of the subject nor will hearsay be sufficient to prove or disprove a matter at issue.

(3) evidence that is merely cumulative of evidence already in the record should be excluded by the hearing officer upon objection or upon a determination by the hearing officer that it is merely repetitious. The hearing officer has the discretion to determine when further evidence on an issue becomes repetitive.

(b) Upon a hearing of the charges, the dean has the burden of going forward with the evidence and has the burden of proving the charges by the greater weight of credible evidence. The standard of proof required for a finding of a violation of the student code of conduct shall be the preponderance of the evidence.

(c) The hearing officer shall:
(1) make all rulings on matters relating to the conduct of the hearing including matters regarding admission of evidence and testimony of witnesses;
(2) have the right to question witnesses and parties;
(3) have the right to the advice and assistance of legal counsel from UT Dallas attorneys and/or the Office of General Counsel of the UT System;
(4) maintain an orderly hearing and permit no person to be subjected to abusive treatment and may eject or exclude anyone who refuses to be orderly;
(4) have the right to the advice and assistance of the hearing advisor;
(5) maintain an orderly hearing and permit no person to be subjected to abusive treatment and may eject or exclude anyone who refuses to be orderly;
(5) render and send to the dean and the accused student a written decision that contains findings of fact and a conclusion as to whether the accused student is responsible for the violations as charged;
(6) upon a finding of responsibility, assess a penalty or penalties the relevant sanction(s); when an accused student is found responsible for the illegal use, possession, or sale of a drug or narcotic on campus, the assessment of a minimum penalty, as stated in Subsections 49.25 (a) (7) and (10), is required;
(7) in instances involving academic dishonesty, the dean will refer to the faculty member’s grade assessment;
(7) in cases involving a crime of violence, notify the alleged victim of the decision. The alleged victim, upon receipt of information regarding the decision, shall be bound to keep in confidence such information.

(d) Consolidated Hearings
(1) where more than one student is charged with conduct arising out of a single occurrence, or out of connected multiple occurrences, a single hearing may be held for all of the students.
charged. Such students may request that their case be consolidated with others, or separated from others.

(2) the hearing officer, Dean of Students, shall make determinations regarding consolidation. All cases affected shall be rescheduled for hearing.

SUBCHAPTER E. APPEAL OF DECISIONS

SECTION 49.30 PROCEDURES

(a) A student may appeal a disciplinary sanction assessed by the dean. A student and/or the dean may appeal the hearing officer's decision to the president by following the procedures set forth in this section.

(b) The appealing party must submit a written appeal statement (hardcopy only; no electronic submissions), stating the specific reasons for the appeal and any argument, to the president of the university, with a copy to the other party. The appeal must be stamped as received by the President’s Office no later than fourteen (14) days after the appealing party has been notified of the sanction assessed by the dean, the Discipline Committee, or the decision of the hearing officer. If the notice of penalty assessed by the dean, the Discipline Committee, or the decision of the hearing officer is sent by mail, the date the notice or decision is mailed initiates the fourteen (14) day period for the appeal. The non-appealing party may submit a response to the appeal, which must be received by the President’s Office no later than five (5) days after the receipt of the appeal with a copy to the other party.

(c) The appeal of the decision of the hearing officer or Discipline Committee will be reviewed solely on the basis of the record from the hearing.

(d) Should the president so request, the dean shall cause the recording of the hearing to be transcribed and shall send the record to the president with a copy to the student. At the discretion of the president both parties may present oral argument in an appeal from the decision of the hearing officer or Discipline Committee.

(e) Upon consideration of the appeal, the president may approve, reject, or modify the decision, or may require that the original hearing be reopened for the presentation of additional evidence and reconsideration of the decision. If the finding as to responsibility is upheld by the president in a case involving the illegal use, possession, and/or sale of a drug or narcotic on campus, the penalty may not be reduced below the minimum penalty prescribed by Subsection 49.25(b) of this Chapter.

(f) The action of the president shall be communicated in writing to the student and the dean within thirty (30) days after the appeal and related documents have been received. The decision of the president is the final appellate review.

SUBCHAPTER F. STUDENT STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

SECTION 49.36 SCHOLASTIC ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

(a) The university expects all students to maintain a high level of responsibility with
respect to academic honesty. Because the value of an academic degree depends on the absolute integrity of the work done by the student for that degree, it is imperative that a student maintain a high standard of individual honor in his or her scholastic work.

(b) The dean may initiate disciplinary proceedings under Subchapter C against a student accused of scholastic academic dishonesty upon complaint by a faculty member or a student.
Academic Certificate Program
Title: Product Management Certificate
School: School of Management

Contacts: Alexander Edsel, Director of Marketing Masters Programs

Implementation Date: Fall 2011

Introduction/Description:

The product management discipline or profession is one that involves both product specific knowledge and a highly specialized set of marketing and business skills. The product specific knowledge is often either learned on the job (i.e. for consumer packaged goods such as potato chips) or attained in some industries and products by having a technical background (i.e. engineers for telecommunications or scientists and pharmacists in drug companies, etc.). In the technical field, many managers are often promoted into a product management role and are unfamiliar with the business and marketing skill sets this new role entails. Often they attend seminars and short courses that vary in quality and duration.

Product managers involved with consumer or other non-technical products often come from a diverse set of educational backgrounds. While some have a business/marketing degree, others have a liberal arts or other non-business degree. However, even those who received a Bachelor’s in Business and who took marketing courses probably did not take courses in product management because these are not commonly offered courses in undergraduate programs.

This academic certificate is intended to fill this academic void in the Dallas Fort Worth area, which has a high concentration of product management positions. The proposed academic certificate can be completed by either students currently enrolled in any School of Management masters program or by non-degree seeking students who wish to complete a set of courses that will allow them to become proficient in this specialized area. This academic certificate also provides employers with a mechanism to make sure their technically competent managers are also knowledgeable in the business and marketing aspects of product management. This will be the only Product Management certificate offered by a university in the DFW area.

Academic Focus of the Certificate

The 12 semester credit hour certificate emphasizes courses that will make the student proficient in the four major areas within product management: New Product Development, Product Management, Brand Management, and Pricing.
Job Market for the Certificate:

This functional area offers an interesting and large pool of potential candidates because it expands the target market to non-marketing professionals. In fact, the key demographic for this certificate will be non-marketing product managers, especially those with a technical background such as engineers or scientists who may have a product development or management role but lack the necessary marketing/business knowledge.

UT Dallas is also home to many high-technology and consumer-packaged goods companies that use and require product managers; some examples are Alcatel, Cisco, Dr. Pepper, Ericsson, Frito Lay, Kimberly Clark, McAfee, Pizza Hut (YUM Brands), Nokia, Nortel, Texas Instruments and Samsung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 2011 Search parameters: search for product manager , salary range &gt;$50,000 if option available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keyword</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CareerBuilder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HotJobs + Monster (companies merged)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admission Policy:

The program is open to degree and non-degree seeking students. Students already enrolled in a degree program in the School of Management are automatically eligible for enrolling in the certificate program and may begin taking required courses immediately via normal course registration procedures. To apply for the Product Management Certificate Program as a non-degree seeking student, the candidate must complete the Graduate Admissions application. This application will then be forwarded to the advising office as a non-degree seeking applicant for the certificate program. The admissions requirements will be the same as existing requirements for non-degree seeking students. The cost for students will be the tuition cost for the required courses.

Organizational Arrangement:

The director of the marketing masters programs will serve as the program director and will be responsible for the implementation, course monitoring and scheduling, the proficiency exam and the promotion of the certificate amongst the product management community.
Credit Hours and Degree Programs:

Four courses or 12 credit hours total available during the Spring or Fall Semesters every year. The academic certificate can be obtained by MS in Marketing students without the need to take additional credit hours as these four courses are electives available within the MS in Marketing. MBA students can also obtain the certificate without the need to take additional credit hours if they are getting a concentration in marketing and choose the four required courses.

Course Offerings:

1. **MKT 6328 Product Management**: Introduction to the theory and practice of product management. The course covers the management and marketing of new or existing products. Topics include: considerations and managing of the product, pricing, promotions and placement throughout a product's lifecycle; competitive analysis and strategies; budgeting and forecasting; product line extensions and portfolio management. Prerequisite: MKT 6301 or consent of instructor. (3-0) T

2. **MKT 6329 New Product Development**: Development and introduction of new products and the management of existing products. Topics include product positioning, screening, concept development, test marketing, and branding strategies. Further students will learn to use conjoint analysis for new product development, measurement of brand equity, product line extensions, and management of services. Prerequisite: MKT 6301 or consent of instructor. (3-0) Y

3. **MKT 6330 Brand Management** (3 semester hours) To study the role and philosophy of brand management in the strategic marketing process and the resulting effects on strategic and marketing decisions. Topics will include the strategic brand building process, segmentation and positioning for building brands, consumer behavior, brand information systems, building brand equity and the application of brand management using marketing principles. Prerequisite: MKT 6301 or consent of instructor. (3 – 0) Y

4. **MKT 6336 Pricing** (3 semester hours) Techniques to price durable goods, packaged goods and services. Topics include: perceived value pricing, bundling, price discrimination, product-line pricing, dynamic pricing over the products’ life-cycle, pricing through the marketing channel, and competitive pricing. In addition to microeconomic approaches to pricing, behavioral approaches to pricing will also be covered. Pricing decisions will be analyzed using spreadsheet analysis. Prerequisites: MKT6301 or consent of instructor. (3-0) T

Locations: Traditional face-to-face on Richardson campus
Assessment Plan:

1. The candidate must get a grade of B or better in each of the required courses in this program in order to qualify for the certificate.

2. Proficiency Examination: after students (both degree and non-degree seeking) complete the required courses, they must take a comprehensive examination on a Pass/Fail basis which will assess their knowledge of the subject matter. Students who fail the exam will have two additional opportunities to re-take and pass the exam.

3. Inserted into the proficiency exam will be a rubric which will measure four Student Learning Outcomes

Faculty/Staffing: all of the courses in the Product Management Certificate are currently being offered for the MBA and other Masters programs including the MS in Marketing. No new or additional staff or hiring is required for this certificate program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Core Faculty and Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree and Awarding Institution</th>
<th>Courses Assigned in Certificate</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norris Bruce, Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD, Duke University</td>
<td>New Product Development</td>
<td>MKT 6329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upender Subramanian Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Product Management</td>
<td>MKT 6328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashutosh Prasad, Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD, The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Pricing</td>
<td>MKT 6336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhijit Biswas, Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>ABD Marketing, Purdue University</td>
<td>Brand Management</td>
<td>MKT 6330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mission of the **Product Management Certificate** degree program is to train and prepare students to be product managers. Graduates will obtain a solid understanding of the key tenets of successful product management through the 4 required courses: New Product Development, Product Management, Pricing and Brand Management. Students who complete this certificate program can transfer these courses to obtain the MS degree in Marketing.

**Learning Student Outcomes**

*Student learning outcomes assessment is defined as the ongoing monitoring of the extent to which students are developing the knowledge, skills, beliefs, and attitudes that are appropriate for graduates of the respective academic programs.*

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO1)**

*Students will acquire essential knowledge in New Product Development and be able to explain fundamentals of launching a new product. Strategies for testing and improving new products and organizational issues*

**Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success, and Time Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Criteria: What Constitutes Success (Target)</th>
<th>Timeframe / Time Table</th>
<th>Findings or Results</th>
<th>“Closing the Loop”/ Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment of content learned in MKT 6329 New Product Development course Program goals will be assessed using a final examination. First assessment is based on 10 multiple choice questions. Second assessment is based on qualitative (open-ended) questions. For this part, grading is based on the content, quality of the answers and the strength of their relationships to New</td>
<td>Students will be assessed in this learning objective by the use of specific multiple-choice questions and an open ended essay type question. The questions will be categorized using a rubric based on a 3-point scale. 80% of the students will score 2 or above on the 3-point scale. Overall, getting 3 is Excellent performance. 2 indicates good performance; 1.0 is Fair performance and below a 1 is Poor performance.</td>
<td>Data will be collected once a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Learning Outcome (SLO2) – Brief Description

**Students will acquire essential knowledge in Product Management**, developing an understanding of the management and marketing of existing products. Specifically, students will learn how to manage the marketing mix (product-pricing-promotions and placement) throughout a product’s life cycle.

### Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success, and Time Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Criteria: What Constitutes Success (Target)</th>
<th>Timeframe / Time Table</th>
<th>Findings or Results</th>
<th>“Closing the Loop”/Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment of content learned in MKT 6328 Product Management course</td>
<td>Students will be assessed in this learning objective by the use of specific multiple-choice questions and an open-ended essay type question. The questions will be categorized using a rubric based on a 3-point scale. 80% of the students will score 2 or above on the 3-point scale. Overall, getting 3 is Excellent performance. 2 indicates good performance; 1.0 is Fair performance and below a 1 is Poor performance.</td>
<td>Data will be collected once a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students will acquire essential knowledge in Product Management, developing an understanding of the management and marketing of existing products. Specifically, students will learn how to manage the marketing mix (product-pricing-promotions and placement) throughout a product’s life cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Criteria: What Constitutes Success (Target)</th>
<th>Timeframe / Time Table</th>
<th>Findings or Results</th>
<th>“Closing the Loop”/Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment of content learned in MKT 6328 Product Management course</td>
<td>Students will be assessed in this learning objective by the use of specific multiple-choice questions and an open-ended essay type question. The questions will be categorized using a rubric based on a 3-point scale. 80% of the students will score 2 or above on the 3-point scale. Overall, getting 3 is Excellent performance. 2 indicates good performance; 1.0 is Fair performance and below a 1 is Poor performance.</td>
<td>Data will be collected once a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Student Learning Outcome (SLO3) – Brief Description

Students will acquire essential knowledge in Brand Management; they will be able to describe and identify all the components of Brand Management and how they affect and improve marketing decision-making; students will design, implement and evaluate Branding strategies and describe and identify all the components of “Brand equity”

Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success, and Time Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Criteria: What Constitutes Success (Target)</th>
<th>Timeframe / Time Table</th>
<th>Findings or Results</th>
<th>“Closing the Loop”/ Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment of content learned in MKT 6330 Brand Management course</td>
<td>Students will be assessed in this learning objective by the use of specific multiple-choice questions and an open ended essay type question. The questions will be categorized using a rubric based on a 3-point scale. 80% of the students will score 2 or above on the 3-point scale. Overall, getting 3 is Excellent performance. 2 indicates good performance; 1.0 is Fair performance and below a 1 is Poor performance.</td>
<td>Data will be collected once a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Learning Outcome (SLO4) – Brief Description**

**Students will acquire essential knowledge in Pricing:** Students will develop an understanding of the key role of pricing in product management including methods for pricing goods and services contingent on product and market characteristics and the product life cycle so as to maximize profitability and quantitative techniques used in pricing.

**Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success, and Time Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Criteria: What Constitutes Success (Target)</th>
<th>Timeframe / Time Table</th>
<th>Findings or Results</th>
<th>“Closing the Loop”/ Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment of content learned in MKT 6336 Pricing course</td>
<td>Students will be assessed in this learning objective by the use of specific multiple-choice questions and an open ended essay type question. The questions will be categorized using a rubric based on a 3-point scale. 80% of the students will score 2 or above on the 3-point scale. Overall, getting 3 is Excellent performance. 2 indicates good performance; 1.0 is Fair performance and below a 1 is Poor performance.</td>
<td>Data will be collected once a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program goals will be assessed using a final examination.  
First assessment is based on 10 multiple choice questions.  
Second assessment is based on qualitative (open-ended) questions. For this part, grading is based on the content, quality of the answers and the strength of their relationships to Pricing.
Summary of assessment for each learning objective: Students will be assessed in each of the 4 learning objective areas by the use of specific multiple-choice questions and an open ended essay type question. The questions will assess each learning objective separately and they will be categorized using a rubric based on a 3-point scale.

Criteria: 80% of the students will score 2 or above on the 3-point scale. An average score of 3 is Excellent performance. 2 to 2.9 indicates good performance; 1.0 to 1.9 is Fair performance and below a 1 is Poor performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO &amp; Measure</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will acquire essential knowledge in New Product Development, special market research techniques, stage-gate and marketing mix considerations (10 multiple choice questions and open ended essay type question)</td>
<td><strong>Score = 0.</strong> Does not demonstrate basic New Product Development (NPD) knowledge</td>
<td><strong>Score = 1.</strong> Student has a weak grasp of NPD concepts.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 2.</strong> Student has a strong grasp of NPD concepts.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 3.</strong> Student demonstrates an excellent understanding of NPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will acquire essential knowledge in Product Management, developing an understanding of the management and marketing of existing products including life cycle challenges and the marketing mix through each stage (10 multiple choice questions and open ended essay type question)</td>
<td><strong>Score = 0.</strong> Unable to demonstrate product management knowledge.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 1.</strong> Demonstrates some product management knowledge.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 2.</strong> Demonstrates strong product management knowledge.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 3.</strong> Can select and implement all relevant product management knowledge concepts and techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will acquire essential knowledge in Brand Management; they will be able to describe and identify all the components of Brand Management and how they affect and improve marketing decision-making; students will design, implement and evaluate Branding strategies and describe and identify all the components of “Brand equity” (10 multiple choice questions and open ended essay type question)</td>
<td><strong>Score = 0.</strong> Unable to demonstrate brand management knowledge.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 1.</strong> Demonstrates some brand management knowledge.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 2.</strong> Demonstrates strong brand management knowledge.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 3.</strong> Can select and implement all relevant brand management knowledge concepts and techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will acquire essential knowledge in Pricing; Students will develop an understanding of the key role of pricing in product management including methods for maximizing profitability and quantitative techniques used in pricing</td>
<td><strong>Score = 0.</strong> Unable to demonstrate pricing knowledge.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 1.</strong> Demonstrates some pricing knowledge.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 2.</strong> Demonstrates strong pricing knowledge.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 3.</strong> Can select and implement all relevant pricing knowledge concepts and techniques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(10 multiple choice questions and open ended essay type question)

Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO &amp; Measure</th>
<th>Poor (%)</th>
<th>Fair (%)</th>
<th>Good (%)</th>
<th>Excellent (%)</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of New Product Development (10 MC questions and qualitative open-ended questions.)</td>
<td>Score = 0</td>
<td>Score = 1</td>
<td>Score = 2</td>
<td>Score = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Product Management (10 MC questions and qualitative open-ended questions.)</td>
<td>Score = 0</td>
<td>Score = 1</td>
<td>Score = 2</td>
<td>Score = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Brand Management (10 MC questions and qualitative open-ended questions.)</td>
<td>Score = 0</td>
<td>Score = 1</td>
<td>Score = 2</td>
<td>Score = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Pricing (10 MC questions and qualitative open-ended questions.)</td>
<td>Score = 0</td>
<td>Score = 1</td>
<td>Score = 2</td>
<td>Score = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of all 4 criteria</td>
<td>Score = 0</td>
<td>Score = 1</td>
<td>Score = 2</td>
<td>Score = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Academic Certificate Program

Title: Market Research & Marketing Analytics Certificate

School: School of Management

Contacts: Alexander Edsel, Director of Marketing Masters Programs

Implementation Date: Fall 2011

Introduction/Description:

Companies have witnessed an exponential growth in customer data generated from store scanners and from web transactions, navigation, search, and more recently, social media. Companies are therefore seeking trained professionals who have the skills to analyze the data to help managers make better marketing decisions. A shortage exists of qualified candidates with the right combination of marketing and analytical skills. Often, companies hire students trained in quantitative areas such as statistics who use different packages such as SAS or SPSS to create marketing decision models. These students sometimes lack an understanding of marketing decision-making and of the key drivers of consumer purchase behavior.

The Marketing Analytics Certificate program seeks to fill this void by offering core courses that provide an introduction to basic marketing principles such as consumer behavior and segmentation, targeting and positioning, market research, and digital marketing along with quantitative courses in marketing analytics using SAS and database marketing. Students who complete this certificate program can transfer these courses to obtain the MS degree in Marketing.

Academic Focus of the Certificate

The 12 semester credit hour certificate emphasizes courses that will make the student proficient in the marketing analytics and market research.

Job Market for the Certificate:

This functional area enjoys two advantages: it is a growth area within marketing and has few qualified candidates for jobs being offered. Salaries for these jobs for professionals with 2-3 years experience start at $55,000 then jump to $65,000 if more than 3 years experience according to a survey of three major marketing analytics firms in the Dallas area. A shift from the traditional standalone market research to a more data driven...
marketing analytics with a market research component has occurred in industry. During the 2008 recession, for example, marketing analytic departments grew while other marketing areas suffered declines.

The Dallas Fort Worth area is home to many marketing-driven companies and agencies that have difficulty filling these positions due to the lack of quantitative skills of many traditional marketers and also the lack of marketing skills of many of the IT/statistical professionals currently filling that role. Some local companies fitting this profile are American Airlines, Fossil, Dr. Pepper, JC Penney, Frito Lay, Hotels.com, Kimberly Clark, Match.com, Pizza Hut (YUM brands), Sabre and advertising and direct marketing agencies with analytics groups such as The Richards Group, Tracey-Locke, Omnicom Group and Wunderman (these last two are billion dollar advertising and direct marketing agencies with large marketing analytics departments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keyword</th>
<th>Nationwide</th>
<th>TX</th>
<th>DFW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CareerBuilder</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admission Policy:

The program is open to degree and non-degree seeking students. Students already enrolled in a degree program in the School of Management are automatically eligible for enrolling in the certificate program and may begin taking required courses immediately via normal course registration procedures. To apply for the Marketing Analytics & Research Certificate Program as a non-degree seeking student, the candidate must complete the graduate admissions application. This application will then be forwarded to the advising office as a non-degree seeking applicant for the certificate program. The admissions requirements will be the same as the current requirements for non-degree seeking students. The cost for students will be the tuition cost for the required courses.

Organizational Arrangement:

The director of marketing masters programs will serve as the program director for the certificate and will be responsible for implementation, course monitoring and scheduling, the proficiency exam, and the promotion of the certificate amongst marketing analytics departments.
Credit Hours and Degree Programs:

Four courses or 12 credit hours total available during the spring or fall semesters every year. The academic certificate can be obtained by MS in Marketing students without the need to take additional credit hours as these four courses are electives available within the MS in Marketing. MBA students can also obtain the certificate without the need to take additional credit hours, as long as they are getting a concentration in marketing and choose the four required courses.

Course Offerings:

1. **MKT 6309 Marketing Research** (3 semester hours) Methods employed in market research to understand consumer behavior to enable better marketing decision-making. Topics include focus groups, understanding different sources of secondary data, questionnaire design, design of experiments, sampling plans, and data analysis using statistical techniques. In addition, the course will cover attitude measurement, and market research on the Internet. Prerequisites: MKT 6301 and OPRE 6301, or consent of instructor. (3-0) Y

2. **MKT 6321 Interactive & Digital Marketing** (3 semester hours) introduction to the theory and practice of interactive and digital marketing. Topics covered include: market research, consumer behavior and segmentation considerations; privacy issues and technology overview; interactive kiosks, websites, search advertising, search engine optimization, email, mobile, video and social networks. Prerequisite: MKT 6301 or consent of instructor. (3-0) T

* **MIS 6344: Web Analytics (3 credit hours)** The course examines the technologies, tools, and techniques to maximize return from web sites. The course includes topics related to web site design issues, web data collection tools and techniques, measurement and analysis of web traffic, visitor tracking, search engine optimization, visitor acquisition, conversion and retention, key performance indicators for web sites, and measurement of online marketing campaigns. The use of web analytics tools such as Google Analytics will be an integral part of the course. Prerequisites: None. (3-0) Y

* The MKT 6321 Interactive & Digital Marketing course may not be offered every spring & fall semester. In order not to impact adversely a student pursuing this certificate, the MIS 6344 course can be accepted as a substitute for the MKT 6321 for the purposes of this certificate with the prior approval of the Program Director.
3. **MKT 6323 Database Marketing (3 semester hours)** Techniques to analyze, interpret, and utilize marketing databases of customers to identify a firm’s best customers, understanding their needs, and targeting communications and promotions to retain such customers. In addition, students will learn to use SAS software. Prerequisites: MKT 6301 and OPRE 6301, or consent of instructor. (3-0) Y

4. **MKT 6337 Marketing Analytics using SAS** (3 credit hours) This course is designed for a career in marketing analytics in which students analyze data from large databases to make important marketing decisions. These methods are commonly employed in online marketing, in grocery stores, and in financial markets. Students will acquire knowledge about the tools and software that are used to understand issues such as who the profitable customers are, how to acquire them, and how to retain them. The tools can also be used to manage brand prices and promotions using scanner data as is done in supermarkets. Prerequisite: MKT 6301. (3-0) Y

**MIS 6334 Advanced Business Intelligence** (3 credit hours) This course is SAS based and is part of the 4-course curriculum for the SAS data mining certificate program. It will cover the topics as required by the SAS certificate program including data manipulation, imputation, variable selection, SAS/STA, SAS/ETS, SAS/QC (DOE) and various SAS stat modules. Students will also learn various advanced business intelligence topics including business data analytics, model analytics, customer analytics, web intelligence analytics, business performance analytics and decision making analytics. Tools to be used include SAS, Weka and spreadsheet modeling. Prerequisite: OPRE 6301, MIS6324 (3-0) Y

** The MKT 6337 Marketing Analytics using SAS course may not be offered every spring & fall semester. In order not to impact adversely a student pursuing this certificate, the MIS 6334 course can be accepted as a substitute for the MKT 6337 for the purposes of this certificate with the prior approval of the Program Director.

**Locations**: Traditional face-to-face on UT Dallas campus
Assessment Plan:

1. The candidate must get a grade of B or better in each of the required courses in this program in order to qualify for the certificate.

2. Proficiency Examination: after students (both degree and non-degree seeking) complete the required courses, they must take a comprehensive examination on a Pass/Fail basis which will assess their knowledge of the subject matter. Students who fail the exam will have two additional opportunities to re-take and pass the exam.

3. Inserted into the proficiency exam will be a rubric which will measure three Student Learning Outcomes

Faculty/Staffing: all of the courses in the Marketing Analytics Certificate are currently being offered for the MBA and other Masters programs including the MS in Marketing. No new or additional staff or hiring is required for this certificate program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Core Faculty and Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Highest Degree and Awarding Institution</th>
<th>Courses Assigned in Certificate</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.P.S. Murthi, Professor</td>
<td>PhD, Carnegie-Mellon University</td>
<td>Interactive &amp; Digital Marketing</td>
<td>MKT 6321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Analytics w/SAS</td>
<td>MKT 6337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanda Kumar, Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD, University of Chicago</td>
<td>Database Marketing</td>
<td>MKT 6323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernan Haruvy, Associate Professor</td>
<td>PhD, The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Marketing Analytics SAS</td>
<td>MKT 6337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuanping Ying, Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD, University of Michigan</td>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td>MKT 6309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Wang, Assistant Professor</td>
<td>PhD, University of Michigan</td>
<td>Interactive &amp; Digital Marketing</td>
<td>MKT 6321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The MIS 6334 and 6344 courses are taught by the faculty of the MIS department
Program/Unit Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Research &amp; Marketing Analytics Certificate</th>
<th>SOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program or Unit Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Edsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Director</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Eckel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School or University Division

Program or Unit Purpose or Mission Statement

Your mission statement or purpose should be in alignment with the university’s mission.

The mission of the **Market Research & Marketing Analytics Certificate** degree program is to train students to analyze data to help companies make better marketing decisions. Students will benefit from courses that combine knowledge and skills used in both marketing and analytics. The certificate program offers core courses that provide an introduction to market research and digital marketing along with quantitative courses in marketing analytics using SAS and database marketing. Students who complete this certificate program can transfer these courses to obtain the MS degree in Marketing.

Learning Student Outcomes

Student learning outcomes assessment is defined as the ongoing monitoring of the extent to which students are developing the knowledge, skills, beliefs, and attitudes that are appropriate for graduates of the respective academic programs.
**Student Learning Outcome (SLO1)**

Students will develop an overall understanding of the principles of Market Research. Be able to define a research problem, specify research objectives & design; collect, tabulate and analyze data. Know both qualitative and quantitative research data collection techniques and statistical measures and methods used.

---

**Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success, and Time Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Criteria: What Constitutes Success (Target)</th>
<th>Timeframe / Time Table</th>
<th>Findings or Results</th>
<th>“Closing the Loop”/ Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment of content learned in MKT 6309 Marketing Research course&lt;br&gt;Program goals will be assessed using a final examination.&lt;br&gt;First assessment is based on 10 multiple choice questions.&lt;br&gt;Second assessment is based on qualitative (open-ended) questions. For this part, grading is based on the content, quality of the answers and the strength of their relationships to Market Research</td>
<td>Students will be assessed in this learning objective by the use of specific multiple-choice questions and an open ended essay type question. The questions will be categorized using a rubric based on a 3-point scale.&lt;br&gt;80% of the students will score 2 or above on the 3-point scale. Overall, getting 3 is Excellent performance. 2 indicates good performance; 1.0 is Fair performance and below a 1 is Poor performance.</td>
<td>Data will be collected once a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Learning Outcome (SLO2) – Brief Description

Students will acquire essential knowledge in Marketing Analytics. Students will develop an understanding of analytical techniques using SAS that will assist in data management and consumer segmentation. Students will be proficient with data reduction techniques, response analysis, and customer classification.

Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success, and Time Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Criteria: What Constitutes Success (Target)</th>
<th>Timeframe / Time Table</th>
<th>Findings or Results</th>
<th>“Closing the Loop”/ Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment of content learned in the MKT 6323 Database Marketing and MKT 6337 Marketing Analytics using SAS courses</td>
<td>Students will be assessed in this learning objective by the use of specific multiple-choice questions and an open-ended essay type question. The questions will be categorized using a rubric based on a 3-point scale. 80% of the students will score 2 or above on the 3-point scale. Overall, getting 3 is Excellent performance. 2 indicates good performance; 1.0 is Fair performance and below a 1 is Poor performance.</td>
<td>Data will be collected once a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Learning Outcome (SLO3) – Brief Description

Students will acquire essential knowledge in Marketing Analytics, Students will develop an understanding of analytical techniques using SAS that will assist in data management and consumer segmentation. Students will be proficient with data reduction techniques, response analysis, and customer classification.
Students will be able to: understand the different types of market research, consumer behavior and segmentation considerations needed in digital marketing. Students will learn how to apply market research and analytics concepts and techniques to data from websites, search advertising, search engine optimization, email, mobile and social networks.

Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success, and Time Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Criteria: What Constitutes Success (Target)</th>
<th>Timeframe / Time Table</th>
<th>Findings or Results</th>
<th>“Closing the Loop”/ Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment of content learned in the MKT 6321 Interactive &amp; Digital Marketing course</td>
<td>Students will be assessed in this learning objective by the use of specific multiple-choice questions and an open ended essay type question. The questions will be categorized using a rubric based on a 3-point scale. 80% of the students will score 2 or above on the 3-point scale. Overall, getting 3 is Excellent performance. 2 indicates good performance; 1.0 is Fair performance and below a 1 is Poor performance. Data will be collected once a year.</td>
<td>Data will be collected once a year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of assessment for each learning objective: Students will be assessed in each of the 4 learning objective areas by the use of specific multiple-choice questions and an open ended essay type question. The questions will assess each learning objective separately and they will be categorized using a rubric based on a 3-point scale.

Criteria: 80% of the students will score 2 or above on the 3-point scale. An average score of 3 is Excellent performance. 2 to 2.9 indicates good performance; 1.0 to 1.9 is Fair performance and below a 1 is Poor performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO &amp; Measure</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop an overall understanding of the principles of Market Research. Be able to define a research problem, specify research objectives &amp; design;</td>
<td><strong>Score = 0.</strong> Does not demonstrate basic market research</td>
<td><strong>Score = 1.</strong> Student has a weak grasp of market research concepts.</td>
<td><strong>Score = 2.</strong> Student has a strong grasp of market research</td>
<td><strong>Score = 3.</strong> Student demonstrates an excellent understanding of market research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Area</td>
<td>Score 0</td>
<td>Score 1</td>
<td>Score 2</td>
<td>Score 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect, tabulate and analyze data. Know both qualitative and quantitative research data collection techniques and statistical measures and methods used. (10 multiple choice questions and open ended essay type question)</td>
<td>Unable to demonstrate marketing analytics knowledge</td>
<td>Demonstrates some marketing analytics knowledge</td>
<td>Demonstrates strong marketing analytics knowledge</td>
<td>Can select and implement all relevant marketing analytics knowledge concepts and techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop an understanding of analytical techniques using SAS that will assist in data management and consumer segmentation. Students will be proficient with data reduction techniques, response analysis, and customer classification. (10 multiple choice questions and open ended essay type question)</td>
<td>Score = 0. Unable to demonstrate marketing analytics knowledge</td>
<td>Score = 1. Demonstrates some marketing analytics knowledge</td>
<td>Score = 2. Demonstrates strong marketing analytics knowledge.</td>
<td>Score = 3. Can select and implement all relevant marketing analytics knowledge concepts and techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to: understand the different types of market research, consumer behavior and segmentation considerations needed in digital marketing. Students will learn how to apply market research and analytics concepts and techniques to data from websites, search advertising, search engine optimization, email, mobile and social networks. (10 multiple choice questions and open ended essay type question)</td>
<td>Score = 0. Unable to demonstrate Interactive &amp; Digital Marketing knowledge</td>
<td>Score = 1. Demonstrates some Interactive &amp; Digital Marketing knowledge</td>
<td>Score = 2. Demonstrates strong Interactive &amp; Digital Marketing knowledge.</td>
<td>Score = 3. Can select and implement all relevant Interactive &amp; Digital Marketing knowledge concepts and techniques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO &amp; Measure</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Market Research (10 MC questions and qualitative open-ended questions.)</td>
<td>Score = 0 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 1 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 2 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 3 (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Marketing Analytics (10 MC questions and qualitative open-ended questions.)</td>
<td>Score = 0 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 1 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 2 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 3 (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Digital &amp; Interactive marketing (10 MC questions and qualitative open-ended questions.)</td>
<td>Score = 0 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 1 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 2 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 3 (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of all 3 criteria</td>
<td>Score = 0 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 1 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 2 (%)</td>
<td>Score = 3 (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBCHAPTER B. APPEALS OF ACADEMIC DECISIONS
SECTION 51.06 APPEAL PROCEDURES

(a) The appeal procedures defined in this section apply to an unresolved grievance concerning some aspect of the student's academic standing at U.T. Dallas. The intent is to address the grievance of the student in a prompt and orderly fashion. A grievance means a dispute concerning some aspect of the student's academic standing arising from an administrative or faculty decision that the student regards as arbitrary or capricious.

Grievances include, but are not limited to, disputes over grades, course requirements, graduation/degree program requirements, and thesis and dissertation committee and/or adviser actions or decisions. Grievances as defined in this section do not include the right to appeal the termination of employment of a teaching assistant or research assistant during the term of the student’s appointment. That appeal process is defined and described in Policy Memorandum 76-III.23-4 University Policies Related to Graduate Student Teaching Assistants and Graduate Student Research Assistants. Grievances as defined in this section also do not include the right to appeal policies adopted by a vote of the faculty, either in a degree program or in the Academic Senate.

(b) A student having a grievance regarding academic concerns may have the issue considered in the following manner:

(1) Initial Consideration of Grievance
In attempting to resolve any student grievance regarding grades, evaluations, or other fulfillments of academic responsibility, it is the obligation of the student first to make a serious effort to resolve the matter through discussion with the instructor, supervisor, administrator, or committee chair with whom the grievance originated (hereafter called “the respondent”) within 60 calendar days after the date on which the decision was first rendered.

(2) Appeal to the Respondent
If the matter cannot be resolved in discussions between the student and the respondent, and the student wishes to appeal the decision, then the student must submit a written appeal to the respondent, with a copy to the respondent’s department/program head. The written appeal must include reasons for the appeal and state the remedies the student is seeking. Within ten business days while classes are in session, the respondent will provide the student and the department/program head with a written response. The department/program head will examine the student’s appeal in order to determine if the student has established a prima facie case of capricious, arbitrary or prejudiced academic evaluation. If not, the department/program head will so inform the student and the instructor within 10 business days while classes are in session with the recommendation that the appeal be terminated. The department/program head will inform the student, who may request that the matter be referred to an appeals panel. If the department/program head finds that the submitted evidence confirms that a prima facie case exists, then the respondent will be informed of the head’s decision.
(3) Academic Appeals Panel

If the matter is not resolved by the written response provided by the respondent in subsection (2), the student may submit a written appeal via email or hard copy, within ten business days while classes are in session of the date the response was sent, to the chair of an appeals panel appointed by the dean of the school hosting the course, comprehensive or oral examination. The Appeals Panel composition will consist of an associate dean of the school with whom the grievance originated, who will act as chair, two faculty members from the same school, an associate dean from another school, and a student. The student selected to serve on the panel will be an undergraduate when the grievance is from an undergraduate student and will be a graduate student when the grade grievance is from a graduate student.

The written appeal by the student to the school dean academic panel must state the reasons the student is appealing the written response from the department/program head. The school dean panel will review the appeal and responses, obtain additional information and opinions if desired, and provide the student with a written response within twenty business days (while classes are in session) of the receipt of the student’s appeal to the school dean panel. The appropriate dean of graduate or undergraduate studies will receive a copy of the panel’s response. The findings and recommendation of the appeals panel are final.

(c) All parties involved in an academic appeal will be informed about the final disposition of the appeal.
School of Arts and Humanities

The following guidelines serve to elaborate and provide greater specificity to the Standard of Creative Productivity and Professional Achievement for the review of faculty in the School of Arts and Humanities.

The creative productivity and professional achievement of faculty members in the School of Arts and Humanities is demonstrated primarily in their published writing or in those artistic endeavors designated as appropriate to the faculty member's area of appointment. In the evaluation of a faculty member, credit may be given for contributions to professional conferences or public forums, informative writing for lay readers, or activities which advance humanistic and artistic understanding beyond the University, but which, in so doing, reflect favorably upon it. There is no question, however, that retention and advancement is based primarily on publications or creative artistic productivity.

Peer review plays an essential role in the process of promotion. In accordance with university policy, promotion to Associate Professor or Professor requires letters of evaluation from distinguished peers above the current rank of the candidate. Normally promotion requires a minimum of five letters of evaluation.

Humanities

(Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies, Literary Studies/Studies in Literature, Historical Studies/History of Ideas, Art History)

For faculty in the Humanities, evidence of creative productivity and professional achievement will normally take the form of the publication of a book or books, and/or chapters and essays in multi-authored publications, and/or articles in peer-review journals.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievement will be assessed in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The candidate has selected research projects which will lead to significant results in the field.
2. The candidate has demonstrated through performance at UTD the ability to conduct independent research.
3. The candidate's independent research has contributed significantly to the field.
4. At what institutions would the candidate's productivity at the time of assessment justify promotion to tenure?

For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievements will be assessed as follows:

1. Scholars in related fields recognize as notable the contributions of the candidate.
2. The candidate has made an impact in the field of the candidate's scholarly pursuits.
3. At what institutions would the candidate's productivity at the time of assessment justify promotion to Professor?

**Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies**

For faculty in Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies, evidence of creative productivity and professional achievement will be as follows:

**ART AND PERFORMANCE/AESTHETIC STUDIES (THEATER):** For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies (Theater), the following guidelines apply:

1. For actors and directors, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of evidence of demonstrated excellence in performance or productions, including regional critical acclaim.
2. For technical directors, stage designers, and costume designers, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of evidence of demonstrated excellence in productions on the UTD campus or elsewhere.

For promotion to Professor in Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies (Theater), the following guidelines apply:

1. For actors and directors, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of evidence of demonstrated excellence in performance or productions, including national critical acclaim.
2. For technical directors, stage designers, and costume designers, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of evidence of demonstrated excellence through regional/national recognition in productions on the UTD campus or elsewhere.

**ART AND PERFORMANCE/AESTHETIC STUDIES (VISUAL ARTS):** For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies (Visual Arts), the following guidelines apply:

1. For studio artists, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of the demonstrated excellence of their exhibited work, including at least regional critical acclaim.

For promotion to Professor in Art and Performance/Aesthetic Studies (Visual Arts), the following guidelines apply:

1. For studio artists, recommendations for promotion are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of the demonstrated excellence of their exhibited work, including national critical acclaim.
LITERARY STUDIES/STUDIES IN LITERATURE (CREATIVE WRITING): For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in Literary Studies/Studies in Literature (Creative Writing), the following guidelines apply:

1. For Creative Writers, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of the demonstrated excellence in creative writing, including publication and regional critical acclaim.

For promotion to Professor in Literary Studies/Studies in Literature (Creative Writing), the following guidelines apply:

1. For Creative Writers, recommendations for promotion and tenure are to be made, among other factors, on the basis of demonstrated excellence in creative writing, including publication and national critical acclaim.

Arts and Technology

Faculty members in Arts and Technology, comprising academic programs in Arts and Technology (ATEC) and Emerging Media and Technology (EMAC), are engaged in a broad spectrum of research and creative endeavor, including new applications for digital media, at the convergence of the creative arts and humanities with digital technology. This work can be collaborative in nature and may transcend the boundaries of disciplines conventionally associated with the humanities. Multi-authored and team projects submitted for consideration must specify the nature and extent of the candidate’s participation.

For faculty candidates in Arts and Technology, depending on the particular focus and nature of their work, evidence of creative productivity and professional achievement may take a variety of forms but must include at least one of the following:

- **Publication and Dissemination of Research**: the publication (in print or electronically) of books, and/or chapters and essays in multi-authored publications, and/or articles in peer-reviewed journals and (where appropriate) media software; and/or conference proceedings.
- **Creative Achievement**: acceptance of works in juried exhibitions, and/or at peer-reviewed conferences, and/or for display in major arts museums.
- **Application**: a lead or critical role in the development and implementation of new processes and/or applications and/or models for digital media, especially those related to the educational and/or cultural mission of the program.

The following criteria, although not essential, will be considered especially relevant:

- **External Support**: a record of external funding from research grants appropriate to the person’s specialty and seniority, especially for projects related to the educational mission of the program. [For promotion to Professor must be listed as Principal Investigator]
- **Awards**: awards (to the individual or a collaborative group) and other forms of formal recognition from professional organizations.
- **Presentation of Research at peer-reviewed conferences**
For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievement will be evaluated in accordance with the following guidelines:

- The candidate has selected research or creative projects which will lead to significant results in the field.
- The candidate has demonstrated excellence and provided evidence of achieving at least a regional recognition according to the criteria of Publication/Dissemination of Research, Creative Achievement, or Application.
- **The candidate has a record that would typically justify promotion to Associate Professor in a comparable program at a peer university.**

For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure, creative productivity and professional achievement will be assessed as follows:

- Scholars in related fields recognize as notable the contributions of the candidate.
- The candidate has made a significant impact in the field through Publication, Creative Achievement and/or Application.
- The candidate has achieved a national reputation for excellence.
- **The candidate has a record that would typically justify promotion in comparable programs at peer universities.**
The UT System is the premier higher education system in Texas.

It is in the interest of the people of Texas that the reputation of the UT System be further enhanced nationally and internationally.

The UT leadership is working effectively to support the ability of all of the campuses in the UT System to contribute to this goal.

The spirit of collaborative governance, promoted by Chancellor Cigarroa, has strengthened the faculty morale and spirit of cooperation throughout the system.

All leading institutions integrate teaching and research. Chancellor Cigarroa and his team have effectively facilitated the advancement of teaching and research within the UT System.

Therefore, the leadership of the UT System, under Chancellor Cigarroa has our full support and the support of the faculties of our institutions.

Recommendation: The Governance Committee recommends that this resolution be adopted and reinforced by the faculty governance bodies on each campus.