1. CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 p.m. in CRCC 115

2. MINUTES: April 1, 2013

3. REQUEST FOR NEW BUSINESS

4. CONSENT CALENDAR
   a. Appendix I: Resignations, Administrative and Faculty Appointments
   b. Appendix II: Auxiliary and Limited Term Appointments
   c. Appendix III: Emeritus Appointments

5. REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATION

6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

7. REPORT FROM ASUU

8. SPECIAL ORDERS – Annual Elections
   a. Election of Senate President-elect
   b. Election of Senate Executive Committee
   c. Election of Senate-elected Committees (instructions for online voting)

9. NOTICE OF INTENT

10. DEBATE CALENDAR
    a. (Updated) Proposal on Senate representation (Phase 1, revised Policies 6-002, 6-300)
    b. Proposal for Intellectual Property policies, Revised Policy 7-002--Patents & Inventions, Revised Policy 5-204—Remunerative Consultation
    c. Proposal for Name Change from Hearing Impairments Program to Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program
    d. Proposal for name change from MS in Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research and Health Policy to MS in Health System Pharmacy Administration
    e. Proposal Certificate of Occupational Safety and Health
    f. Proposed revision of Rule 6-310(IDTP) adding two new programs as Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs
    g. Proposed revisions on Policy 3-232, Operating Regulations For Bicycles, Skateboards, Roller skates And Scooters

11. INFORMATION CALENDAR:
    a. Undergraduate Council Review of the LEAP Program

12. NEW BUSINESS:
    a. Announcement of new President-elect and Senate Executive Committee
    b. April 2013 President’s report

13. ADJOURNMENT:
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
April 1, 2013

Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate, held on April 1, 2013, was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by Robert Fujinami, Senate President. The meeting was held in room 115 C. Roland Christensen Center.


Absent: Barton Blackburn, Reaz Chaudhuri, John Conboy, Charlotte Conerly, Alicia De Leon, William Gershan, Leanne Hawken, Michael Hawkins, L. Eric Huang, Evert Lawton, Melissa Meeks, Dragan Milicic, Harvey Miller, Anne Mooney, Trevor Myrick, Lester Partlow, Marlene Plumlee, Martin Rechsteiner, Gerald Root, Gary Rose, David Rudd, Li Wang

Excused: David Pershing, Vivian Lee

Ex-officio: Robert Flores, Robert Fujinami, Harriet Hopf, Paul Mogren, Allyson Mower, Amy Wildermuth, Shawnee Worsley

Excused with Proxy: Kevin DeLuca (Jim Anderson), Richard Dorsky (Sheryl Scott), Mary Elizabeth Hartnett (Margaret DeAngelis), Bradley Katz (Alison Crum), Chris Myers (Joe Zachary), Alison Regan (Jill Moriearty)

Others: Martha Bradley, Barbara Wilson

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting on March 4, 2013 were approved following a motion from Joanne Yaffe which was seconded by Steve Alder.

Request for New Business
No new business to address
Consent Calendar
The resignations retirements, faculty appointments, auxiliary and limited term appointments, appearing in the Appendices dated April 1, 2013, received approval to forward to the Board of Trustees on motion by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Sonia Salari.

Report from Administration
Interim Senior Vice President Michael Hardman spoke to the Senate regarding the Legislature. Overall Higher Education received its highest increase in history. The U is pleased with response on our targeted initiatives including the medical school class size increase, the $18 million for Mission Based funding, and the approved addition for Huntsman Cancer. USTAR also received an additional $5 million for loss funding and to support more research. Regarding compensation, the U was excluded from the 1% increase that the other state employees will receive. The Legislature did give the U a portion of money that will be used for benefits but cannot be used as a salary increase. The overall tuition increase will be 4.4%, less than the national average. We are seeing a national trend with tuition increases and although we would like to not increase the tuition we are pleased to keep it lower than the national average.

Executive Committee Report
Allyson Mower, Executive Committee Secretary, provided a summary of the Executive Committee meeting held March 18, 2013.

Report from ASUU
Geneva Thompson updated the Senate on the student body elections of the ASUU. Nick Ferre will serve as President, Sam Ortiz as Vice President and Kendahl Melvin as Senior Class President. ASUU has held three events in the past week; The Rock the U, Non-traditional Easter egg hunt, and Shine for Shriners. The next big event will be Geek Week and it will be held at the Marriott Library starting April 21st at noon until April 26th at 10 p.m.

Notice of Intent
The Proposal on auxiliary faculty nomenclature and Senate representation (Phase 1, revised Policies 6-002, 6-300) was presented by Hank Liese, Bonnie Mitchell, and Bonita Austin. In December 2010 the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate requested proposal to provide for Auxiliary Faculty representation in the Academic Senate. In spring 2012, Associate VP for Faculty convened the Ad Hoc Auxiliary Faculty Committee to address multiple issues, including faculty nomenclature and representation of full-time Auxiliary faculty in the Academic Senate. The Ad Hoc Committee now brings for Senate action these two distinct but related proposals: (i) change the official nomenclature for faculty members to three major categories (policy 6-300), and (ii) establish Academic Senate representation for full-time auxiliary faculty (policy6-002).

Regarding the nomenclature proposal, currently faculty nomenclature in Policy 6-300 includes Regular faculty (tenured or tenure eligible), Library Faculty (continuing appointment or continuing appointment eligible) and Auxiliary Faculty (Research Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Lecturer Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, and Visiting Faculty). Existence of Emeritus Faculty is mentioned. The proposed changes of Policy 6-300 are to change the official nomenclature for faculty members to three major categories: (i) Tenure-line (including Libraries faculty members formerly listed with the tenure-equivalent “continuing appointment” status), (ii) Career-line (for full-time Clinical, Lecturer, Research positions), and (iii) Adjunct, Visiting, and Emeritus. This
would eliminate the existing name “auxiliary” currently applicable to the Clinical, Lecturer, and Research positions. It is important to note that the nomenclature change itself is simply a title change and does not directly affect any of the rights or responsibilities of any group of faculty.

The Committee makes these two recommendations for a number of reasons:

- Existing nomenclature causes misuse of titles and confusion about responsibilities and status of Libraries Faculty as well as Clinical, Lecturer, Research, and Adjunct Faculty;
- Existing nomenclature creates inconsistent hiring, record-keeping and reporting practices.
- “Auxiliary” or “Contingent” labels imply supplemental, secondary, and fleeting institutional affiliation and identity;
- Full-time Clinical, Lecturer, and Research Faculty comprise about 40% of full-time faculty;
- “Career-line” is an inclusive, positive, and accurate description of full-time, long-serving faculty who are not hired with the expectation of tenure.
- The existing term “Regular” as a label for Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Faculty negates the important concept of tenure and the accompanying status;
- The term “Regular” for full-time faculty for whom it does not apply carries negative implications, as does the term “Auxiliary.”

The motion to move the nomenclature change proposal (Policy 6-300 revisions) immediately from the Intent Calendar to the Debate Calendar was made by Thad Hall and seconded by Joanne Yaffe. Motion passed with required 2/3 vote and item was moved to Debate.

A lengthy discussion followed on the official nomenclature for faculty members to three major categories.

A motion was made to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees, the nomenclature change proposal, as originally presented in the agenda materials, with a friendly amendment that to meet specific program needs, such as were described today for the School of Medicine we can still have exceptions to the ordinary requirement that only faculty appointed with at least .5 FTE will be appointed in the Career-line categories (Clinical, Lecturer, Research). The motion also included a request that the taskforce on auxiliary faculty issues (which is to be formed to carry on the ad hoc committee’s work as described in the proposal materials in today’s agenda) should report back to the Senate with a census on the number of people who are not tenure line. The motion was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Ron Coleman. Motion passed.

Discussion then proceeded on the second proposal-- that the membership structure of the Senate be modified to add a set of representatives of the Career-line faculty, with voting rights. Specifically, one representative should be elected from each of the college-level units (consisting of the 16 academic colleges, the Libraries as a unit, and the Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs established under Policy 6-310 as a unit). When fully implemented, this will establish 18 positions. The faculty members eligible to serve as representatives should be full-time Career-line and committed to a long-term affiliation with the University, with minimum qualifications of having been in a position of at least .75 FTE continuously for at least three preceding years. They
should have the same terms as Tenure-line representatives; three years, and one-year minimum between terms. These representatives should be elected by their peers within their college-level unit. The voters eligible to participate in selection of the representative from each unit should be Career-line faculty in positions at least .50 FTE at the time of election.

From an historical perspective, there have been two other highly significant policy changes in the Senate membership structure, and then another change in the leadership role. The Senate added representation of academic librarians (with continuing appointment status) in 1977. The next major step occurred through a Policy revision in 1987, which added a set of student representatives to the Senate. The third and most recent progressive step occurred in 1990 with a significant change in leadership of the Academic Senate. Previously, the Vice President for Academic Affairs (provost) led the Senate. As of 1990, the Senate President is not an officer of the central administration but a faculty member, elected by the Senate members.

The current proposal would revise Policy 6-002 to add representatives of Career-line faculty to the Senate, to be elected by fall 2013 and seated in January 2014. Stephanie Richardson made a motion to move this agenda item from the Intent Calendar to the Debate Calendar immediately. Motion was seconded by Joanne Yaffe. Opponents argued that such a significant decision should not be rushed to decision in a single Senate meeting and senators should have the usual month between meetings to study further and consult with constituents. Motion did not pass by the required 2/3 majority, and so the proposal will now appear on the May 6 Debate Calendar per usual procedures. Concluding the discussion, a ‘friendly amendment’ request was made and agreed to add to the proposal an explanation of a specific plan to achieve staggered terms for the newly elected Career-line Senate representatives.

Debate Calendar
Proposal for new Policy 3-010 & Rule 3-010 A- Expenditure of University Funds & Personal Reimbursements was presented by Assoc. V.P. Jeff West. The new policy defines a University business expense and the standards for expenditures of University funds as well as outlining responsibilities. Personal reimbursements are subject to all requirements of expenditures made directly via University funds. The rule establishes minimum documentation requirements for reimbursements and provides guidance for appropriate handling and approval of those below or above certain dollar amounts. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Jim Anderson. Motion passed unanimously.

The Proposal for an undergraduate Minor in Environmental and Sustainability Studies was presented by Dan McCool. The minor will consist of 14 credit hours offered by the ENVST Program and one 3 hour elective course for a total of 17 hours. The required courses must be taken at the University of Utah. The curriculum is designed so a student can earn this minor by taking all online courses or all in class course or combination. Currently there is no minor at the University of Utah focused specifically on environmental issues and sustainability. Weber State University has an emphasis in Environmental Studies, and Southern Utah University has a minor in Sustainability Studies. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Thad Hall and seconded by Joanne Yaffe. Motion passed with one abstention.
Andrea Brunelle presented the Proposal for an Undergraduate Certificate in Climate Change. The proposed certificate takes advantage of a recently developed curriculum in climate change courses in Geography along with climate change courses in other departments on campus to provide an interdisciplinary, value-added educational opportunity for students wanting to increase their expertise in climate change and their marketability for careers requiring this type of expertise. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Ron Coleman and seconded by Joanne Yaffe. Motion passed unanimously.

Proposal to establish a BS Completion to MS Degree in Nursing was presented by Barbara Wilson, Assoc. Dean of Nursing. The targeted audience is Registered Nurses with associate degrees who are interested in pursuing graduate education in any of our master’s degree emphases areas. The purpose of the proposed program is to offer opportunities for students to move seamlessly from their baccalaureate program to a master’s program. This would accelerate the transition into advanced nursing roles by eliminating the usual gap between BSN completion and graduate admission. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Kim Martinez. Motion passed unanimously.

Information Calendar
The proposed deletion of obsolete Policy 3-061 Stipends and Tax Exempt Payments was presented by Assoc. V.P. Jeff West. This policy was last updated in 1976. It is out of date and contains many errors and is not compliant with current law. The new policy 3-010 will cover any issues 3-061 was meant to address. No recommendations were made by senators.

Proposal for Emphasis name change from Teaching Nursing to Nursing Education within the Master program was presented by Barbara Wilson, Assoc. Dean of Nursing. No recommendations were made.

TA Scholars Projects were presented to the Senate by Raichle Farrelly. The TA Scholars Program consists of an interdisciplinary cohort of outstanding graduate students with at least one year of experience teaching undergraduates. Over the course of two semesters, the TA Scholars Program gives teaching assistants and graduate student instructors the opportunity to explore various pedagogical issues. Each TA Scholar also develops an individual project that addresses a specific teaching or learning need of his or her department. For more information you can visit the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence website.

The annual report on the faculty complement per Policy 6-300 was presented by Assoc. V.P. Amy Wildermuth. No recommendations were made.

The description of the Biennial Apportionment of Senate per Policy 6-002 was presented and no recommendations made.

The following Graduate Council Review reports were accepted by the Senate: Graduate Council Review of Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Graduate Council Review of Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Graduate Council Review of David Eccles School of Business School-wide Programs, Graduate Council Review of
Department of Management, Graduate Council Review of Department of Modern Dance, and Graduate Council Review of School of Accounting.

Recommendations for the 2013 Distinguished Innovation and Impact Awards, Calvin S. and JeNeal N. Hatch Prize in Teaching, and 2013 Early Career Teaching Awards Recipients were accepted by the Senate.

New Business
As agreed during the March meeting, further discussion about the report on Student Feedback Measures presented at that meeting was carried over to today’s meeting. Miguel Chuaqui as current chair of the Course Feedback Oversight Committee led a lengthy discussion, including describing Committee responses to various aspects of the report, and described the Committee’s views about further work needed on related issues. Assoc. V.P. Amy Wildermuth explained that in response to the questions that have been raised about how student feedback is used, especially in the RPT process and in merit increases for faculty, a taskforce will be created that will be chaired by Hank Liese. A second taskforce will be created, chaired by Paul Gore, to collect the data on a regular basis from the student course feedback reports and provide the information in a useful format to the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE). If you would like to participate in these taskforces please contact Amy.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shawnee Worsley
MEMORANDUM

To: Senate Executive Committee

From: Hank Liese and Bonnie Mitchell, Co-Chairs
    Ad Hoc Committee on Auxiliary Faculty

Date: April 9, 2013

Subject: Update on Proposed Career-line Representation in Senate, Policy 6-002.

This is an update for the proposal to revise Policy 6-002 to include representatives of Career-line faculty in the Academic Senate. As members will recall, at its April 1 meeting the Senate took two important steps. First, it gave final Senate approval to the proposed revision of Policy 6-300 to change the nomenclature for faculty, including adopting the term "Career-line." And this included a future phase in which the new nomenclature will be incorporated into several other Regulations during 2013-2014.

Second, in the preliminary discussion of the companion proposal for Senate representation of Career-line faculty (revising Policy 6-002), the Senate requested that the Ad Hoc Committee for Auxiliary Faculty prepare a specific plan to accomplish the staggering of terms of the initial set of Career-line representatives, so that in future years those representatives would be replaced in a staggered sequence rather than all at once.

Here is the plan the Ad Hoc Committee has developed in response to that Senate request:

The proposed revision of Policy 6-002 includes the point that the Career-line representatives will ordinarily be elected for three-year terms (as has long been true of the Tenure-line faculty). To avoid having the entire set of Career-line representatives replaced at the same time in future years, this staggered-terms plan will be implemented for the first years of operation under the new membership structure.

1. All of the 18 electing units (the 16 colleges, the Libraries as a unit, and the Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs as a unit) will elect their Career-line representatives by fall 2013, to begin service on the Senate in January 2014 (midway through the 2013-2014 Senate year). The Personnel and Elections Committee, after consultation with the Ad Hoc Committee on Auxiliary Faculty, will, by the end of spring 2014, divide those representatives into three groups.

2. Those assigned to the first group will have special initial terms of only 1 & ½ years (and so their electing units will be conducting elections again in spring 2015, for ordinary three-year terms of service to begin 2015-2016).
3. Those in the second group will have special initial terms of only 2 & ½ years (and so their electing units will be conducting elections again in spring 2016, for ordinary three-year terms of service to begin 2016-2017).

4. Those in the first and second groups will have a special one-time exception of being eligible for election again immediately after their initial shortened term (and it is likely some electing units will vote to return those persons to service for such second terms because of their experience in the founding period of the restructured Senate).

5. Those in the third group will have special initial terms of 3 & ½ years (and so their electing units will be conducting elections again in spring 2017, for ordinary three-year terms of service to begin 2017-2018). This group will be subject to the ordinary restriction of not being eligible for re-election until having spent at least one year out of office (the same restriction has long applied for Tenure-line faculty).

6. By this arrangement, once the initial special terms are completed, one third of the Career-line representatives will be elected each year, to serve the same three-year ordinary terms as do Tenure-line faculty representatives.

[Note to Senate: With addition of this update memorandum, which the Executive Committee approved on April 15, the materials for the May 6 Senate agenda are:

(i) this April 9 update memo to the Executive Committee regarding staggering of terms of the initial set of Career-line representatives elected to the Senate;

(ii) memo to the Senior Vice Presidents March 25, 2013, with signed approvals of the two proposals;

(iii) memo of explanation of the two proposals, from the Ad Hoc Committee to the Senate for the April 1, 2013 Senate meeting;

(iv) appendix of data regarding senate membership structures at other peer institutions; and

(v) the specific changes proposed for Policy 6-002 (Senate representation), and Policy 6-300 (nomenclature for faculty), as were included for the April 1 meeting and are again included for the May 6 Senate meeting.

The Policy 6-300 changes were already approved by the Senate April 1.

The Policy 6-002 changes shown in this set of materials will be the main subject of the debate and voting at the May 6 Senate meeting.]
MEMORANDUM

March 25, 2013

To: Senior Vice President Vivian Lee
   Interim Senior Vice President Michael Hardman

From: Amy Wildermuth, Associate Vice President for Faculty
       Harriet Hopf, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, School of Medicine

Subject: Proposals for Revision 29 of Policy 6-002 (representation of “Career-line” faculty in the Academic Senate), and Revision 16 of Policy 6-300 (changed nomenclature for faculty categories)

Attached is a set of two proposals regarding what are currently known as “auxiliary” categories of faculty members of the University. One proposal would provide for representation within the Academic Senate of full-time, long-serving faculty members in the categories of Clinical/Lecturer/Research (proposed to be collectively identified as the “Career-line” faculty category). This would be accomplished by a revision of Policy 6-002, adding 18 representatives of the Career-line faculty to the Senate. The other proposal would provide for changing nomenclature of the various categories and sub-categories of faculty members by (1) eliminating the existing name “auxiliary” faculty and replacing it with a newly-named category of “Career-line” that would include the three existing sub-categories of Clinical, Lecturer, and Research (all of which would continue to be applicable in individual cases); and (2) eliminating the existing name “regular” faculty and replacing it with the name “Tenure-line,” which currently includes “Tenured” and “Tenure-track” faculty (and those existing sub-categories would continue to be applicable in individual cases).
These are distinct proposals, but are being presented in combination for your consideration (and later that of the Academic Senate) because they are closely interrelated and combined consideration should allow for the most efficient and thorough processing. Both proposals contemplate one phase of Policy revision being approved in spring 2013, and a follow-up phase of further revising to be taken up during 2013-2014 to deal with several issues for fully implementing the two core changes in Senate structure and various University processes. For example, the question of Career-line faculty representation in elected committees of the Senate is proposed to be dealt with in that follow-up phase. Also, it is proposed that the Senate representation change be implemented using 2013-2014 as a transition year, with elections occurring through the fall and the Career-line representatives being first seated as voting members of the Senate in spring 2014.

The proposals reach your desks after lengthy development through a series of steps involving very broad consultation with the important affected constituencies. Of particular note, the impetus for the Senate representation (6-002) proposal arose within the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, which in December 2010 requested that such a proposal be developed and readied for action by the full Academic Senate. The lengthy preparatory work has included formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Auxiliary Faculty (“Ad Hoc Committee”), organized by the office of the Vice President for Faculty (Amy Wildermuth, who succeeded Susan Olson during the 2010-2013 project development period). The Ad Hoc Committee has taken the lead role for the proposals, including conducting extensive research within the University and nationally to identify and consider relevant issues, reviewing a variety of alternative Policy revisions to address those issues, and most recently developing these specific proposals.

Through the lengthy process, much attention has been paid to seeking out and consulting with interested sectors and persons within the University Community. In particular, because one proposal would affect the structure of the Senate, care has been taken to include representatives of the Senate at every stage of the project and ensure that attention is paid to the important principles of shared governance generally, and the specific vital role of the Senate in the shared governance system. As mentioned, the impetus came from the Senate’s Executive Committee in 2010, and the project has repeatedly been discussed in principle with the Executive Committee, especially in recent months, and the proposals, in detail, have now been fully reviewed by the Executive Committee, which approved moving to the next stage at its March 18 meeting. At the January 2013 Senate meeting, members were generally apprised of the pending arrival of the proposals, and their input was invited.

The proposals have been repeatedly discussed in principle with the University RPT Standards Committee from 2010 through the present, an especially valuable series of consultations because of the mandatory representation of tenured faculty from every college on that committee. And the Ad Hoc Committee itself was structured to provide both broad representation of University constituencies, and of the Senate in particular. The current president of the Senate, a former president, and a recent past multiple-term member of the Executive Committee have been core participants of the Ad Hoc Committee. This has allowed the Ad Hoc Committee to be fully cognizant of the workings and ways of the Senate and its crucial role in the shared governance system. These members have served along with representatives of both tenure-line and auxiliary faculty, health sciences and the “lower campus” academic affairs units, and administrators knowledgeable about the various issues encompassed within the projects. The Ad Hoc Committee co-chairs, Hank Liese (tenured Associate Professor and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs in the College of Social Work) and Bonnie Mitchell (Clinical Professor of Law) are to be commended on managing effectively such a diverse Committee and leading them to this stage of preparation for presentation to you and on to the Senate. Finally, the proposals have been processed through and repeatedly discussed by the Institutional Policy Committee.
Further details of each proposal are laid out fully in the accompanying documents, which altogether include (i) this approvals memo, (ii) the Ad Hoc Committee’s memorandum to the Academic Senate (for discussion April 1, 2013), (iii) an appendix of data regarding PAC-12 peer institutions, (iv) the specific proposal for Policy 6-002, and (v) the specific proposal for Policy 6-300.

We believe that both of these proposals are critical steps forward to putting us on equal footing with our institutional peers. In particular, the proposal on nomenclature is important because it more sensibly and respectfully describes what is meant to be conveyed by the labels attached to faculty ranks. Second, including Career-line faculty in the Academic Senate makes clear our institutional commitment both to shared governance and to those on the faculty who work in a full-time capacity.

If you approve, please forward for the approval of President Pershing, and then to the Senate office for presentation at the April and May meetings of the Academic Senate.
MEMORANDUM

From: Ad Hoc Committee on Auxiliary Faculty
To: Academic Senate
Date: April 1, 2013

For consideration at the April 1 meeting of the Academic Senate, these are the combined proposals to:

Obtain Academic Senate Approval to Amend Relevant Policies to:

- Change Faculty Nomenclature
- Allow Representatives of the Full-Time Auxiliary Faculty to be Elected by Their Peers into the Academic Senate

The documents for these combined proposals include (a) this memorandum explaining the proposal (with appendices), and (b) the accompanying proposed changes for Policy 6-002 and Policy 6-300.
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Executive Summary

In response to the December 2010 request from the Senate Executive Committee, the University of Utah Ad Hoc Committee on Auxiliary Faculty (“the Committee”) recommends that the University revise Policies 6-002 and 6-300 in order to:

- Change the official nomenclature for faculty members to three major categories: (i) Tenure-line (including Libraries faculty members formerly listed with the tenure-equivalent “continuing appointment” status), (ii) Career-line (for full-time Clinical, Lecturer, Research positions), and (iii) Adjunct, Visiting, and Emeritus. This would eliminate the existing name “auxiliary” currently applicable to the Clinical, Lecturer, and Research positions (Policy 6-300). Note that the nomenclature change is simply a title change and does not affect any of the rights or responsibilities of any group of faculty.

- Establish Academic Senate representation for full-time auxiliary faculty (Clinical/Lecturer/Research), with one Senator to be elected by auxiliary faculty peers (0.50 FTE or higher) within each academic college, one for the University Libraries, and one for the Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs, for a total of 18 new Senators (the same as the number of student representatives). Candidates for such positions would be required to have a minimum of three years continuous full time (.75 FTE) status, and would serve a three-year term in the Senate. (Policy 6-002)

The Committee makes these two recommendations for a number of reasons. First, nomenclature is an important contributor to organizational culture and can create unintended tensions. The existing term “auxiliary,” currently dictated by Policy 6-300 to apply for the full-time Clinical, Lecturer, and Research positions, suggests that such faculty members are “supplemental,” “secondary,” or “ancillary.” Given that the auxiliary faculty comprise over 40% of the University’s full-time faculty, the term “auxiliary” and its negative implication that these faculty members are merely “supplemental” is contrary to the facts. Many auxiliary faculty members feel they are accorded second-class treatment, exacerbated by the demeaning label of auxiliary. The recommended nomenclature change is appropriately respectful of, and recognizes the importance of, the full-time Clinical/Lecturer/Research auxiliary faculty at the University of Utah. The accompanying change to refer to the category of Tenure-track and Tenured faculty as “Tenure-line” rather than the existing name “Regular” both provides greater clarity of the categories and recognizes the important functional differences of the Tenure-line and Career-line categories.

Second, establishing representation for Career-line faculty within the Senate, through a modestly-sized expansion of Senate membership, will correct a significant deficiency in the University’s otherwise outstanding commitment to general principles of shared governance. Those principles of shared governance are deeply embedded in the culture of the University, as was emphasized in the University’s recent self-report petitioning for accreditation renewal. As the report noted, those principles are reflected through numerous official Policies of the University. As a prime example, Policy 6-300-III-Sec. 6 (Authority of the Faculty) provides for faculty to play a meaningful role in governance, including primary responsibility for course
content and materials, degree requirements, and curriculum. Full-time, long-serving auxiliary faculty members are deeply involved in all of those areas, and so have substantial expertise and wisdom to contribute in shared governance. Including representatives of these faculty members in the Senate creates a mechanism for gaining access to their insights on curriculum and course needs, and mechanisms for assuring quality of teaching, which are among the most important areas of Senate responsibility. These insights can help faculty demonstrate that the integrity of our institution and the effectiveness of our programs and research depend upon maintaining as fully as possible a robust Tenure-line faculty, balanced with more fully benefitting from the contributions that Career-line faculty can make within the shared-governance system.

Third, in addition to supporting the University’s outstanding historical record of shared governance, inclusion of Career-line faculty in the Academic Senate will remove what has until now been an artificial barrier to cooperation between all members of the faculty and alignment of faculty interests. The exclusion of Career-line faculty from University governance has the unintended consequence of fracturing the faculty—an otherwise naturally allied group of professionals. Administrative choices frequently are driven by economic pressures, such as cutbacks in support from the State Legislature. A united faculty is likely to be able to more effectively influence the administration in key areas such as maintaining an appropriate balance between full-time and part-time faculty.

Fourth, the existing exclusion of Career-line faculty from the Senate is inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the academic community—inclusiveness and respect for those who contribute in significant ways to academic endeavors. These fundamental principles prompted the Senate, in its most recent restructurings, to include in its elected membership first the Libraries faculty (of the tenure-equivalent continuing appointment category), and then the student representatives, adding those to the body previously limited to “Regular” faculty, to create the modern Academic Senate. Including Career-line faculty in the Senate now will be consistent with the University’s history of fairness and bring the University in line with our peer institutions, as inclusion of auxiliary faculty on institutional senates is the norm.
I. Introduction, Overview, and Background

A. Introduction and Overview

This is a combined proposal for two types of change in University Policies and associated procedures and practices regarding the full-time, long-serving faculty in the categories of Clinical, Lecturer, and Research.

1. The first type of change is in nomenclature only—the names that are used in official Policies and then used in the day-to-day language of the University community, in referring to full-time, long-serving Clinical, Lecturer, and Research faculty, and in distinguishing those categories of faculty both from the tenured and tenure-track and from other categories consisting of part-time, short-term faculty. Specifically, it is proposed that the University:

   (a) Discontinue using the name “auxiliary” and adopt the name “Career-line” to refer to the combined category of full-time, long-serving Clinical, Lecturer, and Research faculty.

   (b) Discontinue using the name “regular” and adopt the name “Tenure-line” to refer to the combined category of Tenured and Tenure-track faculty (including the encompassed Libraries faculty).

2. The second type of change would allow full-time, long-serving Clinical, Lecturer, and Research (“Career-line”) faculty to serve as voting members of the Academic Senate. Specifically, it is proposed that:

   (a) One full-time, long-serving Career-line faculty member (at least .75 FTE for three continuous years) be elected from each college-level unit (the 16 academic colleges, the Libraries, and the Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs), for a total of 18 Senate positions.

   (b) The voters eligible to participate in the selection of these Career-line faculty should be Career-line faculty who are at least .50 FTE at the time of election.

The combined proposal documents include (a) this memorandum, and (b) the proposed revised versions of Policy 6-002 (the Academic Senate), and Policy 6-300 (categories and nomenclature of University faculty). This memorandum consists of Part I (Introduction, Overview, and Background), Part II (Proposed Change in Faculty Nomenclature), Part III (Proposal to Provide for Representation of the Full-Time Clinical, Lecturer, and Research Faculty as Voting Members in the Academic Senate), Part IV (References), and Part V (Appendices).

B. Background

When Policy 6-300 was substantially revised to provide for the categories of Clinical, Lecturer, and Research faculty, a provision was included requiring that the Senate receive an Annual Report on the Faculty Complement. The Annual Report for this year will reach the Senate at the same time as this proposal. Reviewing the data from past reports, the Ad Hoc Committee on
Auxiliary Faculty (“the Committee”) notes that the number and proportion of faculty who are not tenured/tenure-track compared to those who are tenured/tenure-track (“Tenure-line”) has risen at the University of Utah. This trend is even more dramatic at the national level. According to a new report from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2013), while Tenure-line faculty made up 45.1% of all instructional staff in U.S. higher education in 1975, that figure was down to 24.4% by 2009.

The University of Utah, like virtually all other institutions of higher education, is relying more and more on faculty who are not Tenure-line to teach students, do academic research, and care for patients while modeling their professional skills for students in the “teaching hospital” setting. For those in the “Career-line” categories we focus on for this proposal, work at the University of Utah is their full-time job and long-term career, much as it is for Tenure-line faculty. Yet University policies label the former as “auxiliary” faculty and the latter as “regular” faculty. Continuing to use the label “auxiliary” unnecessarily demeans the full-time, long-serving Clinical, Lecturer, and Research category faculty members.

The University has already taken a few important steps to increase the institution’s ability to efficiently use the expertise and work capacity that the long-serving auxiliary faculty contribute, and also a few steps to increase institutional recognition of contributions of “Career-line” faculty members. Within the past decade, the University Teaching Committee opened more of the teaching awards to auxiliary faculty. Initially at the urging of the primary University accrediting body, and then subsequently by the University’s own internal initiative, the administration and Senate in 2007 and 2010 enacted and then expanded Policy 6-310, which ensures that the work of the “auxiliary” faculty is systematically evaluated and that they are eligible for promotions in rank. It also encourages use of multi-year rather than single-year appointments, greater participation in academic governance within their departments and colleges and at the University level, and access to professional development opportunities.

Implementation of Policy 6-310, however, is inconsistent around campus. As positive examples, the recently revised Fine Arts College Council Charter (discussed at the January 2013 Senate meeting) includes council representation for auxiliary faculty (in “Career-line” status), and the School of Medicine has long enfranchised Clinical faculty in many departmental-level decisions. In many other colleges and departments, though, responses to the accreditation impetus of Policy 6-310 have been much slower. In some colleges, Career-line faculty have limited or no vote and sometimes no voice in departmental and college decision-making, on matters to which they could contribute significant expertise and work capacity. Moreover, at the apex of shared governance at the University, Career-line faculty have no representation in the Academic Senate. Under existing Policy 6-002, membership in and voting for representatives to the Academic Senate are restricted to Tenure-line and Tenure-line equivalent library faculty (continuing appointment), and students.

As work began to implement Policy 6-310 to follow through on the accreditation initiative, conversations with a few Career-line faculty revealed profound discontent with what they perceived as second-class treatment at the University, reflected in both formal University policies and structures and informal departmental cultures. As the genesis for this set of combined proposals, in December 2010, then-Associate Vice President for Faculty Susan Olson
approached the Academic Senate Executive Committee to discuss the idea of incorporating auxiliary faculty into the Senate. The Executive Committee, once made aware of some of the concerns now reflected in this proposal, responded with a request for a proposal. As recorded in the minutes of the meeting of December 20, 2010, “The discussion ended with the Executive Committee requesting that a proposal be prepared and brought back for consideration.” The minutes also note that the then-Senate President asked that the proposal specifically include the alternative of “establishing in the Senate a set of positions dedicated for representation of the auxiliary faculty.” Groundwork for this current combined set of proposals has been under development since that request was made by the 2010-2011 membership of the Executive Committee.

In early 2012, current Associate Vice President for Faculty Amy Wildermuth, in consultation with current Senate leadership, organized an Ad Hoc Committee on Auxiliary Faculty to conduct further research and draft a proposal. That Ad Hoc Committee now brings this combined proposal for consideration. The proposal addresses (1) the formal terms used to describe “regular” tenured/tenure-track (to be “Tenure-line”) and full-time, long serving “auxiliary” faculty (to be “Career-line”) and (2) the lack of representation of the Career-line categories of auxiliary faculty in the Academic Senate. It does not address the full range of concerns expressed by Career-line and other auxiliary faculty, but takes the position that creation of mechanisms for representation of, and communication among, such faculty is an essential step in acknowledging their contributions to campus and hearing their concerns.
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II. Proposed Change in Faculty Nomenclature

A. Committee Charge and Recommendation for Nomenclature Change

One of the Ad Hoc Committee’s charges was to review the existing policies and practices governing nomenclature of faculty, in particular the “auxiliary” category, and recommend changes (1) to facilitate accurate and consistent hiring, review, promotion, record-keeping, and reporting practices; and (2) to ensure that titles accurately and fairly represent faculty responsibility and institutional identity and affiliation, if any, with the University.

To fulfill its charge to review policies and practices governing faculty nomenclature, the Committee recommends discontinuing use of the existing names “regular” and “auxiliary” and adopting a new nomenclature scheme with the following descriptive categories for faculty, which the Committee believes accurately and fairly represent faculty responsibility and institutional identity and affiliation:

- **“Tenure-line”** (encompassing both the formerly named “regular” category of tenured and tenure-track/tenure-eligible, and the formerly named “continuing appointment” Libraries Faculty).
- **“Career-line”** (.50 or greater FTE; a new grouping encompassing the existing sub-categories of Clinical, Lecturer, and Research, formerly lumped under the “auxiliary” heading) (and will include such positions of Libraries faculty which were formerly referred to as “non-continuing appointment”).
- **“Adjunct”** (no proposed significant change from existing Policy definition, although tighter enforcement of existing regulations may be needed—used for personnel whose appointments in the appointing unit are part-time, less than .50 FTE, paid or unpaid, at any rank).
- **“Visiting”** (no proposed significant change from existing Policy definition, used for those expected to remain at the University only for brief periods—not a long-term affiliation).
- **“Emeritus”** (no proposed significant change from existing Policy definition).

See the accompanying proposed Revision 16 of Policy 6-300 for full details of these proposed categories and nomenclature, and Appendix B for dates of implementation.

B. Background

In accordance with its charge “to ensure that titles accurately and fairly represent faculty responsibility and institutional identity and affiliation,” the Committee invested more than a year researching and discussing the positive and negative consequences of selecting specific titles. Early on, the Committee was unanimous that any proposed nomenclature list tenured/tenure-track faculty at the top and be the only category that included the word “tenure” in the main title of the category. This reflects the Committee’s view that all policies and practices of the
University should continue to respect and reflect the great importance of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, as central to the character and functions of the institution.

The Committee also was unanimous early on that the specific nomenclature of “regular” and “auxiliary” be eliminated because of confusing and negative associations described below. For faculty whose primary career affiliation is with the University, the Committee considered and rejected the terms “non-tenure track” and “contingent” (terms commonly used by other institutions) as inconsistent with its charge and unnecessarily demeaning. Aside from those decisions, the Committee had long discussions during meetings and by email about several other titles, considering how well each accurately and fairly represented the category being considered. In its deliberations, the Committee also considered the drafting consequences of amending policies affected by changes in nomenclature, with a goal toward streamlining the nomenclature of categories while allowing for a range of appropriate categories and ranks within those categories.

In accordance with its charge to review faculty nomenclature policies “to facilitate accurate and consistent hiring, review, promotion, record-keeping, and reporting practices,” the Committee believes that the following underscore the need to clarify and streamline faculty nomenclature:

1. The Committee was unsuccessful in reconciling auxiliary faculty information from Human Resources with auxiliary faculty information from the Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis (OBIA).

There is lack of clarity in the policies governing faculty nomenclature which create inconsistencies with Human Resources faculty employment categories. The lack of clarity and inconsistencies can result in inaccurate record-keeping and reporting. Inherent in best practices of a complex institution are consistency and coherence in the assignment of rank, title, position, and function to all who are members. This is particularly true of a public research institution of higher education, which has numerous reporting requirements on the local, state, and national levels and for purposes of accreditation. For administrative and staff employees at the University of Utah, Human Resources has a system of coding, choosing job titles, writing job descriptions, and ensuring fair practices for hiring, review, promotion, salary, benefits, rights, and responsibilities. That system is consistent and coherent.

For faculty at the University of Utah, however, Human Resources lists two categories, with faculty titles under each with an associated job code:

- Regular Faculty
  - Nine coded sub-categories that include instructors and library faculty
- Auxiliary Faculty
  - Thirty-three coded sub-categories

However, the Committee could not reconcile information from Human Resources with information from OBIA to determine how many auxiliary faculty are appointed in which categories in specific colleges and departments at any given time. Moreover, the distinctions between full-time and part-time are unclear, as well as how many auxiliary faculty are actually employed at any given time. Most relevant to this Committee’s work, the 2012-2013 Annual
Report on the Faculty Complement reveals that Career-line faculty comprise 40.3% of the total number of faculty at the University of Utah (see Table 1 in Section III of this memorandum.)

2. Many members of the University community are not well versed with specific aspects of the University’s existing categories, nomenclature, and ranks for faculty.

Many within the University community do not fully understand the distinctions between what are currently categorized as auxiliary faculty and other personnel who perform academic functions, including teaching, but do not have faculty status. Broadly, the personnel of the University fall into four main groups—(1) the faculty, (2) the non-faculty academic employees (e.g., associate instructors, research associates, teaching assistants, teaching fellows, research assistants), (3) the staff employees, and (4) central administration officers. See existing definitions in Human Resources Policy 5-001, http://www.regulations.utah.edu/humanResources/5-001.html.

The Committee’s proposals and draft policy revisions are not intended to apply in any sense to the non-faculty academic employees described above. The proposed change in nomenclature applies only to the faculty categories governed by Policy 6-300, the foundational Policy that establishes the existing categories of faculty and provides the official nomenclature for faculty categories, http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-300.html. Policy 6-300 establishes these existing main faculty categories:

- Section 2. Regular Faculty - Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Faculty
- Section 3. Library Faculty (Continuing-appointment and Continuing-appointment eligible)
- Section 4. Auxiliary Faculty
  - D. Auxiliary Faculty—Categories
    1. Research Faculty
    2. Clinical Faculty
    3. Lecturer or Lecturing Faculty
    4. Adjunct Faculty
    5. Visiting Faculty

Policy 6-300 also acknowledges the existence of “emeritus” status faculty but does not discuss it fully.

As for “ranks” to which members of the faculty may be appointed or promoted, there is occasional confusion. 6-300 provides that (as is true of the “regular” faculty), “Auxiliary faculty may hold the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor” (6-300-III-Sec. 4). The proposed revision of 6-300 will not change the use of those ranks, but through reorganization will add some clarity in the vein of making the Policy more “user-friendly.”

Another area of widespread confusion within the University community is a tendency to misuse the name “adjunct” to refer to all of the sub-categories of auxiliary faculty—including full-time, long-serving Clinical/Lecturer/Research faculty, a tendency likely exacerbated by the current nomenclature (confusing auxiliary and adjunct). That Policy-engendered confusion in turn seems to lead frequently to substantive misunderstandings—members of the University community
who are not well-versed in the official nomenclature tending to conflate part-time, short-term adjuncts and the full-time, long-serving Clinical/Lecturer/Research faculty.

3. The place of Libraries faculty within the categories is another area of occasional confusion within the University community.

Libraries faculty also are governed by Policy 6-300, and in the above classifications, there is a separate section for the Libraries faculty. It defines them with the terminology “continuing appointment” rather than the terminology “tenure.” Under long-established practices, the academic library faculty are appointed in the three University Libraries units (the central Marriott unit, the Eccles Health Sciences unit, and the S.J. Quinney Law unit). They are appointed to positions in two main categories. The “continuing appointment” category positions have the status of “continuing appointment”—which in important respects is functionally equivalent to “tenure.” However, similar to what has occurred in the degree-offering academic colleges and departments, there are positions of Libraries faculty which do not have the continuing appointment/tenure-like status. Those positions currently are classified as “auxiliary” library faculty. For historical reasons, the “continuing appointment” terminology has been used until now. That terminology makes for much confusion and unnecessary complexity in the governing Policies, including 6-300.

Accordingly, the proposed revisions of 6-300 would implement a planned discontinuance of the “continuing appointment” terminology, replacing it with the more easily understood, less confusing, and simpler “tenure” terminology for the Libraries faculty. Thus, the Libraries faculty who have historically been in the “continuing appointment” line will now be appropriately understood as encompassed in the proposed “Tenure-line” category (Tenured or Tenure-track), along with the existing “regular” departmental faculty. This change of nomenclature will have no effect on the Senate representation issue—the continuing appointment Libraries faculty were already incorporated into the Senate membership, and have been making the expected valuable contributions within the main body as elected members of the Senate, serving on and chairing the various Senate-elected committees, and elected by the Senate to serve as presidents of the Senate.

C. Rationale for Adopting “Tenure-line” and “Career-line” Nomenclature

Faced with strong indications of the inadequacies of the terms “auxiliary” and “regular” currently in the University’s scheme of nomenclature, the Committee searched peer and other institutions for possible substitutes that might be in common use for the two distinct groups of full-time academics.

Michael I. Shamos, Ph.D. J.D., Distinguished Career Professor, School of Computer Science at Carnegie Mellon University, created a 150-page handbook (2002) listing more than 800 academic titles culled from about 1,000 faculty handbooks. He stated that his work was motivated to rationalize a scheme of conferring titles at Carnegie Mellon. He found that academic titles matter in substantial ways to individuals and classes of individuals, but there is absolutely no rational scheme for conferring titles. Shamos concludes that institutions charged with selecting academic titles and according rights and responsibilities need to do what works.
for their institution and their faculty with an eye for consistency, transparency, fairness, and unity with their mission. http://euro.ecom.cmu.edu/titles/titlebook.htm

As with the Shamos example, the Committee has not found obviously superior nomenclature in widespread use at other institutions that could be adopted for our needs at the University.

1. “Career-line,” rather than “auxiliary,” nomenclature for full-time, long-serving Clinical, Lecturer, and Research faculty accurately reflects their responsibilities and institutional identity and affiliation.

A large number of full-time auxiliary faculty members have had long careers at the University of Utah, some more than 25 years. Many have won prestigious awards for teaching and research and have devoted years of invaluable service to the University, including serving in some cases as directors of Centers and Institutes. For many, their only post-terminal-degree career affiliation has been with the University of Utah, and their hope is that the relationship will continue until retirement. Their commitment to the academic missions of the University is deep-seated and enduring.

But when it comes to faculty nomenclature, the Committee believes that, indeed, there is something in a name. Citing Williams, Poole, and McCready (2009), a recent (2011) Arizona State University task force on what it terms “non-tenure-track” faculty reported that:

“although fully academically qualified, with many holding terminal degrees, NTT [non-tenure-track] faculty generally have less security of employment, feel less invested, draw significantly lower salaries, and are not always incorporated into all aspects of university life or the full range of faculty rights and responsibilities, and may not be encouraged or rewarded for their scholarly efforts.”

In conversations, both informal and formal, the Committee has had with auxiliary faculty, it has become clear that the term “auxiliary,” implying as it does that someone or something is “supplemental” or “secondary” to someone or something else, serves to reinforce here at the University the equivalent picture of non-tenure-track faculty painted in the ASU task force report.

Levin and Shaker (2011), in their article, “The Hybrid and Dualistic Identity of Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty,” cite Bergom, Waltman, August, and Hollenshead (2010) in observing that:

“On the one hand, FTNT [full-time non-tenure-track] faculty feel marginalized, desire respect, lack a peer networking group on campus, and are frustrated by the dearth of role clarity; on the other hand, they find collegiality in their collaborative work and praise the benefits of being part of the academic community.”

In describing this “hybrid identity,” Levin and Shaker note that the “internal struggles” of their study participants “evidenced the depth and cost of the negative associations affiliated with the
nomenclature of the non-tenure-track—including the terms non-tenure-track and contingent. This could be remedied through the creation of more inclusive and respectful terminology.”

The Committee believes that full-time, long-serving Clinical/Lecturer/Research faculty are justified in their reported perceptions that the University’s currently mandated nomenclature of “auxiliary” carries negative associations. There are similar concerns about other terminology in use nationally, such as “non-tenure-track” and “contingent,” the latter being a term used by AAUP (see next section of this proposal).

2. “Tenure-line,” rather than “regular,” nomenclature captures the role of this category of faculty more precisely and accurately.

As for the second term that is the subject of this proposal, “regular,” the Committee found it to be perceived as implicitly demeaning and insufficiently informative. For those to whom it does not apply, i.e., the Clinical/Lecturer/Research faculty, it is reported to carry an indirect/implied demeaning quality. If the tenure-line faculty are explicitly characterized as “regular,” the implicit connotation is that their faculty colleagues who are full-time, long serving Career-line faculty are something that is less than, and even the inverse of, regular. Directly labeled as merely “auxiliary” and indirectly implied to be “not regular” is a mantle that, at best, is difficult to wear with dignity throughout a career. The Committee was also surprised to learn that, when asked, many “regular” faculty do not like the term “regular” and, as one tenured professor said, “I cringe a little inside when I hear it.” Additionally, the term “regular” is ill-suited for its purposes: it has common meanings that are irrelevant to roles of faculty, and it fails to convey the most important information about this category of faculty—the concept of tenure and all of the important principles accompanying the status of tenure.
III. Proposal to Provide for Representation of the Full-Time Clinical, Lecturer, and Research Faculty (Career-line) as Voting Members in the Academic Senate

A. Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the membership structure of the Senate be modified to add a set of representatives of the Career-line faculty, with voting rights. Specifically, one representative should be elected from each of the college-level units (each of the 16 academic colleges, the Libraries as a unit, and the Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs established under Policy 6-310 as a unit). When fully implemented, this will establish 18 positions. The faculty members eligible to serve as representatives should be full-time Career-line (Clinical, Lecturer, and Research) and committed to a long-term affiliation with the University, with minimum qualifications of having been in a position of at least .75 FTE continuously for at least three preceding years. They should have the same terms as Tenure-line representatives (three years, and one-year minimum between terms). These representatives should be elected by their peers within their college-level unit. The voters eligible to participate in selection of the representative from each unit should be Career-line (Clinical, Lecturer, and Research) faculty in positions at least .50 FTE at the time of election.

The University’s existing, problematic nomenclature for faculty, including the particularly problematic term “auxiliary,” might engender some confusion, perhaps leaving an impression that this is an effort to put part-time, limited-experience adjuncts and visiting faculty into important roles in shared governance. It is not. The focus of the proposal is on adding representation of and by those faculty members who are committed to long-term careers in full-time capacity at the University—those recommended in Part II above to be labeled as “Career-line” instead of “auxiliary.”

B. Background of Senate Membership Structure

From an historical perspective, there have been two other highly significant policy changes in the Senate membership structure, and then another change in the leadership role. The Senate added representation of academic librarians (with continuing appointment status) in 1977. Subsequently, the Library faculty members have proven the wisdom of that progressive change by making important contributions to Senate work over the ensuing years. The next major step occurred through a Policy revision in 1987, which added a set of student representatives to the Senate. As a result of the change in membership, the governing body is now appropriately named the Academic Senate (unlike institutions which have only a “faculty senate”). The inclusion of student representation has been important for the Senate’s work in the following years—proving the wisdom of that progressive step. Students have been significant contributors in important Senate decisions. The third and most recent progressive step occurred in 1990 with a significant change in leadership of the Academic Senate. Previously, the Vice President for Academic Affairs (provost) led the Senate. As of 1990, the Senate President is not an officer of the central administration but a faculty member, elected by the Senate members. (Note that the first elected
The Committee views the current proposal of adding representation from the full-time Career–line faculty as an appropriate additional step in building upon the foundations laid in 1977, 1987, and 1990—to modernize the Senate and increase its effectiveness as the most important, institution-wide entity of shared governance by including representation of all full-time faculty constituents.

As an example of how including Career-line faculty representation will benefit the University, consider two sets of issues that the Senate has recently examined—the student course feedback (i.e., course evaluations) system, and the system for admission of undergraduate students. The course feedback system is governed by Policy 6-100, which was completely revised effective July 2011, after several months of intensive discussion and debate in the Senate. The course feedback system is now in spring 2013 undergoing intensive Senate discussion. The topics in both the earlier and the current discussions are topics on which the Career-line faculty should be expected to have great expertise, and on which they have serious concerns. A substantial number of the courses (i.e., the teachers) being evaluated through that system are taught by Clinical and Lecturer faculty, and their career advancement is heavily dependent on course feedback evaluation results.

Another issue the Senate has dealt with through multiple discussions in 2012-2013 is the complete overhaul of the undergraduate admission system (Policy 6-404). The faculty within the Senate who typically work with newly admitted undergraduates made many important contributions to the final, high-quality content of that revised Policy. Many of those newly admitted undergraduates will spend substantial portions of their freshman and sophomore years in classrooms led by Career-line faculty. The Senate’s deliberations on both the course feedback issues and the undergraduate admission issues were undertaken without benefit of contributions from the Career-line faculty, who have extensive expertise and great interests in those issues. The current configuration of the Senate has excluded those experts from these important discussions.

These are just two instances, among the many, of matters that come before the Senate on a regular basis for which representatives of the Career-line faculty could and should be contributing their expertise and energy.

C. Existing University Policies Pertinent to the Committee’s Recommendation

In addition to establishing the nomenclature and categorization of faculty (see Part II above), Policy 6-300 makes general provisions regarding the voting rights of the various categories, thus indirectly affecting rights of the Clinical/Lecturer/Research faculty to vote in the Senate, as well as other shared-governance structures. Policy 6-002, which establishes the Academic Senate and defines its membership structure, directly and specifically controls eligibility for Senate voting membership—and the existing language in Policy 6-002 explicitly limits faculty representation to Tenure-line faculty. More broadly, Policy 6-300 limits the voting rights of auxiliary faculty:
“The university faculty shall consist of the president, vice presidents, deans, directors of libraries, professors (including distinguished professors, presidential professors and university professors), associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, librarians, associate librarians, assistant librarians, and auxiliary faculty. **All shall have the full rights of faculty members except that persons holding auxiliary faculty positions (research, clinical, lecturer, visiting) or emeritus appointments shall not have the right to vote** and shall not have tenure or the expectation of tenure. [Policy 6-300, Section 1, Membership of the Faculty, emphasis added]

At the same time, however, Policy 6-300 states:

> **The faculty has a right to a meaningful role in the governance of the university, including primary responsibility for course content and materials, degree requirements and curriculum; it has a right to participate in decisions relating to the general academic operations of the university, including budget decisions and administrative appointments.**” [Policy 6-300, Section 6, Authority of the Faculty, emphasis added]

Policy 6-002 governs the membership structure of the Academic Senate (see Appendix C). For the 2012-2013 academic year, the Senate has 99 elected voting members as follows:

- 79 “regular” faculty members (library faculty included) elected by peers in their respective college units (the libraries jointly constituting one unit);
- 2 deans elected by the deans; and
- 18 students from student government (ASUU), one from each college and the ASUU president

### D. Rationale for Representation of Career-line Faculty in the Academic Senate

Research in several important areas helped clarify for the Committee the rationale for Career-line representation in the Academic Senate:

1. **Of those PAC-12 and other peer institutions the Committee surveyed, all included Career-line faculty as voting members of their faculty or academic senates.**

In its research, the Committee learned that the University of Utah is perhaps the only PAC 12 institution without representation of its auxiliary faculty in any capacity on the equivalent of our Academic Senate. The Committee does not expect the University to follow suit because everyone is doing it. Rather, the Committee concludes that full-time Career-line faculty (Clinical/Research/Lecturer) at the University of Utah should have representation and voting rights on the Academic Senate because it is the right thing to do, both because the Career-line faculty have much to contribute to the work of shared governance (see the course feedback and undergraduate admission Policies mentioned previously), and as a matter of general fairness and equity.

In the 2007-2010 accreditation review and the University’s response, a central principle was to bolster full-time auxiliary faculty involvement—encouraging and allowing a greater role in
shared governance for auxiliary faculty at the college and departmental level. While the University has subsequently made progress on that principle (see Policy 6-310 as well as the recently revised Fine Arts College Council Charter discussed by the Senate this spring), the participation of full-time Career-line faculty on the Academic Senate at this time remains barred by policy.

Culling information from Faculty Policies and Procedures at other institutions was a daunting research task. Some information simply could not be obtained or verified. Much was incomplete or internally inconsistent. The task did, however, make the Committee appreciate the relative coherence and clarity of the faculty-related policies at the University of Utah. What the Committee was able to determine (noting the research constraints above) is that the total number of voting members of the equivalent academic governing bodies at peer institutions varies widely. However, faculty eligibility to be a voting member and method of election is largely consistent.

*Range of Number of Voting Members in the Governing Bodies:*

Minimum 40 (USC); maximum 137 (Ohio State)

*Student and Administrator (Non-faculty) Voting Membership:*

Most have a limited number of administrators who are voting members. There are only two institutions that have students as voting members: the University of Arizona has seven voting student members and Ohio State has 41 voting student members.

*Faculty Voting Membership:*

Excluding the University of Utah and Washington State University (whose information was not available online), all surveyed peer institutions include the equivalent of “Career-line” faculty as eligible members of the voting faculty. About half require Tenure-line and Career-line to be .50 FTE. The remaining require “full-time” or .75 FTE for eligibility.

Beyond that, most institutions specify who among faculty are not eligible to vote, such as emeriti, adjunct, and visiting faculty; faculty associates; faculty in residence less than two years; and *ex officio* members.

*Election of Voting Faculty Members:*

The election process of voting faculty members predominately is proportional by college. For the majority of institutions, apportionment is based on numbers of all eligible faculty in a college or apportionment group or a combination of numbers of eligible faculty and student credit hours within the college or apportionment group. The iterations are numerous.

**Notably, no institution among those the Committee surveyed limits the number of Career-line voting members** or allocates a specific number to Career-line faculty. Nor does it appear there are restrictions on who can vote on Career-line faculty, or requirements that only Career-
line faculty elect Career-line representatives. *(The Committee’s proposal departs from these norms, as we tailor our process over time to fit best with the circumstances of the University.)*

2. The AAUP recommends including Career-line faculty in university governance.

In its January 2013 report, “The Inclusion in Governance of Faculty Members Holding Contingent Appointments,” the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), citing the growing number and role of “contingent” (i.e., non-tenure-track) faculty in higher education, notes the following:

“The structures of faculty governance...tend to assume a faculty that is primarily full time and on the tenure track. The participation in institutional and departmental governance of faculty holding contingent appointments is uneven, with some institutions encouraging it, some allowing it, and some barring it.”

The AAUP report describes the current state of affairs—i.e., a growing number of non-tenure-track faculty coupled with a system in which such faculty are only sometimes included in shared governance—as “problematic, first because it undermines faculty professionalism, the integrity of the academic profession, and the faculty’s ability to serve the common good.” The report continues:

“The current state of affairs is also problematic because it undermines equity among academic colleagues. The causes and repercussions of a system in which some faculty receive vastly more compensation, privilege, autonomy, evaluation, information, professional support, and respect than others extend far beyond governance... [As] the percentage of tenure-track faculty at an institution dwindles, any governance system that relies primarily upon them to represent the faculty’s views becomes less representative, less effective, and more easily bypassed.” [emphasis added]

To its credit, the AAUP report acknowledges that, while the exclusion of non-tenure-track faculty from shared governance is problematic, their inclusion might be as well. Among the areas of concern are the following:

1. Non-tenure-track faculty members often receive no formal recognition or credit for governance activities.
2. Non-tenure-track faculty on term contracts may not be able to complete long-term projects.
3. Non-tenure-track faculty may be vulnerable to retaliation for taking unpopular positions in their governance roles, as they are not protected by tenure.
4. Non-tenure-track faculty, for the same reason, may be more susceptible to pressure from administrators or other faculty than are tenure-track faculty.

The Committee has taken these concerns seriously in its extensive research and deliberations leading to the present proposal. The concerns are real, but can be mitigated by careful management, and on balance do not outweigh the substantial benefits to accrue from the progressive change proposed. The Committee’s view, shared with the AAUP, is that the
advantages of non-tenure-track faculty participation in shared governance far outweigh the disadvantages. Of note, many Career-line faculty now participate on University committees where allowed, even if they do not receive specific compensation for such work. Some are motivated because voluntary service might be beneficial in promotion reviews. Others volunteer unpaid time simply because they want to contribute to the University’s shared governance. While some may be reticent to express their opinions on controversial topics due to fear of retaliation, there are others who believe that there is no monetary value that competes with having and exercising a voice in matters one deems important. Further, concerns such as those raised above can and should be addressed by ongoing monitoring, discussion, and, if necessary, action at the department, college, and University level.

Notes the AAUP report:

“[W]e conclude that, on the whole, the exclusion from governance of faculty with contingent appointments is the greater danger to the integrity of the profession and the quality of higher education. In order for the faculty’s voice to be heard and for the faculty to retain its ability to contribute substantially to academic decision making, the expectation of service in governance must be expanded beyond tenured and tenure-track faculty as it has been expanded in the past: a century ago senior faculty members generally were the sole participants in university governance.”

3. The Committee believes Career-line faculty representation in the Academic Senate will not lead to a diminution of the role of Tenure-line faculty at the University.

The Committee is aware that some Tenure-line faculty may be concerned that granting Academic Senate representation to Career-line faculty will effectively amount to an endorsement and encouragement of the trend of increasing the proportion of Career-line (and also the very differently situated Adjunct) faculty relative to Tenure-line faculty. In the Committee’s view, the trends in hiring practices and the issue of shared-governance representation are unrelated. Hiring practices are driven largely by economic considerations, but also by the desire for enhanced flexibility in programs as a way to respond to changes in student needs. Faculty representation is related to governance, fairness, and institutional identity. The underlying forces, including budget forces, driving the trends nationally and at the University should be recognized as distinct from, and appropriately separated from, the issues of how best to structure shared governance to maximize its effectiveness.

With or without the support of Tenure-line faculty, American colleges and universities have steadily reduced the proportion of Tenure-line faculty since the mid-1970s. Tenure-line faculty now account for about 24% of all faculty nationwide due mainly to a sharp rise in part-time faculty hires. A major reduction in state and local government funding, coupled with the relatively high expense associated with Tenure-line hires and retention, has made funding for Tenure-line faculty additions difficult to come by, despite the high institutional value of Tenure-line faculty. Note that per-student apportionments to research and master’s degree granting universities by state and local governments plunged 24% from 2000-2010 (Kirshstein & Hurlburt, 2012).
The University of Utah has faced challenges similar to, if not always equivalent to, its peer institutions. Table 1 below summarizes the changes in faculty distribution by category for the past eight years. Despite the economic pressures, the University, like its public research-intensive peers, has done a good job of preserving Tenure-line positions. In fact, the University added 179 Tenure-line positions in the past eight years. *Moreover, the University relies much less heavily on part-time faculty than most universities.* Part-time faculty here accounted for about a quarter of the faculty, compared to the national average of about 50% part-time faculty. Economic pressures continue to drive administrators to seek cost reductions—including reductions in expenditures on faculty. A 2013 survey of nearly 1,100 university provosts by Gallup showed that over half of public university provosts believe that their institutions will face budget shortfalls in the future (Jaschik & Lederman, 2013). The vast majority of provosts plan to continue to rely on Career-line (and also Adjunct) faculty at current levels, and almost a quarter plan to increase use of Career-line (and Adjunct) faculty in the future.

While the faculty of the University (of any category) have limited ability to remove funding pressures, a united faculty may be able to influence administrative choices. The two-tiered system of no Career-line faculty representation in governance (and the parallel of using demeaning nomenclature) has the unintended consequence of fracturing the faculty and reducing its influence by essentially pitting one group against the other. In addition to supporting the University’s outstanding historical record of shared governance, the inclusion of Career-line faculty in the Academic Senate will remove what has until now been an artificial barrier to cooperation between all members of the faculty and alignment of faculty interests. Moreover, it will allow the Senate to gather important insights on curriculum and other matters from large numbers of faculty members who work closely with students, patients, and in research—faculty members whose insights now are largely unheard. These insights can help faculty demonstrate that the integrity of our institution and the effectiveness of our programs and research depend upon maintaining as fully as possible a robust Tenure-line faculty, balanced with more fully benefitting from the contributions that Career-line faculty can make within the shared-governance system. Inclusion of Career-line faculty in shared governance will also further the University’s long-standing and admirable commitment to the academic traditions of fairness and equity.

**Table 1: University of Utah Faculty by Category 2004-2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Category</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Faculty</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Line</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Career-Line</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Career-Line</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct/Visiting</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012-2013 University of Utah Annual Faculty Complement Report
E. Specifics of the Proposal for Full-time Clinical/Lecturer/Research Faculty Representation in the Academic Senate

Implementing the Committee’s recommendation, i.e., that full-time Career-line faculty participate more fully in shared governance within the University by being eligible to participate as voting members in the Academic Senate, leads to a series of specific issues: (1) the precise requirements for eligibility of those who should serve; (2) their numbers; (3) specific affiliations with constituencies within the overall University; (4) the mechanism for their selection; and (5) their terms of service. All of these are addressed among the following:

1. **The Committee believes moving from no representation to proportional representation of Career-line faculty would be premature.**

The Committee discussed having a Senate membership structure based on maintaining the current formula for faculty, which is generally proportional by college, but would be amended to include the number of full-time Career-line faculty per college in the calculation. The existing formula already makes use of student credit hours taught within a college, including those taught by Career-line faculty. The election procedure would not change. This method mirrors that of the University’s peer institutions the Committee surveyed and provides the potential of giving proportional voice to Career-line faculty. Also, increasing the pool reduces the burden of Tenure-line faculty having to shoulder all of the governance responsibility.

However, the Committee consensus reflected in this proposal is that, at least for an initial period (i.e., a trial basis), college-level units of the University (each college, the Libraries, and a unit comprised of the Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs) should elect one additional senator, from among its full-time Career-line faculty, elected by peers. This would increase the size of the Senate membership by 18. This option parallels the existing election process for, and number of, student representatives.

2. **The proposed number of Career-line representatives has several benefits.**

As will be quickly recognized, this proposed number (18) is quite modest, relative to the size of the Tenure-line faculty representation (79) and relative to the proportion of full-time Career-line faculty within the University (about 40% of all full-time faculty as reflected in the Annual Report data). The Tenure-line faculty will remain a substantial majority of the voting members.

Having a modest number of representatives would allow time to establish channels of communication among Career-line faculty across the lines of departments and colleges—channels of communication that currently do not exist. The Committee, as part of its overall research, found that there are very limited instances of any existing communities/councils or other types of structures within the University that enable a Career-line faculty member within one college—or even department—to learn of the existence of and establish communications with Career-line faculty in other colleges or equivalent units. For example, service on the Senate and Senate-elected committees allows and encourages Tenure-line faculty to establish communications with peers across the lines of colleges and departments. In their current status,
officially barred from membership in the Senate and accordingly barred from election to the Senate-elected committees, the Career-line faculty members lack those mechanisms for cross-campus communication on shared interests and concerns.

Additional benefits of creating a small set of Career-line positions in the Senate would be a means for more easily identifying the Career-line faculty within the various units, accurately assessing the numbers of those who have the requirements for eligibility to vote on or serve as a Senate representative, and learning about their ability and willingness to take time for service in shared governance. Perhaps most important, there is the need to determine how many Career-line faculty have multiple-year contracts that would encourage them to exercise their right to speak freely with less fear of retaliation.

3. There are benefits to the proposed eligibility criteria for Career-line faculty to serve in the Academic Senate, as well as the proposed criteria for electing those representatives.

In keeping with the Committee’s view that any Career-line faculty serving in the Senate should have a full-time and long-running affiliation with the University, there are two recommendations. First, as to the eligibility to vote for representation, the proposal is that Career-line faculty in the categories of Clinical, Lecturer, and Research who are at least .50 FTE be eligible to vote for the Career-line representative from their college-level unit. Second, as to eligibility to stand for election and serve in the Senate, a candidate would have to be a Career-line faculty member (Clinical/Lecturer/Research) in a position at least .75 FTE, and employed in that capacity continuously for at least three years. This requirement assures that, as elected Senate representatives, they are knowledgeable about the University and aligned with the University’s mission and goals sufficiently to make useful contributions in their shared-governance roles.

The college-level unit is an existing structure that facilitates orderly elections and typically is the reference point around which professional identity is established. The Committee believes that Tenure-line faculty may be more receptive to this method of obtaining representation and hopes it will initiate conversations and improve inter-faculty relationships and mutual respect. This is envisioned as an initial method to allow Career-line faculty to have at least one voice per college in the near term, with re-evaluation after an initial trial period as more fully described below.

4. The Committee recommends that there be a transitional process for electing Career-line representatives to the Academic Senate.

The Committee recommends that the various college-level units organize and conduct their elections during fall 2012 and, further, that the new Career-line representatives first take their seats as voting members as of January 2014, midway through the year. The Committee also recommends that a “staggered” system be used so that once the terms of the initially elected set of representatives come to an end, there will not be a complete turnover, but rather a staggered turnover. Finally, the Committee recommends that the process and structure be monitored and reviewed and, if that review so suggests, that possible modifications be considered for implementation in a subsequent year (see task force recommendation below).
This addition of Career-line representatives to the Senate structure will be accomplished by revising the governing Policy on Senate structure, and the specific revisions needed for this change are displayed in the accompanying draft of Revision of Policy 6-002. However, the revisions now proposed will leave certain issues and certain aspects of the Policy needing further work. Most importantly, the Committee view is that, at this time, there should not be a decision made about how Career-line faculty might best be integrated into the Senate-elected committee system. During 2013-2014 there should be further study on that issue, and the outcome of that study should lead to proposed further revisions to those sections of Policy which govern the membership of the Senate committees. So it is a specific component of this current proposal that there be a second phase of additional Policy revisions, developed during 2013-2014, to include further revisions of Policy 6-002 and several related Policies. This second phase revising of Policies regarding shared governance will coincide with the second-phase revising of Policies regarding nomenclature and categories of faculty (see Appendix B).

F. Recommendation to Form a Task Force to Continue the Work of the Ad Hoc Committee

The Committee recommends forming a task force charged with two broad areas of responsibility. One, the task force should monitor and participate in reviewing the newly implemented structure for inclusion of Career-line faculty representatives in the Academic Senate, evaluating the effects of the selected method of allocation and election and gathering input as needed from all constituencies. Second, this task force should also be charged with evaluating other issues affecting Career-line and also part-time, non-tenure track faculty, including issues raised in this proposal as well as others not addressed. The task force should include at least some of the Career-line faculty who are elected to the Senate by their peers and some carry-over membership of the Ad Hoc Committee that has developed this set of proposals. The work of the task force might best coincide with the second-phase Policy revision processes the Committee has recommended above.
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Appendix B

Proposed Implementation of Changes in Faculty Nomenclature

The faculty nomenclature changes are proposed to be implemented as of July 1, 2013. This set of changes to take effect in July will be the first of two steps needed to fully implement changes of nomenclature in a system-wide scope. The Committee has preliminarily identified additional Policy changes that will be needed for the full implementation.

As a specific component of this current phase proposal, the Committee proposes that a second phase be undertaken during the 2013-2014 year, leading to a second-phase proposal for further revisions of Policies. These should include further revisions of certain portions of Policy 6-300 which are not encompassed in the current proposal, but are antiquated and require updating. They should also include revisions of several other Policies in which the existing nomenclature of “auxiliary” and “regular” appears (and others in which there is the “continuing appointment” terminology regarding Libraries faculty).

For example, there should be conforming nomenclature-change revisions made to Policies 5-001 (Employee Definitions), 6-001, 6-301, 6-302, 6-303, 6-304, 6-306, 6-311, 6-317, and 7-011. Most of these will be simple changes of the nomenclature. This second phase of nomenclature-related Policies will coincide with the second-phase revising of shared-governance-related Policies which the Committee is recommending.
APPENDIX C

Membership Structure of the Academic Senate

The membership structure of the Academic Senate is governed by Policy 6-002-III-Section 2, http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-002.html. It establishes certain administrative officials as ex officio non-voting members, and for the voting membership provides for representation from the students (elected through ASUU), two elected deans, and the faculty. Each college must have at least two faculty members and one student member.

A formula determines faculty college representation based on (1) the number of Tenure-line (regular) faculty in the college; and (2) the total student credit hours taught. Note that the formula factor of credit hours taught includes courses which are taught by “auxiliary” faculty, including the full-time Clinical and Lecturer faculty who are the subject of this proposal. Specifically, for the faculty representatives, 6-002 provides:

“1. Faculty. a. The voting membership of the Senate shall include regular faculty members [see Policy 6-300] elected from the following areas of representation: the individual colleges and the university libraries considered as a unit. All regular members of the faculty, without regard for rank or for time in rank, shall be eligible for election to membership in the Senate, except ex officio members of the Senate and members of the faculty serving in administrative positions higher than department chair. All regular members of the faculty, without regard for rank or for time in rank, shall be eligible to vote for candidates for Senate membership only in the areas of representation where they hold primary appointments. Disputes respecting eligibility for election or eligibility to vote shall be decided by the Personnel and Elections Committee, subject to appeal to the Senate and to the faculty.

b. Faculty membership in the Academic Senate shall be apportioned by allocating not more than 79 representatives among the colleges and university libraries[*FN] on a prorated basis of 50 percent according to the number of faculty members in each area and 50 percent according to student credit hours, including evening residence hours, taught in each area during the preceding academic year. The base allocation of not more than 79 faculty members shall be adjusted to ensure that each area of representation will have a minimum of two representatives. The Personnel and Elections Committee shall reapportion the Senate according to the foregoing formula every two years.

[*FN] Representation from the university libraries will be determined by taking the average number of student credit hours per faculty member, of all other colleges, and multiplying that value by the number of library faculty.

c. Areas of representation which, under the foregoing formula, would contribute more than 20 percent of the voting faculty membership of the Senate may, with Senate approval, be subdivided by the Personnel and Elections Committee along department or administrative lines, into two or more separate representation areas, none of which shall contribute more than 20 percent of the voting faculty membership of the Senate. The membership of such subdivided representation
areas shall be apportioned by the Personnel and Elections Committee among the areas as nearly as possible in accordance with the above prorationing formula.

d. Faculty representatives shall be elected to serve regular three-year terms, or as provided in section 5A (3), infra, to complete three-year terms of representatives who do not complete their regular terms. An annual orientation shall be provided for newly elected Senators. Beyond service in the Senate, faculty members of the Senate should expect that they may be called upon to serve on standing and ad hoc committees. Senate faculty members shall be ineligible for nomination for another term until at least one year has elapsed following the expiration of their terms of office or date of resignation therefrom. New terms shall begin on May 15.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>GOVERNING BODY SIMILAR TO U of U ACADEMIC SENATE</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE MEMBERS AND NUMBERS</th>
<th>VOTING OR OTHER LIMITATIONS</th>
<th>ACADEMIC FACULTY CATEGORIES &amp; TITLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>66 total members</td>
<td>Emeritus status has voting privileges in the first 5 years of his/her status, and can be extended for an additional 5 years after that. No candidate for a degree at the University shall be a member of the General Faculty. Undergraduate Council (“UC”): - 1 to 2 student reps from the Associated Students of the Univ. of Ariz. (ASUA) are appointed to the UC. The chair of the UC is appointed by the Chair of the Faculty. Graduate Council (“GC”): - 3 student reps are</td>
<td>“Members of the General Faculty are eligible to vote in matters of faculty governance and to hold offices and serve on committees” For purposes of University government, the General Faculty . . . is composed of: <strong>Faculty members</strong> - (who hold half-time or more tenured or tenure-eligible appointments) <strong>Academic Professionals</strong> - (hold half-time or more continuing or continuing eligible appointments) <strong>Lecturers</strong> - (hold half-time or more multi-year appointments) <strong>Clinical Professors, research professors, and professors of practice</strong> - (hold half-time or more multi-year appointments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 “At-Large” is a designation for representative members of a governing body who are elected or appointed to represent the whole membership of a unit, here, each college.

2 *Ex officio* means, by virtue of an office or position. As in, for example, “the head of the department serves as an *ex officio* member of the board.”
| Arizona State University | The University Senate **Academic Assembly
The University Senate is and selected from the Academic Assembly. The following are | Total membership number unknown
Ex officio voting members of the Senate include:
- The members of the University Academic | Ex officio nonvoting members of the Senate include:
- the president of the university;
- executive VP and provost; | Tenured Appointment and Tenure-eligible Appointment:
- Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor
- Regents’ Professor
- President’s Professor |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of the Academic Assembly:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All faculty in a tenure-eligible or tenured position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All academic professionals with full-time multi-year, probationary, or continuing appointment positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The president of the university and the executive VP, and provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. All full-time faculty with fixed appointments (i.e. instructors, lecturers, senior lecturers, principal lecturers, clinical faculty, research faculty, and professors of practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Members of the Emeritus College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a catch-all Council ("UAC") - The secretary of the Academic Assembly - The "parliamentarian" of the University senate.

The method of selecting senators from any "degree-granting unit" is determined by the assembly members of that unit.

- Degree-granting units with fewer than 40 Academic Assembly members select 1 senator.
- Degree-granting units with 40 or more Academic Assembly members select 1 additional senator.
- Degree-granting units with 100 or more Academic Assembly members "may" select a third senator.

- executive VP and chief financial office of the university;
- dean of the Graduate college;
- university librarian;
- the ombudsperson of the academic assembly;
- Chair of the ASU staff council;
- A representative of undergraduate student government and the president of the graduate and professional students association.

The following positions are not members of the Academic Assembly:
- Faculty Research Associates
- Visiting Faculty
- Faculty Associates

Emeritus:
- Professor Emeriti (given to faculty members who have served the "institution for a substantial length of time the title of 'emeritus.'")

Fixed-term Appointment Faculty Members:
- Research Professor, Research Association Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Research Scholar
- Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor
- Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, Assistant Professor of Practice
- Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer

Annual Fixed-term Appointments:
- Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Scholar, Visiting Scientist, Visiting Artist, Visiting Writer
- Instructor and Instructor, ABD

Semester or Annual, Fixed-term Appointments:
- Faculty Research Associates (appointed on a semester or annual,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of California Berkley</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*The Regents of the University of California state the following: “The Academic Senate shall consist of the President, Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Deans, Provosts, Directors of academic programs, the chief admissions officer on each campus and in the Office of the President, provision stating that all “persons who are designated as faculty on [their] Notice of Faculty” are considered faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notice:</strong> Berkeley’s Bylaws are convoluted. Under Title III (“Organization of the Academic Senate”), it states that the “functions of the Academic Senate are exercised by the following agencies and their committees.” It then goes on to list six agencies and committees: 1. The Assembly of the Academic Senate 2. The Academic Council 3. Standing and Special Committees of the Academic Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors and Instructors in Residence of Less than two years’ service have no vote. Members of the faculties of professional schools offering courses at the graduate level only shall be members also of the Academic Senate, but, in the discretion of the Academic Senate, may be excluded from participation in activities of the Senate that relate to curricula of other schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fixed term appointments, are not eligible for promotion, and are not members of the Academic Assembly) - Faculty Associates (appointed on semester or annual, fixed term appointments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid, Usually Part-time Positions for Limited Renewable Terms: - Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 The **Academic Council** consists of the following members: (1) The Chair of the Assembly, who is also the Chair of the Academic Council; (2) The Vice Chair of the Assembly, who is the Vice Chair of the Academic Council; (3) The Chairs of the Divisions; and (4) The Chairs of the following University Standing Committees: Academic Personnel; Affirmative Action and Diversity; Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools; Educational Policy; Faculty Welfare; Graduate Affairs; Planning and Budget; and Research Policy.
registrars, the University Librarian on each campus of the University, and each person giving instruction in any curriculum under the control of the Academic Senate whose academic title is [listing a host of titles]; however, Instructors and Instructors in Residence of less than two years’ service shall not be entitled to vote.”

http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws/so1051.html

The same provision as above goes on to say: “The Academic Senate shall determine its own membership under the above rule, and shall organize, and choose its own officers and committees in such manner as it may determine.”

http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws/so1051.html

The Assembly of the Academic Senate has the following Members:
- The President
- The Chair and Vice Chair of the Assembly
- All members of the Academic Council serve as ex officio of the Assembly
- 40 divisional representatives “chosen from other than chancellors, vice chancellors, deans, chief administrative officers of and colleges of the University.

Student members shall be eligible to serve on all standing sub-committees.

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/blpart1.html#blpart1-1

44 m/sec1-pdf.html
colleges and schools, and members of the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction.”

- The Academic Council annually prorates these 40 among the Divisions in proportion to their membership, but each Division has at least 1 Divisional Representative in the Assembly.
- And each Division determines its own method of choosing its representatives.

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/blpart2.html#bl105

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Colorado</th>
<th>Faculty Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Another confusing body of bylaws. The Colorado Board of Regents states that the “faculty government bodies are the Faculty</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Faculty Senate consists of all members of the general faculty with the following titles whose appointments are fifty-percent⁴ or more:**
- Professor;
- associate professor;

**Visiting professors are not members.**

If a UC’s employment is not characterized as at least 50% “tenure,” then this employee—no matter what their title—is not a

**Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty:**
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty:**
- Instructor
- Senior instructor

---

⁴ Based on UC’s Bylaws, it appears that a UC employee can be classified as a mix of “tenure” and “non-tenure.” But, in order to be a member of the Senate, the employee must be 50% or more “tenure.” So that if, for example, a UC Professor is classified only 40% tenure, then—although having the title of Professor—this employee will not be a member of the Faculty Senate. It is uncertain what the 50% represents.
Senate and its committee(s), the Faculty Council and its committees, the campus faculty senates, the campus faculty assemblies and their committees and the faculties of the colleges and schools of the university.”

Faculty Council (see [https://www.cu.edu/facultycouncil/constitution/article1.html](https://www.cu.edu/facultycouncil/constitution/article1.html))

Membership:
- The officers of the Faculty Council (chair, vice chair and secretary);
- The most recently retired chair of the Faculty Council;
- 3 representatives from each of the campuses of the University;
- The chairs of the

- assistant professor;
- senior instructor;
- instructor;
- scholar in residence;
- artist in residence
- Adjoint, attendant, clinical and research faculty with fifty-percent or more appointments in the above ranks are also members.
- Designated representative from the Retired Faculty Association shall be a member during her/his tenure.

*Ex officio* members (with right to vote):
- President of the university
- Vice presidents
- The chancellors
- The vice chancellors
- All deans
- The directors of the budget, libraries and museum
- Professors emeriti and emeritae

[https://www.cu.edu/facultycouncil/constitution/article1.html](https://www.cu.edu/facultycouncil/constitution/article1.html)

member of the Senate.

- Lecturer
- Scholar in Residence
- Artist in Residence

Clinical Teaching Track Faculty (Not eligible for tenure):
- Instructor, Clinical Teaching Track
- Etc. (see [https://www.cu.edu/regents/Policies/Policy5L.htm](https://www.cu.edu/regents/Policies/Policy5L.htm))

Clinical Faculty (non tenure eligible/less than 50%):
- Clinical Instructor
- Etc. (see link above)

Research Faculty

Museum Faculty

[https://www.cu.edu/regents/Policies/Policy5L.htm](https://www.cu.edu/regents/Policies/Policy5L.htm)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Faculty Assemblies;</th>
<th>The Chairs of the standing committees of the Faculty Council and of the Faculty Senate</th>
<th>A representative from the Retired Faculty Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>University Senate</td>
<td>Consists of 51-54 voting members representing a total of six constituent groups:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                           | [http://senate.uoregon.edu/sites/senate.uoregon.edu/files/Constitution%20of%20the%20UODec_15_2011.pdf](http://senate.uoregon.edu/sites/senate.uoregon.edu/files/Constitution%20of%20the%20UODec_15_2011.pdf) | - Statutory faculty  
  - (37 core members; defined as the body of professors, University President, tenure-related officers, career non-tenure-track officers, and officers of administration who are tenured)  
  - Librarians (2)  
  - Officers of Administration (3)  
  - Students (5)  
  - Classified Staff (3)  
  - Career Non-Tenure-Track Research Faculty (1)  
  Chair of the Academic Council has a seat. |
|                           | The University President, Provost, and the ASUO President shall be ex officio non-voting members of the Senate. |
|                           | Retired and emeriti faculty members are not members of the statutory faculty. |
|                           | The Senate President and VP must be selected from the Statutory Faculty. |
|                           | 35 of 37 core Statutory Faculty senators must jointly represent the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional schools and colleges, proportionally. |
|                           | No academic department |
| Tenure-track appointments: | Assistant Professor |
|                           | Associate Professor |
|                           | Professor |
| Non-tenured track:        | Clinical Faculty (assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor, clinical professor); |
|                           | Instructor series (Instructor, Senior Instructor I, Senior Instructor II); |
|                           | Lecturer series (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer I, Senior Lecturer II); |
|                           | Librarian |
|                           | Professor of Practice (Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, Professor of Practice); |
can be represented by more than two senators.

If the officers of the Senate are not drawn from the 37 Statutory Faculty members, but instead from another source, then the number of senators rises depending on how many non-statutory faculty chairs are appointed.

**Oregon State University**

Faculty Senate

All defined as Faculty (see the following column box), and who are included in Senate apportionment, are eligible for election to the Faculty Senate. [http://oregonstate.edu/senate/bylaws/](http://oregonstate.edu/senate/bylaws/)

Elected Senators:

**Apportionment groups** are defined as:
- Each college
- combined ROTC staff
- off-campus extension faculty
- student affairs
- associated faculty
- OSU-Cascades and Library

**Faculty**: defined as members of the Unclassified Academic Staff who: (1) are Professional Faculty, or (2) hold one of these academic appointments:

- Professorial Ranks:
  - Deans, VPs, and President
  - Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor
  - Fixed-term Faculty Eligible for Professorial Ranks (fixed-term faculty engaged in extension, research, or clinical practice and with scholarship expectation at a level normally appropriate for a professorial rank);

Tenure-Track Appointments:
- Faculty with professional rank and are 0.5 FTE or more are generally tenure-track appointments
- Some tenure-related positions carry less than 1.0 FTE tenure commitment following granting of indefinite tenure, but must be 0.50 FTE or greater.

All defined as Faculty (see the previous column box), and who are included in Senate apportionment in their apportionment unit, are eligible to vote in the nomination and election of Senators.

Each apportionment group gets at least one elected member.

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate determines (each Fall), the full-time-equivalent (FTE) of faculty in each college or unit and the total student credit hours (SCH)
| Stanford University | Senate of the Academic Council:  
( the powers of the Academic Council are exercise through the action of the Academic Council) | Senate of the Academic Council:  
( composed of fifty five members of the Academic Council apportioned as follows):  
- Graduate School of | Professors Emeriti are Senior Members of the Academic Council with privileges of the floor and of service on committees but not with the right to vote or hold office. | The Professoriate consists of the following categories of appointments:  
**Tenure Line Faculty:**  
- Assistant Professor  
- Associate Professor  
- Professor |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ranks:  
- Instructor  
- Senior Instructor  
- Faculty Research Assistant  
- Senior Faculty Research Assistant  
- Research Associate  
- Assistant Professor  
- Associate Professor  
- Professor | generated by each unit during the most recent academic year.  
Apportionment is 75% according to FTE, and 25% according to SCH. | Fixed-Term Appointments:  
- Faculty members who do not hold professional ranks;  
- Faculty members who hold professional rank but are appointed at less than 0.5 FTE  
- Faculty members who hold professional rank in one of the following appointments:  
  • Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor (Extension)  
  • Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor (Senior Research), or  
  • Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor (Clinical)  
- Faculty members performing academic support, student support, or administrative support functions.  
- Appointments that are temporary, regardless of rank. See more at [http://oregonstate.edu/admin/hr/sites/default/files/jobs/acadapt.pdf](http://oregonstate.edu/admin/hr/sites/default/files/jobs/acadapt.pdf) |  |
Council itself and the Senate

The Academic Council Professoriate consists of:

**Tenure Life faculty:**
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

**Non-Tenure Life Faculty:**
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor (Applied research, Clinical Performance, Teaching, Research)
- Professor (Research, Clinical, Performance, Teaching, Research)
- Senior Fellow at designated policy centers and institutes.

**Non-Tenure Line Faculty:**
- Assistant Professor (Research)
- Associate Professor (Performance, Teaching, Research)
- Professor (Applied Research, Clinical, Performance, Teaching, Research)

**Medical Center Line Faculty:**
- Assistant Professor (MCL)
- Associate Professor (MCL)
- Professor (MCL)

**Other faculty designations:**
- Assistant Professor (Subject to Ph.D.)
- Senior Fellow at designated policy centers and institutes
- Center Fellows at designated policy centers and institutes

**University of California L.A.**

Identical to Berkeley. Operates on the University of California system.

The Senate allows 15 ex officio members without the right to vote.

The Senate allows three standing guests from the Associated Students of Stanford University. Students have a right to speak but no right to vote.
| **University of California, Southern California** | **Academic Senate**  
(The representative body of the faculty at large for university-wide issues) | **All members of the Faculty Assembly are eligible to participate in the Academic Senate and faculty committees.** | **Only tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members may vote on recommendations pertaining to University policies and procedures concerning tenure and the tenure system.** | **Not designated as faculty include: academic staff such as graduate assistants, distinguished practitioners, or other affiliated academic staff.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Faculty Assembly**  
(consists of all full-time faculty members, including tenured and tenure-track faculty, non-tenure-track faculty, and librarians, and those who have retired from these positions.) |  | **The total size of the Senate will be at least 40 and not more than 80 members.** | **The non-voting members of the Academic Senate are:**  
(a) the elected president or one other elected member of the faculty council in each school, the College, and each Division in the College  
(b) additional delegates from the school faculty councils  
(c) the executive officers of the faculty and Members at Large of the Executive Board. | **Tenured, Tenure-Track and Continuing Appointment Faculty:**  
- Instructor  
- Assistant Professor  
- Associate Professor  
- Professor  
- Librarians  
**Clinical Scholar and Similar titles**  
**Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty:**  
- Includes: Lecturers; Researchers; Practitioners; Clinicians; Mathematics.  
**Librarians**  
**Part-Time Faculty (Non-Tenure-Track):**  
- Lecturer; adjunct professor; clinical professor.  
**Voluntary Faculty**  
**Affiliated Academic Staff**  
**http://policies.usc.edu/p4acad_stud/facultyhandbook.pdf** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **School Faculty Council**  
(each school has an elected faculty council. The faculty council in each school is established by the faculty of that school). |  | **Voting Members of the Academic Senate include:**  
(a) the elected president or one other elected member of the faculty council in each school, the College, and each Division in the College  
(b) additional delegates from the school faculty councils  
(see below for explanation*)  
(c) the executive officers of the faculty and Members at Large of the Executive Board. | **Clinical Scholar and Similar titles**  
**Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty:**  
- Includes: Lecturers; Researchers; Practitioners; Clinicians; Mathematics.  
**Librarians**  
**Part-Time Faculty (Non-Tenure-Track):**  
- Lecturer; adjunct professor; clinical professor.  
**Voluntary Faculty**  
**Affiliated Academic Staff**  
**http://policies.usc.edu/p4acad_stud/facultyhandbook.pdf** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

---

University of California, Southern California

*Faculty Assembly (consists of all full-time faculty members, including tenured and tenure-track faculty, non-tenure-track faculty, and librarians, and those who have retired from these positions.)*

http://www.usc.edu/academe/acesen/AboutUs/constitution.htm

School Faculty Council (each school has an elected faculty council. The faculty council in each school is established by the faculty of that school).

*The faculty of each school, by referendum, decides how the “additional delegates” from that school will be selected for the Academic Senate. Apportionment is decided based on size of the faculty in each school.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>University of Washington</strong></th>
<th>Faculty Senate</th>
<th>Voting Members of the Faculty Senate:</th>
<th>The following are not &quot;voting members of the faculty,&quot; and therefore cannot be elected to the Senate:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH22.html">http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH22.html</a></td>
<td>- President of the University</td>
<td>- Persons serving under acting or visiting appointments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Chairs of faculty councils (and Bothell and Tacoma faculty organizations)</td>
<td>- Persons on leave of absence;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• are ex officio members</td>
<td>- Persons serving under clinical or affiliate appointments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Considered members-at-large</td>
<td>- Persons of emeritus status unless serving on a part-time basis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Each school, college, or campus elects 1 senator for each 40 “voting members of the faculty” in the school, college, or campus. To be eligible for the Senate, a faculty member must meet the following criteria:</td>
<td>- Persons serving under adjunct appointments insofar as their adjunct appointments are concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must be a “voting members of the faculty”(^5), and</td>
<td>Non-voting Members of the Senate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must be elected</td>
<td>- VPs and Provost or other administrative officers who qualify as voting members of the faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Chairs of college councils (elected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) To see what qualifies as a “voting member of the faculty” see Section 21-32 (“Voting Membership in the Faculty”), available at http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH21.html#2131.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The University faculty consists of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vice presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- associate professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- assistant professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- principal lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- senior lecturers and senior artists in residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lecturers and artists in residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- teaching and research associates...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...whether serving under:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- affiliate appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or whether serving:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or whether serving in an:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- active, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- emeritus status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Washington State University | Faculty Senate | **It appears that WSU does not have any information about the eligibility requirements or composition of the Faculty Senate.** See [http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/](http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/) | Tenure Accruing Appointments:  
- Academic Faculty  
  - Professor; associate professor; and assistant professor  
- Extension Faculty  
- Library Faculty  
- Scientific faculty  
Non-Tenure Accruing Appointments:  
- Student Affairs Faculty  
- Research Faculty  
Joint Appointments  
Emeritus Faculty Appointment  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of North Carolina at Chappell Hill</th>
<th>Faculty Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(The legislative powers of the General Faculty are vested in a Faculty Council)</td>
<td>Apportionment factors are adjusted so that the number of elected members of the Council is as near 70 as practicable. Plus the Ex officio members. No college or school can be represented by more than one-third of the elected members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/code/code2010.shtml#article2">http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/code/code2010.shtml#article2</a></td>
<td>Tenure Track:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/faculty-policies-procedures/faculty-conduct/index.htm">http://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/faculty-policies-procedures/faculty-conduct/index.htm</a></td>
<td>- Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/faculty-policies-procedures/faculty-appointments/index.htm#P28_2079">http://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/faculty-policies-procedures/faculty-appointments/index.htm#P28_2079</a></td>
<td>- Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Senior Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Master Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clinical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adjunct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professor of the Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personnel of the library - Student Affairs Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. *Elected Members:*

- All members of the voting faculty\(^6\) are eligible for election to the Council.
- The elected members are chosen from 17 electoral divisions.
- Elected on the basis of one representative for each 42 members of the voting faculty assigned to the electoral division.
- Divisions that are entitled to 2 or more representatives, elect on the basis of proportional representation of (1) professors, associate and assistant professors with permanent tenure, and librarians, and (2) all other ranks.
- If there are too few

---

\(^6\) The “voting faculty” comprises: (i) all members of the General Faculty having tenured or probationary-term appointments, (ii) librarians who are members of the General Faculty, and (iii) fixed-term faculty whose positions satisfy the following criteria: (1) the position is not for less than 75% of an equivalent full-time position and is not a visiting appointment; and (2) the duties of the position include teaching, research, or both; and (3) the actual or anticipated length of service in the position is at least three years. Also, a member of the voting faculty who retires but continues on the faculty with a fixed-term appointment that calls for at least one-half time effort is deemed to retain the faculty rank and voting status that he or she held immediately prior to retirement. See [http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/code/code2010.shtml](http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/code/code2010.shtml).
University of Michigan
(Ann Arbor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Senate**</th>
<th>The Senate Assembly consists of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 74 elected faculty members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The 74 members are apportioned among the various schools and colleges according to the number of University Senate members in each unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- See apportionment details, available at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visiting, Adjunct or Clinical Professors, as well as acting or interim appointees to executive or Dean positions, in the absence of a regular professorial appointment, are not entitled to be members of the University Senate. And therefore are not eligible for the Senate Assembly. Also, Directors of centers or institutes who do not

Tenure track faculty:
- Professor and associate professor
- Assistant professor
- Instructor

Clinical instructional faculty

Lecturers

Lecturers covered under a collective bargaining agreement

Adjunct instructional faculty covered under a collective bargaining agreement

---

7 The University Senate consists of the following:

All members of the professorial staff, the executive officers of the University, the dean of each school or college, such members of the research and library staff as may be designated in accordance with standards and procedures approved by the Senate Assembly, and such other major officers as may be designated by the Board of Regents from time to time.

Research personnel who hold Primary Research rank and have a full-time appointment as a regular staff member.

Librarians of any rank who have full-time appointments as regular staff members.
### University of Wisconsin-Madison

**Faculty Senate**

- [http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/index.htm](http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/index.htm)
- [http://www.wisconsin.edu/acss/facreps/institutions.htm](http://www.wisconsin.edu/acss/facreps/institutions.htm)

The members of the Senate include:

- **Elected Members**;
  - The faculty is divided into electoral districts. A department having ten or more voting faculty members holds professorial rank and are not entitled to be members of the University Senate, and, therefore, are not eligible for the Senate Assembly.

Emeritus/emerita faculty with governance rights are not counted in determining the number of senators to be elected from each district.

**Tenure Appointments:**
- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor

**Probationary Appointments:**
- Instructor
- Assistant Professor

---

Non-voting Members of the Senate Assembly include:

- The Secretary of the University Senate (Ex Officio)
- 2 retired University Senate members.

Adjunct clinical instructional faculty hold professorial rank are not entitled to be members of the University Senate, and, therefore, are not eligible for the Senate Assembly.

Visiting instructional faculty

---

8 Voting members, it appears, are determined according to §§ 1.02–1.03. This states that the “university faculty consists of all persons who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor with at least a one-half time appointment in UW-Madison, or with a full-time appointment jointly between UW-Madison and UW-Extension.” See [http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_1.htm#102](http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_1.htm#102) at §§ 1.02–1.03.

9 Departments having fewer than ten voting members are combined into districts. A department having more than five but fewer than ten voting faculty members are designated as a district entitled to elect 1 senator. Voting faculty members without departmental affiliation are grouped in districts consisting of ten or more voting faculty members. Each faculty member is a member of only one district. See [http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_2.htm#204](http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_2.htm#204) at § 2.03.
is entitled to elect 1 additional senator if the number of its voters exceeds a multiple of ten by six or more.

- *Members of the University Committee, Ex officio;*
  - Consist of 6 faculty members, no more than three members are from a single school or college. See [http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_6.htm#654](http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_6.htm#654)

- *The Chancellor and all vice chancellors, Ex officio;*

- *The deans of the schools and colleges, Ex officio.*

| **University of Minnesota (Twin Cities)** | Faculty Senate [http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/constitution/sencon.html](http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/constitution/sencon.html) | The Faculty Senate includes the following voting members: 
(1) The president of the University; 
(2) The vice chair of the Faculty Senate; | The deans, vice presidents, chancellors, provosts, the University Librarian, and the General Counsel serve as Ex officio nonvoting members. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Regular (Tenured and Tenure-Track) Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Term (Non Tenure-Track) Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ohio State University | University Senate | Voting members:  
- 26 administration members  
- 70 faculty members\(^{12}\)  
- 41 student members (26 undergraduate, 10 graduate, 5 professional student members) | Regular tenure-track faculty:  
- Professor  
- Associate professor  
- Assistant professor  
- Instructor  
  - Serve on appointments totaling fifty percent or more service to the university |

\(^{10}\) “Faculty” includes (1) individuals who hold full-time regular appointments as defined in the Regents’ Policy “Faculty Tenure,” and (2) individuals who hold full-time multi-year or annually renewable term appointments and who have completed three years of service at the University. For the Election Process, see [http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/constitution/fac_bylaws1.pdf](http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/constitution/fac_bylaws1.pdf).

\(^{11}\) “Qualified academic staff” means individuals who (1) hold full-time appointments as academic professionals, (2) have faculty-like responsibilities with a primary focus on teaching or research, and (3) have probationary/continuous appointments or have completed five years of service at the University. “Full-time appointments” are defined as requiring at least 67% time.

\(^{12}\) “faculty” includes persons appointed by the board of trustees with regular tenure-track, regular clinical, regular research, auxiliary, and emeritus faculty titles on full- or part-time appointments, with or without salary. See Faculty, available at [http://senate.osu.edu/rulesbooks/facultyrules62212.pdf](http://senate.osu.edu/rulesbooks/facultyrules62212.pdf) at p. 13-34.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-voting members:</th>
<th>Regular clinical faculty:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Chair of the Faculty Council (if not already chosen as a member of the Senate);</td>
<td>- Serve under fixed term contracts and are not eligible for tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The president of the alumni association;</td>
<td>Regular research faculty:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secretary of the university senate;</td>
<td>- Serve under fixed term contracts and are not eligible for tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- President of the freshman senate;</td>
<td>Auxiliary faculty:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- President of the undergraduate student government;</td>
<td>- See <a href="http://senate.osu.edu/rulesbooks/facultyrules62212.pdf">http://senate.osu.edu/rulesbooks/facultyrules62212.pdf</a>, at p. 13-35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- President of the council of graduate students, and;</td>
<td>Emeritus faculty:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The chair of the inter-professional council; and</td>
<td>- See <a href="http://senate.osu.edu/rulesbooks/facultyrules62212.pdf">http://senate.osu.edu/rulesbooks/facultyrules62212.pdf</a>, at p. 13-35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The chair of the university staff advisory committee</td>
<td><a href="http://senate.osu.edu/rulesbooks/facultyrules62212.pdf">http://senate.osu.edu/rulesbooks/facultyrules62212.pdf</a>, at pp. 13-34,35.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal for Revision 29 of **Policy 6-002**. {Draft 2013-03-16, as discussed at the April 1 Senate meeting and now returned without change for debate and approval at the May 6 Senate meeting.}

(This Revision 29 has the primary purpose of integrating the Career-line faculty representatives into the main body of the Senate, as part of the set of proposals from spring 2013 regarding career-line faculty. This version is exactly as presented to the Senate at its April 1, 2013 meeting. The plan for ‘staggering’ the initial terms of the Career-line representatives, which the Senate requested be brought to the May meeting, is described in the separate memorandum from the Ad Hoc Committee—and will be implemented as there described—but it is not considered appropriate to write those temporary implementation details into this permanent version of the Policy and thereby make it more complex than necessary for permanent use.

Also, as mentioned for the April meeting, and now as a reminder for the May 6 meeting——this Policy 6-002 overall is in need of significant reorganizing and updating to be consistent with modern practices, and there is a need to combine and coordinate contents of this Policy and Policy 6-001, but those many needed changes are not being included within this first phase Revision 29 proposal. Rather it is understood that as a second phase of the overall project, a Revision 30 proposal will be developed and brought forward for approval during the 2013-2014 year. At that same time, changes will be proposed in this Policy to appropriately integrate Career-line faculty representatives into some of the Senate-elected committees, which are governed by lengthy sections of this Policy that are not shown in this Revision 29 draft.)

**Policy 6-002: The Academic Senate.** Revision 29  Effective Date [July 1, 2013]

I. Purpose and Scope
   (Reserved)

II. Definitions
   (Reserved)

III. Policy
    SECTION 1. General Provisions

   A. Authority of the Senate

   The Academic Senate, hereinafter referred to as the Senate, subject to the authority of the State Board of Regents and Board of Trustees, shall have power to act for the faculty in the areas specified by University Regulations, **Policy 6-001**, and other applicable provisions of University Regulations and Faculty Regulations. The Senate shall have power to make rules governing its own organization and Procedure.

    SECTION 2. Membership

    The Senate shall be constituted as follows:

    A. Ex Officio Members

    The following administrative officers shall be ex officio members of the Senate: (1) The University president, and the senior vice president for academic affairs and the senior vice president for health sciences. These ex officio members shall have full rights of discussion and making motions but not the right to vote. (2) Each dean, or an associate or assistant dean designated as a dean's representative. Each dean or a dean's designee shall have full
rights of discussion and making motions on matters directly associated with the dean's college or administrative responsibility, but, except for the two voting deans [see III-Sec.2-B-2, below B (2) infra] not the right to vote.

B. Elected Members

1. Faculty members

i. Tenure-line faculty members.

A. a The voting membership of the Senate shall include tenure-line faculty members as defined in [see Faculty Regulations, Policy 6-300] elected from the following areas of representation: the individual academic colleges and the University libraries considered as a unit. All tenure-line faculty members of the faculty, without regard for rank or for time in rank, shall be eligible for election to membership in the Senate, except ex officio members of the Senate and members of the faculty serving in administrative positions higher than department chair. All tenure-line faculty members of the faculty, without regard for rank or for time in rank, shall be eligible to vote for candidates for Senate membership only in the areas of representation where they hold primary appointments. Disputes respecting eligibility for election or eligibility to vote shall be decided by the Personnel and Elections Committee, subject to appeal to the Senate and to the faculty.

/B/ Drafting note for Revision 29: inserting the numbers sixteen and seventeen in the following passage will clarify that this section on Senate membership has been updated to accommodate the creation of the new dentistry college, which becomes the sixteenth academic college. It will also help make clear that “college” as used for purposes of this Senate membership Policy, is not intended to include those entities which do include the term “college” in their names but are not actually academic colleges and therefore are not among the sixteen being referred to here (as of 2013-2014 those are the “Honors College” and the “University College”—neither of which has any tenure-line faculty appointment positions)—but the Honors unit is a Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program with career-line faculty appointments and is to be included with those Programs for career-line representation, below.

B. b Tenure-line faculty membership in the Academic Senate shall be apportioned by allocating not more than 79 representatives among the seventeen areas of representation (sixteen academic colleges, and the University libraries area *) on a prorated basis of 50 percent according to the number of tenure-line faculty members in each area and 50 percent according to student credit hours, including evening residence hours, taught in each area during the preceding academic year (regardless of whether taught by faculty of any faculty category, or by non-faculty instructional personnel). The base allocation of not more than 79 tenure-line faculty members shall be adjusted to ensure that each area of representation will have a minimum of two representatives. The Personnel and Elections Committee shall reapportion the Senate
according to the foregoing formula every two years.

*Representation from the tenure-line faculty of the University libraries will be determined by taking the average number of student credit hours taught within the academic colleges during the preceding academic year (regardless of by whom taught), per tenure-line faculty member, of all other colleges, and multiplying that value by the number of library tenure-line faculty.

C.e Areas of representation which, under the foregoing formula, would contribute more than 20 percent of the voting tenure-line faculty membership of the Senate may, with Senate approval, be subdivided by the Personnel and Elections Committee along department or administrative lines, into two or more separate representation areas, none of which shall contribute more than 20 percent of the voting tenure-line faculty membership of the Senate. The membership of such subdivided representation areas shall be apportioned by the Personnel and Elections Committee among the areas as nearly as possible in accordance with the above prorationing formula.

ii. Career-line faculty members.

A. The voting membership of the Senate shall include career-line faculty members as defined in [Policy 6-300].

B. There shall be one career-line faculty representative elected from each of the following eighteen areas of representation: the sixteen individual academic colleges, the University libraries considered as a unit, and the Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs identified in [Rule 6-310] considered as a unit.

C. All members of the faculty who, continuously for the three years preceding the date their term of Senate membership would begin, have had career-line faculty appointments of at least 75 percent Full-Time-Equivalent (.75 FTE) within a single area of representation, without regard for rank and without regard for category within the career-line categories (Clinical, Lecturer, or Research), shall be eligible for election to membership in the Senate from the areas of representation where they hold such .75 FTE appointments, except ex officio members of the Senate and members of the faculty serving in administrative positions higher than department chair.

D. All members of the faculty who at the time of the election hold career-line faculty appointments of at least 50 percent Full-Time-Equivalent (.5 FTE) within a single area of representation, without regard for rank or for time in rank, and without regard for category
within the career-line categories (Clinical, Lecturer, or Research), shall be eligible to vote for career-line candidates for Senate membership in the areas of representation where they hold such .5 FTE appointments.

iii. General provisions for both tenure-line and career-line elected faculty members.

A. Faculty representatives shall be elected to serve regular three-year terms (or as provided in the subsection below regarding vacancies, section 5A (3), infra, to complete three-year terms of representatives who do not complete their regular terms). An annual orientation shall be provided for newly elected Senators. Beyond service in the Senate, faculty members of the Senate should expect that they may be called upon to serve on standing and ad hoc committees. Senate faculty members shall be ineligible for nomination for another term until at least one year has elapsed following the expiration of their terms of office or date of resignation therefrom. New terms shall begin on May 15.

B. Disputes respecting eligibility for election or eligibility to vote shall be decided by the Personnel and Elections Committee, subject to appeal to the Senate.

C. An annual orientation shall be provided for newly elected Senators.

D. Beyond service in the Senate, faculty members of the Senate should expect that they may be called upon to serve on standing and ad hoc committees.

\[Drafting note for Revision 29: The following section describing elections of faculty representatives to the Senate, which is marked with [[[triple brackets]]] is being moved to this location, so that all important information about the elected faculty members will be presented in close proximity and thereby be more ‘user friendly.’ The existing Policy (Revision 28) had this information located at Section 5-A, some 10 pages later—separated by the lengthy descriptions of various other topics including the workings of the various committees of the Senate.

And once moved, the following changes are made, as marked. The requirement of secret ballots is deleted, because that requirement is inconsistent with the stated principle that each college/area is allowed to “develop its own plan for obtaining nominations and for conducting the election of its allotted representatives.”---Under that principle each of the representation areas should be able to choose whether secret or open ballots are best suited for the ‘culture’ of their areas. And changes are made to make the described procedures workable for both the elections of tenure-line faculty and of career-line faculty.\]

[[/iv. Section 5 Elections—A. Election of Faculty Members to the Senate

A. General Provisions

4

64]
The Personnel and Elections Committee shall supervise elections to the Senate by secret ballot during the month of April.

No person shall be nominated or elected to represent more than one area. No person shall be elected to the Senate without receiving a majority of all votes cast by the eligible voters in the college or area which that person is to represent in the Senate.

B.2 Election Procedures

Not later than March 1st of each year, the Personnel and Elections Committee will send an announcement to each college or area represented in the Senate from which at least one faculty representative’s term is set to expire, giving notice that elections are to be held in each college or such area for new representatives to the Senate.

The announcement sent to each area shall describe the applicable eligibility requirements (as specified in this Policy) for both the candidates and the voters for each position for which an election is to be conducted. Only regular faculty members are eligible to vote in Senate elections and are eligible for election to the Senate from that college or area.

Subject to approval by the Personnel and Elections Committee, each college or area represented in the Senate shall develop its own plan for obtaining nominations and for conducting the election of its allotted representatives to the Academic Senate.

Not later than April 15 of each year in which it is authorized to elect one or more representatives to the Senate, each college or area shall forward to the Personnel and Elections Committee a report of the person or persons elected to represent that college or area. Each college or area shall also forward to the Personnel and Elections Committee all ballots cast in the process of nominating candidates and electing its representative(s) to the Academic Senate.

After verifying the election results, the Personnel and Elections Committee shall announce the roster of newly elected Senators at the May meeting of the Academic Senate.

C.3 Vacancies

In the event the Senate position of an elected faculty member is vacated before expiration of the term for which he or she
was elected, the Personnel and Elections Committee shall
appoint the runner-up from that member's original election to
the Senate to serve the remainder of that member's term or
until the next general election held within that area (or if
necessary a special election), when the vacancy shall be filled
by election for the unexpired term.  

2. Deans

The deans shall elect two deans as voting representatives in the Academic
Senate. The voting deans shall be elected to serve regular two-year terms, (or as
provided in Section 5A (3), infra, to complete two-year terms of representatives
who do not complete their regular terms, elected through the same procedure
described in the preceding section for filling vacancies of elected faculty
members). The term of one of the deans' voting representatives will begin on
May 15 in even numbered years; the term of the other deans' voting
representative will begin on May 15 in odd numbered years.

3. Students

a. Each college shall elect one representative from its members to the
ASUU Student Senate. (Academic Advising and Honors students shall be
considered one college for purposes of equal representation.) The elected
members of the ASUU Student Senate shall be entitled to attend Academic
Senate meetings with full rights of discussion and vote. If a student member
resigns his or her position on the ASUU Student Senate, the vacancy will be
filled by the next runner-up in the affected college or otherwise according to
Procedures described in the ASUU Student Handbook.

b. The ASUU president or the ASUU vice president if designated by the
ASUU president and an additional student appointed by the ASUU President
shall also be members of the Academic Senate, with full rights of discussion and
vote.

c. Student members of the Academic Senate shall serve one-year terms
dating from their installation as ASUU officers.

C. Alternates

Each elected member of the Senate is expected to attend its meetings regularly. When
absence of a faculty or student member is unavoidable, the member shall designate in
writing to the secretary of the Senate an alternative to serve with full power during the
elective member's absence. The alternate so designated shall be one of the available unsuccessful candidates for that Senate seat in the previous election. In the absence of available unsuccessful candidates, any other person eligible for election to that Senate seat may be designated as an alternate.

SECTION 3. Officers

A. Presiding Officer

{Drafting note for Revision 29: The revisions proposed in this section would make it explicit that the President of the Senate must be a tenure-line faculty member---i.e., career-line faculty are not eligible for election to the presidency. This is based on concerns discussed during the process of adding career-line representatives to the Senate. It is frequently the case that the President of the Senate must speak very frankly and forcefully, to protect the interests of the faculty—including occasionally vigorously opposing actions being taken or considered by high level administrators, Trustees and community members. There is significant concern that a career-line faculty member, lacking the protection of a tenure-line position, would not always be able to fill the role of a forceful spokesperson as robustly as is needed in order to serve the overall interests of the University and its faculty.}

a. The President of the Senate will be elected annually by the Senate from the tenure-line faculty at large excluding those who at the time of nomination to the office of Senate President are either ineligible for Senate membership or serve as chair of an academic department. The Personnel and Elections Committee will provide a slate of candidates for election. The person elected for this responsibility will serve a two-year term, the first year as President-elect, the second as President. If the President-elect is at the time of his or her selection, an elected member of the Senate, the President-elect shall be considered an ex officio member of the Senate Executive Committee with full rights of discussion and making motions but without voting privileges. If the President-elect is not, at the time of his or her selection, an elected member of the Senate, the President-elect will be considered an ex officio member of both the Senate and of the Senate Executive Committee, with full rights of discussion and making motions but without voting privileges. If the Senate President, at the time he or she takes office, is an elected member of the Senate, the President shall not, for apportionment purposes, be considered one of the tenure-line faculty members representing the colleges and University libraries; and the college or area which he or she represents shall choose another member with full voting privileges to replace the President during his or her time in office. If the Senate President, at the time he or she takes office, is not an elected member of the Senate, he or she shall be considered a full member of the Senate, with voting privileges as explained in the paragraph below and in Faculty Regulations, [Section 4. A.1. a below e.], but the President shall not, for apportionment purposes, be considered one of the tenure-line faculty members representing the colleges and University libraries.

{Drafting note for Revision 29: The remaining portions of this Section 3 describing the Senate officers, and all of the contents of Section 4 describing the Senate-elected committees, are not shown here, due to their extreme length (seven single-space pages) and that in this Revision 29 no}
changes are proposed to them. It is understood that these sections will be proposed for significant reorganizing and updating in the planned phase two Revision 30 project during 2013-2014, and at that time there will be consideration of the issues of eligibility of career-line faculty for some of the Senate-elected committees—including the Executive Committee.

* * * * * * * *

SECTION 5. Elections

A. Election of Faculty Members to the Senate. [User note: In Revision 29 of this Policy, the entire contents of this Section 5-A were moved to be integrated with the faculty member eligibility description in Section 2-B above].

[[[ General Provisions

1. The Personnel and Elections Committee shall supervise elections to the Senate by secret ballot during the month of April.

2. No person shall be nominated or elected to represent more than one area. No person shall be elected to the Senate without receiving a majority of all votes cast by the eligible voters in the college or area which that person is to represent in the Senate.

Election Procedures

1. Not later than March 1st of each year, the Personnel and Elections Committee will send an announcement to each college or area represented in the Senate that elections are to be held in each college or area for new representatives to the Senate. Only regular faculty members are eligible to vote in Senate elections and are eligible for election to the Senate from their college or area.

2. Subject to approval by the Personnel and Elections Committee, each college or area represented in the Senate shall develop its own plan for obtaining nominations and for conducting the election of its allotted representatives to the Academic Senate.

3. Not later than April 15 of each year in which it is authorized to elect one or more representatives to the Senate, each college or area shall forward to the Personnel and Elections Committee a report of the person or persons elected to represent that college or area. Each college or area shall also forward to the Personnel and Elections Committee all ballots cast in the process of nominating candidates and electing its representative(s) to the Academic Senate.

4. After verifying the election results, the Personnel and Elections Committee shall announce the roster of newly elected Senators at the May meeting of the Academic Senate.

Vacancies

In the event the Senate position of an elected member is vacated before expiration of the term for which he or she was elected, the Personnel and Elections Committee shall appoint the runner-up from that member’s original election to the Senate to serve the remainder of that member’s term or until the next general election, when the vacancy shall be filled by election for the unexpired term. ]]]

B. Elections Within the Senate

[Drafting note for Revision 29: The remaining portions of this Section 5 regarding Elections, within the Senate (i.e., elections of Senate committees, and the Senate officers), and all of the contents of Sections 6, 7, 8 describing Senate meetings procedures, and all of the contents of Section 10 describing hearing procedures of the Consolidated Hearing Committee, and all of contents of Section 11 describing committee structure and investigation procedures of the Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee— are not shown here due to their extreme length (22 single-space pages) and that in this Revision 29 no changes are proposed to them. It is anticipated that these sections will be proposed for significant reorganizing and updating in the expected phase two Revision 30 project during 2013-2014.]

* * * * * * *
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Policy 6-300: The University Faculty--Categories and Ranks (Revision 16) [effective date ??? July 1, 2013]

I. Purpose and Scope [reserved]

This Policy provides the governing descriptions of the categories and ranks applicable for members of the University faculty, and describes certain general provisions regarding the faculty. This Policy does not describe the categories of positions of non-faculty academic personnel of the University (including academic staff, educational trainees, postdoctoral fellows, and medical housestaff, as described in Policy 6-309), or the categories of other positions which may engage in academic activities but are not part of the faculty, including visiting scholars (as described in Policy 6-317) and visiting postdoctoral scholars (as described in Policy 6-405), and this Policy is not intended to be applicable for any such non-faculty categories of positions.

II. Definitions [reserved]

III. Policy

A. Section I. Membership of the University Faculty—General Provisions

The university faculty shall consist of the president, vice presidents, deans, directors of libraries, professors (including distinguished professors, presidential professors and university professors), associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, librarians, associate librarians, assistant librarians, and auxiliary faculty. All shall have the full rights of faculty members except that persons holding auxiliary faculty positions (research, clinical, lecturer, visiting) or emeritus appointments shall not have the right to vote and shall not have tenure or the expectation of tenure.

1. The University Faculty shall consist of the University President, vice presidents, deans, directors of libraries, and members of the faculty within each of the following main categories and their subcategories:

   (a) the Tenure-line Faculty members (in the sub-categories of Tenured, and Tenure-track) as described in Section III-B, which category includes those members of the University Academic Libraries faculty in Tenure-line positions (as described in Section III-C);

   (b) the Career-line Faculty members (in the sub-categories of Clinical, Lecturer, and Research), as described in Section III-D, which category includes those members of the University Academic Libraries faculty in Career-line positions; and

   (c) the Adjunct, Visiting, and Emeritus Faculty members (as described in Section III-E).

2. The categories and names described above are newly adopted as of the effective date of July 1, 2013. They shall be used in place of the prior categories and nomenclature in all other University Regulations and pertinent official documents which are adopted or revised after this effective date. Existing documents using previous nomenclature may be updated in due course. In particular: (a) “Tenure-line faculty” shall be used in place of the formerly used term “regular faculty.” (b) The term “auxiliary faculty,” which was formerly used to
refer to the Clinical, Lecturer, Research, Adjunct, and Visiting faculty categories collectively, shall no longer be used, and shall be replaced with the nomenclature prescribed here, as appropriate in the context in which used.

3. All members of the University Faculty, in any of the categories described here (whether full-time or part-time), shall have those rights and responsibilities of faculty members governed by Policy 6-316—Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. As more fully described in that Policy, “all provisions of [the Faculty Code] apply to faculty members” and central within the Code are the rights of academic freedom and due process for faculty (Policy 6-316-Sec.1, Sec.2).

4. In general (with specific provisions below), individual faculty members in the Tenure-line and Career-line categories shall have the right to vote on those matters and in those elections appropriate for their particular category, status, and rank, and individual faculty members in the categories of Adjunct, Visiting, or Emeritus shall not have the right to vote in the capacity of faculty members in any context within the University (but may be called upon in an advisory capacity). {Drafting note: This rephrased passage will be consistent with the Faculty Code 6-316-Sec.2-C which provides “Where their rank and status are appropriate, faculty members have the right to vote on faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure, and to vote for representatives to college and university legislative bodies.”}

5. As provided in Policy 6-311, only individual faculty members in the Tenure-line category shall have tenure or the expectation of tenure.

6. Section 2.D. If an individual is formally admitted to a degree program in the same college in which that person holds a Tenure-line regular faculty appointment, the individual must resign from that Tenure-line regular faculty appointment immediately, unless an exception to this requirement is granted in writing by the president of the University. {Drafting note: this passage is moved from its former location in Section 2-D, to this location where it better fits as part of the “general provisions.”}

7. The procedures for appointments of individual faculty members, in all of the categories described here, are governed by Policy 6-302, including the provision that for appointments within an academic department, every initial appointment, and every reappointment of a limited-term appointee (including reappointment for the purpose of promotion in rank), shall be processed through the departmental faculty appointments advisory committee, which has as its primary voting membership all of the Tenure-line members of the department faculty, (Policy 6-302-III-B).

B. Section 2. Tenure-line Regular Faculty - Tenured and Tenure-track Eligible Faculty

1. The Tenure-line faculty main category includes the sub-categories of faculty who have been awarded tenure ("Tenured" faculty), and those who are appointed in positions which are designated by the University as tenure-eligible positions but have not yet completed the requirements for achieving tenure ("Tenure-track" faculty). This main category includes the Tenure-line Academic Library faculty.

2. Responsibilities and Rights of Tenure-line faculty.
a. The rights associated with tenure are described in Policies 6-301, 6-311, and 6-313 (and for Library faculty 6-312); and the criteria, standards, and procedures for retention in a Tenure-track position and for awarding of tenure are governed by Policies 6-303 and 6-311.

b. Appointees to the Tenure-line regular faculty (other than the Academic Library faculty, governed by the parallel provisions of Section III-C below) shall commit full-time (or part-time if explicitly so appointed per Policy 6-320) to the scholarly (or creative), educational, and service endeavors carried on under the auspices of the University. In light of the centrality of free inquiry and free expression in the development and dissemination of knowledge, they shall have tenure or be eligible for tenure (except instructors). In light of the interrelationship of the development and dissemination of knowledge, they shall bear the primary responsibility for carrying on the educational research, creative and service missions of the University. While faculty members in the Career-line category shall have appropriate roles in shared governance as further described in this Policy Section III-D, it is a fundamental principle of the University’s commitment to shared governance that Tenure-line faculty members shall have the primary roles in shared governance activities, including setting of academic policies within departments and colleges through majority voting roles on college councils (Policy 6-003) and department and college academic committees, and University-wide through majority voting roles on the Academic Senate and Senate committees (Policy 6-002), the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils (Policy 6-001), and other appropriate University academic committees.

3. Ranks for Tenure-line faculty positions.

   a. The regular faculty ranks to which Tenure-line faculty members (other than the faculty of the Academic Libraries, per III-C below) may be appointed or subsequently promoted shall include the usual ranks of Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors (who shall not have tenure) and the following special rank categories of honored faculty: Distinguished Professor, Presidential Professor, and University Professor.

   b. The criteria, standards, and procedures for promotion of Tenure-line faculty members to (or initial appointment at) the usual ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor are governed by Policies 6-303 and 6-311, and the Departmental RPT Statement Supplemental Rules adopted pursuant to those Policies.

c. Special provisions for the limited-term rank of Instructor. (Drafting note: This description of the special provisions for the Instructor rank was formerly located in Section 2-D, following the descriptions of the special honored ranks of Distinguished Professor, etc. In Revision 16 it is relocated here to Section B-3-c, where it better fits as part of the description of the usual ranks rather than those with honored status.)

   i. Appointments in to positions in the Tenure-line category at the Instructor rank within the regular faculty shall be without tenure and only for a limited term, not to exceed three years, at that rank, because they are intended for individuals who have not quite achieved their terminal degree or board certification. A Tenure-line faculty member initially appointed at the rank of Instructor may be promoted to the usual entry-level rank of Assistant Professor by action of a letter to the cognizant Senior Vice
President from the dean and department chair verifying that the faculty member has completed the terms for such a promotion specified in the initial letter of appointment and has received positive annual retention reviews, as per Policy 6-303-III-B. An Instructor may be terminated without formal review for failing to complete the requirements for promotion to Assistant Professor in the period of time specified in the initial letter of appointment. A department may institute a formal review in any year if it wishes to recommend termination of an Instructor for failure to meet performance standards for retention.

If an Instructor is promoted to Assistant Professor, the period served at the rank of Instructor term appointment may, at the option of the faculty member, be excluded from the pre-tenure probationary period otherwise applicable pursuant to Policy 6-311. The above-mentioned letter to the Senior Vice President regarding promotion to the Assistant Professor rank shall indicate if the appointee is exercising the option to count or not count the limited term appointment as part of his/her pre-tenure probationary period.

If an individual is formally admitted to a degree program in the same college in which that person holds a regular faculty appointment, the individual must resign from that regular faculty appointment immediately, unless an exception to this requirement is granted in writing by the president of the University. (Drafting note. This passage restricting simultaneous status as a degree candidate and tenure-line faculty member in the same college is relocated above to Section III-A where it more appropriately belongs among the general provisions applicable to all Tenure-line faculty.)

d. Special honored ranks for Tenure-line faculty members.

Ai. Distinguished Professor. The rank of Distinguished Professor is reserved for selected individuals whose achievements exemplify the highest goals of scholarship as demonstrated by recognition accorded to them from peers with national and international stature, and whose record includes evidence of a high dedication to teaching as demonstrated by recognition accorded to them by students and/or colleagues. Distinguished Professors will be subject to the same standards and Procedures relative to appointment, retention, and tenure which are applicable to Professors. For academic assignments and budgetary support, Distinguished Professors will be accountable to the academic departments in which they are appointed.

A person should not be recommended to the Distinguished Professorship until that person is a member of the faculty. Any exception to this policy must be considered by the Distinguished Professors present on campus before the recommendation is made.

When a recommendation for appointment to the rank of Distinguished Professor reaches the cognizant vice president for academic affairs, the vice president shall (a) request letters of recommendation from at least six outstanding leaders in the candidate's discipline and (b) appoint, with the advice of the incumbent Distinguished Professors, a special advisory committee to assist the vice president in making a decision on the recommendation. At least one member of this committee shall be knowledgeable in the candidate's academic discipline. All members shall be recognized academicians without administrative assignments. Before completing its review, the committee shall consult with the concerned academic department and the college dean. Except in unusual situations, only one Distinguished Professor in the University may be appointed in a single academic year.
Bii. Presidential Professor. Individuals who are under consideration for appointment to the University faculty may, under exceptional circumstances, be appointed by the president to the rank of Presidential Professor. This rank is reserved for selected individuals whose achievements exemplify the highest goals of scholarship as demonstrated by recognition accorded to them from peers with national and international stature, and whose record includes evidence of a high dedication to teaching. This will be determined by a special advisory committee of Distinguished Professors established in accordance with Section III-B-3-d-i above. The duties and obligations of a Presidential Professor will be the same as those of a regular Professor. Academic and budgetary support of a Presidential Professor will be provided by the academic department where the appointment is held.

Ciii. University Professor. Appointments to the rank of University Professor carry special recognition of extraordinary skill in university teaching which crosses conventional boundaries, emphasizes interdisciplinary relationships, and reflects a strong commitment to liberal education. Individuals considered for appointment to the rank of University Professor shall have demonstrated exceptional ability in challenging and stimulating the intellectual curiosity of undergraduate students. Nominations for appointment as University Professor may be initiated from the faculty through the appropriate college council and from the students through the ASUU. These nominations will be reviewed by the University Professorships Committee and the cognizant vice president for academic affairs. Appointments to the rank of University Professor are for one year at a time. For teaching assignments and budgetary support, University Professors will be accountable to the cognizant vice president for academic affairs. Courses offered by University Professors will be identified and listed separately from regular departmental curricula. Individuals with departmental appointments serving as University Professors will retain their regular departmental appointments and will be eligible to participate in a normal manner in the faculty retention and tenure activities of their respective departments.

D. Instructor. Appointments in the instructor rank within the regular faculty shall be for a limited term, not to exceed three years, because they are intended for individuals who have not quite achieved their terminal degree or board certification. An instructor may be promoted to Assistant Professor by action of a letter to the Senior Vice President from the dean and department chair verifying that the faculty member has completed the terms for such a promotion specified in the initial letter of appointment and has received positive annual retention reviews, as per Policy 6-303-III-B. An instructor may be terminated without formal review for failure to complete the requirements for promotion to Assistant Professor in the period of time specified in the initial letter of appointment. A department may institute a formal review in any year if wished to recommend termination of an instructor for failure to meet performance standards for retention.

If an instructor is promoted to Assistant Professor the period served in the instructor term appointment may, at the option of the faculty member, be excluded from the pre-tenure probationary period. The letter to the Senior Vice President shall indicate if the appointee is exercising the option to count or not count the limited term appointment as part of his or her pre-tenure probationary period.

If an individual is formally admitted to a degree program in the same college in which that person holds a regular faculty appointment, the individual must resign from that regular faculty appointment immediately, unless an exception to this requirement is granted in writing by the president of the University. (Drafting note Revision 16. Most of the section regarding the Instructor rank is relocated above to Section III-B where it better fits with the ‘non-honored’ usual ranks. And the specific passage restricting simultaneous status as a degree candidate and tenure-line faculty member in the same college is moved up to Section III-A where it more appropriately belongs among the general provisions applicable to all Tenure-line faculty.)


Appointees to the Tenure-line Academic Library faculty shall commit full-time (or part-time if explicitly so appointed per Policy 6-320) to support of the University's teaching and
research program, professional growth and scholarly or creative activity, and service to the
University and community. In light of the centrality of free inquiry and free expression in
the development and dissemination of knowledge, they shall have tenure status (formerly
designated as “continuing appointment”) or be eligible for tenure status. The ranks to which
Tenure-line Academic Library faculty may be appointed or subsequently promoted shall
include the usual ranksLibrary faculty shall include academic librarians with the rank of
Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Assistant Librarian. The criteria, standards, and
procedures for promotion to (or initial appointment at) such ranks are described in the
University Libraries RPT Statement Supplemental Rule in accord with Policies 6-303, 6-
306, 6-311, 6-312.

D. Career-line Faculty—Clinical, Lecturer, Research. Section 4. Auxiliary Faculty

1. Career-line faculty positions, sub-categories and appointing units. The Career-line
category of faculty positions includes the sub-categories of Clinical, Lecturer, and
Research (which along with the Adjunct and Visiting categories were all formerly included
within the collective term “auxiliary”). It includes positions within all academic units
(“appointing units”) authorized to make such appointments pursuant to Policy 6-310
(academic departments/colleges, the University Libraries, and qualified interdisciplinary
teaching programs).

positions the auxiliary faculty shall be individuals who participate in the University's
academic program and make a substantial contribution to the academic activities of the
various academic units in which they are appointed colleges, but whose continuing
professional activities are not required to do not span the full range of responsibilities of
Tenure-line regular faculty members in the appointing unitsdepartment or college. Faculty
members may be appointed to Career-line positions as the University and appointing units
determine appropriate, in light of the University's need to retain the flexibility to adjust its
programs to meet changing needs and to employ faculty with more specialized foci, to that
end, auxiliary faculty may be appointed as research, clinical, lecturer (or lecturing), adjunct
or visiting faculty members, as further defined in the sections below. In general, positions
in this category should ordinarily be used when the appointed individuals are anticipated to
have a long-term and full-time affiliation with the University (depending on funding
availability and needs of the institution, and as limited by III-D-6 below). Appointments
expected to be of short duration and/or primarily only part-time will ordinarily be more
appropriately made to a Visiting or Adjunct category position rather than a Career-line
category position. Appointing units should consult with the office of the cognizant vice
president in considering which category is appropriate for a particular proposed
appointment.

Auxiliary Faculty—Categories.

All auxiliary faculty provided for above must be appointed as research, clinical, lecturer,
adjunct or visiting faculty.

(Drafting note: the following descriptions have been moved to this more appropriate location, formerly
in Section 4-D, and then reorganized alphabetically. Also, provisions related to Adjunct and Visiting faculty,
which were formerly included alongside these descriptions, grouped together under the collective term "auxiliary," now appear in III-E below.

3a. Clinical Faculty are instructional faculty members whose primary professional expertise is in the practice context or whose primary professional responsibility is conducted in a clinical, professional or practicum setting.

3b. Lecturer or Lecturing Faculty are instructional faculty members whose primary professional efforts are devoted to teaching.

4c. Research Faculty are faculty members individuals who participate in the University’s academic program, but whose primary professional efforts are devoted to one or more research projects, or non-academic training projects. They may be appointed to the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, provided the additional title of "research" accompanies the designated rank. Appointments to "research" positions are without significance for the achieving or holding of tenure. Any proposed appointment to a research faculty rank shall be considered by the department committee under the same rules which would apply to an appointment to the corresponding regular faculty rank. Advancement within the research faculty ranks shall be considered by the department committee under the same rules which would apply to promotions in the corresponding regular faculty ranks, except that advancement within the "research" ranks is to be based primarily on excellence in performance in research. Appointees to these positions may serve as members of appointed faculty committees and shall have the privileges and responsibilities of faculty members, subject to a determination by the individual colleges and departments of the degree to which they may participate in the processes of setting department or college policy. However, they shall not have the right to vote on matters relating to appointment, retention, tenure or promotion. Appointees to these positions shall not be counted among the number of faculty members of a representation area for purposes of apportioning membership in the Academic Senate, shall not be eligible for election to the Academic Senate, and shall not be eligible to vote for members of the Academic Senate. All annual research appointments end automatically each June 30. Individuals in such positions may be reappointed after appropriate review. Annual reappointment reviews will not be required after a faculty member in a research rank has completed a probationary period of seven years if initially appointed as a research assistant professor or five years if initially appointed as a research associate professor or research professor. After appointees to research positions have completed their probationary periods, their annual reappointment may be handled at the department level by the department chairpersons if the specified funding on which the positions are dependent is available. Research appointments may also be made by means of a written contract for a fixed term of two to five years, when there is reasonable assurance that specific funding to support such term appointments will be available, as determined by the president. Each term research appointment ends automatically on June 30 in the final year of the specified term. Individuals in such positions may be reappointed after appropriate review. /Drafting note: the preceding material is marked for deletion because most of the material is simply redundant of the explanations already given clearly in earlier sections of this Policy applicable for all of the non-tenure-line categories, including the Research sub-category, and therefore adds no important information. That redundancy resulted from revisions
made to the Policy many years ago without attention to resulting redundancy. And the material regarding a probationary period, discontinuance of annual reviews after such a period, and reappointments being conducted unilaterally by a department chair without involvement of the faculty appointments advisory committee is stricken because it is antiquated and inconsistent with the more recently adopted contents of Policies 6-302 and 6-310 (which the University adopted in response to specific requirements of an accreditation review in 2007), which specifically require annual reviews for all ‘auxiliary’ faculty, and provide that the faculty appointments advisory committee of a department must be part of the review and reappointment process for any reappointment of any ‘auxiliary’ faculty member, including faculty in the Research category.

4. Ranks.

The ranks to which Career-line faculty members may be initially appointed, or reappointed with promotion, are Auxiliary faculty may hold the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Instructor. In official documents and communications with members of the University community and the public, a Career-line faculty member’s position should be identified both by particular sub-category of position, and by rank, e.g., “Assistant Professor (Lecturer), Research Associate Professor, Clinical Professor.” Appointing units should consult with the office of the cognizant vice president to determine the appropriate title for each faculty member at the time of appointment or reappointment with promotion in rank. The criteria and standards for reappointment with promotion to (or initial appointment at) these ranks are governed by this Policy 6-300, and Policy 6-310, and the supplemental “Statements” 6-310 requires appointing units to develop.

5. Responsibilities and Rights of Career-line Faculty Members.

a. Appointment to an auxiliary Career-line faculty position is without significance for the achieving or holding of tenure.

b. Auxiliary Career-line faculty members shall not have the right to vote on appointing unit rules/policies regarding appointment, retention, tenure or promotion of Tenure-line faculty members, or on individual personnel decisions relating to appointment, retention, tenure or promotion of any Tenure-line faculty member, except as provided below.

c. However, as a general principle, long-serving term instructional auxiliary Career-line faculty members should be accorded more substantial rights related to curricular matters (members with significant instructional responsibilities), and academic research matters (members with significant research responsibilities) and for setting rules regarding appointments criteria and in individual cases of appointments and reappointments with promotion within their peer-categories, to provide the University the full value of contributions within their areas of professorial responsibility and expertise. Such rights for participation in shared governance should apply both internally within the appointing units (academic departments/colleges, libraries, and qualified interdisciplinary teaching programs), and in University-wide settings.
i. At the University level, Career-line faculty members shall be eligible to serve as representatives of their peers in the Academic Senate, and serve on Senate-Elected Committees, and other University-wide committees to the extent provided in Policy 6-002 and other specific Policies governing such committees. In accord with Policy 6-310, the appointing units of Career-line faculty members should, as appropriate, encourage and support their faculty members in sharing their expertise and making such important contributions to the University’s shared governance activities.

ii. Appointing units Colleges and departments, in accord with Policies 6-302 and 6-310 may permit long-serving faculty members in the Career-line categories such auxiliary faculty to vote on individual appointment and promotion decisions with respect to other auxiliary faculty in their respective peer categories, and to advise on other appointments.

iii. Appointing units Colleges and departments, in accord with Policy 6-310 may accord long-serving term instructional auxiliary Career-line faculty authority to vote on curricular and other policy matters within their unique area(s) of professional responsibility, and accord long-term auxiliary instructional faculty benefits or funding to enhance their professional development. Subject to applicable University Policies and to a determination by the individual appointing units colleges and departments, auxiliary faculty (or any category and/or rank of auxiliary faculty) Career-line faculty members may be permitted to participate in the processes of setting department- or college-level policy, or to engage in other activities of faculty members outside their area of basis.

iv. Long-serving Career-line auxiliary faculty members with appropriate expertise may supervise or serve on graduate student committees if departmental and graduate school policies permit. Appointees to these positions shall not be counted among the number of faculty members of a representation area for purposes of apportioning membership in the Academic Senate, shall not be eligible for election to the Academic Senate, and shall not be eligible to vote for members of the Academic Senate. However, appointees to these positions may serve as members of appointed faculty committees. In these respects, auxiliary faculty members shall have the privileges and responsibilities of faculty members.

{Drafting note: the preceding passage about auxiliary faculty roles regarding the Senate and committees is deleted because these issues are now to be directly governed by the revised Policy 6-002.}

6. Terms of appointments, and early termination for Career-line faculty members.

a. Limited terms and required periodic reviews. Appointments to the auxiliary faculty of Career-line faculty members are for limited terms only. All annual auxiliary faculty appointments end automatically each June 30. Individuals in such positions may be reappointed after departmental review (in accord with Policies 6-302 and 6-310), with no limitation on reappointment, except that Visiting Faculty may only serve in that capacity for a total of three years. Appointments or reappointments may also be made.
by means of a written contract for a fixed term of up to five years, when there is
reasonable assurance that specific funding to support such term appointments will be
available, as determined by the president. Each term appointment ends automatically on
June 30 in the final year of the specified term. Individuals in such positions may be
reappointed at the conclusion of that fixed term for another fixed term of up to five
years after departmental review (as required by Policy 6-310) and with reasonable
assurance of specific funding. Review of all categories of auxiliary faculty (including
annual review, review before reappointment, and review in consideration of
reappointment to a higher rank) should be appropriate in light of the category, rank, and
role of the faculty members.

After three years of continuous full-time service, a Career-line auxiliary instructional
faculty member should be given at least 3 months notice of non-renewal of
appointment, unless particular contractual provisions otherwise govern.

b. Early Termination. Auxiliary faculty members' appointments of Career-line
faculty members may be terminated before the conclusion of the limited term for the
following reasons:

1. for financial exigency, medical reasons or program discontinuation, as provided
   for in Policy 6-313.
2. for violation of the Faculty Code, as provided for in Policy 6-316.
3. for the auxiliary faculty member's failure to meet a term of the contract; or
4. if any condition specified in the contract is not fulfilled.

E. Adjunct, Visiting, and Emeritus Faculty categories.

1. Adjunct and Visiting Faculty.

   a. Appropriate Use of Adjunct and Visiting Positions—Generally. Appointees to
      positions in the Adjunct and Visiting faculty categories shall be individuals who participate in the University's academic program and make a
      substantial contribution to the academic activities of the various academic units in
      which they are appointed, but whose continuing professional activities do not span the full range of responsibilities of the Tenure-line or Career-line
      faculty members in the appointing units. Faculty members may be appointed in these categories of positions, as the University and appointing
      units determine appropriate, in light of the University's need to retain the flexibility to adjust its programs to meet changing needs and to employ faculty with more
      specialized foci. To that end, auxiliary faculty may be appointed as research, clinical, lecturer (or lecturing), adjunct or visiting faculty members, as further defined in the
      sections below.

   b. Ranks and Appointing Units for Adjunct and Visiting Faculty. The ranks to
      which faculty members in the Adjunct and Visiting categories may be initially
      appointed, or reappointed with promotion are Auxiliary faculty may hold the ranks
      of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Instructor. In official
documents and communications with members of the University community and the 
public, an Adjunct or Visiting faculty member’s position should be identified both 
by particular sub-category of position, and by rank, e.g., “Visiting Assistant 
Professor, Adjunct Professor.” Appointing units should consult with the office of 
the cognizant vice president to determine the appropriate title for each faculty 
member at the time of appointment or reappointment with promotion in rank. 
The criteria and standards for reappointment with promotion to (or initial 
appointment at) these ranks are governed by this Policy 6-300, and Policy 6-310, 
and the supplemental “Statements” 6-310 requires appointing units to develop. The 
appointing units authorized to appoint to such positions are those described in 6- 
310.

Ac. Responsibilities and Rights of Adjunct and Visiting Faculty.

i. Appointment to an Adjunct or Visiting auxiliary faculty position is without 
significance for the achieving or holding of tenure (except as provided in III-E- 
1-f regarding Visiting faculty members).

ii. Auxiliary faculty members in Adjunct and Visiting positions shall not have 
the right to vote on any matter in any context of the University (although they 
may be called upon to contribute in a non-voting advisory capacity as 
appropriate) policies regarding appointment, retention, tenure or promotion 
or on individual personnel decisions relating to appointment, retention, tenure or 
promotion, except as provided below. … Subject to applicable University 
policies and to a determination by the individual colleges and departments, 
auxiliary faculty (or any category and or rank of auxiliary faculty) may be 
permitted to participate in the processes of setting department or college policy, 
or to engage in other activities of faculty members outside their area of basis, 
auxiliary faculty may supervise or serve on graduate student committees if 
departmental and graduate school policies permit.) Appointees to these positions 
shall not be counted among the number of faculty members of a representation 
area for purposes of apportioning membership in the Academic Senate, shall not 
be eligible for election to the Academic Senate, and shall not be eligible to vote 
for members of the Academic Senate. However, appointees to these positions 
may serve as members of appointed faculty committees. In these respects, 
auxiliary faculty members shall have the privileges and responsibilities of 
faculty members.

d. Terms of Appointments, and Early Termination, for Adjunct and Visiting 
Faculty.

i. Limited terms. Appointments to the auxiliary Adjunct and Visiting faculty 
positions are for limited terms only. All annual auxiliary faculty appointments of 
such faculty end automatically each June 30. Individuals in such positions may 
be reappointed after departmental review (in accord with Policies 6-302 and 6- 
310), with no limitation on reappointment, except that Visiting Faculty may only 
serve in that capacity for a total of three years. Appointments or reappointments 
may also be made by means of a written contract for a fixed term of up to five
years, when there is reasonable assurance that specific funding to support such term appointments will be available, as determined by the president. Each term appointment ends automatically on June 30 in the final year of the specified term. Individuals in such positions may be reappointed at the conclusion of that fixed term for another fixed term of up to five years after departmental review and with reasonable assurance of specific funding. Review of all categories of auxiliary faculty (including annual review, review before reappointment, and review in consideration of reappointment to a higher rank) shall be conducted pursuant to Policy 6-310, and should be appropriate in light of the category, rank, and role of the faculty members.

After three years of continuous full-time service, an auxiliary instructional faculty member should be given at least 3 months notice of non-renewal of appointment, unless particular contractual provisions otherwise govern.

ii. Early Termination. Auxiliary faculty members' appointments of faculty members in Adjunct and Visiting positions may be terminated before the conclusion of the limited term for the following reasons:

1. for financial exigency, medical reasons or program discontinuation, as provided for in Policy 6-313.
2. for violation of the Faculty Code, as provided for in Policy 6-316.
3. for the auxiliary faculty member's failure to meet a term of the contract; or
4. if any condition specified in the contract is not fulfilled.

4. Additional provisions for Adjunct faculty positions. Adjunct Faculty members participate in the University’s academic program in instructional, advisory or research capacities. Their professional activities do not span the full range of responsibilities of regular Tenure-line or Career-line faculty members in the appointing unit of the Adjunct appointment department or college because of their primary professional efforts are in another department or college of the University or outside the University. Accordingly, appointments to Adjunct Faculty positions ordinarily should not be made for individuals who are expected to serve on a full-time basis within the unit of the Adjunct appointment.

5. Additional provisions for Visiting faculty positions. Visiting Faculty members participate in the University's academic program on an interim basis and make a substantial contribution to the appointing unit department or college during that period in either the instructional and/or research realm. Individuals in such positions may be reappointed up to a cumulative total of three years in residence, but should not hold longer-term appointments and are not entitled to notice of non-reappointment. Appointments to Visiting faculty positions are without significance for the achieving or holding of tenure, unless the individual is appointed to a Tenure-line regular faculty position immediately upon completion of service in the Visiting faculty position. Then the period served in the Visiting faculty
position visiting rank may be counted as part of the pre-tenure probationary period, in accord with Policy 6-311. Whether the period in the visiting rank will be so counted must be agreed upon in writing at the time of the appointment to the Tenure-line regular faculty position rank and documented in the appointee’s “RPT File” maintained by the appointing unit per Policy 6-303.

2. Emeritus Faculty.

This category is comprised of retired members of the faculty who have been appointed to the emeritus status subsequent to their retirement. Emeritus faculty members may be called upon to serve the University in various capacities, and may be accorded various rights and benefits by the University. (See Policies 6-301, 6-001, 5-112, and 5-305). Emeritus faculty members shall not have the right to vote on any matter in any context of the University—except as provided in the “small academic unit rule” of Policy 6-303-III-A-3-a, when called upon to participate in a departmental RPT Advisory Committee proceeding.

Section 1. Persons holding auxiliary faculty positions or emeritus appointments shall not have the right to vote and shall not have tenure or the expectation of tenure.

F. Section 5. Uniform use of Categories and Reports of Instructional Activities

A. It is crucial to the permanent well-being of the University that tenured and tenure-track faculty continue to shoulder the primary responsibility for design of the curriculum and for instruction at all levels of university education.

1. The administration shall report annually to the Academic Senate on the faculty make-up by category, and this report shall include the relative proportion of regular and Tenure-line faculty (including Tenure-line academic library faculty) in part-time or full-time positions.

2. An assessment will be made annually by the Academic Senate of the effects of faculty composition on this central principle.

2. Accordingly, each appointing unit (department, college and program) must appoint faculty to the categories specified above as current contracts expire. Each appointing unit may elect between the two instructional categories of “Clinical” and "Lecturer" faculty or may use both instructional categories in light of its particular mission(s) and instructional approach(es).

{Drafting note for Revision 16. The remaining sections of this Policy 6-300 are not shown here because no changes of their contents are proposed. However, to conform to the overall internal numbering scheme changes included with this Revision 16, those remaining sections and sub-sections will be renumbered. Also a “User Note” will be inserted giving notice that the contents of some of the sections describing certain University committees are in need of significant updating to become consistent with current practices, and it is expected that a project for their revising will be underway in the 2013-2014 year.
The sections of which the contents are not shown here (which will be renumbered as shown here are:

Section 6G. Authority of the Faculty;
Section 7H. Officers of the Faculty;
Section 8I. Meetings;
Section 9J. Order of Business;
Section 10K. Committees of the Faculty;

A1. Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
B2. Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (General University)
C2. Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (Health Sciences)
D2. Other Committees

Section 11L. Faculty Club. }

[Note: Parts IV-VII of this Regulation (and all other University Regulations) are Regulations Resource Information – the contents of which are not approved by the Academic Senate or Board of Trustees, and are to be updated from time to time as determined appropriate by the cognizant Policy Officer and the Institutional Policy Committee, as per Policy 1-001 and Rule 1-001.]

IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources
A. Rules: (reserved)
B. Procedures: (reserved)
C. Guidelines: (reserved)
D. Forms: (reserved)
E. Other related resource materials: (reserved)

V. References (reserved)

VI. Contacts:

Policy Owners: Questions about this Policy and any related Rules, Procedures and Guidelines should be directed to the Associate Vice President for Faculty and the Associate Vice President for Health Sciences.

Policy Officers: Only the Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Sr. Vice President for Health Sciences or their designees have the authority to grant exceptions to this policy.

VII. History:
Renumbering: Renumbered as Policy 6-300 effective 9/15/2008, formerly known as PPM 9-2, and previously as Faculty regulations Chapter II.

A. Revision history:
   Current version: Revision 16
   Approved by Academic Senate: May 3, 2011
   Legislative history of Revision 16. [link to Legislative History file of proposal submitted to Senate]

B. Earlier revisions:
   Legislative History of Revision 15 [link to http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/6-320800_legislativehistory_2011-6-17.pdf]
   Revision 14: Effective dates February 10, 2003 to July 1, 2011 [link to archived Rev 14]
   Revision 13: Effective dates April 8, 2002 to February 9, 2003 [link to archived Rev 13]
   Revision 12: Effective dates May 17, 1999 to April 7, 2002 [link to archived Rev 12]
   Revision 11: Effective dates March 8, 1999 to May 16, 1999 [link to archived Rev 11]
In June 2011, the United States Supreme Court dramatically changed the landscape of patent ownership in a case involving Stanford University and federally-funded research. Because of its far-reaching implications for patent ownership at the University of Utah, the President, with the advice of the Academic Senate President, organized the Intellectual Property Policy Review Committee (the IPPR Committee), comprised of interested faculty and administrators, to discuss what ought to be changed in University policies in response to that decision as well as to address other outstanding issues. In particular, the President charged the IPPR Committee with reviewing and updating the institution’s intellectual property and related policies to ensure that these policies address significant changes in technology, University operations, and applicable law occurring after the policies were most recently revised, and to otherwise address inconsistencies between the University’s intellectual property and related policies.

The IPPR Committee met several times over many months. The Committee is proposing substantive changes to both Policies 7-002: Patents and Inventions and 5-204: Remunerative Consultation and Other Employment Activities. The Committee considered but decided against making any changes to Policy 7-003: Ownership of Copyrightable Works and Related Works.

After it finished its work on the policies and agreed to revisions, the IPPR Committee took the proposal to the Academic Policy Advisory Committee and to the Institutional Policy Committee for approval. Input has also been solicited from the President’s Cabinet and from the Council of Academic Deans. Finally, on April 15, 2013, the Academic Senate Executive Committee considered the proposed revised policies and voted to submit them to the full Academic Senate. Letters of support from IPPR Committee members and other interested faculty members will be forthcoming.

### A. Proposed Changes to 7-002: Patents and Inventions

There are several substantive changes proposed to 7-002, which are described below. Please note, the following is a brief summary of the Committee’s proposed changes. You are encouraged to review the amended policies in their entirety for a more comprehensive understanding of the changes. The principal changes are three.
First, the committee felt very strongly that it was important to better define which inventions the University would claim ownership of because the old definition had given rise to several disputes. It has recommended that inventions that will be subject to Policy 7-002 are those arising within a faculty or staff member’s area of expertise, as well as those resulting from either University research or non-incidental use of University resources. (Sections III.B.1)

Second, it was clear that the University was not in line with its peers with respect to the share of commercialization revenues that it was providing to inventors. As a result, the committee has proposed an increase to the inventors’ share. The inventors’ portion of net commercialization revenues increases to 40% of the first $100,000; 35% of the next $200,000 and 33% of net income thereafter. (Section III.G.1)

Third, there was discussion of how to improve the relationship between the Technology Commercialization Office (TCO) and inventors. The committee has proposed that the TCO must promptly and efficiently process invention disclosures and inform inventors of TCO’s decision whether to protect and commercialize the invention. TCO will honor an inventor’s request for assignment of an invention TCO has failed to commercialize within a reasonable period of time. (Section III.B.5)

In addition to these three major changes, the other changes to the policy include:

- **Non-Incidental Use of University Resources.** University rights to an invention based on use of University resources applies when the inventor uses University resources exceeding those resources available to the general public or to which he or she ordinarily has access as a faculty member, staff member or student, as applicable. (Section II.C)

- **“University Research” Based on Faculty Member Involvement.** The term “University Research” includes research a faculty member performs or manages in his or her official capacity, but not the independent research of students for which the faculty member acts merely as an advisor. (Section II.D)

- **Research Results; Laboratory Notebooks.** The University owns tangible and intangible products of University research. Faculty members remain custodians of their laboratory notebooks, but will provide these to the University upon its request or upon separation of the faculty member from the University. (Section II.B)

- **Student Invention Assignments for Faculty Research.** Faculty members are encouraged to ensure that students participating in a faculty member’s research have provided assignments for resulting inventions they create. (Section III.B.1)

- **Consulting Arrangements.** Faculty members are responsible to ensure their consulting activities are consistent with the requirements of Policy 5-204: Remunerative Consultation and Other Employment Activities. (Section III.B.6)
• Invention Assignment Language. The Policy’s invention assignment provision incorporates language required by the U.S. Supreme Court’s recent decision in Stanford v. Roche. (Section III.B.1)

• Specifically Defined Terms. Specifically defined terms are added or further clarified, consistent with changes elsewhere in the Policy. (Sections II.A through C and III.G.1)

• Copyright Works; Software. Copyrightable works that are also patentable will be treated as Inventions subject to Policy 7-002. Software, whether or not patentable, will be treated as an Invention subject to Policy 7-002. (Section II.B)

• Illustrative Examples. The committee thought it would be helpful for the revised Policy to include, but only as a guide, specific examples related to inventions created by faculty members, staff members and students, applying related policy provisions. (Section III.B.7)

B. Proposed Changes to Policy 5-204: Remunerative Consultation and Other Employment Activities

The major change to this section, in keeping with the practice of peer institutions, is to increase the number of consulting days permitted. Faculty members and administrative officers are permitted to consult four (4) days per month, rather than two (2) days per month (subject to proportionate reduction for part time faculty members and administrative officers). Revised Policy 5-204 will continue to permit faculty members and Administrative Officers to accrue up to twelve (12) unused consulting days. (Section III.E.1).

In addition, the term “consulting” is specifically defined to include consulting (1) performed by a faculty member or administrative officer in his or her individual capacity, (2) directly related to the faculty member’s or administrative officer’s area of expertise, (3) which utilizes that expertise through interactions with the public, and (4) in exchange for which the faculty member or administrative officer receives compensation (subject to certain exceptions). (Section II.A)
I. Purpose and Scope

To outline the University’s policy on employment responsibilities and restrictions on outside remunerative employment activities. To establish the circumstances under which faculty members and Administrative Officers are permitted to engage in consulting activities; provided, in any event, that such consulting activities must not impair an individual’s ability to adequately perform his or her instructional, clinical, research, administrative, service or other University responsibilities.

II. References

Policy 5-403, Additional Compensation and Overload Policy

This Policy applies to all University Employees including, without limitation, Administrative Officers, Faculty, Non-Faculty Academic Employees and Staff.

II. Definitions

For the purposes of this Policy, the following words and phrases have the meanings indicated:

A. “Remunerative Consultation” or “Consulting” includes those professional activities which: (a) are performed by a faculty member or Administrative Officer in his or her individual capacity and not on the University’s behalf, (b) with respect to a faculty member, are related to the faculty member's area of expertise, as indicated by the instructional, clinical and research activities the faculty member performs or has performed on the University’s behalf, (c) advance or communicate that expertise through interactions with industry, the community, or the public, and (d) for which the faculty member or Administrative Officer receives (or expects) compensation or remuneration. Nominal honorariums and reimbursement for expenses will not constitute compensation or remuneration under this Policy 5-204. Consulting includes a fee-for-service or equivalent relationship with a third party and entrepreneurial activities in which a faculty member or Administrative Officer has (or expects) an ownership interest in the party for whom consulting services are provided. For purposes of this Policy 5-204, consulting does not include services performed on the University’s behalf or performed...
by a faculty member or Administrative Officer in his or her official University capacity including, but not limited to, service on national commissions, on governmental agencies and boards, on boards or committees of nonprofit professional associations, on granting agency peer-group review panels, on visiting committees or advisory groups to other higher education institutions, and on analogous bodies, even if the faculty member or Administrative Officer receives or expects compensation for such services. Consulting also does not include “moonlighting” activities that are not directly related to a faculty member’s or Administrative Officer’s area of expertise (and such activities are governed by the provisions of Section III.A restricting activities which interfere with the discharge of full-time service obligations to the University).

B. A. Full-time - An employment relationship, applicable to Employees, which requires a commitment of 100% of the individual's normal and expected working time and effort and defined as Full-time in Policy 5-001 (Employee Definitions). Full-time employment is generally inconsistent with the acceptance of any other employment on a continuous or permanent basis.

C. B. Additional compensation - Payment for services rendered by an Employee in addition to the normal working activity contemplated by the terms of the Employee's appointment.

D. C. Overload status - An employment condition in which the total percent of full time recorded on Personnel Assignment Status Sheets for all assignments held concurrently exceeds 100%.

E. D. Relevant employee category definitions used within this Policy (Employee, Faculty, Administrative Officer, etc.) are defined in Policy 5-001.

III. IV. Policy

A. Full Service Obligation of All Full-Time University Employees

All Employees of the University holding full-time positions shall give full services to the work of the University during scheduled work periods. Any non-University employment must not interfere with the discharge of the person's full-time service obligations to the University. It is expected that all full-time University Staff Members will treat the University as their prime employment activity.

1. Part-time or full-time employment in an off-campus position or business enterprise in addition to full-time University employment is discouraged. Each Employee is responsible to
inform his/her immediate superior of all such outside employment activities.

2. In any case in which present or contemplated outside employment is believed to involve a question as to a potential conflict of interest, the concerned individual is encouraged to seek advice from the administration and, where appropriate, from the Office of General Counsel by requesting an opinion through the cognizant vice president. (See Policy 1-006—Individual Financial Conflict of Interest.)

B. Public Service Activities of University Employees

The University approves of public service activities that are not incompatible with full performance of University duties and not inconsistent with University Policies and Procedures Regulations.

C. Outside Teaching by Full-Time Faculty Members

Faculty members may not accept employment for, and may not perform, any teaching, instructional, or research services for other academic institutions during teaching quarters without the knowledge and written approval of the cognizant dean and vice president. Compensated or uncompensated participation in an occasional short-term conference, seminar, or symposium or the delivery of a scholarly paper or public address at a professional meeting or academic gathering under the auspices of an academic institution, does not violate this policy.

D. Telephone Listings and Off-Campus Offices of Full-time University Employees

Except where permission is given by the president, full-time Employees may not maintain business or professional telephone listings in their own name, or establish off-campus offices for non-University related professional or business activities.

E. Remunerative Consultation by Faculty Members and Administrative Officers

Consultation and other services to persons, firms, institutions, and agencies outside the University may be carried on by faculty members as long as the performance of such services does not interfere with the individual’s service obligations to the University, subject to the following restrictions:
1. Faculty and Administrative Officers are allowed two four days a month for either consulting or outside employment, not counting weekends or holidays. Faculty and Administrative Officers who are not full-time are permitted a proportionately reduced number of monthly consulting days commensurate with their part-time status. Unused consultation time may be accumulated for a period not to exceed thirty (3) months, i.e., for a total accumulation not exceeding a maximum of 12 days for full-time faculty members and Administrative Officers (or a proportionately reduced number of accumulated days commensurate with the part-time status of a faculty member or Administrative Officer), and may be taken during one consecutive period of time. The University has no obligation to compensate personnel for authorized consultation time that, for any reason, is not actually used.

2. This policy is not intended, nor shall it be interpreted, to permit a faculty member or Administrative Officer to engage in consulting activities that impair the individual’s ability to adequately perform his or her instructional, clinical, research, administrative, service or other University responsibilities, as determined by that individual’s department chair, dean or other immediate supervisor, as applicable, even if the faculty member or Administrative Officer otherwise complies with the requirements of this Policy 5-204.

3. Use of consultation time should have a demonstrable relation to the professional interests/area of expertise of the Faculty or Administrative Officer, and to the University’s general mission within the community.

4. Any absence from the University for the purpose of consultation services may be recorded as an excused absence for approved consultation only if the restrictions of this section have been satisfied.

5. Consultation involving service to individual patients or clients may take place in a Faculty or Administrative Officer’s University office or laboratory. Use of University facilities and equipment resulting in clearly identifiable additional cost to the University shall be reimbursed and shall require authorization by the supervisor with direct line authority over the employee.
6. The individual engaged in consultation activities must arrange in advance, with the approval of the responsible department chairperson, director, or other line officer, for scheduling of classes or other work assignments missed as the result of consultation activities.

7. Individual exceptions to this policy may be approved by the cognizant vice president upon recommendation of the dean or director, subject to any specific conditions imposed by the vice president.

8. Intellectual property resulting from consulting services performed in compliance with this Policy, if any, shall be treated as provided in Section III-B-6 of Policy 7-002: Patents and Inventions.

F. Responsibilities of Consultants

University employees engaged in consultation services authorized by this policy must assume the following responsibilities to assure compliance with this policy and with applicable legal requirements:

1. The university employee must advise in writing, on a form provided by, or approved by the university, the person, firm, or agency for whom such consultation services are to be performed that (a) the employee, in his/her role as a consultant, is acting solely as an independent contractor, and not as an agent or employee, or under the sponsorship, auspices, or control of the University of Utah, and (b) the university assumes no responsibility whatever, express or implied, for the actions or omissions of the employee in his/her role as a consultant.

2. The university employee must personally assure that the conditions and limitations upon external consulting activities, as specified in this policy, are fully satisfied, and must be prepared to document that fact if called upon to do so by a responsible university officer.

3. Before entering into a consultation contract, the university employee must personally determine that the contemplated consultation activities and arrangements will not involve a conflict of interest with the individual's duties to the university that may be in violation of the Public Officers' and Employees Ethics Act, or University conflict of interest policies. (See Policy 1-006.) Such conflicts may be
implicated if (a) the consultant is or will be serving concurrently as a principal investigator under a contract or grant from the same external firm or agency; or (b) the consultant's services are directly related to and derived from activities performed under a contract or grant from the same external firm or agency, or from confidential information acquired as a result of participation in such a contract or grant.

G. Public Addresses by Faculty and Administrative Officers

Requests for Faculty or Administrative Officers to give addresses to clubs, community organizations, and other groups may be responded to at the discretion of each individual Faculty or Administrative Officer. Such activities should not be allowed to interfere with university responsibilities.

H. Extended-day and Continuing Education Teaching by Faculty and Administrative Officers

Faculty or Administrative Officers who are able to render full employment services to the university, and at the same time serve the interests of the people of the state by teaching for the University in the Academic Outreach and Continuing Education or in extended-day classes may do so provided the following conditions are met:

1. For Faculty, authorization will be given only for emergency or non-recurring assignments. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the vice president with line responsibility over the Faculty member.

2. A maximum of 38 contact hours per semester will be permitted for overload to Faculty and Administrative Officers for credit teaching, or noncredit teaching, or any combination of the two. (A contact hour is an in-class instructional hour; thus, a five-credit class that meets five hours a week for a semester represents 75 contact hours.)

3. Authorization to teach extended-day classes on an overload basis must be approved by the dean/director with line responsibility over the department offering the course, and the dean/director with line responsibility over the employee. For the Academic Outreach and Continuing Education, authorization to teach must be approved by the dean/director with line responsibility over the course, by the dean of continuing education Assistant Vice President of Continuing Education, and by the dean/director with line responsibility
over the employee. In instances where a dean/director or vice president holds the teaching assignment, authorization must be obtained from the supervisor with line responsibility over that employee.

I. Overload and Additional Compensation for University Employees

Consultation or other services by any University employee which result in overload status or payment of additional compensation by the University are not permitted unless all applicable provisions of Policy 5-403 are satisfied.

J. Full-Time Medical Faculty Consultations

Full-time medical faculty may not engage in private practice or consultation work except in conformity with the Medical Services Practice Plan (Policy 8-001) or other policies approved by the president, upon recommendation by the senior vice president for health sciences, subject to such conditions and limitations as the president may require. Such medical practice or consultation work must not interfere with the faculty member's primary responsibility to the University.

IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and Other Related Resources

A. Rules [Reserved]
B. Procedures [Reserved]
C. Guidelines [Reserved]
D. Forms [Reserved]
E. Other related resource materials

Company Consulting Services Agreement Form

V. References

Policy 5-403, Additional Compensation and Overload Policy.
VI. Contacts

Policy Owners: Questions about this Policy and any related Rules, Procedures and Guidelines should be directed to the Director of Benefits for Human Resources and the Compensation Analyst.

Policy Officer: Only the Vice President for Human Resources or his/her designee has the authority to grant exceptions to this Policy.

VII. History
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Policy 7-002: Patents and Inventions

Revision Status: Revision 4  Effective Date: [July 1, 2013 or upon final approval by the Board of Trustees, if later]

I. Purpose and Scope

A. To outline the University’s Policy regarding patents and inventions. This policy applies to all University administrative officers, faculty members, non-faculty academic employees, staff members (whether full or part-time) and students.

II. References/Definitions:

For the purposes of this policy, the following words and phrases have the meanings indicated:

A. Policy 5-204, “Remunerative Consultation and Other Employment Activities”

“Area of expertise” means, with respect to a faculty member (including regular faculty members and auxiliary faculty members), his or her specialized skills or expertise, as indicated by the instructional, clinical and research activities the faculty member performs, or has performed, on the University’s behalf.

The “area of expertise” of an administrative officer, staff member (including student-employees) and non-faculty academic employees is indicated by the specialized skills or expertise that employee must have to perform his or her University duties and responsibilities.

Questions regarding whether a particular invention arises within the scope of an inventor’s area of expertise for purposes of this policy will be referred to the Director of the Technology Commercialization Office (“TCO”), who will make a determination in consultation with the inventor and his or her department chair. In the event the inventor, the TCO Director and department chair disagree regarding the inventor’s area of expertise, the determination will be made by the vice president for research, in consultation with the inventor, the TCO Director and the department chair.

B. Policy 7-004, University Faculty Profit-Making Corporation

“Inventions” shall mean and include: inventions, technological advances, scientific discoveries and improvements (whether or not patentable); all trade secrets and know-how; trademarks and service marks; and the tangible and intangible results of research (including, for example, data, lab notebooks, charts, biological materials, cell lines and samples). “Inventions” shall also mean copyrightable works that include subject matter that
is also patentable, as determined by the TCO Director, and software, notwithstanding the extent to which software may be governed by University Policy 7-003 (Ownership of Copyrightable Works and Related Works). Each faculty member will be deemed the custodian of his or her laboratory notebooks and must promptly deliver such notebooks upon the University’s request or upon termination of his or her appointment with the University, in which event, the faculty member will be entitled to retain a copy of such notebooks.

C. Policy 7-003. Copyright Policy: Ownership “Non-incidental use of University resources” shall mean use of University resources (including, for example, funding, personnel time, property, equipment, facilities, supplies, resources or intellectual property owned by or paid for through the University) other than (a) property, equipment, facilities, supplies or other resources the University makes available either to the general public (for example, library facilities and resources) or to the inventor and his or her colleagues in the inventor’s department or unit (for example, office furnishings, office supplies, computers, communications equipment, and administrative support if such use is not in excess of the amount normally provided the inventor and his or her colleagues). “Non-Incidental use of University resources” shall include the efforts and/or time of the inventor to the extent the University has compensated (or will compensate) the inventor for such efforts and/or time.

Because the determination of “non-incidental use of University resources” depends, in part, on facilities that are customarily accessible to similarly situated faculty members, non-faculty academic employees, staff members and student-employees, the standards may vary from one department to another according to local culture and tradition. It is the responsibility of the TCO to consult with the dean, chair, or equivalent supervisor of the inventor in making a determination of whether the inventor has made non-incidental use of University resources in connection with creation of the invention. If the parties disagree with the determination of the TCO, the matter shall be referred to the cognizant vice president or similar administrator, whose decision shall be final.

Each department chair or college dean, in consultation with the faculty members of such department or college may from time to time promulgate supplemental rules that will guide determinations of “non-incidental use” for that department or college. Such supplemental rules should be tailored to reflect the traditional practices that exist in the discipline, and are subject to the approval of the cognizant dean, if promulgated by a department chair, and
“University research” means any research supported or funded by the University (including, for example, commercially sponsored research and federally funded research). Research projects (whether or not involving students) performed or managed by faculty members in the course of their University employment will be deemed University research for purposes of this Policy. A faculty member is not performing or managing research for purposes of this Policy when he or she merely advises students in the performance of their independent or student-initiated research and otherwise makes no inventive contribution in connection with the research. The University often performs clinical studies or other similar services for which the University is paid a fee. Under these circumstances, the University might agree in contracts related to these arrangements that resulting inventions, if any, will belong to the outside party purchasing such services. Under these circumstances, such services will be deemed University research for purposes of this Policy 7-002; however, ultimate ownership of any resulting intellectual property may be governed by the applicable agreement.

III. Policy

A. General Policy

As a public institution, the University of Utah is entrusted with the responsibility to facilitate application of scientific and technical research findings for public use and to provide for an equitable disposition of interests among the inventor(s), the University, and where applicable, the sponsor.

B. Patent Ownership of Inventions; Assignment Agreements

1. As Upon agreeing to be bound by University Policy, and as a condition of the University’s provision of employment, services, facilities, equipment or materials to faculty, staff and students, the University acquires and retains title to all inventions, discoveries and improvements made as the result of University employment or research, or created through the use of time, facilities, equipment or materials owned or paid for by or through the University, except when such facilities, equipment or material are available to the General public. Each full-time faculty and staff member is bound through this Policy as is each part-time faculty and staff member and student employee or student participating in research (see also III.B.6, below), and any of the foregoing non-faculty academic employees, staff and students. (a) each faculty,
non-faculty academic employee and staff member (including a student-employee having invented in his or her capacity as an employee) agrees to assign and does assign to the University title to all inventions he or she conceives, develops, reduces to practice or creates (1) that are within his or her area of expertise (as defined below), (2) in the course of University research, or (3) with non-incidental use of University resources, and (b) each student agrees to assign and does assign to the University title to all inventions he or she conceives, develops, reduces to practice or creates (1) in the course of University research or (2) with non-incidental use of University resources. Each faculty member, non-faculty academic employee, staff member, student-employee and student may be asked to execute an assignment of such inventions, discoveries, and improvements to the University to confirm the University’s rights and shall do so on request. With the assistance of the TCO and prior to commencement of University research in which unpaid students will participate, faculty members supervising such research are encouraged to ensure the University has received from participating students invention assignment agreements for inventions resulting from that research. No inventor of an invention described in the foregoing paragraph has the authority to assign, license, or otherwise dispose of such invention except to the University or its designee pursuant to this policy.

2. The signing of a patent agreement, an invention assignment is an administrative convenience for dealing with confirming technology ownership rights, but the terms of this Policy are controlling and, as with other University policies, constitute conditions of employment and participation in research.

3. Where an invention, discovery or improvement is related to research conducted by faculty, staff or students, a student in connection with both University employment or other research activity involving the use of time, facilities, equipment or materials owned or paid for by the University ("University-related activity"), and with non-University research and with non-University activities, such invention, discovery or improvement shall be presumed to result from University-related activity research unless the inventor can demonstrate to the vice president for research that the technology in question invention was developed created solely in connection with non-University activity and without the use of confidential University intellectual property or other proprietary information belonging to the University.
4. Each full or part-time faculty and non-faculty academic employee, staff member and student employee, and each student participating in University research or making non-incidental use of University resources, is expected also to inform promptly the director of the University Technology Transfer Office TCO concerning all inventions, improvements, and discoveries made as a result of University employment, or created through the use of time, facilities, equipment, and/or materials owned or paid for by or through the University or as a result of University employment or participation in research at the created within his or her area of expertise, in the course of University research, or with non-incidental use of University resources, as applicable; to cooperate with and assist the director of the University Technology Transfer Office TCO in the handling of such matters; to execute all rightful papers and do necessary and proper acts to assist the University in obtaining, utilizing and enforcing patent protection on such matters; and to abide by and benefit from the patent Policy of the University in effect during the inventor's respective associations with the University.

5. TCO shall promptly and efficiently review all invention disclosure forms and provide to disclosing inventors, within a reasonable amount of time, confirmation of whether (i) the form does not disclose a patentable invention, (ii) the form discloses a patentable invention, but TCO has elected not to pursue patent protection at that time, or (iii) TCO will file a provisional or non-provisional patent application for the disclosed invention. If TCO elects to file a patent application, TCO will do so within a reasonable amount of time.

The University, in its sole discretion, may release to an inventor, by written instrument only, those inventions owned by but not of interest to the University. It is understood if the University does not actively promote or develop the invention over a 3-year period within a reasonable amount of time, the inventor's claim to full rights will be honored. Requests for releases should be made to the director of the University Technology Transfer Office TCO.

6. The Subject to the time limitations established in Policy 5-204 (Remunerative Consultation and Other Employment Activities), the University claims no right in or to any invention originated to the extent created by full or part-time faculty and staff members and student employees Administrative Officers as a result of private consulting services performed in
compliance with University of Utah Policy 5-204, relative to Remunerative Consultation and Other Employment Activities and not involving substantial unless the invention is created with non-incidental use of University facilities (subject to III.B.3) resources. Further, the University claims no right in or to any invention originated to the extent created by any full or part-time student (excluding a student-employee) who is not participating in organized or sponsored research. University research relating to the invention (subject to Section III.B.3) and who creates the invention with only incidental use of University resources, if any. Faculty members and Administrative Officers who engage in outside consulting, and faculty and staff members who engage in other external activities, are responsible for ensuring that any agreements relating to those activities are not in conflict with this Policy 7-002 or Policy 5-204.

7. **Examples:**

The following are examples intended to assist faculty members, non-faculty academic employees, employees and students in applying the provisions of this Policy 7-002. III.B. These examples are intended to be illustrative only and by no means should they be viewed as a comprehensive list of those activities and inventions to which this Policy 7-002 applies.

a. **Example One:** Faculty Member A creates an invention while working as a PI under the terms of a federal research grant, performance of which has been subcontracted to the University. In the absence of other relevant facts, the University will assume ownership of the invention because it is a product of University research and arises within Faculty Member A’s area of expertise. (See Section III.B.1(a)(1) and (2).)

b. **Example Two:** Faculty Member B teaches School of Medicine courses in oncological sciences. Working at her desk at home on Saturday, she designs a chemical compound that may fight non-Hodgkin’s Lymphoma. In the absence of other relevant facts, the University will assume ownership of the invention because the invention arises within Faculty Member B’s area of expertise. (See Section III.B.1(a)(1).)

c. **Example Three:** Staff Member C is an engineer
employed by the University to fabricate medical devices. Working in his garage on Saturday, Staff Member C invents a topical cream that accelerates the healing process for cuts and abrasions. In the absence of other relevant facts, the University will not assume ownership of the invention because creation of the invention did not require the specialized skills and expertise Staff Member C must have to perform his University responsibilities. (See Sections II.A and III.B.1(a)(1).)

d. Example Four: Participating in a specific research project funded by the School of Engineering and supervised by University faculty, Student D invents a novel shale extraction process. In the absence of other relevant facts, the University will assume ownership of the invention, even if Student D received academic credit in connection with the research, because the invention was created as a result of University research. (See Sections II.D and III.B.1(b).)

e. Example Five: As a result of a chemistry course, Student E independently creates a novel chemical compound useful in the semiconductor production process. Student E’s research is not directed by his professor. However, sometimes Student E seeks guidance from his professor in connection with research methodology. In the absence of other relevant facts, the University will not assume ownership of the invention, unless Student E made non-incidental use of University resources, because Student E did not create the compound in connection with University research. (See Sections II.D and III.B.1(b).)

f. Example Six: Faculty Member F is a law professor who has an undergraduate degree in meteorology. Faculty Member F has never taught University courses, or conducted University research, in connection with meteorology. On weekends, Faculty Member F invents a novel device that measures precipitation in remote wilderness areas. Faculty Member F enlists a colleague in the College of Engineering to assemble a prototype of the device, which the colleague does in her University lab. In the absence of other relevant facts, the University will assume ownership of the invention because Faculty
Member F reduced the invention to practice with non-incidental use of University resources. (See Sections II.C and III.B.1(a)(3).)

Example Seven: Student-Employee G is a computer science major who is also a part-time employee in the University’s Software Development Center. The University’s Nano Institute funds research for development of medical devices using nanotechnology, and sometimes engages the Center to create software programs related to these devices. Working on one of these projects, Student-Employee G writes a software program that is patentable. In the absence of other relevant facts, the University will assume ownership of the invention because Student-Employee G created the program in connection with University research. In addition, the University will compensate Student-Employee G for the time she is employed to create the invention. Therefore, the invention is created with non-incidental use of University resources. (See Sections II.C and D, and III.B.1(a)(2) and (3).)

C. University Technology Transfer Commercialization Office

1. Reporting to the vice president for research, the University Technology Transfer Commercialization Office (“TCO”) is responsible for meeting patent regulations associated with research grants and contracts, oversees retaining whenever possible University rights to inventions developed on such programs, and provides information and General assistance to faculty and other University employees and research participants concerning patent development.

2. The Office TCO evaluates and pursues patent protection on those inventions deemed appropriate for commercialization.

3. The director of the University Technology Transfer Office TCO acts as an agent of the University of Utah Research Foundation (the "Research Foundation"), and has authority, with the approval of the vice president for research, the Technology Transfer Commercialization Advisory Committee and the cognizant dean, to award additional funds as available from the Technology Transfer Office TCO to inventors as needed to develop additional information to aid patent prosecution. The director serves also as the principal
staff for the Technology Transfer Commercialization Advisory Committee.

D. Patent Review Technology Commercialization Advisory Committee

The Technology Transfer Commercialization Advisory Committee is appointed by the president of the University. The Committee acts as an oversight committee to the University Technology Transfer Office TCO. These oversight functions include but are not limited to reviewing the functioning of the TTO, Policy interpretation, and Policy recommendations on intellectual property, protection of inventions and licensing of University-owned technology. The committee also may recommend changes in University intellectual property policies and is available to the Research Foundation for technical advice on the foregoing matters.

The Technology Transfer Commercialization Advisory Committee must approve exceptions to standard University intellectual property Procedures, proposed royalty distributions and related matters. The Committee may, upon request, advise the University administration on disputes involving intellectual property issues.

E. University of Utah Research Foundation

The University of Utah Research Foundation is the instrument of the University that commercializes inventions through royalty agreements with external organizations for the mutual benefit of the University and full-time or part-time faculty and staff members, non-faculty academic employees and student employees or student participants involved in University research. The University assigns to the University of Utah Research Foundation all rights to those patents inventions that should be exploited. Any surplus funds realized by the Research Foundation from this activity are allocated to fund the research and education programs of the University.

IV. Procedures

F. Implementation: Commercialization and Royalties, Patent Prosecution and Commercialization

1. The Research Foundation purchases services of the director of the University Technology Transfer Office TCO to prosecute patents, explore commercialization, and negotiate
agreements. The Research Foundation shares royalty income with inventors in accordance with University practice (see B. Section III.G, below).

2. Surplus funds derived from the patent program by the Research Foundation are allocated by its Board of Trustees to support appropriate University activities. In making such awards, consideration is given to schools, departments, centers or units of the University which are the origin of, or which have contributed significantly to, commercially successful patents.

3. The University/Foundation in its sole discretion may cause applications or patents to be filed upon assigned inventions in any country. The University/Foundation has the sole right to negotiate and enter into or modify licensing and other agreements covering the manufacture, use and/or sale of products and/or processes based on University-owned intellectual property. The University/Foundation will pay all expenses required to obtain and exploit patent protection on such an invention in the best public interest. In those instances where the University/Foundation determines that it does not wish to cover the expenses required to obtain patent protection, the University/Foundation will permit the inventor to pay all such expenses and thereafter to share any royalty or other revenue with the inventor (see IV.B.2).

G. Distribution of Royalty Income

1. Inventors shall receive a share of royalty income or other revenue received by the University of Utah Research Foundation as a result of commercialization of an invention. The inventors' share of income shall be based on a percentage of such income or revenue remaining after (i) reimbursement of the University for all direct costs of patent prosecution or maintenance and (ii) payments to other institutions required by University agreement, including but not limited to inter-institutional agreements for the management of jointly owned patents, and (iii) all development funds advanced pursuant to section III.C.3 ("net revenue"). The inventors' share (in the aggregate where there is more than one inventor) shall normally be forty percent (40%) of the first twenty-one hundred thousand dollars ($2,000,000) of net revenue, thirty-five percent (35%) of the next twenty-two hundred thousand dollars ($2,000,200,000) of net revenue, and thirty-three percent (33%) of any additional net revenue received by the Research
Foundation.

2. When the University permits the inventor to pay expenses to patent and license an invention, the sharing of any royalty or other revenue shall be on the basis of sixty-five percent to the inventor and thirty-five percent to the University after the inventor has been reimbursed for patent expenses.

2. Exceptions to the above Procedures shall be approved by the Technology Transfer Commercialization Advisory Committee.

H. Copyright Commercialization

In selected instances where commercial marketing of University-owned software programs is envisioned, the responsibility for marketing and licensing is assigned to the University of Utah Research Foundation and the University Technology Transfer Office TCO (see Copyright Policy: Ownership, Policy 7-003).

IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and Other Related Resources

A. Rules [Reserved]

B. Procedures [Reserved]

C. Guidelines [Reserved]

D. Forms [Reserved]

E. Other Related Resource Materials [Reserved]

V. References

A. Policy 5-204, Remunerative Consultation and Other Employment Activities

B. Policy 7-004, University Faculty Profit-Making Corporation

C. Policy 7-003, Ownership of Copyrightable Works and Related Works

VI. Contacts:

Policy Owner: Questions about this Policy and any related Rules, Procedures and Guidelines should be directed to the

-----------------------------------------------
Policy Officer: Only the Vice President for Research or his/her designee has the authority to grant exceptions to this Policy.
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April 5, 2013

University of Utah Academic Senate
201 Presidents Circle, Room 115
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Dear Colleagues:

I am a University of Utah faculty member and Dean of the College of Engineering. My college is deeply involved in commercialization. In the first two months of 2013, the College had 56 new disclosures, 23 provisional patents filed, and nine new licenses, including four licenses to start-up companies. The College of Engineering has spun out 48 companies in the past six years, which represent 41% of all of the University of Utah spinout companies formed during that time.

The purpose of this letter is to express my support for the proposed amendments to the University policies related to intellectual property (Policy 7-002: Patents and Inventions) and consulting (Policy 5-204: Remunerative Consultation and Other Employment Activities). These policies have needed to be updated in order to better align them with the culture of innovation, entrepreneurship and commercialization that exists among University faculty members and researchers, and to make them consistent with best practices throughout the country. The Intellectual Property Policy Review Committee (IPPR Committee) is ready to present these changes to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and then to the Senate.

Before presenting its proposed revisions to the Academic Senate, the IPPR Committee presented its proposed changes to the Counsel of Academic Deans. As a member of CAD, I carefully reviewed the revised policies and worked closely with IPPR Committee members to resolve the concerns that I had regarding the proposed changes.

In my judgment, the intellectual property and consulting policies, as amended by the IPPR Committee and presented to the Academic Senate for its consideration, protect the interests of both the institution and its faculty members in intellectual property created at the University, while incentivizing investment by private industry in the further development and commercialization of these technologies.

I encourage members of the Academic Senate and its Executive Committee to approve the IPPR Committee’s proposed amendments.

Sincerely,

Richard B. Brown
February 15, 2013

University of Utah Academic Senate
201 Presidents Circle, Room 115
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Re: Letter of Support for Proposed Amendments to University Intellectual Property and Consulting Policies

Dear Colleagues:

I am a University faculty member and Chair of the Orthopaedics Department of the School of Medicine.

This letter serves as an indication of my support for amendments to University of Utah Policy 7-002: Patents and Inventions, and Policy 5-204: Remunerative Consultation and Other Employment Activities.

These amendments have been adopted by the University’s Intellectual Property Policy Review Committee (the “Committee”) and are currently under consideration by the University’s Academic Senate and its Executive Committee.

I recently served as a member of the Committee, which included members representing a significant cross-section of University colleges, departments and disciplines, including the School of Medicine, Engineering, Chemistry, Fine Arts, Library Science, and Law, to name a few. The Committee also included representatives of Academic Affairs, the Office of the Vice President of Research, the Center for Medical Innovation, the Scientific Computing and Imaging Institute, the Technology Commercialization Office and the Office of General Counsel.

I encourage members of the Academic Senate and its Executive Committee to approve the Committee’s proposed amendments. The amendments support the University’s mission of attracting and retaining excellent faculty members by making the University’s intellectual property and consulting policies more consistent with the policies of other academic institutions. Specifically, the amended
policies will increase the amount of commercialization revenues to which a faculty or student inventor is entitled. In addition, full-time faculty members will be entitled to consult a total of four days per month, rather than two days per month. Finally, the amended policies require that the Technology Commercialization Office promptly and efficiently respond to invention disclosures, and to ensure inventors are aware of actions TCO intends to take in response to such disclosures.

It is my view that the Committee’s proposed amendments are likely to serve well the University and its faculty members, students and employees.

Sincerely,

Charles Saltzman, M.D.
Chair, Department of Orthopaedics
February 15, 2013

Robert Fujinami  
President, Academic Senate  
201 Presidents Circle, Room 115  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Re: Proposed Amendments to University Intellectual Property and Consulting Policies

Dear Dr. Fujinami:

The purpose of this letter is to express my support for the amended intellectual property and consulting policies currently under consideration by the University’s Academic Senate and its Executive Committee.

I recently served as a member of the University of Utah Intellectual Property Policy Review Committee (the “Committee”). You may be aware that President David Pershing convened the Committee for the purpose of reviewing and updating the institution’s intellectual property and related policies. The Committee was comprised of approximately twelve deans, department chairs, faculty members and researchers, as well as representatives from Academic Affairs, the Office of Vice President for Research, the Technology Commercialization Office and the Office of General Counsel.

The Committee proposes several important changes to the University’s patents and inventions policy (Policy 7-002: Patents and Inventions) and its consulting policy (Policy 5-204: Remunerative Consultation and Other Employment Activities). These proposed amendments are the culmination of careful deliberations by Committee members over the course of several meetings in the Spring and Fall of 2012.

I believe that the Committee’s proposed amendments advance the interests of the institution, its faculty and staff members, researchers and students.

Specifically, the amendments incentivize innovation and entrepreneurship among University faculty members and students by increasing the share of commercialization revenues that is distributable to inventors under the policy. The amended consulting policy doubles the time faculty members are currently permitted to engage in consulting activities. The amended patent and inventions policy provides a more useful standard for identifying those inventions in which the University will claim an ownership interest, the result of which likely will be far fewer disputes regarding ownership of intellectual property.
Finally, the revised policies incorporate better defined concepts and terms, the lack of which in current policies has created some uncertainty regarding proper interpretation of policy provisions.

I encourage members of the Academic Senate and its Executive Committee to approve the Committee’s proposed policy amendments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dean Y. Li, M.D., Ph.D.
Vice Dean for Research and Chief Scientific Officer
Director, University of Utah Molecular Medicine (U2M2) Program
Director, University of Utah MD/PhD Program
HA and Edna Benning Endowed Professor of Medicine and Cardiology
University of Utah School of Medicine
March 26, 2013

Michael Hardman
Interim Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
205 Park
Campus

Dear Interim Vice President Hardman,

Enclosed is proposal for a name change from Hearing impairments Program to Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program; which was approved by the Graduate Council on March 25, 2013. Included in this proposal packet are the signature page, proposal, and letter of approval from the Undergraduate Council.

Please forward this proposal to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next meeting of the Senate.

Sincerely,

Donna White
Interim Dean of the Graduate School
March 4, 2013

TO: Donna M. White  
Chair, Graduate Council

FR: Ann Darling  
Chair, Undergraduate Council

RE: Name change for Hearing Impairments Programs

At its meeting on Thursday, February 28, the Undergraduate Council voted to approve a proposal from the Special Education Department to change the names of their current “Hearing Impairments” Programs to “Deaf and Hard of Hearing” Programs.
Institution Submitting Request: University of Utah
Proposed Title: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program
Currently Approved Title: Hearing Impairments Program
School or Division or Location: College of Education
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: Department of Special Education
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code\(^1\) (for new programs): 13.1003
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for existing programs): 13.1003
Proposed Beginning Date (for new programs):
Institutional Board of Trustees’ Approval Date:

Proposal Type (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>Minor*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>Emphasis*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>Certificate of Proficiency*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>New Administrative Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Unit Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Unit Restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Unit Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td>New Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1</td>
<td>Out-of-Service Area Delivery of Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
<td>Program Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3</td>
<td>X Name Change of Existing Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4</td>
<td>Program Discontinuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5</td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Administrative Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\)Requires “Section V: Program Curriculum” of Abbreviated Template

Chief Academic Officer (or Designee) Signature:
I certify that all required institutional approvals have been obtained prior to submitting this request to the Office of the Commissioner.

____________________________________
Signature

Date:

Printed Name:

\(^1\) CIP codes must be recommended by the submitting institution. For CIP code classifications, please see http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55.
Section I: Request

This document proposes a change in name to the existing Hearing Impairments Program, a bachelor's, master's, and licensure only program within the Department of Special Education, College of Education at the University of Utah. The department requests that the program name be changed to the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program.

Section II: Need

There are two overriding reasons for this change. First, the name change to the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program more closely represents current terminology used in research and scholarly writings within the field of Deaf and Hard of Hearing/Hearing Impairments across the nation. This name change is also consistent with a survey of higher education teacher preparation programs throughout the nation.

Second, the Utah State Office of Education endorsement in Deaf and Hard of Hearing was called Hearing Impairments as far back as the 1980s. Most recently, the State Office has changed the title of the endorsement our students will receive to Deaf and Hard of Hearing.

Section III: Institutional Impact

Changing the name from Hearing Impairments Program to the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program will more appropriately describe the populations our teachers will serve, the titles of the programs will employ them, and the terminology that is currently being used in peer reviewed journals and scholarly writing.

At the time of its creation in 1989, the program used what was considered the appropriate terminology; hearing impairments. As the field of special education and education of Deaf and Hard of Hearing students evolves, so does the appropriate and acceptable terminology within the field. It is our obligation to convey our ongoing efforts to maintain a program that endorses the most current evidence passed practices to the students going through our program, the school districts that we collaborate with, the community of Deaf individuals and the other institutions of higher education that we interact with through the Association of College Educators for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Maintaining outdated terminology in the title of our program may erroneously lead the above stakeholders to believe we do not endorse current practice.

In the Spring of 2012, all faculty in the Multi-University Consortium Teacher Preparation Program in Sensory Impairments (including full-time faculty and auxiliary faculty in both Hearing Impairments and Vision Impairments) attended a meeting for the purpose of an end of the year program review. At that time it was unanimously agreed upon, that the program in Hearing Impairments should make application to change the name of the program to Deaf and Hard of Hearing. The motion of the name change was then brought to the entire Department of Special Education faculty at a regular monthly faculty meeting in the Fall of 2012. At that meeting as well, it was unanimously agreed upon, that the program in Hearing Impairments should make application to change the name of the program to Deaf and Hard of Hearing.
Section IV: Finances

There are no anticipated additional costs associated with the proposed change in name.

Section V: Program Curriculum

***THIS SECTION OF THE Template REQUIRED FOR EMPHASES, MINORS, AND CERTIFICATES ONLY***
February 13, 2013

Vivian Lee
Senior Vice President, Health Sciences
Park 203
Campus

Dear Senior Vice President,

Enclosed is a name change proposal: MS in Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research & Health Policy; which was approved by the Graduate Council on March 25, 2013.

Please forward this proposal to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next meeting of the Senate.

Sincerely,

Donna White
Interim Dean of the Graduate School
Institution Submitting Request: University of Utah.
Proposed Title: MS in Health System Pharmacy Administration
Currently Approved Title: MS in Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research & Health Policy
School or Division or Location: College of Pharmacy
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: Department of Pharmacotherapy
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code\(^1\) (for new programs): 00.0000
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for existing programs): 51.2008
Proposed Beginning Date (for new programs): 08/01/2013
Institutional Board of Trustees' Approval Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Proposal Type (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>Minor*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>Emphasis*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>Certificate of Proficiency*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>New Administrative Unit Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td>New Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3</td>
<td>New Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4</td>
<td>New Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1</td>
<td>Out-of-Service Area Delivery of Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
<td>Program Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3</td>
<td>Name Change of Existing Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4</td>
<td>Program Discontinuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5</td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) CIP codes must be recommended by the submitting institution. For CIP code classifications, please see http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=95.

Chief Academic Officer (or Designee) Signature:
I certify that all required institutional approvals have been obtained prior to submitting this request to the Office of the Commissioner.

Signature: [Signature]
Date: 03/26/2013

Printed Name: Vivian S. Lee, MPharm, PhD
Program Request - Abbreviated Template
University of Utah, College of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacotherapy
MS in Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research & Health Policy
03/15/2013

Section I: Request

The purpose of this request is a name change for the Master of Science (MS) degree program in the Department of Pharmacotherapy from MS in Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research and Health Policy to MS in Health System Pharmacy Administration. As you will likely remember from the department’s recent Graduate Program Review, the department has a relatively new PhD program in Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research and Health Policy. The department also provides graduate level study for the MS degree, a program which has been in existence since the early 1980s.

Section II: Need

First, due to a departmental name change from Pharmacy Practice to Pharmacotherapy in 2004, the MS program name was changed from Pharmacy Administration to Pharmacotherapy in order to be consistent with the department’s name. In 2011, the University of Utah Graduate Council and the State Board of Regents approved the new PhD program and program name, Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research and Health Policy. At the time the PhD program was approved, the department’s Graduate Programs Committee made the decision that the name of the MS program should change from Pharmacotherapy to Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research and Health Policy, again for consistency, but without long-term consideration of the impact on the advanced practice administrative residencies as described below.

The first class of Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research and Health Policy PhD students were admitted in Fall 2012, and pharmacotherapy research outcomes-focused MS students are no longer admitted (PhD level study only). However, the MS program remains active and continues to be aligned with health system pharmacy administration residencies (advanced practice-based training) offered by Intermountain Healthcare (IHC, 1 administrative resident/year, 2 year program) and University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics (UUHC, 2 administrative residents/year, 2 year program) that are accredited by the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists (ASHP). Therefore, the department only admits students to the MS program if they are concurrently enrolled in the local ASHP Health System Pharmacy Administration residencies.

Second, as part of the department’s continuous quality improvement process, the corporate administrative pharmacy directors from IHC (Dr. Tina Aramaki) and UUHC (Dr. Linda Tyler), advanced practice managers from both institutions, current and past residents/MS program students, myself as chair of the department and Dr. Nancy Nickman as chair of the department’s Graduate Programs Committee and primary advisor for the MS students, met over a series of 3 evenings last fall 2012 to review the MS program curriculum and the extent to which MS program coursework matched outcomes goals for the ASHP Health System Pharmacy Administration Residencies. The outcome of this process was a re-designed curriculum that has been attached to this letter as an information item for the Graduate Council. The revised curriculum, tentatively retitled MS in Health System Pharmacy Administration until Graduate Council approval, has been designed to meet a number of needs relative to advanced education and training of future health system pharmacy administrators. The curriculum was unanimously approved by the department’s Graduate Programs Committee at its December 2012 meeting.
Section III: Institutional Impact

Finally, the requested name change is well supported by a documented process of quality improvement relative to a graduate program. Dr. Nickman, Dr. Tyler and I would be pleased to attend Graduate Council in order to answer questions relative to this request at your earliest convenience. The change will attract more residents to the program and will require no change in administrative structure, faculty, staff, or resources.

Section IV: Finances

No costs or savings are involved in this change.

Section V: Program Curriculum

University of Utah College of Pharmacy
MS in Health-System Pharmacy Administration Curriculum
in conjunction with PGY1/PGY2 HSPA Residency Program

The MS program is designed to complement the 2 year Health-System Pharmacy Administration residency program. The MS program is used by residents of University of Utah Hospitals & Clinics and Intermountain Health Care. Course sequencing coordinates with the residency. In particular, residents have a light course load the initial semester to allow time to concentrate on clinical rotations. All courses are offered late in the afternoon. For the new courses that will be developed, an emphasis will on case based and skill based learning through small group discussion, active learning, and workshop formats. 30 credits are required for graduation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6500</td>
<td>Research ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>continued from original MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6910</td>
<td>Project Research: Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>continued from original MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6XXX</td>
<td>Current Issues in Pharmacy Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>new course in PCTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6XXX</td>
<td>Accounting and Financial Management for Leaders I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>new course in PCTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6XXX</td>
<td>Operations Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>new course in PCTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6891</td>
<td>Research seminar II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>continued from original MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6XXX</td>
<td>Pharmacy Human Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>new course in PCTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Financial Management for Pharmacy Leaders II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Skills for Pharmacy Leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Semester, Year 2 (August to December)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIS6040 Data Analysis and Decision Making I</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6XXX Current Issues in Pharmacy Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6895 Survey of Hospital Pharmacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varied Electives (3-6 credit hours)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Semester, Year 2 (January to June)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIS6041 Data Analysis and Decision Making II</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6891 Research seminar II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTH 6910 Project Research: Masters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varied Electives (3-6 credit hours)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM:</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final credits will range 31-34 with electives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPMD6400</td>
<td>Public Health Policy and Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEDU5450</td>
<td>Health Care Financial Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEDU6790</td>
<td>Health System Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS6772</td>
<td>Quality Improvement in Health Care</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTH7150</td>
<td>Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These represent the most popular courses in the current program, but electives are available based on the resident’s interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP56010</td>
<td>Introduction to Statistics &amp; Research Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University of Utah College of Pharmacy
Proposed New PCTH Courses for MS program in Health-System Pharmacy Administration

Draft Course Descriptions

PCTH 6XXX  Current Issues in Pharmacy Leadership (1 credit, must take at least 2 semesters) Journal club reading contemporary articles and books on pharmacy leadership.

PCTH 6XXX  Accounting and Financial Management for Pharmacy Leaders I (1 credit hour)
First course in the sequence will emphasize accounting principles and skills necessary for preparing budgets, analyzing income statements and balance sheets. Course will concentrate on pharmacy department accounting and budgeting issues.

PCTH 6XXX  Accounting and Financial Management for Pharmacy Leaders II (2 credit hours)
This second course in the series will build on the accounting principles in the first course and extend to overall hospital operations. Budgeting for capital, revenue cycle, and forecasting issues will be included. The course will progress to address the financial principles for pharmacy departments and health care organizations. Impact of health care reform on financial management will also be discussed.

PCTH 6XXX  Operations Management for Pharmacy Leaders (2 credit hours)
The course will emphasize how to manage pharmacy distribution and clinical operations. Topics discussed will include analyzing process flow, measuring and improving performance, managing supply chain, contracting, and customer service. Organizational structure, strategic planning and goal setting, and benchmarking will be discussed. Using informatics, automation and technology to improve operations will be discussed. Implications of accreditation and regulatory issues will be addressed.

PCTH 6XXX  Pharmacy Human Resources (2 credit hours)
This course will begin with discussing how one manages one’s self. This will include discussing managing stress, emotional intelligence, and work styles. A variety of tools (e.g., Strength Finders, Meyers Briggs, Color Code) will be used to describe different workplace and leadership styles. The course will progress to discuss how to manage others by addressing topics such as: recruiting, retention, recognition, evaluation, employee actions, compensation, job descriptions, employee development, succession planning, and accountability.

PCTH 6XXX  Practical Skills for Pharmacy Leaders (1 credit, must take at least 2 credits)
This course is offered in workshop format with rotating topics. Potential topics include facilitating meetings, negotiation skills, marketing, advocacy, team building, and conducting root cause and failure mode analyses relevant to medication safety initiatives.
February 13, 2013

Vivian Lee
Senior Vice President, Health Sciences
Park 203
Campus

Dear Senior Vice President,

Enclosed is proposal for the Certificate of Occupational Safety and health; which was approved by the Graduate Council on March 25, 2013.

Please forward this proposal to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next meeting of the Senate.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Donna White
Interim Dean of the Graduate School
Institution Submitting Request: University of Utah  
Proposed Title: Certificate of Occupational Safety and Health  
Currently Approved Title: Not applicable  
School or Division or Location: University of Utah School of Medicine  
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, Division of Occupational and Environmental Health  
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code\(^1\) (for new programs): 51.3815, 51.2206, 60.0420, 15.0701  
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for existing programs): 00.0000  
Proposed Beginning Date (for new programs): 08/26/2013  
Institutional Board of Trustees' Approval Date: To be determined

Proposal Type (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>Minor*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>Emphasis*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>Certificate of Proficiency*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>New Administrative Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>Administrative Unit Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>Administrative Unit Restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>Administrative Unit Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td>New Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td>New Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td>New Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1</td>
<td>Out-of-Service Area Delivery of Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
<td>Program Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
<td>Program Restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
<td>Program Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3</td>
<td>Name Change of Existing Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4</td>
<td>Program Discontinuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4</td>
<td>Program Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5</td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5</td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Administrative Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\)Requires “Section V: Program Curriculum” of Abbreviated Template

Chief Academic Officer (or Designee) Signature:  
I certify that all required institutional approvals have been obtained prior to submitting this request to the Office of the Commissioner.

Signature:  
Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Printed Name: Name of CAO or Designee

\(^1\) CIP codes must be recommended by the submitting institution. For CIP code classifications, please see http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55.
Section I: Request

Project Description

The University of Utah’s Department of Family and Preventive Medicine (DFPM) and Rocky Mountain Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine (RMCOEH) request approval for a graduate Certificate of Occupational Safety and Health (COSH) that will help meet graduate-level regional and national needs for personnel trained in Occupational Safety and Health (OSH).

The COSH will require students to complete at least 15 credit hours of graduate level coursework in OSH. Students will elect to participate in one of the following options:

- COSH with emphasis in Ergonomics and Safety (E&S)
- COSH with emphasis in Industrial Hygiene (IH)
- COSH without emphasis (General OSH, (G))
- COSH with emphasis in Occupational Health (OH)

The courses included in the COSH are already taught in the Graduate Programs in Occupational Health curriculum in the DFPM’s Division of Occupational and Environmental Health [Master of Occupational Health (MOH), Master of Science in Occupational Health (MSOH), and PhD in Occupational and Environmental Health (OEH)]. The Division of Occupational and Environmental Health constitutes approximately 70% of the University’s Rocky Mountain Center for Occupational and Environmental Health, with approximately 25% in the College of Engineering’s Department of Mechanical Engineering which teaches the Ergonomics and Safety courses. The Biostatistics course is taught in the DFPM’s Graduate Programs in Public Health curriculum (MSPH/MPH). Faculty and staff at the DFPM’s OEH Division will administer the COSH along with the existing Graduate Programs.

The following table summarizes the COSH curriculum.
# Proposed Graduate Certificate of Occupational Safety and Health Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Emphases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6370</td>
<td>Occupational Epidemiology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6750</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6760</td>
<td>Administration and Management of Health and Safety Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** 8

### Elective Courses: Select at least three of the following courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6100</td>
<td>Biostatistics I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6703</td>
<td>Clinical and Behavioral Aspects of Occupational Injuries and Diseases</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6504</td>
<td>Clinical and Behavioral Aspects of Preventive Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6752</td>
<td>Introduction to Industrial Toxicology &amp; Physiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6751</td>
<td>Advanced Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6753</td>
<td>Industrial Ventilation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6754</td>
<td>Noise and Other Physical Agents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6756</td>
<td>Hazardous Substances</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6730</td>
<td>Quantitative Risk Assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6761 / ME EN 6100</td>
<td>Ergonomics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME EN 6110</td>
<td>Introduction to Industrial Safety</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME EN 6120</td>
<td>Human Factors Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Credits** 15-17

The COSH will be appropriate for baccalaureate prepared students seeking recognition of additional competency in OSH. Many of these students will already have jobs with OSH responsibilities and will be seeking improved knowledge and skills to better perform or advance in their careers. Some of the COSH students will likely continue to masters or doctoral studies in OSH.

The COSH will meet the academic requirements for physicians working in OSH who seek board certification in Preventive Medicine in the specialty of Occupational Medicine through the American Board of Preventive Medicine’s
complementary pathway. The RMCOEH also anticipates interest in the COSH amongst nurses who work or want to work in OSH as occupational health nurses.

The RMCOEH is a National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)-sponsored Education and Research Center housed primarily within the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine within the University of Utah School of Medicine. The RMCOEH has trained over 525 graduates in masters and doctoral OSH programs since it was established in 1977. Currently the RMCOEH offers the MOH, MSOH, and PhD in OEH degrees with emphases in occupational medicine, industrial hygiene, hazardous substances management, and ergonomics and safety. Additionally, the RMCOEH offers occupational medicine residency training, doctoral degrees in injury prevention, and graduate degrees in mechanical engineering (ergonomics and safety) through the Department of Mechanical Engineering.

All of the RMCOEH’s faculty participated in the planning for, and design of the COSH. The idea for the COSH was first presented to the faculty in Spring 2011 in conjunction with the RMCOEH’s plan to apply for a grant from the University of Utah’s Technology Assisted Curriculum Center (TACC) to support the conversion of five courses from the MOH curriculum from in-person-only to online delivery. The five courses supported by the grant would serve as the core courses required of physicians seeking board certification in occupational medicine and together would constitute the beginning of an online certificate program (assuming approval of the certificate by the University of Utah). Each course director also supported the vision of delivering an online certificate and eventually an online masters program. The COSH proposal was formally discussed, vetted and agreed to by all of the RMCOEH’s faculty and staff at the RMCOEH’s annual retreat in August 9, 2012. Faculty and staff provided recommendations as to which courses and emphases should be included in an OSH certificate program, and all course directors were at this retreat except for the biostatistics course (later represented in the approval process, see following sentences). These recommendations were incorporated into the COSH program proposal. The Executive Committee of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, including Dr. Alder (Biostatistics), discussed and approved the proposal in January 18, 2013. The Chair of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine. Thus, 100% of the affected faculty are represented in the approval processes above.

Section II: Need

There is a shortage of OSH-trained personnel in the United States. In 2011, NIOSH commissioned a study of the demand for and supply of OSH personnel. This survey found that employers in the United States plan to hire about 25,000 OSH professionals over the next five years. Existing training programs in occupational safety and health are expected to graduate only about 13,000 professionals in the next five years. Funding for training programs has decreased in the last several years, such that many academic training programs currently lack the resources to meet the increasing training needs. The current population of OSH professionals is also aging, with employers estimating that about 10% of the workforce will retire this year.

Overall, the NIOSH-requested assessment “found that based on current trends, future national demand for occupational safety and health services will significantly outstrip the number of professionals with the necessary training, education, and experience to provide such services.”

This conclusion reinforces findings from prior reports on the need/demand for OSH personnel. The Institute of Medicine 2000 report, Safe Work in the 21st Century, concluded “that the continuing burden of largely preventable occupational diseases and injuries and the lack of adequate OSH services in most small and many larger workplaces indicate a clear need for more OSH professionals at all levels.”

Despite the recognized need for OSH personnel, there are currently no certificate-level OSH academic training programs in the Intermountain region - only very few bachelors, masters, and doctoral programs. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) sponsors non-academic certificate training programs for
working professionals across the United States, including through the RMCOEH at the University of Utah. However, these non-academic courses do not meet the needs of individuals considering additional graduate-level education, or who may need to demonstrate academic credit to meet professional requirements, like physicians seeking board certification.

The proposed COSH will be one of the few OSH academic certificate programs in the United States that will provide the course requirements for board certification under the American Board of Preventive Medicine’s complementary pathway. Until recently, occupational medicine residency programs required all resident physicians to complete a masters degree with required OSH courses as part of the residency training. The new complementary pathway allows physicians who meet past training and experience requirements the opportunity to qualify for board certification after taking a set of specified courses that would be available through the COSH.

The RMCOEH anticipates that nurses working in OSH will also participate in the COSH. The need for occupational health nurses in Utah is severe. The only occupational health nurse masters training program in the region closed over a decade ago and many of the current occupational health nurses in Utah are nearing retirement age. The COSH would be the only academic certificate program in Utah that could provide nurses with knowledge and skills to function as occupational health nurses.

This certificate adds to the RMCOEH’s complement of degrees that lead to meaningful jobs.

The RMCOEH expects participation in the COSH to be high, particularly given the growth in enrollment that the RMCOEH has experienced in its other OSH degree programs. Since starting the MOH/MSOH programs in 2008 (previously most students obtained MPH degrees), the RMCOEH has seen strong enrollment growth, from 24 total students in 2008-2009 to 31 students in 2010-2011 to 57 in 2012-2013. The occupational medicine residency program experienced greater gains going from a contingent of 4-5 residents a few years ago to 9-10 residents over the last four years. For several years, the distance-based version of the FP MD 6760 Administration and Management of Health and Safety Programs course enrolled one to seven students a year. In response to a posting on a widely viewed occupational health list-serve, enrollment jumped to 29 students in 2010. Many of these students were encouraged to participate by their employers.

Section References:

Section III: Institutional Impact

University of Utah entities likely to be affected by the COSH program include the existing graduate degree programs in the RMCOEH, the Division of Public Health within the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, and the Teaching and Learning Technologies center.
The RMCOEH does not anticipate that the COSH will reduce enrollment in its current masters and doctoral programs because COSH students will not be eligible for the same NIOSH grant-funding as the OSH masters and doctoral students. The COSH students will either be self-funded, scholarship-funded, or funded to participate in the COSH by their employers. The RMCOEH anticipates that some of the COSH students will continue their education in the OSH masters or doctoral programs, leading to an increase in students in all of the RMCOEH’s graduate programs. The COSH program is anticipated to attract regional and out-of-state students who might not otherwise seek education through the University of Utah.

Faculty in the RMCOEH currently teach almost all of the courses proposed for inclusion in the COSH. The RMCOEH courses have room to accept additional students without adding faculty or staff resources. The administrative infrastructure to manage the admissions process, student mentoring, and graduation requirements already exists for the current masters and doctoral programs. The RMCOEH anticipates that these current resources will be adequate to initiate the COSH program. Dr. Rodney Larson, the current director of the MOH, MSOH, PhD in OEH, and Industrial Hygiene programs in the RMCOEH will serve as the director of the COSH program. Janet Torkelson, the educational coordinator for the MOH and MSOH programs, will also coordinate the COSH program. As the COSH program grows, additional faculty and staff resources will be allocated to support the program.

The COSH program will increase the number of students enrolling in FP MD 6100 Biostatistics I, which is taught in the Masters of Public Health curriculum. Please see the letter of support for the COSH from the Public Health program.

The online COSH courses will require ongoing technical, test administration, and design support from the Teaching and Learning Technologies center at the University of Utah. In 2011, the RMCOEH received a grant from the University of Utah’s Technology Assisted Curriculum Center (TACC) to support the conversion of five courses from the MOH curriculum to online delivery in anticipation of starting the COSH program. All of the COSH courses will eventually be available online to meet the scheduling needs of working persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline for online course development and implementation under the TACC Course Development grant.</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* FP MD 6370 Occupational Epidemiology</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid &amp; Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6703 Clinical and Behavioral Aspects of Occupational Injuries and Diseases</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid &amp; Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* FP MD 6760 Administration and Management of Health and Safety Programs</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid &amp; Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6752 Introduction to Industrial and Environmental Toxicology and Physiology</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid &amp; Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* FP MD 6750 Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid &amp; Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* core course in the COSH

The RMCOEH anticipates that many or most COSH students will participate in courses online. Therefore, the RMCOEH does not anticipate a need for new physical facilities to support the COSH program. Some of the COSH courses that have not yet been converted to online delivery contain significant laboratory or hands-on components that may not be replicable in an online-only environment. For these courses in the Ergonomics and Safety and
Industrial Hygiene emphases, the RMCOEH will explore providing intensive in-person training experiences periodically through the year.

Section IV: Finances

No new funds will be needed initially to deliver the COSH because the infrastructure and course resources for the program already exist. The COSH program is anticipated to increase revenue to the RMCOEH through increased tuition payments. This revenue will be applied to the administrative and faculty time that will be needed to support the COSH program.

This program is not anticipated to impact the budgets of other programs or units within the University of Utah.

| Certificate of Occupational Safety and Health - Five-Year Revenue and Expense Projections |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Revenue                                       |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| OEH Graduate MBM formula*                     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
|                                              |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| OEH Certificate Tuition Diff                  | $12,331         | $17,263         | $21,560         | $21,560         | $21,560         |
| MOH/MSOH MBM Formula**                       | $22,669         | $20,497         | $11,126         | $6,736          | $3,775          |
| MOH/MSOH Tuition Diff**                      | $20,000         | $19,000         | $12,000         | $9,000          |                 |
| Income                                        | $55,000         | $56,760         | $58,567         | $60,421         | $62,327         |
| Expenses                                      |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Faculty Salaries / Benefits                   | $40,000         | $41,200         | $42,436         | $43,709         | $45,020         |
| Program Coordinator (Part Time)              | $12,000         | $12,360         | $12,731         | $13,113         | $13,506         |
| Video Recording/Equipment                     | $3,000          | $3,200          | $3,400          | $3,600          | $3,800          |
| Expenses                                      | $55,000         | $56,760         | $58,567         | $60,422         | $62,326         |
| Net (loss)                                    | ($0)            | ($0)            | $0              | ($0)            | $0              |

* MBM formula: $179.66 per student credit hour x 12 credit hours $2,156 x # students
** Initially will be subsidized by regular OEH Differential and regular MBM funding

Tuition Differential = $205.51 per credit hour
Year 1: 5 students, 6 credit hours per semester (12 credit hours per year) = 60 credit hours * $205.51
Year 2: 7 students = 84 credit hours
Year 3: 10 students = 120 credit hours
Year 4: 12 students = 144 credit hours
Year 5: 15 students = 180 credit hours
Section VI: Program Curriculum

All Program Courses

The following tables list the courses associated with the areas of emphases included in the COSH.

COSH with Emphasis in **Ergonomics and Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6370</td>
<td>Occupational Epidemiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6750</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6760</td>
<td>Administration and Management of Health and Safety Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6761 / ME EN 6100</td>
<td>Ergonomics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME EN 6110</td>
<td>Introduction to Industrial Safety</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME EN 6120</td>
<td>Human Factors Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Credits**: 17

COSH with Emphasis in **Industrial Hygiene**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6370</td>
<td>Occupational Epidemiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6750</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6760</td>
<td>Administration and Management of Health and Safety Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total**: 8

**Elective Courses**: Select at least three of the following courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6100</td>
<td>Biostatistics I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6752</td>
<td>Introduction to Industrial Toxicology &amp; Physiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6751</td>
<td>Advanced Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COSH without emphasis (General OSH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6370</td>
<td>Occupational Epidemiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6750</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6760</td>
<td>Administration and Management of Health and Safety Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Elective Courses:</strong> Select at least three of the following courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6100</td>
<td>Biostatistics I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6703</td>
<td>Clinical and Behavioral Aspects of Occupational Injuries and Diseases</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6504</td>
<td>Clinical and Behavioral Aspects of Preventive Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6752</td>
<td>Introduction to Industrial Toxicology &amp; Physiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6751</td>
<td>Advanced Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6753</td>
<td>Industrial Ventilation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6754</td>
<td>Noise and Other Physical Agents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6756</td>
<td>Hazardous Substances</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6730</td>
<td>Quantitative Risk Assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6761 / ME EN 6100</td>
<td>Ergonomics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME EN 6110</td>
<td>Introduction to Industrial Safety</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME EN 6120</td>
<td>Human Factors Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Credits 15 to 17**
COSH with Emphasis in Occupational Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6370</td>
<td>Occupational Epidemiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6750</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6760</td>
<td>Administration and Management of Health and Safety Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total 8

Elective Courses: Select at least three of the following courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6100</td>
<td>Biostatistics I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6703</td>
<td>Clinical and Behavioral Aspects of Occupational Injuries and Diseases</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6504</td>
<td>Clinical and Behavioral Aspects of Preventive Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6752</td>
<td>Introduction to Industrial Toxicology &amp; Physiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Credits 17

New Courses to Be Added in the Next Five Years

No new courses are needed to provide the COSH, though a course related to OSH case management may be added to the COSH curriculum for nurse participants. The addition of a course specific to nursing will be guided by input from community occupational health nurses and the American Board of Occupational Health Nurses.

Program Schedule

The following tables illustrate the schedule of courses that could be taken by students in the different COSH emphases. The COSH can be completed in two semesters. The RMCOEH anticipates that many students will complete the program over three to four semesters.

Potential Class Schedule for the COSH with emphasis in Ergonomics and Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

135
### Potential Class Schedule for the COSH with emphasis in Industrial Hygiene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6370</td>
<td>Occupational Epidemiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6750</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6756</td>
<td>Hazardous Substances</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6760</td>
<td>Administration and Management of Health and Safety Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME EN 6110</td>
<td>Introduction to Industrial Safety</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME EN 6120</td>
<td>Human Factors Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential Class Schedule for the COSH with emphasis in Occupational Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6370</td>
<td>Occupational Epidemiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6750</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6703</td>
<td>Clinical and Behavioral Aspects of Occupational Injuries and</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6760</td>
<td>Administration and Management of Health and Safety Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6100</td>
<td>Biostatistic I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP MD 6752</td>
<td>Introduction to Industrial Toxicology &amp; Physiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 28, 2013

Kurt Hegmann, MD, MPH, Professor and Director,
Rocky Mountain Center for Occupational and Environmental Health
391 Chipeta Way, Suite C
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Dear Dr. Hegmann:

We appreciate the opportunity to express support for the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine (DFPM) and Rocky Mountain Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine (RMCOEH) proposal for a graduate Certificate of Occupational Safety and Health (COSH) that will help meet graduate-level regional and national needs for personnel trained in Occupational Safety and Health (OSH). This certificate program will complement the masters and doctoral programs in occupational safety and health that have promoted cross-campus synergies and enhanced occupational safety and health in our region.

The Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library is fully committed to supporting healthcare professional education that focuses on the development of the skills and expertise required to assure highly effective integrated interprofessional healthcare teams. Toward this end, Eccles Library has recently established an Interprofessional Education Librarian position to support and foster the development of interprofessional efforts among all the health sciences programs.

Since the courses included in the COSH are already taught in the Graduate Programs in Occupational Health curriculum in the DFPM’s Division of Occupational and Environmental Health [Master of Occupational Health (MOH), Master of Science in Occupational Health (MSOH), and PhD in Occupational and Environmental Health (OEH)], Eccles Library expects to continue to be able to provide the information resources required. As the RMCOEH anticipates that many or most COSH students will participate in courses online, it is of particular importance that these students be able to access the wide variety of electronic information resources licensed by the libraries. Our University libraries and the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC) work together to stretch our collection dollars in order to obtain access to a full range of electronic journals and databases. Eccles Library, in particular, provides access, training, and assistance on searching PubMed; the TOXNET suite of databases on toxicology, hazardous chemicals, environmental health, and toxic releases; CINAHL: The Cumulative Index to Nursing and Health Literature; and a wide range of other resources relevant to occupational and environmental health. Current OEH faculty and students are high-powered users of these resources and of the interlibrary loan service through which access is provided to the collections of a nationwide network of health science libraries, including the National Library of Medicine. Every effort is made to license these resources so that they are accessible remotely to all faculty, staff and students with current university network IDs.

In summary, Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library fully supports the proposed graduate Certificate of Occupational Safety and Health (COSH). We look forward to working with this new program.

Sincerely,

Jean P. Shipman, MSLS, AHIP, FMLA
Director

Jean P. Shipman, MSLS, AHIP, FMLA
Director
March 8, 2013

Michael Magill, M.D., Chair
Family and Preventive Medicine
375 Chipeta Way, Suite A
SLC, UT 84108

RE: Proposal for a Graduate Certificate of Occupational Safety and Health

Dear Dr. Magill:

I support the proposal to create a Graduate Certificate of Occupational Safety and Health within the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine’s Rocky Mountain Center for Occupational and Environmental Health. This certificate program will address the significant need for additional occupational safety and health personnel in the United States. The existing occupational safety and health masters and doctoral programs have been very successful in recruiting and graduating skilled professionals. This history of achievement portends well for the success of this certificate program.

Sincerely,

Vivian S. Lee, M.D., Ph.D., M.B.A.

VSL/amb
Memorandum

To: Michael Hardman, Interim Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Amy Wildermuth, Associate Vice President for Faculty

Date: April 9, 2013

Subject: Proposal to include (i) the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program and (ii) the Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program, as Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs authorized to appoint Lecturer faculty, under Revision 1 of University Rule 6-310 (IDTP).

Introduction:

This is a proposal to revise Rule 6-310 (IDTP) for the purpose of authorizing the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program (EAE) and the Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program (ENVST) to make appointments of faculty in the category of Lecturer. Revising the Rule will add these two programs to the list of what the Rule establishes as “Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs” (QIDTPS) granted the authority to make such appointments.

The QIDT Program concept was initially established through the enactment of Rule 6-310 (IDTP) in 2010. Under the Rule, academic teaching units which are interdisciplinary such that they do not appropriately fit into a traditional academic department structure, and which otherwise meet the qualifying criteria, are designated as QIDT Programs and authorized to become the appointing unit for Lecturer faculty positions. The Rule establishes a rigorous set of requirements, sets up a structure of internal committees within each such Program, and establishes the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (UIDTP Advisory Committee) as a body to review and oversee implementation of the rigorous requirements for those Programs.
The original version of the Rule identified five programs as preliminarily appropriately qualified for the QIDTP Status, and directed the UIDTP Advisory Committee to receive and after careful review approve proposals from each of the five for their operations with QIDTP Status. The five were subsequently so reviewed and approved, and since 2010 have been operating effectively, making significant contributions to the University’s teaching mission in their respective interdisciplinary fields. Those original five programs, and websites where further information about each may be accessed, are:

- The Ethnic Studies Program [http://ethnic.utah.edu](http://ethnic.utah.edu)
- The Gender Studies Program [http://genderstudies.utah.edu](http://genderstudies.utah.edu)
- The Honors College [http://honors.utah.edu](http://honors.utah.edu)
- The LEAP Program [http://leap.utah.edu](http://leap.utah.edu)
- The University Writing Program [http://writing-program.utah.edu](http://writing-program.utah.edu)

Extensive background information on the 2010 decision of the Academic Senate, Trustees and administration to establish the QIDTP system by enacting Rule 6-310 may be seen at [http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/6-310.R1_3-09-10_legislativehistory.pdf](http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/6-310.R1_3-09-10_legislativehistory.pdf)

The proposal in 2010 contemplated that in future years a small number of additional programs could be found suitable for similar QIDTP status, and to ensure any such decision would be undertaken only through a careful process culminating with specific Senate approval, the original Rule was crafted so that adding further programs would be accomplished by a revision of the Rule. As had been contemplated in 2010, two further suitable programs have now been identified.

This current proposal to include those two additional programs with QIDTP Status has been under consideration over the past year. The two programs requested that my office consider and advise them about QIDTP Status. In the process, the programs have been carefully studied to determine that they fit well with the purposes of the QIDTP system, including the need to have Lecturer faculty appointment authority, their interdisciplinary nature making traditional academic department affiliation inapplicable, and their readiness to meet the rigorous requirements for quality-assurance which are at the core of Rule 6-310 and the provisions for oversight by the UIDTP Advisory Committee. Most significantly in this review process, the programs have taken the anticipatory step of already preparing and submitting to the UIDTP Advisory Committee their prospective governance documents by which they would carry out the appointments and reviews of Lecturer faculty. The UIDTP Advisory Committee, by experience carrying out its duties under Rule 6-310, has developed expertise in such matters. It has carefully reviewed and preliminarily granted its required approval of the documents and underlying plans of operation—certifying that the two programs are ready to join the ranks of the QIDTPS and begin hosting appointments of Lecturer faculty.
Further information about the two programs, and their appropriateness for QIDTP Status:

The teaching personnel of the EAE and ENVST programs are highly qualified, experienced, and dedicated to teaching. The programs’ important shared characteristics are that they are *interdisciplinary* in subject areas, are *not organized as academic departments* (and not housed within any academic department—due to their interdisciplinary nature), and have *teaching as one of their primary missions*. Both programs are well situated to manage their important curricular offerings, as well as the Lecturer faculty appointment and evaluation responsibilities they would assume once fully approved.

(I) The Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program

The Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program is an interdisciplinary program between the Colleges of Engineering and Fine Arts and delivers undergraduate and graduate classes in the area where computers and arts combine. EAE began in 2007 offering undergraduate emphases in the School of Computing and the Department of Film and Media Arts. Graduate emphases were added in 2010/11 attached to the MS in Computing from the School of Computing and an MFA in Film and Media Arts from the Department of Film and Media Arts. At the end of March, 2013, the Board of Regents approved a new Masters of Entertainment Arts and Engineering (MEAE) degree, with emphases, along with a joint MEAE/MFA degree.

In its relatively short existence, EAE has rapidly gained national recognition. As of the 2013 Princeton Review, EAE’s undergraduate program is ranked #1 and the graduate program is #2 (USC is number 2 and number 1 respectively). The program has about 150 undergraduate and 65 graduate EAE students.

The Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program has a complex administrative and curricular reporting relationship to the University of Utah’s upper administration. Currently, the Deans of Engineering and Fine Arts oversee the EAE budget and the hiring and appointment of faculty members who teach in the program. The EAE curriculum is also overseen by the Colleges of Engineering and Fine Arts (who grant the EAE degrees.) The Executive Director of EAE reports jointly to the Deans of both Colleges.

The Executive Director has the administrative responsibilities of managing the budget, personnel, teaching assignments and the oversight of program planning and growth. The Executive Director also teaches in the Program. The Executive Director, together with the directors of the EAE graduate tracks, constitute the program’s governing body, the Executive Committee. The Executive Director is appointed for a renewable five-year term by the two Deans. The Executive Director’s role is much like that of a department chairman.
Besides the tenure-line faculty teaching in the program, EAE has one Assistant Professor-Lecturer faculty member who has an appointment in the School of Computing, but this person’s entire salary is paid out of EAE. The School would prefer that the position be located within EAE, where the breadth of EAE faculty can properly evaluate and review the faculty member for reappointment and promotion. In addition, EAE would like to promote one person currently in the status of “Associate Instructor” (which is a non-faculty position under University Policies) with an MFA to a faculty position as Assistant Professor-Lecturer and appoint a third Adjunct Assistant Professor to the Lectureship ranks. As an interdisciplinary program across two colleges, it is important that those who truly understand the nature of the work and contributions of interdisciplinary Lecturer faculty are evaluating their performance without the myopic evaluation lens of a single college. EAE offers a large number of classes and currently relies on a number of non-faculty Associate Instructors, most of whom are full-time in the local industry. EAE desires to appoint Lecturer faculty to replace those Associate Instructors. In addition, the new MEAE degree requires the creation of several new courses, some of which could be taught by Lecturer faculty. EAE anticipates hiring on the order of three or four Lecturer faculty over the next several years.

In terms of quality assurance, the EAE Program, as required by Rule 6-310, now has in place a preliminarily approved *IDTP Statement of Rules with Procedures, Criteria, and Standards for Appointment, Evaluation, and Reappointment of Associate Instructors and Lecturers*. The review of Associate Instructors and appointment/review of Lecturers will be carried out by the EAE Auxiliary Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (AFAAC). AFAAC will be comprised of the EAE Executive Director, the EAE joint appointment (i.e., tenure-line) faculty, and EAE Lecturer ranks (holding the same or higher rank as candidates being reviewed). AFAAC itself will select a chair from its members. The primary function of the AFAAC will be to conduct reviews and develop a report and recommendation/vote regarding the consideration at hand for the candidate.

If the decision relates to reappointment of an Associate Instructor, the Executive Director will inform the candidate of the outcome of the AFAAC meeting. However, if the decision is regarding the initial appointment, reappointment, or reappointment with promotion to a Lecturer position, the Executive Director will submit the recommendation to the Deans of Engineering and Fine Arts, and then to the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (UITPFAAC) and on to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Senate, and Board of Trustees for final disposition (Policy 6-302 and Rule 6-310.)

One of the reports that AFAAC will use in its determination will be solicited from the EAE Student Advisory Committee (EAESAC). The EAESAC is composed of undergraduate and graduate EAE students. Students serving on EAESAC also generate a report on joint
appointment faculty who may be undergoing formal RPT reviews in their home department, plan
social events, and represent Entertainment Arts and Engineering on University Committees that
call for student participants. In addition, EAE utilizes peer observation and evaluation of
teaching in its review process. In accordance with the interdisciplinary nature of the EAE
Program, the teaching assessment plan will take account of and respect the variation among the
methodologies and achievement criteria specific to each discipline.

(II) The Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program

The ENVST Program, which began in 1994, offers courses from six colleges and 22
departments. Students consider human-environmental relationships and sustainability in the
context of natural, social, and economic systems, exploring the relationships between humans
and environments from an interdisciplinary perspective that includes the natural sciences, social
and behavioral sciences, health, the humanities, and fine arts. The program emphasizes the
principles of sustainability that are embodied in the University of Utah’s definition of that
concept: “Sustainability is the harmonious and equitable interaction among ecological, social,
and economic systems that provides resources for current generations and leaves future
generations with no less access.”

The ENVST Program added the word “Sustainability” to its name two years ago,
indicating a fundamental shift in focus that would allow inclusion in the curriculum of all the
basic themes and concepts of sustainability. Six new core courses were created, increasing the
need for well-qualified teaching faculty. At the same time, the program was reviewed by the U.’s
Undergraduate Council, which strongly recommended that the program hire additional teaching
personnel, given the dramatic growth in the number of majors, the expanding scope of the
program, and the anticipated number of new courses.

While expected to grow, the ENVST Program is currently quite small, directly employing
only four teaching personnel:

- The part-time Program Director (who currently holds a tenure-line faculty position within
  Political Science).
- The Assistant Director (who currently holds an Associate Instructor position, i.e., non-
  faculty instructional personnel as described in University Policy 6-309 and Rule 6-310).
- A second Associate Instructor.
- A portion (1/3) of the appointment of the Professor of Sustainability (a tenure-line faculty
  position which is a joint appointment of the College of Humanities and the College of Social
  and Behavioral Science).
The Program also hires on a temporary basis tenure-line faculty from other “home” departments to teach specific courses (e.g., from Geography; Parks, Recreation, and Tourism; Sociology; Biology), as well as additional non-faculty Associate Instructors as needed.

Of the two ENVST Associate Instructors currently employed by the program, one holds a Ph.D. degree and the other will complete the Ph.D. this spring semester. Both have been teaching core courses for at least a year, with excellent reviews, and the ENVST Program Director would like to propose that they be promoted to faculty positions—in the category and rank of Assistant Professor-Lecturer. As a QUIDTP, the Program would be authorized to do this (upon completion of the rigorous multi-level review process outlined above)—as well as appoint, reappoint, and evaluate all Associate Instructors and Lecturer faculty in the future as the program expands.

The Program Director reports directly to the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science. Faculty consultation and input comes from three committees: The ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee; the ENVST Advisory Board, which consists of representatives of the colleges with courses in the ENVST curriculum; and the College Curriculum Committee. Of these three committees, only the ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee will have a direct role in appointment, retention, and promotion decisions. This Committee consists of:

- Four ENVST faculty, i.e., individuals who teach courses funded by the ENVST Program. These four are chosen from (1) tenure-line faculty; (2) individuals with a Ph.D. hired to teach individual courses as Adjuncts; (3) individuals with a Ph.D. hired as Associate Instructors; and (4) the Professor of Sustainability. They are appointed by the Dean of Social and Behavioral Science with advice from the ENVST Program Director and the members of the Committee.
- Three tenure-line faculty members, two from the College of Social and Behavioral Science and one from another college. These three members are appointed by the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science with advice from the ENVST Program director and members of the Committee.
- The ENVST Program Director as ex officio.

In terms of quality assurance, the ENVST Program, as would be required by Rule 6-310, already has developed and received preliminary approval of its IDTP Statement of Rules with Procedures, Criteria, and Standards for Appointment, Evaluation, and Reappointment of Associate Instructors and Lecturers. Under that plan, candidates for initial appointment as Associate Instructor are interviewed at one of the periodic ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee meetings, with final decisions being made by the Program Director and Assistant Director in consultation with the Dean of Social and Behavioral Science. Candidates for appointment to or promotion within the Lectureship ranks are initially evaluated by the Program
Director and Assistant Director, who seek input from the Executive/Curriculum Committee and the ENVST Student Advisory Council (SAC). Peer observation and evaluation of teaching is done for all formal reviews, and is carried out by the ENVST Program Director.

**Process and remaining steps for this proposal:**

As noted above, the original version of Rule 6-310 was designed such that the appropriate mechanism for adding other programs to QIDTP Status would be a proposal for revising the list of programs named within the Rule itself. Accordingly, this comes to you as a proposal for Revision 1 of Rule 6-310. The proposal contents have been carefully considered by the internal faculty committees within each of the two programs, all levels of administrators for the two programs, the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (which is assigned oversight of all such programs), and my office. The specific revisions of Rule 6-310 have also been processed through the Institutional Policy Committee (as with any change of a University Regulation).

If you approve of the proposal, it should then be forwarded to the Academic Senate office, and in accord with Policy 1-001, the Academic Senate will have final authority for approval of the revised Rule.

**Contacts:** Questions about each of these programs may best be addressed to:

The Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program -- Robert Kessler, Professor of Computing (kessler@cs.utah.edu, 581-4653);

The Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program -- Dan McCool, Professor of Political Science (dan.mccool@poli-sci.utah.edu, 585-6455)

Questions about Rule 6-310 may be addressed to my office -- Amy Wildermuth, Associate VP for Faculty (amy.wildermuth@utah.edu, 581-8763).
University Rule 6-310(IDTP)

Subject: Appointment, Reappointment and Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty and Other Non-Faculty Instructional Personnel in Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs.

(Revision 01. Effective date March 9, 2010 July 1, 2013 ??)

I. Purpose.

To implement University Policy 6-310 and Policy 6-302 with respect to certain specified academic units designated here as qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs. To establish a University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee. To augment Policies 6-310 and 6-302 by further specifying procedures for appointments, evaluations, and reappointments (including reappointments with promotion) of Lecturer faculty within the designated qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs.

II. Definitions.

The definitions provided in Policy 6-310 apply for purposes of this Rule.

III. Rule.

A. Designation of Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs.
1. The academic units of the University listed in section III-A-2 are hereby designated as Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs (“QIDT Programs”), which pursuant to Policy 6-310 and this Rule have the limited authority to make appointments of faculty in the category of Lecturer for individuals whose primary responsibilities are the teaching of courses offered through such programs.

2. Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs are:
   - The Ethnic Studies Program
   - The Gender Studies Program
   - The LEAP Program
   - The University Writing Program
   - The Honors College (formerly known as the Honors Program)
The Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program
The Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program.

3. Criteria. This designation is made based on the following significant characteristics of these programs:
   Interdisciplinarity of subject matter.
   Teaching as one of the primary functions, and with established expertise in offering multiple courses (particularly including credit-bearing courses for the undergraduate curriculum) significant to the overall teaching mission of the University.
   Not administratively housed within any academic department and not otherwise authorized to make appointments of regular or auxiliary faculty of any category.
   Established internal governance structures suited to providing faculty-peer input and internal administrator input for making recommendations regarding appointments, periodic evaluations, and reappointments of Lecturer faculty candidates.

B. Establishment and functions of University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee.

1. The University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (“UITP Committee”) is established. The membership and leadership shall be as follows:

   The Committee will be composed of nine members drawn from University faculty. Seven of those shall be regular tenure-line (tenured/tenure-eligible track) faculty members drawn from the faculty of the academic colleges which offer undergraduate degrees, with no more than one of the seven from any one college. The eighth and ninth members shall be regular tenure-line faculty members who are in some capacity affiliated with one of the QIDT programs. These two members may have their regular tenure-line appointments in any college (including the same as one of the other seven members). The eighth and ninth members and any others who are affiliated with one of the QIDT programs are prohibited from voting on (but may participate in discussions regarding) internal rules and individual appointments from the QIDT program with which they are affiliated.

   For its first year of operation, the committee members shall be appointed by the President of the University, with three members appointed for a one-year term, three for a two-year term, and three for a three-year term (so that subsequent membership changes will be staggered). For subsequent years, new members shall be nominated by the Senate Personnel and Elections Committee and appointed by the President, and all new members shall be appointed for three-year terms. Vacancies due to early resignation shall be filled by nomination of the UITP Committee’s chairperson with majority approval of the remaining members of the Committee, to complete the resigning member’s term.
The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs shall appoint the non-voting chairperson (ordinarily the Associate Vice President of Interdisciplinary Studies). The Associate Vice President for Faculty, or designee, shall serve as a non-voting, ex officio member of the committee.

2. The UITP Committee shall have the functions described in Parts III-C, D and E of approving the internal rules of each of the QIDT Programs for faculty appointments, evaluations, and reappointments, making recommendations to the Senior Vice President regarding individual appointments and reappointments of Lecturer faculty within the QIDT Programs, and approving the rules of each QIDT Program for evaluation of non-faculty instructional personnel.

C. Statements of rules with procedures, criteria, and standards for appointments, evaluations, and reappointments (including reappointments with promotion) of Lecturer faculty by QIDT Programs.

1. Each QIDT Program shall develop a Statement of rules with procedures, criteria, and standards for initial appointment, periodic evaluation, and reappointment (including reappointment with promotion) of Lecturer faculty. Such criteria and standards shall be suitable for the expected teaching role of the candidate within the overall teaching mission of the Program, and shall be consistent with the University’s commitment to excellence.

2. Such Statements of Rules shall be approved by the primary administrator of the Program, and a committee of faculty affiliated with the Program, and shall be subject to approval by the UITP Committee.

3. The procedures described in each Statement for appointments, evaluations, and reappointments (including reappointments with promotion), shall not be inconsistent with the procedures generally described for auxiliary career-line (particularly Lecturer) faculty appointments in Policy 6-302 (with adaptation for variations in structure), and may draw generally upon the principles for conducting evaluative reviews of regular tenure-line faculty described in Policy 6-303.

The procedures shall include the following.

a. Each Program shall establish an internal committee of faculty affiliated with the Program to serve as a Program Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (“Program Advisory Committee”). That Program Advisory Committee, by majority vote, shall prepare a recommendation as to each candidate considered for initial appointment or reappointment (including reappointment with promotion in rank). That Committee may allow for non-voting
participation in its deliberations by non-faculty personnel affiliated with the Program (if so described in the Statement). For purposes of its deliberations, that Committee shall be provided with sufficient information about the qualifications of the candidate—including competence in teaching.

b. The primary administrator of each Program shall review the recommendation prepared by the Program Advisory Committee, and shall independently prepare a recommendation, as to each candidate considered for appointment or reappointment.

c. As appropriate for the circumstances of a particular Program, provision may be made for a recommendation to be prepared by any other administrator with oversight responsibilities for the Program.

4. The Statement of rules of each Program shall include a schedule for conducting periodic evaluations of all faculty holding Lecturer appointments in the Program pursuant to this Rule. That schedule shall include annual reviews of all Lecturers, and more thorough reviews to be conducted no less frequently than every five years for long-term Lecturers, consistent with Policy 6-310. That schedule ordinarily will coordinate the evaluation review process with the process of considering candidates for reappointment (including reappointment with promotion in rank).

D. Review and recommendations of Lecturer appointments/ reappointments by the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee.

For each candidate considered for initial appointment or reappointment (including reappointment with promotion in rank) by a QIDT Program, the recommendations from the Program Advisory Committee and the recommendation(s) from the relevant administrator(s) shall be forwarded to the UITP Committee. The UITP Committee may require all or part of the record regarding the candidate to be delivered to the Committee for its deliberations. At the request of either a QIDT Program representative or any Committee member, the Committee shall invite a representative of the Program to meet with Committee members to discuss recommendations regarding any candidate or group of candidates. The UITP Committee by majority vote shall produce a recommendation regarding appointment or reappointment, and shall forward that recommendation, along with the recommendations from the Program and relevant administrators, to the cognizant senior vice president (for further processing as described in Policy 6-302 for all faculty appointments).

E. Evaluations of non-faculty instructional personnel.

Each QIDT Program shall develop a Statement of rules describing procedures, criteria, and standards for initial employment, reemployment, and periodic evaluations of non-faculty instructional personnel (as defined in Policy 6-310) who perform teaching activities in the
Program. This Statement shall be subject to approval by the UITP Committee, and may be joined with the Program’s Statement of rules regarding Lecturer faculty.

---

[Note: Parts IV-VII of this Regulation (and all other University Regulations) are Regulations Resource Information – the contents of which are not approved by the Academic Senate or Board of Trustees, and are to be updated from time to time as determined appropriate by the cognizant Policy Officer and the Institutional Policy Committee, as per Policy 1-001 and Rule 1-001.]

IV. Policies, Procedures, Guidelines, forms and other related resources

A. Policies.
   - Policy 6-310 [http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-310.html]
   - Policy 6-302 [http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-302.html]
   - Policy 6-303 [http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.html]

B. Procedures [reserved]
C. Guidelines [reserved]
D. Forms [reserved]
E. Other related resources [reserved]

V. References: [reserved]

VI. Contacts:

The designated contact officials for this Policy are:

A. Policy Owner (primary contact person for questions and advice): Academic Affairs--Associate Vice President for Faculty (801) 581-8763.

B. Policy Officer: Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs

These officials are designated by the University President or delegee, with assistance of the Institutional Policy Committee, to have the following roles and authority, as provided in University Rule 1-001:

“A “Policy Officer” will be assigned by the President for each University Policy, and will typically be someone at the executive level of the University (i.e., the President and his/her Cabinet Officers). The assigned Policy Officer is authorized to allow exceptions to the Policy in appropriate cases.”

“The Policy Officer will identify an “Owner” for each Policy. The Policy Owner is an expert on the Policy topic who may respond to questions about, and provide interpretation of the Policy; and will typically be someone reporting to an executive level position (as defined above), but may be any other person to whom the President or a Vice President has delegated such authority for a specified area of University operations. The Owner has primary responsibility for maintaining the relevant portions of the Regulations Library… [and] bears the responsibility for determining which reference materials are helpful in understanding the meaning and requirements of particular Policies…” University Rule 1-001-III-B & E

VII. History:

A. Current version.
Revision 1. Approved [__]. Designated effective date [July 1, 2013??].

Background information for Revision 1. [link to legislative history file]

B. Earlier versions.

Revision 0. Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, and President of the University, January 20, 2010. Reviewed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee and categorized as academically significant for purposes of Policy 1-001. Approved by the Academic Senate March 1, 2010. Presented for the information of the Board of Trustees: March 9, 2010. Designated effective date March 9, 2010.

Background information for Revision 0. [link http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/6-310.R1_3-09-10_legislativehistory.pdf]
April 15, 2013

To: Michael Hardman, Interim Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Robert Newman, Chair, University Interdisciplinary Teaching Program Committee
Dean, College of Humanities and Special Advisor to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: Recommendation to grant Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program status and approval of policy statement on appointment, review and promotion of lecturer faculty

The University Interdisciplinary Teaching Program Committee (UIDTP) is pleased to recommend that the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program be approved as a qualified interdisciplinary teaching program under University Rule 6-310 (IDTP). Dr. Robert Kessler, Director of this program has met with the committee on several occasions this past academic year to petition its recommendation for approval.

The Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program meets the criteria of other approved qualified teaching programs because its primary function is teaching a fundamentally interdisciplinary curriculum which relies upon faculty and courses from other departments at the University of Utah. The program is not housed in another academic unit and does not currently have authority to appoint teaching faculty. The EAE curriculum has a set of required courses which are currently taught on a regular basis by Associate Instructors or other faculty on campus. The ability to appoint Lecturer faculty will strengthen and stabilize the teaching schedule of core course offerings. The UIDTP committee concurred that the EAE program meets the criteria for qualified teaching program status and unanimously recommends your support.

The EAE program together with the assistance of Professor Hank Liese, Chair, University RPT Standards Committee, have established a policy statement governing the appointment, evaluation and promotion of Lecturer faculty. The UIDTP committee has reviewed the policy statement and recommends your approval with the award of QIDTP status. A copy of the policy statement is enclosed.

It is my understanding that EAE will petition the Academic Senate to obtain QIDTP status. It is the intention of the committee to fully endorse their request with notice of your support.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free contact me or Amy Wildermuth, an ex-officio member of the committee.

RN/jd
Encl
Cc Amy Wildermuth, AVP for Faculty
       Robert Kessler, Director
April 25, 2013

Michael Hardman
Interim Senior Vice President

Dear Sr. VP Hardman,

I am writing to express my support for the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Proposal to be designated as a Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program (QIDTP).

In a relatively few short years, Executive Director Robert Kessler and his team have created very special undergraduate and graduate programs in video game design that are now ranked #1 and #2 respectively in the 2013 Princeton Review. They currently have about 150 undergraduate and 65 graduate students working on the theory, design, practice, and skills of creating video games. An important part of the EAE program is that interdisciplinary students work together in teams. This reflects the state of the industry and helps those students more easily adapt to the workplace environment.

Permitting EAE to directly hire lecturing faculty will allow the EAE to fill the unique positions that require specialized background for game development, and to evaluate these lecturing faculty for appointment, retention, and promotion. The fact that they draw from both Engineering and Fine Arts backgrounds, with a focus on games, makes it important that they be able to hire lecturers who fit their needs directly. I believe that this will lead to stronger, better faculty which will be reflected in a better educational experience for our students. QIDTP status is timely as they have several lecturing faculty positions to fill for the 2013-14 academic year. Professor Kessler has indicated that the incoming Master’s class will be about 50% larger than last year’s class. Growth in the number of students means that having more educational resources via QIDTP-appointed faculty will afford EAE the ability to handle the growth.

In closing, QIDTP status for EAE is timely and advantageous, and thus I fully support the EAE program’s proposal.

Sincerely,

Richard B. Brown
Dean of Engineering
Memorandum

Date: April 10, 2013

To: Michael Hardman
   Interim Senior Vice President

From: Raymond Tymas-Jones
   Associate Vice President for the Arts and Dean, College of Fine Arts

Subject: Supporting the Requested Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program (QIDTP) Designation for Entertainment Arts and Engineering (EAE)

The purpose of this memo is to express my support for the QIDTP proposal from the EAE program. EAE has been an excellent interdisciplinary program since 2007, originating in the Department of Film & Media Arts and the School of Computing. I have been pleased with its progress as the number of students interested in this area has grown, and EAE’s stature has grown both regionally and nationally.

The EAE program has a diverse set of faculty, such as artists, engineers, game designers, and producers. QIDTP status will allow the program to continue to grow and appoint lecturing faculty from across this wide spectrum of expertise. Also, this request is particularly well timed to start July 1, as it will help handle the anticipated growth of the Board of Regents’ recently approved Masters of Entertainment Arts and Engineering degree. Thus, I support EAE’s application for designation as a Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program.
April 15, 2013

To: Michael Hardman, Interim Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Robert Newman, Chair, University Interdisciplinary Teaching Program Committee
        Dean, College of Humanities and Special Advisor to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: Recommendation to grant Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program status and approval of policy statement on appointment, review and promotion of lecturer faculty

The University Interdisciplinary Teaching Program Committee (UIDTP) is pleased to recommend that the Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program be approved as a qualified interdisciplinary teaching program (QIDTP) under University Rule 6-310. Dr. Daniel McCool has met with the committee on several occasions this past academic year to petition its recommendation for approval.

The Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program meets the criteria of other approved qualified teaching programs because its primary function is teaching a fundamentally interdisciplinary curriculum which relies upon faculty and courses from over twenty departments at the University of Utah. The program is not housed in another academic unit and does not currently have authority to appoint teaching faculty. The ESS curriculum has a set of required courses which are currently taught on a regular basis by Associate Instructors or other faculty on campus. The ability to appoint Lecturer faculty will strengthen and stabilize the teaching schedule of core course offerings. The UIDTP committee concurred that the ESS program meets the criteria for qualified teaching program status and unanimously recommends your support.

The ESS program together with the assistance of Professor Hank Liese, Chair, University RPT Standards Committee, have established a policy statement governing the appointment, evaluation and promotion of Lecturer faculty. The UIDTP committee has reviewed the policy statement and recommends your approval with the award of QIDTP status. A copy of the policy statement is enclosed for your review.

It is my understanding that ESS will petition the Academic Senate to obtain QIDTP status. It is the intention of the committee to fully endorse their request with notice of your support.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free contact me or Amy Wildermuth, an ex-officio member of the committee.

RN/jd
Encl

Cc Amy Wildermuth, AVP for Faculty
    Daniel McCool, Director
MEMORANDUM

Date: April 9, 2013

To: The Academic Senate

From: Jeffrey Kentor, Acting Dean
       College of Social & Behavioral Science

I fully support the application of the Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program (ENVST) to be recognized as a Qualified Inter-Disciplinary Teaching Program (QIDTP). The ENVST Program meets all of the requirements for QIDTP status, as identified in Policy 6-310 and adopted by the Academic Senate on May 9, 2010. QIDTP status will provide the ENVST Program with the authority necessary to meet its expanded enrollment and mission, enhance its ability to serve its growing number of majors, and provide consistency in its instructors. The ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee will provide thorough faculty review of all faculty appointments and help ensure a high level of teaching performance and program quality.
IDTP Statement of Rules and Procedures, Criteria, and Standards
for Appointment, Evaluation, and Reappointment of Associate Instructors and Lecturers
within the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program

Submitted September 15, 2012 (revised Jan 29, 2012), by Robert Kessler, Executive Director,
Entertainment Arts and Engineering (EAE)

Approval Status

Approved by Entertainment Arts and Engineering Executive Director and Executive Committee
on September 14, 2012
Approved by Dean of Engineering [Nov 29, 2012]
Approved by Dean of Fine Arts [Nov 29, 2012]
Approved by the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments
Advisory Committee [January 29, 2013] to take effect July 1, 2013
Appointment, Reappointment, and Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty and other Non-Faculty Instructional Personnel

A. Introduction and background information on the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program

Introduction

This document serves as the “Statement of rules with procedures, criteria, and standards for initial appointment, periodic evaluation, and reappointment (including reappointment with promotion) of Lecturer faculty,” and was developed by the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program pursuant to University Rule 6-310 (IDTP) and University Policy 6-310.

http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-310.html
http://www.regulations.utah.edu/Rules/academics/R6-310.html

Other relevant University Policies are Policy 5-001 (Personnel Definitions); Policy 6-309 (Academic Staff, Educational Trainees, Postdoctoral Fellows and Medical House staff).

Appointment to a faculty Lecturer position makes applicable a range of University regulations, including the provisions of the Faculty code providing for rights and responsibilities. See Policy 6-316. See also Policy 6-300-Sec. 4 (auxiliary faculty generally); and Policy 6-311-Sec. 5 (advance notice of termination for long-term auxiliary faculty).

To see each policy, refer to the policy list in the University of Utah Regulations Library at http://www.regulations.utah.edu/info/policyList.html

Auxiliary Faculty categories are defined at http://www.admin.utah.edu/facdev/faculty_ranks_categories.htm

Lecturer faculty and Associate Instructors contribute in significant ways to the teaching, service, research, and administrative mission of the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program. The purpose of this document is to define the policies and describe the procedures to appoint Lecturer faculty and Associate Instructors, reappoint them, and evaluate their performance on a regular basis.

Background Information

Mission of the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program

The Entertainment Arts and Engineering (EAE) program is an interdisciplinary program between the Colleges of Engineering and Fine Arts and delivers undergraduate and graduate classes in the area where computers and arts combine. EAE began in 2007 as undergraduate emphases in the School of Computing and the Department of Film and Media Arts. Graduate emphases were added in 2010/11 attached to the MS in Computing from the School of Computing and an MFA.
in Film and Media Arts from the Department of Film and Media Arts. Starting July 1, 2012, EAE is now an interdisciplinary program reporting directly to the Deans of the two colleges with its own base budget and organizational identity.

In its relatively short existence, EAE has rapidly gained national recognition and is currently ranked as the number three video game design program in North America by the 2012 Princeton Review, just behind USC and MIT. The program has about 150 undergraduate and 65 graduate EAE students.

The Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program’s administrative structure

The Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program has a complex administrative and curricular reporting relationship to the University of Utah’s upper administration. The Deans of Engineering and Fine Arts oversee the EAE budget and the hiring and appointment of faculty members who teach in the program. The EAE curriculum is also overseen by the Colleges of Engineering and Fine Arts (who grant the EAE degrees.) The Executive Director of EAE reports jointly to the Deans of both Colleges.

The Executive Director has the administrative responsibilities of managing the budget, personnel, teaching assignments and the oversight of program planning and growth. The Executive Director also teaches in the Program. The Executive Director, together with the directors of the EAE graduate tracks, constitute the program’s governing body, the Executive Committee. The Executive Director is appointed for a renewable five-year term by the two Deans. The Executive Director’s role is much like that of a department chairman.

An Executive Director who holds a joint appointment undergoes RPT reviews as an Entertainment Arts and Engineering joint appointment and/or as a member of his or her tenure department; this document provides no further information on the review of the teaching and research components of this position. Further, since review of the Executive Director’s administrative performance is not governed by Rule 6-310 and University Policy 6-310, no further information is provided here.

B. Overview of teaching personnel in the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program

Joint Appointment Faculty

The term joint appointment (sometimes known as “split appointment”) refers to a tenure-line faculty member who has a faculty appointment in a home department and also has responsibilities in EAE. The funding obligation for such a person’s single faculty appointment at the University is “split” between two units—the home department and EAE. Accordingly, the appropriate fraction (typically 50% although it may be higher or lower) of each joint appointment faculty member's teaching and other professional responsibilities are housed in Entertainment Arts and Engineering, and the other fraction in his or her home department. As described in University Policy:
When a candidate for retention, tenure or promotion in a department is also a member of an academic program, the department chairperson shall notify the chair/director of the academic program of the action to be considered at the same time that the faculty candidate is notified. Academic program faculty as defined by Procedures established by the program (and not participating in the departmental review committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation which shall be sent to the department chair in a timely manner.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-4)

The EAE Executive Director shall respond to this request and provide a recommendation letter to the joint appointment faculty member’s home department.

As members of the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Executive Committee, joint appointment faculty are involved in EAE curricular and other policy planning, participate in the procedures for appointments and reviews of Lecturers and reviews of long-serving Associate Instructors, and provide other service as negotiated with the Executive Director of EAE.

Given the interdisciplinary nature of the Entertainment Arts and Engineering field, joint appointment faculty will typically have home appointments either in the School of Computing or the Department of Film and Media Arts. Due to the diversity of teaching requirements between these two departments, teaching loads are negotiated on a case-by-case basis taking into consideration the percentage of appointment in each location.

### Associate Instructors

This is a “non-faculty” category per University Policy 6-309. Entertainment Arts and Engineering typically employs in this category persons of two somewhat distinct backgrounds. First, there are persons who have completed their graduate degrees and do not necessarily have a contractual association with a U of U department other than Entertainment Arts and Engineering. Candidates for such positions usually hold a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree. However, candidates who hold a Bachelor’s Degree and have significant career experience in the fields of animation, gaming, interactive design, and/or computer science are also considered.

Second, there are persons under the personnel category of Educational Trainees (University Policy 6-309), i.e., students pursuing graduate degrees at the University of Utah who may be employed in the category of Associate Instructors. Associate Instructors are appointed for one semester or one year at a time. (University Policy precludes any single appointment for a term greater than one year.)

### Lecturers

Lecturers typically are persons who have completed their graduate degrees and do not necessarily have a contractual association with a U of U department or program other than Entertainment Arts and Engineering. Lecturers are typically expected to hold a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree, but candidates with a Masters degree, together with significant career experience in the fields of animation, gaming, interactive design, and/or computer science, are also considered. Lecturers will frequently be drawn from the pool of Associate Instructors with
Entertainment Arts and Engineering who have met the criteria for promotion into a Lecturer position. Lecturers may be appointed for terms of up to five years (as determined feasible administratively, and documented with a contract that describes their teaching load and other responsibilities and details their remuneration).

C. Process for appointing, reappointing, and evaluating Associate Instructors and Lecturer faculty

When initially appointing Lecturers and Associate Instructors, Entertainment Arts and Engineering shall follow University Policies 6-310 and 6-302, which includes:

- Verifying that the candidates possess appropriate credentials by way of degrees and field of study for the position, consistent with university policy.
- Maintaining on file a curriculum vitae for each individual hired into one of these positions.
- Ensuring that the terms of such appointments and the process for making such appointments shall be consistent with university policies.

Given the interdisciplinary nature of Entertainment Arts and Engineering, Lecturer faculty and Associate Instructors typically come from the same disciplinary areas as EAE’s joint appointment faculty, and possibly other related areas. While each instructor’s particular knowledge is based in the discipline that granted his or her degree, Entertainment Arts and Engineering teaching personnel broadly share a focus on the complex interaction of arts and engineering.

Entertainment Arts and Engineering’s detailed process to be followed during reviews for appointment, reappointment, or awarding Lectureship rank or promotion after the appropriate period of service is described below (Policy 6-310 and Rule 6-310).

Committees responsible for appointment and/or review process

Entertainment Arts and Engineering Auxiliary Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (AFAAC)

The review of Associate Instructors and appointment/review of Lecturers is carried out by the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Auxiliary Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (AFAAC). AFAAC is comprised of the EAE Executive Director, the EAE joint appointment faculty, and EAE Lecturer ranks (holding the same or higher rank as candidates being reviewed). AFAAC itself selects a chair from its members. The primary function of the AFAAC is to conduct reviews and develop a report and recommendation/vote regarding the consideration at hand for the candidate.

If the decision relates to reappointment of an Associate Instructor, the Executive Director will inform the candidate of the outcome of the AFAAC meeting. However, if the decision is regarding the initial appointment, reappointment, or reappointment with promotion to a Lecturer position, the Executive Director will submit the recommendation to the Deans of Engineering
and Fine Arts, and then to the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (UITPFAAC) and on to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Senate, and Board of Trustees for final disposition (Policy 6-302 and Rule 6-310.)

**Entertainment Arts and Engineering Student Advisory Committee (EAESAC)**

One of the reports that AFAAC uses in their determination is solicited from the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Student Advisory Committee (EAESAC). The EAESAC is composed of undergraduate and graduate EAE students. Students serving on EAESAC also generate a report on joint appointment faculty who may be undergoing formal RPT reviews in their home department, plan social events, and represent Entertainment Arts and Engineering on University Committees that call for student participants.

**Timeline**

All Associate Instructors and Lecturers will be reviewed annually. Materials to be reviewed annually will include at least their University-administered course evaluations, course syllabi, and Faculty Activity Reports. In addition, the Lecturer and Associate Instructor faculty will undergo more thorough reviews at the time intervals specified below (according to the processes, criteria, and standards specified below in Section D). These more thorough reviews will occur when candidates first apply for Lectureship and when they apply for reappointment with promotion, and in any case no less frequently than every five years.

**Initial Appointment**

Ordinarily, a new course instructor will first be employed as an Associate Instructor, and after up to five years in that category, teaching at least two courses per year, will be eligible for consideration for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer).

**Reappointment with Promotion**

After attainment of the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer) and maintaining a teaching load of at least one EAE class per fall and spring semester, a formal review will be held in the third year. Then in their sixth year a second formal review will be held where the candidate will also be considered for promotion to Associate Professor (Lecturer). In their fifth year following that promotion, and maintaining a similar teaching load, the candidate will eligible to be considered for award of the rank of Professor (Lecturer).

**Variations**

Variations from the ordinary periods may be considered as appropriate based on individual circumstances. A candidate may qualify for initial appointment at a higher rank or more rapid advancement through the ranks based on a combination of equivalent experience outside of Entertainment Arts and Engineering (another department of the U of U or a different institution
of higher education), or by demonstrating the required achievements in less time than the normal period.

D. Appointment and review process, criteria, and standards

In accordance with the interdisciplinary nature of the EAE program (described above in Section B, “Overview of teaching personnel in the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program”), the EAE program’s teaching assessment plan will take account of and respect the variation among the methodologies and achievement criteria specific to each discipline.

Detailed criteria for advancement of auxiliary faculty are specified below, but may be summarized as sustained and valuable service to Entertainment Arts and Engineering and its students. In the case of Associate Instructors, clear evidence of continuing significant progress in fulfilling the criteria will be necessary for reappointment. In the case of Lecturers, fulfillment of the criteria will be a minimum standard for reappointment, and surpassing of the criteria through extraordinary initiative will be necessary for promotion.

Associate Instructors

Associate Instructors are typically appointed for one semester or one year at a time (and University Policy precludes any single appointment for a term greater than one year).

The process for initially appointing an Associate Instructor includes the following steps and file contents:

- First, if the candidate is someone who has completed his or her graduate degree and does not have a contractual association with a U of U department or program, he or she will be required to submit a letter of interest, a curriculum vitae (CV), supporting materials such as teaching evaluations or evidence of non-teaching career experience applicable to EAE, and letters of recommendation or references who may be contacted for additional information. Where applicable, the candidate should submit syllabi for courses taught at the University of Utah or other teaching institutions, together with a synopsis of teaching evaluations.
- Second, if the candidate is pursuing a graduate degree at the University of Utah, he or she will be required to submit a letter of interest, a curriculum vitae (CV) and supporting materials (syllabi for courses taught at the University of Utah or other teaching institutions, together with a synopsis of teaching evaluations).
- Initial applications are reviewed by the EAE Executive Director, who verifies a candidate’s appropriate credentials and history and makes a determination as to whether they are to be hired.
- Upon a positive recommendation, the Entertainment Arts and Engineering office issues a letter of appointment informing the candidate of the role, duties, length of contract, and remuneration associated with the position. The candidate is required to accept the appointment in writing.
To be **reappointed** as an Associate Instructor, an instructor must meet at least the following teaching criteria:

- Ongoing positive performance on Entertainment Arts and Engineering course evaluations, as compared with the evaluations of faculty teaching courses on similar levels in Entertainment Arts and Engineering and throughout the University.
- Implementation of course syllabi that fulfill Program aims and University expectations for any other attributes for which the course qualifies.
- Completion of the annual Faculty Activity Report.

**Lecturers**

The process of **initial appointment, informal reappointment, formal reappointment or formal reappointment with promotion** for Lectureship faculty includes the following steps (including the following file contents):

- For all of the above actions, the candidate submits a portfolio including the following items to the Entertainment Arts and Engineering office:
  - A letter to the Executive Director of Entertainment Arts and Engineering requesting Lectureship initial appointment, reappointment, or reappointment with promotion. The letter will emphasize his/her accomplishments within the period since employment by the Program (if being reviewed for reappointment or reappointment with promotion), and will also outline plans for his/her future contributions to Entertainment Arts and Engineering.
  - In addition, the candidate will provide supporting documents, including at least a current CV, syllabi of classes taught in Entertainment Arts and Engineering, and a summary of student evaluations from the last five years of classes taught.
  - Data from the annual Faculty Activity Report.
- For the initial appointment and formal proceedings, the following additional items must be included in the portfolio:
  - A statement of teaching philosophy reflecting the individual's view of the teacher's role and how the individual's activities fit with that philosophy.
  - The candidate will submit the names of at least two references that will be contacted by the EAE office and asked to provide letters of recommendation. These letters will be added to the candidate's file.
- For the formal proceedings, the following items must be included in the portfolio:
  - For any EAE course, student course evaluation information will be added to the candidate’s file, as well as peer evaluations of teaching. (The EAE office will handle this step.)
  - The Entertainment Arts and Engineering office will solicit a recommendation from the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Student Advisory Committee (EAESAC). The recommendation will consist of EAESAC’s evaluation of the candidate’s teaching through examination of his or her student evaluations and, optionally, interviews with students who attended the candidate’s classes. This document will be added to the file.
• This application will be reviewed by AFAAC and then passed up the administrative ladder to the Deans of Engineering and Fine Arts, the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee and on to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Senate, and Board of Trustees for final approval (Policy 6-302 and Rule 6-310(IDTP).

• In addition to the items specified above, candidates may wish to include the following in their teaching portfolios:
  o Representative course syllabi detailing course content and assignments, teaching methods, readings, homework assignments and evaluation activities, possibly highlighting how courses have changed over the years in response to student feedback or instructor growth.
  o Description of steps taken to improve teaching, either through the improvement of individual courses or in general through activities to enhance teaching skills or background knowledge. This could include attendance at special training programs or workshops.
  o Descriptions of instructional innovations attempted and evaluations of their effectiveness.

Auxiliary Faculty in Lectureship ranks are expected to advance EAE’s mission through excellent teaching and through sustained and superior service to EAE and its students.

The following timeline is adopted for Lectureship rank candidates:

• An informal reappointment occurs every year that there are no formal proceedings.
• Assistant Professor (Lecturer) faculty will have a formal reappointment evaluation in their third year and will be considered for formal reappointment with promotion in their sixth year.
• Associate Professor (Lecturer) and above will have their formal proceeding every fifth year. Promotion to Professor (Lecturer) may be considered in the first fifth year evaluation.

The following standards apply to increasing levels of promotion:

1. At the time of initial appointment, evaluation of Lecturer candidates will be based both on past achievement and the anticipation of future contributions. Such issues as prior teaching experience, related work experience, service, teaching awards and contribution to the education mission of Entertainment Arts and Engineering will be used to determine the appropriate rank. The candidate’s activities will be considered in terms of their significance, innovation, consistency and impact as well as their potential for future growth.

2. Associate Instructor to Assistant Professor (Lecturer). The academic record of successful teaching of Associate Instructors who apply for the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer) should demonstrate the potential for future excellence. Teaching evaluations, the teaching portfolio, and other relevant experience or expertise will form the core of the evaluation. The rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer) will be given to candidates who are consistently prepared and effective in their teaching, clearly articulating teaching objectives, using effective methods of conveying
information and skills, and providing timely and meaningful feedback and assessment of student learning. In addition, counseling, mentoring and advising of students in general are activities that contribute to Entertainment Arts and Engineering’s teaching mission, and will be evaluated as such.

3. **Assistant Professor (Lecturer) to Associate Professor (Lecturer).** An Associate Professor (Lecturer) demonstrates creativity in developing new pedagogies and a deep understanding of the discipline. Criteria include performing teaching responsibilities with consistency, imagination and resourcefulness; employing effective methods of teaching; receiving strong teaching evaluations and EAESAC recommendations; and regularly interacting with students in advising and mentoring roles. The successful candidate shall have made efforts to enhance teaching methods and improve learning outcomes, or carried out other related activities, and may have applied for teaching grants. Successful candidates will have provided service to EAE as negotiated with the Executive Director through such activities as partnering with other campus units; performing administrative duties; working with industrial and government relations; recruiting students; promoting EAE on and off campus; revising and improving EAE curriculum and programs; and serving on EAE, College, and University committees. Research and scholarship shall not be considered requisite for appointment to this rank but, if fulfilled, would strengthen the candidate’s application.

4. **Associate Professor (Lecturer) to Professor (Lecturer).** Professor (Lecturers) must demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching through teaching evaluations and other indicators of excellence, innovation, and commitment to the EAE Program. Excellent teaching is stimulating, informed, timely and scholarly, employing innovative or effective methods of teaching. This is demonstrated in part through consistently high teaching evaluations, strong EAESAC recommendations, and regular interaction with students in advising and mentoring roles. Other considerations might be winning national or University teaching awards, developing new programs and curricula within the College, being awarded grants or fellowships, or being recognized in the community for teaching work. Successful candidates will have provided service to EAE as negotiated with the Executive Director through such activities as partnering with other campus units; performing administrative duties; working with industrial and government relations; recruiting students; promoting EAE on and off campus; revising and improving EAE curriculum and programs; and serving on EAE, College, and University committees. Research and scholarship shall not be considered requisite for appointment to this rank but, if fulfilled, would strengthen the candidate’s application.
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This document implements University Policy 6-310 and University Rule 6-310 (IDTP), and
readers should refer to that Policy and Rule; also see Policy 6-302 (faculty appointments).

I. ENVST program overview

The ENVST Program offers students an opportunity to consider human-environmental
relationships and sustainability in the context of natural, social, and economic systems. Students
explore the relationships between humans and environments from an interdisciplinary
perspective that includes the natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, health, the
humanities, and fine arts. The program emphasizes the principles of sustainability that are
embodied in the University of Utah’s definition of that concept: “Sustainability is the
harmonious and equitable interaction among ecological, social, and economic systems that
provides resources for current generations and leaves future generations with no less access.”
The ENVST major is not a single field of study leading to a specific profession. Instead, the
curriculum emphasizes flexibility and breadth, and prepares students to understand the
environment from three inter-related scholarly traditions:
1. Biology/Natural Sciences
2. Humanities/Aesthetics
3. Social and Behavioral Sciences/Policy/Decision Making

A principle assumption of the program is that a basic understanding of these diverse fields and
disciplines is essential to understanding the complexity and systemic nature of environmental
problems and the challenges of living sustainably.

II. Overview of courses and categories of teaching personnel

The ENVST Program’s curriculum consists of two sets of courses:
A. Five required ENVST core courses and two ENVST elective courses are taught by ENVST faculty; the people who teach these courses are subject to the procedures identified in this document.

B. The remainder of the curriculum is comprised of courses taught by other departments and programs.

Thus, the ENVST Program must provide personnel to teach its own courses, but not those taught by other departments and programs. The personnel who teach the ENVST courses consist of:

1. The Program Director, who has teaching responsibilities in the ENVST Program. The Director holds a tenured faculty position in one of the seven departments in the College of Social and Behavioral Science. The Program Director is selected by the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science. The Director holds tenure in a home department, and must undergo standard RPT procedures in that department. The Director is also periodically reviewed by the Dean of the college.

2. Faculty or instructors from outside departments who are hired by ENVST to teach specific courses on an adjunct basis. They are hired by the Program Director on an ongoing annual basis, and reviewed annually by the ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee, the Program Director, and the Assistant Director, following the procedures outlined below.

3. The Professor of Sustainability, who has a tenure-track position. This is a joint appointment shared by the College of Humanities and the College of Social and Behavioral Science. The person who holds this position has teaching responsibilities in the ENVST Program, holds a position in a home department, and must undergo standard RPT procedures in that department. This person’s teaching responsibilities for the ENVST Program are periodically reviewed by the ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee, the Program Director, the Assistant Director, and the deans of the Colleges of Humanities and Social and Behavioral Science.

4. The Assistant Director, who has teaching responsibilities in the ENVST Program. The Assistant Director is hired by the Director in consultation with the Dean, and is reviewed annually by both the Program Director and the Dean. The Assistant Director’s teaching is reviewed annually by the ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee and the Director. Because this person teaches for the program, he/she is eligible for appointment and/or promotion to the rank of Assistant, Associate, or Professor (Lecturer) in ENVST if she or he meets the criteria outlined below.

5. A non-tenure track teaching position in the ENVST Program. This person is hired by the Director, in consultation with and subject to approval by the Dean and in accordance with the procedures outlined below. This person is eligible for appointment or promotion to the rank of Assistant, Associate, or Professor (Lecturer) in ENVST if she or he meets the criteria outlined below.
III. Program Structure

A. Overview

The ENVST Program is quite small, directly employing only four teaching personnel: the part-time Director, the Assistant Director, an instructor, and 1/3 of the appointment of the Professor of Sustainability. The Program also hires on a temporary basis regular faculty and instructors to teach specific courses. The Program Director reports directly to the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science. Faculty consultation and input comes from three committees: The ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee, described in detail below; the ENVST Advisory Board, which consists of representatives of the colleges with courses in the ENVST curriculum; and the College Curriculum Committee. Of these three committees, only the ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee has a role in appointment, retention, and promotion decisions.

B. Joint appointment faculty

The term joint appointment (sometimes known as “split appointment”) refers to a tenure-line faculty member who has a faculty appointment in a home department and also has responsibilities in ENVST. The funding obligation for such a person’s single faculty appointment at the University is “split” between two units—the home department and ENVST. Accordingly, the appropriate fraction (typically 50% although it may be higher or lower) of each joint appointment faculty member's teaching and other professional responsibilities are housed in ENVST, and the other fraction in his or her home department. As described in University Policy:

“When a candidate for retention, tenure or promotion in a department is also a member of an academic program, the department chairperson shall notify the chair/director of the academic program of the action to be considered at the same time that the faculty candidate is notified. Academic program faculty as defined by Procedures established by the program (and not participating in the departmental review committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation which shall be sent to the department chair in a timely manner.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-4)

The ENVST Program Director shall respond to this request and provide a recommendation letter to the joint appointment faculty member’s home department.

C. ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee membership and functions

This committee consists of:

1. Four ENVST faculty, defined as people who teach courses funded by the ENVST Program. These individuals have the greatest stake in how the program is managed, and their professional lives are directly affected by the administration of the program, and thus they should have a significant voice in the administration of the ENVST Program. Thus, these members will be chosen from:
   -- tenured/tenure-track faculty who teach an ENVST course (not including cross-listed courses that are offered by other departments) as either overload or inload
--people with a Ph.D. hired to teach individual courses as Adjuncts
--people with a Ph.D. hired as Associate Instructors to teach ENVST courses
--the person who holds the position of Professor of Sustainability

These four members will be appointed by the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science with advice from the Program Director and the members of this committee, and serve for a two-year term.

2. Three tenured/tenure-track faculty members, two from the College of Social and Behavioral Science, and one from another college. These three members will be appointed by the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science with advice from the Program Director and the members of this committee, and serve for a two-year term.

3. The Program Director as ex officio. The full authority for ultimate decision making rests with the Program Director, with the reporting line directly to the Dean’s office. In the case of a disagreement between a majority of people on this committee and the Program Director, they can appeal directly to the Dean. The committee will be chaired by a member of the committee selected by vote by committee members and will serve a two-year term. The committee will meet once each fall and spring semester, and on other occasions when additional input is desired.

The Committee’s duties are:
-- Approve all changes and additions to the ENVST curriculum.
-- Advise and consult with ENVST staff, including the Program Director, on all program matters.
-- Assist the Program in development and external fund-raising efforts.
-- Assist in regular program reviews and evaluations, including RPT reviews of tenure-line ENVST faculty from other departments.
-- Advise the Dean on future appointments of the Program Director.
-- Assist the Program Director to maximize program quality and financial sustainability.
-- A subcommittee will identify “affiliated faculty” and invite them to join a list of faculty identified as such. This subcommittee will recommend the appropriate criteria and titles for affiliated status. All appointments of “affiliated faculty” must be approved by the full committee.

IV. Process for appointments, reappointments, and reappointments with promotion

A. Overview

All ENVST course instructors are reviewed informally annually, and candidates for Lectureship promotions undergo a more extensive review at the time they apply for promotion. A more extensive review will also occur for all course instructors at least every five years, whether or not the individual is applying for promotion. Ordinarily, three years of experience teaching at least one ENVST course each fall and spring semester will be required before a candidate may apply for promotion from Associate Instructor to Assistant Professor (Lecturer), five years of subsequent service before application for promotion to Associate Professor (Lecturer), and an additional five years of service before application for promotion to Professor (Lecturer). However, this timeline may be abridged if the candidate’s qualifications appear to warrant such action. Nor is promotion automatic after a certain period of service; rather, promotions are based
on satisfaction of the appropriate criteria and standards. (See the explanation of criteria for advancement below in Section V.)

1. For non-faculty instructional personnel

Candidates for initial appointment as Associate Instructors for the ENVST Program will submit to the Program Director and Assistant Director an application letter, a current CV, copies of student evaluations from courses taught, and two letters of recommendation from persons familiar with their teaching. ENVST emphasizes teaching and program contributions; thus, the candidate’s skill, activity, and innovation in these areas will be the most important in securing a position.

Candidates are interviewed at one of the periodic ENVST Executive/Curriculum Committee meetings, so that input from all course instructors may be sought. Final decisions regarding hiring are made by the Program Director and Assistant Director, in consultation with the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science. Instructors will normally teach no more than two ENVST courses per semester in their first, probationary year unless they already have a record of teaching excellence.

2. For Lecturers

Candidate files for appointment to or promotion within Lectureship ranks are initially evaluated by the Program Director and Assistant Director. They then seek input from the Executive/Curriculum Committee and the ENVST Student Advisory Committee (SAC). Faculty participating in promotion decisions must be of equal or greater rank to the person being considered for promotion. After evaluating the candidate’s file (the contents of which are detailed below) and receiving input from the Executive/Curriculum Committee and the SAC, the Program Director prepares a recommendation regarding the candidate’s application, which is forwarded to the Dean. If the Program Director’s recommendation differs from that of the Assistant Director, the Executive/Curriculum Committee, or the SAC, s/he will state specifically the reasons for such difference. The Assistant Director, Executive/Curriculum Committee, and the SAC may, at their discretion, also submit recommendations directly to the Dean. The Dean will make the final choice, in accord with the steps for external review of Lectureship candidates set forth in University Rule 6-310 and Policy 6-302.

A. Annual reviews for all course instructors in ENVST

All ENVST teaching personnel – Associate Instructors and Lecturers -- are reviewed informally annually. In the case of Associate Instructors and any Lecturers on annual appointments rather than multi-year appointments, this review determines eligibility for reappointment. For both Associate Instructors and Lecturers, the annual review may, at the discretion of the Program Director, also produce recommendations for salary increases if funds for such are available.

To initiate this informal annual review process, the Associate Instructor or annually appointed Lecturer will submit in May of each year a letter to the ENVST Program Director outlining activity and accomplishments within the ENVST Program, the University, and the wider
community during the past academic year. This letter will be accompanied by copies of ENVST course syllabi and student evaluations from the past academic year as well as documentation relevant to other criteria, as noted below in Section V, and input from the candidate’s peers, students, and the Assistant Director.

Review of this material will be conducted by the Program Director and Assistant Director, who will make a recommendation to the Dean, who will then determine whether or not reappointment and/or salary increases are warranted.

B. Formal reviews for Lecturers in ENVST

As noted above, Lecturers are reviewed informally on an annual basis in conjunction with offers of salary for the coming year. Such review requires that a letter outlining accomplishments and activities over the last academic year be sent to the Program Director, accompanied by a current CV, copies of syllabi of courses taught that year, and student evaluations from the past year, as well as documentation relevant to other criteria, as noted below in Section V, and input from the candidate’s peers, students, and the Assistant Director. This material is reviewed by the Program Director and Assistant Director and a recommendation is made to the Dean.

Formal review will be coordinated with the process of considering candidates for reappointment after a multi-year contract has expired (if such should be offered), when candidates have applied for promotion within the Lectureship ranks, or at least once every five years in the case of Lecturers who are not seeking promotion. It will require that candidates submit a file constituted by the material detailed below, which will be examined by the Program Director, Assistant Director, Executive/Curriculum Committee, and ENVST SAC. The Director will then forward a recommendation to the Dean. The Assistant Director, the Executive/Curriculum Committee, and the SAC may, at their discretion, also submit recommendations directly to the Dean. The Dean will make the final decision. Faculty participating in promotion decisions must be of equal or greater rank to the person being considered for promotion.

C. Contents of the file of a candidate for formal review, Lectureship appointment, or promotion within Lectureship ranks

The ENVST course instructor undergoing formal review either at the five-year mark or in conjunction with application for Lectureship or promotion within Lectureship ranks must submit the following to initiate this process:

- An application letter reviewing program activities and accomplishments since joining the ENVST Program or since initial appointment to a Lectureship rank, and outlining plans for future contributions to the program.
- A current CV.
- Copies of syllabi of all courses taught for ENVST.
- Copies of all student evaluations from ENVST courses for the past five academic years.
- Evaluative letters or other similar evidence of teaching effectiveness and contributions to the ENVST Program as, for example, from students, supervisors, peers, or community or campus partners.
• Evidence of having met other criteria as set forth below.

It shall be the responsibility of the Program Director to see that candidate files are collected and complete.

V. General criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion of ENVST Associate Instructors and Lecturers

Instructors of ENVST courses, in whatever category, are expected to advance program goals and to establish a record of significant accomplishment in supporting the ENVST mission. Such accomplishment is measured by tracking their performance using the following metrics, applicable to both Associate Instructors and Lecturers:

A. Design and implementation of course syllabi that fulfill program aims and University expectations for courses.

B. Implementation of the AAC&U Liberal Education for America’s Promise Essential Learning Objectives as adopted by the Board of Regents and promoted by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, development of assignments reflecting realization of these Essential Learning Objectives, and eventual display of responses to these assignments in e-portfolios.

C. Effective teaching performance, as measured through standard University course evaluations, as compared with the evaluations of course instructors teaching other courses of comparable size and level in ENVST and throughout the University.

D. Reflections on teaching effectiveness emerging from exit interviews with students in the instructor’s ENVST courses.

E. Recommendations regarding re-appointment and/or rank advancement generated by the Student Advisory Committee.

F. Reflections on teaching effectiveness emerging from interviews with the Assistant Director.

G. Observation and assessment by the Program Director of the quality of teaching and satisfaction with courses.

H. Service to the program, including attendance at periodic faculty meetings, representing ENVST in various venues, student recruitment and program marketing efforts, and planning of and/or participation in ENVST special events.

I. Contributions made to the ENVST program and efforts toward its ongoing development, improvement, and impact.

J. Sustained accessibility to students as manifested in advising, counseling, writing of
recommendations, working outside of class with students, and other interactions.

K. Innovations in pedagogy, curriculum, class activities, teamwork, or assessment of student learning.

L. ENVST curriculum development, including proposal and/or implementation of new partnerships with colleges and programs.

M. Establishing, maintaining, expanding, or promoting collaboration between ENVST and other colleges, departments, or programs.

N. Awards for teaching and/or service given by the University, community, professional or academic societies, non-profit organizations, etc.

O. Establishing, maintaining, expanding, or promoting ENVST’s outreach beyond the campus.

P. Service to the wider University and the non-University community through, for example, committee membership or the establishment, maintenance, or expansion of community service partnerships.

Q. Designing or conducting program assessment and the reporting of assessment results in various venues.

R. Publishing and/or giving conference presentations relevant to or reflecting the ENVST Program, its curricula, and its mission.

S. Serving in an administrative capacity within ENVST, as Program Director, Assistant Director, or in other ad hoc or standing offices.

As noted above, these criteria for success in the ENVST Program are applicable both to Associate Instructors and to Lecturers at all ranks. However, for reappointment as an Associate Instructor, more emphasis will be given to excellence in teaching than to other contributions to the Program, and no evaluation by the SAC will be required. See below, Section VI, for the specific standards applicable to appointment of ENVST course instructors at the Associate Instructor level, as well as the standards for promotion from Associate Instructor to Assistant Professor (Lecturer) and within the Lectureship ranks.

Evidence that candidates have met these standards should emerge from and is detailed in the description of the contents of the candidate’s file.

VI. Standards for each level of advancement as an ENVST course instructor

A. Standards qualifying candidates for initial appointment and reappointment as ENVST Associate Instructors are:
1. The candidate must hold the Ph.D. or appropriate professional terminal degree; and

2. The candidate must have at least one year’s teaching experience, which might have been acquired as a Teaching Assistant, with strong teaching evaluations.

B. Standards for promotion from Associate Instructor to Assistant Professor (Lecturer) and within the Lectureship ranks

1. Overview: Ordinary timing of promotions

Three years of service in ENVST, teaching at least one ENVST class per year, is required before an Associate Instructor in ENVST may apply for Lectureship at the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer). However, candidates demonstrating exceptional qualifications and previous experience may initially be appointed to a Lectureship rank in the ENVST Program, without having to serve first as Associate Instructors. This might, for example, be the case for a candidate who came to the University without a faculty appointment, but who held such an appointment at a previous institution of higher learning.

After attainment of the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer), another five years of teaching at least one ENVST per year must elapse before application for promotion to Associate Professor (Lecturer), and another five years of teaching in ENVST beyond this before application for award of the rank of Professor (Lecturer). Again, this timeline may be abridged in exceptional cases, and such advancement is certainly not automatic upon completion of the requisite years of service. Advancement standards, detailed below, may be summarized as sustained and superior service to the ENVST Program and its students. At each level, the candidate’s activities will be evaluated in terms of their significance, innovation, and impact as well as their potential for contribution to program development. Lectureship appointments in ENVST instituted under Rule and Policy 6-310 will be considered to be initial appointments within ENVST and will not depend on or refer to any rank or appointment already held at the University of Utah or elsewhere.

2. To be considered for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer) in ENVST

The candidate must show evidence that s/he has fulfilled the criteria A through H as described above in Section V, either in the ENVST Program or in an analogous teaching situation at the University of Utah or at another institution of higher learning. The academic record of successful teaching of Associate Instructors or other applicants who apply for the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer) should demonstrate effectiveness and the potential for future excellence. The rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer) will be awarded to candidates who are consistently prepared and effective in their teaching, clearly articulating teaching objectives, using effective methods of conveying information and skills, and providing timely and meaningful feedback and assessment of student learning. The candidate will also be assessed in regard to the quality of their counseling, mentoring, and advising of ENVST students; these will be considered requisite for attainment of the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer), as will other service to the
ENVST Program, including attendance at faculty meetings, and planning of and/or participation in ENVST special events.

3. **To be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (Lecturer) in ENVST:**

The candidate must show evidence that s/he has fulfilled the following criteria as described above in Section V, either in the ENVST Program or in an analogous teaching situation at the University of Utah or at another institution of higher learning:

   a. Criteria A through M: The successful candidate will demonstrate creativity and innovation in developing and delivering new pedagogies. Standards include performing teaching responsibilities with consistency, imagination, and resourcefulness, employing effective methods of teaching, and receiving consistently good teaching evaluations. Receipt of University, community, disciplinary, or other awards for teaching or service and innovative contributions to ENVST curricula shall not be requisite for award of the rank of Associate Professor (Lecturer), but would strengthen a candidate’s application. In addition, the successful candidate will demonstrate a strong record of regularly interacting with students in advising and mentoring roles, and have established, maintained, or expanded collaboration between ENVST and other colleges, departments or programs, either on or beyond the campus; served the University or wider community in a significant fashion; and given sustained service to the Program in the form of representing ENVST in various venues, assisting with special ENVST events, or participating in ENVST student recruitment or marketing efforts.

4. **To be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor (Lecturer) in ENVST:**

The candidate must show evidence that s/he has fulfilled all the criteria described in Section V, either in the ENVST Program or in an analogous teaching situation at the University of Utah or at another institution of higher learning. This promotion is based on a consistent record of teaching excellence as evidenced by: student evaluations and SAC reports; teaching that is stimulating, informed, timely, and scholarly, employing innovative or effective methodologies; teaching or service awards from the University, community, disciplinary bodies, or other organizations; designed or helped to design new ENVST curricula, classroom pedagogies, teamwork strategies, or techniques for assessment of student learning; regular interaction with ENVST students in a mentoring and advising capacity; establish, develop, or sustain ENVST partnerships with other colleges, departments, or programs on campus; promote the ENVST Program through relevant presentations, publications, or by generating or revising internal working plans and documents; attend and assist in planning and carrying out special ENVST events; promote ENVST’s outreach beyond campus; and serve the wider University through committee memberships or community service partnerships. Serving in an administrative capacity within the program shall not be considered requisite for appointment to this rank but, if fulfilled, would strengthen the candidate’s application.
Memorandum

To: Arnold B. Combe, Vice President for Administrative Services
From: Robert Payne, Associate General Counsel
      Scott Folsom, Chief of Police
Date: April 8, 2013
Re: Policy 3-232, OPERATING REGULATIONS FOR BICYCLES, SKATEBOARDS, ROLLERSKATES AND SCOOTERS

Attached for your consideration is revised policy 3-232. The University has noticed a significant increase in the use of bicycles, skateboards and other non-motorized devices on campus. Though the University encourages alternative forms of transportation to, from and across campus, some operators of non-motorized devices use their devices in unsafe and damaging ways that place others in the University community at risk and cause significant damage to University property. This policy has been revised to provide greater clarity concerning the University’s expectations for operation of non-motorized devices on campus. The policy has also been revised to provide the University with more effective tools to enforce, and obtain compliance with, the policy including greater sanctions and the ability to impound devices in appropriate circumstances.

Please note that the enclosed policy has been reviewed and approved by a working committee which was comprised of members from across campus disciplines including University Relations, Student Affairs, ASUU, Facilities, UPD, General Counsel, Risk Management and Health and Safety. The policy has also been reviewed by the Institutional Policy Committee and by the Cabinet.

It is proposed that the enclosed policy take effect immediately upon approval by the Board of Trustees.

If you approve of this proposed revising of Policy 3-232, please sign your approval below, and forward this proposal to the Academic Senate Office, for consideration of the Senate Executive Committee and Senate.

Approved:

Arnold B. Combe, Vice President for Administrative Services
submitting to Academic Senate Executive Committee
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(Rev.2010-09-20)
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3. Contact person(s) for questions & comments (name, email, phone#): Robert Payne
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   b. Committees/Councils/other Officers consulted: Institutional Policy Committee, Bicycle/Skateboard Committee

6. Check YES or NA (not applicable) of documents submitted--- (In digital form. Preferred file format MS Word doc. Special exception allowed for PDF format if previously arranged.)
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   **Yes** VP/Presidential approval signatures (separate sheet, or affixed to memo cover).

   **Yes** Text of proposed Regulation addition/revision.

   **Yes** (If revision of existing Regulation) text changes are clearly marked, using permanent font markings (not MS Word 'Track' Changes non-permanent markings).

Date submitted to Senate Office: [April 8, 2013]

The Executive Committee will consider whether the proposal is ready for presentation to the full Senate, and if so will schedule it for a subsequent Senate meeting either as i) a matter of academic significance—set on the "Intent" & "Debate" Calendars over two monthly meetings with final "approval" voting at the second, or ii) not academically significant—set on the "Information" Calendar for a single monthly meeting, with opportunity for questions and recommendations. See Policy 1-001 http://www.regulations.utah.edu/general/1-001.html; Rule 1-001 http://www.regulations.utah.edu/general/rules/R1-001.html; Senate procedures http://www.admin.utah.edu/asenate/index.html. Further information--Senate Office: Nancy Lines 581-5203 nancy.lines@utah.edu.
I. **Purpose and Scope**

A. The purpose of this Policy is to govern the operation and use of non-motorized riding devices, including bicycles, skateboards, rollerskates and scooters, on the campus of, or on other property owned, operated or controlled by, the University of Utah.

   The University’s wishes to encourage and facilitate the use of non-motorized forms of transportation by members of the University community while also ensuring a safe environment for pedestrians, reducing risks of personal injury for pedestrians or device riders, and avoiding damage to University facilities caused by inappropriate use of devices on University premises. In order to balance these interests, the University finds it necessary to impose relatively greater usage restrictions on certain types of riding devices which lack effective braking or steering mechanisms.

B. This Policy governs the use of non-motorized riding devices by all members of the University community, which includes current University students and faculty, University employees, and other persons who are formally affiliated with the University. The use of such devices on University premises by other persons who are not formally affiliated with the University and who enter University premises as visitors (including patients and other visitors at University healthcare facilities) is not within the scope of this Policy, and is governed by a separate regulation (Utah Administrative Rule 805-1).

This Policy is not intended to govern the use of any non-motorized riding device carried out as a planned part of a special event specifically approved by University officials to be conducted on University premises, including a riding competition, exhibition, or similar event. Use of riding devices as part of any such event will be governed by the terms of any applicable contract or event rules.

II. **Definitions**

These definitions apply for the limited purposes of this Policy and any Rules or other University Regulations associated with this Policy.

A. "Bicycle" means a device propelled by human power upon which a person may ride having two tandem wheels either of which is more than 12 inches in diameter. It also includes any device generally recognized as a bicycle, although equipped with more than one front or rear wheel (e.g., a tricycle).

B. "Skateboard" means a non-motorized device consisting of two or more wheels affixed to a platform or footboard upon which a rider stands and which does not have steering capability similar to that of a bicycle or brakes which operate on or upon the wheels of the skateboard. It also includes every device generally recognized as a skateboard.

C. "Scooter" means a non-motorized device consisting of two or more wheels affixed to a platform or footboard upon which a rider stands and which has a handle or other mechanism for holding or guiding the device. It also includes every device generally recognized as a scooter. "Scooter" does not include such devices if they have steering capability similar to a bicycle and brakes that operate on or upon wheels of the device. It does not include mopeds, whether operated with or
without motor power. For the purpose of these regulations, mopeds and motorcycles are considered motor vehicles, and are not within the scope of this Policy.

D. "Rollerskates" means a device consisting of a shoe with a set of wheels attached for skating or a metal frame with wheels attached that can be fitted to the sole of a shoe worn by a person. It includes in-line skates, rollerblades and every device generally recognized as rollerskates.

E. "University property premises" means the University campus and any other real property or structure located on real property owned, operated or controlled by the University of Utah.

F. “Non-motorized riding device” means any non-motorized device designed or used for riding by one or more persons including any bicycle, skateboard, scooters, or rollerskates, as defined above. “Non-motorized riding device” does not include a wheelchair or similar device when being used for transportation by any person with disabilities or a baby stroller or similar device when being used for transporting any child.

G. “University-related activities” are those activities ordinarily engaged in on University premises by members of the University community in conjunction with their formal affiliations with the University. They include but are not limited to teaching or attending classes; preparing for, presenting at or attending lectures, panel discussions, cultural exhibits, or similar presentations; studying; conducting research; participating in free speech activities; using designated recreation facilities; participating in extracurricular activities managed by official student organizations; residing in University-operated residential facilities; and carrying out any assigned duties of University employees.

III. Policy

Bicycles

A. Permissible and Impermissible Uses of Non-Motorized Riding Devices.

1. Every person riding a bicycle shall exercise due care and reasonable caution to prevent injury to others, to self, or to property. Obstacle riding or other acts or maneuvers which may endanger the bicycle operator or others or damage property is prohibited. Members of the University community (including students or employees) may ride non-motorized riding devices on University premises for the limited purposes of commuting to or from the University, or commuting between University locations, in conjunction with participating in University-related activities. Except as specifically described immediately below, any recreational, athletic, or other use of a non-motorized riding device on University premises unrelated to participation in University-related activities is strictly prohibited. This recreational use prohibition shall not apply to officially designated sections of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail which traverse the east end of the University campus.

2. Every person riding a bicycle shall yield the right of way to pedestrians at all times. In areas where designated bicycle paths are provided, bicycles may only be ridden in such designated bicycle paths. Where bicycle paths are not available for reaching a particular location, bicycles may be ridden upon roadways and pedestrian sidewalks to reach such areas. However, the University may identify and by appropriate signage designate some locations in which bicycle riding is prohibited either permanently or during certain time periods (e.g., restricting bicycle riding on certain highly congested pedestrian walkways during designated periods). Bicycle
riders shall comply with all official traffic control devices and signs including posted signs prohibiting riding in a particular designated location. Bicyclists may dismount and walk their bicycles across any pedestrian accessible area in which bicycling riding is prohibited.

3. No person riding a bicycle shall exceed a reasonable and proper speed under the circumstances then and there existing. In no event shall any person ride a bicycle at a speed greater than 10 miles per hour upon any sidewalk or pedestrian pathway except as part of a university approved competition or function. Skateboards, scooters and rollerskates (or other non-motorized riding devices other than bicycles) may only be ridden upon designated bicycle paths and pedestrian pathways. Riding such devices on roadways or in parking lots is strictly prohibited at all times—because the University has determined that such uses would present unacceptable risks of injury to riders and other users, and unacceptable impeding of motor vehicle traffic in such areas. Also, the University may identify and by appropriate signage designate certain areas in which riding of any particular type of non-motorized device is prohibited (e.g., it may designate certain pedestrian pathways as off-limits for skateboard riding because risks of personal injury are heightened due to steep grades or congestion). Persons riding such non-motorized riding devices shall comply with all official traffic control devices and signs including posted signs prohibiting riding in a particular designated location. Device users may dismount and carry their devices across any pedestrian accessible area in which riding of such devices is prohibited.

4. Bicycles Non-motorized riding devices of any type shall not be ridden upon any ramp, stairway, wall, bench, fountain, or other structure or facility, or on or over landscaping, shrubbery, grass or flower beds. Bicycles Such devices shall not be ridden within any building or parking structure except as part of a university approved competition or function.

5. Unless otherwise provided by regulations or traffic signs, bicycles may only be ridden upon roadways and sidewalks, except that where a bicycle path has been provided adjacent to a roadway or sidewalk, bicycle riders shall use such bicycle path. Every person riding a non-motorized riding device in any pedestrian accessible area shall yield the right of way to pedestrians at all times.

6. No person riding a bicycle shall attach the same in any manner to any moving vehicle, except that this shall not prohibit the attaching to a bicycle of a bicycle trailer or semitrailer specifically designed for such attachment. Every person riding a non-motorized riding device shall exercise due care and reasonable caution to prevent injury to others, to self, or to property.

7. No person riding a non-motorized riding device shall exceed a reasonable and proper speed under the circumstances then and there existing (including the limited braking or steering capabilities of the device). In no instance shall any person operate a non-motorized riding device at a speed greater than 10 miles per hour upon any bicycle path, sidewalk or other pedestrian pathway.

8. Bicycles Non-motorized riding devices shall not be ridden two or more abreast on any bicycle path, sidewalk or other pedestrian walkway, except as part of a university approved competition or function.
8. No person shall ride a bicycle upon or along a sidewalk, pedestrian walkway, or across a roadway where the riding of bicycles is prohibited by official traffic control devices or signs, except as part of a university approved competition or function.

9. No bicycle non-motorized riding device shall be used to carry more persons at one time than the number for which it is designed and equipped, except that an adult bicycle rider may carry a child securely attached to his/her person in a backpack or sling or in a child carrier securely attached to the bicycle. No bicycle rider shall carry any package, bundle, or other article which may prevent the rider from keeping at least one hand on the handle bars.

10. No non-motorized riding device shall attach the same in any manner to any moving motor vehicle, except that this shall not prohibit the attaching to a bicycle of a bicycle trailer or semitrailer specifically designed for such attachment.

11. Every bicycle ridden on University premises shall be equipped with such brakes, reflectors and other safety devices as is required by State Utah state law for operating a bicycle on streets or highways.

12. No non-motorized riding devices of any type shall be left unattended or parked on or at ramps, entrances or other facilities designated for persons with physical disabilities or in such a manner as to impede the free and clear use of such facilities.

13. No non-motorized riding devices shall be left unattended or parked in the public areas of any building, including but not limited to hallways, stairwells, and classrooms. Such devices shall not be left unattended or parked at or near any building entrance or exit in such manner as to impede the free and clear use of such areas.

14. No non-motorized devices shall be parked at or attached to any fire hydrant, standpipe, building service equipment or other safety device.

15. No bicycles may be ridden on university property between the hours of 11:30 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. except as necessary for the transportation of university employees and students who have legitimate reasons for being on university property during these hours.

16. State traffic laws pertaining to bicycles are in full force and effect on university property.

A. Skateboards, Scooters and Rollerskates

1. Every person riding a skateboard or scooter or using rollerskates shall exercise due care and reasonable caution to prevent injury to others, to self, or to property.

2. Every person riding a skateboard or scooter or using rollerskates shall yield the right of way to pedestrians at all times.

3. No person riding a skateboard or scooter or using rollerskates shall exceed a reasonable and proper speed under the circumstances then and there existing and in no event shall any person riding a skateboard or scooter or using rollerskates exceed a speed of 10 miles per hour upon any sidewalk or pedestrian walkway except as part of a university approved competition or function.

4. Skateboards, scooters or rollerskates shall not be ridden upon or used on any ramp, stairway, wall, bench, fountain, or other structure or facility or on or over any landscaped...
area, including, but not limited to, grass, shrubbery, or flower beds. Skateboards, scooters and rollerskates shall not be ridden or used within any building or parking structure.

5. Unless otherwise provided by regulations or traffic signs, skateboards, scooters and rollerskates may only be ridden or used upon pedestrian sidewalks. Skateboards, scooters and rollerskates shall not be ridden or used upon any sidewalk where there is a posted sign prohibiting such activity. Except as part of a university-approved competition or function, skateboards, scooters, and rollerskates shall not be ridden or used in any parking lot.

6. Skateboard and scooter riders and rollerskate users shall not engage in obstacle riding or other acts or maneuvers which may endanger the rider or others or which may damage property.

7. Skateboards, scooters, or rollerskates shall not be left unattended on or at ramps, entrances or other facilities designated for persons with physical disabilities or in such a manner as to impede the free and clear use of such facilities.

8. Skateboards, scooters, or rollerskates shall not be left unattended in the public areas of any building, including but not limited to hallways, stairwells, and classrooms. Skateboards, scooters, or rollerskates shall not be left unattended at or near any building entrance or exit in such a manner as to impede the free and clear use of such areas.

9. The appropriate bodies may adopt policies concerning the riding of skateboards and scooters and the use of rollerskates in university student apartment areas.

10. No skateboards, scooters, or rollerskates may be ridden or used on university property between the hours of 11:30 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. except as necessary for the transportation of university employees and students who have legitimate reasons for being on university property during these hours.

11. All state laws pertaining to skateboards, scooters or rollerskates are in full force and effect on university property.

B. Sanctions for impermissible Uses

1. These regulations will be enforced against university students, university staff and university faculty by violation notices which will be processed and settled through the office of Parking and Transportation Services. Any member of the University community who violates sections III(A)(1) through III(A)(10), above may be subject to the following sanctions:

a. For a first offense, the University will record the individual’s name and provide a written warning against further non-motorized riding device use in violation of this Policy. If, at the time of violation, an individual does not produce satisfactory identification, his/her non-motorized riding device will be impounded. The non-motorized riding device will be released when the individual presents appropriate proof of the individual’s identification to the University’s Department of Public Safety. There is no impoundment fee (or any fine) for the first offense. (However, note that per section III-F below, any violation which results in serious injury to another person or major damage to property could result in criminal prosecution or civil liability under applicable Utah state law. In such serious cases, a Public Safety officer may take the device into custody as evidence).

b. For a second offense which takes place within twenty-four months of an individual’s first offense or warning, the non-motorized riding device will be impounded for not
less than forty-eight hours and the individual shall be required to pay a fine of not less than $100 dollars plus the applicable impoundment fee.

c. For offenses after an individual’s second offense, which are within twenty-four months of the individual’s immediately preceding offense, the non-motorized riding device will be impounded for not less than thirty calendar days and the offender shall be subject to an escalating schedule of fines for each offense beyond the second offense, plus the applicable impoundment fee.

d. Member of the University community who commit two or more offenses under this section, and/or who fail to pay fines levied under this section, may also be subject to discipline under the appropriate other University Policies (including for student violators the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities—Policy 6-400).

e. In appropriate cases, including but not limited to chronic or flagrant violations of this Policy, members of the University community may be prohibited from riding or using non-motorized devices on University premises, permanently or for a designated period.

2. Any member of the University community who violates sections III(A)(1) through III(A)(14), above may be subject to the following sanctions:

a. Payment of violation. Receipt of a violation notice which will be processed and settled through the office of Commuter Services. Violation notice fees shall be paid within seven working days of receipt of the notice. After the seven day period, additional fees or penalties will be invoked. It is the responsibility of the recipient of a violation notice to promptly settle it.

b. Non-motorized devices parked or placed in prohibited areas will be impounded, or otherwise secured by the Department of Public Safety. Non-motorized devices parked or placed in areas where they may constitute a hazard to others will be removed and impounded.

3. Unsettled violation notice fees may be withheld from the paychecks of faculty and staff. The sanctions set forth under section III(B)(2) will not be applied in in an instance in which an individual receives sanctions under section III(B)(1) for the same offense.

4. Unsettled fines, impoundment fees and violation notice fees may be withheld from the paychecks of a University employee. Registration holds may be placed against delinquent student violators; student registration for courses may be canceled in any instance where a student circumvents the system and registers without clearing delinquent violation notices; transcripts of credits may be withheld for students leaving the University with delinquent violation notices. Chronic or flagrant student violators may be referred to the Student Behavior Committee for appropriate disciplinary action.

5. Chronic or flagrant student violators may be referred to the Student Behavior Committee for appropriate disciplinary action.
6. These regulations will be enforced against nonuniversity affiliated persons by alternative violation notices. These alternative violation notices will be handled in the same manner as alternative parking violation notices.

7. Failure to settle alternative violation notice fees by non-university affiliated persons may result in civil or criminal penalties.

8. Violation notices and alternative violation notices

C. Impoundment

Impounded non-motorized riding devices will be held by the University’s Department of Public Safety or office of Commuter Services and released only during regular business hours to individuals with satisfactory identification. Payment of an impoundment fee (not to exceed $25) will also be required for release, except as provided in (III)(B)(1)(a) above.

Devices impounded under this section will be held for a maximum of sixty days following the applicable impoundment period. Devices not retrieved during this period are presumed to have been abandoned and will be subject to disposal by University Surplus and Salvage. The device owner who has abandoned his/her device shall not be entitled to repurchase the device at University Surplus and Salvage.

The University and its officers, agents, and employees shall not be liable for loss or damage of any kind resulting from impounding, storage, or sale of any item under this section.

Impoundment or sale of any non-motorized riding device under this section shall neither substitute for, nor release any person from, liability for damage to persons or property caused by use of a non-motorized device on University premises (under applicable Utah law per Part III-E); nor does it remove the obligation for any fines or fees associated with the violation or other outstanding citations. Any proceeds resulting from the sale of a non-motorized riding device will be credited toward the outstanding fee associated with the impoundment of that device.

D. Appeals

1. Impoundments and fines or fees assessed pursuant to Section III(B)(1) above may be appealed to the Parking Appeals Office under the same rules, including time limitations, as parking violation notices. The decision of the Vice President for Administrative Services, or his designee, shall be final.

2. An adverse ruling of the Parking Violation notices provided pursuant to Section III(B)(2) above may be appealed to University’s office of Commuter Services under the same rules, including time limitations, as parking violation notices. An adverse ruling of an Appeals Officer may be appealed to the Campus Citation Appeals Committee under the same rules, including time limitations, as parking violation notices. The decision of the Parking Appeals Committee shall be final.

10. Bicycles, scooters, skateboards, or rollerskates parked or placed in prohibited areas will be impounded, or otherwise secured by the Department of Public Safety. Bicycles, scooters, skateboards, or rollerskates parked or placed in areas where they may constitute a hazard to others will be removed and impounded.
11. In appropriate cases, including but not limited to chronic or flagrant violations of these regulations, university affiliated persons or nonuniversity affiliated persons may be prohibited from riding or using bicycles, scooters, skateboards or rollerskates on university property.

12. In appropriate cases, including but not limited to chronic or flagrant violations of these regulations, non-university affiliated persons may be ordered to leave university property. Failure to leave university property when ordered to do so by a university officer is a Class C misdemeanor.

E. Other Applicable Regulations and Laws

1. The University may adopt and enforce additional regulations specifically concerning the riding of non-motorized devices in designated University student housing areas.

2. All Utah state laws pertaining to non-motorized riding devices are in full force and effect on University premises. In particular, improper usage of such devices resulting in injury to other persons or property damage may subject the user to criminal prosecution or civil liability under applicable state law, in addition to any sanctions provided for under this Policy.

IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources

[reserved]

V. References

A. Federal, State and Local Laws
   1. Utah Administrative Rule R805-1, Operating Regulations for Bicycles, Skateboards and Scooters

B. Relevant University Regulations
   a. Policy 3-233: Operation of Motorized Vehicles on Pedestrian Walks

VI. Contacts:

   Policy Officer: Chief of Police (801) 581-7619
   Policy Owner: Vice President Administrative Services (801) 581-6404

VII. History: Original policy adopted July 10, 1995. Amendments adopted by the Board of Trustees on
March 26, 2013

Michael L. Hardman
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
205 Park Bldg.
Campus

RE: Undergraduate Council Review
LEAP Program Review

Dear Vice President Hardman:

Enclosed is the Undergraduate Council's review of the LEAP Program. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Undergraduate Council, the self-study, and the Memorandum of Understanding resulting from the review wrap-up meeting.

After your approval, please forward this packet to the Executive Committee of the Senate for its review. It will then be sent to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next Senate meeting.

Sincerely,

Ann Darling
Senior Associate Dean
Undergraduate Studies

Encl.

XC: Martha Bradley, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Carolyn Bliss, Director, LEAP Program
Jeff Webb, Associate Director, LEAP Program
The Undergraduate Council has completed its study of the LEAP Program.

The External Review Committee was:
M. Gregory Kendrick, Director
Freshman Cluster Program, University of California Los Angeles
Jennifer Keup, Director
National Resource Center for the First Year Experience and Students in Transition
Marilyn Linton, Associate Vice Provost
Undergraduate Studies, University of Oregon

The Internal Review Committee from the University of Utah was:
Patricia Eisenman, Professor
College of Health
Susan Olson, Associate Vice President Emerita
Professor Emerita, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Brent Schneider, Professor
College of Fine Arts

The Undergraduate Council Review Committee was:
Sharon Aiken-Wisniewski
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs/Undergraduate Studies
Associate Dean for University College Advising
Alexa Doig, Assistant Professor
College of Nursing
Ole W. Fischer, Assistant Professor
School of Architecture

The following summary is based on the LEAP Program self-study and reports provided by External and Internal Review Committees.
Part I. General Program Overview

This is the first formal review of the LEAP Program that was established in 1994 by an interdisciplinary group of faculty.

Program Description

The LEAP program mission, as described in the self study document is to “provide first-year students with a good start in college, equipping them with strategies leading to academic success, anchoring them in campus and community life, assisting them in choosing and beginning their majors, and thereby encouraging their retention and persistence to graduation.” In 2005 the LEAP Program won a university-level award for Equity and Diversity, and in 2011 was given the Utah Campus Compact Award for a Community Engaged Program.

The LEAP program enrolls approximately one third of the incoming freshman class, having enrolled 1000 students in 2010.

Currently all tracks in the LEAP program offer a two-semester general education course series (called LEAP seminars) that satisfy one of the humanities and one of the social/behavioral sciences Intellectual Explorations requirements, as well as the University’s diversity requirement. Students are enrolled with a cohort and take the two seminars with the same instructor. In 2011-2012, the LEAP program taught 30 sections of the first year LEAP seminar series. The LEAP program also offers LEAP sections of the lower division writing requirement course in partnership with the University’s Writing Program. LEAP courses have an enrollment cap of 30 students.

The LEAP Program also offers tracks for students in specific majors or pre-professional tracks (Architecture, Engineering, College of Health, Business, Pre-Law, Fine Arts, and Education), special interest areas (Health Sciences, Service Learning) and student groups (residence halls, returning veterans, and international students). Two of these tracks offer a four-year program for under-represented and disadvantaged students–Health Sciences LEAP and Pre-Law LEAP. These tracks are described in more detail in the self-study document. The LEAP Program partners with University College to offer a one-credit course to help students investigate majors at the university.

Another component of LEAP is the Peer Advisor Program where LEAP alumni return to provide peer mentoring to current freshman cohorts. Peer Advisors who receive a stipend, are trained and supervised by a program faculty member, and provide a range of support services to the students. Each PA is assigned to one LEAP course. One of the Peer Advisors serves in a leadership role as a Senior Peer Advisor.

LEAP students are encouraged to participate in student engagement activities beyond the classroom, such as research, community service, teaching, and leadership activities. In some of the tracks, this level of engagement is a required part of the program.

LEAP is also a partner with the Honors program. Students achieving an A or A- grade in a LEAP course can count that course towards an Honors degree. There are scholarships available to students who transition from LEAP into Honors.
Program Administration

The LEAP Program is currently under the leadership of the Director, Carolyn Bliss and Associate Director, Jeff Webb. Internal and External Reviewers make particular note of the time and efforts that these program administrators have invested into the ongoing management, evaluation, refinement and expansion of the program.

There is an Executive Assistant (1.0 FTE) and an assistant to the Executive Assistant (0.75 FTE). These support staff manage administrative duties, planning and executing program events, keeping financial records, and supervision of outreach activities.

In 2010, the LEAP program instituted a new formal standing advisory committee called the LEAP Policy Board (to replace a cumbersome 25 member advisory board). The main role of the Policy Board was to implement a new faculty hiring and promotion policy (see Faculty). It was noted in the External Reviewer’s Report and in the program’s response to that review that this board could be better utilized to formalize program governance, and help the program respond to opportunities and negotiate challenges. The LEAP Policy Board currently lacks a formal role and mission.

Faculty

The LEAP Program currently employs thirteen faculty (updated, provided in the LEAP Program’s response to the Internal and External Reviews). All LEAP faculty (except the instructor for the Architecture LEAP who has a MS in Architecture) have a PhD in the humanities or social sciences in alignment with the topics of the first year seminar courses. LEAP faculty have won a wide variety of awards at the University and in the community.

Teaching faculty are generally part-time, with auxillary or academic staff appointments. The LEAP program has a systematic approach to socializing and mentoring new faculty in the role of LEAP instructor.

Faculty in the program, which is not directly associated with any college at the university, recently gained the opportunity to be appointed and promoted through the ranks of Lectureship positions. This opportunity was put in place in 2010 when the LEAP program was recognized by the University as a Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program. In the program’s response to the Internal and External Reviewers Report, it was stated that when hiring, retaining and promoting faculty, the LEAP program looks for teaching excellence and a record of scholarly work. The latter will become important for formal retention and promotion processes.

The University of Utah wants to increase the number of new students in LEAP. Also with the projected growth of new students that the University anticipates in the next 4 years, the program will need to hire more faculty to maintain the current instructor-to-student ratio. Another concern was limited funds for faculty professional development (e.g., attending conferences). When interviewed by the Internal Review Committee, LEAP faculty expressed an interest in becoming more involved in the university as a whole and serving on university committees.
Students

LEAP is designed for incoming freshmen, however any interested student may enroll and not all fit the traditional freshman mold. The latter groups include transfer students, freshmen with a significant number of AP or concurrent enrollment credit, returning missionaries, etc.

Recruitment

The LEAP program recruits students through its website, printed materials (sent out with all student recruitment packets through the University), and presentations at every orientation and student recruitment event. The program has a recruitment video that is shown at new student orientation. Former LEAP students are involved in the recruitment events. However, the program voiced a desire to find better ways to make incoming students aware of the program earlier and a better way to clarify the myriad of options within the learning community.

Student Support and Advising

The LEAP program offers student advising through LEAP seminar faculty who remain with the students for the two-semester course series and formal Peer Advising with one Peer Advisor assigned to each class. Also, University College offers modules on advising in many of the LEAP courses. Peer Advisors help with student retention, model successful student behavior, and are the liaison between the professor and the students. LEAP students can enroll in a one credit-hour course in major selection to explore majors with advising from the course faculty and advisors from different colleges.

Curriculum

As noted in the program overview, the LEAP curriculum consists of a two-semester general education course series (called LEAP seminars) that satisfies one of the humanities and one of the social/behavioral sciences Intellectual Explorations requirements, as well as the University’s diversity requirement. There are currently 14 different LEAP tracks and many of the LEAP seminars relate to the theme of the track. Many of the seminars involve guest speakers from colleges on campus or experts from the community. The program also offers LEAP sections of WRTG 2010 that satisfy the lower division writing requirement. In addition to the first year LEAP seminars and writing course sections, the LEAP Program provides students with a series of 10 library sessions where they learn about library resources and research strategies with university librarians. Students are encouraged/expected to apply their library training to their projects in their LEAP courses.

Diversity

Faculty

The LEAP program reports that eight instructors are women, five are men, and two are persons of color. The proportion of female faculty is substantially higher than for the University as a whole.

Students

The LEAP program has recruited approximately equal numbers of male and female students, with the females consistently representing slightly less than 50% of the student body over the past 5 years. Approximately one third of LEAP students self-identify as non-white, which is significantly higher than the University average (11%).
Program Effectiveness - Outcomes Assessment

Evaluation Methods

The LEAP program’s intended outcomes for students are stated in the self study document as follows:

Through participation in LEAP students will gain:

- The desire and confidence necessary to persevere in university study, as measured by: a) increased year-to-year retention, and b) on-time graduation.
- An understanding of available fields of study, enabling them to choose their majors in an informed and timely way.
- Intellectual skills ranging from knowledge of specific domains to analysis of text and data to evaluation of arguments (adapted from Bloom’s “Taxonomy of Cognitive Skills”).
- A sense of their active role in the university community.

The LEAP Program has a systematic approach to program evaluation. Although the program originally used a ‘home grown’ survey and the University’s senior exit survey (which is not implemented anymore), they currently use Educational Benchmarking Incorporated (EBI), an external company that administers online surveys and benchmarks programs against peer programs and institutions. The focus of the EBI survey is on the aforementioned expected student outcomes and the degree to which students believe the program is contributing to their growth as researchers, problem solvers, communicators, and citizens.

The LEAP Program faculty have also conducted research studies to compare outcomes for LEAP vs. non-LEAP students, and to examine program outcomes over time.

The Engineering LEAP program students create a portfolio of their work throughout the program, which is also used to track student learning outcomes.

Both the External and Internal Reviewer Reports highlight the program’s dedication to comprehensively evaluating student progression, achievement, and satisfaction related to expected student outcomes.

Summary of Main Program Outcomes

Student evaluations of LEAP courses are strong—recent course evaluation scores averaged 5.3/6 with an average of 5.45/6 for instructor scores. Historically these scores have been equal to, or in most instances, well above the university average.

Results from the 2011 EBI survey (first survey administered through this method, 27% response rate) found that students’ perception of course effectiveness was related to three factors – whether the course improved critical thinking, the usefulness of course readings, and whether the course included engaging pedagogy. All three factors were highly rated by students who completed the survey.

Results from a ‘twin study’ conducted by LEAP program faculty found that 1) LEAP students returned to the University for their second year at higher rates than matched non-LEAP students, 2) LEAP students had higher GPAs than matched non-LEAP students, and 3) 4- and 6-year graduation rates are higher among the LEAP students. These results were even more prominent for women.
Facilities and Resources

Physical Space

The LEAP program is housed in a small area within the Sill Center. The space has faculty offices, rooms for PAs, and space for the administrative staff. The program reports that with the remodeling of the building, more space (and hopefully a better designed) space will address their expanding space requirements.

The program also has a ‘LEAP House’ next to the Heritage Center on upper campus that provides a classroom, small computer lab, student lounge, and office space primarily for the Health Sciences LEAP program.

Program Funding

The LEAP program is funded by Undergraduate Studies (i.e., not through student credit hour revenue). The program’s estimate of expenses is close to $700,000/year with a discretionary budget of $9000/year.

The LEAP program secured $62,000 in scholarships for students and Peer Advisors. Program administrators consider this amount inadequate for the number of students (~1000) and continue to seek more development/advancement funding.

II. Commendations:

Both committees recognized the special strengths of the LEAP program:

1. The LEAP faculty fosters a collaborative culture both within its ranks and amongst faculty staff and administration, which underlines their emphasis on partnerships.

2. The LEAP faculty consists of dedicated, high-quality scholars and teachers from a wide range of personal backgrounds and disciplinary areas. Their skills have been recognized both by students in course evaluations and honored by national awards. These faculty members have become experts in freshman education and successfully integrated new colleagues into the collaborative style of the LEAP program.

3. The LEAP program has been successful in community building among students. The two-semester format keeps students together with the same classmates and instructor in small course sizes that allows relationships to grow. Increasing enrollment testifies to the program’s appeal to incoming students as well as the support from advising in encouraging students to register for these courses. Also, the College of Engineering sees LEAP as critical for facilitating concepts required in the ABET accreditation process, which resulted in many engineering students enrolling in LEAP.

4. The assessment plan for the LEAP program is comprehensive and innovative. It generates information that provides a strong foundation for a data-driven decision making culture. The assessment plan has evolved over the years to maintain relevancy and effectiveness. It is inclusive of course and instructor evaluations as well as student level assessments that include a national assessment tool and a question on the institution’s graduating senior survey. Together these tools collect data that addresses a range of outcome measures that speak to LEAP.
students’ retention and graduation as well as the students’ success with respect to other learning outcomes (such as critical thinking, reading and writing skills, information literacy, etc.).

The LEAP assessment plan represents a standard of best practice from a methodological perspective as well. Using data from multiple time-points allows for the development of a full and rich picture of program effectiveness and impact. The use of standard control group (i.e. comparison of LEAP and non-LEAP students) and of sophisticated matching and control group studies in the form of twin and triplet studies represents an innovative approach. Results from multivariate analyses are able to explore the more nuanced and conditional effects of the LEAP program on student outcomes. Finally, social network analyses are cutting-edge means of addressing the impact that the academic and social connections forged in the LEAP programs have on the satisfaction and performance of students. These ongoing self-assessment efforts will be published and have been supported with research grants.

5. The goals of the LEAP program – increased year-to-year retention and on-time graduation – are particularly amenable to precise analysis. In the twin study students who had participated in LEAP returned to the University for their second year (6.5%-points higher), earned higher average grades in their first year and also graduated at a statistically significantly higher rate than did non-LEAP students. While all students reap practically and statistically significant benefits from LEAP participation, it appears that the impact is even greater for women and students of color, who have been historically at-risk populations at the University of Utah.

6. The Peer Advising program is one of the most impressive features of the LEAP program. It provides freshmen students an additional source of guidance and gives the advisors a deeper experience with and lasting commitment to the University of Utah. Many peer advisors apply for the position because of the positive experience they had with a peer advisor in their freshman year. As strong advocates for the program, they understood and articulated its benefits, both for first-year students and for themselves as liaisons between faculty and LEAP students. The leadership opportunity for service on campus and in the wider community is particularly impressive. As part of their Peer Advisor (PA) committee work, PAs are involved in service initiatives and fundraising activities.

The training and mentoring of the Peer Advisors is well designed and successful in achieving its goals: PA’s enjoy a supportive community and feel well prepared to work with students and faculty. Initial training is done through a 10-week summer online course and two-day workshop at the start of the fall semester; PA’s meet with the LEAP professor regularly and as a group every other week. Peer Advisors felt the online training, experience in speaking to groups and other leadership activities, opportunity to work on campus, and relationship with faculty were all very good. The triplet study demonstrated that peer advisors persisted to graduation at a significantly higher rate than regular LEAP students or non-LEAP students.

7. Another strength of the LEAP program is its reliance on campus partners, including the academic departments that sponsor their own LEAP (e.g. departments in architecture, business, health, education, fine arts, and engineering). It draws from collaborative partnerships with numerous other campus and community partners, such as the Marriott Library, Crossroads Urban Center, Writing Program, Orientation, Washington Elementary School, Honors, Neighborhood House and University College. Qualified students are able to transit easily from LEAP to Honors, and there are 10 scholarships reserved for such students.
All of these formal and informal partnerships are represented among the membership of the new LEAP Policy Board, which affords these different campus constituency groups the opportunity to convene and communicate with one another.

8. The current LEAP director Carolyn Bliss is providing strong leadership for the program as well as being a dedicated teacher for the four-year Health Science LEAP students. In addition to the formal program assessments, the innovations in LEAP programming as well as her support for faculty through mentoring individuals and developing the new policy of Lecturer appointments testify to her foresight and skill.

The LEAP program enjoys significant buy-in and support from the senior leadership of the campus. It reports to Martha Bradley, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, who provides strong and visionary leadership for the program and represents it to the upper administration.

III. Recommendations

LEAP is a strong program that makes multiple contributions to the University of Utah campus by providing an opportunity to explore and understand a university education in a safe, supportive environment that includes committed faculty and engaged peers that provide mentorship. With that being said, both reports from the internal and external reviewers provided recommendations that engage the LEAP Program in continued growth and development. These recommendations focused on strategic planning, commitment to faculty, exploring alternative funding models, and comprehensive marketing.

Strategic Planning

LEAP has experienced tremendous success that is clearly evidenced in the assessment process as well as the variety of options available to students. Due to this success, it has positively responded to requests to do more beyond first year students. It has provided programming for pre-professional students beyond the first year, it offers courses that meet bachelor’s degree requirements, and it is expanding the upper division course offerings again. It was recommended that LEAP take this opportunity to participate in a strategic planning process. The campus is anticipating growing enrollment, new and enhanced programming for new students, and changes to the general education program. Before LEAP moves too quickly in developing additional offerings, it is important to articulate a vision, mission, and goals that offer focus and direction. Some questions that might contribute to this strategic review are:

- What is the mission of LEAP?
- How will the activities of LEAP execute and communicate the mission?
- How will this mission be communicated across the campus?
- How will this plan nurture current “champions” and grow a new cadre of supporters for sustainability?
- What name or tagline explains this mission?

The act of strategic planning offers a foundation for reacting to the campus growth and other changes that will impact first year students.
Faculty

The Internal and External Reviewer Reports discussed one of the key resources of the LEAP Program, which is the faculty. This is a dedicated cohort of teachers and scholars who are focused on pedagogy that enhances the experience of the first year students at the U of U. But some fundamental issues are surfacing as the faculty grows to support the program offerings. These issues focus on faculty development, internal collaboration, and resources to expand and explore effective pedagogical practices for first year students. Thus, it is recommended that the LEAP Director facilitate a dialogue with the LEAP faculty that clarifies their needs with respect to the mission established in the strategic plan, identifies opportunities to meet these needs, and prioritizes these opportunities with respect to positive impact on the LEAP Program and undergraduate students at the U of U. The LEAP Director will then have a direction as she works with various entities to create a resource stream that focuses on faculty who are the foundation of the LEAP Program.

It was also recommended that LEAP faculty participate in the Faculty Activity Report (FARS). With the recent change in appointment and advancement in the Lecturer ranks this is a key suggestion that supports the faculty status of this group.

Resources & Funding

The current funding model for LEAP is addressed through the Office of Undergraduate Studies with a small budget for LEAP non-personnel expenses (reported as $9000). In the past this model was advantageous due to the scope of LEAP. But LEAP is a program that supports the mission of the U of U through teaching multiple sections of multiple courses to new and continuing students, engages these students in community learning, and models development of relationships with faculty at a research extensive institution. Also, the number of students engaged through LEAP has grown tremendously in the last 10 years. Due to the current scope of LEAP, once a strategic plan is developed, the Director should explore funding models that would reflect the leadership LEAP offers in transitioning new students to the institution. This exploration should include:

- exploring a funding model used for academic departments,
- understanding the impact of collaboration and how to share expenses,
- understanding the opportunities presented through the LEAP Advisory Board as well as other committee memberships held by LEAP faculty and staff to explore revenue streams,
- exploring external donors who might be interested in funding if a name was tied to the program or certain activities in the program,
- Increase collaboration with and solicit support (funding, advisors, etc.) from Colleges and Departments, especially those for which the LEAP program offers specific tracks, and
- establishing perpetual gifts for a continuous scholarship stream for LEAP students.

As the U of U campus grows and considers alternative funding models, the fiscal future of LEAP should be considered.
**Marketing & Branding**

The external reviewers discussed challenges with the name since most people do not remember or know what LEAP stands for and recommended that the name be changed. However, the Director of the LEAP Program expressed concern due to the familiarity of the name on campus. The Director discussed some “taglines” that could trail the name to offer focus and definition. Once the naming issue is clarified and the strategic plan is formalized, it is imperative that a marketing plan be developed that informs all relevant parties of this key program in a timely manner so that new students who arrive at Orientation are anticipating enrollment in LEAP. This marketing plan should extend to the U of U community to guarantee that all faculty and staff are aware and encouraging students to participate in this opportunity that has multiple facets for contributing to first year retention and overall graduation success. Some questions that inform this recommendation are:

- What is the brand for LEAP?
- How is this brand marketed to key constituencies to be clear and concise on what LEAP has to offer and why students should participate?

Through branding and marketing, LEAP will reach the appropriate students and foster success.
## STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Student Annual FTE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>158.30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>163.23</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>159.60</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>118.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>120.10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Student Headcount</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2011-2012 AY Top Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Pre-Business</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Pre-Medicine</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Pre-Civil Engineering</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Pre-Nursing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INSTRUCTORS/STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>No Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Instructors with Doctoral Degrees or Terminal Degrees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Instructors with Master's Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Instructors with Bachelor's Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Instructors with Unknown Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
Faculty of record for the courses taught in the LEAP program during 2011-2012 AY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial/Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Aides/Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Graduate Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
Teaching/Graduate Assistant taught in the LEAP program during 2011-2012 AY
Program has an Executive Assistant listed under Undergraduate Studies, IPEDS title is Other Professional
## STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total SCH for Academic Year*</th>
<th>2007-2008</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>5 Year % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000-2999</td>
<td>3555</td>
<td>3461</td>
<td>4695</td>
<td>4805</td>
<td>4637</td>
<td>+30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000-5999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>+133%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3603</strong></td>
<td><strong>3540</strong></td>
<td><strong>4788</strong></td>
<td><strong>4897</strong></td>
<td><strong>4749</strong></td>
<td><strong>+32%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000-2999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000-5999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Levels</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Academic Year (summer, fall, spring); Includes all courses listed under “LEAP” as well as ARCH 1610, 1611, and UUHSC 2500, 3000, 3001, 4000, 4001
**FINANCIAL ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Costs</td>
<td>440,454</td>
<td>460,637</td>
<td>482,037</td>
<td>541,018</td>
<td>594,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support costs</td>
<td>102,700</td>
<td>107,900</td>
<td>105,800</td>
<td>115,500</td>
<td>155,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>17,924</td>
<td>18,304</td>
<td>18,304</td>
<td>19,504</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>561,078</td>
<td>586,841</td>
<td>606,141</td>
<td>676,022</td>
<td>776,771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Appr. w/EB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation 49910</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations*</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>53,600</td>
<td>50,275</td>
<td>58,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition to Program**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong>*</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>53,600</td>
<td>50,275</td>
<td>58,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue-Expense</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

Financial Data provided by the LEAP program

* Donations are scholarships awarded to LEAP students, funded through Undergraduate Advancement

** Any SCH funding goes to the Office of Undergraduate Studies

*** Additional funding for the program is provided by the Office of Undergraduate Studies
Memorandum of Understanding
LEAP Program
Undergraduate Council Review

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on January 7, 2013 and concludes the Undergraduate Council Review of the LEAP Program. Michael L. Hardman, Interim Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Martha Bradley, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; Steve Roens, Senior Associate Dean of the Office of Undergraduate Studies; Carolyn Bliss, Director of the LEAP Program; and Jeff Webb, Associate Director of the LEAP Program, were present.

The discussion centered on, but was not limited to, commendations and recommendations included in the Undergraduate Council Review completed on November 29, 2012.

Recommendation 1. Strategic Planning

The LEAP Program should undertake a strategic planning process that a. envisions the program in the context of the other learning communities and programs on campus that serve incoming and continuing students; and b. connects growth and resources to metrics of student retention and graduation rates.

Recommendation 2. Re-naming the LEAP Program

As part of the strategic planning process, LEAP should consider renaming the program “LEAP First-Year Learning Communities” or “ULEAP First-Year Learning Communities.”

Recommendation 3. Faculty Development

The budget of the Office of Undergraduate Studies will include $10,000 each year for LEAP faculty development that could be used to send LEAP faculty to conferences and to provide an incentive system for faculty. This will be a new budget request.

Recommendation 4. Professional Marketing

LEAP needs to find better ways to insure that faculty, advisors and administrators across campus know about the program and its mission. In addition, the current version of the LEAP orientation message is overly complex. LEAP needs to have a better marketing approach to streamline this. The annual budget of the Office of Undergraduate Studies will include an element for professional marketing for the LEAP Program. This will be a new budget request for $5,000.

Recommendation 5. Administrative Recognition of LEAP Faculty

LEAP faculty should be recognized by the University as part of a program rather than as adjunct faculty, and so should complete the Faculty Activity Report every year and serve on University committees.

Recommendation 6. LEAP and the Integrated Minor
LEAP represents an excellent starting point for integrated minors and should work to further develop these.

**Recommendation 7. Diversity**

LEAP should undertake an assessment of how students' attitudes toward diversity change as a result of participation in the program. This assessment should focus particularly on behaviors with regard to those conceived of as different or "other" – both the behaviors of white students and of students of color and how these change as a result of participation in LEAP, and particularly what effects, if any, the diversity semester of the LEAP curriculum has on such behaviors.

This memorandum of understanding is to be followed by annual letters of progress from the Director of the Program to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Letters will be submitted each year until all of the actions in the preceding paragraphs have been addressed.

Michael L. Hardman  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Carolyn Bliss  
Director, LEAP Program

Jeff Webb  
Associate Director, LEAP Program

Martha S. Bradley  
Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
1. The David Eccles School of Business made the biggest jump among the University’s graduate programs in this year’s edition of “America’s Best Grad Schools 2014,” published by *U.S. News & World Report*, moving up an impressive 23 spots from the year before. The Business School graduate programs placed at 61 in the nation in the new 2014 ranking, tying with four other schools. Another bright spot is Pharmacy, which came in at number 10, and the S.J. Quinney College of Law, which is now the highest ranked law school in the state of Utah, 41st nationally, moving up six spots from last year. The college also ranked number 12 nationally for the specialty of environmental law. Utah’s highly respected College of Engineering moved up three spots this year, to rank 51st nationally for its comprehensive graduate programs. Health Sciences made a strong showing, and the medical school is ranked 48th once again for research, and 29th for primary care. The College of Nursing moved up a full seven spots to be ranked number 29 in the nation.

2. The S.J. Quinney College of Law was recently ranked 19th among “the 25 Law Schools Whose Grads Earn the Most” by *Forbes* magazine. Dean Hiram Chodosh said the College of Law’s inclusion on the Forbes list confirms what students, alumni, peers, and practitioners already know: the U provides exceptional value at a very reasonable price: “We have studied the data for others in Forbes top 25 ranking, in particular what the other schools charge in tuition and the average debt levels carried by their graduates. Within this group, we have the lowest tuition and the lowest average debt level.” “The ranking also demonstrates in a quantitative way how well our students have done” Chodosh added, noting that others on the list include Columbia, Harvard, Stanford, Michigan and Yale. This is the fifth top 20 ranking the College of Law has received this year. The College was also ranked third nationally in externships last year, and the moot court team won the prestigious national moot court competition award for best brief.

3. Entertainment Arts & Engineering (EAE) at the University of Utah is ranked number one for its undergraduate program and number two for its graduate program by the Princeton Review. The University’s EAE program is known for its high number of graduates in the industry, large number of award winning and published student games, medical games—including a game to help children fight cancer—and games research. The program is well-regarded for its interdisciplinary philosophy and collaboration with industry leaders.

4. Academic Analytics recently ranked the University as 31st overall in faculty scholarly productivity among the nation’s public comprehensive universities and 28th in the number of federally funded grants received per faculty member. In addition to the U’s overall national ranking, 23 of its graduate disciplines were ranked among the top 25 percent in the nation. “The University of Utah has had a consistently strong showing in this national analysis over the past several years and the recognition continues to grow,” said Michael Hardman, interim senior vice president for Academic Affairs. “These rankings are indicative of the high quality and hard work of the U’s dedicated faculty and represent their commitment to academic excellence.” Both pharmaceutical chemistry and computing ranked ranked #2, and the remaining 21 graduate disciplines come from a wide range of programs across the U’s campus. The disciplines and their respective rankings are: geological engineering (3), neurobiology and anatomy (4), accounting (5), finance (8), speech-language pathology (8), chemical physics (10), medicinal chemistry (12), rehabilitation sciences (13), special education (15), geography (18), nursing
(21), chemistry (24), physiology (24), sociology (30), biology (32.5), biochemistry (34), English (35),
computer science (40), neuroscience (40), mathematics (42) and electrical engineering (45).

5. Kent Ono, professor of communication and department chair, was recently awarded the 2013 Paul
Boase Prize for Scholarship. The Boase Prize, named after the former director of the School of
Communication Studies at Ohio University, honors scholars who have made an outstanding
contribution to the discipline through recent scholarship that has had a major influence on the field.
The criteria for the award also includes: intellectual creativity and depth of the scholarship, its
immediate impact on the community scholars, and its potential for enduring value.

6. The University’s Young Alumni Board is being recognized with an award from the Council of
Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) for outstanding programming. The award was given
for the board’s successful efforts in putting together the Young Alumni 5k Run and KidsK on
Homecoming Day. The CASE District VII awards recognize efforts by colleges and universities in the
Western region of the United States.

7. Holly Godsey, manager of the Center for Science and Math Education and assistant professor of
geology and geophysics, has won the 2013 Utah Science Teacher Association’s Higher Education
Award. “This award traditionally goes to an individual in higher education who has taken K-12 science
education in the state of Utah to new heights, and has demonstrated a track record of dedication to the
science students and teachers in Utah,” says Sarah Young, science specialist for the Utah State Office
of Education. “Holly’s commitment and leadership at both the university and state levels have been
instrumental in the science education community. We are amazed and thankful for her passion and
dedication to improving science in Utah.” Young says Godsey won the award for work ranging from
“supporting current classroom teachers to earn their master’s degrees, to her efforts creating and
supporting this years’ Earth science statewide professional development, to her time spent working
with University of Utah graduate students to support local K-12 classrooms.”

8. Paul Gore, associate professor of educational psychology, was recently selected as a fellow by the
American Council on Education (ACE). His selection was based on his academic credentials and
potential for administrative leadership, the recommendations of professional colleagues, the judgment
of interviewing team of senior administrators, and overall qualifications as measured against the
standards of the ACE Fellows Program.
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