1. CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 p.m. in 110 SFEBB

2. MINUTES: October 7, 2013

3. REQUEST FOR NEW BUSINESS:

4. CONSENT CALENDAR
   a. Appendix I: Resignations, Administrative and Faculty Appointments
   b. Appendix II: Career-line, Adjunct and Visiting Faculty Appointments
   c. Appendix III: Emeritus Appointments

5. REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATION

6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

7. REPORT FROM ASUU

8. NOTICE OF INTENT
   a. Revised Policy 8-002 School of Medicine Faculty Parental Benefits-Leaves of Absence

9. DEBATE CALENDAR
   a. Name change Department of Orthopaedics
   b. Name change for Fitness Leadership Emphasis
   c. Name change for the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences
   d. Academic Calendar Changes
   e. Center for Latin American Studies
   f. Memo from Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee

10. INFORMATION CALENDAR
    a. Undergraduate Emphasis in Animation
    b. Updated Senate Committee Charges (Formal Proposal to revise policy 6-002 due to Senate January 2014)
    c. Graduate Council Review Department of Sociology
    d. Graduate Council Review Department of Pharmacotherapy
    e. Graduate Council Review Department of English
    f. Graduate Council Review Department of Pathology

11. NEW BUSINESS

12. ADJOURNMENT
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
October 7, 2013

Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate, held on October 7, 2013, was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Allyson Mower, Senate President. The meeting was held in room 110 Spencer Fox Eccles Business Building.

Present: David Ailion, Peter Alfeld, Orly Alter, Chrisoula Andreou, A.K. Balaji, Keith Bartholomew, Tim Benvegnu, Michael Blomgren, Nilufer Cagatay, Tully Cathey, Marjorie Chan, Thomas Cheatham, Marcus Chen, Mary Ann Christison, Alison Denyer, Justin Diggle, Maria Dobozy, Megan Dolle, Florence Fernandez, Ole Fischer, Francis Friedrich, Sabine Fuhrmann, Jennifer Garvin, William Gershan, Jordan Gerton, Franz Goller, Thad Hall, Mary Elizabeth Hartnett, Leanne Hawken, Jared Hurdman, Thunder Jalili, Anne Jamison, Christian Johnson, William Johnson, Bradley Katz, Evert Lawton, Uri Loewenstein, John Longino, William Lowrance, Raina Mahanes, Erminia Martinez, Theresa Martinez, Jannah Mather, Jannah Mather, Ashley McMullin, Heather Melton, Duncan Metcalfe, Meredith Metzger, Joel Miller, Jill Moriearty, Alfred Mowood, A. Chris Nelson, Ingrid Nygaard, Sam Ortiz, Patrick Panos, Christina Porucznik, Matthew Potolsky, M. Pollie Price, Lorie Richards, Stephanie Richardson, Steve Roens, Gerald Root, Jody Rosenblatt, Paul Shami, Clough Shelton, Debra Simmons, Gregory Smoak, David Stevenson, Taylor Thurman, Li Wang, Rachel Wootton, Joanne Yaffe

Excused with Proxy: Joan Gregory (Jeanne Leber), Tom Henderson (Chuck Hansen), Xan Johnson (Robert Nelson), Patricia Murphy (Lynn Hollister)


Excused: Vivian Lee


Others: Ed Barbanell, Mariana Ramiro Gomez, Michael Harris, Lindsey Whitehurst

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting on September 9, 2013 were approved.

Request for New Business
No new business to address
Consent Calendar
The resignations retirements, and faculty and administrator appointments dated September 9, 2013, received approval to forward to the Board of Trustees.

Report from Administration
President David Pershing updated the Academic Senate on the State Board of Regents meeting that was held on September 12 & 13 at Utah State University. The Board of Regents agreed to the Presidents Council recommendation for the request for a 3% increase of salaries for the faculty and staff at the legislative session. Items approved for funding at the meeting included Crocker Science Center (George Thomas Building Renovation, Addition and Seismic Upgrade), Distinctive mission, Utility Distribution Infrastructure Replacement Phase II and Library consortium. Non-state funded items approved include Alumni House Expansion and Renovation and Lassonde Living Learning Center.

A workshop for the Deans, Department Chairs and Directors was held on Thursday, October 3 by President Pershing and Ruth Watkins. The workshop focused on missions and goal setting.

Overall undergraduate enrollment is down by 1%. This decrease shows mostly in the freshman class and almost directly related to the LDS missionary age change. This year 500 students were admitted but deferred enrollment.

The College of Law celebrated its one-hundredth birthday with a Centennial Gala and Symposium on September 20th. The keynote address was given by Former Utah Law Professor and U.S. Court of Appeals Judge Michael McConnell. The College of Fine Arts held it’s Distinguished Alumni Awards on October 3th at Kingsbury Hall. Honorees were presented with a bronze medal designed by faculty from the Art & Art History Department. During their return to campus, the alumni shared their talents and expertise teaching master class and lectures in their former departments. President Pershing recommended that other colleges consider implementing such alumni awards programs. The Block U party will be held Saturday, October 12 on the Plaza from 1pm to 4 pm.

Executive Committee Report
Steve Alder, Executive Committee Secretary, provided a summary of the Executive Committee meeting held September 16, 2013.

Report from ASUU
ASUU President, Sam Ortiz gave an update of ASUU events. The PAC 12 Leaders’ Summit has been moved to January. The “Paint-the-Campus-Purple event will be held October 9th 11 am to 2 pm at the Library Plaza. The Block U party will be held on Saturday with music, kid zones, lots of food and MUSS tailgate.

Special Order
A special online election will be held to fill a vacancy on the Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee.
Notice of Intent
The proposed Revision to University Policy 6-101-III-H-2 “Department and College Admission Criteria” was presented by Ed Barbanell. Previously, a major revision was completed to Policy 6-404 Undergraduate Admission, and during this revision it was determined that the one paragraph section of 6-404 covering department and college admission criteria did not belong in the Undergraduate Admission Policy and should be moved to the appropriate policy location. In order to expedite the revisions to the Policy 6-404 it was decided that the paragraph in question should be moved to Policy 6-101, and any substantive revising should be dealt with as a later project. Now the passage has been reviewed and changes are recommended. Perhaps the most significant change is to eliminate the requirement that special criteria for admission to undergraduate majors and minors be subject to Senate “approval”--- and instead merely require that they be “reported to” the Senate. The proposal was reviewed by Student Affairs, Undergraduate Studies, General Counsel’s office, and Credits & Admissions Committee. The motion to move this item to the Debate Calendar was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Jill Moriearty. Motion passed unanimously. The motion to approve a friendly amendment to change wording in second to last sentence to “All such criteria must be approved in advance by the appropriate college council and shall be reported to the Academic Senate for its information” was made by Joanne Yaffe. This motion was seconded by Maria Dobozy. Motion passed. The motion to approve the proposal as amended and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Maria Dobozy. Motion passed.

Debate Calendar
The proposed name change from the Division of Cardiology to the Division of Cardiovascular Medicine was presented by Dr. James Fang. This name change is to align the name of the Division with the name of its Cardiovascular Disease Fellowship and with national norms consistent with the nomenclature now being used within the profession. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Mary Hartnett and seconded by Jill Moriearty. Motion passed unanimously.

The proposed discontinuation of the Revitalization of Endangered Languages Certificate was presented to the Academic Senate. The Department of Linguistics is no longer able to offer the courses required for the certificate due to recent changes in the faculty. Because the courses are no longer offered, students are unable to pursue this certificate. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Bill Johnson and seconded by Brad Katz. Motion passed unanimously.

Brenda Peterson and Valerio Pascucci presented the proposal for an undergraduate Data Center Engineering Certificate. This certificate would prepare students to deal with the specific needs and challenges of the complex environment of modern data centers in government, industry, and academia. The certificate will require students to complete 27 credit hours. The interdisciplinary combination of classes addresses the specific need of this industry sector for a skilled workforce with knowledge in power and thermal energy, computer science, general management, and best practices for managing large scale facilities. There was discussion about the adequacy of inclusion within the required courses of treatment of ethical issues associated with operating such large data centers, and the presenters pointed out that one of the required courses will cover
that topic. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Leanne Hawken. Motion passed with two abstentions.

Bob Flores presented the proposed Senate Career-line elections exception. This special exception is for the limited purposes of the elections occurring from now through spring 2015, for a Career-line representative to the Senate elected from certain areas. The ordinary requirement of Policy 6-002 limiting eligibility to “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 within a single area of representation” shall be modified to require only one year rather than three years with such an appointment. This exception is needed because the affected programs are only recently created and so will not initially have sufficient candidates meeting the three-year eligibility requirement. In addition to debate about the appropriateness of having this special exception, there was discussion of various topics not directly related to the proposal. The proposal originally contemplated applying the special exception for two areas—the Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs, and the new Dentistry college, and a motion to amend the proposal to include a third area—the college of Architecture + Planning, was made by Chris Nelson. The motion was seconded by Keith Bartholomew. Motion passed with one abstention. The motion to approve as amended and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Bill Johnson. Motion passed. It was explained that the document describing the proposal also included a preview list of some the various Regulations that will be proposed for revision during this year as part of the second phase of the projects begun in spring 2013 to change nomenclature used for faculty and to integrate career-line faculty into the Senate and into various committees.

Information Calendar
The proposed Procurement Policy 3-100 Revisions were described by Associate V.P. Jeff West. After brief discussion and clarification of certain points, discussion concluded with no recommendations for changes made.

New Business
Senate President Mower explained that information about meetings and decisions of the Senate will now be reported in the “FYI-Newsletter” that is circulated on-line to faculty and staff.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Shawnee Worsley
Coversheet & Checklist form—for submitting to Academic Senate Executive Committee

Proposal for addition/revision of University Regulation. (Rev.2013-8) http://regulations.utah.edu/info/IPCresources.php

1. Regulation(s) involved (type, number, subject): Policy 8-002 Revision 2: School of Medicine Faculty Parental Benefits— Leaves of Absence with Modified Duties and Review Extensions.

2. Responsible Policy Officer (name & title): Vivian Lee, Sr. V.P. Health Sciences

3. Contact person(s) for questions & comments (name, email, phone#): Carrie Byington, Vice Dean
   Academic Affairs and Faculty Development School of Medicine 585-2372
   Carrie.Byington@hsc.utah.edu

4. Presenter to Senate Exec (if different from contact person. name, phone#): Carrie Byington

5. Approvals & consultation status.
   a. Administrative Officers who have approved (VP/President, name & date): Sr. VP Vivian Lee, October 28, 2013
   b. Date(s) processed through Institutional Policy Committee: October 18, 2013.
   C. Other Committees/Councils/other Officers consulted: School of Medicine Parental Leave Committee, Presidential Commission on the Status of Women; Senate Salaries and Benefits 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.)
   __YES__ Explanatory memorandum (key points of proposal, rationale).
   __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 unless special exception previously arranged).

Date submitted to Senate Office: October 14 & Oct 28, 2013

After presentation the Executive Committee will consider whether the proposal is ready for the full Senate, schedule it on a Senate agenda if so, and categorize it either as i) a matter of academic significance— set on the “Intent” & “Debate” Calendars presumptively over two monthly meetings with final “approval” voting at the second, or ii) not academically significant—set on the “Information & Recommendations” Calendar for a single monthly meeting, with opportunity for questions and recommendations from senators to the presenter. See Policy 1-001 http://regulations.utah.edu/general/1-001.php; Rule 1-001 http://regulations.utah.edu/general/rules/R1-001.php; Senate procedures http://admin.utah.edu/academic-senate. Further information— Senate Secretary: Shawnee Worsley 581-5203 shawnee.worsley@utah.edu
Memorandum

TO:  Vivian Lee, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, Dean, School of Medicine and Chief Executive Officer University Health Care

FROM: Carrie L. Byington, Vice Dean for Academic Affairs and Faculty Development, School of Medicine

DATE: October 28, 2013

RE: Proposed Revision 2 of University Policy 8-002: School of Medicine Faculty Parental Benefits—Leaves of Absence with Modified Duties and Review Extensions.

I. Introduction:
   This is a proposal for revision of University Policy 8-002 regarding parental leave of absence benefits for faculty of the School of Medicine. This proposal stems from a series of reviews of the existing version of the Policy and its implementation, reviews which began in the first year after the Policy was originally enacted, and continued with a thorough review by an ad hoc committee in the past year. The August 7, 2013, report from that most recent phase of review is the basis for the most important substantive changes incorporated in this proposal, and attached is a copy of that report, including specific recommendations that were made by the ad hoc committee—the School of Medicine Parental Leave Committee.

II. Highlights of important substantive changes, and rationales for change:
   The existing Policy provides for two types of benefits for full-time faculty members of the School of Medicine in connection with the birth or adoption of a child. One type is a review timetable extension (extending the ‘tenure clock’) for tenure-line faculty, and there are no significant substantive changes proposed for that type of benefit (although it will be greatly clarified by bringing its description up to date in line with the equivalent part of the University “main” Policy, as explained below).

   The other type is a leave of absence with pay (for both tenure-line and career-line faculty). The most important changes now proposed will change the funding model for the pay faculty members receive during such a leave of absence. The proposed model creates a new benefit for paid leave of absence that does not require the use of vacation or sick leave accruals. In addition, for faculty members who use the paid leave, the rate of pay on which the leave will be calculated is increased from the current base rate (of $30,000 for Assistant Professors, $40,000 for Associate Professors, or $50,000 for
Professors) to the National Institutes of Health salary cap ($179,700 for FY 2014). This increase is the heart of the proposal, and it is expected that making this set of changes will greatly improve the effectiveness of the Policy for accomplishing its intended purposes of supporting faculty members through paid leave that more closely reflects their actual pay, encouraging their return to work following leave, and allowing faculty to use NIH support in accordance with federal regulations for parental leave.

• Changed pay rate and sources of funding for pay during parental leave.

Under the existing Policy, there are three potential funding sources for parental leave. For faculty members with vacation or sick leave accrual, these may be used during the time of parental leave to support paid leave. For faculty members who do not have these accruals or who do not wish to use them for parental leave, the Departments will provide support for up to 12 weeks of leave based on a pay rate of $30,000 for Assistant Professors, $40,000 for Associate Professors, or $50,000 for Professors. This pay rate represents, on average 30% of pay for faculty members in the basic science Departments and 15% for those in clinical departments at the Assistant Professor level. The complexity of the current leave policy, the significant reduction in pay during the leave period, and/or the need to use accruals have resulted in complaints from faculty members, department chairs, and administrators. The current policy is also poorly aligned with other peer-institutions, potentially affecting our ability to recruit. Finally the current policy does not allow the School of Medicine to take advantage of the NIH parental leave policy.

With the Policy revised as the committee is proposing, the parental leave benefit will be supported using Departmental and Central resources. In addition, faculty members with federal grant support can use grant funds to support the leave for the FTE paid through grant funding up to the NIH salary cap. In addition, the rate of pay will increase from the base rate described above to the annual salary rate (base plus negotiated pay) up to the NIH salary cap. For clinical faculty members at the assistant professor level, the NIH salary cap represents ~ 92% of annual salary.

• Conforming to National Institutes of Health parental leave requirements, to enable continued grant funding during parental leaves.

Subsequent to the University's adoption of original Policy 8-002, the NIH has enacted agency policy which allows grant funds to support parental leave if the School of Medicine has a parental leave policy that supports paid leave for all faculty members. The existing 8-002 is not sufficient to meet those requirements because the paid portion of the leave may be different for all faculty members and is dependent on vacation and sick leave accruals. Further, the current rate of pay does not allow us to pay individuals the salary and benefits guaranteed by the NIH award.

We anticipate that other granting agencies will adopt similar agency policies in the future. This proposed revision of Policy 8-002 is crafted to comply with the NIH requirements (and anticipated similar requirements of other agencies), and so open up significant funding resources for the University as well as enhancing the development of our faculty researchers who make use of parental leave.

• Parental leave policy—diversity—and accreditation.

Finally, having a uniform paid parental leave policy is seen by the Liaison Committee of Medical Education (LCME) as an important contribution by the School of Medicine toward a flexible and inclusive work environment. Accreditation by the LCME is vital for the School of Medicine and an important factor in accreditation is our ability to demonstrate commitment to policies and processes that support diversity and inclusion.
III. Extensive reorganization and rephrasing of 8-002 to regain consistency with the main Policy 6-315, for greater clarity of compliance with anti-discrimination principles.

The proposed revision of Policy 8-002 will appear to be very different from the existing version—extensively expanded, reorganized and phrased differently in many parts. These are mostly not substantively significant changes, and are needed to bring this SOM-only Policy up to date to regain consistency with its counterpart main Policy, and thereby incorporate significant improvements that have already been made in 2007 and 2011 to that counterpart main Policy—including improvements made to clarify that the University in enacting and implementing its parental benefits policies is attentive to and compliant with principles of civil rights law—avoiding unlawful sexual discrimination.

The University’s formal policies on faculty parental benefits emerged from the vital work of the University’s Presidential Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW), which after some years of study presented in 2005 a report and policy proposal. That led to enactment of the first such University Policy in 2006, which was a single Policy encompassing all of the University’s colleges and the libraries, but explicitly provided that implementation within the School of Medicine would be delayed for one year while certain key issues were being worked out. During that year of delay, it was decided that because of significant differences between the School of Medicine and the rest of the University on those key practical issues, it was best to restructure the original single Policy into two separately-numbered Policies—a “main” version applicable for the entire University except Medicine (now named Policy 6-315), and the SOM-only version (now named Policy 8-002).

A core principle of the 2007 decision to separate the one into two Policies was that the two should be kept written as similarly as possible—differing only to the limited extent actually necessary to account for the differences between the School of Medicine and the other colleges and libraries on key practical issues. The separated SOM-only Policy was put into effect in 2007 and per that core principle, it was written from the model of the main policy, with the same basic structure and identical or near-identical phrasing except in parts where different circumstances required substantively different content (reflecting the practical differences on the key issues).

Since the original single-policy enactment, the main Policy (6-315) has been reviewed extensively and undergone two sets of major revisions, effective in 2007 and 2011, and meanwhile the SOM-only Policy has also been under repeated review, and the needs to revise it to keep up with extensive revisions of the counterpart main Policy have been kept in mind, but kept “on hold” until the also-needed major substantive changes were ready to move forward. This current proposal accomplishes both those long-awaited extensive revisions of the entire SOM-only Policy 8-002 for clarification and consistency (including clarity of compliance with anti-discrimination laws), and the important substantive expansions of the paid parental leave benefit for the SOM faculty.

For brevity, lengthy explanations of the overall history of the two Policies, including the reasons behind the significant 2007 and 2011 revisions of the main Policy are not repeated here, but can be found in documentation already available online, listed below under Attachments.

And because the resulting structural and phrasing changes now proposed for Policy 8-002 are so extensive (and not significantly affecting substantive rights), those specific changes are not highlighted here and we have not attempted to prepare a line-by-line comparison of existing and proposed revised text (which would be more confusing than helpful to readers). Instead, a copy of the existing version is attached, marked as being entirely replaced by the revised version.

Finally, note that a very few changes incorporated in this revision of 8-002 to achieve consistency with text of 6-315 are technical changes that do not yet actually appear in 6-315, but are planned to be made to it later this year when it and a large set of other Regulations are revised as a phase of purely technical revisions to conform to the changes of nomenclature for faculty approved in spring 2013 and planned to be carried out this year (discarding the terms “regular” and “auxiliary” faculty in favor of “tenure-line” and “career-line”).
IV. Convenient comparison of main Policy and SOM-only Policy, upon completion of proposed revisions.

As an earlier discussion with the Senate Executive Committee showed, the Academic Senate discussion of this proposal will likely engender questions about specific points on which this SOM-only Policy will be substantially different from the main Policy once both the extensive consistency-driven updating and significant substantive changes of this proposal are completed. To facilitate efficient discussions and timely processing of this proposal, here are some highlights of the substantive differences (and similarities) that will exist upon completion of these planned revisions:

- Types/categories of faculty covered: Main Policy: all tenure-line faculty, including full-time and part-time (as a result of Policy 6-320 and 6-315 combined), of the University Libraries and all of the academic colleges other than Medicine. Not career-line. SOM-only Policy: full-time (no part-time), both tenure-line and career-line. Both Policies: no waiting period, eligibility begins immediately upon appointment to faculty position.

- Review timetable extension (commonly known as extending the tenure “clock”): Both Policies, identical: available twice during an entire career at the University, delaying formal reviews for one year in each instance, available for tenure-line faculty (not considered relevant for the SOM career-line faculty, as there is no functional equivalent of a tenure “clock”).

- Paid leave of absence for a period of care-giving for newly arrived child (birth or adoption), and/or for childbearing mother’s health issues: Both Policies: provide some period of leave, with some amount of pay, but they differ significantly on major elements, based on very different circumstances of the two settings. Main Policy: uniformly one-semester for each instance (based on typical work arrangements of teaching semester-length courses), available twice in a career at the University (i.e., two instances of child birth/adoption are supported), pay is 95% of otherwise applicable annual salary. SOM-only Policy: length of leave flexible from one to maximum six weeks each instance (semesters being not relevant), available to maximum total of 24 weeks during entire career at University (i.e., four instances of childbirth/adoption of six weeks each), pay is now being raised to 100% of annual salary up to NIH cap. Also, taking more than six weeks leave (up to 12) in given instance is possible—-not covered by this paid leave Policy but achievable in some circumstances by taking on after the six weeks additional leave time under terms of FMLA either unpaid or paid using accrued vacation & sick pay (accrued by faculty employees with 12-month rather than 9-month appointments). Both Policies: explicitly allow for departments to provide even greater benefits (e.g., higher pay) so long as done consistently for all users.

- Work during the paid leave period: Both Policies, nearly identical: leave-taking parent can opt out of all work, but may choose to keep up some work such as advising students/trainees, participating in faculty hiring and RPT decisions, or for SOM “limited clinical work” such as reviewing a medical record to advise on a case.

V. Consultations and Conclusion:

The important substantive features of this proposed revision of Policy 8-002 were unanimously approved by the School of Medicine Executive Committee, have been reviewed by the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women, the Academic Senate’s Salaries and Benefits Committee, and were previously discussed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to facilitate formulating the final proposal. The specific proposal has been processed through the Institutional Policy Committee.

If you approve of the proposed revisions, this proposal will be presented for formal approvals of the Academic Senate, the President of the University, and the Board of Trustees, per normal procedures. It is the intention of the School of Medicine to implement these policy changes on January 1, 2014.

VI. Attachments:
• Proposed contents of Revision #2 of Policy 8-002
• Existing Revision #1 of Policy 8-002 (marked for complete replacement)
• Report of ad hoc committee – School of Medicine Parental Leave Committee-- Summary and Recommendations, August 7, 2013
• Letter of support and recommendations of the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women

Documentation of the histories of the single and separated Policies on parental benefits, not attached here but available online, includes:

- Second revision of main Policy in 2011 at: http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-315.php
- Existing version of the SOM-only Policy 8-002 after the separation, effective 2007 to present, at http://regulations.utah.edu/health-sciences/8-002.php

--end--
Proposal for Revision 2 of Policy 8-002, draft 2013-10-28, for Academic Senate Nov. 4

[Note to Senate: the passages in yellow highlight font are those on which there are differences between this SOM-only Policy, and its counterpart “main” Policy 6-315 applicable outside the School of Medicine, and are highlighted for your convenience in understanding the relationship and differences between the two Policies.]

Policy 8-002: School of Medicine Faculty Parental Benefits—Leaves of Absence with Modified Duties and Review Extensions. [Revision 2. Effective Date January 1, 2014 ] [Drafting note: Effective date is proposed to be set at January 1, rather than July 1 date ordinarily chosen for most academic policies]

I. Purpose and Scope

To establish the University's Policy for parental leaves of absence and extensions of the review timetable for the birth or adoption of children by full-time tenure-line and career-line faculty members in the School of Medicine. To maintain the University's general preference of providing leaves for faculty, except for brief absences, in increments of an academic term or semester, consistent with the length of most teaching assignments. To establish the maximum length of periods for such leaves consistent with the needs and resources of the University. To support faculty members in the School of Medicine as they balance the duties of work and family and to enable flexibility during times of family formation and the effective return to full-time work. Any questions regarding this Policy should be referred to the School of Medicine’s Vice Dean for Academic Affairs and/or the Office of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences.

This Revision 2 of this Policy takes effect January 1, 2014, and the prior version remains in effect until December 31, 2013.

This Policy 8-002 applies only for faculty members in the School of Medicine. The counterpart Policy 6-315 applies for faculty members in the University Libraries and in all academic colleges except the School of Medicine.

II. Definitions

For purposes of this Policy and any associated Regulations, these terms are defined as follows.

A. “Academic year” is defined for purposes of this Policy as July 1 to June 30 for a faculty member on a twelve-month appointment.

B. "Adopted child” refers to a child under six years of age or a special needs child (as defined here) placed for adoption.
C. **Salary-related terminology:**

“Annual salary” refers to the academic salary of an individual faculty member (as approved in the annual operating budget by the Office of the Senior Vice-President for Health Sciences), which includes two components—the “base” salary and the “negotiated” salary of the individual. The annual salary is for normal and expected working time and effort, not in excess of 100% of full-time, for all services performed under all assignments during the appointment period. The annual salary, as used for purposes of determining the salary amount to be paid during a period of paid leave provided for under this Policy, does not include incentive pay for clinical activities (sometimes referred to as "Clinical Incentive Pay," See Policy 8-001 Medical Practice Plan for the University of Utah SOM Full-Time Faculty).

D. "Eligible faculty member" is defined as a full-time tenure-line or full-time career-line faculty member with an appointment that began before the expected arrival of a child. The categories of tenure-line faculty (formerly “regular” faculty) and career-line faculty (formerly “auxiliary” faculty) are as described in Policy 6-300 The University Faculty -- Categories and Ranks. Full-time is 0.75 or greater of Full-Time-Equivalent (“.75 FTE”) (sometimes referred to as “benefits-eligible”).

E. "Parental benefits” refers to both the leave of absence benefits and the review extension benefits provided under this Policy. “Parental leave benefits” refers to parental leaves of absence with modified duties provided under this Policy (including disability leaves for birth mothers and care-giving leaves for all eligible caregiver parents). The parental leave of absence benefit provided under this Policy is for a paid leave. As further explained in Part III-C-3 (Parental Leave and the Family and Medical Leave Act), a faculty member might also qualify, separately, for a period of leave based on the FMLA and pertinent University Regulations.

F. “Partner” refers to a spouse or, in the case of an unmarried faculty member, to an adult who is certified as a domestic partner through Human Resources procedures (See Rule 5-200A).

G. “Eligible caregiver” is defined differently for purposes of each type of parental benefit.

(1) “Eligible caregiver” for purposes of a care-giving leave means a faculty member who provides the majority of child contact hours during the faculty member's regular
academic working hours for the length of the period of the leave of absence actually taken by the faculty member under this Policy (up to the maximum allowable period).

(2) "Eligible caregiver" for purposes of an extension of the review timetable means a faculty member who provides the majority of child contact hours during time that the faculty member would normally spend on productive scholarship for the length of the period of the leave of absence actually taken by the faculty member under this Policy (up to the maximum allowable period).

H. “Review timetable extension” refers to an additional year added to the probationary period before a tenure review of a tenure-track faculty member or the ordinary period before a post-tenure review of a tenured faculty member.

I. “Special needs child” means a child under the age of 18 who is incapable of self-care on a daily basis because of a mental or physical disability that substantially limits one or more major life activities.

III. Policy

A. General eligibility for parental benefits

1. (a). An eligible faculty member is guaranteed a review timetable extension parental benefit provided under this Policy no more than twice. Any subsequent requests for such extension benefits in conjunction with additional instances of birth or adoption will be subject to the approval of the cognizant senior vice president. (b). An eligible faculty member may qualify for a total maximum of 24 weeks of paid leave of absence parental benefits provided under this Policy during that faculty member’s employment with the School of Medicine.

2. For a given instance of childbirth or adoption, only one University of Utah faculty member is guaranteed to qualify for parental benefits provided under either/both Policy 8-002 (School of Medicine faculty) and/or the counterpart Policy 6-315 (faculty of other units of the University), which together comprise the University’s regulations regarding faculty parental benefits. (Temporary Note to Users: An explanation of coordinating the SOM policy (8-002) and the main policy (6-315) will be added here, once the revised SOM policy is in final form.)

3. This Policy does not apply for birth parents who do not anticipate becoming the legal parent of the child following birth. In such cases, a birth mother may be covered by sick leave and FMLA Policies.
4. Exceptions to these and other eligibility criteria below must be approved by the cognizant senior vice president.

B. Notification

1. An eligible faculty member should
   a. Complete the Parental Benefits application form \{insert link\} and submit it to the School of Medicine Vice Dean for Academic Affairs and Faculty Development.
   b. The Vice Dean for Academic Affairs and Faculty Development will notify the faculty member’s department chairperson and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences of the application as soon as possible and within 5 working days after the application is submitted.

2. A request for a parental leave of absence with modified duties should normally be made no fewer than three months prior to the expected arrival of the child.

C. Parental Leaves of Absence With Modified Duties

1. Eligibility for leave

   a. Disability leave benefits and the resulting modified duties under this Policy are available to an eligible faculty member who gives birth to a child during that faculty member’s employment with the School of Medicine.

   b. Care-giving leave benefits and the resulting modified duties under this Policy are available to an eligible faculty member who serves as an eligible caregiver (as defined for this purpose) of her or his own newborn child or a partner's newborn child or of a newly adopted child during the period for which leave is sought.

2. Benefit

   a. Upon approval of a parental leave of absence request, an eligible faculty member will be granted a parental leave of absence with modified duties (e.g., teaching, service, research and/or clinical work) for a leave period of a length chosen by the faculty member, within the applicable limits described below.

      i. The faculty member will be released from professional duties during this period, but may choose to continue some professional activities (e.g., meeting students and trainees, doing research or limited clinical work such as medical record review, participating in faculty appointment or faculty review decisions). ii. The faculty member who is released from
duties should not be expected to maintain normal scholarly or clinical productivity during a period of modified duties.

ii. The faculty member is encouraged to provide the department chairperson with a written statement of the activities, if any, the faculty member intends to continue during the leave.

b. Paid parental leave limits, and rate of pay.

i. Length of each leave. For a given instance of childbirth or adoption, the maximum length of the paid leave provided for under this Policy is six weeks, and the faculty member may elect a leave period of that or any lesser length. (Note that for any such instance, the faculty member might also seek and be found to qualify for additional weeks of leave based on the Family and Medical Leave Act and pertinent University Regulations, as described in Part III-C-3 below, and in such case, the maximum total length of the leave period the faculty member may take for a given instance, combining the paid leave provided under this Policy and any FMLA-based leave, is twelve weeks).

ii. Cumulative length limit for all leaves. For all instances of paid parental leave taken under this Policy, combined (i.e., all instances of childbirth/adoption) throughout the faculty member’s employment with the School of Medicine, the total maximum number of such paid weeks of leave allowed is 24 weeks. The faculty member may take multiple parental leaves during that time of employment (if all other eligibility requirements are satisfied in each instance), and may apportion the available 24 weeks among such multiple leaves in any increments desired, consistent with the single-instance six-week maximum length.

iii. Rate of pay and funding sources. For any paid parental leave of absence taken under this Policy, the rate of pay during the leave, and sources of funding for that pay will be as follows:

A. The rate of pay will be determined by reference to (1) the faculty member’s annual salary (as defined in Part II, consisting of base and negotiated salary), for the academic year during which the leave will begin, and (2)
the then-current annual salary cap set by the National Institutes of Health (“NIH”). The rate of pay will be the faculty member’s annual salary, up to a maximum of the then-current annual NIH salary cap.

The NIH salary cap reference point will be determined annually in accord with NIH rules (and for example for 2014 is set at $179,700). B. Portions of the faculty member’s compensation during the leave period for which the funding sources are grants or contracts must be based on actual effort performed for the award to the extent required by the funding agency, and all award requirements must be met. Faculty members may and ordinarily are expected to, when applicable, request from the relevant funding agencies permission to use grant or contract funds to support the chosen number of weeks of paid parental leave for the portion of work (FTE) that would normally be covered by the relevant grant funds during the period of the leave. This Policy 8-002 is intended to be interpreted to be consistent with requirements of the NIH parental leave policy (information available at http://grants.nih.gov/training/faq_childcare.htm#1350), and similar policies of other agencies.

C. A department may supplement the total amount of pay for its faculty members taking paid parental leave under this Policy, either in the form of providing a higher rate of pay during the paid leave period and/or in the form of providing pay for more than the maximum six weeks this Policy provides for. Any such supplementation must be applied consistently for all faculty members of that department who take parental leave.

c. Disability leave under this Policy shall begin no more than three months prior to the birth of the child and shall be completed at the end of the period for which the leave is sought.
d. Care-giving leave under this Policy shall begin no sooner than two weeks before the birth or four weeks before the adoption of the child, and shall be completed no more than 12 months following the arrival.

3. Relationship of Parental Leave and Leave Based on the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and Pertinent University Regulations

a. Any periods of leave taken as paid parental leaves of absence with modified duties under this Policy are substituted for care-giving leave otherwise available under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and University Regulations pertinent to the FMLA.

b. Eligible faculty members, in addition to (or instead of) taking paid parental leave under this Policy, may also qualify for leave under the FMLA and pertinent University Regulations during the same twelve (12) month period, but only in connection with a serious health condition either before or after the child's birth or adoption or to the extent the faculty member has not received twelve (12) full weeks of care-giving leave under this Policy. (Note that in a given instance an eligible faculty member might therefore combine paid parental leave under this Policy—of up to six weeks, with additional weeks of FMLA-based leave, for a combined period of caregiving leaves of up to twelve weeks.)

c. Under pertinent University Regulations, FMLA-based leave is normally unpaid, but will be paid in cases in which the faculty member has accrued sick leave or vacation leave and this accrued leave is used during the FMLA leave period.

d. See Policy 5-200 and Rule 5-200A for more information regarding FMLA-based leave.

D. Review Timetable Extensions (for tenure-line faculty members)

1. Eligibility for Extension

A one-year extension of the pre-tenure probationary period (i.e., tenure clock) for a tenure-track faculty member or the time before a post-tenure review for a tenured faculty member is available to an otherwise eligible faculty member who either i) gives birth to a child, or ii) serves as an eligible caregiver (as defined for this purpose) of her or his own newborn child or a partner's newborn child or of a newly adopted child.

2. Notice
A request for a review timetable extension is made on the same Parental Benefits application form {insert link} as a request for a parental leave. A request for an extension may be made at the same time as the request for leave and must be made within six months after the arrival of the child and before external reviewers are solicited or other action is taken to begin a formal review, whichever is earlier.

3. Benefit

Upon approval of a request, a formal review in the current year will be postponed (a) if the faculty member (i) is due to and/or does give birth to a child no later than June 30 of the year in which the review to be extended is scheduled, or (ii) is planning to and/or begins to serve as an eligible caregiver to her or his own newborn child or a partner's newborn child or of a newly adopted child no later than June 30 of the year in which the review to be extended is scheduled and (b) if the faculty member gives the department notice of the birth or adoption before the formal review is initiated. Births or adoptions after June 30 may extend a subsequent formal review, but not the review in the current year. An extension taken at any time in a pre-tenure probationary period will extend the date for the final tenure review.

4. A previously submitted request for a timetable extension may be revoked by written notice from the faculty member, submitted before the date on which action would ordinarily be taken to begin a formal review in that year's review cycle.

E. Unanticipated Events

Not all events surrounding pregnancy, childbirth, adoption, and the health of a young child can be fully anticipated for purposes of this Policy. Requests for exceptions to this Policy should be directed to the senior vice president for health sciences.

F. Obligation to Return

The obligation to return to University service following the leave, applicable to other leaves under Policy 6-314-III- Section 9-B, applies to paid disability and caregiving leaves under this Policy as well. [The recipient of a paid leave must agree to return to the service of the University after the termination of the leave for a period of time at least equal to the length of the leave. If he/she does not so return,
or returns for a shorter period of service than required under this Policy, the University will be entitled to a proportionate refund of the compensation paid by the University during the leave. Upon a determination that the enforcement of this obligation will create an extreme hardship or would be seriously inequitable, the President may waive the refund in whole or in part. For the purpose of this paragraph, "compensation" includes salary plus all payments from University funds for non-salary employee benefits.

G. Relationship to Other Policies

1. Nothing in this Policy precludes academic units from providing similar benefits to faculty members other than faculty eligible under this Policy or providing to any faculty members more extensive benefits for parental or other family responsibilities or personal disability, so long as similarly-situated faculty members in the same unit are treated consistently.

2. Other leave that has been taken or is scheduled to be taken by a faculty member shall not preclude eligibility for parental leave benefits under this Policy. Correspondingly, parental leave taken or scheduled under this Policy shall have no bearing on decisions regarding other leave for a faculty member, except to the extent that a faculty member with a twelve-month appointment is subject to a department Policy regarding proration of sick leave, vacation leave or professional development leave.

3. If any other University Policy is inconsistent with the provisions herein, this Policy shall govern.

H. Special Co-Parent Benefit—One-Week Paid Time Off

As a form of additional support for faculty members with parental responsibilities, the School of Medicine provides for one week of co-parenting paid time off. This applies for a given instance of childbirth or adoption, for an eligible faculty member of the School of Medicine (as defined in Part II), who is not taking paid parental leave under this Policy, whose co-parent (spouse or domestic partner) is to be the primary caregiver of the child, and that co-parent is also a full-time member of the faculty of the [School of Medicine]. The eligible faculty member will, upon request, receive up to one week (five days) of paid time off of responsibilities to the School of Medicine. The rate of pay during this time-off period will be calculated in the same way as the rate of pay calculation for a paid parental leave of absence as described in Part III- above. The paid time off must be used within two weeks before or six weeks after the arrival of the child. This co-parent benefit is available a maximum of four times during the faculty member’s employment with the School of
Medicine if all other requirements are met, including that both parents are employed by the University of Utah School of Medicine at the time of the birth or adoption. (Note that any time taken as such co-parent paid time off may affect the faculty member’s eligibility for other forms of leave, including FMLA-based leave, as will be governed by the University Regulations pertinent to such other forms of leave.)

I. Policy Review

The implementation and the fiscal impact of this revised parental benefits Policy will be reviewed by the School of Medicine in three (3) years from the date of passage. The report will be given to the Academic Senate. Concerns should be reported to the School of Medicine Vice Dean of Academic Affairs and Faculty Development and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences.

[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:
B. Procedures:
C. Guidelines:
   Examples of application of University Policy 6-315
   Examples are provided for illustrative purposes only. They do not constitute any part of this Policy.
D. Forms:
   Parental Benefits application form
E. Other related resource materials:
   Executive Summary & Update
   Full Evaluation Report

V. References

Policy 5-200, Leaves of Absence (Health-Related)
Policy 5-201, Leaves of Absence (Non Health-Related)
Policy 6-311, Faculty Retention and Tenure of Regular Faculty (extension of pre-tenure probationary period for disability)
Policy 6-314, Leaves of Absence
Policy 8-007, School of Medicine (SOM) Faculty Parental Leaves of Absence
29 Code of Federal Regulations 825.100 et seq., Family and Medical Leave Act Regulations

VI. Contacts:

The designated contact officials for this Policy are:
A. Policy Owners (primary contact person for questions and advice): School of Medicine Vice Dean of Academic Affairs and Faculty Development
B. Policy Officers: Sr. Vice President for Health Sciences.

These officials are designated by the University President or delegatee, 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:
Renumbering: Renumbered as Policy 8-002 effective 9/15/2008, formerly known as PPM 8-8.2.
Revision history:
Current version: Revision 2
Approved by Academic Senate: ____
Approved by Board of Trustees: ____ , with effective date of [January 1, 2014 or ???]
Legislative History for Revision 2 [link to +++]
Earlier revisions:
Revision 1 [link to +++]
Effective dates March 12, 2007 to December 31, 2013 ???+++ 
Legislative History for Revision 1

Revision 0: Effective dates July 1, 2006 to March 11, 2007
Background information for Revision 0

I. Purpose
To outline the University of Utah's School of Medicine (SOM) policy for parental leaves of absence and/or modified duties for the birth or adoption of children by benefit-eligible regular and auxiliary faculty. Any questions regarding this policy will be referred to your Department Chairman, the cognizant Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and/or the cognizant Senior Vice-President.

II. Effective Date
The effective date of this policy shall be July 1, 2007. Current policies on Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) in Policy and Procedures 5-200 and on probationary period extensions in Policy 6-311 will remain in effect until June 30, 2007.

III. References
Policy 5-200, Leaves of Absence (Health-Related)
Policy 5-201, Leaves of Absence (Non Health-Related)
Policy 6-311, Faculty Retention and Tenure of Regular Faculty
Policy 6-315, Faculty Parental Leaves of Absence
29 Code of Federal Regulations 825.100 et seq., Family and Medical Leave Act

IV. Definitions
a. "Academic year" is July 1 to June 30 for SOM faculty members on twelve-month appointments.
b. "Adopted child" refers to a child under six years of age or a special needs child placed for adoption. "Special needs child" means a child under the age of 18 who is incapable of self-care on a daily basis because of a mental or physical disability that substantially limits one or more major life activities.
c. "Annual salary" refers to the academic (base and negotiated) salary, as approved in the annual operating budget by the Office of the Senior Vice-President for Health Sciences. The compensation to a faculty member is for normal and expected working time and effort, not in excess of 100% of full-time, for all services performed under all assignments during the appointment period.
d. "Clinical Incentive Pay (CIP)" refers to incentive pay for clinical activities. (See Policy 5-204 1. Medical Practice Plan for the University of Utah SOM Full-Time Faculty.)
e. "Benefits" refers to discretionary and non-discretionary items such as health and long-term disability insurance, retirement contributions, etc. For the purposes of this policy, benefits will be based on the actual salary paid during the parental leaves period, as described in the next paragraph (Section III. F). Long-term disability insurance premiums and benefits will be based on the salary paid immediately prior to the parental leaves period. Faculty members are urged to review their benefits with the Human Resources Department at the University.
f. "Parental Leaves Period" refers to the period of absence for parental leaves and/or modified duties for the birth or adoption of children by an eligible faculty member. The proposed period of leaves is a maximum of 12 weeks per occurrence, and no more than 24 weeks during a faculty member's employment with the School of Medicine. The faculty member may apportion the 24 weeks of total parental leaves of absence in any increment desired, not to exceed 12 weeks per occurrence.
g. "Salary during the parental leaves of absence" is proposed to come from a mixture of three sources: sick leave (paid by the faculty member's home (primary) department, at current annual salary (refer to Section III.C); accrued at 1 day per month of employment), vacation leave (also paid by the faculty member's home (primary) department, at current annual salary (refer to Section III.C); maximum of 5 weeks), and "SOM Contribution" (refer to Section III.G).

h. "SOM Contribution" refers to the School of Medicine's potential financial contribution during the period of absence for parental leaves, based on rank. The faculty member's home (primary) department will be responsible for the "SOM Contribution". The "SOM Contribution" is prorated based on FTE.

i. "Domestic partner" definition will adhere to university guidance with definition provided by Human Resources.

j. "Primary caregiver" means a faculty member who provides the majority of child contact hours during the faculty member's regular working hours for the leave period.

V. SOM Faculty Parental Leaves of Absence

A. Eligibility

Benefits under this policy are available to any regular or auxiliary faculty who is "benefits-eligible", and who either gives birth to a child or serves as the primary caregiver of her or his own newborn child or domestic partner's child, or of a newly adopted child, within the period for which the leave is sought.

This policy does not apply to birth mothers who do not anticipate becoming the legal parent of the child following birth. In such cases, the faculty member will be covered by sick leave and FMLA policies.

Modified duties under this policy shall begin no more than three (3) months prior to the birth/placement of a child and be completed no more than six (6) months following the birth/placement. Exceptions must be approved by the Department Chairman and cognizant Senior Vice-President.

Only one University of Utah faculty member in a family unit will qualify for parental leaves of absence and/or modified duties for a given instance of childbirth or adoption.

B. Notification

The eligible faculty member should notify her/his department chair of a request for modified duties as soon as possible, and normally no later than three (3) months prior to the start of the expected modified duties. The request for an extension to the pre-tenure probationary period or post-tenure review process must be initiated before a review begins. A Parental Leave application form is available.

C. Modified Duties During Parental Leaves of Absence

During the period of parental leave, the faculty member may choose to be fully absent from the SOM workplace or the faculty member may choose to continue some professional activities (e.g., meeting students, doing research, participating in hiring or RPT decisions) during this period. The modified duties may be assigned, through negotiation with the department chairman, for up to 12 weeks per occurrence of parental leave, and no more than 24 weeks total during the eligible faculty member's employment with the SOM. Any subsequent requests will be
subject to the approval of the Department Chairman and cognizant Senior Vice President.

Parental leaves under this policy are in addition to paid or unpaid (FMLA) sick leave for which the faculty member may be otherwise eligible (e.g., sickness associated with or not associated with pregnancy). Eligible faculty members may in addition qualify for unpaid leave under the FMLA during the same period but only in connection with a serious health condition.

Other leaves taken or scheduled to be taken by an eligible faculty member shall not preclude parental leaves under this policy. Correspondingly, parental leaves taken or scheduled under this policy shall have no bearing on decisions regarding other leave for an eligible faculty member, provided adequate coverage for their faculty duties are maintained.

D. Compensation Sources During Parental Leaves of Absence

The parental leaves period may be drawn from sick and/or vacation leave accruals, as well as from the SOM Contribution, as outlined in Section III, G and H. Sick leave and vacation accruals are paid at the annual salary level, as outlined in Section III, G. A faculty member may chose to receive the SOM Contribution exclusively for each parental leaves of absence occurrence, as outlined in Section III, H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 Weeks (Maximum per occurrence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty member who requests parental leaves of absence chooses among the three sources (one of three, two of three, three of three sources of salary).

If a portion of the faculty member's compensation is received from grants or contracts, that portion of compensation must be based on actual effort performed for the award. All award requirements must be met.

E. Adjustments to Tenured or Tenure-Eligible Appointments

Upon request, an eligible faculty member will automatically receive a one-year extension on her or his timetable for RPT or post-tenure reviews. Faculty members are not expected to maintain normal scholarly productivity during an extension granted under this policy. A faculty member may receive this extension no more than twice. Any subsequent requests will be subject to the approval of the Department Chairman and cognizant Senior Vice-President.

F. Unanticipated Events

Not all events surrounding pregnancy, childbirth, adoption, and the health of a young child can be fully anticipated by this policy. Requests for exceptions to this policy should be directed to the Department Chairman and cognizant Senior Vice-President.
G. Obligation to Return
The obligation to return to university service following the leave, applicable to other leaves under Policy 6-314, Section 9. B, applies to this policy as well.

VI. Relationship to Other Policies
This policy does not preclude a department from providing similar benefits to other faculty members. A department can give more extensive benefits for parental leaves as long as this is consistent throughout the department. If any other University policy is inconsistent with the provisions herein, this policy shall govern.

VII. Policy Review
The implementation and the fiscal impact of this parental leaves policy will be reviewed in two (2) years from the date of passage. The report will be given to the Academic Senate. Concerns should be reported to the Dean of the SOM and cognizant Senior Vice-President.

VIII. Contacts:
Policy Owner: Questions about this Policy and any related Rules, Procedures and Guidelines should be directed to the Dean of the School of Medicine.
Policy Officer: Only the Sr. Vice President for Health Sciences or his/her designee has the authority to grant exceptions to this Policy.

History of Policy 8-002.
Renumbered as Policy 8-002, September 2008, formerly PPM 8-8.2.

Revision 1. Approved by the Academic Senate February 5, 2007. Approved by the Board of Trustees March 12, 2007 to take effect March 12, 2007.

Revision 0. http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/revisions_6/6-315.R0.pdf
Committee Members:
Carrie L. Byington, MD (Vice Dean Academic Affairs and Faculty Development)
Ed Clark, MD (Chair, Pediatrics)
Erik Barton, MD, MBA (Chief, Division of Emergency Medicine)
Karen Eilbeck, MSc, PhD (Associate Professor Biomedical Informatics)
Nelangi Pinto, MD, MSCI (Assistant Professor Pediatrics)
Cynthia Best (Associate Dean of Finance)
Rick Smith (Director Human Resources)
Trever McGuire (Associate Director Emergency Medicine)

Charge:
The Parental Leave Committee was organized to address issues related to parental leave in the SOM, to evaluate parental leave policies at other institutions, and to consider alternatives to the current policy.

Background:
The University of Utah School of Medicine Parental Leave benefit refers to the period of absence and/or modified duties for the birth or adoption of children by an eligible faculty member. Parental leave is distinct from the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) that entitles eligible employees of covered employers to take unpaid, job-protected leave for specified family and medical reasons with continuation of group health insurance coverage under the same terms and conditions as if the employee had not taken leave. The maximum FMLA leave is 12 weeks in a 12-month period.

The parental leave benefit has been available for all benefit-eligible regular (tenure-line) and auxiliary (career-line) faculty members in the School of Medicine since July 1, 2007 (FY 2008). The period of parental leave is a maximum of 12 weeks per occurrence, and no more than 24 weeks during a faculty member’s employment with the School of Medicine. The faculty member may apportion the 24 weeks of total parental leaves of absence in any increment desired, not to exceed 12 weeks per occurrence. Eligible faculty members may use both parental and FMLA leave concurrently but not consecutively.

The current parental leave policy allows paid leave if the faculty member uses accrued sick leave or vacation leave. Full-time faculty members accrue 1 day of sick leave per month, which may carry over to a maximum accrual of 130 days. Full-time faculty members with 12-month appointments are eligible for 25 vacation days per year with no carry-over. Faculty members may also request support through the SOM contribution (Table 1). The annualized salary used to calculate the SOM contribution reflects the tenure guarantee in place for most clinical Departments for Associate and Full Professor.
TABLE 1: School of Medicine Contribution for Parental Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>SOM CONTRIBUTION</th>
<th>SOM CONTRIBUTION</th>
<th>SOM CONTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annualized Salary</td>
<td>12 Weeks</td>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$ 6,923</td>
<td>$ 3,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$ 9,231</td>
<td>$ 4,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$11,538</td>
<td>$ 5,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Use of Parental Leave by SOM Faculty Members

A review of requests for parental leave by SOM faculty members indicate that 50 such leaves have been requested by faculty members since inception with a mean of ~ 8 per year (Figure 1). All requests were from female faculty members.

Of the 22 basic and clinical departments in the SOM, faculty members from 13 (59%) have requested parental leave, with a significant proportion (38%) of leave requests from a single Department (Pediatrics). Approximately 10% of requests were from basic science departments and the remainder from clinical departments.
Significant Issues Identified with Current Parental Leave Policy

Several issues were identified by faculty members, department leadership, and administrative staff in relation to the current SOM parental leave policy including:

- Under-utilization of the approved parental leave policy
  - Faculty members may be discouraged by Chair or other faculty members from applying for parental leave
- Inability to use NIH funding for parental leave
- Variation in administration of parental leave across the academic departments
- Complexity of determining the paid benefit for eligible employees
- Low annualized salary for SOM contribution
- Policy unclear for faculty members who work primarily in shifts
- Lack of accruals for faculty members who have recently been hired
- Faculty members reluctance to use accrued vacation for parental leave
- Difficulty in determining sick leave accrual
- Sustainability of clinical coverage for parental leave

The issues related to utilization and administration of the parental leave policy were of concern to the Committee as they result in the dissatisfaction of faculty members with numerous complaints made to the Vice Dean and the perception of unfairness. The lack of uniformity in interpretation and administration of the policy exposes the institution to legal risk.

In addition, administrators, division chiefs and chairs expressed frustration with the complexity of the policy, particularly in determining the paid benefit. Conflicts arise between faculty members and department leadership and administration over these financial disagreements that may impact collegiality and the ability to work effectively.

Faculty members commented that use of vacation for parental leave results in hardships when the faculty member returns to work, as they have limited ability to take vacation leave with family or to use vacation leave to meet the needs of the infant during periods of illness or when disruption in childcare occurs.

Finally, faculty members who receive NIH funding are allowed to use NIH funds to support paid parental leave for the FTE paid through grant funds. This can only be done if the institution has a paid parental leave policy for all faculty members. Because no such policy exists at the University SOM, several individuals each year are unable to use NIH funds to support parental leave, creating a hardship for the faculty member and the institution.

Review of Parental Leave Policies at Peer Institutions
The Committee reviewed the parental leave policies at several peer institutions through a web-based query to an academic human resources list-serve and through manual review of institutional websites.

In summary, all institutions examined offered parental leave to benefitted faculty members. There were differences between public and private institutions. In general public institutions offer 6-12 weeks of parental leave and the leave is paid through employee accruals. However, we found several exceptions that offered paid leave, including ASU, which is also a PAC-12 school. ASU requires repayment of paid parental leave if the employee does not return to work. Private institutions offered paid parental leave for 6-8 weeks. (Table 2).

Table 2: Summary of Parental Leave Policies at Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Institutions</th>
<th>Parental Leave Duration</th>
<th>Faculty Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>Accruals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>At least 6 weeks</td>
<td>Accruals for most faculty; 6 weeks base pay for academic senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>Accruals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>Accruals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas System</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>Accruals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>6 weeks (traditional)</td>
<td>Sick Leave short-term (15 days) and long term available to those employed &gt; 2 years (paid for up to 6 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-Chapel Hill</td>
<td>15 weeks</td>
<td>60 days paid by Department and remainder is accruals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Up to 90 days</td>
<td>Accruals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>Accruals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Paid (For employees &gt; 2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>Physician determined</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>Up to 12 weeks</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Implications for Paid Parental Leave

We performed, with MBM support, an analysis of cost for paid parental leave. Currently, for faculty members who elect to use sick leave and vacation accruals, pay continues
uninterrupted and is at a level equal to base plus negotiated salary and includes all
benefits. Clinical incentive pay is not generally paid during parental leave.

Faculty members may face financial hardship if they do not have sick leave or vacation
accruals and then rely on the Departmental (SOM) contribution, which provides a base
salary that is significantly lower than the mean or median salaries for faculty members in
basic and clinical sciences. The majority of leaves are taken by Assistant Professors.
The base salary of $30,000 represents ~33% of the mean salary for those in basic
science Departments and ~15% of the mean salary for Assistant Professors in the
clinical departments.

We used FY 2012 salary data to calculate the mean salaries for all Assistant Professors.
These calculations serve as a reference point for estimating the financial costs that
might be incurred if the parental leave policy was altered to provide paid leave for faculty
members. The mean salary plus benefits in the basic science departments is $91,499. In
the clinical departments there are several pay models and the variation in salary is
significant across departments. The mean salary plus benefits for Assistant Professors is
$197,546 with a range from $81,813 for PhDs in some clinical departments to $325,022
for MDs in incentive based clinical departments.

We calculated the pay required to support faculty members at the rank of Assistant
Professor for six weeks. Estimating the number of leaves that would occur each year
was difficult, as so few applications are made for parental leave. We estimated the costs
for 8 leaves per year as the minimum and provide estimates for up to 40 leave requests
per year. The annual cost for paid parental leave is estimated to be between $223,000
and $1,100,000. The funding of paid parental leave will require new resources from
Department Chairs and central SOM administration.

Recommendations:

1. Simplify the current parental leave policy.
2. Administer applications for parental leave centrally through the Office of
   Academic Affairs and Faculty Development. The office provides a neutral
   resource and will facilitate the uniform administration of parental leave requests.
3. Set a minimum paid parental leave policy for all SOM faculty members. This
   leave is designed to support faculty members during the recovery post childbirth,
   will allow bonding with the newborn infant or adopted child, and allow time to
   provide for the needs of the infant or child, parent(s), and family.
4. The provision of paid leave is meant to support faculty members so that they can
   return and function productively in the work environment.
5. Departments can provide more than the minimum, but all Departments would
   provide at least the minimum.
6. Provide faculty members who give birth to or adopt a child up to 6 weeks of paid
   parental leave. This leave would not require the use of accrued sick or vacation
   leave. This change addresses faculty concerns and is in line with national efforts
   to change unpaid FMLA to paid leave.
7. The period of paid parental leave under this policy is a maximum of 6 weeks per
   occurrence, and no more than 24 weeks during a faculty member’s employment
   with the School of Medicine. The faculty member may apportion the 24 weeks of
total paid parental leave in any increment desired up to the maximum of 6 weeks per occurrence.

8. Salary for parental leave would be base plus negotiated salary up to a maximum of the NIH salary cap ($179,700 for FY 14). Although many faculty members requesting leave will have a salary below the NIH cap, using the NIH cap will allow the institution to fully utilize grant funds to support leave requests for eligible faculty members.

9. Faculty members who take paid parental leave and fail to return to work after the expiration of this leave or return to work but fail to remain for at least a time period equal to the paid leave, agree to reimburse the University of Utah salary paid under this policy. (Exceptions for serious illness, disability in faculty member or child)

10. Faculty members may elect to use accrued sick leave in lieu of paid parental leave.

11. Faculty members may elect to use FMLA leave in addition to paid parental leave for up to 12 weeks during a 12-month period.

12. If the spouse or partner of the birth mother or an adoptive parent is also a SOM faculty member, they are eligible to receive 1 week (5 days) of paid parental leave. Parental leave would be concurrent with FMLA. Additional leave can be taken through unpaid FMLA, or accrued sick leave and vacation.

13. The financial responsibility for paid parental leave will be shared. We will investigate shared funding models between the Departments, the Dean's Office and UUMG. Any funding arrangement will be piloted for three years.

14. The financial costs of the paid parental leave policy will be evaluated annually.
TO: Academic Senate,

RE: Revisions to the School of Medicine Parental Leave Policy (8-002)

FROM: Mary Anne Berzins, Chair of the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women

DATE: October 24 2013

The Presidential Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW) has had the opportunity to review the proposed changes to the School of Medicine Parental Leave policy. The PCSW is generally supportive of the changes overall as these continue to be of benefit to faculty members in the School of Medicine.

Commission members noted that:

- While it is not ideal that there are two parental leave policies, a separate School of Medicine policy has existed for some time and the suggested revisions do not alter the current situation. However, it is suggested that appropriate opportunities for convergence rather than divergence in parental leave policies be explored going forward.
- The Commission is supportive of the one week of paid leave for the spouse or partner (if also School of Medicine faculty) and would like to suggest that efforts be made to explore the potential to extend this arrangement beyond the School of Medicine.
- The Commission acknowledges that the proposed revisions support the operational needs of the School of Medicine and will enable faculty to take advantage of parental leave provisions in NIH grants.
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Undergraduate Council
Graduate Council X
Both Approvals
Grad Approval/Undergrad Notification

This proposal has been approved by:

Chair of Undergraduate Council

Chair of Graduate Council
Donna White Date: 9·30·13

Once the appropriate signature(s) have been obtained, please forward this completed form to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. (NOTE: The SVP-AA is the Chief Academic Office for the University of Utah and reports to the Board of Regents in this capacity. When necessary, the CAO will get a signature from the SVP-HSC.)

Chief Academic Officer
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Program Restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Administrative Unit</td>
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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] 10/11/2013
Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Printed Name: Name of CAO or Designee
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Section I: Request

The Department of Orthopedics requests that the name of the Department of Orthopedics be changed to the Department of Orthopaedics. There will be minimal, if any, impact on the primary activities of the department. This request does not affect degree titles.

This proposal was submitted to and approved by the Chair of the Department of Orthopedics. Next the proposal was discussed at the department Faculty meeting and then voted on by Orthopedic faculty. After the vote process, the Department Chair submitted the proposal to the Dean of the School of Medicine where it was reviewed and approved.

Section II: Need

The need is to align the name of the Department with the name of its ACGME accredited residency and fellowship programs. The Department of Orthopedics wishes to update terminology to be more current and in line with the profession. This change will align our department’s name with the American Board of Orthopaedic Surgery (ABOS), the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgery (AAOS), and the American Orthopaedic Association (AOA). The leading academic institutions of this country use this designation.

Section III: Institutional Impact

There will be little, if any, institutional impact with changing the name of the Department of Orthopedics to the Department of Orthopaedics. The change will provide closer alignment between the Department and its professional peer and certifying organizations. There will not be any change in degree titles.

Section IV: Finances

The only anticipated costs include printing of stationary. The budgetary impact will be nominal.
Degree/Departmental Name Changes

Instructions: This list is required information, for internal purposes, that must be submitted with your proposal. Pick the section that best describes the changes/additions being made. If you have any questions please contact Ed Barbanell at edward.barbanell@utah.edu or 585-6423.

Degree Name Changes:
Include the following items if the degree name is changing:

Old Degree Name

New Degree Name

  e.g., MS Family Ecology is now MS Human Development and Social Policy

First Semester Effective

  e.g., Fall 2012

Will any degrees awarded be grandfathered under the original degree name?  

Yes  No

How long?

Department Name Changes:
Include the following items if the department name is changing:

Old Department Name  Department of Orthopedics

New Department Name  Department of Orthopaedics

  New Subject Code (if applicable)

Old Degree Name  1

New Degree Name  1

Old Degree Name  2

New Degree Name  2

Old Degree Name  3

New Degree Name  3

  e.g., MS Meteorology is now MS Atmospheric Sciences

First Semester Effective  Fall 2013

  e.g., Fall 2012

Will any degrees awarded be grandfathered under the original degree name?  

Yes  No

How long?  Indefinitely

Claudia Sadowski  MD  6/11/13
June 17, 2013

Vivian S. Lee, M.D., Ph.D., M.B.A.
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University Health Care

Re: Department Name Change

Dear Dr. Lee,

I am writing to request that the formal name of my department be changed from “Department of Orthopedics” to “Department of Orthopaedics.” I request this to bring the department’s name in line with the correct spelling of the medical specialty.

The following websites confirm that the correct spelling is Orthopaedics.

ACGME:

The American Board of Orthopaedic Surgery
https://www.abos.org/

The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgery
http://www.aaos.org/

The American Orthopaedic Association (the academic society)
http://www.aoaonn.org/

Although the change is seemingly minor, it does matter that we spell the department’s name correctly. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charles Saltzman, M.D.
Chairman, Department of Orthopaedics
Louis S. Peery, M.D. Presidential Endowed Professor
Note: This form is intended to track the progress of a proposal (whether from Academic Affairs or Health Sciences) through the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils.

Proposal: Name Change for Fitness Leadership Emphasis
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- Graduate Council
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Chair of Graduate Council
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Chief Academic Officer

Once the Chief Academic Officer’s signature has been obtained, this approval document will be forwarded to the Office of the Academic Senate.
Degree/Departmental Name Changes

Instructions: This list is required information, for internal purposes, that must be submitted with your proposal. Pick the section that best describes the changes/additions being made. If you have any questions please contact Ed Barbanell at edward.barbanell@utah.edu or 585-6423.

Degree Name Changes:
Include the following items if the degree name is changing:

Old Degree Name  BS Exercise and Sport Science, Emphasis Fitness Leadership
New Degree Name  BS Exercise and Sport Science, Emphasis Fitness and Wellness Specialist

First Semester Effective  Fall 2014

Will any degrees awarded be grandfathered under the original degree name?  Yes  No

How long?

Department Name Changes:
Include the following items if the department name is changing:

Old Department Name
New Department Name

New Subject Code (if applicable)

Old Degree Name 1
New Degree Name 1

Old Degree Name 2
New Degree Name 2

Old Degree Name 3
New Degree Name 3

First Semester Effective

Will any degrees awarded be grandfathered under the original degree name?  Yes  No

How long?
Institution Submitting Request: University of Utah  
Proposed Title: Fitness and Wellness Specialist  
Currently Approved Title: Fitness Leadership  
School or Division or Location: College of Health  
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: Exercise and Sport Science  
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code¹ (for new programs):  
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for existing programs): 31.0505  
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Proposal Type (check all that apply): 
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<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>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<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>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>
</tbody>
</table>

*Requires “Section V: Program Curriculum” of Abbreviated Template
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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.
Program Request - Abbreviated Template
University of Utah
Bachelor of Science Exercise and Sport Science Major
06/10/2013

Section I: Request

The Department of Exercise and Sport Science at the University of Utah proposes that the following alternation to the current Fitness Leadership emphasis be made starting the Fall of 2014:

1. Emphasis name be changed to Fitness and Wellness Specialist. The Department Faculty have met and approved this change. This proposal was then taken to the College of Health Curriculum Committee and the name change was approved.

Section II: Need

Changing the name of the emphasis from Fitness Leadership to Fitness and Wellness Specialist will align the program better with the current job market and terminology current to the field, as well as make it easier to determine which professional area the candidate has expertise and professional preparation. The name change also better reflects the content of the emphasis coursework and skill development.

Section III: Institutional Impact

There is no anticipated impact to the department or institution.

Section IV: Finances

There is no anticipated financial impact to the department or institution.
## Emphasis Requirements (Fall 2014)

**Exercise and Sport Science**  
**Emphasis: Fitness and Wellness Specialist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1050 College Algebra</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1040/1070 Statistics (or an approved statistics course)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 2325 Human Anatomy (Req. Prereq. BIOL 1210)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 2420 Human Physiology (Req. Prereq BIOL 2325)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTR 1020 Foundations of Nutrition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 2500 Exploration of Movement Science (Prereq or CoReg Statistics)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 2600 or 2601* Sport and American Society</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 3091 or 3094* Exercise Physiology (Prereq BIOL 2325, BIOL 2420 &amp; ESS 2500)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 3092 Kinesiology (Prereq BIOL 2325 &amp; ESS 2500)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 3340 or 3341* Sport Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 3670 Physical Activity Epidemiology (Prereq ESS 3091/3094)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEDU 4251 Facilitating Physical Activity and Other Healthy Behaviors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 4464 Exercise Instructor Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 4465 Exercise Programming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESS 4466 Exercise Programming</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 4670 Aging and Exercise  (Prereq ESS 3091/3094)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESS 4690 Training and Planning</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 4800 Practicum</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 4810 Supervised</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTR 5360 Weight Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total:** 67  
**Upper Division:** 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elective Courses (from approved list)</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESS Elective (ESS only)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS Elective (ESS or NUTR only)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS Elective (ESS, HEDU, or NUTR only)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total:** 9  
**Upper Division:** 9

**Total Number of Credits:** 76
## Standard Course Planner for Fitness Leadership Emphasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL 1</th>
<th>Cr Hrs</th>
<th>SPRING 1</th>
<th>Cr Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1050 - College Algebra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MATH 1040/1070 - Statistics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR2 - Writing 2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BIOL 1210 (SF) - Principals of Biology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Credits of Electives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Credits of Electives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL 2</th>
<th>Cr Hrs</th>
<th>SPRING 3</th>
<th>Cr Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESS 2500 - Exploration of Movement Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BIOL 2420 - Human Physiology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 2325 - Human Anatomy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ESS 2600 - Sport and American Society</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ESS 3340 - Sport Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTR 1020 (AS) - Foundations of Nutrition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 Credits of Electives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Credits of Electives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL 3</th>
<th>Cr Hrs</th>
<th>SPRING 3</th>
<th>Cr Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESS 3091 (QI) - Exercise Physiology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ESS 4464 - Exercise Instructor Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 3092 - Kinesiology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ESS 4465 (QI) - Exercise Programming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ESS 4466 - Applied Exercise Programming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ESS 4670 - Aging and Exercise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Credits of Electives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ESS, NUTR, or H EDU Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL 4</th>
<th>Cr Hrs</th>
<th>SPRING 4</th>
<th>Cr Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESS 4800 - Practicum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ESS 4810 - Supervised Internship</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS 3670 - PA Epidemiology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H EDU 4251 - Facilitating Physical Activity &amp; Other Healthy Behaviors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ESS 4690 - Training and Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NUTR 5360 - Weight Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS or NUTR Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HF: Humanities Exploration  
FF: Fine Arts Exploration  
AI: American Institutions  
AS: Applied Science  
SF: Physical/Life Science Exploration  
CW: Upper Division Communication/Writing  
DV: Diversity  
IR: International Requirement  
Qi: Quantitative Intensive BS
Council Approval

Note: This form is intended to track the progress of a proposal (whether from Academic Affairs or Health Sciences) through the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils.

Proposal: Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences Name Change

This proposal needs to go through:
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Both Approvals
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This proposal has been approved by:

Chair of Undergraduate Council

Chair of Graduate Council  Donna White  Date: 9.30.13
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| Date: 7/25/2013 |

Printed Name: Randall J Olson, M.D., Professor and Chair, CEO John A. Moran Eye Center

Section I: Request

We want to change the name of our Department from the Department of Ophthalmology to the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences.

Section II: Need

As a clinical department we have the greatest percentage of our budget dedicated to the Visual Sciences side of what we do, more than any other department in the School of Medicine. This represents about 40% of our budget. When we include what the clinical side does, we are probably close to 50/50 effort at this time between clinical ophthalmology and visual sciences research. This is a national trend and simply represents that fact that the clinical speciality of ophthalmology in institutes similar to our is very bit as much about the science of vision as we are engaged in clinical ophthalmology. We feel that is name more fairly represents what we do.

Section III: Institutional Impact

We do not offer any degrees in our department. This change will not affect or change the structure, faculty or staff in any way. No new physical facilities or modifications will be needed. No equipment will be needed.

Section IV: Finances

We do not anticipate any costs or savings from this name change. No new funds will be required and it will not impact budgets at our institution.
June 17, 2013

Dr. Edward M Barbanell
195 CENTRAL CAMPUS DR RM 110
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84112

Dear Dr. Barbanell:

On June 17, 2013 at Executive Committee Meeting the following name changes about departments were discussed and approved:

- Department of Ophthalmology would like to be recognized as the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences.
- Department of Orthopedics would like to be recognized as the Department of Orthopaedics.
- The Division of Cardiology would like to be recognized as the Division of Cardiovascular Medicine. This Division is part of the Department of Internal Medicine.

The vote results were as follows:

- Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences – 15 approvals/0 disapprovals/1 abstention
- Department of Orthopaedics – 15 approvals/0 disapprovals/1 abstention
- Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine – 16 approvals/0 disapprovals/0 abstentions

I am supportive of these department/division name changes.

Sincerely,

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

VSL/pna
June 10, 2013

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
5201 Clinical Neurosciences Center
Salt Lake City, UT 84132

RE: Department Name Change from “Department of Ophthalmology” to “Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences”

Dear Vice President Lee:

This is actually the third time that we are working on this having thought that this name change had occurred several years ago. I apologize that, supposedly, after we had done all that we were told to do, that somehow the ball was dropped, but whatever the reason this simply represents what we do as a Department at this time. I do think now as a clinical department, we have the greatest percentage of our budget dedicated to the Visual Sciences side of what we do than any other Department in the School of Medicine. This represents about 40% of our budget. When we included what the clinical side does, we are probably close to 50/50 effort at this time between clinical ophthalmology and visual sciences research.

This is a national trend and simply represents the fact that the clinical specialty of ophthalmology in institutes similar to ours is every bit as much about the science of vision as we are engaged in clinical ophthalmology. We felt that this new name more fairly represented what we do and had requested this name change many years ago.

If there are any issues or questions in regards to this, please do not hesitate to contact me. I appreciate getting this carried through all the way to where the name is finally official.

Sincerely,

Randall J Olson, M.D.
Professor and Chair of Ophthalmology & Visual Sciences
CEO, John A. Moran Eye Center

RJO: sb
MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Academic Senate

From: Mary Parker, Commencement Committee Co-chair
Laura Snow, Commencement Committee Co-chair

Date: October 28, 2013

Re: Proposal to discontinue Spring Semester Reading Day

This proposal stems from a recent change to the Commencement schedule. You will recall that General Commencement 2013 was held on a Thursday evening rather than a Friday morning. This move was part of an experimental effort designed to create new traditions and appeal broadly to the graduates, faculty and campus community. Based on the positive feedback, President Pershing has adopted the recommendation to continue the Thursday evening celebration in perpetuity, beginning with Commencement 2014. Please reference the attached memo from the President for additional details on this change.

This change requires a modification of the spring semester final exam period to begin and end one day earlier, allowing students to complete finals on Wednesday and participate in the General Commencement convocation on Thursday. In order to accommodate this schedule, the existing Reading Day, held on the Thursday prior to the final exam period, would be eliminated beginning with April 24, 2014 and in perpetuity.

To date, the proposal has been reviewed with the following constituent groups: Commencement Committee, Council of Academic Deans, President Pershing, Vice President Barb Snyder, Student Commission, Undergraduate Council, Academic Senate Executive Committee, Student Assembly and Student Alumni Board. Response has been mostly favorable although some students and faculty expressed opposition. Below is a summary of the issues raised.

In favor:

- removes what may be an obstacle for student attendance at General Commencement
- consistency - there is no Reading Day in either fall or summer semesters
- do students really use it for the purpose intended?
- the weekend satisfies need for study / preparation time
- sentiment that both students and faculty are ready to finish the semester sooner than later
- some faculty use it as an exam day

In opposition:

- beneficial as a study / preparation day
- Bennion Center has traditionally held a service event that day
In an effort to create a memorable and meaningful experience for our graduates and their families, various changes were made to last year’s General Commencement ceremony. Instituted on a trial basis and recommended by a committee of students, faculty and staff, these changes were driven by a goal to develop new campus traditions to appeal broadly to the graduates, faculty, and the campus community.

During the summer, a survey was conducted to gauge overall response to the changes, as well as support for implementing them for Commencement 2014 and beyond. Based on the positive feedback received, I am pleased to announce that several changes will be adopted going forward.

The most significant of these is the move of our General Commencement to a Thursday evening celebration, providing an institutional celebration of the graduating class’ collective success and accomplishments. Scheduled to be held on Thursday, May 1, at 6:30 p.m. in the Jon M. Huntsman Center, the 2014 General Commencement will serve as an "opening ceremony" to the college convocations.

Most college convocations will be held throughout the following day, Friday, May 2. While
the date and/or time may have changed for some of these convocations, every effort has been made to maintain each individual college's preferred venue, logistics and floor plans (see the attached 2014 College Convocation Schedule).

Please contact Mary Parker, Commencement Co-chair and Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, with any questions or concerns regarding 2014 Commencement. She can be reached at 801-581-3490 or MGParker@sa.utah.edu.

Thank you for your support of this important annual event. I look forward to joining with you to celebrate the University of Utah's Class of 2014.

DWP/Im
Attachment
Council Approval

Note: This form is intended to track the progress of a proposal (whether from Academic Affairs or Health Sciences) through the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils.
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Program Request - Abbreviated Template
University of Utah
Center for Latin American Studies
08/20/2013

Section I: Request

The College of Humanities at the University of Utah requests approval for the establishment of the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS) and requests that the Center be granted permanent status. The center aims to increase knowledge, understanding, and awareness of Latin American countries, cultures and languages through multidisciplinary and multi-institutional collaborative activities. CLAS will collaborate with the current Latin American Studies Program at the University of Utah, which will continue to administer its academic programs.

Faculty Consultation: The Latin American Studies Program currently has approximately 70 affiliated faculty members across more than 10 colleges and 20 academic departments, but has no faculty lines of its own. During the summer of 2013, the draft proposal to establish CLAS was circulated among all affiliated Latin American Studies faculty, who were then invited to attend two meetings to discuss the Center’s proposed missions, institutional structure, and activities. We invited the faculty who were unable to attend the meetings to submit comments and suggestions via email. The meetings to discuss the draft proposal were held on June 20 and August 1, 2013. The faculty received the proposal with enthusiasm, noting that the program’s recent growth beyond the academic programs justified the creation of center status. They agreed that as a center, CLAS would provide faculty and students with new opportunities to enhance their research, teaching and learning, as well as expand the Center’s overall research profile, its ability to compete for external grants, and its efforts at public engagement. We did not receive any objections to the proposal to establish the center.

Section II: Need

A. Mission

The Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS) at the University of Utah fosters knowledge of Latin America and its peoples by enhancing the scope and quality of teaching, research, and community engagement related to the region.

To accomplish this mission, CLAS

- Supports teaching and curricular initiatives related to Latin America across campus, including the social sciences, humanities, natural sciences, medical sciences, and professional schools.
- Fosters and enhances the scope and quality of research related to Latin America carried out by faculty and students at the University of Utah.
- Encourages collaboration with community partners and with other national and international universities.
- Disseminates scholarship, innovative teaching materials, and information about Latin America through its website, through conferences, public events, lectures, workshops, and teacher training.
• Serves as a resource to business, government, community organizations, and the media that have a need for expertise on Latin America or Latin American communities living in the United States.
• Collaborates with local and national K-16 institutions by providing teacher training opportunities, innovative curricula, and assessment.

B. Need

The Latin American Studies Program is one of several area studies programs at the University of Utah that seek to contribute to the internationalization of the campus and ensure that the university continues to evolve into a truly global and globalized institution. Given Latin America’s geopolitical, cultural, and economic importance to the United States and Utah, the existence of a strong center that promotes teaching, research and outreach related to the region and supports the teaching mission of the Latin American Studies Program is essential to the success of the university’s internationalization initiatives. Mexico and Brazil are regional economic powerhouses with close economic and political relationships with the United States and Utah. Utah exports to South America have more than doubled since 2005 while exports to Mexico have increased by 350% during the same period. Brazil is a global economic powerhouse – it recently passed Italy and the United Kingdom to become the sixth largest economy in the world, and will likely soon surpass France to become the fifth largest (behind only the U.S., China, Japan and Germany). Mexico is the third largest trading partner of the United States (behind only Canada and China) that as a result of NAFTA (the North American Free Trade Agreement) has an economy that is closely integrated with our own. Other countries, such as Chile, Venezuela, Cuba, Colombia, Argentina and Peru are also strategically and economically important to the United States. Indeed, one of the current priorities for the Utah Governor’s Office of Economic Development is to deepen economic ties to Latin American countries such as Brazil, Mexico and Peru.

Deepening economic, cultural, and political linkages between the United States and Latin America have created strong demand for individuals with advanced competency in Latin American languages and sophisticated understanding of the region’s peoples, countries, cultures, and contemporary issues. The need for such specialized knowledge is now critical in sectors such as business, health care, education, social services, the military and international law enforcement, making programmatic development in Latin American Studies more pressing than ever. Much of this need is domestic. The number of immigrants from Latin America living in Utah has increased by more than 200% during the past two decades, one of the fastest growth rates in the country. In some cities in the state (Salt Lake City, Midvale, West Valley City) immigrants from Latin America make up more than 20% of the population, and in some smaller towns (Wendover, Moroni), the percentage is even higher. This demographic shift now requires that social workers, school teachers, nurses, lawyers, and doctors have much greater linguistic and cultural competency to adequately serve this population. Therefore, immigration from Latin America to the United States creates a need for expertise in Latin American cultures and languages among professionals, and this expertise is highly valued by employers across industries, in both public and private sectors.

To meet local and national need for Latin American specialists, for innovative research about Latin America, and for graduates with advanced skills in Latin American languages, we have expanded and restructured during the last five years around six new initiatives: 1) the creation of a B.A. Degree in Latin American Studies; 2) strengthening the instruction of Spanish and Portuguese at the university; 3) the enhancement of course offerings and course content related to Brazil and Brazilian Studies; 4) the
development of instruction of Nahuatl and Quechua, two major indigenous languages spoken in Latin America; 5) the creation of an MA degree program in Latin American Studies; 6) and the creation of a new Center for Latin American Studies, which will collaborate with the degree programs and enhance our ability to compete for and administer external grants.

With the approval of the MA in Latin American Studies by the Board of Regents in January 2013, we successfully completed the first five steps of our plan for institutional development, and are ready to establish a center to oversee research and community engagement and to support the teaching mission of the academic program that will continue to house the minor, major and MA degrees in Latin American Studies. The establishment of the center is necessary for CLAS to fulfill its mission of becoming a major hub for Latin American-related activities on campus, as well as a resource center with the capacity to support research, teaching and outreach related to Latin America. In particular, establishing CLAS as a center will allow us to compete for and manage multiple extramural grants simultaneously. In 2012 the Latin American Studies Program received a $160,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Education to enhance teaching of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Utah, to develop Brazilian Studies content across colleges, and to provide opportunities for faculty training and development. More than 20 faculty from a dozen departments participated in this grant. We have also collaborated with the Honors College to raise and distribute $80,000 in student scholarships since 2010. The next major strategic goal for CLAS is to apply to the Department of Education to become a Title VI National Resource Center (NRC) for Latin American Studies. Grants and programs like these will significantly raise the prestige of the University of Utah as a major center for Latin America-related scholarship, teaching and outreach.

A strong Center for Latin American Studies that fosters cutting edge research, actively disseminates knowledge about the region, and supports the teaching mission of the ongoing Latin American Studies Program to train graduates with knowledge of Latin America will allow the university to develop into an important regional and national resource for business, government, and nonprofit sectors. As a center, CLAS will have greater capacity to coordinate and support activities that link the University to the wider Utah community by sponsoring public lectures, organizing seminars for business and political leaders, providing consulting services for businesses and nonprofits, and developing innovative teaching materials and teacher training workshops for K-16 institutions in the state. We expect to work closely with the university’s new Office for Global Engagement to strategize about and implement initiatives related to Latin America.

C. Similar programs and centers

No other colleges or universities in Utah currently house a Center for Latin American Studies, and upon approval, this will be the only such center in the entire Intermountain region.

Section III: Institutional Impact

The creation of center status will have minimal impact on the institutional or administrative structures that already exist on campus. CLAS will be housed administratively in the College of Humanities, along with the Latin American Studies Program, which will continue to administer the undergraduate and graduate degree programs. CLAS will rely on existing staff and budgets, which presently support the many activities that enhance research, teaching and community engagement already under way. The creation of center status
will have no initial impact on instructional programs or on enrollments related to the Latin American Studies Program and will not impact the Program’s relationships or agreements with affiliated departments.

As funds become available and the institutional capacity of CLAS grows, the Center will support student research opportunities, scholarships, study abroad opportunities, internships and public events that will raise the profile of Latin American Studies among students. These initiatives will provide incentives for students to take courses in the Latin American Studies Program and in the Department of Languages and Literature, and to pursue majors, minors and graduate degrees in Latin American Studies and related disciplines. We expect this to have a positive influence on enrollments in courses and degree programs related to Latin American Studies.

The Latin American Studies Program already has sufficient office and activity space in the Carolyn Tanner Irish Humanities Building to support the activities of the newly established center so no new equipment or space is needed. CLAS will share staff with the Latin American Studies Program and continue to collaborate with the Asia Center to share costs and staff where appropriate. The current Director and Associate Director of the Latin American Studies Program will also serve as the Director and Associate Director of CLAS. The administrative officer (shared with the Asia Center) and two work-study office support positions (shared with the Asia Center) are currently sufficient to support CLAS activities. As funds become available and initiatives multiply, the Center will increase staff to support the management of grants and scholarships, events planning and coordination, and community engagement.

The center will establish a Faculty Advisory Board that will consult with and advise the Director on center priorities, missions, and strategic initiatives, decisions on major policy questions, and proposals for interdisciplinary research, teaching and outreach activities. The Faculty Advisory Board will consist of six affiliated faculty (in addition to the Director, who serves as the Chair of the board), who will be recruited and appointed by the Director. In selecting members, the Director will strive to achieve balance in representation of colleges, departments, faculty rank, and area of specialization.

**Section IV: Finances**

No new funds will be required for the Center at this time. Existing budgets and grant funding will initially support Center activities and staff. The cost-sharing arrangements between Latin American Studies and the Asia Center will remain in place.

Fundraising and competing for external grants will be top priorities for CLAS. During the spring of 2014, we plan to apply for a Department of Education Title VI grant to establish a National Resource Center for Latin American Studies at the University of Utah. With the ongoing success of the Latin American Studies Program, previous success receiving external grants, demonstrated ability to support scholarship and community outreach activities, and establishment of the Center for Latin American Studies, the University of Utah will be in an excellent position to compete for this prestigious grant.
September 24, 2013

TO: Graduate Council

FR: Ann L. Darling
   Chair, Undergraduate Council

RE: Center for Latin American Studies

On Thursday, September 3, the Undergraduate Council voted to approve a proposal from the College of Humanities for creating a Center for Latin American Studies. The Council felt strongly that the consolidation of several disparate activities under one administrative umbrella would enhance the experience of our undergraduate students.
August 20, 2013

To: The University of Utah Graduate Council

From: Robert Newman, College of Humanities

Re: Support for creation of the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS)

As Dean of the College of Humanities, I write in support of the creation of the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS) to be housed in the College of Humanities, along with the existing Latin American Studies Program. The College of Humanities and the Latin American Studies Program have greatly expanded their teaching, research, and outreach initiatives during the past five years. These initiatives include the creation of a BA and an MA degree program and the procurement of a major federal grant to strengthen instruction in Latin American Studies across colleges at the University of Utah. As the College further expands its focus on Latin American Studies by applying for National Resource Center Status next year, there will be many opportunities for additional growth. The existence of the Center for Latin American Studies will be a great asset in procuring NRC status, in applying for other major grants, and in providing the institutional structure necessary for further expansion. The new center will collaborate with the current Latin American Studies Program, which will continue to administer the undergraduate and graduate degree programs in Latin American Studies. The existing administrative staff and space of the Latin American Studies Program are sufficient to support the establishment and operation of CLAS and thus the center will require no new funding from the university.

In short, there is ample need for CLAS, its creation will contribute to the university’s international and interdisciplinary initiatives, and it will provide significant benefits to faculty, students, and the community.

Thank you for your attention,

RN/jd
August 12, 2013

To: The University of Utah Graduate Council

From: Robert Newman, College of Humanities

Re: Support for creation of the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS)

As Dean of the College of Humanities, I write in support of the creation of the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS) to be housed in the College of Humanities. The College of Humanities and the existing Latin American Studies Program have greatly expanded their teaching, research, and outreach initiatives during the past five years. These initiatives include the creation of a BA and an MA degree program and the procurement of a major federal grant to strengthen instruction in Latin American Studies across colleges at the University of Utah. As the College further expands its focus in Latin American Studies by applying for National Resource Center Status next year, there will be many opportunities for additional growth. The existence of the Center for Latin American Studies will be a great asset in procuring NRC status, in applying for other major grants, and in providing the institutional structure necessary for further expansion. The new center will replace the current Latin American Studies Program and take over administration of its academic programs, grants and activities. The existing administrative staff and space are sufficient for the operation of CLAS and thus the center will require no new funding from the university.

In short, there is ample need for CLAS, its creation will contribute to the university’s international and interdisciplinary initiatives, and it will provide significant benefits to faculty, students, and the community.

Thank you for your attention,

RN/jd
September 11, 2013

Rebecca Horn, Director  
Latin American Studies Program  
University of Utah  
215 South Center Campus Drive, Room 210  
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Dear Professor Horn,

I am writing in support of your proposal to create the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS) in the strongest possible terms. As Dean of the Honors College, I have worked closely with LAS in recent years on a number of initiatives, initiatives that have contributed to the internationalization and diversification of the Honors College. We collaborated on a grant from the Mexican government to fund scholarships for students of Mexican descent, which over four years will have distributed $90,000 to UU students, including those in the Honors College. I’m especially enthusiastic about the Culture and Languages Across the Curriculum (CLAC) initiative, which LAS has piloted, in which students study discipline-based content (e.g., art history, history, political science) in Spanish or Portuguese. Through our ongoing collaboration, the Honors College has agreed to offer two courses 2014-15 fully in the target language, constituting a significant dissemination of the CLAC model on campus.

These are examples of the kind of activities undertaken by LAS that contribute significantly to internationalization of the campus and its colleges and departments. The creation of a Center for Latin American Studies will provide the institutional setting for such activities and prove to be a great asset to all students at this university.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Torti  
Dean, Honors College
September 12, 2013

Rebecca Horn, Director
Latin American Studies Program
University of Utah
210 Carolyn Tanner Irish Humanities Building
CAMPUS

Dear Rebecca,

As Chief Global Officer in the Office for Global Engagement, I write to express my support for the proposal to create the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS).

In the last decade, the Latin American Studies Program has flourished, currently boasting a vibrant and successful academic program that includes the minor, major and MA degrees. Various other initiatives are now also underway, including the administration of external grants, sponsorship of campus and community events, and involvement with K-16 outreach, among others. The proposal to create the Center for Latin American Studies reflects the expansion of activities beyond the core academic program and the need for a new and appropriate administrative home for them.

The creation of CLAS will support teaching, research and service activities related to Latin America campus-wide. It thus aligns with and complements the mission of the Office for Global Engagement (OGE), which is to provide "leadership for cross-campus coordination and support of global initiatives at the University of Utah." CLAS will enhance these efforts and elevate the visibility of Latin American Studies on campus and beyond. Center status would also enhance the application by Latin American Studies to the U.S. Department of Education for designation as a National Resource Center (NRC), an application that will be submitted this academic year (2013-14).

In summary, I strongly support the proposal to establish the Center for Latin American Studies. I consider it a critical element in the creation of a truly globalized university.

Sincerely,

Michael Hardman, Distinguished Professor
Chief Global Officer
Office for Global Engagement
September 25, 2013

Memorandum

To: Rebecca Horn, Director, Latin American Studies

From: Janet Theiss, Director, The Asia Center

Re: Support letter for establishment of a Center for Latin American Studies

As founding director of the Asia Center at the University of Utah, I enthusiastically support the establishment of a Center for Latin American Studies. I work closely with the director of Latin American Studies because the missions and activities of the two programs are essentially the same and we are developing along parallel trajectories. The Latin American Studies program has grown dramatically in the last few years since the creation of an undergraduate degree. Like the Asian Studies Program before it, has become increasingly involved in facilitating the development of Latin American foci in teaching, research, and outreach across the campus and in the wider community. As its activities have grown far beyond the scope of an academic program, it is now appropriate to establish a Center to manage them. Following the path of the Asia Center, Latin American Studies has garnered enough faculty and external funding to apply for Department of Education funding as a Title VI National Resource Center (NRC) for Latin American Studies. This prestigious status will bring substantial resources to the university for fellowships for graduate and undergraduate students, curriculum development, faculty development and more. The establishment of a Center for Latin American Studies is essential for attracting grant funding and other external resources and for the continued growth and excellence of activities across the university related to Latin America.

Sincere regards,

Janet Theiss
Director, The Asia Center
Associate Professor, History Department
TO: Utah State Board of Regents

FROM: University of Utah Academic Senate

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2015 Utah System of Higher Education Budget Request

DATE: November 4, 2013

The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee (FBPAC) of the University of Utah Academic Senate has reviewed the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request submitted to the State Board of Regents by the Utah System of Higher Education. The committee and the Academic Senate wish to register its general endorsement of this request.

USHE recommends a 3% employee compensation increase to help the state of Utah “build capacity for the 66% goal” whereby 66% of Utah high school graduates shall be able to earn degrees from institutions of higher education. As part of the context for this request, USHE asks the Legislature to note and redress “inequities” that have arisen. Since 2003, for example, the system of higher education “has grown by a net of 14,800 students” with no funding for enrollment growth.

Overall, USHE requests “an on-going State appropriation increase” of 17.5% “above the fiscal year 2013-14 base budgets” (including compensation, health and dental insurance contributions, and Mission Based Funding), and it requests that the Legislature “allow the Regents and institutions flexibility to prioritize and manage institutional needs.”

USHE believes—and so does the University of Utah Academic Senate—that Utah resident students should receive “state support based on institutional mission and student type.”

FBPAC notes in particular that USHE requests $3,900,000 per year for University of Utah utility infrastructure, and increased funding for Regents and New Century Scholarships ($6 million) and Success Stipends ($1 million). These programs are crucial not only to the 66% goal but to future growth of the tax base in the state.

Respectfully submitted,

Howard Horwitz
Professor, Department of English
Chair, Academic Senate Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee
The Utah System of Higher Education and the State Board of Regents are committed to building capacity to reach the state’s goal that 66% of adults hold a degree or certificate by 2020. This funding request supports the missions of Utah’s public colleges and universities in meeting the state’s educational and economic goals.

Higher education in Utah is responsive to the needs of students and the economy. Within the base budget, institutions are continually reprioritizing, finding efficiencies, eliminating outdated programs and adding new ones based on demand. The following budget priorities are in addition to the ongoing base budget.

### USHE Top 3 Budget Priorities

**#1 Employee Compensation: $31,611,300**

- **Base Compensation Package** $21,128,300
  A three percent Performance Based compensation pool allows USHE institutions to recruit and retain qualified faculty and staff in a competitive, national market.

- **Health Package** $8,675,600
  In order to maintain current health care programs, medical insurance premiums are projected to increase 9.5% in 2014-15.

- **Utah Retirement Systems Package** $1,807,400
  URS retirement premiums for Tier 1 employer contributions are increasing 7.88%, with Tier 2 at 9.32%.

**#2 Mission Based Funding: $79,705,000**

- **Acute Equity Funding** $69,705,000
  Enrollment growth in Utah higher education has not been funded since 2003. Yet in that time, USHE has grown by 14,800 students. While all USHE institution receive less in tax funds or tuition than their peers, funding inequities are most acute at institutions with open-access missions. The Board of Regents’ Acute Equity funding request is based upon the principle that Utah resident students should receive similar state support based on institutional mission and student type, regardless of which state institution they attend.

The request seeks to establish a minimum floor of state funding for resident undergraduate students of $4,800 annually. This number is equal to 90% of the mean for Carnegie Foundation’s peer institutions.

**Distinctive Mission $10,000,000**

To support the State Board of Regents’ strategic plan of increasing participation, completion, and economic development each institution will propose unique initiatives based regional and statewide educational needs. Past projects have included expanding STEM cohorts, increasing online course delivery, enhancing retention and student success efforts, and entrepreneurship programs that meet local economic development needs.
USHE Budget Priorities for 2014-15

#3 Performance Based Funding: $2,000,000

USHE recommends funding core performance measures which emphasize completions to reach the 66% goal. Institutions submit specific measures (metrics), current data, and benchmarks for evaluation, to receive allocations based on achievement or significant progress. Metrics from 2013 include:

- Retention & completion rates
- Increasing graduate education
- Transitioning students from developmental math to college math courses

Operational Imperatives: $7,047,200

O&M for Non-State Funded Projects $1,947,200

For state-funded buildings, the O&M costs are budgeted for funding at the time the building is approved. For non-state funded buildings, since it is often unclear how soon these buildings will open after legislative approval, thus funding is not budgeted until after the building is complete and enters service. This amount represents one-third of the amount the Legislature has authorized USHE to request.

Univ. of Utah Utility Infrastructure $3,900,000

This ongoing appropriation will allow the University to complete the replacement of outdated infrastructure.

Higher Education Tech. Initiative $1,200,000

HETI funds are used to support USHE technology initiatives. This year’s request is focused on three areas:

- Teaching & Learning Platform software license to provide instructors the means to offer a multi-media rich learning experience.
- Network Security & Software for USHE institutions to implement shared storage and cloud services along with data security.
- ServiceNow cloud-based application suite

which will allow users to manage IT services, create self-service catalogs for web hosting, classroom technology installation, and network security.

Statewide Programs: $7,800,000

Student Access $7,250,000

- Regents’ & New Century Scholarships: to fund growth in number of recipients $6,000,000
- Success Stipends: need-based aid $1,000,000
- Engineering & Computer Science Scholarships $250,000

Collaborations $750,000

- Utah Data Alliance (UDA) $150,000
- Technology Intensive Concurrent Enrollment (TICE) $150,000
- Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC) $250,000

State Initiatives: $10,400,000

Utah State University: $3,000,000
Veterinary Medicine & Graduate Program Support
Salt Lake Community College: $3,400,000
Student Access Support & Completion
Dixie State University: $2,500,000
University Implementation
Snow College: $1,500,000
Rural Superintendents Concurrent Enrollment

To view the entire budget narrative document, please visit our website. higheredutah.org/budgetfinance
Council Approval

Note: This form is intended to track the progress of a proposal (whether from Academic Affairs or Health Sciences) through the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils.

Proposal: Animation Emphasis for Film and Media Arts BA

This proposal needs to go through:

- Undergraduate Council  
- Graduate Council  
- Both Approvals  
- Grad Approval/Undergrad Notification

This proposal has been approved by:

Chair of Undergraduate Council  
Date: 10/4/2013

Chair of Graduate Council

Once the appropriate signature(s) have been obtained, please forward this completed form to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. (NOTE: The SVP-AA is the Chief Academic Office for the University of Utah and reports to the Board of Regents in this capacity. When necessary, the CAO will get a signature from the SVP-HSC.)

Chief Academic Officer  
Date: 10/11/2013

Once the Chief Academic Officer’s signature has been obtained, this approval document will be forwarded to the Office of the Academic Senate.
Animation Emphasis (transcript emphasis)

Institution Submitting Request: University of Utah
Proposed Title: Animation Emphasis
School or Division or Location: College of Fine Arts
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: Department of Film and Media Arts
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code¹ (for new programs): 10.0304
Proposed Beginning Date (for new programs): 08/25/2014
Institutional Board of Trustees’ Approval Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Proposal Type (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regents’ General Consent Calendar Items</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R401-5 OCHE Review and Recommendation; Approval on General Consent Calendar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION NO.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ITEM</strong></td>
</tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1.1</td>
<td>□ New Administrative Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1.2</td>
<td>□ Administrative Unit Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1.3</td>
<td>□ Administrative Unit Restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1.4</td>
<td>□ Administrative Unit Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2.1</td>
<td>□ New Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2.2</td>
<td>□ New Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2.3</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2.1</td>
<td>□ Program Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3.1</td>
<td>□ Program Restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3.2</td>
<td>□ Program Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4.1</td>
<td>□ Name Change of Existing Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5.1</td>
<td>□ Program Discontinuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5.2</td>
<td>□ Program Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5.3</td>
<td>□ Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5.4</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] 10/11/2013

Date: MM/DD/YEAR

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.
Program Request
University of Utah
Animation Emphasis
07/25/2013

Section I: Request

The Department of Film & Media Arts wishes to offer an emphasis in Animation. We will offer the emphasis with the help of our partners in the Art & Art History Department by using courses from the new undergraduate drawing minor (approved 5/17/13). These classes will be used as the allied hours requirement of the Film & Media Arts BA. Students will be able to earn the drawing minor by taking two additional drawing courses should they wish to do so. Students will complete specified animation courses already in the Film & Media Arts elective curriculum. The emphasis will be a Film & Media Arts degree and students in the emphasis must meet all requirements of the general Film & Media Arts BA. The animation emphasis will require the same credit hours as the existing Film & Media Arts BA. The faculty of the Department of Film & Media Arts voted unanimously in favor of offering an emphasis in Animation on April 26, 2013.

Section II: Need

For some time our students have asked for a clear map to direct their efforts to study and train as animators. The purpose of this emphasis is to provide undergraduates an interdisciplinary academic path toward animation careers in film and television and to prepare them to pursue graduate degrees in animation. The transcript emphasis will allow employers and graduate selection committees to more easily recognize these students as trained animators.

Several institutions in the intermountain west including University of Nevada, Las Vegas, University of Arizona, University of Idaho, Moscow and University of New Mexico offer courses in animation but not an emphasis, adding an animation emphasis would attract students in the region and allow the University of Utah to compete for students who might otherwise chose to attend other institutions.

Brigham Young Universities Center for Animation is a highly regarded program and many graduates are placed in top studios. Recently in discussions with Brent Adams, Director of the Center for Animation, he indicated his support for animation at the University of Utah because BYU cannot graduate sufficient numbers of graduates to support the industry in the state; “We currently don’t produce the critical mass necessary to expand the industry here in Utah.” In accordance with the Prosperity 2020 goal of increasing Utah adults with postsecondary education to 66 percent, adding an animation emphasis will attract students interested in this expanding industry.

This program will enable the University of Utah in particular, and the USHE in general, to be at the forefront of educating students in Animation/Digital Media and to compete for students interested in animation. Offering an emphasis in animation will benefit the University of Utah and the USHE by providing students in the state with a focused program that produces graduates increasingly important to the state, region, and nation.

Section III: Institutional Impact

Our faculty has created the Animation Emphasis curriculum in consultation with the Art & Art History Department and we’re ready to promise a challenging and comprehensive path towards focused study in the field now. An emphasis will work as a road map to find the right path as well as a credential to let others
know they have made the journey. We expect to attract at least 20 interested students within the first year we offer the emphasis in animation and at least that many in each succeeding year. Our partners in the Art & Art History Department are ready and welcoming. With the collaboration of the Art & Art History Department we need no new faculty or facilities to proceed.

Section IV: Finances

In August The Department of Film & Media Arts hired a new full-time advisor, Rachel Osterman, in partnership with the College of Fine Arts and the University College Rachel’s presence vastly increases Film & Media Arts students advisor access and will easily cover increased enrollment from implementing the Animation Emphasis. This will make advising students in the Film & Media Arts Department with an interest in animation vastly easier. Counselors, faculty, and our administrator will all use less of their time accommodating student animators.

Section V: Program Curriculum

***THIS SECTION OF THE TEMPLATE REQUIRED FOR EMPHASES, MINORS, AND CERTIFICATES ONLY***

All Program Courses (with New Courses in Bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILM 2100</td>
<td>Critical Intro to Film</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 3110</td>
<td>History of Film I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 3120</td>
<td>History of Film II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 3500</td>
<td>Film Production I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 2600</td>
<td>Beginning Animation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 2630</td>
<td>Traditional Animation I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 3610</td>
<td>Computer Animation I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 3620</td>
<td>Computer Animation II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 2640</td>
<td>Traditional Animation II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 3160</td>
<td>Animation Film Survey</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 4165</td>
<td>Contemporary Animation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 3170</td>
<td>Japanese Anime</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 3130</td>
<td>Drawing I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3120</td>
<td>Life Drawing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 3040</td>
<td>Drawing the Human Head</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 4120</td>
<td>Advanced Life Drawing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one more Film elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Number of Credits</th>
<th>56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1</td>
<td>FILM 2100 Critical Intro to Film</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FILM 2600 Beginning Animation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPANISH 1010 Begin Spanish I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MATH 1070 Statistics</td>
<td>QB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1</td>
<td>FILM 3110 History of Film I</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPANISH 1020 Begin Spanish II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART 3130 Drawing I</td>
<td>AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2</td>
<td>FILM 3120 History of Film II</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FILM 3610 Computer Animation I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPANISH 2010 Intermediate Spanish I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2</td>
<td>FILM 3620 Computer Animation II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPANISH 2020 Intermediate Spanish II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FILM 3500 Film Production I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 3</td>
<td>FILM 2630 Traditional Animation I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART 3120 Life Drawing</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 3</td>
<td>ART 3040 Drawing the Human Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 4</td>
<td>FILM 4165 Contemporary Animation-Simpsons to South Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART 4120 Advanced Life Drawing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 4</td>
<td>FILM 4820 Screenwriting I</td>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 18, 2013

To Whom It May Concern,

The Department of Art & Art History is very happy to open our courses for the Drawing Minor to students from the Department of Film and Media Arts. These courses will be available to all students from their department whether they are pursuing a minor or just want to enhance their drawing skills. Enrollment will be on a first come first serve basis and space availability. We feel this will be mutually beneficial through the classroom environment where students from different emphasis will bring there perspectives and ideas to drawing as well as receive excellent instruction from the faculty teaching these courses. We also feel these courses fit nicely into the Film and Media Arts curriculum for the new emphasis in Animation or, story boarding, EAE computer animation and any other form of the creative process that fills the need for drawing to express ideas narratively and conceptually, in linear time or more dimensionally.

If you have any further questions about this agreement between Art and Film please feel free to contact me anytime. We look forward to this and other opportunities to work with Film and Media Arts that expand the possibilities for our students.

All the best,

Brian Snapp, Chair
Department of Art & Art History
Associate Professor, Ceramics
University of Utah
801 585-3576
Date: May 22, 2013

To: Ed Barbanell, Associate Dean
    Undergraduate Studies

From: Raymond Tymas-Jones, Dean
      College of Fine Arts

Subject: Support for BA in Film & Media Arts Animation Emphasis

This memorandum is in support of the BA in Film & Media Arts Animation Emphasis. This proposal has received support from the faculty, Department Chair, and College Curriculum Committee; I now add my support as well. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your consideration and assistance.
May 3, 2013

Raymond Tymas–Jones, Dean  
College of Fine Arts  
Brent Schneider, Associate Dean  
College of Fine Arts  
and Subsequent Committee Members

Dear Dean Tymas–Jones, et. al.

The Film & Media Arts Department is proud to put forward this proposal for a Transcript Emphasis in Animation.

The emphasis was designed with the input of our animation faculty, our Art Department partners, and with the advice received from our peers at Utah State University, Salt Lake Community College, and especially the generous comments of our friends in Brigham Young University’s animation program.

The emphasis, as you see it, was approved by vote of the faculty on April 26th and is endorsed by the department chair.

We hope to offer a clear and productive plan to the many students pursuing an education in animation within our department.

Thank you all for your time and consideration.

Very Truly Yours,

[Signature]

Kevin Hanson  
Chair, Film & Media Arts
October 3, 2013

To:
Allyson Mower, Senate President

From:
AFFR Committee

Re:
Inclusion of Career Line Faculty

Dear Allyson and the Executive Committee of the Senate;

The AFFR Committee met on October 1, 2013. As part of our agenda we discussed the inclusion of Career Line faculty on this committee. We are one of the few committees that currently have Career Line faculty representation. We feel it is important for this to continue, and would like to emphasize our collective opinion that there is a need for enhanced policy, and clarity about the rights and responsibilities of career line faculty within the University of Utah. Opportunities exist for tenure line faculty to have their concerns addressed beyond the departmental and college level, for example the Consolidated Hearing Committee (CHC), and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTAC). Currently there are minimal venues for addressing similar faculty concerns expressed by career line faculty beyond the departmental and college level. Continuing the voice of Career Line faculty on AFFR is a step towards the goal of recognizing issues of importance to all faculty that carry out the missions of the University of Utah.

Respectfully submitted;

[Signature]

Margaret F Clayton, PhD APRN
Chair, AFFR Committee
Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee

1. The Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee consists of twelve members elected by the Senate from the university faculty members (tenure-line and career-line) other than ex officio members of the Senate.
2. In addition to its role, prescribed in Section 11 of this policy, the committee will oversee the application and updating of the Policy 6-316 Code of Faculty Responsibility and will review for Senate consideration all legislative matters concerning faculty rights and responsibilities.
Proposed changes to charge:

Academic Policy Advisory Committee
1. The Academic Policy Advisory Committee consists of eight nine tenure-line and career-line faculty members and three students. Faculty members shall be elected by the Senate for two three-year terms, with four three of these terms beginning each June 16. Student members shall be selected for one-year terms in accordance with Procedures established by the ASUU, with terms beginning each June 16.
2. The Academic Policy Advisory committee is authorized to consider any matter relating to academic policy which may be suggested by members of the committee, members of the faculty, administrative officers, or students. Upon its selection of a subject for study, the committee shall notify all interested agencies within the university, including standing committees, and invite their cooperation. At least once each academic year, the committee shall submit a written report of its studies and recommendations, if any, to the Senate.

The proposed changes that are being recommended to the Senate Executive Committee are justified below. Numbers 1, 3 and 4 are interdependent.

1) Nine members: A change is suggested to increase the committee membership by one member in order to accommodate an equal number of members to rotate on and off each year.
2) Tenure-line and career-line: A change is made to the language of the charge to specifically include career-line faculty.
3) Three-year terms: A change in member term-length is suggested in order to (a) not only accommodate an equal number of members to rotate on and off each year, (b) but also allow members additional time (i.e., an additional year of service) on the committee to become more familiar and knowledgeable with APAC’s activities, especially for an incoming chair.
4) Three of these terms: A change is suggested to replace three members each year in order to accommodate an equal number of members to rotate on and off each year.
Annuities and Salaries Committee Salaries and Benefits

1. The Annuities and Salaries Committee—Salaries and Benefits Committee consists of six members of the regular faculty (consisting of both career-line and tenure-line faculty), elected by the Academic Senate to serve for three-year terms. The terms of two committee members shall end each year on June 15, and the terms of newly elected committee members shall begin on June 16. Members of the committee shall represent the university faculty as a whole and not any particular area or college. The Director of Human Resources—Chief Human Resources Officer shall be an ex officio nonvoting member of the committee.

2. The Annuities and Salaries Committee—Salaries and Benefits shall function in a research and advisory capacity and shall report to the Senate and from time to time make recommendations to the Senate on matters relating to sabbatical leaves, salaries, salary schedules, cost of living, faculty retirement plans, annuities, health and life insurance, and other benefits. The committee shall not, however, exercise budgetary or administrative powers in relation to these subjects. The committee shall advise the administration on matters pertaining to annuities and salaries salaries and benefits and report the advice they gave to the next regular meeting of the Senate.
12 October 2013

TO: Academic Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Howard Horwitz, chair, Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee

SUBJECT: Career line membership on Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee

The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee is aware that Career line faculty shall receive representation on Senate committees proportionate to their representation in the Academic Senate. At this time, no Career line faculty serve on the Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee, which has eight members. We request that at the first available opportunity, the Personnel and Elections Committee should please include Career line faculty on ballots to fill openings on FBPAC.

Respectfully submitted,

Howard Horwitz
Department of English
Chair, Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee
Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee

1. The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee consists of eight members of the regular faculty (tenure-line and career-line), elected by the Academic Senate to serve four-year terms. The terms of two committee members shall end each year on June 15, and the terms of newly elected members shall begin on June 16. Members of the committee shall represent the university faculty as a whole and not any particular area or college. Not more than two committee members may be from the same area or college.

2. Despite the general duties assigned to the Personnel and Elections Committee, all nominations for the Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee, except nominations made from the floor during a formally convened meeting of the Academic Senate, shall originate from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

3. The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee may establish its own rules which shall provide that individual faculty members are entitled to submit information to the committee, that no committee member is permitted to participate in discussions or to vote on matters directly affecting the member's own college, and that committee members will hold in strict confidence all budget information which the committee receives on a confidential basis from the university president or other administrative officers of the university.

4. The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee should respond to directions from the Academic Senate, while retaining the freedom to set its own agenda. The committee's principal role is one of consultation with the university administration, and of presenting and arguing for the views and interests of the whole faculty in the administration's long-range academic and budgetary planning. The committee should strive to persuade the administration to make critical budgetary and academic policy decisions in as open and public a way as possible.

5. The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee shall perform the functions assigned to it by applicable provisions of Policy 6-313 - opens new window, University Regulations, Section 5.
Library Policy Advisory Committee

1. The Library Policy Advisory Committee consists of one faculty (tenure-line or career-line) representative from each College and one from the University Libraries elected by the Academic Senate for three-year terms, and six students (including at least one graduate student) selected by ASUU. The directors of the Marriott Library, the Eccles Health Sciences Library, and the S.J. Quinney Law Library are ex officio, non-voting members of the committee.

2. The Library Policy Advisory Committee confers with and advises directors of the Marriott Library, the Eccles Health Sciences Library, and the S.J. Quinney Law Library concerning library policies and practices. It provides liaison between the libraries and the faculty and student body. The Library Policy Advisory Committee reports to the Academic Senate and the cognizant vice presidents.
1. The Personnel and Elections Committee consists of eighteen persons elected by the Senate from its members, and shall include one faculty representative (tenure-line or career-line) from each Senate area of representation and two students. Faculty shall be elected for three-year terms. A member of the Personnel and Elections Committee must be a senator at the time of election, but can remain on the Personnel and Elections Committee for three years even though his or her term of service on the Senate may expire during that three-year period of time. The number of career-line faculty shall not exceed the number of tenure-line faculty on the P&E Committee. The President of the Senate, may serve, at the election of the committee, as its chair.

2. This committee shall make nominations for elected standing committees of the Senate and for all other Senate committees, and if the Senate is requested to make nominations or recommendations for a committee to be appointed by the university administration, the Personnel and Elections Committee shall prepare the list of nominees. It will review university standing committees on a 5-year rotating schedule. This review will use self-study Procedures, and include an assessment of perceived appropriateness of committee membership, charter, functions, meetings and others. The committee shall review any new university-wide standing committee charters or changes to university standing committee charters. In alternate years, it will apportion Senate membership according to Section 2.B.1.b. of this policy. The committee will also review the necessity of retaining existing university committees, recommending to the Senate any possible excisions. It shall pursue an affirmative action program to secure significant representation of women, minorities, and nontenured career-line ranks in positions of responsibility within the university, and to seek a distribution of committee nominations among colleges and departments in order to obtain a range of backgrounds among the members of each committee.
University Diversity Committee

1. Membership. The University Diversity Committee will consist of 12 members of the regular faculty (6 tenure-line faculty and 6 career-line faculty), 3 staff members, and 3 student members. The faculty members will be elected by the Senate for three year terms. The staff members will be nominated by UUSAC and approved by the Senate Executive Committee for three year terms. The student members shall be selected for one year terms in accordance with Procedures established by the ASUU. Terms will begin each August 1. Non-voting ex-officio members shall include: Associate VP for Diversity, Associate VP for Diversity for Health Sciences, UUSAC Chair, ASUU President, Academic Senate Past-president, Director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, and two representatives from the community. The Chair of the University Diversity Committee will be invited to serve by the Senate President, with installation (vote) by the committee each year.

2. Charge. This committee shall provide leadership and expertise to the University of Utah community in promoting diversity in their various roles and activities; serves as a forum for the exchange of ideas within the University. The University Diversity Committee should respond to directions from the Academic Senate, while retaining the freedom to set its own agenda. The committee's principal role is to identify issues, projects, and proposals that would further a positive climate of diversity on the University of Utah campus, would enhance relations with diverse elements in the community, and would promote appreciation of diversity in the wider community. The committee's role includes forwarding information and recommendations to the Academic Senate. The committee will submit an annual report to the Academic Senate of its activities.

3. Budget. An annual budget will be offered by the President and administered by the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity.
1. Membership. The University Retention Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee (UPTSC) voting membership shall consist of sixteen tenured faculty members, with one faculty representative from each Senate area of representation elected for three-year terms by the Academic Senate and six career-line faculty members, elected for three year terms with no more than one representative per college. These faculty members may be divided into two subcommittees, one to review tenure-line RPT standards and the second to review career-line review standards. The Associate Vice President for Faculty, or designee, shall be a non-voting ex officio member. Voting members shall be elected as follows:
   1. Nominations will be proposed in advance by the Personnel and Elections Committee, and additional nominations of eligible faculty members who have agreed to serve may be made from the floor immediately prior to the election. Voting will be by preferential ballot.
   2. Members of the University RPT Standards Committee Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee will not be eligible for nomination for another term until an interval of one year has passed following the completion of their term on the committee.
   3. In each successive year, the Personnel and Elections Committee shall include among its nominations for the University RPT Committee Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee two or more candidates whose tenured or career-line faculty appointments are in colleges whose current member is rotating off the committee.

2. Vacancies. If vacancies occur in the University RPT Standards Committee Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, they shall be filled either by the runner-up from the original elections or, if that is not possible, by special elections conducted in the Academic Senate by the Personnel and Elections Committee.

3. Duties. See University Policy 6-305 (Duties of University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee).
October 2, 2013

Ruth V. Watkins  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
205 Park Bldg.  
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review  
Department of Sociology

Dear Vice President Watkins:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Department of Sociology. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Graduate Council, the Department Profile, and the Memorandum of Understanding resulting from the review wrap-up meeting.

Please forward this review to President David Pershing for his approval. After approval by President Pershing, the review will be forwarded to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next Senate meeting.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David B. Kieda  
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Cynthia Berg, Interim Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Science  
Kim Korinek, Chair, Department of Sociology

[Signature]

David B. Kieda  
Dean, The Graduate School

Approved

[Signature]

Ruth V. Watkins  
201 Presidents Circle, Room 302  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9016  
(801)581-7642  
FAX (801)581-6749  
http://www.gradschool.utah.edu

10-10-13
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Sociology. The External Review Committee included:

Arthur S. Alderson, PhD (Committee Chair)
Professor, Department of Sociology
Indiana University

Sarah Fenstermaker, PhD
Professor, Department of Sociology
University of California-Santa Barbara

Arland Thornton, PhD
Professor, Department of Sociology
Research Professor, Population Studies Center and Survey Research Center
University of Michigan

The Internal Committee of the University of Utah was composed of:

James VanDerSlice, PhD (Committee Chair)
Research Associate Professor
Department of Family and Preventive Medicine

Michael Caserta, PhD
Professor
College of Nursing

Tony Ekdale, PhD
Professor
Department of Geology and Geophysics
This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study report submitted by the Department of Sociology and the findings of the internal, external, and University Diversity committees. It is also informed by the Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis (OBIA) profile and responses to the internal and external committee reports by the department chair and college dean.

DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Department of Sociology at the University of Utah was founded 120 years ago. During its first 90 years, it developed successful undergraduate and graduate programs and a solid record of research accomplishments. About 30 years ago, the department began to falter in the areas of research, graduate training, and collegiality. It was placed in receivership in 1986 with a moratorium on faculty hiring as well as admission to the PhD program.

In the fall of 1998, the college dean appointed Frederick Rhodewalt, an assistant dean and professor of psychology, to the position of department chair, beginning a renaissance of the department. Rhodewalt oversaw the department's reform efforts from 1998–2002, guided by a memorandum of understanding that had been drawn up in response to the 1996 Graduate Council Program Review. During this time, a number of faculty members left, taking early retirement or finding positions elsewhere, and the central administration permitted the department to begin hiring new faculty. During the term of the next department chair (internal appointment of Michael Timberlake, 2002-2008), the program continued to rebuild: hiring new faculty members from top U.S. graduate programs, admitting applicants to the doctoral program, restructuring its curriculum, and significantly increasing faculty productivity in terms of research output. Complementing its existing strengths in criminology, gender, and race/ethnicity, the department’s research focus was expanded to include specializations in Comparative International Sociology (CIS) and Population and Health (PH).

Subsequent to the previous Graduate Council review, the second consecutive internal chair was appointed, Jeffrey Kentor, who served from 2008-May 2012 (and then became Associate Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science). During this period, research productivity continued its upward trajectory; graduate enrollments continued to increase; admission standards continued to rise; and the department offered outstanding instruction. The department lost two of its early career outstanding faculty members (to University of Chicago and University of North Carolina), but was able to replace them with other excellent faculty members.

While the department has continued to build on excellence in teaching, research, and service, it has struggled financially from approximately 2006 until several years ago. Thus, while Kentor assumed the chair position at a time at which the department was improving overall, it was also a time of financial difficulty. Over the last few years, the department has managed to increase enrollments and pay down a significant portion of its debt.
The internal reviewers noted that the relationship between the department faculty and the dean of the college at the time of the review was “problematic.” Their report states, “This is a serious concern that was expressed in various ways and to various degrees by virtually all the faculty – both junior and senior faculty – with whom we spoke. The chief concern seems to be an absence of collegial communication and lack of transparency in the Dean’s office with the department faculty. Part of this concern apparently is related to the widespread perception of a top-down micromanagement style of the Dean that leaves the faculty feeling in the dark about important decisions that affect them directly.”

After the internal and external reviews were conducted, the interim chair, Kim Korinek, was appointed chair in May 2012. Dean Rudd forgave the remaining debt in April 2012 (as reported by the chair’s letter of September 2012, though not mentioned by the Dean in his letter of May 2012). The chair is working to increase graduate student stipends to levels competitive with peer institutions and to secure resources to adequately compensate staff and add a “financial specialist.”

There are approximately 500 declared undergraduate majors, 120 minors, and 180 pre-Sociology and certificate students in the department. Other undergraduates take classes in the Sociology Department to fulfill general education requirements in the social sciences as well as other distributive requirements, including quantitative- and writing-intensive courses and diversity courses. In addition, students in interdisciplinary majors such as Gender Studies, Ethnic Studies, International Studies, and Asian Studies take classes in the Sociology Department.

The doctorate is a five-year program for students entering with the bachelor’s degree and receiving a master’s in passing along the way toward the PhD. The curriculum consists of 12 core and elective courses selected for the individual’s program of study in consultation with the supervisory committee; thesis and dissertation research credit hours; a thesis; the written and oral qualifying examinations; the research project; a dissertation proposal colloquium; the dissertation; the final oral dissertation defense; and a teaching assistantship. The teaching assistantship requirement may be fulfilled at any time during the program and is adapted to the individual’s program of study.

Faculty

The faculty profile in the self-study indicates that the department has 13 tenured and tenure-track faculty members plus the department chair. At the time of the review, one of its full professors was actively engaged in the college administration (Kentor) and three faculty members had split appointments (two of whom have Sociology as their home department), including two with joint appointments with the Gender Studies Program (Geist and Gaytan). In Fall 2012, a new faculty member, Akiko Kamimura, joined the department. There is currently a new search underway for an Associate Professor, and one faculty member is being considered for tenure. During the period of the review, six core faculty were hired and nine faculty left: two had negative tenure decisions, four moved to other schools, two retired, and one passed away.
The total faculty FTE is currently 12.25. By national standards, this is small for a Sociology Department. The faculty profile indicates that the department has 6 assistant professors, 5 associate professors, and 2 full professors. Consequently, while many Sociology Departments nationwide are top-heavy, this department is composed of a large number of junior faculty.

Faculty members are very productive with substantial contributions to the top journals in Sociology and related disciplines. Furthermore, as the internal review indicates, this productivity is increasing. This review also noted, however, that “those faculty members involved in interdisciplinary scholarship feel an ongoing need to justify the value of their efforts and defend the impact of their work.” The external review committee met with all of the members of the department faculty, including three adjunct faculty members, and report being impressed with the productivity and accomplishments of the faculty as well their morale and collegiality. The external committee also reports that students positively commented on the accessibility and approachability of the faculty.

While there has been little net change in the size and tenure distribution of the faculty since the last departmental review, there has been substantial faculty turnover. Recent searches have been successful in attracting candidates from top-quality graduate programs around the country, and the faculty hires since the previous departmental review have resulted in adding a very strong and energetic cadre of junior faculty to the department. Most informal and formal RPT actions since the last review have resulted in retention, tenure and/or promotion.

The faculty demonstrates a strong commitment to excellence in teaching and displays a genuine concern for the welfare of their students. Three faculty members have received Superior Teaching Awards in the last three years. Both undergraduate and graduate students express a high degree of satisfaction with the quality of their classes and the concern and effort put forth by their instructors.

The number of auxiliary faculty has been cut to four since the last review. These individuals have taught with the department for many years and are highly regarded by both the regular faculty and the students. They are considered an integral part of the department and value their good relationships with the regular faculty and the students.

Students and Curriculum

Undergraduate. The Sociology Department has had an average of 406 undergraduate majors per academic year since 2006. The Department dedicates considerable energy to student recruitment, particularly working with Salt Lake Community College through student “meet and greets,” and with the College of Social and Behavioral Science through orientation programs for new students.

The Department offers a wide range and diversity of undergraduate-level courses. However, reviewers noted that some students voiced concern about “the apparent
disconnect between the undergraduate offerings and the areas in which they knew their faculty were themselves researching.” In addition, over the years, the department has greatly increased its number of online courses, to the extent that it is now possible for students to complete the major by taking online courses only. The external reviewers note that the students’ view of online instruction is mixed, “with some grateful for the flexibility online courses represent, and others wishing for a more residential experience.”

The reviewers noted that many students voiced concerns about undergraduate advising. Although many students believe that the staff and academic advisor are doing “extraordinary jobs,” the large number of students may necessitate more than a .85 FTE academic adviser. Several students also expressed the desire for greater communication of their options as majors and more detailed information regarding the graduate school application process.

**Graduate.** The department had an average of 26 graduate students per academic year between 2006-2011. Currently there are 34 graduate students in the department. The two major emphasis areas within the graduate program are Comparative International Sociology, and Population and Health.

The department reports that they provide funding for 75-80% of their PhD students (the majority through teaching assistantships and a smaller percentage through external funding). PhD students are typically funded as teaching assistants for up to five years, with stipends between $11,000-$13,000 per academic year. The department notes that this is a “relatively low stipend.” External reviewers recommended that graduate student support levels “should be a Department and College first priority” and that insufficient levels of graduate support may eventually drain away opportunities for recruitment of both students and faculty.

External reviewers also expressed concern regarding doctoral students being expected to teach their own courses during their first year in the program, as well as the current practice of requiring two qualifying exams given only once per year.

**Diversity**

With respect to diversity within the Sociology Department faculty (not including the new hire), approximately 9 of the regular faculty are female, 4 male, 2 Latino, and 2 Asian. Full-time auxiliary faculty consist of 3 men and 1 woman, all being non-Hispanic White. Of the faculty who have left for various reasons, all nine were male; five were Asian (two of whom retired and three of whom left to take jobs at other universities). The department was recognized with a “seal of approval for gender equity” by the Sociologists for Women in Society in 2009, but acknowledges that it has been less successful in recruiting other underrepresented groups. The current search aims to enhance faculty diversity.

The self-study reports that the student body is diverse, including a large number of commuter students of nontraditional age, students of color, and international students. The Diversity Committee report states that, of the approximately 400 students enrolled in 2011-12, approximately 65% were white. The department reports that 56% of its majors are female.
Recruitment initiatives have included visits to SLCC to recruit from a diverse student body; participation in College of Social and Behavioral Science new student orientations; the offering of certificates that appeal to underrepresented groups (the Criminology Certificate and Diversity Certificate addresses issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and social class); a Diversity Internship; and scholarships. Campus advertising includes signs placed strategically on campus and the use of campus LED panels. Online classes are offered to encourage nontraditional and working students.

Retention efforts include having knowledgeable, available, and user-friendly staff, plus an academic advisor for consultations. Funding is provided for 75-80% of graduate students. In the future, the focus will be to recruit UU undergraduates to enter the graduate program.

Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

According to the internal review report, the department does not have a system for outcomes assessment. Other than the University-wide course assessments, the department has not implemented other mechanisms for tracking post-graduation employment. Although they are able to track the few PhD graduates each year, the department has not implemented exit surveys that could help track undergraduates or graduate students leaving the program after completing their master’s degrees.

Facilities and Resources

Space allocated for the department in the Social and Behavioral Sciences Building is woefully inadequate. The department occupies one and one-half floors, and every group that was interviewed – faculty, staff and students – complained bitterly about the lack of quality space in the department. Administrative office space is terribly cramped; graduate student offices are criminally tiny; and faculty offices are hidden within a rabbit warren of narrow hallways. Walls are paper-thin and not sound-proofed, thus allowing for distracting sounds to interfere substantially with activities in adjacent rooms. There are no common areas in the building for students to study and interact with one another. Undergraduate students would like to have means for more cohesiveness, such as a physical gathering or study space dedicated to undergraduate sociology students. The department severely needs additional space, and this need will increase markedly as the department seeks to grow.

Dean Rudd recently reported he is launching a building campaign to provide a new building for the college.
COMMENDATIONS

1. The environment within the Sociology Department is notably collegial and professional. That the department rebuilt itself in an exceptionally challenging environment speaks volumes about the faculty and leadership of the department. It also undoubtedly goes some way toward explaining how the department has been able to attract and retain such a talented young faculty.

2. The faculty of the department is first-rate, a glowing testament to the department’s leadership in a period of rebuilding and to the investment in the department made by the college and university. The department has been very successful in recruiting junior scholars and nurturing them into productive careers.

3. The department has made significant inroads toward establishing new leadership and addressing its financial woes. The dean should be commended for forgiving the outstanding debt.

4. The department makes a large contribution to the undergraduate teaching mission of the College of Social and Behavioral Science. Undergraduates are very happy with the quality and accessibility of their faculty and enjoy the large and diverse offerings in the undergraduate curriculum.

5. Graduate students in the department believe in their faculty and feel lucky to be trained by them. They are excited about the work they can accomplish in the two areas in which the department focuses and believe they have bright futures. A high proportion are provided financial assistance through teaching or research assistantships.

6. The department staff provides high-quality support to faculty and students. Their efforts are nearly herculean, and go well beyond expectations. The three staff members are genuinely enthusiastic about the program, and are happy with each other. They clearly contribute to an overall atmosphere of generosity and collegiality that is modeled for students.

7. There is an acceptable amount of student diversity within the graduate and undergraduate programs and the department has made solid attempts to hire a diverse faculty.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The department and college should work to retain excellent current assistant and associate professors through improved mentoring, facilities, and financial support. The size of the faculty should grow, with a focus on building at the senior level.

2. Facilities should be expanded and improved.

3. The department should work to develop a clearly stated vision for the department and a well-developed set of strategies for attaining that vision. A serious and forward-looking strategic planning effort will be crucial to the department’s future.

4. The department should work to sustain and build on current strengths in Comparative International Sociology and Population and Health as well as unexploited synergies between them. At the same time, the Department could benefit from building additional supplemental strengths outside these areas.

5. Interdisciplinary collaborations (particularly on grant submissions and peer-reviewed publications) between Sociology faculty and those in other disciplines across campus and nationally should be recognized by the department and its RPT document.

6. All faculty should be routinely involved in seeking external grants and contracts for their research activities, making greater use of the college’s full-time grants officer. In addition, the department should make a concerted effort to build development funds, with support from the development officer in the dean’s office.

7. Undergraduate advising should be improved and the department should institute a program that encourages undergraduates to engage in research. The department should conduct a systematic review to assess whether students may complete their undergraduate program without taking in-class courses in Sociology and if this is optimal.

8. As the current chair recognizes, substantial increases in graduate support should be a department and college first priority. Graduate students should not be expected to teach their own courses until after their second year in the program, or perhaps not before the MA is completed. The department should re-examine the purpose and format of the qualifying exams and offer each more than once a year.

9. Support staff should be expanded to include an Administrative Assistant and full-time Academic Advisor. At present, there is a great deal of clerical work, often shared among the current staff, taking them away from tasks that serve students and faculty more directly.
Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

Nan Ellin (Committee Chair)
Professor and Chair, Department of City and Metropolitan Planning
College of Architecture + Planning

Vladimir Hlady
Professor, Department of Bioengineering
College of Engineering

Karen Wilcox
Professor, Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology
College of Pharmacy

Steven Roens (Undergraduate Council Representative)
Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies
Professor, School of Music
College of Fine Arts
### FACULTY AND STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>CONTRACT</th>
<th>ADJUNCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Doctoral degrees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Master's degrees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Bachelor's degrees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FULL-TIME</th>
<th>PART-TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial/Clerical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Aides/Instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OBIA tables included with the Graduate Council report were required by the Board of Regents during the 2011-12 review cycle, but do not currently match the University of Utah’s faculty classifications.
### STUDENTS

NOTE: Faculty FTE has been reduced by the amount of FTE paid for by sponsored research (Fund 5000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACAD YR</th>
<th>Student Annual FTE</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student FTE to Faculty FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ugrad</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>566.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>525.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>482.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>452.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>457.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACAD YR</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Degrees Conferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ugrad</td>
<td>Grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>1,254,898</td>
<td>1,044,801</td>
<td>975,920</td>
<td>1,265,287</td>
<td>1,283,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Costs</td>
<td>421,850</td>
<td>584,497</td>
<td>662,620</td>
<td>358,669</td>
<td>365,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>154,071</td>
<td>66,630</td>
<td>138,294</td>
<td>76,543</td>
<td>87,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>1,830,819</td>
<td>1,695,928</td>
<td>1,776,834</td>
<td>1,700,498</td>
<td>1,735,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Appr. w/EB</td>
<td>1,720,193</td>
<td>1,603,695</td>
<td>1,611,339</td>
<td>1,769,317</td>
<td>1,833,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation 49910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition to Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>1,720,193</td>
<td>1,603,695</td>
<td>1,611,339</td>
<td>1,769,317</td>
<td>1,833,032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue-Expense</td>
<td>(110,626)</td>
<td>(92,234)</td>
<td>(165,495)</td>
<td>68,819</td>
<td>97,047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on September 9, 2013, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Sociology. Ruth V. Watkins, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Michael L. Hardman, Former Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Cynthia Berg, Interim Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science (CSBS); Kim Korinek, Chair of the Department of Sociology; Donna M. White, Associate Dean of the Graduate School; and Denise Haynie, Executive Secretary in the Graduate School, were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on February 25, 2013. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1: The Department and College should work to retain excellent current assistant and associate professors through improved mentoring, facilities, and financial support. The size of the faculty should grow, with a focus on building at the senior level.**

Since the review took place, the Department has promoted two faculty members to the rank of Professor and hired a new Associate Professor; two other faculty members (senior level) have left the institution. With new Chair, Dean, and Sr. Vice President leadership now in place, and based on the commendable progress of the Department since the last review, the Dean and Sr. Vice President will work with the Chair to recruit top candidates for two positions that will be at the Assistant and Associate levels. This Recommendation is closely dependent on the development of a strategic plan (see Recommendation #3). The Dean is in general discussions with the Sr. Vice President regarding low faculty salaries in the college more generally, and more specifically to discuss a merit increase for one of the Department’s professors who has strong future senior leadership potential. With assistance from the former Interim Sr. Vice President and the former College Dean, two other excellent faculty members who were being recruited away from the U. were successfully retained.

**Recommendation 2: Facilities should be expanded and improved.**

The College initiated a facilities assessment during 2013 and the Sr. Vice President is currently reviewing that facilities assessment to create a master plan for remodeling some other aging facilities on campus. The CSBS will be involved in this planning initiative. Due to the poor conditions of the facilities, the Department has already moved forward with some allocated funds from the College and remodeled an unused and outdated Social Psychology laboratory space to create a graduate student office suite. An e-classroom proposal is being submitted to
outfit one of the Social and Behavioral Science classrooms with a permanent laptop projection system. The bigger renovations and seismic upgrades that are needed will be part of the larger institutional master plan that is being implemented over the next few years.

**Recommendation 3:** The Department should work to develop a clearly stated vision for the Department and a well-developed set of strategies for attaining that vision. A serious and forward-looking strategic planning effort will be crucial to the Department’s future.

The Department Chair and executive committee will make progress on this recommendation during AY 2013/14. It is good timing for them to formulate a vision statement and strategic plan that will align with the University’s seven core commitments as well as the College vision. The Chair will consult with the Graduate School Dean and College Dean for input on this initiative.

**Recommendation 4:** The Department should work to sustain and build on current strengths in Comparative International Sociology and Population and Health as well as unexploited synergies between them. At the same time, the Department could benefit from building additional supplemental strengths outside these areas.

Again, this is a strategic question as to whether the Department should sustain and build on current strengths in the two areas mentioned (CIS and PH) or work to build additional supplemental strengths outside these areas. The Chair will work with the faculty and Dean through the strategic planning process to determine the optimal direction for the future of the Department. The Sr. Vice President mentioned that these discussions might be shaped by what emerges as strong themes at the College or campus level.

**Recommendation 5:** Interdisciplinary collaborations (particularly on grant submissions and peer-reviewed publications) between Sociology faculty and those in other disciplines across campus and nationally should be recognized by the Department and its RPT document.

The RPT document is in the process of review through the Chair’s establishment of a new Tenure Standards Committee. Guidelines to better evaluate book projects alongside journal publications, and to evaluate interdisciplinary collaborations, alongside work that falls within Sociology’s disciplinary boundaries, will be considered. Additionally, the Committee will work to clarify how credit for multi-authored publications will be determined for the RPT process. The timeline for making revisions will be during AY 2013/14; University approval will likely be received by the end of Spring semester 2015. A research mixer event sponsored by the College this fall will assist faculty members in Sociology in making additional interdisciplinary collaborations.
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Recommendation 6: All faculty should be routinely involved in seeking external grants and contracts for their research activities, making greater use of the College’s full-time grants officer. In addition, the Department should make a concerted effort to build development funds, with support from the development officer in the Dean’s office.

The Sr. Vice President commented that the Department’s goal should not necessarily be that all faculty be mandated to routinely seek external grants and contracts, but that all faculty engage in the highest level of research possible, involving students where feasible. The Chair’s response states that, “In recent years faculty in the Department have significantly increased proposal submissions and have met with increased success in receiving awards.” The Dean is implementing a needs assessment plan for all departments in the College and will make future determinations for resource allocations based on her findings. As an example of strategic efforts for obtaining funding from external sources, the College is making a concerted effort to reach out to alumni for donations to increase graduate student stipends. The Department is also increasing efforts (e.g., creation and wide circulation of a Department newsletter) to build communication and relationships with alumni so as to enhance development opportunities for undergraduate and graduate support. In addition, because increasing stipends for graduate students is a top priority, the Chair will work with the Dean to present the Sr. Vice President with a phased three-year plan to make these increases during the 2014/15 budget cycle. The Dean cited linking increasing student stipends to development efforts as a major effort related to strategic goals. The Chair will inform her faculty about the grant writing workshops provided by the Associate Dean for Research, Cynthia Furse’s office. Additionally, the Dean has made available funds to bring in consultants to pre-review grants slated for submission.

Recommendation 7: Undergraduate advising should be improved and the Department should institute a program that encourages undergraduates to engage in research. The Department should conduct a systematic review to assess whether students may complete their undergraduate program without taking in-class courses in Sociology and if this is optimal.

Since the review took place, the Department has increased the FTE of their undergraduate advisor from .85 to 1.0. Former Sr. Vice President Hardman advised the Chair to investigate the possibility of hard funding this FTE increase to stabilize the advisor’s position. The Department’s Undergraduate Program Chair will be working actively with the faculty to encourage them to involve undergraduate students in their research to a greater extent. The UROP Director, Jill Baeder, has met with the Program Chair and Department faculty several times and is currently advising students in UROP projects.

The Chair and faculty will continue to assess which instructional delivery systems (online courses vs. in-class courses) best fit the Department’s curriculum needs, keeping in mind that regular assessment of student outcomes will help ensure high course quality.
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Recommendation 8: As the current Chair recognizes, substantial increases in graduate support should be a Department and College first priority. Graduate students should not be expected to teach their own courses until after their second year in the program, or perhaps not before the MA is completed. The Department should re-examine the purpose and format of the qualifying exams and offer each more than once a year.

Related to Recommendation #6, increasing graduate student support was cited by both the Chair and the Dean as a top priority. After deliberation by the Chair with the faculty, a decision has been made not to have MA students teach their own courses until after completing their MA degree coursework and area examination (typically after their second year in the program). Changes have already been implemented in the qualifying exam structure that should streamline time to degree.

Recommendation 9: Support staff should be expanded to include an Administrative Assistant and full-time Academic Advisor. At present, there is a great deal of clerical work, often shared among the current staff, taking them away from tasks that serve students and faculty more directly.

Along with the increase of the undergraduate advisor’s FTE (see Recommendation #7), the Executive Secretary position has been increased to 1.0. The Department also continues to employ an Administrative Officer at 1.0 FTE. According to the Chair, increasing the Executive Secretary position to 1.0 FTE has greatly relieved the heavy workload on the executive secretary and other office staff members. Again, the former Sr. Vice President suggested investigating the possibility of hard funding these FTE increases to make the positions and their value to the Department sustainable.

This memorandum of understanding is be followed by regular letters of progress from the Chair of the Department of Sociology to the Dean of the Graduate School. Letters will be submitted until all of the actions described in the preceding paragraphs have been completed.

Ruth V. Watkins  
Cynthia Berg  
Kim Korinek  
David B. Kieda  
Donna M. White

________________________________________
David B. Kieda  
Dean, The Graduate School  
October 2, 2013
October 3, 2013

Vivian S. Lee
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
5th Floor, CNC
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review
    Department of Pharmacotherapy

Dear Vice President Lee:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Department of Pharmacotherapy. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Graduate Council, the Department Profile, and the Memorandum of Understanding resulting from the review wrap-up meeting.

After your approval, please forward this packet to President David Pershing for his review. It will then be sent to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next Senate meeting.

Sincerely,

David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Chris M. Ireland, Dean, College of Pharmacy
    Diana I. Brixner, Chair, Department of Pharmacotherapy

[Signature]
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Pharmacotherapy. The External Review Committee included:

Louis P. Garrison, PhD  
Professor and Associate Director  
Pharmaceutical Outcomes Research and Policy Program  
School of Pharmacy  
University of Washington

John E. Murphy, PharmD  
Professor, Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science  
Associate Dean, College of Pharmacy  
University of Arizona

Dennis W. Raisch, PhD  
Professor and Chair  
Pharmacoeconomics, Epidemiology, Pharmaceutical Policy, and Outcomes Research  
College of Pharmacy  
University of New Mexico

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Mary C. Beckerle, PhD  
Professor and Executive Director  
Huntsman Cancer Institute

Michael K. Magill, MD  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Family and Preventive Medicine

Ginette A. Pepper, PhD  
Professor and Associate Dean for Research  
College of Nursing
This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study report submitted by the Department of Pharmacotherapy, the findings of the internal and external review committees, the OBIA profile, and a letter written by the Chair of the department (co-signed by the Dean of the College of Pharmacy) in response to reports provided by the review committees.

DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The department was established in 1977 and took its current name, the Department of Pharmacotherapy, in 2005. It is one of four departments in the College of Pharmacy. It is the home to the Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research Center (PORC), which was established in 2002 by the current Department Chair, Dr. Diana Brixner. A majority of the department’s research is focused in PORC, and department funding is primarily received from pharmaceutical companies. The department sponsors an MS program and a new PhD program and these programs align with PORC focus and activities.

Dr. Brixner will vacate the chair position in July 2013, and a search for her replacement is currently in progress. She will continue to lead PORC and also serve as Director of Outcomes for the new Program in Personalized Healthcare at the University. This new program is interdisciplinary and represents a multidiscipline effort to create new opportunities for collaborative research. Dr. Brixner’s leadership role should expertly position the department to increase their interdisciplinary collaborations.

The department was last reviewed in October of 2005. At that time it was recommended that they increase diversity of faculty, devote more attention to faculty mentoring, and develop plans and implement their MS program followed by their PhD program. As can be seen from the summary below, the department has achieved many of the recommendations suggested by their 2005 review.

The PORC is integral to the department, particularly the graduate program. It has substantial research funding (although self-study materials provided estimates varying from approximately $500,000 to $4 million), primarily from industry contracts, but also a small but growing number of federal and foundation grants. These projects provide rich research experiences for the doctoral students. Returned indirect costs and direct costs from these projects fund the graduate student support. The Utah Poison Control Center (UPCC), directed by Barbara Crouch, has active research studies that may be a resource for PhD students, but are not currently utilized.

Faculty

The department has 26 faculty members: 7 tenure, 6 research track, and 13 clinical faculty. Among the tenure track faculty, 5 are full professors and 2 are assistant professors. The doctorally prepared faculty represent a variety of specialties, with only one faculty member holding a traditional PhD pharmacy degree. Other members have degrees in medical
informatics, political science, medicinal chemistry and health policy. The clinical faculty, in addition to providing direct patient care, serve on master’s project/thesis and dissertation committees, and provide clinical supervision. The tenured faculty have a strong record of grants, publications, and receipt of honors and awards at the international level. For example, Dr. Brixner is former president of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR). Assistant Professor Dr. Joanne LaFleur recently received the Outstanding Young Investigator award from ISPOR. The majority of faculty are female (15 of 26). The department does not have any underrepresented minority faculty members.

Faculty make substantial contributions to teaching and clinical supervision for the College’s PharmD program. The department itself offers an MS/administrative residency program in Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research and Health Policy. The department also offers a PhD in Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research and Health Policy, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in 2011.

All faculty, even clinical faculty, are expected to conduct research. According to the external reviewers’ report, faculty scholarly productivity is greater than other universities of similar stature. Although the department is strongly supported by the pharmaceutical industry, both the internal and external reviewers noticed very little federal funding but noted there was increased interest and planning for securing peer-reviewed applications. In particular, the internal reviewers strongly emphasized that investigator-initiated peer-reviewed funding is necessary to increase the departments’ competitiveness at a national level, strengthen innovation, and ensure interdisciplinary collaborations to impact moving both research and education forward.

Faculty morale was reported as high and junior faculty felt the level of mentoring was appropriate. Two main concerns were voiced by faculty. The first concern related to the doctoral program and included concerns about sufficient faculty resources and stable financial support. Currently, if a single core faculty were unable to teach a course there could be significant disruption to students’ progression. Additionally, the PhD student support is based on funding but faculty were concerned about the stability of the funding resource. The second primary faculty concern related to workload stress with insufficient time for research. According to the external review, this was of particular concern to faculty with heavy teaching and clinical responsibilities. Both the internal and external reviewers noted that there was a need for more faculty, particularly with expertise in health economics and to help manage the planned growth of their graduate program.

**Students**

The department currently has 5 PhD students in Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research and Health Policy, 2 admitted in 2011, 2 admitted in 2012 and one transfer from the MS program. The PhD program has had between 19-24 applicants since its inception in 2011. The data on numbers of MS students reported in the department’s self-study is inconsistent and numbers also vary between the internal and external review documents. Approximately 17 students enrolled in the MS program since the last review, with approximately 9 graduating and 3 withdrawing. The MS program averages 20 applicants per year. The PhD program has had between 19-24 applicants since its inception in 2011. Internal and external reviewers’ interviews with students report high morale and satisfaction with the new programs.
PhD student tuition is covered under the Graduate School’s Tuition Benefit Program. Students also work as Graduate Assistants or Graduate Research Assistants. Master’s students in the administrative residency programs are funded by the University of Utah hospital or Intermountain Health Care.

Assessment of students’ progress and learning are monitored by the Graduate Program Committee and the students’ supervisory committees. MS students take a comprehensive examination in their first year. PhD students take first- and third-year comprehensive examinations. Students from both programs are required to be involved in project research, which also allows faculty to closely monitor their learning.

The Graduate Program Committee Chair meets annually with MS program directors. Additionally, the Graduate Program Committee annually reviews PhD courses and PhD student progress and performance.

**Diversity**

Since their last review, the department has increased the percentage of female faculty, now having 15 female faculty out of 26. In their self-study, the department acknowledges they have been unsuccessful in addressing the issue of faculty ethnic diversity. They do not have any underrepresented minority faculty members; however, they report “every effort will be made to attract women and minorities” in their search for a new chair.

Regarding student diversity, of the 20 graduate students (master’s and PhD) since 2006, 8 have been female and 12 male. One is of Hispanic descent, two are African Americans, one is a Pacific Islander, two are South Asian and one is Arabic. All of the 5 currently-enrolled PhD students are international.

**Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment**

Since the PhD program is new, there is no student placement outcome data. Outcome data provided in the self-study of MS students is inconsistent and neither internal nor external reviews could make a definitive summary. The external review document indicates that “MS/Administrative residency students are highly sought after in the job market.”

**Facilities and Resources**

At present, the operating budget is largely supported by the research and clinical contracts. According to the external review, the level of research support for the department’s missions is greater than comparable universities. The internal reviewers noted that a “common theme” derived from faculty interviews was a concern about sustained funding support from current sources for the PhD program.

At the time of this report, the department has recently moved into and occupies the entire fifth floor of the new state-of-the-art Pharmacy Research Building. Prior to the relocation, departmental units were spread across three different locations. Despite being dispersed, internal
reviewers noted that the department had done an “exemplary job of sustaining communication and collegial culture.” With the relocation, the students who were already quite involved with the PORC faculty will now have increased access to faculty, research and clinical experiences at the Utah Poison Control Center (UPCC). The PORC has substantial research funding, primarily from industry contracts. The projects provide financial support (both returned indirect and direct costs) for doctoral students as well as intensive research experiences. The PORC has 13 faculty, 8 staff (administrative assistant, project coordinator, accountant, computer professional, medical writer, senior research analyst, and 2 research associates), 6 research fellows (postdoctorates), as well as the Drug Regimen Review Center. The UPCC is directed by Dr. Barbara Crouch and is entirely supported by internal staff. UPCC has a relatively small but active series of ongoing research studies that may be a resource for PhD students, but are not currently utilized.

The Department of Pharmacotherapy has a staff of four: two administrative assistants, an accountant, project coordinator and academic program manager. Many of the faculty utilize the PORC staff and report feeling adequately supported.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research Center (PORC) is a true strength of the department. The center as well as its faculty are highly respected and well-known internationally. PORC has a sustained record of industry funding that has led to important contributions to outcomes research and support of faculty and the graduate program. Given PORC’s success, it is well positioned to respond to the growing research focus in and funding support for comparative effectiveness research and patient-centered outcomes research.

2. Faculty are dedicated, morale is high, and junior faculty report receiving strong mentorship.

3. Graduate students report satisfaction with the programs, the funded support, early experiences with research, and accessibility to faculty.

4. Dr. Brixner will continue to lead PORC, and starting July 2013 she will assume leadership of the Outcomes division of the Institute for Personalized Healthcare at the University. Her role will help position the department for new collaborative research opportunities.

5. The recent move of the department to the fifth floor of the state-of-the-art Pharmacy Research Building allows all departmental faculty, staff and students to be in a common location. This should further improve collaboration and communication.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Several specific suggestions were provided to help the department develop a strategy to expand from their current contract-industry-based research organization model to a model that increases their peer reviewed/investigator initiated research funding. 1) Dr. Brixner, as the new Director of Outcomes for the Program for Personalized Healthcare, should have a systematic plan to link outcomes research components to appropriate NIH-grants. 2) Increase interdisciplinary collaborations and team-based approaches across the health professions and academic departments with the goal of increasing federal and foundation research funding. 3) Build on the foundation of expertise in outcomes research to expand disciplinary impact, for example adding scholarly research related to new methodology, paradigms, tool development, and/or models.

2. For clinical faculty, the workload is high, in part due to the responsibilities of teaching in the College’s PharmD program. It was suggested the department seek methods to free clinical faculty time for research and publication productivity. This could possibly include an incentive plan for clinical faculty who exhibit high productivity in research and dissemination.

3. Integrate the Poison Control Center into teaching, clinical and research missions of the department. Students and faculty are likely to benefit with increased access and collaboration with Poison Control faculty and clinicians and vice versa.

4. The graduate programs are in their early phases and the department plans a slow growth in student enrollment. It is recommended that the department establish a stable source of support for graduate student stipends.

5. A plan for expansion of the graduate programs will require the hiring of additional faculty and would also benefit the students as they would have more peer collaborations and more faculty mentors. Two areas of faculty expertise that should be considered in future faculty hires in order to benefit the graduate students are health economics and quality-of-life measurement (also called patient-reported outcomes). Additionally, the department should “advertise” the graduate program’s coursework to other colleges and departments in the university with the goal of increasing class size and the richness that can come from cross-fertilization of students from other disciplines.

6. The department should take the opportunity for new faculty hires to increase the ethnic diversity among the faculty. A meeting with Evelyn Gopez (Assoc. Vice President for Inclusion) is recommended in accordance with new guidelines established by the Graduate Council. The use of annual progress reports to the Graduate School should also be considered as a way to encourage the department to work effectively towards this goal.
ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW

In November 2012, Dr. Brixner, Chair of the Pharmacotherapy Department, provided a letter (co-signed by the Dean of Pharmacy) to the Graduate Council describing steps they have either initiated or plans they are actively considering in response to the internal and external reviews.

1. Dr. Brixner stated that the department has increased its focus on federal and foundation research funding but stated that government funding for cost-effectiveness research is limited. In response to the recommendation for increased interdisciplinary research collaborations, the chair indicated that they currently collaborate with four other University departments/colleges and will continue this practice. As the Director of Outcomes in the Program of Personalized Health Care, Dr. Brixner intends to expand disciplinary impact. She also described two projects the department has underway that already support this effort.

2. The department currently uses a “combination of Department and research monies” to fund the graduate program. The chair maintains that commercially sponsored outcomes research remains the strongest support for their program.

3. Faculty hires as well as cross-training are likely to further support the graduate program. The department recently hired a 1.0 FTE research faculty member and three part-time research faculty members, all of whom are eligible and qualified to mentor PhD students. The hiring of a new Department Chair will likely increase the number of tenure-track faculty and expand student research opportunities. The department will consider an economist in their faculty recruitment or actively seek an affiliation from the University. In addition, the department is restructuring teaching assignments to increase cross-training and allow for more equitable distribution of effort across faculty members.

4. With the Utah Poison Control Center being located in the new space, Dr. Brixner believes it will naturally become more integrated into the program. In addition, they have a collaborative project with Humana to develop a predictive model of adverse events which involves working closely with the Poison Control Center.

5. The department will explore ways to advertise and recruit more broadly for their graduate programs. For example, they plan to promote a funded 10-week summer research fellowship program to PharmD students to expose them to research opportunities.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate School

Lee Ellington, PhD (Chair)
Associate Professor
College of Nursing

Connie Bullis, PhD
Associate Professor
Department of Communication

Sean M. Redmond, PhD
Associate Professor
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
### FACULTY: With Doctoral Degrees Including MFA and other terminal degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### With Masters Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### With Bachelor Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Headcount Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FTE from A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Salaried</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time or Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Number of Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Number of Students Based on Fall Third Week Semester Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in Masters Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in Doctoral Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department FTE Undergrad</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department FTE Graduate</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department SCH Undergrad</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>1,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department SCH Graduate</td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>3,458</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>4,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate FTE per Total Faculty FTE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate FTE per Total Faculty FTE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cost Study Definitions***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instructional Expenditures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Student Fte</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Funding

| Appropriated Funds | 1,025,355 | 1,083,900 | 1,150,149 | 1,217,374 | 1,128,207 | 1,093,762 | 1,073,884 |

*Auxiliary faculty numbers represent a mix of paid FTE, appointed faculty, and adjunct faculty.
**Undergraduate and graduate student numbers and FTE numbers include students enrolled in the college-wide PharmD program.
***No state appropriated funds are designated for direct instructional expenditures or cost per student FTE.

Faculty Degrees represent total number of degrees awarded per faculty member
Full time faculty is > .75 fte
FTE Cost Study Definitions are the number of faculty FTE's supported by Appropriated Instructional Funding. Faculty with Administrative appointments are excluded.
Total Department FTE divides undergraduate sch by 15, graduate sch by 10
Memorandum of Understanding  
Department of Pharmacotherapy  
Graduate Council Review 2012-13

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on August 28, 2013, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Pharmacotherapy. Vivian S. Lee, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; Chris M. Ireland, Dean of the College of Pharmacy; Diana I. Brixner, Chair of the Department of Pharmacotherapy; Nancy A. Nickman, Professor in the Department of Pharmacotherapy; David B. Kieda, Dean of the Graduate School; and Donna M. White, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on March 25, 2013. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1**: Several specific suggestions were provided to help the department develop a strategy to expand from their current contract-industry-based research organization model to a model that increases their peer reviewed/investigator initiated research funding. 1) Dr. Brixner, as the new Director of Outcomes for the Program for Personalized Healthcare, should have a systematic plan to link outcomes research components to appropriate NIH-grants. 2) Increase interdisciplinary collaborations and team-based approaches across the health professions and academic departments with the goal of increasing federal and foundation research funding. 3) Build on the foundation of expertise in outcomes research to expand interdisciplinary impact, for example adding scholarly research related to new methodology, paradigms, tool development, and/or models.

1) The Chair sees part one as a “top priority” and also the “most doable.” The Department has taken systematic steps to link outcomes research components to NIH and other grants. Dr. Diana Brixner’s role as the Director of Outcomes in the Program for Personalized Healthcare will expand disciplinary impact by providing avenues to pursue collaborative grants, many of which have been submitted since the review took place. Significant efforts are being made to increase the Department’s peer-reviewed/investigator research funding to work in concert with their existing contract-industry-based research, including AHRQ training submissions and PCORI submissions; several foundation grants have been awarded since the review.
2) New models of interdisciplinary collaborations and team-based approaches are being developed in hopes of increasing federal and foundation research funding. Dr. Brixner is a member of the Health Systems Innovation and Research (HSIR) program.

3) The Chair and faculty are building an international foundation of expertise in outcomes research through research collaboration with the Oncotyrol-Center for Personalized Medicine in Cancer in Innsbruck, Austria. Through this collaboration, new methodologies, paradigms, tool development, and/or models will be explored. Additionally, a teaching grant is being written to the International Exchange Program Committee at the University to expand opportunities of educational exchange for students.

Recommendation 2: For clinical faculty, the workload is high, in part due to the responsibilities of teaching in the College’s PharmD program. It was suggested the department seek methods to free clinical faculty for research and publication productivity. This could possibly include an incentive plan for clinical faculty who exhibit high productivity in research and dissemination.

The Chair questioned the feasibility of this recommendation because clinical faculty have major commitments and responsibilities to their patients and to the clinics in which they work. They are highly dedicated, so to free up their time in order to teach and conduct research is problematic for them. The Dean agreed to focus on and support plans for incentives and will work with the Department to explore and implement models that will facilitate clinical faculty release time.

Recommendation 3: Integrate the Poison Control Center into teaching, clinical and research missions of the department. Students and faculty are likely to benefit with increased access and collaboration with Poison Control faculty and clinicians and vice versa.

The Department agrees with this recommendation and will work to integrate the UPCC into the program. Now that the Poison Control Center is on the same floor as the Department in the new College of Pharmacy building, opportunities exist for graduate students that were not possible previously. There was a recent collaboration with Humana Health Plans to develop a predictive model for adverse events and there are plans to work closely with the UPCC to identify characteristics associated with drug overdose or misuse.
Recommendation 4: The graduate programs are in their early phases and the department plans a slow growth in student enrollment. It is recommended that the department establish a stable source of support for graduate student stipends.

Graduate students are supported through external grant funding at competitive rates. The Chair is keenly aware of the need to control student enrollment growth in relationship to available funding for their stipends, which have to be acquired through external sources. The Dean encouraged the Chair to explore the possibility of using T-32 grant funding for stipends; the Chair will follow up on his suggestion.

Recommendation 5: A plan for expansion of the graduate programs will require the hiring of additional faculty and would also benefit the students as they would have more peer collaborations and more faculty mentors. Two areas of faculty expertise that should be considered in future faculty hires in order to benefit the graduate students are health economics and quality-of-life measurement (also called patient-reported outcomes). Additionally, the department should “advertise” the graduate program’s coursework to other colleges and departments in the university with the goal of increasing class size and the richness that can come from cross-fertilization of students from other disciplines.

The Department is actively recruiting a new faculty member and is considering candidates who have expertise in health economics and quality-of-life measurement. There is a current foundation grant whereby interdisciplinary programs have been started across the Health Sciences. The Dean and Chair agree that the Department should explore the possibility of using a combined programs model to leverage funds for stipends and to increase class size and cross-fertilization.

Recommendation 6: The department should take the opportunity for new faculty hires to increase the racial/ethnic diversity among the faculty. A meeting with Evelyn Gopez (Assoc. Vice President for Inclusion) is recommended in accordance with new guidelines established by the Graduate Council. The use of regular progress reports to the Graduate School should also be considered as a way to encourage the department to work effectively towards this goal.

Gender diversity has increased quite dramatically since the last review and the international diversity of the student body is excellent, but increasing underrepresented racial/ethnic representation among the faculty and student body has proven to be more difficult. The Department will continue to work with the Diversity Advisory Board at the College level annually and agrees to meet with Dr. Gopez to enlist her ideas and recommendations on ways to increase their recruitment of underrepresented domestic students. Resources such as unconscious bias trainings for faculty search committees and the Vice President’s initiative to collect more data on searches generally in the Health Sciences are excellent steps toward increasing racial/ethnic diversity among faculty and the student body in the future.
This memorandum of understanding will be followed by regular letters of progress from the chair of the Department of Pharmacotherapy to the dean of the Graduate School. Letters will be submitted until all of the actions described in the preceding paragraphs have been completed.

Vivian S. Lee
Chris M. Ireland
Diana I. Brixner
Nancy A. Nickman
David B. Kieda
Donna M. White

David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School
October 3, 2013
October 2, 2013

Ruth V. Watkins  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
205 Park Bldg.  
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review  
Department of English

Dear Vice President Watkins:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Department of English. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Graduate Council, the Department Profile, and the Memorandum of Understanding resulting from the review wrap-up meeting.

Please forward this review to President David Pershing for his approval. After approval by President Pershing, the review will be forwarded to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next Senate meeting.

Sincerely,

David B. Kieda  
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Robert D. Newman, Dean, College of Humanities  
Barry L. Weller, Chair, Department of English
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of English. The External Review Committee included:

Sara Blair, PhD  
Professor, Department of English  
Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Initiatives, The Graduate School  
University of Michigan

Brian Evenson, PhD  
Professor, Literary Arts Program  
Brown University

Sandra Macpherson, PhD  
Associate Professor, Department of English  
The Ohio State University

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Ellen Bromberg, MFA  
Professor  
Department of Modern Dance

Beth Krensky, PhD  
Associate Professor  
Department of Art and Art History

Davar Khoshnevisan, PhD  
Professor  
Department of Mathematics
This report of the Graduate Council is based on the Self-Study submitted by the Department of English, the Reports of the Internal and External Review Committees, the OBIA profile, and the Department Chair’s letter dated January 14, 2013 in response to the Internal and External Review Committee Reports. The Dean of the College of Humanities did not provide a separate response, but indicated his agreement with the Chair’s response.

DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Department of English [hereinafter the “Department”] has a distinguished history in teaching, scholarship, and service. Its faculty has a national reputation for scholarly achievements and other creative activities, evidenced by a broad range of awards, fellowships, publications, and speaking invitations. Moreover, the faculty reports a strong sense of collegiality and belonging to an exciting intellectual community. At the same time, the faculty has expressed concern that their historical successes might be threatened by a recent decline in faculty numbers and by the University’s current focus on revenue production. In particular, faculty members expressed concern that, under current budgetary models, the Department’s teaching and scholarly strengths are not being adequately recognized by the University. Diversity concerns were also raised with respect to the number of faculty from underrepresented minorities, as well as the seniority status of female faculty.

Both graduate and undergraduate students express broad satisfaction for the quality of teaching and support they receive in the Department. Though the Department offers an impressive array of both graduate degrees and undergraduate majors and minors, questions have arisen as to whether the teaching mission might be better accomplished through additional or different curricular offerings in the future. In addition, concerns over dropping student enrollments and ways to reverse that trend are of utmost priority to the Department and its new Chair.

This highly successful Department is at a crossroads in terms of defining its future teaching and scholarly mission. The growth of new technologies, possibilities of distance learning, and the changing interests and needs of both graduate and undergraduate students are raising questions about the direction of future curricular offerings and specializations among its faculty. Nonetheless, the Ad Hoc Review Committee feels that, given its strong faculty and highly committed new Chair, the Department will have little difficulty maintaining its stellar status as it moves forward.

Faculty

The Department’s highly successful and committed faculty are a valued resource at the University of Utah. As noted by the external reviewers, “Perhaps the greatest strength of the department is its faculty, who are highly visible, productive scholars and writers.” Elsewhere,
the reviewers noted, “[T]he English faculty at the University of Utah is distinguished by its scholarly and creative productivity and its intellectual versatility.”

The list of international invited talks presented by the Department’s faculty is very impressive. The faculty’s publications have appeared in journals including *Novel, Modernism/Modernity, Contemporary Literature, English Literary History, Genre, the Cardozo Journal of Law and Literature, Victorian Poetry, Post45*, and *Social Text*, while monographs have been published by the University of Chicago Press, Johns Hopkins University Press, Routledge, the University of Pennsylvania Press, Cambridge University Press, Columbia University Press, and Duke University Press, among others. In addition, faculty have held national fellowships at the Huntington Library and the Newberry Library, grants from the Graham Foundation and the NEH, as well as winning internal awards for distinguished teaching, scholarship and service. Moreover, faculty have performed invaluable service for national scholarly societies, editorial boards, and other bodies.

The creative writing faculty has established an equally strong national reputation through their impressive publications, including books, stories, poems and essays in significant journals. Two creative writers, one poet and one fiction writer, received Guggenheim Fellowships this year, and a number have received other significant grants. One was named Poet Laureate of Utah; another received a National Endowment of the Arts Fellowship.

The Department lists 33 tenured or tenure-track faculty, with an FTE of 28. In addition, there are three auxiliary faculty and two visiting members. There has been a decline in faculty size over the past 5-6 years; the department roster in 2005-2006 listed 38 faculty members in the Department. This decline impacts the Department’s ability to fulfill its teaching, advising and program-building missions. There is a sense that a logic-of-replacement needs to be established as faculty retire or leave.

Moreover, other faculty commitments including joint appointments, leadership roles in Ethnic Studies and Gender Studies, and the soon to be independent University Writing Program, lower the faculty’s availability for teaching and other activities. The use of auxiliary faculty and full-time adjunct instructors enables the department to meet its basic teaching obligations, but stifles future planning with respect to possible changes in curricular or program development.

The faculty expressed a strong sense of collegiality, including an ability to engage in healthy discussion and disagreements working toward consensus. The faculty also reported a strong concern that the University’s current emphasis on revenue production might undermine the Department’s historical successes and values. This concern raises not only immediate funding concerns, but also more long-term concerns related to future planning, enrollment, and mission challenges, all concerns facing English departments nationwide. The Department believes the University needs to consider new ways to assess the unit’s pedagogical and scholarly strengths.

The faculty is actively engaged in both mentoring and program support. This admirable commitment, however, produces a heavy service load, one that the reviewers believe might be lessened by a more efficient allocation of departmental responsibilities among the faculty. There was a sense that the Department needs to clarify expectations for faculty productivity and
professional promotion at all levels. In support of this endeavor, it was suggested that written feedback be provided to all junior faculty, a step that will strengthen morale as well as the likelihood of professional success. Reviewers suggested that the annual review process needs significant overhauling, including adopting alternative, more efficient structures for assessing faculty progress.

**Students**

The Department serves some 560 undergraduate majors and about 89 graduate students. Of the graduate students, 50 are female and 39 male; three are international students, with only a small percentage of underrepresented minority students. Sixty-six of the graduate students (74%) are enrolled in the PhD program; the remainder are in MA and MFA programs. In recruiting graduate students, the Department offers several scholarships and teaching fellowships. Because the funding offered to recruits tends to be low compared to other universities, faculty expressed concern about losing potential students, including students from underrepresented minorities.

Literary studies graduate students uniformly praised the faculty for its accessibility, hard work, and commitment. Nonetheless, they expressed a desire for additional support related to professional development, including roundtables and discussion focused on alternative career opportunities.

Graduate students in both creative writing and literary studies expressed strong feelings of belonging to a community. They expressed a desire for annual written feedback, a practice now adopted in PhD programs at many peer institutions. In addition, they expressed a desire for more faculty oversight and feedback concerning their classroom teaching.

The Department has awarded 51 doctoral degrees since 2007, of which 87% went to creative writers. The centrality of the PhD program in Creative Writing is clearly a historical and future strength of the department, but this does raise questions about the mission and scope of the PhD in literature. The reviewers question whether the entire program might not benefit from accepting a smaller cohort who in turn are given greater funding.

With respect to undergraduate students, special challenges arise because many in the undergraduate population tend to be older and married with families. As such, there is a greater need to develop new hybrid and online courses to meet the special needs of such a population. There was a sense that the Department needs to engage in more active recruitment to make potential undergraduate students aware of the English major.

**Curriculum**

The Department currently offers Bachelor of Arts degrees in English and in the Teaching of English, with minors in English Creative Writing, and Teaching of English. At the graduate level, it offers Master of Arts degrees with emphases in British and American Literature or American Studies; a Master of Fine Arts degree in Creative Writing, as well as a new modular
MFA; and Doctor of Philosophy degrees with emphases in British and American Literature, Creative Writing, American Studies, and Rhetoric and Composition.

The English Department also offers Minors in Literature, Creative Writing, and Teaching. The undergraduate program is highly elective, allowing students to add an additional major or minor(s). The department offers traditional, online and hybrid courses to meet the needs of various undergraduate students. In addition, civically engaged learning courses are offered through English Education and children’s literature courses.

Curriculum at the undergraduate and graduate levels is organized around longstanding study areas: British and American Literature, Critical Theory, Creative Writing, English Education, and Rhetoric and Composition.

The faculty expressed a desire to increase the general education options for students and thereby not only increase enrollments but also serve a wider range of students. The reviewers suggested that accomplishing this goal may force the faculty to rethink their historical resistance to larger lecture classes.

In general, the faculty expressed uncertainty as to the best way to reconceive its undergraduate mission (online, hybrid, or distance learning models; possible after-hours instruction; greater diversity of offerings or developing “blockbuster” courses). In addition, there is uncertainty about whether to sustain all current graduate degree programs, or to focus more concertedly on the most successful and most promising among them.

The Department’s overwhelming concern related to the Student Credit Hour (SCH) funding model, a model the faculty believes has prevented them from reimagining the curriculum in a way to increase enrollments.

More generally, the reviewers urged that the Department’s curriculum needs to be reconsidered as a whole. They question the efficacy of continuing to offer an array of courses across traditionally conceived historical fields, an approach they suggest is counter to both available faculty resources and student interests. In addition, they see the development of interdisciplinary programs as a potentially fruitful way of enhancing the curriculum. They urge the University to find ways to support course and program development in the Department.

**Diversity**

Currently, of the 33 tenured and tenure-track faculty, the Department includes 13 women and five underrepresented minority colleagues in its ranks, but they are disproportionately less senior than colleagues at large. There are currently three women at the full professor rank among creative writers but only one female full professor on the literature faculty. There is a strong sense that increasing faculty diversity is an important goal for the Department.

With respect to students, the Department has 445 undergraduate majors (282 female and 163 male) and 89 graduate students (50 female 39 male). The Department reports that 17% of undergraduate and 5% of graduate students are from diverse backgrounds. The faculty expressed a strong commitment to increasing student diversity. The department actively recruits both
undergraduate and graduate students with ethnic minority status. Advisors are working to increase diversity within the undergraduate cohort by doing outreach to students at the Salt Lake Community College Redwood campus twice a year and promoting the English Department programs through University of Utah recruiting opportunities. Teaching fellowships and other forms of financial support are used for recruiting and retaining ethnically diverse graduate students.

**Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment**

With respect to its undergraduate students, the Department has developed a range of assessment strategies appropriate to the diversity of its activities and mindful of the various career paths taken by its majors. These include narrative course evaluations, exit interviews, and some alumni polling. The reviewers urge the Department to track post-graduation careers more systematically.

With respect to graduate students, the reviewers note that the program’s placement record since 2007 (nearly half, or 47%, of its PhD graduates obtaining tenure-track positions) is highly admirable. They encourage the Department to track placements systematically across a three- or five-year arc, since tenure-track placements tend to be more relevant on that scale. Moreover, the reviewers suggest that, to best determine how resources should be channeled and to provide better guidance to students, the Department should track the placement of its literature PhDs as distinct from creative writers. In addition, the reviewers urge the department to track MA and MFA outcomes more regularly and systematically.

**Facilities and Resources**

The uncertainties inherent in the SCH budgeting model have made it difficult for the Department to undertake long-term programmatic planning. At the same time, the reviewers suggest that the Department’s leadership needs to conduct more goal-directed budget planning—to consider what kinds of activities might best be worth investing in as part of a concerted effort to reframe its key projects and activities.

Concern was expressed that the space allocated to the Department in the Language and Communication Building is not configured to promote contact among faculty or between faculty and students. In particular, the regular use of designated seminar rooms for meeting rooms, lounges, event spaces and regular classrooms was a point of concern. Moreover, there is a dearth of office space for graduate students. The lack of technological support in classrooms is also a concern raised by faculty.

Universal praise was expressed for the professionalism and dedication of the office staff. The reviewers expressed concern that no faculty or staff are currently charged with overseeing Web development, Web communications, or social networking activity—all of which are deemed critical to the Department’s ability to expand its outreach, develop alternative pedagogical platforms, and expand its networks among current students, alumni, and interested members of the community.
COMMENDATIONS

1. The Department’s faculty are dynamic, highly collegial, and professionally successful. Faculty scholarly activity, publication, and recognition in the form of fellowships and other honors are highly impressive, and many faculty play active leadership roles at the University and nationwide. Faculty morale is high. There is a strong commitment to the programs and to collaborative problem solving within the Department.

2. The new Department Chair deserves praise for the dedicated concern and creative approach that he is taking to solving problems that exist in the Department and to rethinking new ways for the Department to move into the future. His recent initiatives to create new courses in collaboration with the Business School and with the Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program are to be applauded. Moreover, the Associate Chair, Director of Graduate Studies and Director of the Creative Writing Program are very effective and deeply committed to their respective positions.

3. In scholarship and teaching, the Department sustains a tradition of strength in numerous program areas and subfields, including creative writing, British literature, American literature, and theory. The success of the Department’s teaching mission is reflected in the extent to which graduate students publish books and articles, and receive prestigious faculty positions.

4. Graduate students at all levels and in all fields report high satisfaction with their programs, their faculty, and their cohorts. Placement for PhDs in creative writing remains quite strong in a significantly contracted academic job market.

5. The Department’s faculty are deeply committed to students, who feel supported and appreciated. In particular, faculty have taken their student mentoring role very seriously, and regularly receive praise for their open communication with students.

6. The Department continues to be successful in attracting a large number of students to its major despite considerable cultural and economic pressure to choose more instrumental fields of study, evidenced by a national decline in undergraduate enrollments in English and humanities courses.

7. The faculty express high confidence in their staff colleagues, and working relations between faculty and staff are collegial and productive. The staff is enthusiastic, supportive and capable. Moreover, the Department has successfully sustained strong working relations with allied and associated units, at a time when collaboration on curricular and program development will be critical to successful planning across the humanities.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Department’s greatest challenge is to envision programmatic and curricular changes that will enable it to continue fulfilling its mission while taking account of changing budgetary models, changing student desires and needs, and the emerging role of technology in the modern university. Specifically,

   a. The faculty should consider ways to reimagine the undergraduate curriculum, both in format (online courses, hybrid courses, large lectures) and in substance (specific areas for targeted growth and development, which might well involve on-site offerings), in light of current needs and budgetary demands, as well as long-term Departmental goals. In addition, new opportunities for interdepartmental collaborations and joint appointments should be carefully explored.

   b. The faculty should consider new approaches to faculty hiring, approaches that build on current scholarly strengths, but which will support new curricular models. Among the hiring models that should be considered is the making of joint appointments with other departments. In undertaking this effort, the faculty should pay close attention to identifying new ways to recruit underrepresented minority scholars.

   c. The faculty needs to identify new strategies for increasing student enrollments, especially the enrollments of underrepresented minority undergraduate and graduate students.

   d. The faculty needs to address concerns raised by graduate students with respect to increasing ways to support their professional development and to offer them more career guidance.

2. There is a sense that the Department should devote greater attention to mentoring with respect to career development of junior faculty. Among other ways to achieve this, timelines and expectations for success should be made more explicit, and written annual feedback for junior faculty should be instituted. As a general matter, the Department’s annual faculty review program needs to be reconsidered and perhaps overhauled.

3. The Department needs to devote staff and resources to Web development, outreach, as well as raising on-campus awareness of its important contribution to the University. More particularly, the Department needs to build a new media profile that will allow it to target communications to existing students, to potential new students, as well as to build stronger, more focused, proactive relations with alumni.

4. The University Administration needs to work with the Department to find new ways, within existing budgetary funding models, to support long-term curricular innovation, and to give the Department adequate recognition and rewards commensurate with its extraordinary achievements and its national reputation.
5. The University Administration needs to assure that the Department is provided with adequate technology support to further its teaching and scholarly goals. Such support is needed not only to support research and excellent classroom instruction, but also to support curriculum innovation (e.g., online instruction, hybrid instruction, courses in such potential growth areas as cultural studies, film, and new media).

6. The Department is well aware of its need to recruit both faculty and students from communities of historically underrepresented minorities. It should expand its current efforts to do so, and continue to pursue diligently the achievement of this goal.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

Terry Kogan (Chair)
Professor, S.J. Quinney College of Law

Marjorie Chan,
Professor, Department of Geology and Geophysics

Winston Kyan
Assistant Professor, Department of Art and Art History

Sharon Aiken-Wisniewski (Undergraduate Council Representative)
Asst. Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Undergraduate Studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of English</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY: With Doctoral Degrees Including MFA and other terminal degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Masters Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Bachelor Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE from A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Salaried</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time or Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of English</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTE from A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Graduates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degrees</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degrees</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students Based on Fall Third Week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Undergraduate Majors</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Masters Program</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Doctoral Program</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department FTE</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>2,854</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>2,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department SCH</td>
<td>45,717</td>
<td>86,052</td>
<td>85,377</td>
<td>86,994</td>
<td>83,382</td>
<td>89,151</td>
<td>85,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Study Definitions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instructional Expenditures</td>
<td>2,293,368</td>
<td>2,984,555</td>
<td>3,331,675</td>
<td>3,205,287</td>
<td>3,196,004</td>
<td>3,914,555</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Student Fte</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>7,216</td>
<td>9,241</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>9,870</td>
<td>8,225</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated Funds</td>
<td>3,604,552</td>
<td>3,761,100</td>
<td>3,704,200</td>
<td>3,840,215</td>
<td>3,766,557</td>
<td>3,674,420</td>
<td>3,782,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Degrees represent total number of degrees awarded per faculty member

Full time faculty is >.75 fte

FTE Cost Study Definitions are the number of faculty FTEs supported by Apprpropriated Instructional Funding. Faculty with Administrative appointments are excluded.

Total Department FTE divides undergraduate sch by 15, graduate sch by 10
Memorandum of Understanding
Department of English
Graduate Council Review 2012-13

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on September 10, 2013, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of English. Ruth V. Watkins, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Robert D. Newman, Dean of the College of Humanities; Barry L. Weller, Chair of the Department of English; Donna M. White, Associate Dean of the Graduate School; and Denise Haynie, Executive Secretary in the Graduate School, were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on April 29, 2013. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1. The Department’s greatest challenge is to envision programmatic and curricular changes that will enable it to continue fulfilling its mission while taking account of changing budgetary models, changing student desires and needs, and the emerging role of technology in the modern university. Specifically,

a. The faculty should consider ways to reimagine the undergraduate curriculum, both in format (online courses, hybrid courses, large lectures) and in substance (specific areas for targeted growth and development, which might well involve on-site offerings), in light of current needs and budgetary demands, as well as long-term Departmental goals. In addition, new opportunities for interdepartmental collaborations and joint appointments should be carefully explored.

According to the Department Chair, he and the faculty are exploring these ideas and experimenting with some of them. They are looking at the possibility of teaching larger lecture classes and developing online instruction as well as collaborative course designs that reach beyond a traditional English curriculum. The Chair and faculty have concerns about the impact this could have on their traditional emphasis on writing and the intensive feedback that is critically important in introductory courses in particular. The Dean encourages the Department to look carefully at this recommendation, particularly as the re-envisioning of the General Education requirements is taking place and also with the move toward Digital Humanities, an initiative he would like to support. The Chair will stay involved with the leaders of these initiatives and remains committed to exploring new possibilities to increase enrollments where it is feasible and desirable. He is exploring such ideas as building a large lecture course based around visiting writers coming to campus and also establishing a partnership with The King’s English Bookstore in the area of young adult literature.
The Sr. Vice President noted that the core issue in this recommendation is related to the strategic agenda of the Department. The Chair will continue to work with the faculty on their strategic vision for the future.

b. The faculty should consider new approaches to faculty hiring, approaches that build on current scholarly strengths, but which will support new curricular models. Among the hiring models that should be considered is the making of joint appointments with other departments. In undertaking this effort, the faculty should pay close attention to identifying new ways to recruit underrepresented minority scholars.

The Chair is eager to consider new hiring models when lines become available. With the failed attempt last year to hire a Chicano Studies Scholar in collaboration with Gender Studies, it is clear that adding more diversity to the faculty continues to be a challenge. Nonetheless, the faculty is unanimous in its desire to hire a faculty member from an underrepresented group, at the senior level if at all possible. To aid in the recruitment process, the Dean is committed to assisting to bring possible candidates to campus as visiting lecturers. The Dean and Chair will meet with Dr. Ed Buendia regarding garnering his support toward this effort. This section of the recommendation is linked to section 1a as the faculty looks strategically at the development of the curriculum in relationship to new hires and vice versa.

c. The faculty needs to identify new strategies for increasing student enrollments, especially the enrollments of underrepresented minority undergraduate and graduate students.

The Chair noted that each faculty member is committed to visiting at least one local school or community each year to enhance the Department’s presence in the community with the long-term goal of recruiting students. He also set up a new outreach committee that is working to raise the visibility of the department. Currently, there are active recruitment initiatives at Horizonte and in the Rose Park area. Professor Janet Kaufman, a Distinguished Service Professor, also has ongoing recruitment projects in place. Rosenblatt Prize recipient Kathryn Stockton designated her Rosenblatt Prize money to create an endowment for funding first-generation students, and the College has a first-generation scholarship campaign in place. The Dean noted that he would like to see a significant ramp-up of a Departmental media profile, an enhanced Web presence, and the more effective use of social media to recruit students and market the Department, and the Chair is in agreement. Associate Graduate Dean White referred the Chair to the services provided by the Graduate School’s Diversity Office and Assistant Dean, Colin Ben, to recruit and retain underrepresented graduate students.
d. The faculty needs to address concerns raised by graduate students with respect to increasing ways to support their professional development and to offer them more career guidance.

The Chair believes the Department is putting a lot of effort into career development but he is committed to doing even more. A 50% job placement rate for their graduates was cited. The Dean of the Graduate School, with the assistance of Deans from Humanities, Fine Arts, and Social and Behavioral Science, will investigate the feasibility of hiring an additional career advisor for the Career Services Center. Student employment data will be tracked more closely moving forward.

Recommendation 2: There is a sense that the Department should devote greater attention to mentoring with respect to career development of junior faculty. Among other ways to achieve this, timelines and expectations for success should be made more explicit, and written annual feedback for junior faculty should be instituted. As a general matter, the Department’s annual faculty review program needs to be reconsidered and perhaps overhauled.

The Chair and Dean were somewhat surprised by this recommendation. The College provides a well-developed mentoring program for junior faculty, and after meeting with them, the Chair believes they feel mentored overall. To strengthen existing efforts, he is preparing additional guidelines that will provide additional logistical information such as a clear and accessible schedule for the stages of RPT process, etc. The Dean also encourages the junior faculty to meet with development and grants resource staff in the College. Additionally, his office regularly sends out announcements about the Associate Dean for Research, Cindy Furse’s grant writing workshops for junior faculty across disciplines.

Recommendation 3: The Department needs to devote staff and resources to Web development, outreach, as well as raising on-campus awareness of its important contribution to the University. More particularly, the Department needs to build a new media profile that will allow it to target communications to existing students, to potential new students, as well as to build stronger, more focused, proactive relations with alumni.

The Chair has a new committee in place working on this recommendation. The Dean encouraged the Chair to submit a proposal to his “Great Ideas” program to try to acquire the financial resources needed to increase the Department’s efforts to market and illuminate the excellent program and faculty here at the U.
Recommendation 4: The University Administration needs to work with the Department to find new ways, within existing budgetary funding models, to support long-term curricular innovation, and to give the Department adequate recognition and rewards commensurate with its extraordinary achievements and its national reputation.

(See action items under Recommendations #1 and #3.) Additionally, the Chair suggested that the current budget paradigm has not been beneficial to the Department. He is looking for an expansion of soft-money budget resources for research visibility, travel, etc. The Sr. Vice President is aware of the budget model’s problems for Departments that rely on small classes with high student/faculty contact requirements and she will continue to explore alternatives. She encouraged the Chair to work with the Dean to present a realistic budget plan for increasing soft funding resources during the next budget cycle.

Recommendation 5: The University Administration needs to assure that the Department is provided with adequate technology support to further its teaching and scholarly goals. Such support is needed not only to support research and excellent classroom instruction, but also to support curriculum innovation (e.g., online instruction, hybrid instruction, courses in such potential growth areas as cultural studies, film, and new media).

Because there was some confusion about the intention of this recommendation, the Dean and Associate Dean were invited to a faculty meeting to clarify some miscommunication about this issue. Part of the problem is that English courses are taught primarily in Orson Spencer Hall, which is in desperate need of reconstruction, so infusing funds into those classrooms for upgraded technology is not feasible at the current time. The Dean offered to facilitate scheduling more of the English courses to be taught in the Carolyn Tanner Irish Humanities Building, where there are state-of-the-art classrooms. The Chair will follow up on this offer. In an effort to strengthen graduate programs within the department, the Sr. Vice President supports exploring potential models for stronger funding of graduate students, as well as exploring the possibility of matching funds for an endowed chair in Creative Writing.

Recommendation 6: The Department is well aware of its need to recruit both faculty and students from communities of historically underrepresented minorities. It should expand its current efforts to do so, and continue to pursue diligently the achievement of this goal.

Making contacts with Acting Vice President for Equity and Diversity, Ed Buendia’s office and Assistant Dean for Diversity, Colin Ben, have been noted in Recommendation #1. The Kathryn Stockton scholarship campaign for first-generation underrepresented students will provide additional
recruitment resources, and at the suggestion of the Sr. Vice President and Dean, the Chair will continue to investigate coordinating efforts to find possibilities to pair money in partnerships with other departments as a way to recruit highly qualified underrepresented students.

This memorandum of understanding is be followed by regular letters of progress from the chair of the Department of English to the dean of the Graduate School. Letters will be submitted until all of the actions described in the preceding paragraphs have been completed.

Ruth V. Watkins
Robert D. Newman
Barry L. Weller
David B. Kieda
Donna M. White

David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School
October 2, 2013
October 3, 2013

Vivian S. Lee
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
5th Floor, CNC
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Pathology

Dear Vice President Lee:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Department of Pathology. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Graduate Council, the Department Profile, and the Memorandum of Understanding resulting from the review wrap-up meeting.

After your approval, please forward this packet to President David Pershing for his review. It will then be sent to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next Senate meeting.

Sincerely,

David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Peter E. Jensen, Chair, Department of Pathology
    David J. Stillman, Head, Division of Microbiology and Immunology
    JoAnn P. Fenn, Head, Division of Laboratory Science
    Julio Delgado, Assoc. Head, Division of Laboratory Science
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Pathology. The External Review Committee included:

For the PhD Program within the Division of Microbiology and Immunology
Andrea J. Sant, PhD
Professor, Department of Microbiology and Immunology
University of Rochester Medical Center

Jeremy M. Boss, PhD
Professor and Chair, Department of Microbiology and Immunology
Emory University School of Medicine

For the Medical Laboratory Science (MLS) Division
Vicki S. Freeman, PhD
Professor and Chair, Department of Clinical Laboratory Sciences
University of Texas Medical Branch

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Cynthia J. Burrows, PhD
Distinguished Professor
Department of Chemistry

Angela Deneris, CNM, PhD
Professor, Clinical
College of Nursing

Charles B. Grissom, PhD
Professor
Department of Chemistry
This report of the Graduate Council is based on the Self-Study submitted by the Department of Pathology, the Reports of the Internal and External Review Committees, the OBIA profile, and the Department Chair’s letter dated January 9, 2013 in response to the Internal and External Review Committee Reports (co-signed by Senior Vice-President and Dean of the School of Medicine Vivian Lee).

DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Department of Pathology is located in the School of Medicine and is a hybrid of clinical and basic science faculty. Within the Department of Pathology there are five divisions - Clinical Pathology, Anatomic Pathology, Pediatric Pathology, Microbiology (Cell Biology) and Immunology, and Medical Laboratory Science. The Associated Regional and University Pathologists, Inc. (ARUP) is a strong partner in supporting the Medical Laboratory Science (MLS) program.

The Chair of the Department, Dr. Peter Jensen, is a nationally recognized leader who seeks to develop the Department of Pathology into one of national prominence. A new plan to form an interdepartmental collective (with potential new hires within the Department) will focus on Immunology and Infectious Disease and Inflammation. This focus can help the Department develop a clear scientific identity nationally and encourage truly synergistic interactions. This effort would also help the issue of sustainability.

The School of Medicine’s Department of Pathology [hereinafter the “Department”] has two divisions that offers 4 degree programs evaluated in this review, as listed below.

- Division of Medical Laboratory Science (hereafter described as the MLS)
  - BS Program in Medical Technology (MT), also called Medical Laboratory Science
  - BS Program in Cytotechnology (CT)
  - MS Program in Laboratory Medicine and Biomedical Science (MS)
  - Division of Microbiology and Immunology
    - PhD Program in Microbiology and Immunology (MI)

Under the organizational headers of this report, the degree programs are generally presented in the order listed above, using the indicated abbreviations.

**Division of Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)**

MT – The MT BS program is accredited by the National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences, and students must successfully pass the MLS Comprehensive Exam at the end of the degree program. Program goals include providing graduates with entry level
competencies for the clinical laboratory as well as providing students an avenue to grow professionally as a member of the health care team. Traditional students routinely enter the program during their junior year in college (2 + 2); however, it takes most students five years to complete the curriculum, as many work part-time. A post-baccalaureate option was introduced into the MLS Program in 2004 (4 + 1) to accommodate graduates with a previous bachelor’s degree in biology, chemistry or microbiology.

CT – The CT BS program is accredited by the Commission on the Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP). The program was declared ‘Inactive’ (Accreditation Status) for two years, 2005 and 2011, in order to evaluate the curriculum (particularly to develop some molecular content) and to refocus on student recruitment. The program is now active and is one of three active programs in 13 western states and accepts 4 students/year. Following completion of the program, students are eligible to sit for the American Society of Clinical Pathologists (ASCP) Board of Certification. Students typically enter the program during their senior year of college after completing 21 semester hours of prerequisites and complete the program in 1 year.

MS – The MS graduate program objectives include increasing student technical competence and helping them to understand and carry out a research project, with sufficient preparation to continue on to a PhD or medical school program if they desire.

Division of Microbiology and Immunology

MI – In the MI PhD program in basic science, students participate in formal coursework, the Division’s Research-in-Progress (RIP) and Journal Club seminar programs, and original research projects in cellular and molecular immunology, microbial pathogenesis, regulation of gene expression, basic cell biology and related areas. The Department recognizes opportunities for synergistic activities with both Huntsman Cancer Institute and Primary Children’s Hospital. Several current faculty members collaborate in the area of cancer research and helped establish the Pathology Research and Translational Oncology Core Facility at HCI.

Faculty

Each degree program involves a different hybrid of clinical and basic science faculty.

Division of Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

JoAnn Fenn is the Division Head for MLS that currently consists of 4 faculty members plus one additional vacant faculty position (yet to be filled) and one currently in phased retirement.

MT – Normally, five full-time faculty teach the MLS didactic and student laboratory courses (4 of the 5 are Professors; none are tenured). Other faculty from the Department and the professional community assist with guest lectures. In addition, one full-time and one part-time
staff person support faculty and students in the laboratory sessions. There are ~ 20 clinical teaching technologists who coordinate the students' clinical training in each of their respective disciplines at the clinical facilities. The average age of the Department of Pathology MLS faculty is 53.6 years (age range is 33-66). The Department of Pathology follows University guidelines for promotion and tenure. The director for the MT program is Dr. Karen Brown.

CT – The undergraduate Cytotechnology program currently has a total of 1.5 FTEs in faculty lines: Michael Berry (1.0 FTE), who also serves as the Program Director; Barbara Chadwick, M.D., Medical Director (0.25 FTE); and Denise Smith, Ph.D., ARUP Cytology Scientist (0.25 FTE).

MS – Pathology faculty teach students in the graduate courses and serve as research mentors and thesis committee members. Concern was expressed by the students and faculty about finding “tenured or tenure-track” faculty to serve as thesis committee chairs. Co-directors of this degree program are JoAnn Fenn and Dr. Julio Delgado.

Division of Microbiology and Immunology

MI – The Division has 15 tenured or tenure-track faculty members, 4 research-track faculty members and 8 adjunct faculty members, all of whom make significant contributions to the MI PhD program. The faculty members are highly active in research, typically with 1-2 NIH grants per faculty member, steady publication rates, and visibility at conferences. Faculty members report a high level of morale and general satisfaction with the direction of the department. Future plans include recruitment of 3-4 additional tenure-track faculty members with a focus on immunology and on molecular and translational pathology.

Future hires will include a balance of mechanism-driven research and areas of potential impact to clinical programs; it is recognized that a disease focus is advantageous to both federal funding and other fundraising activities.

The director of the MI program is Dr. David Stillman.

Students

Division of Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

The MLS has ~ 80 undergraduate and ~ 20 master’s level students. Student recruitment information and applications are on the program webpages. Students often find out about the degree programs through web searches or word of mouth (informal polling of current students).

MT – Two types of students are accepted into the MLS Undergraduate Program. Individuals with a minimum of 41 hours of prerequisites are accepted into the BS degree program. The other group is composed of individuals with BS degrees in the basic sciences such as biology, chemistry, and microbiology who have the option to enter the post-graduate
certific program or obtain another BS degree. For Fall 2012, there were 42 first-year MT students and 30 senior MT students enrolled in both the traditional and post-baccalaureate programs. The students are very complimentary of the MT program and program of study. They find the faculty to be individually very responsive to their input and approachable about academic concerns. Many students reported that they work for ARUP. If the student works 20 hours per week for ARUP, the company pays their full tuition. Students enjoy flexible work hours there and have increased work opportunities after graduation. Upon degree completion, the students find positions in clinical or basic science research laboratories.

CT – The CT program currently has four students that form a close, supportive group. The students are very complimentary of the CT program and faculty. Students generally need to have a strong biology background in order to complete the program in a timely manner. Upon completion, the students generally find positions in cytotechnology laboratories.

MS – Student applicants must have a BS degree with a certification in Medical Technology, Clinical Laboratory Science, or a BS degree in another basic science (and provided they have met appropriate prerequisites). Of the 30-40 yearly applications to the program, 8-10 students are accepted and 6-7 graduate. Although the program of study is two years, most students are part-time and “internal,” i.e., working in ARUP clinical or research laboratories or other local hospital laboratories, thus typically requiring three years to graduate. Upon completion, students find positions in clinical or basic science research laboratories and some continue for higher levels of education (i.e., doctorates or medical school).

Division of Microbiology and Immunology

MI – Graduate students (~ 5 per year), are recruited primarily through the Molecular Biology Program and secondarily through either the Biological Chemistry Program or the MD/PhD program. Traditionally it has been difficult to recruit students from most campus-wide departments because students have had little exposure to immunology in their previous curricula. A fall term “Open House” event with posters and talks on the exciting research opportunities in microbiology and immunology is a possibility to raise the program’s visibility. Most students take an average of more than 6 years to complete the PhD.

The current graduate students are a congenial group who report a high level of satisfaction with the program. Students are eager to publish their work and find a supportive environment in Journal Clubs and Research in Progress seminars. A few student suggestions for program improvement included:

- more interaction with ARUP and an expanded view of clinical applications of their basic research
- more career guidance and guest speakers from allied paths (clinical, pharmacy, law, regulatory agencies, etc.)
- a uniform set of program degree guidelines in a handbook or on a website.
Curriculum

Division of Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

MT – The curriculum is a combination of (a) didactic classes covering all aspects of laboratory medicine and (b) clinical rotations that provide students with the practical aspects of what they learn in their didactic classes. The two-year curriculum is well delineated and students have a part-time option for progression through the program.

CT – The one-year CT program consists of lectures, demonstrations and conferences, as well as clinical rotations. It is the only accredited program of its kind in the Intermountain West. The curriculum is well delineated and students have a part-time option for progression through the program. Following successful completion of the program, graduates are eligible to sit for the ASCHP Board of Certification Examination in Cytotechnology.

MS – A minimum of 30 semester hours are required for graduation, which include 6-10 hours of Thesis Research and 6-10 hours of approved electives. A recent review of the program has begun and some changes will include the addition of new electives. The curriculum is well delineated and students have a part-time option for progression through the program.

Division of Microbiology and Immunology

MI – The core MI curriculum is formal coursework in the parent fields of microbiology and biochemistry. Major components of the graduate program include laboratory research and the seminar program of twice weekly for Research-in-Progress (RIP) and Journal Club (JC) presentations by graduate students. Through the seminar venue the students feel that all of the faculty become familiar with their (student) research projects as well as their scientific capabilities. The JC program was recently improved to provide more faculty oversight of topic discussions, with more feedback given to students after their presentations. The preliminary examination is taken in the 2nd year. Students are required to serve as a Teaching Assistant for one semester, typically in their 3rd year.

Recent NIH training grants in Microbial Pathogenesis as well as in Genetics have been an asset to the doctoral and post-doctoral students. There was interest in a proposal to create a one-year research option for MD students that could give medical students greater insight into current research initiatives in microbiology and immunology and could also benefit research programs by adding a strong student to the laboratory for one year. However, a funding mechanism would need to be identified for such a program.
Diversity

Student Diversity

In all of the Department programs, there are very few ethnically diverse students -- as is typical across the Health Science campus at the University of Utah. For example, in the MS program, currently there are two African American students and one Hispanic student enrolled out of 23 students. There has typically been some increased diversity through international students. The Department recognizes the need to reach out to different communities, yet the recruitment of a diverse student body remains a challenge.

Faculty Diversity

MLS – The MLS faculty report there is not significant ethnic diversity within their ranks; however, there is good representation of gender and educational background. Recently a “Women in Pathology” group (supported by the American Society of Microbiology) was formed and 42 women attended their second meeting this year. In the MS program, out of 31 faculties participating in the program, 16 are male and 15 are female. Twenty-seven out of 31 faculties are Caucasian, two are Asian, one is African American, and one is Hispanic/Latino. Both African-American and Hispanic faculties were recruited since the last review.

MI – The Division of Microbiology and Immunology consists of 22 male and 5 female faculty members. Among the tenured/tenure-track faculty, one is Hispanic, two are Asian, and three are women, indicating that diversity is good, but could be an area of improvement as new hires are sought. The Division has met with Dr. Octavio Villalpando (Associate Vice President for Equity and Diversity), to discuss the diversity issues that face the Department. Attempts to obtain demographic statistics for recent faculty searches were only partially successful (i.e., data are incomplete).

Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

In all of the Department programs, outcomes assessment generally takes place through some combination of certification scores, job placement, clinical rotation evaluations, employer surveys, and course evaluations. Students evaluate each of their classes through online course evaluations at the end of each semester. Meetings with the ARUP Cytopathology Lab and representatives from the MLS occur occasionally to discuss changes to the program.

Division of Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

MT – Students all feel they have excellent employment opportunities and are finding employment within six months of graduation. Some students continue with higher education. One year after graduation, students are sent a questionnaire to measure the MT Program’s effectiveness and track student success.
CT – Surveys are sent to each CT graduate and employers three months after the hire date. Survey information on employer satisfaction with the CT graduates is used in evaluating the overall effectiveness of the program. Students take the American Society of Clinical Pathologists Board of Registry examination. Although the pass rate was not reported, student performance is utilized to improve the program. Job placements for certified graduates appear to be good, but positions are limited in the Salt Lake City area.

MS – The curriculum supports the students in meeting the goals of graduating as a competent researcher, with skills in scientific writing and data management, and helps them to gain an awareness and knowledge of new laboratory-related technologies. Job placements appear to be good with some students continuing research in ARUP laboratories and others moving to PhD and medical school programs.

Division of Microbiology and Immunology

MI – The completion rate for PhD students is very high, and most students go on to postdoctoral positions at prestigious institutions.

Facilities and Resources

Overall, the School of Medicine has excellent facilities in state-of-the-art buildings. Didactic teaching is located in the Health Sciences Education Building (HSEB) at the University of Utah Health Sciences Campus (UUHSC). Some major clinical laboratory training takes place via rotations at ARUP in Research Park. Excellent laboratory space in the E. E. Jones Medical Research Building houses most of the research groups in the Division of Microbiology and Immunology.

Program Response to Recommendations in Previous Graduate Council Review

Division of Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

MT – The program has been responsive to the suggested changes by providing clearer expectations for faculty (e.g., RPT), creating a greater sense among faculty that their contributions are valued, and providing better access for students to faculty with timely attention to their academic concerns, and better knowledge of employment opportunities after graduation.

CT – The CT program was not reviewed during the last review cycle, since it was temporarily inactive.

MS – The MS has attempted to positively address previous recommendations in providing better access to faculty with timely attention to their academic concerns and providing students with better knowledge of employment opportunities after graduation. Although a biotechnology track was not added, students have the opportunity to participate in biotechnology
projects. Also, there is a slight increase in the diversity of students in the program (international applicants and underrepresented students), but the number of ethnically diverse students is still small.

Division of Microbiology and Immunology

MI – The MI program responded to the last review with several procedural changes:

• A weekly seminar program to engage both clinical and research participants more fully.
• Identification of growth areas in molecular oncology, immunology and infectious disease, and molecular and translational pathology.
• A more consistent, tightened preliminary examination process.
• Increased faculty oversight of the journal club program.

In addition, the division examined the system of mentoring and chairing the student supervisory committee and concluded that no change was needed.

COMMENDATIONS

Overall the Department programs are healthy and flourishing, with satisfied students, good job placement, appropriate accreditations, and engaged faculty.

Division of Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

1. MT – The Medical Laboratory Science Bachelor of Science Program in Medical Technology is strong and provides students with an excellent education. The Department of Pathology’s financial support is instrumental in the success of the program as well as ARUP’s support for clinical rotations. Specific commendations of the program are as follows:

   a. The MT program provides good advising and produces graduates that have no difficulty finding employment. Students are pleased with their program faculty and the personal attention they receive.
   b. There is high faculty morale and recognition that the Department strongly supports faculty growth and development. For example, five faculty were supported to develop curriculum and continuing education in Ghana (summer 2012) through the U’s School of Medicine Global Health Initiative.
   c. The MLS Program did not have any deficiencies from the 2009-2010 National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences (NAACLS) Self-Study Report Paper Review and subsequent Site Visit. The B.S. Program in Medical Laboratory Sciences received 7 years NAACLS accreditation with no citations.

2. CT – The Medical Laboratory Sciences Bachelor of Science Program in the Cytotechnology
Track is strong and provides students with an excellent training and education. Specific commendations of the program are as follows:

a. This profession provides an important aspect of patient care, and these students are highly employable. Students were very complimentary of their program and the guidance they receive.
b. The CT Program received continuing accreditation from the CAAHEP that applies until 2016. With the partnership with ARUP and continued improvements, this program has the potential to become one of the leading cytotechnology schools in the country.
c. The ARUP Cytopathology Lab provides a well-equipped laboratory for clinical experience coursework.

3. MS – The Medical Laboratory Science Master of Science Program in Laboratory Medicine and Biomedical Science is an excellent program for graduate study in the field. The following specific aspects of the program are to be commended.

a. Students are able to tailor their program of study due to: diverse electives, support from ARUP, and a variety of research areas/topics and opportunities.
b. Students are very complimentary of the program, and they have many professional opportunities after graduation.
c. Faculty morale is high as they believe their contributions are valued, and they have access to good resources regarding career development and promotion. Diverse educational backgrounds of the faculty help strengthen the program.

Division of Microbiology and Immunology

4. MI - The Division of Microbiology and Immunology is both a highly respected and highly collegial group of faculty who provide an excellent graduate program. The following specific aspects of the MI program are to be commended.

a. The vibrant faculty is productive and has an excellent track record of funding. They are committed to teaching, and there is a strong sense of a supportive academic community, as well as an excellent faculty mentoring program. Strong leadership has promoted exceptional faculty loyalty and expectations that the Department can grow and achieve greater prominence.
b. The Division serves educational needs of medical students and graduate students in many disciplines. Additional training grants also enhance the student experiences and the quality of the research program.
c. Students are enthusiastic about the faculty and their program. In particular, the RIP and journal club are a highlight, with good participation rates and apparent effectiveness.
RECOMMENDATIONS

A recurring theme in several of the Department programs is the length of time to degree completion. Although there are various reasons cited (e.g., students in medical technology work part time, students discover a program late in their preparatory coursework, or other), the Department should devote greater attention to help guide students to timely degree completion utilizing regular supervisory committee meetings and explicit expectations for success outlined to the students early in their programs. In particular, the MI PhD program could use a more detailed process description, as discussed by the Department Chair’s response letter.

All of the Department programs should make stronger steps towards diversity in both the student population and in the faculty. This should include revisions to the recruitment and admissions processes. A meeting with Evelyn Gopez (Assoc. Vice President for Inclusion) is recommended in accordance with new guidelines established by the Graduate Council. The use of regular progress reports to the Graduate School should also be considered as a way to encourage the Department to work effectively towards this goal.

The recommendations below are summaries of the internal and external reviews.

Division of Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

1. MT Program Recommendations:
   a. To increase both numbers and diversity, the program should consider recruiting through the high school Health Science Academy Program and have higher visibility in the basic science courses in the Biology, Chemistry and Microbiology Departments.
   b. The students request more case studies, patient simulations and knowledge of how their professional work will enhance patient care. With the need for more interprofessional collaboration, finding avenues for students to interact with other health professional students would be of value for the program. Additionally, the students would like more instruction on laboratory equipment and equipment troubleshooting (experience employers inquire about).
   c. There is potential to leverage ARUP support with even more student exposure in certain areas, notably flow cytometry (the current program devotes only one day to this topic), balanced by possible reduction in other areas (such as in hematopathology).
   d. The Department may want to invest in a microscope-camera-TV projection system that can be more efficient for teaching larger groups in topics such as cell morphology.

2. CT Program Recommendations:
   a. According to the Self-Study, the CT program director believes a more private office is desirable for student conferences and counseling. We support this recommendation.
   b. The students request more case studies, patient simulations and knowledge of how their professional work will enhance patient care. CT students would also like more interaction...
with other MLS students and courses/programs (e.g., cell identification) to foster more interprofessional collaboration. Again, these student requests appear to have merit.

c. Students should have increased input into the program and major decisions that affect their program (via student representation in Departmental matters).

d. The CT field is rapidly changing and nationally looking more towards molecular diagnostics. As this topic is mentioned in the accreditation review, a plan and timeline should be implemented to ensure that the program stays at the cutting edge.

e. The glass slide teaching collections commonly get damaged slides; thus, the program could benefit from the addition of digital images to the slide collection.

3. MS Program Recommendations

a. The University of Utah Graduate School guidelines for student committees place emphasis on tenure-track faculty involvement, and there are corresponding limitations on clinical track faculty chairing a student’s thesis committee. Clinical faculty are often responsible for the student’s research, particularly at the ARUP Research and Development Institute, and competent to chair the student’s research. We recommend that the Department consider amending its rule on graduate committee membership. Another option is to consider switching the requirement of a thesis to a student project.

b. The Department could help address the issue of limited student stipend funds (currently $6,000) to support MS students, possibly through greater development efforts.

c. Students expressed specific concerns with the level and unevenness of the 6900 course, Techniques of Biochemical Analysis in Laboratory Medicine, that serves both fellows and master’s level students. Students also suggested that the Scientific Writing course should be a requirement for all MS students (currently it is an elective). These concerns should be attended to.

d. The students could use more communication about the processes for degree completion and when they should take their preliminary examination. A timeline and flowchart outlining the major steps for degree completion should be developed for the students.

**Division of Microbiology and Immunology**

4. MI Program Recommendations

a. Expectations for what is considered by the graduate program for a PhD degree should be clearly articulated by the graduate program and efforts should be made to shorten the time to complete the PhD degree. Currently the time to degree completion is long relative to national standards. A requirement or process for a thesis proposal could help accelerate student progress and research. This requirement could include components such as more feedback from the supervisory committee to the student; creation of a graduate student handbook with clear listings of requirements and the timetable; and/or financial incentives in terms of stipend or tuition payments.
b. The format of the preliminary exam is to identify a topic completely separate from the thesis area of research and develop an NIH research proposal. Students and faculty found this to be a productive endeavor but that it is too restrictive to identify the exam topic that is completely separate from the area of students’ future research. The external reviewers recommended that this arrangement be given further consideration.

c. Several programmatic course suggestions from the review committees include: an early graduate-level depth immunology class as an elective, biostatistics and bioinformatics classes (possibly available through other programs), and opportunities for more student feedback on coursework and on how to improve content/delivery of material covered.

d. Additional recruiting efforts for graduate students in the Division would be desirable, such as an annual “Open House” with poster sessions and free lunch to highlight the programs of the Division.

e. Students are interested in more interaction with ARUP and clinical aspects of pathology, and are also concerned about job placement after the PhD. A Career Day event or occasional seminar speakers from non-academic venues (clinical labs, regulatory agencies, patent law, etc.) could help provide career guidance. With uncertainties about the economy and job market, current graduate students feel they could use advising on career alternatives in basic sciences, or academics including law, pharmacy, etc.

f. More efforts on development and endowed funds could enhance the program in the following ways: a one-year research rotation for MD students (similar to the Hughes program), and endowed chairs that would serve to recruit and retain world-class faculty.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

Marjorie Chan (Chair)
Professor, Department of Geology and Geophysics

Robert Mayer
Professor, Department of Family and Consumer Studies

Sean Redmond
Associate Professor, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY

FACULTY:  With Doctoral Degrees Including MFA and other terminal degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With Masters Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With Bachelor Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Headcount Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTE from A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Salaried</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time or Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Degree</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degrees</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degrees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Students Based on Fall Third Week Semester Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Undergraduate Majors</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Masters Program</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Doctoral Program</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department FTE</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department SCH</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td>15,309</td>
<td>16,272</td>
<td>17,049</td>
<td>15,338</td>
<td>11,331</td>
<td>11,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Information Provided by School of Medicine:**

**Costs:** The following shows costs for the last 7 years for the Microbiology and Immunology (M&I) and Medical Laboratory Science (MLS) Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;I</td>
<td>1,285,901</td>
<td>1,380,536</td>
<td>1,648,105</td>
<td>1,701,350</td>
<td>1,931,410</td>
<td>2,104,338</td>
<td>2,168,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLS</td>
<td>823,053</td>
<td>917,610</td>
<td>912,512</td>
<td>909,215</td>
<td>994,392</td>
<td>1,057,910</td>
<td>1,119,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revenue:** The following shows the State Appropriated revenue for all department education programs including graduate programs, BS programs, as well as a substantial amount of teaching in the Medical School and allied Health Science programs and residency programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State - 6100</td>
<td>1,521,459</td>
<td>1,898,717</td>
<td>2,028,795</td>
<td>2,014,752</td>
<td>2,897,828</td>
<td>2,021,937</td>
<td>2,203,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum - 1001</td>
<td>279,688</td>
<td>298,467</td>
<td>314,896</td>
<td>303,302</td>
<td>172,120</td>
<td>161,826</td>
<td>291,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Degrees represent total number of degrees awarded per faculty member

Full time faculty is >.75 FTE
Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Pathology
Graduate Council Review 2012-13

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on August 19, 2013, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Pathology. Vivian S. Lee, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; Peter E. Jensen, Chair of the Department of Pathology; David J. Stillman, Head of the Division of Microbiology and Immunology; JoAnn P. Fenn, Head of the Division of Laboratory Science; Julio Delgado, Associate Head of the Division of Laboratory Science; David B. Kieda, Dean of the Graduate School; and Donna M. White, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on April 29, 2013. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

General Recommendations for all Programs in the Department:

1. A recurring theme in several of the Department programs is the length of time to degree completion. The Department should devote greater attention to help guide students to timely degree completion.

   See Recommendations 3d, 4a, and 4b as action items for making improvements.

2. All of the Department programs should make stronger steps towards diversity in both the student population and in the faculty. The office of Inclusion and Outreach is committed to this goal and may provide useful ideas and strategies in this regard. The use of regular progress reports to the Graduate School should be considered as a way to encourage the Department to work effectively towards this goal.

   See Recommendations 1a and 4f as action items for making improvements.

Division of Medical Laboratory Science (MLS)

1. Medical Technologist (MT) Program Recommendations:

   a. To increase both numbers and diversity, the program should consider recruiting through the high school Health Science Academy Program and have higher visibility in the basic science courses in the Biology, Chemistry and Microbiology Departments.
The Department Chair and Division Director are continuing to address recruitment strategies that will increase numbers and diversity in the MT Program. One faculty member oversees recruitment, attends the many freshman orientation sessions on lower campus, directs an introductory course for freshman and sophomore students at the university who want to learn about the MT program and the profession, and maintains relationships with the pre-med advisors on lower campus. Additionally, the Department has developed a recruitment relationship with Snow College. Faculty regularly attend the national Clinical Laboratory Educators' Conference where recruitment ideas and approaches are shared. The Sr. Vice President suggested that the Program work closely with Dr. Evelyn Gopez, Vice President for Inclusion, and Carrie Byington, Director of the Native American Research Internship (NARI) Program, to link into their well-developed and coordinated recruitment efforts for the Health Sciences. Efforts will be made internally to track the effectiveness of these various strategies in order to pick and choose those that are most fruitful for the Program.

b. The students request more case studies, patient simulations and knowledge of how their professional work will enhance patient care. With the need for more inter-professional collaboration, finding avenues for students to interact with other health professional students would be of value for the program. Additionally, the students would like more instruction on laboratory equipment and equipment troubleshooting (experience employers inquire about).

The Division is supportive of this recommendation. Faculty will look carefully at how the case study format is utilized and look for ways to further develop patient simulations. For example, students in their final year will have the opportunity to “shadow” working professionals at ARUP. The Sr. Vice President suggested having a faculty member sit on the Inter-Professional Education (IPE) Area Committee. Both of these initiatives will be pursued by the Program Director. Providing more laboratory instrumentation for the student laboratory sessions is a challenge because of the initial expense of the instruments, service contracts, and reagents, but students are exposed to a variety of instruments during the 18-week clinical rotation at laboratory facilities in the Salt Lake Valley, where they receive hands-on training.

c. There is potential to leverage ARUP support with even more student exposure in certain areas, notably flow cytometry (the current program devotes only one day to this topic), balanced by possible reduction in other areas (such as in hematopathology).

The Program Director and faculty agree with the reviewers’ assessment of the importance of flow cytometry and the recommendation that the time be increased. The Program Director has worked with ARUP and the rotation is now expanded to two days – one in hematologic flow and the other in immunologic flow.
d. The Department may want to invest in a microscope-camera-TV projection system that can be more efficient for teaching larger groups in topics such as cell morphology.

The Program is fortunate to have a microscope-camera-TV projection system that is used regularly by several faculty in the Division for projection of microscopic images of blood cells, parasites, molds and yeasts, and urine sediment (the reviewers must not have been aware of this). It was proposed that a new multi-headed system be purchased for use by the hematology instructor. The old multi-headed scope belongs to the School of Medicine and was used for teaching histology as well as for some teaching of the MLS students. Histology is now using virtual imaging and a computer/projection system for teaching and they are not interested in the multi-headed scope system. In further discussion with the MLS hematology instructor, it was decided that this is the direction she will pursue rather than requesting a new multi-headed scope.

2. Cytotechnology (CT) Program Recommendations:

a. According to the Self-Study, the CT program director believes a more private office is desirable for student conferences and counseling. We support this recommendation.

The Chair and Program Director must work within the space constraints and policies of ARUP, and a private office is not available for the small number of students in the Program. However, the Program Director can routinely have private conversations with students in the teaching multi-headed microscope conference room, and all student records and privacy information are locked in filing cabinets in adjacent areas.

b. The students request more case studies, patient simulations and knowledge of how their professional work will enhance patient care. CT students would also like more interaction with other MLS students and courses/programs (e.g., cell identification) to foster more interprofessional collaboration. Again, these student requests appear to have merit.

The Program Director and faculty support the student request and the reviewers’ suggestion for more case studies and patient simulations in cytotechnology. As with the Medical Technology Program, case studies can certainly be incorporated more in lectures and laboratory sessions. The Program Director regularly looks for glass slide cases and requires microscope practice. In the future he plans to include the photographs of the College of American Pathologists proficiency samples to boost the number of appropriate cases (50/year). The Program is also looking at creating elective opportunities for students to have more interprofessional collaboration (see Recommendation 1b).
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c. **Students should have increased input into the program and major decisions that affect their program (via student representation in Departmental matters).**

There is agreement with the reviewers’ suggestions regarding this. Even with just four students, it is important for them to have avenues for representation and for their voices to be heard. The CT Program will explore the system utilized by the MLS-Medical Technology Program to increase the avenues for input within the cytotechnology student group. The Program Director will follow up on this.

d. **The CT field is rapidly changing and nationally looking more towards molecular diagnostics. As this topic is mentioned in the accreditation review, a plan and timeline should be implemented to ensure that the program stays at the cutting edge.**

The Program Director/Education Coordinator has completed training modules in molecular diagnostics and has received certification in molecular biology through the American Society for Clinical Pathology. The additional credential is indicated as MB(ASCP). The Program is moving in the right direction toward creating a required course that would provide background in Molecular Diagnostics. This should be in place by June 2014 for the 2014/15 academic year.

e. **The glass slide teaching collections commonly get damaged slides; thus, the program could benefit from the addition of digital images to the slide collection.**

The Program Director has reviewed the collection and determined how best to replace old or broken slides. Because glass slides are still relevant and working with them provides students with necessary techniques/skills, the Director has created and maintains a database of glass slide case studies (since 2006) of new glass slide additions. This allows him to effectively manage the collection, and he has received support from the ARUP cytopathology laboratory personnel to spend time to put the glass slide teaching sets together from patient cases after the slides have been pulled from the archive glass slide files. The Director will investigate building and maintaining online access for the wider community to help build prominence of the collection.
3. MS Program Recommendations:

a. The University of Utah Graduate School guidelines for student committees place emphasis on tenure-track faculty involvement, and there are corresponding limitations on clinical track faculty chairing a student’s thesis committee. Clinical faculty are often responsible for the student’s research, particularly at the ARUP Research and Development Institute, and competent to chair the student’s research. We recommend that the Department consider amending its rule on graduate committee membership. Another option is to consider switching the requirement of a thesis to a student project.

The Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School will work with the Graduate Council to explore the creation of a Graduate Faculty (GF) who would be designated to serve on student committees. The Graduate Faculty designation would be assigned based on a number of criteria (to be determined by the Graduate Council, the Dean, and departments) and this would alleviate the current logistical issues that are created by the current requirement of allowing only tenure-track faculty to serve. The Graduate School will target implementation of the GF designation for the 2014/15 academic year.

b. The Department could help address the issue of limited student stipend funds (currently $6,000) to support MS students, possibly through greater development efforts.

The Program Co-Directors strongly support this recommendation. However, as discussed above, the availability of funds is limited. The Chair is pursuing fundraising with alumni and through other sources via the Development Office.

c. Students expressed specific concerns with the level and unevenness of the 6900 course, Techniques of Biochemical Analysis in Laboratory Medicine, that serves both fellows and master’s level students. Students also suggested that the Scientific Writing course should be a requirement for all MS students (currently it is an elective). These concerns should be attended to.

The Program Directors and Chair agree with the reviewers’ suggestions and have met with the course director and lecturers to more clearly define the scope of subject material and outcomes measurement. In addition, they have consulted with a student group for direct feedback and suggestions and believe they have addressed their concerns. Follow-up evaluations will be tracked.
The faculty focuses on technical or scientific writing with the MS students during the first-year courses. The Program Directors feel that there is significant emphasis on scientific writing within the Program and prefer not to require a separate formal course. They will recommend the course for our students, but prefer that it remain an elective rather than a core course. They will also get the word out to students that the Department of Writing and Rhetoric offers WRTG 7060 Scientific Writing and WRTG 6000 Writing for Publication.

d. The students could use more communication about the processes for degree completion and when they should take their preliminary examination. A timeline and flowchart outlining the major steps for degree completion should be developed for the students.

Following the visits of the reviewers, the Program Directors constructed a document with the timelines and sequences of Program and Graduate School requirements. It was introduced to the first-year students at the end of Fall semester, in a review of requirements session, and was well received. The document will be used in the yearly update sessions between the Program Directors and students who have been in the Program 1+ years, and it will be included on the MS Program website.

Division of Microbiology and Immunology

4. MI Program Recommendations:

a. Expectations for what is considered by the graduate program for a PhD degree should be clearly articulated by the graduate program and efforts should be made to shorten the time to complete the PhD degree. Currently the time to degree completion is long relative to national standards. A requirement or process for a thesis proposal could help accelerate student progress and research. This requirement could include components such as more feedback from the supervisory committee to the student; creation of a graduate student handbook with clear listings of requirements and the timetable; and/or financial incentives in terms of stipend or tuition payments.

In response to the reviewers’ comments the Program has made several changes in its PhD program to try to reduce the time it takes for a student to complete the degree: 1) The timeframe has changed and students will now advance to candidacy early in their second year; 2) After each Thesis Advisory Committee meeting the thesis advisor will prepare a document summarizing the meeting, including student accomplishments and goals for the future. It is hoped that clearer communication of expectations will help students focus on the highest priority tasks at hand; 3) The Program will
increase the frequency of Thesis Advisory Committee meetings for students starting with their fifth year. Students in their fifth and sixth years will be required to have two meetings per year, and students in their seventh year and beyond will have three meetings per year. 3) The Program Director and Division faculty are in discussion regarding the best way to handle the thesis proposal (see Recommendation 4b) so that it helps rather than hinders students’ progress.

b. The format of the preliminary exam is to identify a topic completely separate from the thesis area of research and develop an NIH research proposal. Students and faculty found this to be a productive endeavor but that it is too restrictive to identify the exam topic that is completely separate from the area of students’ future research. The external reviewers recommended that this arrangement be given further consideration.

The Program faculty have discussed this recommendation and have modified the rules so that the preliminary exam guidelines are less restrictive regarding choice of topic.

c. Several programmatic course suggestions from the review committees include: an early graduate-level depth immunology class as an elective, biostatistics and bioinformatics classes (possibly available through other programs), and opportunities for more student feedback on coursework and on how to improve content/delivery of material covered.

The Program Director agrees that it is a good idea to offer Introductory Immunology as an elective course available to first-year students in the Molecular Biology and Biological Chemistry programs. The plan to offer the course in Spring semester is in progress toward implementation. Student evaluation questions are currently being revised to more accurately reflect student feedback on the effectiveness of course content and delivery.

There are a number of courses currently that have been offered from other departments, including Human Genetics 6090 (Introduction to Bioinformatics), Biomedical Informatics 6030 (Foundations of Bioinformatics), Biomedical Informatics 6105 (Statistics for Biomedical Informatics), and Biology 6500 (Statistical Modeling for Biologists). Students will be informed about these courses.
d. Additional recruiting efforts for graduate students in the Division would be desirable, such as an annual “Open House” with poster sessions and free lunch to highlight the programs of the Division.

The Program faculty believe the annual retreat of the Microbial Pathogenesis Training Grant serves the purpose of recruitment well. It is well attended and considered to be very effective. In future years invitations will be extended to all first-year graduate students in addition to marketing it in broader ways.

e. Students are interested in more interaction with ARUP and clinical aspects of pathology, and are also concerned about job placement after the PhD. A Career Day event or occasional seminar speakers from non-academic venues (clinical labs, regulatory agencies, patent law, etc.) could help provide career guidance. With uncertainties about the economy and job market, current graduate students feel they could use advising on career alternatives in basic sciences, or academics including law, pharmacy, etc.

1) The Pathology Department has begun a new program to encourage collaborations between basic scientists in the Microbiology and Immunology Division and the clinical scientists in other divisions, and will try to include students in these endeavors; 2) ARUP has an annual colloquium where investigations into new clinical testing are presented; an invitation will be extended to all students to attend this colloquium; 3) The Clinical Pathology Division has a monthly Grand Rounds seminar series, and graduate students will be invited to this seminar series in the future.

The Molecular Biology and Biological Chemistry Programs run a Career Day every other year that has speakers on a variety of career options in addition to academics. There is anecdotal evidence that students have found the Career Day to be helpful in their career planning. The Graduate Dean suggested that more career services for graduate students in general be implemented in the Health Sciences and informed all parties present about the career workshops and services offered through the Graduate School’s Office for Postdoctoral Affairs.
f. More efforts on development and endowed funds could enhance the program in the following ways: a one-year research rotation for MD students (similar to the Hughes program), and endowed chairs that would serve to recruit and retain world-class faculty.

The Department Chair and Program Directors think these are excellent ideas, both for the medical students and for the Department. They will consider initiating a post-sophomore medical student fellowship in Pathology if adequate new funds become available through endowments or other external sources. A newly established endowed chair in the Department and the “Triple I” interdepartmental collective (Immunology, Infectious Disease, and Inflammation) initiative will both serve to recruit and retain world-class faculty.

This memorandum of understanding is be followed by regular letters of progress from the Chair of the Department of Pathology to the Dean of the Graduate School. Letters will be submitted each year until all of the actions described in the preceding paragraphs have been completed.
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