ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA
April 7, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 p.m. in Eccles Institute of Human Genetics Auditorium

2. MINUTES: March 3, 2014

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. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

6. REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATION

7. REPORT FROM ASUU

8. NOTICE OF INTENT
   a. Policy Updates to 2-005, 6-001, 6-303, 6-310 (plus rule)

9. DEBATE CALENDAR
   a. Academic Governance Policies, 6-001, 6-300, 6-003, 6-015, 7-100
   b. Proposal to close out Department of Physiology
   c. Proposal to create Population Health Sciences
   d. Academic Calendar 2014-2021

10. INFORMATION CALENDAR
    a. University of Utah Scholarship Program
    b. Senate Committee Reports
    c. Graduate Council Review Department of City and Metropolitan Planning
    d. Graduate Council Review Department of Health Promotion and Education
    e. Graduate Council Review Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy
    f. Graduate Council Review Nursing PhD and Gerontology MS Programs – College of Nursing
    g. 2014 Distinguished Professors
    h. 2014 Early Career Teaching Awards Recipients
    i. Calvin S. and JaNeal N. Hatch Prize in Teaching

11. NEW BUSINESS
    a. March 2014 President’s Report

12. ADJOURNMENT
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
March 3, 2014

Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate, held on March 3, 2014, was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by Allyson Mower, Senate President. The meeting was held in room 1750 Health Sciences Education Building.

Present: David Ailion, Peter Alfeld, McKay Allred, Chrisoula Andreou, Tim Benvegnu, Lyda Bigelow, Kelly Bricker, Kate Canas, Tully Cathey, Marcus Chen, Robin Craig, Kevin DeLuca, Alison Denyer, David Dinter, Maria Dobozy, Megan Dolle, Randy Dryer, Xiao Fang, Ole Fischer, Michael Free, Frances Friedrich, Caren Frost, Sabine Fuhrmann, Michael Gardner, Jennifer Garvin, William Gershan, Stephen Goldsmith, Joan Gregory, Thad Hall, Glen Hanson, Michael Harris, Mary Elizabeth Hartnett, Leanne Hawken, Rachel Hayes-Harb, David Hill, Michelle Hofmann, Lynn Hollister, Thunder Jalili, Anne Jamison, Brandon Jennings, Peter Jensen, Xan Johnson, William Johnson, Lori Kowaleski-Jones, Evert Lawton, John Longino, Gary Lowder, William Lowrance, Ross Marabella, Erminia Martinez, Theresa Martinez, Jannah Mather, Sandra McIntryre, Ashley McMullin, Heather Melton, Duncan Metcalfe, Meredith Metzger, Joel Miller, Jill Moriearty, Alfred Mowdood, Patricia Murphy, Sam Ortiz, Patrick Panos, Janiece Pompa, Christina Porucznik, Bruce Quaglia, Mariana Ramiro, Reva Rauk, Lorie Richards, Steve Roens, Gerald Root, Gary Rose, Jody Rosenblatt, Paul Shami, Clough Shelton, Debra Simmons, Gregory Smoak, David Stevenson, David Temme, Rachel Wootton, Joanne Yaffe, Jingyi Zhu


Excused: Vivian Lee


Excused with Proxy: Therèse de Raedt for Matthew Potolsky, Jason Goldsmith for Bradley Katz, Aaron Kaplan for Mary Ann Christison

Others: Ed Barbanell, Maureen Condic, Dave Kidea

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting on February 3, 2014, received no objections.

Request for New Business
The following items of New Business will be discussed:

- Senate Advisory Committee on Budget and Planning Survey Questions
Consent Calendar
The resignations retiresments, and faculty and administrator appointments dated March 3, 2014, received no objections and will be forward to the Board of Trustees.

Executive Committee Report
Steve Alder, Academic Senate President-elect, provided a summary of the Executive Committee meeting held February 10, 2014.

Report from Administration
President David Pershing gave an update to the Academic Senate regarding the Legislative session. The number one request for the University is still compensation for the faculty and staff. Distinctive mission is the second highest request with an increase in funding for online education. Currently there are 8,000 students taking online courses and the majority of those students are taking lower division classes. Other priorities include mission-based funding, infrastructure, Huntsman Cancer Institute Phase IV, and funding for the Crocker Science Center.

The ribbon cutting ceremony for the Beverley Taylor Sorenson Arts and Education Complex took place on Thursday, January 30th. Women’s Week will be held February 28th through March 6.

Report from ASUU
Sam Ortiz, ASUU President spoke to the Academic Senate regarding the recent activities of ASUU. The voting for General Elections will close on March 6th with final election results release on March 7th. The Annual Grand Kerfuffle will be held on April 4th on the Union lawn. It will feature Hoodie Allen with Talib Kweli, Burrell Washburn, and The Druthers. Tickets are available at the Union Front Desk. Geek week will take place the week of finals for Spring semester.

Notice of Intent
No Items on Notice of Intent

Debate Calendar
Howard Horwitz presented the Senate Advisory Committee on Budget and Planning Survey Questions. The Senate Advisory Committee on Budget and Planning (SACBP) consults with the university administration and represents the views and interests of the whole faculty in the administration’s long range academic budget and planning. Through the questionnaire the SACBP is trying to acquire feedback from faculty about the budget process and some initial data about faculty views of budget priorities. The motion to approve and move forward with the survey was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Maria Dobozy. Motion passed.

The Revisions of Policy 6-100 was presented by Ed Barbanell. With the disbanding of the Academic Evaluations and Standards committee, Policy 6-100 will need to be updated. The updated policy will read, The Academic Evaluations and Standards Committee is eliminated, effective July 1, 2014, by Revision 22 of Policy 6-100. The Committee’s former functions have been assigned to various other committees and offices within the University. The motion to
approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Xan Johnson and seconded by Bill Johnson. Motion passed.

The Songdo Academic Calendar was presented by Steve Alder and Tim Ebner. The Academic year will start in September and end in June. The Fall term begins September 1st 2014 and will end December 12th. Spring term begins March 2nd and ends June 10th. Spring term will be delayed until after the lunar holiday. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Jill Moriearty. Motion passed.

Allyson Mower presented the Faculty & Student Response Pool Ad Hoc Committee. The Faculty and Student Response Pool will be an Ad hoc 2-year Senate committee to provide a pool of faculty and students to draw from when administrators or university committees need feedback, perspective, or advice of faculty and students. The motion to create the ad hoc the Faculty & Student Response Pool was made by Xan Johnson and seconded by Patricia Murphy. Motion passed.

David Kieda presented the Learning Enhancement and Outcome Assessment Ad Hoc Committee. The University of Utah’s accreditation body, Northwest Commission of Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), recently moved from a ten-year accreditation to a seven year cycle. Part of the transition includes changing the accreditation requirements for a once per decade snapshot to an ongoing stewardship of the accreditation process by NWCCU at each university. This new accreditation process includes mandatory interim reviews and targets goals every two years and will require the commitment of resources beyond those needed in the past. NWCCU has implemented new academic performance requirements, including development and use of Expected Learning Outcomes and Outcomes Assessment for every academic program at the University. The charge to the committee includes: Develop a campus-wide structure for coordination and evaluation of assessment practices in each department and college; Provide recommendations for a university-wide oversight body that will track periodic review results of Outcomes Assessments in each program and evaluate ongoing improvements in student outcomes; Provide recommendations for improving access and accuracy of Office of Budget and Institutional Activities to departments and colleges to assist in their yearly program evaluations; Recommend a periodic interval (yearly) for departmental and college reports to the institution wide assessment oversight body. The motion to create the ad hoc committee was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Bill Johnson. Motion passed with one abstention.

Keith Bartholomew presented the Senate Ad-Hoc Vehicle Idling Committee. The Senate Ad-Hoc Vehicle Idling Committee (SAVIC) will review existing university policy on vehicle idling on campus and make recommendations to the full senate for possible policy development to help advance the campus’ overall commitment to clean air and climate stability. The committee expects to complete its work by the May 2014 senate meeting. The motion to create the ad hoc committee was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Xan Johnson. Motion passed.

Information Calendar
The following items were presented for the information and recommendations of the Academic Senate:
- Revising Policies 6-001, 6-300, and others on academic governance and authority of the Senate and faculties
- 2014 Distinguished Innovation and Impact Award
- John R. Park Teaching Fellowship

No questions or recommendations were raised. The 2014 Distinguished Innovation and Impact Award and John R. Park Teaching Fellowship items will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees.

Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m. after the BoardDocs training session.

Respectfully submitted,
Shawnee Worsley
Memorandum

From: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee (formerly University RPT Standards Committee)

To: Senate Executive Committee

Re: Proposal for revising Regulations on Faculty Review Standards and Procedures-- Policy 6-303, Policy 6-310, and Rule 6-310(IDTP).

Date: March 31, 2014.

1. Introduction:

This proposal is the second phase of a project to revise University Regulations which govern standards and procedures for periodic reviews of individual faculty members. The first phase proposal was approved in January 2014. It involved revision of Policy 6-002 (The Academic Senate) to integrate career-line faculty into the set of Senate standing committees. For the committee which the Senate has established to represent the Senate in overseeing the systems by which reviews of faculty members are conducted, that first phase changed the name, membership structure, and functions of the committee. In that first-phase proposal it was explained that to fully implement those system changes started with the revisions of 6-002, it would be necessary to follow through with revising related contents of the other Regulations that directly govern the faculty review systems in which the Senate’s committee is involved. The January proposal explicitly included a commitment to return later this spring semester with this second-phase proposal, to complete the overall project.

The most important accomplishments from the combined results of the two phases are (i) to expand the responsibilities of the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee (formerly University RPT Standards) to have direct authority for approving contents of the Statements of Standards, Criteria, and Procedures for Faculty Reviews which are developed and implemented by individual departments and colleges, for all categories of faculty, (ii) to expand membership of that Committee to accommodate its new responsibilities, and (iii) to establish a relationship of the Committee and the cognizant vice president’s office in which the final approval authority for such Statements is jointly shared by both, so that reviewing and approving contents of the Statements will be carried out jointly, combining the important perspectives of faculty members elected to the Committee by the Senate, with expertise and resources of the administrative office. Altogether these will result in systems for developing, reviewing, and approving such Statements which should be more efficient and lead ultimately to higher quality systems for reviews of faculty members. To finish accomplishing those improvements begun by the first phase revisions of the Senate’s Committee description in 6-002, this proposal will revise Policy 6-303 (which will now govern all types of reviews of tenure-line faculty, pre- and post-tenure), and Policy 6-310 and Rule 6-310 (which govern reviews of career-line faculty as well as non-faculty instructional personnel). Along with the main changes regarding the role of the Senate’s Committee, other changes are proposed for these Regulations to (iv) conform to the changed nomenclature for categories of faculty.
adopted in spring 2013 (tenure-line, and career-line), and (v) clarify various aspects of the Regulations to provide better guidance on developing and approving the contents of such Statements by which reviews of individual faculty members are governed, with clarifications based on experience gained over the past several years.

II. Highlights of revisions:

A. Policy 6-303:

- Changing the name used in 6-303 for the Senate’s Committee, to conform to the change made in Policy 6-002 in January, with the former University RPT Standards Committee renamed as the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee. (Similarly, references to two other committees are updated to use their new names—the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee, and the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights).

- Changing the nomenclature used within 6-303 to refer to “tenure-line” rather than “regular” faculty, to conform with the mandate for such changes to be made throughout all University Regulations, as stated in the revising of Policy 6-300-- University Faculty Categories and Ranks-- which was approved in spring 2013.

- Moving into 6-303 (new Part III-L) the main existing Policy provision for a system of periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty (Tenured Faculty Reviews—TFR). With that move, 6-303 will become a ‘one-stop’ resource for the most important information regarding review systems for tenure-line faculty members in all career stages, including the stages of pre-tenure Retention, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) and those post-tenure TFR reviews. Also regarding the TFR procedures, a new explanation is added that having such review processes in place is mandated by statewide policy of the Utah Board of Regents, to make clear that the University is acting in full compliance with the letter and spirit of the Regents policy. The existing provision regarding TFR is being moved to 6-303 from its current location in Policy 2-005. (To keep this current proposal at a manageable size, this current proposal does not include revising the contents of 2-005, but that will need to be done in a later phase, changing 2-005 so that it will merely refer to 6-303, rather than covering the same topic of TFR procedures in a duplicative and contradictory way.)

- Assigning to the Senate Committee on Faculty Review Standards a new role in approving contents of Tenured Faculty Review Statements, such that the Committee and the office of the cognizant vice president will jointly share that authority and responsibility of approving Statements. (Part III-L) This follows through with changes for the Committee made in January’s approval of revised 6-002. Also, a note is inserted acknowledging that after some experience in its new role in approving Statements for TFR processes, the Committee will likely identify and propose improvements for this new TFR section of the Policy.
Similarly, establishing a jointly shared authority and responsibility of both the Committee and the vice-president’s office for approving contents of RPT Statements (governing Retention, Promotion, and Tenure reviews of faculty). (Part III-A-2). This follows through with changes made in January’s approval of revised 6-002.

For both RPT and post-tenure TFR review procedure Statements, providing explicitly that the Senate’s Committee, in consultation with the vice president, may establish a schedule for periodically reviewing and updating the contents of the Statements, to ensure they are kept consistent with current Regents Policy and University Regulations and do not become obsolete and fail to reflect changes in departmental standards and practices. This authority of the Committee was present but somewhat unclear under prior versions of Policies, was then made clear in the January revising of 6-002, and the clarifying revision of 6-303 will conform to that change. (Part III-A-2, and III-L)

Explicitly providing for the Committee, in consultation with the vice president’s office, to provide guidance for departments and colleges in updating contents of both the RPT Statements and the TFR Statements, including by preparing and distributing guidance materials. (Part III-A-2, and III-L). This conforms with the January change made to 6-002.

Making several mostly minor clarifications regarding the RPT review processes that are governed by 6-303, based on experience of the Committee gained from working with the vice president’s office and departments and colleges over the past several years, identifying certain points within the Policy where clarification will be useful. For efficiency, these are proposed to be made as part of this project, rather than requiring a separate project. They include:

- Providing within in 6-303 a helpful summary of the topics governed by separate Policies which govern the length of RPT probationary periods, including possible grounds of extending or shortening such periods. This will facilitate departments including in their RPT Statements a similar summary, to ensure that pre-tenure faculty are adequately informed about their rights (e.g., rights to parental leaves which may extend the probationary period). This new section (Part III-A-3) briefly summarizes topics governed by Policies 6-311, 6-315 & 8-002, 6-320).

- Clarifying that RPT Statements should describe the “evidence” departments will use in determining whether an RPT candidate has met the requisite standard of performance for each criterion of research/creative activity, teaching, and service. (Various locations).

- Clarifying that on procedural matters for which University Policy allows departments to make choices among multiple alternatives, those choices made should be described in the RPT Statements (e.g., the length of the pre-tenure probationary period, the number and scheduling of mid-probationary formal retention reviews, procedures for selecting external evaluators). (Part III-A-2)
o Requiring that Statements include a notice as to when new Standards will become applicable for new hires, and what ‘grandfathering’ arrangements are provided for existing faculty. The office of General Counsel has advised such notice is necessary, and the Committee, the vice presidents’ office, and the Counsel’s office have over the past two years have jointly developed a standard clause for this purpose which the Committee has required be inserted in all recently approved Statements. So this change will conform Policy to recent practice. (Part III-A-2)

o Providing that peer observation of teaching and peer examination of teaching materials should “ordinarily” be included among multiple methods as part of “best practices” for assessing an RPT candidate’s teaching performance. (Part III-D-3). This will bring Policy 6-303 into accord with policy of the State Board of Regents which requires periodic reviews of teaching performance and requires that the University “evaluate teaching through student, collegial, and administrative assessment.” (See Regents R481 at http://higheredutah.org/policies/). The Committee proposes phrasing this new passage as only “ordinarily” requiring peer observation, so that there will be some flexibility for a department to substitute other methods that are found to be at least equally effective.

o Clarifying which time periods for a candidate’s responses to various phases of reviews are measured as “calendar” days and which are based on “business days.” The existing version was vague on those points, thus creating grounds for confusion and disputes. (Various sections).

B. Policy 6-310 [renamed as] Reviews of Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty Members, and Other Instructional Personnel (Standards and Procedures):

Because this Policy governs reviews of career-line faculty, and the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee has not yet incorporated into its membership a set of representatives of the career-line faculty (which will be done for the 2014-2015 year), the Committee has called upon two groups to assist in identifying and crafting appropriate revisions for Policy 6-310. One was a specially convened Task Force on Career-Line Faculty and other related topics. The other was the elected Senate members representing career-line faculty throughout the University. This proposal is therefore a joint undertaking of the Committee, that Task Force, and the career-line Senate members. The proposed revisions include some that are required to conform with the changes previously begun through revisions of Policy 6-002 and Policy 6-300, and a small number of additional changes that will clarify ambiguities in the existing 6-310, as well as implementing points identified as useful through the past several years of experience working with the existing Policy.

- Changing the nomenclature used within Policy 6-310 to refer to faculty categories as “career-line” and “adjunct” rather than “auxiliary” faculty, to conform with the mandate
for such changes to be made throughout all University Regulations, as stated in the revising of Policy 6-300 (University Faculty Categories and Ranks) which was approved in spring 2013.

- Assigning to the Senate Committee on Faculty Review Standards a new role in approving contents of the Statements developed by colleges to govern reviews of the career-line and adjunct faculty. Similar to the arrangement described above for Statements governing tenure-line faculty reviews per Policy 6-303, the Committee and the office of the cognizant vice president will jointly share that authority and responsibility of approving Career-line reviews Statements, and of developing and providing guidance for formulating such Statements. This follows through with changes for the Committee made in January’s approval of revised 6-002. It will serve the important function of ensuring faculty perspectives in the approval and guidance processes. With the accompanying expansion of membership of the Committee to include career-line members, those perspectives will come from both career-line and tenure-line members. Similar to its responsibilities with regard to Statements of Procedures for RPT and TFR reviews (described above for 6-303) the Committee, in consultation with the administration, may develop a schedule for periodically updating these Statements, and will provide helpful guidance for the units, including by sharing “best practices” developed by other units. (Part III-C)

- The original version of the Policy was enacted in 2007 as a very rapid response to concerns raised by the University’s accrediting body at that time, and as has been noted by units attempting to develop the requisite Statements, that rapidly enacted Policy is rather vague and provides units with only minimal guidance. With that in mind, a “User Note” is being inserted acknowledging that after some experience is gained in its new roles of developing guidance and approving Statements for Career-line processes, the Committee will likely later identify and propose further improvements for this Policy.

- Adding a statement of principle that the Policy, and the faculty review systems which are established under its authority, are to be guided by fundamental principles of academic freedom and academic excellence. (Part I) And a reminder is added that when appropriate under the circumstances facing a particular unit, reappointment terms of longer than a single year (up to five years) are considered “strongly encouraged” for full-time career-line faculty, because the stability which accompanies longer-term appointments is an important element for ensuring meaningful academic freedom, and fostering academic excellence. (Part III-A-4)

- Adding an explanation that departments and colleges will likely find it useful to use for the evaluation of teaching of career-line and adjunct faculty some of the same methods and processes used for evaluating teaching of tenure-line faculty (as described in the RPT Statements governed by Policy 6-303, mentioned above). (Part III-A-2). The concerns of the University’s accrediting body which compelled original adoption of this Policy were primarily about the University’s lack of systems for ensuring the quality of teaching by
what at that time were known as “auxiliary” faculty, and so the Committee is seeking to aid departments and colleges to put in place systems for reviews of teaching which are both effective and efficient.

- Adding a statement of principle that the University “strongly encourages and highly values involvement of career-line faculty in shared-governance activities.” When career-line faculty members serve the interests of the University community by participating in such activities, for example by serving as elected members of the Senate or Senate committees (in keeping with the restructuring of the Senate through recently revised 6-002) their home units should reasonably recognize and accommodate such valued service, as part of the systems for reviews, reappointments and promotions. (Part III-A-5)

B. Rule 6-310 (IDTP): Appointment, Reappointment and Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty and Other Non-Faculty Instructional Personnel in Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs:

Only two changes are proposed for this Rule.

- First, consistent with the previously approved reconfiguring of the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and assigning it as the primary representative of the Senate on matters regarding processes for reviews of career-line faculty members (by previous revision of Policy 6-002 and the current revisions of Policy 6-310), a new passage is added allowing that Senate Committee, in consultation with the cognizant vice president, to provide its expert guidance for the development and approval of “Statements of rules” governing reviews of career-line faculty members within the Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs. (Part III-F) That guidance should prove helpful, given the expertise the Committee is developing as a result of its new configuration (expanded to include perspectives of career-line representatives) and its parallel function regarding processes for reviews of the career-line faculty in all other units of the University, per Policy 6-310 above.

- Second, as a minor update, the list of such Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs which appears in the Rule is revised to delete mention of the University Writing Program. That unit has recently been approved to transition to the status of an academic department, and upon completion of that transition its status as a Program will necessarily end, so its name should be removed from the list.

III. Consultations and further information.

This proposal was developed through joint efforts of the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee (with tenure-line faculty members representing each of the University’s academic colleges), a special Task Force on Career-line Faculty convened by the Office for Faculty (with broad representation of career-line and tenure-line faculty from throughout the University), and the career-line members of the
Academic Senate during spring 2014 (representing all academic colleges, the University Libraries, and
the Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs established under Rule 6-310). Bob Flores, Professor
of Law, Senate Policy Liaison, and Special Assistant on Faculty Policy for the Office for Faculty, acted as
primary researcher and draftsperson. Hank Liese, Associate Professor of Social Work, Associate Dean
for Academic Affairs--College of Social Work, and Special Assistant to the Associate Vice President for
Faculty, served as co-chairperson of both the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and the special
Task Force on Career-line Faculty during this project. The proposal has been presented to the Institutional
Policy Committee (with representation of all administrative areas of the University, including the office
of General Counsel), and has been reviewed by the elected faculty and student members and ex officio
administration representatives of the Senate Executive Committee.

For further information, contact Bob Flores, robert.flores@law.utah.edu 581-5881, or Hank
Liese, hank.liese@socwk.utah.edu.

##
Policy 6-303, Revision 2021: Reviews of Tenure-Line Faculty Members (RPT and TFR Criteria, Standards and Procedures). Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Effective Date: May 15, 2014

I. Purpose and Scope.

To establish criteria, standards, and procedures for reviews of tenure-line faculty members for purposes of retention, promotion, and tenure decisions (RPT), and for periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured-faculty members (TFR) of regular faculty. To implement policies of the Utah State Board of Regents regarding such reviews, including [Regents Policy R4811, Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Tenure, Termination, and Post–Tenure Review.] To establish departmental retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committees and committees for reviews of tenured faculty, and describe their functions. To describe certain functions of the University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee, and the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee, and functions of University officers (department chairpersons, deans, cognizant vice presidents, and the President, as related to retention, promotion, and tenure, and post-tenure reviews.

This Policy governs performance review processes for all faculty members appointed to any tenure-line faculty position in any academic unit of the University. The rights associated with the status of retention in a tenure-track position, or holding a tenured position, are described in other University Regulations, including Policy 6-311. Review processes for faculty members appointed to career-line, adjunct or visiting faculty category positions (as described in Policy 6-300), or for persons in non–faculty academic employee positions (as described in Policy 6-309), are separately governed by [Policy 6–310]. Review processes for persons holding any special “named position” such as an endowed chair are separately governed by [Policy 9–003: Endowed Chairs].
II. Definitions. (Reserved)

A. The faculty categories of “tenure-line,” “tenure-track,” and “tenured,” are defined for purposes of this Policy as described in Policy 6-300: The University Faculty--Categories and Ranks.

B. The faculty appointment status of “tenure” is defined for purposes of this Policy as described in Policy 6-311: Faculty Retention and Tenure.

C. The academic units of “academic department,” “academic college,” and “interdisciplinary academic program,” are defined for purposes of this Policy as described in Policy 6-001: Academic Units and Academic Governance.

III. Policy: Reviews of Tenure-line Faculty Members (RPT and TFR): Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

Overview: This Policy governs the criteria, standards, evidence and procedures for all reviews of tenure-line faculty members both pre-tenure and post-tenure. Parts III–A to III–J govern reviews conducted during the pre-tenure probationary period leading up to the granting of tenure, and also any reviews for purposes of promotion in rank conducted after granting of tenure. Part III–K governs reviews for granting of tenure at the time of initial appointment. Part III–L governs regular periodic post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty members (other than reviews for the purpose of granting a promotion in rank).

A. Retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) reviews

1. Purpose:
   a. Retention. A probationary period is normally required for all individuals appointed to regular faculty rank (tenure-track faculty positions) prior to the granting of tenure. Annual reviews shall be scheduled during this probationary period to evaluate the academic performance of non-tenured individuals, to
provide constructive feedback on their academic progress, to retain those who meet the applicable standards for retention, and to terminate the appointment of those who do not meet the standards of the department and the expectations of the University during the probationary period after their initial appointments. (See University Policy 6–311, and Board of Regents Policy R481 regarding termination of appointment, notice of termination, and the terminal appointment period.)

b. Promotion. Promotion in rank is the acknowledgment by the University of continuing and increasing professional competence and responsibility in teaching, research and creative work, and University and public service.

c. Tenure. Granting tenure implies a commitment by the University to defend faculty members' academic freedom. Likewise, faculty members who are granted tenure make an equally strong commitment to serve their students, their colleagues, their discipline, and the University in a manner befitting a responsible academic person. (See Policy 6–311.) Granting tenure is regarded as the University's most critical personnel decision. Except for extraordinary instances, when specific and persuasive justification is provided, tenure will not be granted to faculty members prior to their advancement to the rank of associate professor. It is therefore imperative, before such commitments are made, that a responsible screening process be followed to ensure that the most highly qualified candidates available are granted tenure. Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years as per Policy 2–005–Section 5–C. (Drafting note: this information regarding Tenured Faculty Reviews is moved below to new Part III–L and revised as shown there.)

2. Criteria, Standards, Evidence and Procedures (RPT)

a. Development and approval of statements of RPT criteria, standards, evidence and procedures (“RPT Statements”). (Drafting note: capitalization corrections for the phrase “RPT Statement” are made throughout this draft, but to minimize burden on readers are not marked as changes. The same is true for the terms, President of the University.)
i. Each department (or college) shall formulate and distribute to all regular faculty members, and when appropriate revise, a Statement of criteria, standards, evidence and procedures to be used in retention, promotion, and tenure (“RPT”) reviews. These RPT Statements shall address the qualifications of candidates with respect to the primary criteria areas of (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative activity, and (3) University, professional, and public service. These Statements shall be consistent with applicable provisions of University Regulations, especially including Policies 6-303, 6-311 (Retention and Tenure), and 6-316 (Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities), as well as professional codes if appropriate, and with the purpose of the University of Utah as stated in Chapter 1, Section 1, of the State Higher Education System Regulations. The Statements shall include the rationale for the criteria and standards, and a description of evidence to be used in assessing performance relative to selected standards for each criterion. The Statements shall include a description of departmental procedures which are required by University Regulations (or instead provide specific references to the pertinent provisions of those Regulations), and a description of departmentally selected procedures on which where University Regulations permit departmental variation, such as the selection of either a six-year or seven-year normal probationary period, and number and scheduling of mid-probationary formal retention reviews (Part III-A-3), timing of eligibility for post-tenure review for further promotion in rank (Part III-B-2-d), the procedures for informal reviews in (Part III-B-1-a) of this Policy and, any rules for allowing non-voting faculty participants in meetings of the departmental RPT advisory committee as referred to in (Parts III-A-3, III-E-1 and III-K-1) of this Policy, any requirement of external evaluations for reviews other than tenure or promotion reviews (Part III-B-2), procedures for selecting a set of external evaluators (Part III-D-9), and any procedures for assigning to individuals or special committees specified
responsibilities within RPT proceedings (e.g., mentoring, peer reviews of teaching, file preparation, file review, or preparation of reports). Each revision of a Statement shall specify the date on which its requirements become effective for all newly appointed candidates, and describe any delay period (‘grandfathering’) or consent procedure for making changed requirements applicable for reviews of existing faculty members.

ii. Each Statement and any revision of a Statement must be approved by majority vote of the regular tenure-line faculty of the department, the dean, and jointly finally approved by the cognizant senior vice president and the Senate Faculty Review the URPT Standards Committee.

Two or more departments within a multi-department college may jointly adopt a single RPT Statement, and in such cases the required approval of the faculty shall be by majority vote within the tenure-line faculty of each joining department. If all departments within the college so join, the Statement shall be treated as a “college-wide RPT Statement,” operative within all of the departments.

In its role in approving RPT Statements, the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee acts as delegate of the authority of Academic Senate, pursuant to Policy 6–002–III–D–1–k, and in accord with that Policy the Committee, in consultation with the cognizant vice president, may establish a regular schedule for reexamination and revision of RPT Statements, initiate reviews of Statements on its own initiative or in response to requests from faculty members or administrators, prepare guidance materials for use in developing and approving Statements, and otherwise assist departments with development of Statements, including by identifying and sharing best practices developed by other departments.
iii. An RPT Statement fully approved becomes the governing Statement for that department until replaced by a fully-approved revised version. The department chairperson shall make contents of the current governing Statement available to all tenure-line faculty members. Pertinent contents of the governing Statement shall be provided to all committees and individuals participating in RPT proceedings and all committees or individuals making any recommendation or decision in an RPT proceeding shall do so consistent with the governing University Regulations and the substantive criteria, standards and evidence set forth in the governing RPT Statement.

b. Criteria and evidence.

i. The primary criteria of teaching, research/creative activity, and service shall be assessed for retention, promotion, and tenure in terms of standards incorporating both the quantity and quality of work achieved. Departmental RPT Statements shall identify types of evidence to be used as means of assessing quantity and quality appropriate to the discipline or profession.

ii. Any departmental expectation of accomplishment of or potential for obtaining external funding support (and the rationale for imposing such expectation) shall be described with particularity in the departmental Statement.

iii. In carrying out their duties in teaching, research/other creative activity and service, faculty members are expected to demonstrate the ability and willingness to perform as responsible members of the faculty, as defined in the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (Policy 6-316). Assessments of teaching, research/other creative activity and service may consider the candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty.
c. Standards. Insistence upon the highest attainable standards for faculty members is essential for the maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery as well as the assimilation and transmission of knowledge. Departmental RPT Statements and the decisions based upon them shall emphasize the University's commitment to the achievement and maintenance of academic excellence.

i. Teaching and research/other creative activity. For granting of tenure, it is indispensable that there be a cumulative record demonstrating sustained effectiveness in each of the two areas of teaching and research/other creative activity, and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas. This set of requirements may be met through articulation and application of departmental standards that require either (i) effectiveness in one area and excellence in the other, or (ii) effectiveness in each area and combined achievements in the two areas that taken overall constitute excellence. Departments shall select, clearly articulate, and apply the selected standards in a manner that is appropriate to the characteristics and standards of the discipline and the intended roles of faculty members within the department. A department may select standards higher than these minimum requirements if clearly described in the departmental RPT Statement.

For retention during the probationary period, the record for the two areas must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure. For promotion in rank, the record for the two areas must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the particular rank. Departmental RPT Statements shall clearly describe the standards applicable for each rank.

ii. University, professional, and public service. Recognition shall be accorded faculty members for the quality and
extent of their public service. Demonstration of effective
service at a level appropriate to rank is essential for
retention, promotion, and tenure. A department may select
higher standards if clearly described in the departmental
RPT Statement.

d. Prior accomplishments. Candidates in a regular tenure-line
faculty appointment may have accomplishments achieved prior
to their probationary period at the University of Utah be
considered as relevant to the demonstration of their
achievement of the applicable RPT criteria and standards. Prior
accomplishments, such as research publications or teaching
experience, shall not substitute for a continuing record of
accomplishments during the probationary period at the
University of Utah. The burden is on the candidate to
demonstrate that these achievements satisfy the RPT criteria and
standards. (For evaluation process, see Policy 6-311–III–Section
4–C–1.)

3. Department retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committee
[User note: In Revision 21 of this Policy, the existing description of
the voting membership and chairperson of the departmental RPT
Advisory Committee which previously appeared in Part III–A–3 was
moved to Part III–E–1 below (to be incorporated with the description
of the actions of the Committee). And the summary descriptions of
the RPT pre-tenure probationary period and procedures for changing
the length of a probationary period (details of which are governed by
other Policies) were added into Policy 6–303–III–A–3, to better guide
departments in formulating RPT Statements and better inform RPT
candidates regarding those important topics.]
{Drafting note: The following passage describing the department RPT committee is
moved to III–E–1 below.}

a. Committee membership:
   i. Retention. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are
      eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in
      individual cases on matters of retention. Other faculty members may participate in the
      consideration of candidates for retention if allowed by department rules, but may not
      vote.
   ii. Promotion. In each department all regular tenure-line faculty members of equal or higher
      rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the
      consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of
promotion. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for promotion if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.

iii. Tenure. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for tenure if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.

iv. Small academic unit rule. Any department or division advisory committee making a formal RPT recommendation must include at least three members eligible to vote by tenure status and rank. If the unit does not have at least three eligible members, the department or division chair must recommend to the dean one or more faculty members with the appropriate tenure status and rank and with some knowledge of the candidate's field from other units of the University of Utah or from appropriate emeritus faculty. In advance of the chair's contacting such faculty members, the chair shall notify the candidate of the potential persons to be asked, and the candidate must be offered the opportunity to comment in writing on the suitability of the potential committee members. The final selection rests with the dean.

v. Single vote rule. No individual may cast a vote in the same academic year in any person's case in more than one capacity (e.g., as member of both department and academic program, as member of both department and college advisory committees, as member of both department and administration).

b. Chairperson. The chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee shall be elected annually from the tenured members of the department. In this election all regular tenure-line faculty members of the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor shall be entitled to vote. The department chairperson is not eligible to chair this committee.

{Drafting note: The following passages in [[double brackets]] summarily describing the RPT probationary period are added here to make this important information more accessible, and they are based on the very detailed descriptions existing in the various separate governing policies cited.}

[[ #3. RPT pre-tenure probationary period and schedule of reviews.

As more fully described in and governed by the following cited Policies:

a. The normal pre-tenure probationary period, (i) for candidates initially appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor or Instructor is seven years (unless the department within the approved RPT Statement has adopted the alternative of six years), and (ii) for candidates initially appointed at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor is five years. (Policy 6-311–III–Section 4–B)

b. There shall be (i) a final formal review for tenure during the final year of the probationary period, (ii) normally either one or two mid-probationary-period formal reviews for retention (with the number and normal scheduling to be specified in the approved RPT Statement), and (iii) informal reviews in all other years. (Part–III–B below)
c. The probationary period length (and accordingly the schedule of formal reviews) for a particular candidate may be varied on the grounds and through the procedures prescribed regarding (i) shortening based on "credit for prior service" or "extraordinary progress toward tenure" (Policy 6-311–III–Section 4–C–1), or (ii) extending, based on "leave of absence," "effect of administrative assignments," or "extraordinary circumstances" (Policy 6-311–III–Section 4–C–2), or under the terms of other relevant Regulations, including those regarding Faculty Parental Benefits (Policy 6-315, Policy 8–002) or Part Time Status (Policy 6–320).

B. Informal or Formal Reviews (RPT procedures).

All tenure-eligible track faculty members shall be reviewed annually to assess their achievement in teaching, research/other creative activity, responsibility, and service. Informal annual reviews are required in each year in which a formal review is not held. More extensive, formal reviews are required for mid-probationary retention reviews; final probationary year reviews (consideration for tenure); consideration for termination at any point in the probationary period (such as triggered reviews); and promotion decisions. (A chart of the timing and review requirements is set forth below at Policy 6–303–III–D–12.)

1. Informal reviews. Informal reviews must minimally include 1) a face to face meeting between the candidate and the department chair (or a designee, as per department rules) to discuss the candidate's progress based on the file; 2) involvement, determined by the department, from the RPT advisory committee (and academic program if relevant); and, 3) a written report to be made available to the candidate, the members of the RPT advisory committee and the department chair.

a. Procedures. The department RPT Statement of RPT criteria, standards and procedures adopted by the department (or college) must prescribe specific requirements for informal reviews. Minimally, it must state the required documentation and who provides it, procedures for preparing and distributing
the written report, the nature of the involvement by the RPT advisory committee (and interdisciplinary academic program if relevant), procedures and criteria for appointment of a chair's designee, if any, and the timetable for the annual reviews. Departments may elect to include in their Statements more extensive review procedures than the minimum required. Procedures for first-year reviews shall be described separately if differing (typically less extensive) from informal reviews of later years.

b. Actions after the report. Candidates shall have the opportunity to make a written response to the report. The report and the response, if any, are then filed in the candidate's cumulative file with a copy of each sent to the dean. The informal review concludes at this point.

c. Triggering formal retention reviews. If a tenure-eligible track faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, the department chair or department RPT advisory committee in consultation with the reviewers may trigger a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external evaluator review letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.

2. Formal reviews. Formal reviews must provide a substantive assessment of the candidate's research or other creative activity, teaching and service to date. Formal reviews require a vote of the full RPT advisory committee. External evaluations, as discussed below (Policy 6-303-III-D-9), are required for tenure and promotion reviews. Departments, through departmental RPT Statements, may also mandate external evaluations for mid-probationary and/or triggered reviews. When such external evaluations are not mandated, candidates still retain the right to have external letters solicited unless quality of research or creative activity is not an issue in the
review (e.g., a triggered review focused solely on teaching) and provided that such request is made before the review commences.

a. Mid-probationary retention reviews. All tenure-eligible track faculty members shall have at least one formal, mid-probationary review in their third or fourth year, as determined by departmental rules. Department RPT Statements must prescribe the number of reviews and the year(s) in which they occur.

b. "Triggered" reviews. The results of an informal review may "trigger" a formal review earlier than ordinarily prescribed by departmental rule if an informal review has demonstrated inadequate performance or progress, as described in Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c above.

c. Tenure. Tenure-eligible track faculty members must be reviewed for tenure by the final year of their probationary period. As summarized in Part III-A-3 above (and directly governed by Policy 6-311-III-Section-4):

i. Deadline for tenure review. The final year is the fifth year for persons candidates appointed at the ranks of associate professor or professor and the seventh year for those appointed at the rank of assistant professor (unless the department has established, through its RPT Statement, a six year probationary period for assistant professors). See Policy 6-311-III-Section-4-B

ii. Request for earlier review. Within limits specified by the departmental RPT Statement and Policy 6-311 candidates by University Policy 6-311-III-Section-4-C-1, tenure-eligible faculty may request a review for tenure earlier than the year of the mandatory review.

d. Promotion in rank.

i. Timing for tenure-eligible track faculty. Tenure-eligible track faculty members are usually reviewed for promotion to higher rank concurrently with their tenure
reviews. Under unusual circumstances, tenure-eligible track faculty members may request a review for promotion earlier than the year of the mandatory tenure review.

ii. Timing for tenured faculty. Tenured faculty members may request a review for promotion within limits specified by the departmental RPT Statement.

C. Notice to involved individuals \textit{(RPT procedures)}.

1. Notice to candidate. Each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure shall be given at least 30 days advance notice of the department RPT advisory committee meeting and an opportunity to submit any information the candidate desires the committee to consider.

2. Notice to department faculty and staff. At least three weeks prior to the convening of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the department to submit written recommendations for the file of each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation.

3. Notice to student advisory committee. Prior to the convening of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson shall notify the college's representative to the Student Senate and the department student advisory committee(s) (SACs) of the upcoming review and request that the department SAC(s) submit a written report evaluating teaching effectiveness and making RPT recommendations as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC evaluation and report should be based on guiding principles approved by the \textit{University RPT Senate Faculty Review} Standards Committee and provided to the SAC by the department chairperson. The SAC shall be given at least three weeks to prepare its report, but upon failure to report after such notification and attempts by the department chairperson to obtain the reports, the SAC’s recommendations shall be deemed
conclusively waived and their absence shall not thereafter be cause for complaint by faculty members appealing an adverse decision.

4. Notice to interdisciplinary academic program. When a candidate for retention, tenure or promotion in a department is also a member of an interdisciplinary academic program through a shared-appointment agreement with the department (as described in Policy 6-001-III-A), the department chairperson shall notify the chair/director of the academic program of the action to be considered at the same time that the faculty candidate is notified. Academic program faculty as defined by an approved RPT Statement of Procedures established by the program (and not participating in the departmental review committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation which shall be sent to the department chair in a timely manner.

D. Candidate's file (RPT procedures).

Proper preparation and completeness of each candidate's file are essential for the uninterrupted progress of a RPT review through all the stages of the review process. Required components and their timing are identified in the table below in Policy 6-303–III-D-12.

1. Structure of the file. The file is envisioned as a notebook in the department office, which is growing throughout a faculty member's probationary period at the University. However, a physical notebook is not the only method allowable – for example an electronic file or other format may be used alone or as a supplement. The file shall be cumulative and kept current as described in the following sections.

2. Curriculum vitae. The candidate's file is expected to provide a current and complete curriculum vitae (CV), which is organized in a clear and coherent manner, with appropriate dates of various items and logical groupings or categories related to the department's RPT criteria. The CV should be updated annually, but not during the course of a given year’s review. During a review, new accomplishments may be reported and documented as a part of any of the reports or responses in the regular process.

3. Evidence for research/creative activity and evidence for teaching.
a. The candidate is expected to provide evidence for review of research and other creative activity, updated annually, consistent with the department’s description of evidence considered appropriate for this criterion, as provided in the RPT Statement.

b. The RPT Statement shall describe the types of evidence to be included in the file appropriate for evaluation regarding the criterion of teaching. These shall include multiple indicators of quality of teaching, consistent with the University’s commitment to “assess its courses and instruction in multiple ways” (Policy 6–100–III–N). In addition to the minimum requirements of (i) course evaluation results, developed using the University’s approved “Course Feedback Instrument and Report” pursuant to Policy 6–100–III–N (and filed per Part III–D–4 below), and (ii) SAC report (developed and filed per Part III–C–3 and D–7), the types of evidence should ordinarily include (iii) assessments from peer observations and analyses of teaching and teaching materials conducted by peer observers qualified by experience and familiarity with the methods of teaching and subjects appropriate for the discipline and department.

The Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and office of the cognizant vice president advise and guide departments regarding best practices for methods of assessing teaching quality, to be incorporated in the approved RPT Statements in keeping with the University’s commitment to high quality education.

4. Past reviews and recommendations. The department chairperson shall include the recommendations from all previous reports submitted by all voting levels in formal reviews, i.e. SAC, department and college RPT advisory committees, letters from chairs, deans, vice presidents, the president and recommendation from UPTAC (if present), teaching evaluations and letters or reports from all informal reviews should also be included. The past reviews and recommendations in a file for a post-tenure review for promotion to Professor shall include the candidate’s vita at the time of the previous promotion (or at appointment if hired as Associate Professor), all reports and recommendations from tenured faculty
reviews, and teaching evaluation summaries since the previous promotion (or appointment). If that promotion or appointment was more than five years earlier, teaching evaluation summaries should be included for at least the most recent five years.

(See Policy 6-100–III–N regarding the “Course Feedback Instrument and Report forms” approved by the Academic Senate for use in development of teaching/course evaluation summaries the chairperson shall include in the candidate's file.)

5. Evidence of faculty responsibility. Letters of administrative reprimand and the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials, arising from relevant concerns about the faculty member should also be included in the candidate's file.

6. Recommendation from academic program. In the event that an interdisciplinary academic program with which the department has a shared-appointment agreement regarding the candidate produces a recommendation as under [this Policy 6-303 Part III–C–4], the department chairperson shall include the recommendation in the candidate's file before the department faculty RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.

7. Recommendation from the department student advisory committee. If the department SAC produces a recommendation as under Policy 6–303–III–C–3, the recommendation shall be placed in the candidate's file by the department chairperson before the department RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.

8. Other written statements. Any other written statements – from the candidate, faculty members in the department, the department chairperson, the college dean, staff, or interested individuals—which are intended to provide information or data of consequence for the formal review of the candidate, must be placed in the file by the department chairperson before the department faculty RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.

9. External evaluations. The purpose of external evaluations is to provide an objective assessment of the quality of the candidate's
work and its impact on the academic and/or professional community at large. Along with the actual review, the external evaluator should describe his/her qualifications and relationship to the candidate. The department chairperson should make sure that any letters of evaluation from outside the department are requested early enough for the letters to arrive and be included in the candidate's file before the program and department RPT advisory committee meetings. Before external letters of evaluation are requested, the faculty member being reviewed shall be presented with a departmentally prepared form containing the following statements and signature lines:

*I waive my right to see the external letters of evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/promotion/tenure review.*

*signature date*

*I retain my right to read the external evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/promotion/tenure review.*

*signature date*

That form, with the candidate's signature below the statement preferred by the candidate, shall be included in the candidate's review file. When the candidate reserves the right to read the external letters of evaluation, respondents shall be informed in writing that their letters may be seen by the faculty member being reviewed.

10. Candidate's rights. Candidates are entitled to see their review file upon request at any time during the review process, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department if the candidate has waived the right to see them. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or to take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal review file, the candidate's written comment or exception must be added to the file before the department RPT advisory committee meeting is held.
11. Review of file. The candidate's file shall be made available to those eligible to attend the departmental RPT advisory committee meeting a reasonable time before the meeting, which may be specified in the department RPT Statement.

12. Table of Minimum University Requirements for Reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate or &quot;full&quot; Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Triggered-b,c</td>
<td>Mid-Probationary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End of Probation, or see U-Policy 6–311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Typically end of probation or when meets department standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved parties:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As per departmental rule-a</td>
<td>As per departmental rule-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy program, if appropriate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department RPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation-d</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chair-f</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College RPT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As per 6-303-G-1-a</td>
<td>As per 6-303-G-1-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Receives report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate includes in file: (minimum requirements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Includes in File: (minimum requirements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC report</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Letters (could be internal to University but external to department)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As per departmental rule-a</td>
<td>As per departmental rule-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Reviews and Recommendations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments from others</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Course Evaluations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Candidates retain the right to have external letters be solicited in a formal review if quality of research or creative activity is an issue in the review. See Policy 6-303–III–D–9 above.

b. This triggered review may occur in the same year as the review or in the subsequent year.

c. The required components for triggered and mid-probationary reviews may be identical or different, as determined by department rule.

d. This representation occurs through the type of involvement set forth in departmental rule. See Policy 6–303– III–B–1 above.

e. Reports from all voting levels in all RPT reviews and letters or reports from all annual reviews. Policy 6–303– III–D–4

f. A designee may be used for informal reviews in large departments' reviews as noted in Policy 6–303–III–B–1.

E. Action by the department retention, promotion, and tenure advisory committee (RPT procedures).

1. Meetings, membership, and chairperson of the departmental RPT Advisory Committee. The department chairperson shall call a meeting of the departmental RPT advisory committee to conduct
reviews as described in Policy 6–303–III–B. (Drafting note: the following description of the membership and chair of the RPT Advisory Committee, appearing in [double brackets]]is being moved here from its former location in Part III–A–3, and then slightly revised as marked. It is moved so that the membership description will be adjacent to the description of Committee functions and procedures, rather than having the overlapping topics inconveniently separated by several pages.)

a. Committee voting membership:

i. Retention. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for retention if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.

ii. Promotion. In each department all regular tenure-line faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for promotion if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.

iii. Tenure. In each department all tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure. Other faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for tenure if allowed by department rules, but may not vote.

iv. Small academic unit rule. Any department (or division) advisory committee making a formal RPT recommendation must include at least three members eligible to vote by tenure status and rank. If the unit does not have at least three eligible members, the department (or division) chairperson must recommend to the dean one or more faculty members with the appropriate tenure status and rank and with some knowledge
of the candidate’s field from other units of the University of Utah or from appropriate emeritus faculty. In advance of the chairperson’s contacting such faculty members, the chairperson shall notify the candidate of the potential persons to be asked, and the candidate must be offered the opportunity to comment in writing on the suitability of the potential committee members. The final selection rests with the dean.

v. Single vote rule. No individual may cast a vote in the same academic year in any person’s candidate’s case in more than one capacity (e.g., as member of both department and interdisciplinary academic program, as member of both department and college advisory committees, as member of both department and administration).

b. Chairperson. The chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee shall be elected annually from the tenured members of the department. In this election all regular tenure-line faculty members of the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor shall be entitled to vote. The department chairperson is not eligible to chair this committee.  [Drafting note: end of passage moved here from II-A-3.]

2. Committee secretary. A secretary of each meeting shall be designated by the chairperson of the department RPT advisory committee and shall take notes of the discussion to provide the basis for developing a summary.

3. Quorum. A quorum of a department advisory committee for any given case shall consist of two-thirds of its members, except that any member unable to attend the meeting because of formal leave of absence or physical disability shall not be counted in determining the number required for a quorum.

[Drafting note: the automatic formatting starting here has some problem, which will need to be repaired before posting to the Regulations website. Paragraph #4 through #6 should be at the same outline level as #3 and #7.]
4. Absentee voting. Whenever practicable, the department chairperson shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted the same as other votes. Absentee votes must be received prior to the meeting at which a vote is taken by the department advisory committee.

5. Limitations on participation and voting. Department chairpersons, deans, and other administrative officials who are required by the regulations to make their own recommendations in an administrative capacity may attend and, upon invitation by majority vote of the committee, may submit evidence, judgments, and opinions, or participate in discussion. By majority vote the committee may move to executive session, from which nonvoting participants may be excluded. Under the single-vote rule (Part III–E–1–a above), department chairpersons, deans, and other administrative officials who cast RPT votes in their administrative capacities shall not vote at the department level.

6. Committee report. After due consideration, a vote shall be taken on each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure, with a separate vote taken on each proposed action for each candidate. The secretary shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare a summary of the meeting which shall include the substance of the discussion and also the findings and recommendations of the department advisory committee. If a candidate is
jointly appointed with also a member of an interdisciplinary academic program through a shared-appointment agreement and per [Part III–C–4 above] the program produces a recommendation, the department advisory committee report shall reflect the department’s discussion and consideration of the report and recommendation of the academic program.

7. Approval of the committee report. This summary report of the meeting, signed by the secretary and bearing the written approval of the committee chairperson, shall be made available for inspection by the committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modification as the committee approves, the secretary shall forward the summary report to the department chairperson and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.

8. Confidentiality. All committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and should be treated with confidentiality in accordance with policy and law.

F. Action by department chairperson (RPT procedures).

1. Recommendations. After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the department chairperson shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file on the retention, promotion, or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation.

2. Notice to faculty member. Prior to forwarding the file, the department chairperson shall send an exact copy of the chairperson's evaluation of each faculty member to that faculty member.

3. Candidate's right to respond. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the summary report of the department RPT advisory committee and/or the
evaluation of the department chairperson. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chairperson's evaluation, which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the department chairperson within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the chairperson's evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chairperson within this time limit, the candidate's statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chairperson.

4. Forwarding files. The department chairperson shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the dean of the college.

G. Action by dean and college advisory committee (RPT procedures).

1. Referral of cases to the college advisory committee / membership of committee. Each college shall establish a college RPT advisory committee and define its membership. The definition of membership shall specify whether there must be representation from all or fewer than all departments within the college, and whether or in what way representatives from a department are to participate or not participate in matters involving candidates from the representatives' departments, consistent with [Part III-E-1-a-v-A-3-a-v. of this policy] (single vote rule). The definition of membership shall be included in the charter of the college council (governed by Policy 6-003), or may be included in a college-wide RPT Statement, the college's Statement of RPT criteria, standards and procedures (described in Part III-A-2 of this policy).

   a. Retention. The dean at his/her discretion may request the college advisory committee to review and submit recommendations on any candidate for retention. However, if termination of a candidate is recommended by the SAC, or the department advisory committee, or the department chairperson, the dean shall transmit the entire file on that candidate to the college advisory committee.
b. Promotion or tenure. The dean shall forward the entire file on all cases dealing with promotion or tenure to the college advisory committee.

c. Attendance and participation at meetings. Neither the dean nor the chairperson of the department concerned shall attend or participate in the deliberations of the college committee except by invitation of the committee.

d. Recommendations of the college advisory committee. The college advisory committee shall review the file of each case referred to it and shall determine if the department reasonably applied its written criteria, standards and procedures to each case. The college committee shall make its recommendations on an individual's retention, promotion, or tenure, based upon its assessment whether the department's recommendations are supported by the evidence presented. The college committee shall use the department's criteria and standards (or college criteria and standards if the college has college-wide instead of departmental criteria and standards) in making its assessment. If documents required by policy are missing, the college committee may return the file to the department for appropriate action. The college committee shall advise the dean in writing of its vote and recommendations.

2. Recommendations of the dean. The dean shall then review the entire file for each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure and shall make recommendations in writing, stating reasons therefore, and shall forward the file, including all the recommendations, to the cognizant senior vice president (for academic affairs or for health sciences).

3. Notice to faculty members. Prior to forwarding the file, the dean shall send an exact copy of the college advisory committee's report of its evaluation and an exact copy of the dean's evaluation of each faculty member to that faculty member and to the department chair.

4. Candidate's right to respond. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written
statement to his/her formal review file in response to the report of
the college advisory committee's evaluation and/or the dean's
evaluation. Written notice of this option shall be included with the
copy of the dean's evaluation which is sent to the candidate. If the
candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement
must be submitted to the dean within seven [calendar] days, except
in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the dean's
evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a
written statement to the dean within this time limit, the candidate's
statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the
dean.

5. Forwarding files. The dean shall then forward the entire file for each
individual to the cognizant senior vice president.

H. Action by cognizant vice president, and the University Promotion and Tenure
Advisory Committee (RPT procedures).

1. Referral of cases to the University committee. The cognizant senior
vice president shall forward to the University Promotion and Tenure
Advisory Committee ("UPTAC") [see Policy 6-304] for its review and
recommendation the files in all cases in which the college is
organized and functions as a single academic department ("single-
department college") or there is a differing recommendation from
any of the prior review levels--the student advisory committee, the
interdisciplinary academic program, the department RPT advisory
committee, the department chairperson, the college RPT advisory
committee, or the college dean. The cognizant senior vice president,
in his/her sole discretion, may also send any other RPT case to
UPTAC for its review and recommendations. UPTAC provides advice
to the senior vice president.

2. Recommendations of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory
Committee. The committee shall review the entire file for all cases
referred to it, and after due deliberation shall submit its
recommendations with reasons and its vote to the cognizant senior
vice president.
a. In cases reviewed only because they arise from single department colleges, UPTAC shall determine whether the college reasonably applied its written criteria, standards and procedures to each case and whether the college's recommendations are supported by the evidence presented.

b. In cases in which there were differing recommendations from the prior reviewing entities, UPTAC shall identify the source(s) of the differences or controversy, determine how each level addressed the issues in controversy, and assess the degree to which the file is sufficiently clear to support any conclusive recommendation.

c. In cases which are reviewed at the discretionary request of the senior vice president, UPTAC shall review the file to respond to the specific issues identified by the senior vice president.

d. In making all reviews, UPTAC shall perform its duties consistent with requirements of Policy 6-304 (including disqualification of interested members), and UPTAC shall consider only the material in the file. UPTAC shall summarize its assessment of the issues identified in a, b, or c above in a written report to the senior vice president, but not report a conclusion of its own on the candidate's overall qualification for retention, promotion, or tenure.

3. Consideration by the senior vice president. The cognizant senior vice president shall review each file, including the recommendations (if any) of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. If the senior vice president determines that the file is incomplete or unclear, he/she may return the file to the department with a request to clarify specific matters, materials, and/or issues. All levels of review shall reconsider the file and their votes if appropriate, with the candidate responding in writing at the normal points in the process. (SAC need not reconsider the file unless teaching is the issue in question.)

4. Senior vice president's decision. In cases of positive retention decisions, the senior vice president's decision shall be the
University's final decision. In all cases of promotion and tenure and in cases of retention when termination is recommended, the senior vice president shall prepare a final recommendation to the President with respect to the candidate's retention, promotion, and/or tenure, stating reasons therefore.

5. Notice of senior vice president's recommendation. In positive retention cases, the senior vice president shall transmit the final decision and the report of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (if any) to the candidate, the department chair, and the dean. In all other cases, prior to forwarding the file to the President, the senior vice president shall send an exact copy of the report of the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (if any) and an exact copy of the senior vice president's recommendation with respect to that faculty member to the candidate, the dean, the department chairperson, and the chairpersons of the departmental RPT advisory committee and the Student Advisory Committee, together with a copy or summary of Policy 6-303-III-subsection I (Appeal of recommendation). The chairpersons of the departmental RPT and student advisory committees shall notify the members of their committees in an expeditious manner of the senior vice president's recommendation. The senior vice president shall not submit the final recommendation to the President until at least fourteen [calendar] days have elapsed following the giving of such notice, so that parties may notify the senior vice president's office if they intend to appeal.

6. Extension of time limits. The time limits provided by this subsection H may be extended by the senior vice president in the interest of justice.

I. Appeal of recommendation with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure (RPT procedures).

1. Appeal by faculty member RPT candidate. A faculty member RPT candidate may appeal to the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee (SCHC) for review of an unfavorable final recommendation with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure by following the
procedures provided in Policy 6-011 6-002-III Section 10 and upon the grounds enumerated in that section. The SCHC is the hearing body for an appeal brought on any grounds, including academic freedom, but if the candidate alleges that the unfavorable recommendation violates academic freedom, then the SCHC shall refer that part of the appeal to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee for pre-hearing consideration and report, as per Policy 6-0106-002-Section 10-III-F-1-a-hi.

2. Other appeals. Appeals of the vice president's recommendation on promotion and/or tenure may also be initiated by the department SAC, a majority of the departmental RPT advisory committee, the department chairperson, or the dean, when the vice president's recommendation opposes their own recommendation. The appeal is made to the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee and should follow the procedures provided in Policy 6-011 6-002-III Section 10, and upon the grounds enumerated in that section. Authorized parties initiating an appeal may have access to the entire file except that the faculty member RPT candidate may not see external letters which he/she waived the right to read.

J. Final action by president (RPT procedures).

1. Action in absence of review proceedings. If no proceedings for review have been initiated under Policy 6-303-III-I within the time provided therein, the recommendation of the vice president with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure of a faculty member shall be transmitted to the President for action. After reviewing the recommendation, giving such consideration to the documents in the candidate's file as the President deems necessary under the circumstances, the President shall make a final decision granting or denying retention, or granting or denying promotion, and/or tenure, and shall advise the candidate, the cognizant vice president, the dean and the department chairperson of that decision, stating reasons therefore.
2. Action after conclusion of review proceedings. If proceedings for review have been timely initiated under subsection III–I of this Policy, the recommendation of the vice president with respect to retention, promotion, and/or tenure shall be placed in the candidate's file but shall not be transmitted to the President for action. Except as provided in [subsection J–3], below, the President shall not consider the merits of the matter and shall not take final action with respect thereto until the pending review proceedings have concluded. Upon conclusion of the review proceedings, the President shall review the file and make a final decision consistent with [paragraph J–1], above.

3. Notice of termination. When review proceedings have been timely initiated under subsection III–I of this Policy, the president, on recommendation of the cognizant vice president, may give a candidate advance written notice of termination pursuant to Policy 6–311–III–Section 5. Such notice shall be effective as of the date it is given if a final decision to terminate the faculty member's appointment is subsequently made by the President, on or before the termination date specified in the notice, but shall have no force or effect if a final decision is made by the President on or before that date approving retention, promotion, and/or tenure or otherwise disposing of the case in a manner that does not require termination.

K. New appointments with tenure–expedited procedures for granting tenure

Tenure may be granted at the time of initial appointment of a faculty member (commonly known as 'hiring with tenure'). See Policy 6–311–III–Section 3–B. When a decision regarding tenure is to be considered contemporaneously with a decision regarding initial appointment, the procedures for the appointment and initial rank decisions are governed by Policy 6–302, and the procedures for the tenure decision are as described here in this Policy in Section III–K.

Section K allows the use of expedited procedures for tenure decisions arising in circumstances in which more complex and lengthy procedures are inappropriate.

1. For purposes of expedited decisions on granting of tenure at the time of initial appointment of a candidate, the voting membership of the department RPT advisory committee shall consist of all tenured faculty
members of the department, regardless of rank (subject to the single vote rule, Part III-E-1-a-v, limitations of Part III-A.3.a.v, and part III.E.5). If allowed by departmental rule described in the departmental RPT Statement, other faculty members may participate in consideration of the candidate, but shall not vote on the tenure decision.

2. The chairperson of the department shall provide interested persons with notice of scheduled meetings of the committee, and invite them to submit information for consideration by the committee. Notice may be given orally, or in writing as circumstances permit, and should be given as early as practicable under the circumstances. Notice shall be given to the candidate, the department faculty and staff, and student representatives (including any members of the student advisory committee who are available, and/or other students determined by the department chairperson to adequately represent student interests). If it is contemplated that the candidate will also become a member of an interdisciplinary academic program through a shared-appointment agreement (see Part III-C-4 above) with an academic program separate from the tenure-granting department, notice shall also be provided to the chair/director of that academic program, who may in turn give notice to members of that program.

3. The candidate’s file shall include information submitted by the candidate, faculty, staff, and student representatives of the department, and representatives of any related interdisciplinary academic program, and other information determined by the department chairperson or department RPT chairperson to be relevant. It shall include a curriculum vitae, available evidence of research/creative activity, available evidence of teaching effectiveness, and a report from student representatives, and may include available evidence regarding faculty responsibility. The file shall include letters of evaluation from at least three external evaluators. It shall be presumed that the candidate waives any right to see such external evaluation letters, unless the candidate submits to the RPT chairperson a written request for access to any letters prior to the time the letters are submitted.

4. The actions of the department RPT committee and the department chairperson shall proceed as described in Parts III-E and F of this Policy, except that i) the RPT committee chairperson may set a shortened period for
inspection of the report of the RPT meeting, ii) the candidate need not be provided copies of either the committee report or the chairperson's recommendation, and iii) the candidate need not be given an opportunity to respond to either the committee report or the chairperson's recommendation.

5. The actions of the dean and college RPT advisory committee shall proceed as described in Part III–G, except that the candidate need not be provided copies of the committee's or the dean's recommendations, and the candidate need not be given an opportunity to respond to either recommendation.

6. The actions of the vice president and UPTAC shall proceed as described in Part III–H for a tenure decision, except as follows. UPTAC reviews all recommendations of tenure accompanying new appointments, regardless of college or of votes by prior levels. UPTAC may delegate its responsibilities to a subcommittee formed for purposes of such expedited proceedings, and its reports may be made in abbreviated form. The candidate need not be provided copies of either the committee's report or the vice president's recommendation. The student representatives need not be provided such copies, but when practical shall be informed of the recommendations of UPTAC and the vice president. The vice president may submit the final recommendation to the President immediately (without awaiting notice from any person of an intent to appeal).

7. In expedited proceedings neither the candidate nor any other person has a right of appeal of either a favorable or unfavorable recommendation of the vice president. The final action of the President shall be taken as provided in Part III–J.

**L. Tenured Faculty Reviews (“TFR”).**

1. In keeping with the principle that the faculty and administrative officers of the University have jointly “an affirmative obligation to manage its tenured faculty positions in a manner clearly conducive to the achievement of excellence in the discharge of its academic mission” and that there is a specific obligation of departments and colleges for “effectively carrying out programs for performance review and career
development of tenured faculty members,” (Policy 6–311–III–Sec. 7–A), and in accord with Utah Board of Regents Policy requiring reviews of tenured faculty (both annual reviews along with all other faculty members, and also in-depth periodic post–tenure reviews—Regents Policy R481 Post–Tenure Review), the University establishes the following review processes for tenured faculty.

2. Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed annually (through an abbreviated process along with all other faculty members), and shall be reviewed every five years through a more in-depth post–tenure review process. [[Policy 6–303–III–A–1. Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years as per Policy 2–005–Section 5–C.]]

{Drafting note: this sentence above in [brackets] is moved here from Part III–A–1, then revised as marked. The passages below in [brackets] are existing content of Policy 2–005, being moved here to Policy 6–303–III–L, and revised as marked. The major changes incorporated in this spring 2014 Revision 21 project, compared to previous policy and practice are that the document describing procedures is given a name as “TFR Statement”, and Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee is given a new central role in the approval of the contents of that Statement, as well as a role of advising and guiding departments in formulating the contents. Thus the changes significantly increase the role of University faculty members in formulating the Statement contents, bringing to bear the experience and resources of the University–wide committee (which committee is now being extensively restructured to accommodate its new responsibilities, by the simultaneous revision of the Policy 6–002 description of the committee). In addition, the “user note” will be temporarily included, making users aware that the Standards Committee and office of the vice presidents will likely be developing a proposal for further extensive revising of this section of the Policy, after the Committee has had some experience in its new roles, and best practices can be identified and shared.)

3. [[Policy 2–005–III–C–Section 5. Department Chairpersons: Review of Tenured Faculty & Section 3. Deans, Duties and Responsibilities. It shall be the duty of the department chairperson to administer a review of the work of each tenured faculty member of the department every five years. The dean shall ascertain that each department in the college is effectively reviewing tenured faculty members.]

Such Procedures for these five-year periodic reviews shall involve a faculty review committee. Procedures for such a review process shall be formulated by the chairperson, in consultation with the department faculty, in a written Tenured Faculty Review (“TFR”) Statement, which shall be and submitted for approval to the dean of the college and
jointly for final approval to the cognizant senior vice president for academic affairs for approval and Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee. Any revision of these Procedures TFR Statement will be subject to similar approval.

In its role in approving TFR Statements, the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee acts as delegee of the authority of Academic Senate, pursuant to Policy 6–002–III–D–1–k, and in accord with that Policy the Committee, in consultation with the cognizant vice president, may establish a regular schedule for reexamination and revision of TFR Statements, initiate reviews of Statements on its own initiative or in response to requests from faculty members or administrators, prepare guidance materials for use in developing and approving Statements, and otherwise assist departments and colleges with development of Statements, including by identifying and sharing best practices developed by other departments.

4. If, as a result of the TFR review Procedure, the person under review is deemed not to be meeting the minimum standards required of a tenured member of his/her department, the chairperson, together with a review committee, shall consult with the faculty member in question and develop strategies for improvement of his/her performance. []

[User note: This Part III–L regarding Tenured Faculty Reviews is a new section within Policy 6–303, added through Revision 21 in spring 2014, combining contents existing contents of Part III–A–1, and existing contents moved here from Policy 2–005, with updating. As of 2014, a project is underway to consider further extensive revising of this Policy section, which will be based on experiences of the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee in its new role in approving TFR Statement contents, and advising and guiding in their formulation. For further information on the project, contact the V.P. Office for Faculty.]
Footnote 1 (EndNote 1: Adaptation of Policy 6–303 for variations in organizational structure of academic departments and colleges.)

a. The regulations stated provisions here in Policy 6–303 are stated in terms appropriate for the most widely adopted form of organizational structure of academic units, in which a tenure-line faculty appointment is made in a subdivision known as an "academic department," which is organized together with related subdivisions in a parent "multi-department academic college." In that structure, Policy 6–311 provides that tenure is established in an academic department. There are several variations in organizational structure relevant to appointments and tenure of faculty, as explained in [Policy 6–001 Academic Units and Academic Governance, and Policy 2–004 (Organization of the University)]. See also 2–005 (Officers of the University).

b. These regulations provisions in Policy 6–303 shall be interpreted for appropriate adaptation to accommodate such relevant variations in organizational structure, including the following:

i. Where necessary, the term "department" shall refer to an academic subdivision within a parent multi-department college, which operates as equivalent to a department but is known by another name, including any "free-standing division" or "school." See Policy 6–001, and Policy 2–004.

ii. Where necessary, the term "college" shall refer to an academic organization which operates as equivalent to a college, but is known by another name, including a "school." See Policy 6–001, and Policy 2–004.

c. For colleges that have no formal internal academic subdivisions (known commonly as 'single-department colleges' or 'nondeparmentalized colleges'), appointments and tenure are established in the college. See Policy 6–001, Policy 2–004, and Policy 6–311–Section 1. Accordingly, the procedures described here for development of criteria and standards, and making and reviewing of retention, promotion and tenure decisions, shall be modified appropriately, including as follows:

i. Formulation of criteria, standards and procedures for retention, promotion, and tenure reviews, described here in 6–303–III–A–2 and elsewhere, shall be conducted by the college (including approval of the governing RPT Statement by majority vote of the tenure-line faculty of the college, and the dean).

ii. The functions described here in 6–303–III–A and elsewhere as being performed by a department-level RPT advisory committee shall be performed by a college RPT advisory committee. The description of the membership and leadership of the committee shall be interpreted to include appropriate modifications, including that the college dean is ineligible to serve as committee
chair, and that committee members shall be drawn from the ranks of the college faculty.

iii. The functions described here in 6–303–III–B–1, and III–F and elsewhere as
being performed by a department chairperson shall be performed by the college
dean (see Policy 2–005–Section 5–F), including such activities as holding
meetings with RPT candidates.

iv. The functions described here in 6–303–III–Section C–3 and elsewhere as
being performed by a department-level student advisory committee shall be
performed by the college SAC.

v. The actions described here in 6–303–III–Section G, and elsewhere as being
performed by a college dean and college-level RPT committee shall be
inapplicable. Instead, RPT actions from a single–department college shall be
forwarded for review at the level of the cognizant vice president and
appropriate committees as provided in Section III–H and elsewhere.

vi. For tenured faculty reviews (TFR), the functions described here in 6–303–
III–L shall be performed by the dean and tenure–line faculty of the college.

(EndNote 2: Adaptation of Policy 6-303 for University Libraries.)

[Reserved.] [Note to users: As of 2014, a project is underway to develop
content providing for adaptation of RPT and TFR procedures for the University
Libraries, as part of a larger project of updating and revising multiple Regulations
regarding the Libraries and library faculty members. That content may be proposed to
be included in a Note within Policy 6-303, or in a new University Regulation.]}

[Note: The parts this Regulation (listed below) 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
   Checklist & Guideline for Department RPT Statements
   University RPT Standards Committee Approval Process Overview (Approval Process Handout)
   University RPT Standards Committee Guide on Articulating Department RPT Statements
D. Forms
E. Other related resource materials
   Supplemental Rules (Department Statements of RPT Criteria Standards & Procedures)
   Resource information
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Policy Officers: Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Sr. Vice President for Health Sciences.

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

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

"The Policy Officer will identify an 'Owner' for each Policy. The Policy Owner is an expert on the Policy topic who may respond to questions about, and provide interpretation of the Policy; and will typically be someone reporting to an executive level position (as defined above), but may be any other person to whom the President or a Vice President has delegated such authority for a specified area of University operations. The Owner has primary responsibility for maintaining the relevant portions of the Regulations Library... [and] bears the responsibility for determining requirements of particular Policies...."
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I. Purpose and Scope

This Policy and associated Regulations are intended to serve the University's fundamental general commitments to academic freedom and academic excellence in all areas, and particularly in its teaching mission, and are intended to maintain the high quality of the University's auxiliary career-line, adjunct, and visiting faculty members and of non-faculty instructional personnel by establishing minimum requirements for systematic review processes to ensure that quality and encourage academic unit practices supportive of academic freedom as a foundation for academic excellence. Because auxiliary career-line, adjunct, and visiting faculty members and non-faculty instructional personnel engage in a wide range of activities within a variety of organizational structures, considerable flexibility is allowed for academic units to determine details appropriate to such processes for their own operations, provided that such processes comply with University-wide requirements and are consistent with the University’s fundamental principles. Accordingly, this Policy addresses requirements of review processes, including criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures for reviews.

This Policy applies for all academic units of the University which appoint any auxiliary career-line, adjunct, or visiting faculty member (of any category) or employ any non-faculty instructional personnel (as defined here), including academic colleges, academic departments, free-standing academic divisions, qualified interdisciplinary academic teaching programs, and libraries. This Policy governs reviews only for the above-designated categories of faculty and other instructional personnel. For reviews of tenure-line faculty see Policy 6-303, and for reviews of persons holding special “named positions” (such as endowed chairs) see Policy 9-003.

Effective date: March 9, 2010

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

The faculty categories of “career-line” (which includes subcategories of “Clinical, Lecturer” and “Research”), “adjunct”, and “visiting” are defined for purposes of this Policy as described in “Auxiliary faculty member” means any individual who holds a faculty appointment (including library faculty) within any academic unit of the University as a Lecturer, Clinical, Research, Adjunct, or Visiting faculty member. (See Policy 6-300--Auxiliary Faculty The University Faculty--Categories and Ranks).

“Non-faculty instructional personnel” for purposes of this Policy means any individual who does not hold a regular or auxiliary faculty appointment at the University (in any of the faculty categories described in Policy 6-300), but is employed by any course-offering academic unit of the University to teach any credit-bearing course. (Course-offering units and credit-bearing courses are as described in Policy 6-001 and Policy 6-100). Such personnel may include those classified as academic staff (associate instructors, or research associates), as well as graduate student instructors of record, or postdoctoral fellows. (See Such categories of non-faculty academic personnel positions are as described in Policy 6-309: Academic Staff, Educational Trainees, Postdoctoral Fellows and Medical Housestaff).

“Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program” means an academic unit of the University which is an “interdisciplinary academic program” as described in Policy 6-001 and which further meeting specified criteria as being a program with teaching as a primary mission, contributing substantially to the University's overall teaching mission, and interdisciplinary in subject matter. Such programs, which are not otherwise included among the University’s faculty-appointing units authorized to appoint members of the University faculty (see Policy 6-001-III, and Policy 6-300-II)(regular or auxiliary), may pursuant to this Policy and an associated Rule be designated as qualified appointing units with limited authority to make faculty appointments in certain instructional auxiliary career-line, adjunct, or visiting faculty members.

A “faculty-appointing unit” for the limited purposes of this Policy is any academic unit which is authorized to and does make any appointment of any auxiliary career-line, adjunct, or visiting faculty member (regardless of whether the
unit also appoints tenure-line faculty members). The various other types of “faculty-appointed” academic units are described in Policy 6-001-III.

III. Policy

A. Auxiliary Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty

1. Initial Appointments of Auxiliary Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty.

   a. Authority for appointments of auxiliary career-line, adjunct, and visiting faculty by academic units.

      i. As provided in Policy 6-001, any academic unit which has authority to appoint members of the regular tenure-line faculty (as defined in Policy 6-300, tenure-eligible, tenured or library faculty equivalent) has full authority for appointments of faculty in all categories, and therefore also has the authority to act as an appointing unit to appoint members of the auxiliary faculty in any category of career-line (Clinical, Lecturer, Research), or Adjunct, or Visiting or equivalent for faculty of the libraries), and to employ any other non-faculty instructional personnel. These units include academic colleges, academic departments, free-standing academic divisions, and the University Libraries (and libraries). (In addition to Policy 6-001, see Policies 2-004, 6-311, 6-300, 6-301, 6-302, 6-306, 6-312).

      ii. Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs designated for purposes of this Policy as meeting the criteria specified in a University Rule (Rule 6-310) associated with this Policy shall have the limited authority to act as appointing units to appoint members of the auxiliary career-line, adjunct, and visiting faculty in an instructional auxiliary faculty category. These include only those academic units specifically designated in such University Rule as being Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs. These Programs shall also continue to have the authority to employ other non-faculty instructional personnel.

b. Qualifications and credentials for initial appointments of auxiliary members of the career-line, adjunct, and visiting categories of faculty.

   All faculty-appointing units initially appointing auxiliary members of the career-line, adjunct, or visiting categories of faculty
must verify that the candidates possess appropriate credentials by way of degrees and field of study for the position consistent with University Regulations, and must maintain on file appropriate documentation for each individual appointed. The terms of such appointments and the processes for making such appointments shall be consistent with University Regulations regarding appointments of auxiliary faculty members in such categories, including Policy 6-300 III- D and E (limited and maximum lengths of terms of auxiliary faculty appointments) and Policy 6-302 (procedures for faculty appointments and reappointments).

2. Evaluation and Reappointment of Auxiliary members of the Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting categories of Faculty.

   a. All faculty-appointing units which appoint any auxiliary members of the career-line, adjunct, or visiting categories of faculty in any category must develop and present for approval a Statement of academic unit rules that provide for procedures, criteria and standards, evidence and procedures for the initial appointment and subsequent review processes for evaluation and reappointment of each category of auxiliary career-line, adjunct, or visiting faculty used appointed in the unit. These Statements must address evaluation reviews and reappointments of both compensated and uncompensated (volunteer) faculty members, and must provide for more thorough review of the former.

   For multi-department academic colleges (described in Policy 6-001-III-A-1-b, encompassing multiple departments (or free-standing divisions), such Statements for all appointing units within the college (unless it is determined that separate independent rules are necessary for one or more of the units because of widely varying circumstances within the college). A college-wide main Statement with general provisions applicable for all units may include designated appendices providing further details specific to particular units within the college.

   b. The Statements shall provide for and describe procedures for conducting reviews of faculty members prior to their being considered as candidates for reappointment. The procedures for making initial
appointments and reappointments (including reappointments with promotion) of auxiliary, career-line, adjunct, or visiting faculty members in any category, after such a review has been conducted, are governed by and (as described in the Statements) shall be consistent with University Policy 6-302 (including the required recommendation from the Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee of the appointing unit) (with adaptations as appropriate for the organizational structure of the appointing unit).

c. For purposes of reappointments, each appointing unit must designate a committee or individual(s) responsible for administering evaluation review processes and making a recommendation to the unit's Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee before that committee's members vote on the reappointment or non-reappointment. That designation shall be described in the unit's Statement of procedures for evaluations reviews and reappointments.

d. The review processes shall include (i) at least minimum-level reviews conducted annually for all faculty members (including Statements of appointing unit rules may distinguish between procedures followed for annual evaluations associated with annual reappointments and annual reviews of faculty members with multi-year appointments not due for a more extensive reappointment review), and those followed for (ii) more thorough reviews of long-serving auxiliary faculty, which must occur at least every five years (consistent with Policy 6-300 limiting each appointment to a maximum term of five years). (iii) Review processes and requirements for the longer-term reviews ordinarily will differ from those for the annual reviews, and each shall be suited to the nature of the positions and responsibilities of the faculty members. (iv) For faculty members whose duties include teaching, the annual reviews shall at a minimum include annual consideration of course evaluations (conducted per Policy 6-100-III-N) by at least one responsible reviewer, and the course evaluations along with multiple other indicators of teaching quality must be used in these more thorough longer-term reviews. The required evidence and procedures adopted by the appointing unit for such teaching-related longer term reviews may and typically will be closely modeled on those followed by the unit in conducting teaching-related
reviews of tenure-line faculty pursuant to Policy 6-303 (as described in approved “RPT” and “TFR” Statements).

e. In pursuit of the University's commitment to excellence, appointing unit rules must provide for action, such as developing and implementing a plan for improvement or non-reappointment, if evaluation of a candidate indicates areas of concern. Concomitantly, when evaluations show high quality performance, appointing units are encouraged to use appropriate means of recognizing such performance and retaining high quality auxiliary faculty, including offering of promotions in rank, and longer term reappointments (see III-A-4 below).

f. If an academic unit serves as the appointing unit for a faculty appointment for an individual whose work primarily takes place in a different unit, the appointing unit shall consult with the primary workplace unit in developing and implementing criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures for evaluations.

g. When a faculty member holding an Adjunct appointment in one academic unit also holds a regular tenure-line faculty appointment in another unit of the University and is subject to thorough periodic reviews in that home unit, the unit of the Adjunct appointment may simply rely on the regular review procedure in the faculty member's home unit (as governed by Policy 6-303 and the home unit's “RPT” and “TFR” Statements), supplemented by an annual consideration of course-evaluations for any teaching occurring in the unit of the Adjunct appointment, or may do its own review.

3. Documentation of Reviews of Auxiliary members of the Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty.

Reviews of faculty members must be documented, and documentation of each review must be retained in the department appointing unit and available on request by the cognizant senior vice president.

4. Promotions of Long-Serving Auxiliary members of the Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty, and Multi-year Reappointments.
The University's commitment to excellence is served by recognizing and retaining auxiliary faculty of high quality. Accordingly, appointing units with auxiliary faculty in the career-line categories of Clinical, Lecturer, Research, or the Adjunct category, must establish criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures for reviews leading to promotions in rank. (Available ranks are described in Policy 6-300, and promotions, after review which are accomplished through reappointment with promotion per Policy 6-302). These should apply primarily for long-serving auxiliary faculty members (and especially for those in full-time positions). Because multi-year appointments are recognized as important in implementing the University’s fundamental principles of academic freedom and significantly contributing to overall academic excellence, appointing units are also strongly encouraged to consider offering multi-year reappointments for faculty with high qualifications (particularly for accomplished teaching faculty making significant contributions to the University’s teaching mission), as may be appropriate to the circumstances of the unit. (See As described in Policy 6-300--annual terms as norms, longer terms of up to 5 years are permitted, although annual or shorter multi-year terms are used when appropriate). Statements of unit rules shall include descriptions of the required information criteria, standards, and evidence for reviews regarding promotions in rank, and any rules adopted by the unit regarding length of terms of appointments for particular faculty categories.

5. Governance Roles for Auxiliary Career-line Faculty.

As reflected in Policy 6-300 describing rights and responsibilities for the career-line faculty, and in Policies 6-001 and 6-002 describing roles of faculty generally and career-line faculty particularly in the Academic Senate and University councils and committees, the University strongly encourages and highly values involvement of career-line faculty in shared-governance activities, in roles appropriate relative to the roles of tenure-line faculty in academic policy-making. Academic units appointing auxiliary faculty (particularly long-serving members) in the career-line categories of Clinical, Lecturer, or Research are also strongly encouraged to establish rules addressing participation of such faculty members in departmental and/or college academic governance and service, including in peer faculty review.
processes (and shall recognize and accommodate appropriate, recognition of participation in University service, including elected positions on the Academic Senate and its Senate Committees as described in Policy 6-002), and encouraged to make resources for professional development available to such faculty. Description of such matters should be included with the Statement of unit rules required under this Policy.

B. Employment, Evaluation and Reemployment of Non-Faculty Instructional Personnel

Academic units which regularly employ any non-faculty instructional personnel (as defined for this Policy) shall develop and submit for approval a description of procedures, criteria, evidence, and standards for employing and reemploying, and most importantly for periodically evaluating the teaching work of such personnel. A brief statement describing such matters may be incorporated with the Statement of academic unit rules required under Part III-A of this Policy (for those units which appoint auxiliary, career-line, adjunct, or visiting faculty). The criteria for employment/reemployment must ensure that such personnel have appropriate qualifications by way of education and field of study appropriate to the assigned duties. Evaluation plans must provide for closer scrutiny of new instructors and those teaching in new areas. Classroom observation of new instructors is encouraged. Academic units must designate a committee or individual(s) responsible for evaluating all such instructional personnel and making a recommendation on each person to the department chair person or designee responsible for staffing courses prior to reemployment. Units must maintain on file appropriate documentation of the qualifications of all active non-faculty instructional personnel.

C. Approval Requirement for Rules

The Statements of academic unit rules for appointment, evaluation, and reappointment (including reappointment with promotion) of auxiliary, career-line, adjunct, and visiting faculty (Part III-A), and/or employment/reemployment and evaluation of other non-faculty instructional personnel (Part III-B) must be approved by the dean of the college (or equivalent), and jointly by the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee. In
its role in approving such Statements, the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee acts as delegee of the authority of Academic Senate, pursuant to Policy 6-002-III-D-1-k, and in accord with that Policy the Committee, in consultation with the cognizant vice president, may establish a regular schedule for reexamination and revision of such Statements, initiate reviews of Statements on its own initiative or in response to requests from faculty members or administrators, prepare guidance materials for use in developing and approving Statements, and otherwise assist units with development of Statements, including by identifying and sharing best practices developed by other units.

[User note: As of 2014 this Policy is under review for further clarification, and a proposal for revisions will be developed, based on the experience gained as the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee is restructured and implements its new roles provided for in Revision 2, in guiding and assisting with development of and final approval of review Statements, as representative of the Academic Senate and faculty of the University.]

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
   Rule 6-310 (IDTP)
B. Procedures [reserved]
C. Guidelines [reserved]
D. Forms [reserved]
E. Other related resource materials. [reserved]

V. References:
   Policy 6-300, University Faculty—Categories and Ranks
   Policy 6-003, College Faculties and Councils
   Policy 6-302, Appointments of Faculty
   Policy 6-309, Academic Staff, Educational Trainees, Postdoctoral Fellows, and Medical Housestaff
   Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, Accreditation Standard 4.A., Policy 4.1 on Faculty Evaluation

VI. Contacts:
The designated contact officials for this Policy are:
A. Policy Owners (primary contact person for questions and advice): Associate Vice President for Faculty and the Associate Vice President for Health Sciences.
B. Policy Officers: Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs and the 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 6-310 effective 9/15/2008, formerly known as PPM 9-5.7

Revision History:

1. Current version: Revision 2
   - Approved Academic Senate: ??
   - Approved Board of Trustees: ??
   - Legislative History of Revision 2 [link to new history file]

2. Earlier versions:

   Revision 1 [link to marked outdated version of Revision 1]. Effective March 9, 2010 to ??
   - Legislative History of Revision 1

   Revision 0: effective May 14, 2007 to March 8, 2010
   - Legislative History of Revision 0
University Rule 6-310(IDTP)-- Appointment, Reappointment and Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty and Other Non-Faculty Instructional Personnel in Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs. Revision 42.

Effective Date: July 1, 2014. (Note: Ending the status of the University Writing Program as a Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program, accomplished by deleting its name from the list within this Rule, is to take effect upon completion of all steps for that academic unit to transition into the status of an academic department, as has been approved by the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees. The office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will give notice when those steps are completed.)

[Drafting note: Contents of Part I, Part II, and most contents of Part III are not shown here, to keep the proposal length of manageable size and because no changes are proposed for the contents not shown here.]

III. Rule.

.. .

2. Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs are:

The Ethnic Studies Program

The Gender Studies Program

The LEAP Program

The University Writing Program

The Honors College (formerly known as the Honors Program).

The Entertainment Arts and Engineering Program

The Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program.

.. .

F. Guidance from the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee.

The Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, as primary delegee of the Academic Senate authority under Policy 6-002 and Policy 6-310, may in consultation with the cognizant vice president provide guidance for development, periodic updating, and approval of the Statements regarding Lecturer faculty (Part III-C) and the Statements regarding non-faculty instructional personnel (Part III-E) governed by this Rule, and for future revisions of this Rule.

.. .

_ _ _ end _ _ _
Memorandum

From: Bob Flores, Senate Policy Liaison
To: Senate Executive Committee members

Re: Final proposal for revisions to University Policies regarding academic units and academic governance--- Policies 6-001, 6-300, 6-003, 6-015, 7-100

Date: March 28, 2014

I. Overview:

In keeping with the feedback provided by the Executive Committee members, Senate members, representatives of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, and others consulted, this is the final revised version of the proposal that has been discussed within the Executive Committee over the past several months and preliminarily presented at the March 2014 Senate meeting, in contemplation of being presented for action at the April 7 Senate meeting.

This proposal for revising multiple University Policies regarding academic governance and academic organizational structures combines, for efficiency, phases of three projects which have been underway during years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.

First and most significantly, the proposal is to follow through with a second phase of changes needed for Policies 6-001 and 6-300. In the first phase of that project approved in spring 2013, major changes to the structure of the Academic Senate and its committees were made through revising Policy 6-002, and major changes for the nomenclature and categories of faculty were made through partially revising Policy 6-300. Of particular note, those changes integrated members of the career-line category of faculty into the Senate and Senate Committee structure. By decision of the Executive Committee at that time, to keep that first phase proposal of manageable size and complexity, further changes to descriptions of the Senate in Policy 6-001 and changes to descriptions of University committees, the University faculty and procedures for meetings of the faculty in Policy 6-300 were not included in that first phase, but rather delayed, with an explicit commitment that they would be dealt with through a second phase during spring 2014. This current proposal follows through with that commitment. Among other effects, the changes held over for this second phase will eliminate serious conflicts between the previously revised contents of 6-002 and now outdated contents of 6-001 regarding Senate committees, and eliminate conflicts and redundancies between contents of revised 6-002 and 6-300.

Second, other changes are being proposed for 6-001 which will lay a needed foundation in Policy for improvements to be made to the University’s systems for establishing and periodically reviewing academic units. This is done in contemplation of an important initiative currently underway to focus attention on a particular category of academic units-- Centers, Institutes, and Bureaus. A task force is now at work on improved systems for establishing and periodically reviewing such units. Outcomes of that task force project will include proposed new contents providing a Policy framework for the processes followed in establishing and reviewing all types of academic units—and the new contents will be placed in Policy 6-001. So, for
efficiency, this current proposal for revising 6-001 includes very significantly reorganizing it in such a way that a location for the “unit-establishment and reviews” contents is marked now, and the contents now being researched and developed can later be easily added.

Third, there is a general project of reorganizing and otherwise ‘cleaning up’ contents of several Policies which suffer from various problems, including multiple policies redundantly and inconsistently purporting to govern the same topics, having treatment of topics scattered among multiple Policies, having too many functionally unrelated topics jumbled together in a single Policy, and having badly outdated contents inconsistent with current practices. For efficiency, the third project of making those long-needed reorganizing and cleanup revisions is being combined with the other two projects, because many of the same Policies are involved in each of the three projects.

II. Policies included (and contents of this overall proposal which are attached with this memorandum):

   Revised Policy 6-001: Academic Units and Academic Governance--Roles of Faculties, Committees, Councils, and Academic Senate. Revision 18.

   Revised Policy 6-300: The University Faculty -- Categories and Ranks. Revision 17


   New Policy 6-015: The University Libraries. Revision 0.

   New Policy 7-100: University Research Committees (Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee; Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects). Revision 0.

III. Highlights of changes:

   A. Policy 6-001: [renamed as] Academic Units and Academic Governance--Roles of Faculties, Committees, Councils, and Academic Senate. Revision 18.

   As reorganized and with contents moved here from other Policies, as well as new contents added, this Policy will serve multiple important functions. It will provide a descriptive overview of all of the types of academic units of the University (e.g., departments, and colleges). Alongside that description it will house contents which prescribe the academic-decision-making authority of the faculty, within the various types of academic units, as well as the overall authority of the University faculty and the Academic Senate. This will be accomplished primarily by gathering into 6-001 certain contents previously scattered among Policy 2-004 (describing academic units), and Policy 6-300 (prescribing the authority of the University faculty), and Policy 6-003 (authority of faculty of colleges). And then new contents are being added to fill in gaps within the existing moved contents.
• The existing description of academic departments, free-standing divisions, and colleges (and “schools”) currently located in Policy 2-004 is being copied into 6-001 to be adjacent to related topics (and then updated and expanded to be more fully useful). To keep this current proposal of manageable size, the deleting of that content from 2-004 and some other cleanup work needed in that Policy is not being included in this current proposal. There will be a subsequent proposal for that purpose (necessary because the content ‘borrowed’ from 2-004 will now become redundant and in conflict with 6-001, and is already inaccurate).

• Two important concepts regarding the authority of various types of academic units are being explained—the authority of a unit to offer credit bearing courses, and the authority of a unit to appoint members of the faculty. (Part II-definitions.) Having those concepts explained will then be useful for the upcoming description of processes for establishing and reviewing various types of academic units (below).

• Descriptions are being added of two categories of academic units that have previously been absent from any mention in University Policies—the interdisciplinary academic programs (such as Ethnic Studies, Gender Studies, the Honors and LEAP programs), and Centers, Institutes and Bureaus. (Part III-A-1). A “placeholder” section is now being added (Part III-2) where later will be inserted detailed coverage of the processes for establishing and periodically reviewing those Centers, Institutes and Bureaus (as part of detailed description of processes regarding establishment and review of all types of academic units—to come in a subsequent phase of revision). Those placeholders are marked with notes as being “RESERVED” for content to be developed and added later (which of course will be done through the regular approval channels, including voting by the Senate).

• The existing descriptions of the general authority and responsibility of the faculty for academic decision making is being bolstered. Existing descriptions of the composition and authority of the faculty within colleges, and within the University as a whole are being preserved but moved from previously scattered locations and gathered into 6-001 (Part III-B). Oddly, the existing descriptions did not include any recognition of the responsibilities and rights of the faculty for decision-making within individual academic departments, and so a new description of that is being added, consistent with longstanding practices (Part III-B- 2 & -3).

• There has long been in Policy a description of procedures which would be followed if the entire faculty of the University were to hold faculty meetings. Unlike as it is that such a large gathering would ever occur in modern times, given the sheer size of such a meeting, it seems wise to preserve that description of meeting procedures, ‘just in case’, and so that existing description is being preserved but moved from 6-300 into 6-002 to be near related topics. It is also being updated to conform to the prescription of voting rights of categories of
faculty which was provided for in the spring 2013 partial revision of Policy 6-300 (carrying through with the plan set forth in 6-300 that career-line faculty are newly being provided voting rights, but only consistent with the fundamental principle that the tenure-line category of faculty are to retain majority authority in academic decision making).

- Existing descriptions of the roles of committees and councils within the overall academic governance system are being preserved and gathered from scattered locations into an organized presentation, and updated to conform to modern practices (Part III-C). In that vein, as requested by its leadership during the consultation about this project, the provision for membership of the Undergraduate Council is being updated to add a representative of the college of Social Work (which has in recent years developed a significant undergraduate degree program), and the description of the functions of that Council in overseeing ‘general’ education are being updated to conform with current nomenclature and practices (Part III-C-3).

- The existing description of the authority of the Academic Senate is being preserved without significant change. However, existing passages which formerly described membership and functions of the Senate Executive Committee and the Senate’s Library Policy Committee are being deleted from 6-001, because those matters are now governed fully and exclusively by the January 2014 approved revision of Policy 6-002.

- Finally, a lengthy “policy statement” regarding the University of Utah Libraries is being removed from 6-001, where it is obviously out of place, and moved into a new home in new Policy 6-015 (see below).

B. Policy 6-300: The University Faculty—Categories and Ranks. Revision 17.

The first half of this Policy was thoroughly revised in spring 2013, and that proposal included a specific commitment to return this year to make needed changes in the second half. Those needed additional changes were held over as a way to help keep the 2013 project to a manageable size. The already revised first half changed the official nomenclature used for faculty, including creating the new category and name of “career-line faculty,” and eliminated the former blanket prohibition of any voting rights for that category. The held-over changes now being addressed are primarily to take out of 6-300 coverage of topics which are out of place there, and move those contents into more appropriate Policies.

- Passages regarding the role of the “University Faculty” as a whole, including “Authority of the Faculty,” “Officers of the Faculty,” and “Meetings” and “Order of Business” for meetings of the entire University faculty are moved out of 6-300 and into 6-001 as described above.
Passages regarding two existing University committees, the “Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee,” and Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects, are moved out of 6-300 and into a new Policy 7-100 (University Research Committees), see below (done in consultation with administrators for those committees).

A passage regarding the authority and processes for establishing and populating various University committees is moved out of 6-300 and into 6-001 to be combined there with overlapping coverage of that same topic.

The existing passage which establishes the Faculty Club is renumbered (Part III-K) but otherwise preserved without change (after consultation with current Club leadership who advised that no changes are needed).


The primary reason for including 6-003 in this project is to take from it and move to Policy 6-001, as a more appropriate location, an existing description of the authority of the faculties of each academic college within the overall system of shared governance (“jurisdiction over all questions of educational policy affecting that college”).

For efficiency (rather than having to revisit this Policy as a separate project) it also being proposed to make in 6-003 some clarifying changes regarding the process for approvals of the composition of college councils and the charters in which the composition is documented. The existing language provides that such matters are subject to the approval of the Senate Executive Committee, and that the Committee has authority to direct various functions as among the college councils and various University committees. The proposed clarifying language would make clear that in such an approval role, the Executive Committee is acting on the delegated authority of the Senate, and that it has the discretion to develop a schedule for periodic updating of council charters, and aided by the cognizant Vice President’s office may develop and provide guidance for colleges in doing such updating of the council charters. That sort of guidance has in fact been carried out in practice in recent years helping several colleges have updated their charters (e.g., most recently completed Engineering, Fine Arts, Health), and the added language would conform Policy to match current practice.

D. [New] Policy 6-015—The University of Utah Libraries. Revision 0.

There is existing in Policy 6-001 a lengthy description titled “University of Utah Libraries—Policy Statement for their Government and Administration.” 6-001 is not an
appropriate location for that content, and so the proposal is to remove it from 6-001 and move it into a new Policy created specifically for the purpose of receiving this moved content now. It is anticipated that in a later project contents regarding the Libraries that is now scattered around among multiple other Policies in a fragmented and confusing way will also be moved to this new Policy 6-015. Much of the content in both this passage now being moved, and in those scattered sections of other existing Policies, is outdated, otherwise inaccurate, and conflicting. Discussion is already underway with Senate leadership and Libraries representatives about a likely subsequent phase addressing those problems by consolidating into 6-015 and simultaneously updating the multiple scattered contents of the various Policies.

As the existing content is being moved from 6-001 into this 6-015, one significant change is to delete an existing description of what was formerly the Library Policy Advisory Committee, already being renamed the Senate Advisory Committee on Library Policy—because that existing description is outdated and in conflict with the recently updated description in Policy 6-002, which governs all Senate Committees.

E. [New] Policy 7-100--- University Research Committees. Revision 0.

As explained above for Policy 6-001, there is existing in 6-001 lengthy descriptions of two research-related committees, the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, and the Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects. Those committee descriptions are out of place in 6-001, and are sufficiently important and complex that they deserve being in a separate Policy dedicated to the subject of research-related committees. So the only change for those contents in this current project is to move the descriptions all into this new Policy. However, consultation with the administrators associated with the committees has revealed that the existing descriptions are tremendously outdated and otherwise inaccurate, and that major substantive revisions are needed, and should be done soon because of expressed concerns of federal granting agencies. The committee administrators are ready and anxious to follow up this current project with another follow-up project of revising the contents, within their new home in 7-100.

IV. Consultations and further information:

This proposal has been under consideration and development since the first phase revisions of Policy 6-300 and 6-002 were approved in spring 2013, at which time the commitment was made to follow up with this next phase of revisions. See Senate agenda of May 2013 (http://admin.utah.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/20130506-Agenda.pdf ). Previews of the project were given at Senate meetings in fall 2013 and again January 2014, and detailed drafts of the Policy revisions were presented to the Senate in March 2014, with feedback requested. http://admin.utah.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/20140303Agenda.pdf
The proposal has been discussed in multiple Senate Executive Committee meetings and refined through those discussions. Because certain proposed revisions will affect the Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, and the two research-related committees mentioned above for Policy 7-100, representatives of each of those areas have been consulted about those relevant portions of these Policies. The project has been repeatedly presented to the Institutional Policy Committee (with its representation of most administrative areas of the University, including General Counsel). Feedback received through these many presentations and consultations has been incorporated into this final proposal.

For further information-- please contact Bob Flores, as Senate Policy Liaison acting for the Executive Committee as primary researcher and draftsman for this project. 

robert.flores@law.utah.edu, 581-5881.
Proposal for revising Policy 6-001 (Revision 18) (and other Policies—by moving their existing contents into 6-001, or vice-versa).

{Draft 2014-03-28}


I. Purpose and Scope  (Reserved)

This Policy describes the types of academic units through which the academic missions of the University are carried out by its faculty and supporting personnel, prescribes processes and criteria for initially establishing, periodically reviewing and discontinuing such academic units, describes the faculties of the academic units and of the University as a whole, acknowledges the authority of the faculty for academic decision-making, describes procedures for meetings of the University faculty as a plenary body, establishes and describes a system of academic decision-making structures including various committees, the College Councils, and the Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, and describes the general authority and responsibilities of the Academic Senate.

This Policy applies to all of the University’s faculty members, all of its academic units, and all of its academic administration officers.

For related information, refer to Policy 6-300, which describes the various categories and ranks of members of the faculty, including general voting rights for academic decision-making. Policy 2-005 establishes general duties of the officers assigned to administer the various types of academic units. Policy 6-002 governs the membership and procedures of the Academic Senate, and the membership and functions of the Senate Committees.

II. Definitions  (Reserved)

*Course-offering unit*—for purposes of this Policy is as defined in Policy 6-100-II, (Instruction and Evaluation), “an academic unit authorized to offer credit-bearing courses and bearing primary responsibility for the content, instruction and evaluation of such courses.”

*Faculty-appointing unit*—is an academic unit authorized by the cognizant vice president to make appointments of faculty members. Such authorization may *limited* authority allowing only for appointments of faculty members in certain specified categories, or *full* authority, allowing for appointments of faculty members in all categories. The applicable categories of appointments of faculty, as more fully described in Policy 6-300, are *tenure-line* (tenure-track and tenured), career-line (Clinical, Lecturer, Research), and *adjunct and visiting* faculty.
positions. The authorization of a unit to make any appointment to a tenure-line faculty position includes authorization for establishing tenure for that position within that unit (See Policy 6-301, 6-311). Any unit with either limited or full faculty-appointing authorization is also authorized to hire individuals in non-faculty academic personnel positions (which positions are described in Policy 6-309).

III. Policy

A. Academic Units and Academic Organizational Structure Generally

1. Overview: Types of Academic Units.

{Drafting note: the following passages in [[double brackets]] are moved here from Policy 2-004-III-Section 1. Academic Organization, and then modified as marked.}

[[a. As further described below, academic activities furthering the academic missions of the University are carried out primarily by the members of the University faculty, supported and assisted in various ways by non-faculty academic personnel, students, and staff employees, working cooperatively within “shared-governance” academic decision-making structures. The work of the faculty, and those assisting and supporting the faculty, is organized through various academic units, each administered by an administrative officer of the University, reporting respectively to a cognizant vice president and ultimately the President of the University. This Part III-A-1 serves as a descriptive overview of the various types of academic units and the roles of the faculty and administrative heads of such units, within the University’s overall academic organizational structure. Parts III-A-2 through 3, below, govern the processes for establishing, modifying, and periodically reviewing performance of such units. The responsibilities of the administrative heads of such units, as officers of the University (college deans, department chairpersons, and others), and the processes for periodic reviews of their performance, are governed by Policy 2-005.

b. Academic Departments and Free-Standing Divisions, Colleges (and schools).

i. The academic department is the standard academic unit of the University. An academic department is the most common unit of instruction. A department generally offers both undergraduate and graduate degrees. All academic departments (including those which are structured as single-department academic colleges) are authorized as course-offering units, authorized as faculty-appointing units with full authority for appointments of faculty in all categories, and authorized to conduct academic research activities.

Faculty are appointed to a department and may earn tenure in the department. The administrative head of a department is called a...}
chairperson; the chairperson reports to the dean of the college to which the
department belongs.

Academic units which have the authority of an academic department but
are given the title of “Schools” are for all purposes treated as academic
departments. Such a school is generally a large unit of instruction and should
incorporate multiple areas of specialization that are reflected in the degrees
offered. A school often includes interdisciplinary cooperative efforts. A school
generally offers both undergraduate and graduate degrees. Faculty are appointed
to a school and may earn tenure in the school. The administrative head of a school
is usually called a has the title of director, but this person’s the administrative
level is equal to that of a department chairperson. The director reports to the dean
of the college to which the school belongs.

Free-standing divisions are also recognized as academic course-
offering units of instruction; these units and faculty-appointing units and, are
governed by policies on departments unless otherwise specified. A free-standing
division is generally the smallest of these academic units of instruction in terms of
FTE regular the number of full-time equivalent tenure-line faculty positions. Such
divisions may offer undergraduate and graduate degrees. Faculty are appointed to
such divisions and may earn tenure in the division. The degree of budget
autonomy for a division is decided by the college to which the division belongs.
The administrative head of a free-standing division is usually called a has the title
of division chairperson; the chairperson reports to the dean of the college to which
the division belongs.

The designation of an academic unit as a department, school, or free-
standing divisions is influenced by the mission of the unit, the relationship of the
unit to the parent college, and disciplinary traditions across the country. For
purposes of administration, departments, schools, and free-standing divisions are
assigned to a parent academic college.

The processes for initially establishing, periodically reviewing, and when
appropriate discontinuing an academic department (or equivalent unit) are
governed by Part III-A-2 through-3 below.

Internal subdivisions, which are not free-standing, may also be
established, typically within an academic department (including within a “single-
department college” described below). They may serve various purposes,
including conducting academic research, but they are not authorized as faculty-
appointing units, and ordinarily will not be authorized as course-offering units.
The administrative head of such an internal division most commonly has the title of director, but may be given the title of chairperson, or chief, as determined appropriate by the cognizant vice president.

ii. An academic college is usually an administrative organization of related department-level units (free-standing divisions, departments, and schools) and those encompassing two or more such department-level units are known as “multi-department colleges.” Some academic colleges are structured such that they have no formal internal departmental-level academic subdivisions and these are known as “single-department colleges,” with the scope of the single-department and the college being coextensive. These currently consist of (e.g., Architecture, Law, Nursing, Dentistry, and Social Work). The administrative head of an academic college is called a has the title of academic dean, and the head of a single-department college has both the responsibilities of a dean and those typical of a department chairperson (as stated in Policy 2-005-III-A-5-f) (e.g. roles in faculty appointments and faculty review processes, per Policies 6-302, 6-303, 6-310). Each dean of an academic college reports to the cognizant vice president (either the senior vice president for Academic Affairs or senior vice president for Health Sciences).

The processes for initially establishing, periodically reviewing, and when appropriate discontinuing an academic college are governed by Part III-A-2 through -3 below.

The University, for historical and other reasons, contains includes the following two units named “schools” that for all purposes function as academic colleges and are headed by academic deans: The School of Dentistry, The School of Medicine, and The David Eccles School of Business.


{Drafting note: The following passages not within [brackets] are entirely new material, not moved from any existing Policy.}

iii. For historical and other reasons, in some instances, as authorized by the cognizant vice president, the name “college” is used to refer to a unit of the University which is not an academic college and does not have the full authority of an academic college. These currently include the “Honors College” (an interdisciplinary teaching program further described below), and the “University
College” (with student advising and related responsibilities described in Policy 6-101).

In some instances, as authorized by the cognizant vice president, the title of “dean” is used for an administrative position which is not the head of an academic college (e.g., Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of Students).

And the University includes numerous administrative units with the name “department” or “division” or “program” which have neither course-offering or any faculty-appointing authority.

{Drafting note: The following description of interdisciplinary academic programs is new. This type of academic unit has existed at least since the early 1970's, however, the classification is not currently mentioned in any University Policy. Among the more important purposes of this revising of 6-001 is to acknowledge in policy the longstanding existence and important functions of such units, and with that foundation established in official policy, to in an upcoming project also add to this Policy a description of how such units are created and periodically reviewed. This regularization of the process for approval and review of such Programs is especially important because it is anticipated that when new sections of the Policy are added to govern the unit establishment process, they will include a principle requiring that, any academic unit (other than an academic department) which seeks to be authorized as a course-offering unit must meet qualifications as an interdisciplinary teaching program. The “shared-appointment” concept explained here has also existed at least since the 1970’s, but is not currently mentioned in any University Policy, which may be a cause of frequent misunderstanding about that concept, with some persons erroneously thinking that faculty members involved in such arrangements have “joint appointment” status. Adding the description of the shared-appointment concept here should help eliminate such confusion and misunderstanding.}

c. [[Interdisciplinary Academic Programs (of limited authority)].

In specific circumstances in which academic activities to be conducted are of an interdisciplinary character such that they cannot be effectively conducted either entirely within the ordinary structure of a single academic department (or equivalent unit) within an academic college, or entirely through cooperative arrangements among academic departments or colleges, a special interdisciplinary academic program may be established for that purpose, with the following limited authority.

Such units ordinarily may conduct academic research. As determined appropriate by the cognizant vice president, and subject to the establishment, modification, and periodic review procedures described below, such a program may be authorized as a course-offering unit, and if so authorized, the program may hire and assign non-faculty academic personnel (see Policy 6-309) to teach such courses.

Such units are not fully-authorized faculty appointing units. Under the terms of a specific formal agreement made between the program and another cooperating academic unit which has faculty appointing authority (ordinarily an academic department) and approved by the cognizant vice president, such a program may be granted limited
authority to participate in a “shared-appointment” agreement, through which some portion of the work (described in the agreement as a percentage of full-time equivalent) of a faculty member whose formal faculty appointment is in that cooperating academic unit, is shared with the academic program. (This differs from a “joint appointment” status in which a faculty member has two separate appointments made directly in each of two fully authorized faculty-appointing units, per Policy 6-319).

Such a course-offering program may also be given limited authority to make direct appointments of instructional faculty (ordinarily in the Lecturer career-line category only) directly within the program, if approved as a Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program (through the process governed by University Rule 6-310, which requires case-by-case approval of such Qualified status by the Academic Senate and cognizant vice president).

The names of and administrative reporting structures for such interdisciplinary programs, may vary, as appropriate for their interdisciplinary character and selected functions. They are ordinarily called “program,” but some are given other names. The administrative head ordinarily has the title of director, but other titles may be used. They may be assigned to report directly to an academic dean or directly to an associate vice president (who for purposes related to the program’s offering of courses takes on some functions of a dean), and ultimately to the cognizant vice president.

The processes for initially establishing, periodically reviewing, and when appropriate discontinuing an interdisciplinary academic program are governed by Part III-A-2 through-3 below.

Currently the interdisciplinary academic programs which have been authorized as course-offering units are: The Entertainment and Arts and Engineering Program, The Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program, The Ethnic Studies Program, The Gender Studies Program, The Honors College, The LEAP Program, and the Middle East Center. Those which have also been granted limited faculty appointing authority under the terms of University Rule 6-310 are listed within that Rule.

(Note that the University Writing Program, which has long been included among these special authorized programs is not being listed here because it is now being transitioned to status of a fully authorized academic department within the College of Humanities, and so its status as an “Interdisciplinary Academic Program” for purposes of this Policy will cease. Rule 6-310 is being revised to remove it from the list of Qualified IDT Programs.)

(Drafting note: The following passage in [double brackets] regarding the Libraries, is moved here from Policy 2-004 and then modified as marked. And note further below that the lengthy explanation regarding the libraries that formerly appeared as par of this Policy 6-001 is being removed and moved to become part of new Policy 6-015: The University Libraries.)
The University of Utah Libraries shall consist of the following units, each headed by its director (or equivalent position): (i) the Marriott Library and its branches reporting directly to the senior vice president for academic affairs, (ii) the Eccles Health Science Library reporting directly to the senior vice president for health sciences and (iii) the S. J. Quinney Law Library in the college of law reporting directly to the dean of the college of law and ultimately to the senior vice president for academic affairs. Pursuant to this reporting structure, the libraries are administratively independent of one another, but participate in cooperative activities, including participating in and being advised by the Senate Advisory Committee on Library Policy (as described in Policy 6-002).]

The libraries are not ordinarily authorized as course-offering units.

Each library is a fully authorized faculty-appointing unit, for appointing to positions within the categories of faculty of the libraries as are described in Policy 6-300.

Further information regarding the structure and functions of the libraries is provided in Policy 6-015—The University of Utah Libraries. [Drafting note: Policy 6-015 is a new Policy, being created to receive certain contents with detailed information about the libraries which is being moved out of Policy 6-001. It will become the main policy regarding the libraries. There are also several other existing policies regarding the libraries, with much of their contents being outdated and no longer accurate, and it is anticipated that a project will be underway to update and otherwise revise those policies within the 2014-2015 year. Also there has been some very preliminary discussion of the possibility that one or more of the libraries might eventually seek authorization to offer credit-bearing courses. The phrasing used above regarding the authority of the libraries allows for the possibility of that future change of authorization, while still accurately describing the current and longstanding status—by stating that “ordinarily” they do not have such authority—such that an exception might be authorized by the cognizant vice president, upon establishment of the requisite capabilities of carrying out all of the functions that are required of any course-offering unit, per requirements later to be described in Part III-A-2 below.]

e. Other Academic Units (Centers, Institutes, and Bureaus).

i. In addition to the academic departments (the primary type of unit, authorized to conduct all types of academic activities), the interdisciplinary academic programs, and the libraries, as are described here in Part III-A, the University authorizes certain types of academic activities to be conducted through other types of units, ordinarily including academic centers, academic institutes, and academic bureaus (hereafter “C/I/B”).

ii. These academic C/I/B types of units typically are authorized by the cognizant vice president to conduct academic research activities. They are not authorized faculty appointing units, as they do not have authority to directly appoint any faculty of any category, but through specific formal agreements approved by the cognizant vice president may be authorized to engage in
“shared-appointment” arrangements sharing the work of faculty members whose appointments are made directly in a cooperating academic unit (similar to the arrangements described above for interdisciplinary programs). Any direct faculty appointing authority may only be extended to such a C/I/B unit through the process of approval of the unit as a Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program per Rule 6-310.

These C/I/B types of units are ordinarily not authorized as course-offering units, and ordinarily they participate in course activities only through an arrangement in which a course with which the unit has some association is formally offered through and administered by an academic department (or other authorized course-offering unit). Such a C/I/B unit may only gain authorization to directly offer credit-bearing courses by obtaining status as an approved interdisciplinary academic program of the type described in Part III-A-1-b above, which includes obtaining approval as a course-offering unit through the process described in Part III-A-2 below.

iii. Further information regarding C/I/B units. [Reserved]

[User note: as of 2014, a project is underway to clarify and improve the University’s regulations and processes regarding C/I/B types of units. A task force is examining existing regulations and systems for establishing, periodically reviewing, and discontinuing these types of units. It is anticipated that one product of the project will be further details to be added here to this Part III-A-1-e as well as adding content to A-2 below, to be accomplished by another formal revision of Policy 6-001. For further information, contact the VP Office for Faculty and/or the Graduate School.]

[Drafting note: The work of the C/I/B task force likely will not be entirely completed before the end of the Academic Senate’s spring 2014 schedule, and in order to ensure that the treatment of those units here within Policy 6-001 is accurate and thorough, it seems wise to use this strategy of “reserving” a place within 6-001 to subsequently add further explanation, and this “user note” will alert readers that a project for development of the additional information is underway.]

g. Updating Lists and Names of Units.

The lists and specific names of existing academic units and titles of administrative positions in current usage appearing above in Parts III-A-1 of this Policy may be updated whenever needed by authorization of the cognizant vice president presented to the Chairperson of the Institutional Policy Committee.
2. Creation, Review, and Discontinuance of Academic Units

{Drafting note: this following bracketed passage is moved from Policy 2-004.}

a. [Proposals to create, modify, or delete academic units are considered first by the Graduate Council, then by the Academic Senate, then by the Board of Trustees.]

b. Further information regarding creation, significant modification, review, and discontinuance of academic units. [Reserved.]

[User note: As of 2014 a project is underway to develop additional detailed content for University Regulations regarding the procedures and standards for creation and significant modification of academic units, for their periodic review, and for their discontinuance. Existing practices for creation and periodic reviews of academic departments and interdisciplinary programs (including reviews overseen by the Graduate and/or Undergraduate Council) will be better described in Policy. A significant portion of the new content will focus on Centers, Institutes, and Bureaus, and a task force has been assembled to work on that topic. The project will include further revising of these Parts III-2 & -3 of Policy 6-001. The added content will include these topic areas: (i) Procedures for creation or significant modification of academic units; (ii) Principles for creation of academic departments, and other course-offering academic units; (iii) Principles for creation of 0ther academic units (not course-offering); (iv) Naming or renaming of academic units (functional or honorary names, primarily referring over to existing content of Policy 9-001 “Naming of University Facilities and Programs.”) (v) Procedures and principles for periodic reviews of various types of academic units, and (vi) Procedures and principles for discontinuance of academic units (including reference over to existing Policy 6-313--“Terminations and Program Discontinuance”). For further information, contact the VP Office for Faculty and/or the Graduate School.]

B. A. Faculties of the University—Composition and Authority of the University Faculty.

{Drafting note: the following passages regarding the composition and authority of faculties are existing passages within Policy 6-001-III, here expanded upon and otherwise modified as marked to provide a more comprehensive description of the organizational structure of faculties.}

1. Composition of faculties.

a. To carry out their individual and collective responsibilities as the primary academic workforce of the University, the individuals holding faculty appointments (as defined in Policy 6-300) within the University are organized into various faculties (groups). For faculty members appointed to academic departments, each individual is at minimum a member of (a) the faculty of the academic department in which his/her primary faculty appointment is made, (b) the faculty of the college in which the
department is situated, and (c) the faculty of the University overall. For faculty members appointed to one of the libraries, each individual is a member of the particular library faculty, and the faculty of the University. For faculty members appointed directly in one of the interdisciplinary academic programs (see Part III-A-1-c above), each individual is a member of the faculty of that program, and the faculty of the University. When an individual holds two joint appointments to two academic departments (Policy 6-319), or a shared appointment to a department and an interdisciplinary program, or a center, institute, or bureau (Part III-A-1-c, and-e above), or both a primary appointment in one unit and any adjunct appointment in any other faculty-appointing unit, the individual is a member of the faculties of those multiple units.

b. Within each of the faculties of which they are a member, each individual has the responsibilities and rights of a faculty member, as described in the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities—Policy 6-316, and the voting rights for each category of faculty are as provided in Policy 6-300-III supplemented by the Statement applicable for career-line faculty of a particular academic unit pursuant to Policy 6-310. (And see Policy 6-010-III, regarding academic grievances related to duties and rights for participation by faculty members in departmental, collegial and University governance.)

2. Faculties of Academic Departments, Academic Colleges, University Libraries, and other Academic Units.

a. Department (and similar unit) faculties. For each authorized faculty-appointing unit, or appointment-sharing unit (academic department/ freestanding division, academic library, interdisciplinary academic program, or center/ institute/ or bureau), the individuals with direct and/or shared faculty appointments in that unit collectively constitute the faculty of that unit.

D. Composition and Authority of School and College faculties. An academic school or college faculty shall consist of the dean of the school or college and such members of the staffs of departments and freestanding divisions, and any other academic units within the college pursuing research or offering a major, a teaching major, or prescribed work in the school or college as are eligible to membership in the University faculty (as defined in Policy 6-300). The University President shall be an nonvoting ex officio member of all school and college faculties. If a department (or other academic unit) serves more than one school or college, the department chairperson may designate a staff member to represent the department at meetings of the faculties of schools or colleges other than that to which the department is assigned for administrative purposes without abrogating the right of other members of the department to participate and vote in the meetings of such faculties.

c. Faculty governance-equivalent committees for non-appointing units. For academic units which do not directly appoint faculty, but through which substantial academic activities are carried out by affiliated faculty members (e.g., centers, institutes, bureaus, and other programs), special-purpose academic governance committees are established and assigned responsibilities approximating as nearly as practically possible
the roles of faculties in governance of academic departments and colleges (e.g., decision-making power on curricular matters, in keeping with the principles in Part III-B-3 below). Such committees are comprised with a majority of voting-qualified members of the University faculty.

3. Authority of the Faculties, and Procedures for Actions of the University Faculty as a Whole (Plenary).

a. Authority of Faculties of Academic Departments, Colleges, and other Academic Units.

{Drafting note: the following passages in [[brackets]] are existing content of Policy 6-003 being moved here to 6-001 and modified as marked}.

[[School and College Faculties. Each school and college (The faculty of each academic department, academic college, or other academic unit) shall have, subject to the approval of the Academic Senate and appeal to the University faculty, jurisdiction over all questions of educational policy affecting that school or college academic unit, including requirements for entrance, graduation, and major, and prescribed subjects of study. Majors shall be authorized by the school or college faculty concerned, but the content of the major shall be determined by the department or departments in which it is given. Majors and their content shall be subject to the review of the Academic Senate in accord with Policy 6-001, Section 4 Part III-D of this Policy. A statement of the action taken upon educational policy by any school or college academic unit faculty shall be presented at the next regular meeting of the Academic Senate for consideration and action thereon.]]

{Drafting note: the following passages are existing content of both Policy 6-001 and Policy 6-300, combined and being modified as marked, for purposes of merging the overlapping existing contents of the two Policies, and for updating to conform to changes in nomenclature of faculty previously made in 6-300 and updating consistent with modern practices. The overlapping treatment of topics in existing 6-100 and 6-300 is an odd relic of the pre-2008 history of there being two separate systems of University Regulations and Faculty Regulations, with certain topics redundantly treated in each system. The dual objectives of this proposal are to merge and simultaneously update those overlapping contents, into a single cohesive treatment of the topics. They describe the principles of the authority of the University Faculty for academic decision-making, and they provide detailed procedures for meetings & actions of the University Faculty as a Whole. Those descriptions of procedures were developed in an historical era in which it was practical to have gatherings of the entire voting faculty (which would at that time have been limited to regular—tenure-line faculty). Although such meetings of the entire faculty are now unlikely to occur frequently (if at all—given the modern size of the faculty), the description of procedures should remain in Policy nevertheless, so that clear procedures are in place in case ever needed.}
b. Authority of the University Faculty

The University faculty shall have authority, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, to legislate on matters of educational policy, to enact such rules and regulations as it may deem desirable to promote or enforce such policies, and to decide upon curricula and new courses of study involving relations between schools and colleges or departments. The faculty has a right to a meaningful role in the governance of the University including primary responsibility for course content and materials, degree requirements and curriculum; it has a right to participate in decisions relating to the general academic operations of the university including budget decisions and administrative appointments.

“Substantial alterations in the scope of existing institutional operations… the establishment of a branch, extension center, college, professional school, division, institute, department or a new program in instruction, research, or public services, or a new degree, diploma, or certificate,” shall not be made without prior approval of the State Board of Regents. Utah Code Ann. 53B-16-102(4) (19942009).

The legislative power of the University faculty collectively will normally be exercised by the faculty through their representatives in the Academic Senate and the college or area and Graduate and Undergraduate councils, except that the voting members of the University faculty with voting rights (determined as described in Policy 6-300-III, including majority role of the tenure-line faculty) shall have the appellate power to review all actions affecting educational policy including legislation enacted by the Academic Senate, whenever an appeal is made from the Senate to the faculty as hereinafter provided.

The authority of the faculty and of the Academic Senate is based on state law, the regulations of the State Board of Regents, and regulations promulgated by the university president and approved by the Board of Trustees. Whatever in this document is in conflict with these is of no effect. Utah Code Ann. 53B-1-101 et seq. (19942011).
and curriculum; it has a right to participate in decisions relating to the general academic operations of the University, including budget decisions and administrative appointments.

In all matters, except those granted to the Academic Senate, the faculty shall have original jurisdiction. Whenever the faculty is acting within its province as here designated, its actions shall be effective without approval unless they involve an increase in the expense of instruction or administration. Whenever such an increase is involved, whether by action of the University faculty, the Academic Senate, or a school or college faculty, the University president shall report the action to the Board of Trustees with the university president's recommendations. (See Policy 6-001, University Regulations, Section 1.)

c. Members and Officers of the University Faculty

The University faculty shall consist of the University President, vice presidents, deans, directors of libraries, and the categories of faculty described in Policy 6-300, professors (including distinguished presidential and university professors), associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, librarians, associate librarians, and assistant librarians. All shall have the full rights of faculty members except that persons holding adjunct, clinical, research, visiting, lecturer, or emeritus appointments shall not have the right to vote. At the discretion of the university president, academic personnel holding non-faculty appointments may be afforded faculty privileges other than the right to vote.

The President of the University is the chairperson of the faculty. In the University President's absence, the vice president for academic affairs shall preside. The faculty shall have a secretary, who need not be a member of the faculty, appointed by the president at the beginning of each autumn semester for the academic year. The secretary shall be an ex officio member of the Academic Senate. The secretary shall record all action of the faculty and the Academic Senate and preserve all records in a form convenient for reference.

6-300-II-H.

d. University Faculty Meetings Procedures

Regular quarterly meetings may be held at a time decided upon by the faculty. Special meetings of the faculty may be held at any time and may be called by the University President or the Academic Senate. Special meetings for the consideration of specified agenda shall also be called by the University President on the written petition of at least five percent of the voting faculty. The vice president for academic affairs shall announce the number of total voting faculty at the beginning of each academic year. To insure a wide distribution of faculty sentiment, not more than one-half of the signatures presented on such a petition shall be counted from any college or school. No action pertaining to any department shall be considered at a special meeting unless the chairperson of the department has been duly notified.
Any number over ten percent of the voting faculty shall constitute a forum for discussion, but no vote shall be binding with less than fifty percent of the tenure-line voting faculty in attendance and with the support of less than a majority of those tenure-line faculty in attendance (in keeping with the “primary role” principle of Policy 6-300-III-B-2).

Nonfaculty members of the Academic Senate shall have the right to attend all meetings of the faculty. On the invitation of the University President, persons holding teaching and research positions not defined in [Section 2 of this policyPolicy 6-300] as members of the faculty may attend meetings of the faculty and may participate in the discussion of any or all questions. Nonmembers of the voting faculty, as this is described in [Section 1 of the chapterPolicy 6-300], may neither vote nor introduce formal motions in faculty meetings.

Every member of the faculty shall have free and equal voice in its deliberations. Should the faculty be equally divided on any question, the University President shall have one vote in addition to one vote as a member of the faculty.

The agenda for special as well as general faculty meetings shall be announced to faculty members and all others authorized to attend or invited to the meeting at least one week in advance of the meeting. In case of emergency the University President may waive this time restriction.

6-300-III-I.

e. University Faculty Meetings Order of Business

Roll call, when requested by the University President
Announcements and communications
Reports from the officers of administration, school and college and Graduate and Undergraduate councils, and committees
Unfinished business
New business
Adjournment ]} [Drafting note: end of passages being moved here from 6-300 regarding the University Faculty plenary.]

C. Academic Governance Committees and Councils.

1. Committees and Councils of Academic Departments, Academic Colleges, University Libraries, other Academic Units.

   a. Committees within Academic Departments (and Similar Units).
Each academic department and other academic unit shall establish such committees as appropriate to carry out the academic functions of the unit and as required by pertinent University Regulations. For authorized course-offering units these may include curriculum oversight committees, and for faculty-appointing units these shall include faculty appointments committees (per Policy 6-302), and include faculty review committees (per Policies 6-303 and 6-310). Such committees shall be composed in keeping with the fundamental principle of the authority of the faculty of the unit over academic matters.

b. College Councils and Committees within Academic Colleges.

College councils. [6-001-III-D]In accord with [Policy 6-003] college or area councils shall be are created by the academic colleges of the University with compositions defined by the colleges involved and described in council charters, which compositions and charters are subject to the approval of the Senate Executive Committee and subsequently submitted for the Information of the Senate. College or area councils may include councils serving more than one college where appropriate. Such councils shall have decision-making authority, as stated in Faculty Regulations [Policy 6-003], subject to review by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and subject to the power of the Academic Senate to legislate on matters of general University concern.

College committees. Academic colleges shall establish such standing committees as are appropriate to carry out the academic functions of the colleges and as required by Policy 6-003 and other pertinent University Regulations, and these standing committees shall be described in the charters of the councils.

c. Committees within Other Academic Units (Interdisciplinary Academic Programs; Centers, Institutes and Bureaus). [Reserved] [Drafting note: In the planned subsequent phase, appropriate content will be proposed to be added here, based on the work of the Task Force which is developing a system with procedures and principles for creating and reviewing the C/I/B types of units. The principles will include assurances of faculty control over academic decision-making within such units, especially on curriculum.]

B. Composition and Authority of the Academic Senate.

C. 2. Committees of the University--Composition and Authority of University Committees

a. University Committees (other than Committees of the Academic Senate).

The University President shall appoint, before the opening of the academic year, such standing committees as the work of the University may require. Special committees may be appointed at any time as the University President may deem wise, which shall report to the faculty Academic Senate, or to the appropriate council, or to the University President the progress of their work and their recommendations.
The University President, or Administration, or Academic Senate will notify the Senate Personnel and Elections Committee (a standing committee of the Academic Senate) about the creation of any University-wide standing committees. Upon the creation or reorganizing of a University-wide standing committee, the Senate Personnel and Elections Committee will review the committee charter and membership requirements, and shall make any requested nominations, and subsequently shall make requested nominations for the replacement of members as needed. (See Policy 6-002-III-D-1-c- “Functions of SPEC”).

Committees of the faculty and of the Academic Senate shall act only within the limits set for them.

{drafting note: the following passage in [[double brackets]] is moved to here from 6-300 and modified as marked.}

[[ 6-300 J. Committees of the Faculty

The University President shall appoint, before the opening of the academic year, upon nomination by the Senate Personnel and Elections Committee, such other standing committees as the work of the University may require.

Special committees may be appointed at any time by the faculty or the University President. The University President shall be an ex officio member of all committees of the faculty and of the Academic Senate.

Faculty committees, other than Academic Senate committees, must report to the faculty the progress of their work and any action taken and shall act only within the limitations placed upon them. ]]

b. Academic Senate Committees. {Drafting note. This existing lengthy section of 6-001 describing Senate committees is changed to simply refer to the recently revised 6-002, which now exclusively governs the structure and functions of the Senate committees.}

Standing and special committees of the Academic Senate are established under and governed by the terms of Policy 6-002.

The Academic Senate shall establish an Executive Committee to include the following voting members: ten faculty members elected annually from the Senate's elected membership to serve one year, the ASUU president, a graduate and an undergraduate representative from the student Academic Senators, one of whom shall be the Student Senate Chair and the other of whom shall be elected by the Student Senate; and the President of the Academic Senate. The President of the Academic Senate shall chair the committee but shall vote only when necessary to prevent an equal division of the committee. The ex officio, non-voting members will include the university president, the vice president for academic affairs and the vice president for health sciences or their designees, the president-elect of the Academic Senate, and the past president of the Academic Senate.
The Executive Committee shall screen and review matters for the Academic Senate and perform other functions as assigned to it by Regulations or by action of the Academic Senate. (See Policy 6-200, et seq., Faculty Regulations.)

The Executive Committee is empowered to receive confidential committee reports indicating a serious concern about the systemic operation of a program, department or college, and to request further supporting information from any committee so empowered to report. If the Executive Committee concludes that there is a serious concern about the systemic operation of a program, department or college, it shall bring this to the attention of the cognizant vice president and provide supporting information. The cognizant vice president shall acknowledge receiving the report and in a timely fashion inform the Executive Committee and the originating committee what steps are being taken to investigate or resolve the concern and, subsequently, inform both committees of the outcome of the investigation and of any resolution achieved.

The Academic Senate shall elect annually members of the following committees from faculty members other than ex officio members of the Senate and the Executive Committee of the Senate: Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee, Academic Policy Advisory Committee, Annuities and Salaries Committee, Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee, Consolidated Hearing Committee, Library Policy Advisory Committee, Personnel and Elections Committee, University RPT Standards Committee, University Diversity Committee, and such other committees determined by the Senate to be needed to serve the interests of the university.

Vacancies in faculty positions on elected committees shall be filled either by the runner-up from the original elections or by special election by the Senate. (See Policy 6-003, Faculty Regulations.)

D. Composition and Authority of School and College Faculties

3. Councils of the University—Graduate, Undergraduate, Academic Deans.

 a. In addition to the system of college councils (Part III-C-1 above), there are three University-wide councils: The Graduate Council, the Undergraduate Council, and the Council of Academic Deans.

 b. Graduate Council--Composition and Authority of Graduate Council.

The Graduate Council is hereby established within the system of academic governance of the University. As more fully described in Policy 6-200, the Council supervises graduate study at the University of Utah, and reviews and evaluates proposals for new graduate degrees and certificates, or name changes or major revisions. However, the administration of professional degrees may be delegated by the Graduate Council to colleges, schools, or departments. The Council is responsible for the review and evaluation of all existing departments and programs that award graduate and undergraduate degrees and certificates. The Undergraduate Council participates with the Graduate Council in the review of undergraduate programs based in departments awarding graduate degrees. The Graduate Council also reviews and evaluates proposals for new graduate degrees and certificates, academic administrative units (e.g., departments, divisions); centers, institutes and bureaus; and proposals for name changes or major revisions of the preceding, through the processes described above in Part III-A-2 (“Creation, Review, and Discontinuance of Academic Units”). It assumes other
responsibilities as established by University Regulations or Board of Regents Policy.

{Drafting note: the above passage is nearly identical in both 6-001 and 6-200 and eventually that duplication should be dealt with by deleting at least some of it from 6-200, which would leave 6-001 as controlling the structure of the Grad Council, and 6-200 as governing the process of approval of graduate degrees, etc., and not purporting to redundantly address the responsibilities of reviewing proposals for new/changed academic units.}

The Graduate Council members shall be appointed by the University President on recommendation of the dean of the Graduate School. Nominations of faculty members will be made by College Councils for communication by the college dean to the dean of the Graduate School. Nominations of student members will be made by the Associated Students of the University of Utah (ASUU) for communication by the ASUU president to the dean of the Graduate School. Faculty members on the Council shall represent all schools and colleges offering degrees under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Council. Student membership shall be limited to three members, two graduate and one undergraduate, broadly representative of the schools and colleges of the University.

The Graduate Council shall establish policies and procedures for the Graduate School, such policies and procedures being subject to review by the Academic Senate as specified in Faculty Regulations.

F. c. Undergraduate Council—Composition and Authority. {Drafting note: The descriptions of the structure and functions of the Undergrad Council are being substantively modified to conform with current circumstances and practices. The changes include adding to the Council representation from the college of Social Work, which now offers an undergraduate degree, and all interested parties have been consulted and agreed to that membership change. The modern nomenclature of “General Education and Baccalaureate Degree requirements replace the old “general-liberal” education nomenclature, and the former details about those general ed requirements, and the committee structures which oversee them, are eliminated from this Policy so that such matters are left to be governed by Policy 6-101 which has become the main Policy for governing undergraduate curriculum matters.}

The Undergraduate Council is hereby established within the system of academic governance of the University. The Council consists of one elected faculty representative from each academic college offering undergraduate degrees and making a significant contribution to undergraduate education across the campus (currently including [listed here only for convenience and subject to change by authority of the cognizant vice president as needed without formal revision of this Policy] --Architecture and Planning, Business, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Health, Humanities, Mines & Earth Science, Nursing, Science, and Social and Behavioral Science, and Social Work), a second elected representative from three colleges (Humanities, Science, and Social and Behavioral Science), one elected representative from the University Libraries, one elected representative from the “Honors College interdisciplinary program,” and an appointed representative of other interdisciplinary programs and three undergraduate students each representing a different college and recommended by
ASUU, two of which shall come from the Student Senate. Elected members of the Undergraduate Council shall serve for three-year terms. Ex-officio non-voting members shall come from: Enrollment Management (Student Affairs), the Academic Outreach and Continuing Education, University College Academic Advising, the Graduate School, University Professor(s), and administrators in Undergraduate Studies; other ex officio non-voting members may be added as deemed necessary by the Associate Academic Vice President for Undergraduate Studies. The Associate Academic Vice President for Undergraduate Studies or a person so designated by that office shall chair the Council. The Council shall report directly to the office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs through the Associate Academic Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the academic policies and procedures recommended by the Council shall be subject to approval through the regular governance process including the Academic Senate.

The Undergraduate Council is charged with the responsibility: (1) to coordinate and encourage the development of undergraduate studies across the University and (2) to oversee all University-wide undergraduate requirements. The Associate Academic Vice President for Undergraduate Studies and Council shall have the responsibility of establishing and maintaining a program of general liberal education and of other general requirements, General Education and Baccalaureate Degree requirements in accord with Policy 6-101--Undergraduate Study and Degrees, in cooperation with the academic departments and colleges. It shall be the responsibility of the Associate Academic Vice President for Undergraduate Studies to insure quality in the instruction and in the content of the courses meeting general liberal education and other requirements through periodic review of teachers and of curriculum. All students will undertake work in all of the four areas of liberal education -- physical and life science, social science, humanities, and fine arts. To facilitate proposals from the areas such review, the Associate Academic Vice President for Undergraduate Studies will appoint faculty committees. Committees establishing policy and reviewing course proposals for other general undergraduate requirements (e.g., Diversity, Writing) which will report to the Undergraduate Council for approval. The Council is responsible for reviewing and evaluating proposals for new undergraduate programs as well as proposed deletions or significant revisions of undergraduate programs and degrees by colleges and departments. It assumes other responsibilities as established by Policy 6-101, and other pertinent University Regulations or Board of Regents policy. In addition, the Council is responsible for reviewing and evaluating all undergraduate degrees and programs that are not located in departments with graduate degrees. The Undergraduate Council also participates with the Graduate Council in the review and evaluation of undergraduate programs based in departments awarding graduate degrees (see Part III-C-3-b above, Section 5 of this policy and Policy 6-200-III-Section 1).

d. Council of Academic Deans. The Council of Academic Deans is established and governed by Policy 2-004. Its composition and functions are as determined by the
cognizant vice president. Duties of the deans as officers of the University are governed by Policy 2-005. \textit{(Drafting note: This content is kept very minimal, because as a council of University officers reporting to the VP’s, the structure and functions of this council must be left to the discretion of the President and VP’s, to be modified as needed without requiring Senate approval of changes inscribed in this Policy. Currently 2-004 is the only coverage of this topic, and simply provides that “The following faculties and councils are hereby established in the University of Utah: ... the Council of Academic Deans ... ”)}

**D. Authority of The Academic Senate.** \textit{(Drafting note: the most significant revision here is to delete existing portions purporting to describe the composition of the Senate and two Senate committees— a descriptive task which has now been taken over exclusively by newly revised 6-002. )}

**B. Composition and Authority of the Academic Senate.**

There shall be an The Academic Senate ("Senate") is constituted as provided in and governed by the Faculty Regulations Policy 6-002.

The Academic Senate shall have the power to act for the University faculty in all matters of educational policy, including requirements for admissions, degrees, diplomas, certificates, and curricular matters involving relations between schools and colleges or departments. Within this province the action of the Senate shall be effective without approval, subject to the appellate power of the University faculty. Matters of educational policy coming before the Senate for action should, as a matter of course, be evaluated as to any additional expenses involved (e.g., library support costs for new programs) and proposed sources of revenue.

The Academic Senate shall also have the following powers:

1. to receive and consider reports from all faculty committees, councils, departments, divisions, administrative officers, schools, colleges, faculties and libraries, and other academic units, and administrative officers, and to take appropriate action thereon within the scope of this authority;

2. to consider matters of professional interest and faculty welfare and make recommendations to the University President and other administrative officers concerned;

3. to propose to the Board of Trustees amendments or additions to the University Regulations for the government of the University (through the process and under the terms of authority described in Policy 1-001 and Rule 1-001).

In accord with the faculty appointments procedures of Policy 6-302 the University President shall inform the Academic Senate of proposed appointments and promotions of faculty members and shall recommend these appointments and
promotions to the Board of Trustees at its next meeting unless there is objection to any of these recommendations by a majority of the Senate quorum. Objections shall be referred to the Executive Committee of the Senate for investigation and the report of the Executive Committee shall be transmitted by the University President to the Board of Trustees.

__Pursuant to Policy 6-307__, the University President shall also inform the Academic Senate of all faculty resignations. Any faculty member shall have the right to request the review of any resignation, and each request for such a review must be referred to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee for proceedings described in [Policies 6-307 and 6-010, 6-302, Sec. 6].

The University president may refer to the Senate any matter upon which the University president feels it would be useful to have the advice of that body. When such matters pertain to academic freedom or faculty rights, the Senate shall refer them to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee for study and report back to the Senate and University president. The University president may also appoint an ad hoc committee of faculty members and others when appropriate to advise the University president when a question arises concerning the competence or conduct of a staff or faculty member in a given department.

__G. University of Utah Libraries—Policy Statement for Their Government and Administration__:

1. Administrative Units in the University Library System (* * * lengthy contents not shown here)
2. The Marriott Library Collections (* * *)
3. "Area Collections" in Marriott Library (* * *)
4. Departmental or Branch Libraries (* * *)
5. Library Policy Advisory Committee (* * *)
6. The Director of Libraries (* * *)
7. Duties of the Director (* * *)
8. Changes in Instructional and Research Programs Affecting the Library (* * *)
9. University Archives (* * *)

{Drafting note: The existing lengthy contents about the University Libraries are being moved out of 6-001, into new Policy 6-015 (newly created for the purpose of initially receiving these contents moved from 6-001, and then in a later revision phase for consolidating there the contents of various policies regarding the libraries). The contents are not shown here due to their length, and may be seen in their entirety in the accompanying draft of 6-015.}
IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources.

A. Rules [reserved]

B. Procedures [reserved]

C. Guidelines

D. Forms [reserved]

E. Other related resource materials [reserved]

V. References:

Policy 6-003: College Facilities and College Councils
Policy 6-200: Graduate Studies and Degrees (Role of Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council)
Policy 6-300: University Faculty—Categories and Ranks
Policy 6-302: Appointments of Faculty

VI. Contacts:

The designated contact officials for this Policy are:

A. Policy Owners (primary contact person for questions and advice): Associate Vice President for Faculty and the Associate Vice President for Health Sciences.

B. Policy Officers: Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs and the 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 6-001 effective 9/15/2008, formerly known as PPM 8-5, and formerly as University Regulations Chapter V.

Revision History:

1. Current version: Revision 18
   Approved: Academic Senate _____
   Approved: Board of Trustees ____ with designated effective date of May 15, 2014.
   Legislative History of Revision 18. [create and link to legislative history file, from Senate agenda materials]
2. Earlier versions:


Legislative History of Revision 17.

Revision 16: Effective dates April 9, 2007 to September 13, 2010

Legislative History of Revision 16

Editorially revised: 10/15/2008

Revision 15: Effective dates February 10, 2003 to April 8, 2007

Revision 14: Effective dates December 27, 1999 to February 9, 2003

Revision 13: Effective dates September 17, 1999 to December 26, 1999

Revision 12: Effective dates May 17, 1999 to September 16, 1999

Revision 11: Effective dates July 13, 1998 to May 16, 1999
Policy 6-300: The University Faculty -- Categories and Ranks.  Revision 17  
Effective date May 15, 2014

{Drafting note: Except for the definition of “faculty appointing unit” added in Part II as shown, the contents of Parts I & II, and Part III-A to –F, are not shown here, due to their great length, and that no changes are proposed to those contents as part of this project. Those contents, establishing new nomenclature for faculty categories, were comprehensively revised in Revision 16, effective on July 1, 2013.}

II. Definitions.  [Reserved].

Faculty-appointing unit (or “appointing unit”)—is an academic unit authorized by the cognizant vice president to make appointments of faculty members, as more fully defined in Policy 6-001-II.

III. Policy . . .

{Drafting note: the following passages, Parts III-G through –J, regarding authority of the faculty, procedures for plenary meetings of the University faculty etc. are being deleted from this Policy 6-300, and moved to and merged with closely related contents in revised Policy 6-100.}

G. Authority of the Faculty.

The authority of the faculty and of the Academic Senate is based on state law, the regulations of the State Board of Regents, and regulations promulgated by the university president and approved by the Board of Trustees. Whatever in this document is in conflict with these is of no effect. Utah Code Ann. 53B-1-101 et seq. (1994).

The university faculty shall have power subject to the authority of the State Board of Regents, and the university president and Board of Trustees to legislate on matters of educational policy, to enact such rules and regulations as it may deem desirable to promote or enforce such policies, and to decide upon curricula and new courses of study involving relations between schools and colleges. The faculty will normally exercise this power through its representative, the Academic Senate. The faculty shall, however, have the appellate power to review all actions affecting educational policy, including legislation enacted by the Academic Senate, whenever an appeal is made from the Senate to the faculty as hereinafter provided.

The faculty has a right to a meaningful role in the governance of the university, including primary responsibility for course content and materials, degree requirements and curriculum; it has a right to participate in decisions relating to the general academic operations of the university, including budget decisions and administrative appointments.

In all matters, except those granted to the Academic Senate, the faculty shall have original jurisdiction. Whenever the faculty is acting within its province as here designated, its action shall be effective without approval unless they involve an increase in the expense of instruction or administration. Whenever such an increase is involved, whether by action of the university faculty, the Academic Senate, or a school or college faculty, the university president shall report the action to the Board of Trustees with the university president's recommendations. (See Policy 6-001, University Regulations, Section 1.)

H. Officers of the Faculty.
The president of the university is the chairperson of the faculty. In the university president's absence, the vice president for academic affairs shall preside. The faculty shall have a secretary, who need not be a member of the faculty, appointed by the president at the beginning of each autumn semester for the academic year. The secretary shall be an ex officio member of the Academic Senate. The secretary shall record all action of the faculty and the Academic Senate and preserve all records in a form convenient for reference.

I. Meetings

Regular quarterly meetings may be held at a time decided upon by the faculty. Special meetings of the faculty may be held at any time and may be called by the university president or the Academic Senate. Special meetings for the consideration of specified agenda shall also be called by the university president on the written petition of at least five percent of the voting faculty. The vice president for academic affairs shall announce the number of total voting faculty at the beginning of each academic year. To insure a wide distribution of faculty sentiment, not more than one-half of the signatures presented on such a petition shall be counted from any college or school. No action pertaining to any department shall be considered at a special meeting unless the chairperson of the department has been duly notified.

Any number over ten percent of the voting faculty shall constitute a forum for discussion, but no vote shall be binding with less than fifty percent of the voting faculty in attendance.

Nonfaculty members of the Academic Senate shall have the right to attend all meetings of the faculty. On the invitation of the university president, persons holding teaching and research positions not defined in Section 2 of this policy as members of the faculty may attend meetings of the faculty and may participate in the discussion of any or all questions. Nonmembers of the voting faculty, as this is described in Section 1 of the chapter, may neither vote nor introduce formal motions in faculty meetings.

Every member of the faculty shall have free and equal voice in its deliberations. Should the faculty be equally divided on any question, the university president shall have one vote in addition to one vote as a member of the faculty.

The agenda for special as well as general faculty meetings shall be announced to faculty members and all others authorized to attend or invited to the meeting at least one week in advance of the meeting. In case of emergency the university president may waive this time restriction.

J. Order of Business

Roll call, when requested by the university president

Announcements and communications

Reports from the officers of administration, school and college councils, and committees

Unfinished business

New business

Adjournment

{Drafting note: the following passages, Part III-K, regarding two research-related committees (the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, and the Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects), are being entirely moved to newly created Policy 7-100. It is anticipated that very soon, as part of another revision project, they will be substantively modified to conform to changes in federal regulations and changed practices.}
K. Committees of the Faculty

[USER NOTE: The contents of Policy 6-300 are under review to be significantly revised during the 2013-2014 year. The project will include moving the following descriptions of certain University committees from this Policy to another Policy and updating those descriptions, and also updating of other portions of this Policy 6-300. Contact the Office for Faculty for further information regarding the revision project.]

A. Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee

1. The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) is federally mandated to monitor, treat, housing, and use of animals in University laboratory and research programs to assure that animals are treated humanely and in accordance with the Animal Welfare Act of 1966, as amended (7 USC 2131 et. seq.), Department of Agriculture Animal Welfare Regulations, 9 CFR 3, and all other applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

2. The IACUC consists of at least six faculty and one citizen member. At least one faculty member shall be a Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, with experience or training in laboratory animal science and medicine, who has direct or delegated program responsibility for activities involving animals at the University. The citizen member shall not be affiliated in any way with the University, other than as a member of the IACUC, and shall not be a member of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the University. It is intended that the citizen member will represent general community interests in the proper care and treatment of animals. Not more than three members shall be from the same administrative unit of the University. Members shall be appointed for three-year terms by the University President, upon nomination by the Personnel and Elections Committee, with one-third of the membership changing each year. The chair of the IACUC shall be designated by the University President, upon recommendation by the Personnel and Elections Committee. The IACUC reports to the Vice President for Research.

3. The IACUC shall:
   a. Review and approve, require modifications in (to secure approval), or withhold approval of proposed research and teaching activities involving the care and use of animals to insure that the proposed activities are conducted in accordance with applicable laws and regulations;
   b. Review and approve, require modifications in (to secure approval), or withhold approval of proposed significant changes involving the care and use of animals in ongoing activities to insure that the proposed changes are in accordance with applicable laws and regulations;
   c. At least once every six months, review the University's program(s) for humane care and use of animals;
   d. At least every six months, inspect all University animal facilities;
   e. Submit reports of its evaluations of the University's programs and animal facilities to the Vice President for Research;
   f. Participate in the University's submission of an annual Animal Welfare Assurance to the Office for Protection from Research Risks, National Institutes of Health;
   g. Review and, if warranted, investigate concerns involving the care and use of animals at the University resulting from public complaints or from reports of noncompliance received from laboratory or other University personnel;
   h. Make recommendations to the Vice President for Research regarding any aspect of the University's animal programs, facilities, or personnel training;
   i. Suspend or terminate approval of activities that are not being conducted in accordance with the IACUC's requirements or that has been associated with unexpected pain or discomfort to the animals.
4. No IACUC member may participate in the IACUC's initial or continuing review of any project in which the member has a conflict of interest, except to provide information requested by the IACUC.

B. Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (General University)

1. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Research with Human Subjects (IRB) (General University) is federally mandated to monitor and approve research involving humans as subjects in accordance with the Department of Health and Human Services, Protection of Human Subjects Regulations, 45 CFR 46, and other applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations applicable law.

2. Each IRB panel. The IRB (General University) consists of at least six faculty and two citizen five members who are sufficiently qualified to execute the IRBs charge based on experience, expertise, and diversity. The IRB shall consist of members from more than one profession. The IRB shall include at least one member who is a non-scientist and at least one citizen member who is not affiliated with the University, other than as a member of the IRB, and who is not a member of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the University. IRB membership is determined consistent with federal regulations. Members shall be appointed for three-year terms by the University President, upon nomination by the Personnel and Elections Committee, with one-third of the membership changing each year. The chair of the IRB shall be designated by the University President, upon recommendation by the Personnel and Elections Committee. The IRB reports to the Vice President for Research.

3. The IRB (General University) shall:
   a. Approve research activity, specify modifications required to secure IRB approval of the research activity, or disapprove any research activity. Review and approve, require modifications in, or withhold approval of proposed research activities involving the use of human subjects in projects outside the health sciences to ensure that the proposed activities are conducted in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected, that adequate and informed consent is obtained, and that confidentiality is maintained, and that potential benefits of the research are commensurate with the possible physical, psychological, social, and/or legal risks involved;
   b. Conduct continuing review of approved protocols for purposes of renewal of the IRB approval period, at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk; Conduct continuing review of research involving human subjects;
   c. Have authority to observe or have a third party observe the consent process and the research;
   d. Review and, if warranted, investigate concerns involving the use of human subjects at the University resulting from public complaints or from reports of noncompliance received from laboratory or other University personnel;
   e. Consult with the University administration as necessary regarding the Multiple Project Assurance of Compliance, required by the Office for Protection from Research Risks, National Institute of Health. Federal Wide Assurance required by the Department of Health and Human Services Office for Human Research Protections.

4. No IRB member may participate in the IRB's initial or continuing review of any project in which the member has a conflict of interest, except to provide information requested by the IRB.

C. Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (Health Sciences)

1. The Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (IRB) (Health Sciences) is federally mandated to monitor research involving humans as subjects in accordance with
the Department of Health and Human Services, Protection of Human Subjects Regulations, 45 CFR 46, and other applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

2. The IRB (Health Sciences) consists of at least six faculty and two citizen members who are sufficiently qualified to execute the IRB's charge based on experience, expertise, and diversity. The IRB shall consist of members from more than one profession. The IRB shall include at least one member who is a non-scientist and at least one citizen member who is not affiliated with the University, other than as a member of the IRB, and who is not a member of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the University. In addition, one citizen member recommended by the Utah State Board of Corrections shall serve as a prisoner advocate. Members shall be appointed for three-year terms by the University President, upon nomination by the Personnel and Elections Committee, with one-third of the membership changing each year. The chair of the IRB shall be designated by the University President, upon recommendation by the Personnel and Elections Committee. The IRB reports to the Vice President for Research.

3. The IRB (Health Sciences) shall:

   a. Review and approve, require modifications in (to secure approval), or withhold approval of proposed use of human subjects in projects in the health sciences to insure that the proposed activities are conducted in accordance with applicable laws and regulations that the rights of the subjects are protected, that adequate and informed consent is obtained, that confidentiality is maintained, and that potential benefits of the research are commensurate with the possible physical, psychological, social, and/or legal risks involved;
   
   b. Conduct continuing review of research involving human subjects at least once every year, and shall have authority to observe or have third party observe the consent process and the research;
   
   c. Suspend or terminate approval of research that is not being conducted in accordance with the IRB's requirements or that has been associated with unexpected serious harm to subjects;
   
   d. Review and, if warranted, investigate concerns involving the use of human subjects at the University resulting from public complaints or from reports of noncompliance received from laboratory or other University personnel;
   
   e. Consult with the University administration as necessary regarding the Multiple Project Assurance of Compliance, required by the Office for Protection from Research Risks, National Institutes of Health.

4. No IRB member may participate in the IRB's initial or continuing review of any project in which the member has a conflict of interest, except to provide information requested by the IRB.

{Drafting note: the contents of this following passage, formerly Part III-K-4, regarding “Other Committees” are being moved to and merged with closely related contents in newly revised Policy 6-100}.

K. 4. Other Committees

The University President shall appoint, before the opening of the academic year, upon nomination by the Personnel and Elections Committee, such other standing committees as the work of the University may require. Special committees may be appointed at any time by the faculty or the University President. The University President shall be an ex officio member of all committees of the faculty and of the Academic Senate.

Faculty committees, other than Academic senate committees, must report to the faculty the progress of their work and any action taken and shall act only within the limitations placed upon them.
Faculty Club

There shall be a Faculty Club on the University of Utah campus, to be governed by a constitution adopted by its membership and approved by the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees. Amendments to the Faculty Club Constitution shall also require the approval of the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees.

[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.]
Policy 6-003: College Faculties and Councils, and University Curriculum Policy Review Board

I. Purpose and Scope (Reserved)

II. Definitions (Reserved)

III. Policy

Drafting note: this passage regarding authority of the faculties of the colleges marked for deletion here is being moved into Policy 6-001 as a more appropriate location and modified as shown there.

A very few changes are also proposed for the remaining contents of this Policy 6-003 regarding college councils, first to comply with some recent changes in other policies (including replacing the nomenclature of “auxiliary” faculty with “career-line” faculty to conform with spring 2013 changes to Policy 6-300. Some clarifying changes are also proposed regarding the role of the Senate Executive Committee in the approval process for charters of college councils. The existing language clearly provides that the composition of each council, to be reflected in each charter, is subject to approval by the Executive Committee, and also clearly provides that the Executive Committee shall direct functions among the councils and other University committees. Some additional clarifying language is proposed to make clear that Executive Committee (aided by the cognizant VP office) may establish a schedule for periodic reviews and updating of council charters, as well as providing some guidance to help colleges doing such updating. No other substantive changes are proposed for this Revision 6. However, it is likely that after spring 2014 the Senate leadership will consider and propose further revising these existing contents regarding the college councils, as part of a project begun this year of studying and identifying concerns within the University’s somewhat troubled system of college councils. One possible future change would be to describe some additional principles applicable for the structure and authority of the college councils, to provide more thorough guidance for both colleges and the Senate Executive Committee in the process of revising and granting approval of council charters.

SECTION 1. School and College Faculties

Each school and college faculty shall have, subject to the approval of the Academic Senate and appeal to the University faculty, jurisdiction over all questions of educational policy affecting that school or college, including requirements for entrance, graduation, and major, and prescribed subjects of study.

Majors shall be authorized by the school or college faculty concerned, but the content of the major shall be determined by the department or departments in which it is given. Majors and their content shall be subject to the review of the Academic Senate in accord with Policy 6-001, Section 4.

A statement of the action taken upon educational policy by any school or college faculty shall be presented at the next regular meeting of the Academic Senate for consideration and action thereon.

SECTION 2. College Councils

A. Establishment and Authority of College Councils

1. Establishment. College councils are hereby established within the system of University governance.
2. Organizational Scope. A college council shall be organized and shall function within each academic college (as described in Policy 6-001). Any academic unit or personnel with tenure-line faculty appointments not administratively situated within an existing college shall affiliate with and become a constituent part of a college council designated by the University President, but which may be only for the purpose of participating in the University governance responsibilities vested in such college council.

3. General Powers. A college council shall formulate policies and exercise primary authority to make decisions relating to college and department affairs to the extent authorized by Policy 6-001 and other University Faculty Regulations. All actions taken by a college council shall be reviewable by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in accordance with criteria approved by the Senate, and shall be subject to the power of the Academic Senate to establish uniform policies and take final action on all matters of University concern.

B. Areas of Responsibility of College Councils

1. Faculty Personnel Actions

Appointments, and retention, promotion and tenure. The role of college councils within the process of making appointments of faculty shall be as prescribed in Policy 6-302. As is more fully described in that Policy, each college council may adopt college policy regarding the establishment and role of any college-level faculty appointments advisory committee, and may adopt college policy regarding the eligibility of auxiliary career-line faculty to serve on departmental faculty appointments advisory committees.

The role of college councils with regard to decisions on retention, promotion, or tenure of tenure-line faculty shall be as prescribed in Policy 6-303. As is more fully described in that Policy, each college shall establish a college RPT advisory committee, and such committees shall make recommendations with respect to certain RPT decisions.

Colleges may choose to establish a single committee to carry out both the advisory function for appointments, and the advisory function for decisions of retention, promotion and tenure, in all cases, or to serve both functions only for cases in which it is proposed that tenure be granted at the time of initial appointment (commonly known as hiring with tenure).

2. Academic Policy Actions

College councils shall develop curriculum and related academic programs to meet the goals and purposes of the University. Any program requiring approval of the State Board of Regents including the establishment of a new department or a new degree, must be submitted to the Academic Senate for approval.


The chairpersons of the various college curriculum committees, as well as the Dean of the Graduate School and the University Registrar, will be convened as a University Curriculum Policy Review Board to review curriculum policies and procedures, coordinate curriculum planning and intercollege consultations, and promulgate modifications in guidelines for processing curricular proposals. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Undergraduate Studies, or his/her designee, will chair the Review Board. The guidelines proposed by the Review Board, after approval by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, will be the operating rules for
making curriculum changes during the academic year. Each college council shall develop appropriate Procedures consistent with guidelines established by the Review Board for initiating and reviewing curriculum changes and adjustments for all programs within their respective jurisdictions.

4. General Policy Recommendations
A college council may recommend to the Academic Senate, through the Executive Committee of Academic Senate, new policies or policy modifications in relationship to any aspect of the University operation.

5. Additional Duties
College councils shall perform other functions and duties assigned to them by the Academic Senate from time to time.

C. Council Structure
The organizational structure and membership of each college council shall be determined, and may be modified from time to time, by majority vote of all voting faculty members of the college involved (in keeping with the principles described in Policy 6-300 for voting rights of faculty categories), and may be either plenary or representative. The college councils should include student members. Where a representative structure is adopted, the representation formula should be broad, and shall be The structure shall be described in the charter of the council. The composition of the council and contents of the charter are submitted to and subject to the approval of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and subsequently submitted for the Information of the Senate (See Policy 6-001-III-C-1).

Each college council shall establish appropriate committees and procedures to expedite its work, and shall provide for meaningful involvement of students in department and college deliberations and activities, including effective coordinating with departmental student advisory committees.

When dealing with faculty personnel action, a college council representing two departments or less or having a total of fewer than twenty-five faculty members in the ranks of professor, associate professor and assistant professor, shall provide for committee processing, where necessary, by referring the matter to the appropriate University-wide committee.

D. College Council Coordination With University-Wide Committees
To the extent necessary to effectuate the purposes of the college council system of governance as provided herein, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall (1) direct the transfer to the college councils of responsibility for functions delegated to them and heretofore performed by University-wide committees and (2) modify the responsibilities of University-wide committees in corresponding manner.

In its roles described above in approving compositions and charters of, and otherwise directing functions of, college councils, the Senate Executive Committee acts as delegatee of the authority of Academic Senate per this Policy and Policy 6-001, and in accord with these the Committee, in consultation with the cognizant vice president, may establish a schedule for reexamination and revision of charters, initiate reviews of charters on its own initiative or in response to requests from faculty members or administrators, provide guidance for use in developing and approving charters, and otherwise assist colleges with
development of charters, including by identifying and sharing best practices developed by other colleges.

{Drafting note: the above changes will conform this description of the Executive Committee role in the charter approval process with the description given in Policy 6-001. The phrasing regarding functions of the Executive Committee is modelled on that used in Policy 6-303 for the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, acting as delegate of the authority of the Senate in the process of approving (and providing guidance for) contents of department/college Statements of standards for reviews of faculty members (RPT, TFR, Career-line). This phrasing does not compel the Executive Committee to set up a regular review schedule for council charters— or even identify a preferred time period— but leaves to the discretion of the Committee the flexibility of arranging for such reviews, based on current circumstances of and need and resources.}

Endnote: Adaptation of Policy 6-003, regarding college councils, for academic units not structured as typical academic colleges. [Reserved]

{Drafting note: This ‘placeholder’ Note is added as part of Revision 6. It reserves a location for possible later development of an explanation of how an equivalent of a college council may be formed for allowing participation in the University shared-governance system of academic units that do not fit the standard structure of an academic college for which the Policy is designed. In particular such an ‘adaptation’ note may prove useful for accommodating the needs of the University Libraries, which currently do not have a functional equivalent of a college council, but may consider developing one. This also may prove useful for adaptation for shared-governance participation of interdisciplinary academic programs.}

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. [contents not shown]
Policy 6-015: The University Libraries. Revision 0. Effective date: May 14, 2014.

I. Purpose and Scope. [Reserved].

[User note: As of 2014 this Policy is under review for extensive updating and likely expansion to incorporate other topics related to the University Libraries. The existing content formerly appeared within Policy 6-001, and was moved to this new Policy as part of a thorough revision of 6-001 and other Regulations effective May 2014. At that time minimal updating was also performed, reflecting changes recently made in other related policies (including 6-002 and 6-300), with the understanding that other substantive changes remain to be made after further careful examination. For further information contact the office of the Senate, the Associate Vice President for Faculty, or administration of any of the Libraries.]

II. Definitions. [Reserved]

III. Policy

A. University of Utah Libraries - Policy Statement for Their Government and Administration.

1. Administrative Units in the University Library System

Marriott Library and its branches are operated under the administrative jurisdiction of the Director of Libraries. The Law and Health Sciences Libraries are autonomous administrative units, are located on the sites of their respective schools and have their own directors, who shall cooperate closely with their faculties in the development and maintenance of their collections and make these available to researchers in related fields.

See Policy 6-001-III-A-1-c describing the University of Utah Libraries within the context of other academic units and academic governance of the University.

The following regulations pertain essentially to the operations of the Marriott Library.

2. The Marriott Library Collections.

The University's collections are to be primarily housed in its central library (the Marriott Library). Departments are enjoined to keep their own collections to immediate research needs and otherwise channel requests for new acquisitions to Marriott Library, in order to avoid costly duplications and make these materials available to a wider audience. The University
administration should annually monitor departmental expenditures for library materials.

3. "Area Collections" in Marriott Library.

"Area Collections" involving academic units other than Law and Medicine may be eligible for special arrangements in the Marriott Library, if deemed advantageous to the users and still conducive to administrative and fiscal effectiveness. The library administration and staff shall work closely with the Senate Advisory Committee on Library Policy Advisory Committee, the faculty concerned, as well as student representatives to examine and determine such needs.

4. Departmental or Branch Libraries.

A departmental or branch library may be established and maintained with the approval of the vice president for academic affairs and the University President. Any request for such approval must be accompanied by an assessment from the Director of Libraries and the Senate Advisory Committee on Library Policy Advisory Committee. Space assignments shall be made in consultation with the library administration. Any officially approved new library shall be operated as a part of the centrally administered library system. All funds that may be provided for development of library collections, for equipping, or for staffing libraries in the University shall be administered through the various accounts comprising the overall University library budgets.

Any request for the establishment of a centrally administered departmental or branch library shall be supported by documentation showing that additional funding from special sources will be forthcoming, to make sure that the financial resources for maintaining the research collections in the Marriott Library can be kept on a sufficient level.

An approved departmental or branch library must be managed by a professionally trained librarian with adequate support staff.

University library patrons should have access to the use and circulation of branch library materials regardless of departmental affiliation according to policies developed by the library administration and approved by the Senate Advisory Committee on Library Policy Advisory Committee.
5. Senate Advisory Committee on Library Policy Advisory Committee (LPACSACLPLPAC).

[User note: With Revision 18, the description of the Library Policy Advisory Committee (renamed as Senate Advisory Committee on Library Policy) which previously appeared here was moved over to Policy 6-002—III-D-1-i, effective May 15, 2014.]

A standing Library Policy Advisory Committee (LPAC) shall be appointed in accordance with the Procedures governing other standing committees of the university. Its members shall include a representative from each academic college and shall include study body representatives. The principal function of this committee shall be to advise the directors of the Marriott Library, the Eccles Health Sciences Library, and the S.J. Quinney Law Library on matters of operational policies, the development of existing holdings, and the expansion of existing facilities from a broad, university-wide perspective. It shall also bring before the Academic Senate matters affecting library needs, policy and administration that it deems appropriate for consideration by that body. The directors of each of the three university libraries shall be ex officio, non-voting members of LPAC.

6. The Director of Libraries.

The Director of Libraries is an academic officer with the rank of "Librarian" and with the administrative status of a dean. He/she is an ex officio member of the Academic Senate. In accordance with established University procedures relating to the administrative tenure of deans, he/she shall be reviewed at certain intervals by the University administration in consultation with the faculty and staff of the central library.

7. Duties of the Director.

Among such tasks as may be required to fulfill the responsibilities of his/her office, the Director shall:

a. Administer all funds provided from any source for library acquisitions, binding, personnel, supplies, and equipment.

b. Determine in consultation with the library faculty and staff and with the advice of the SACLPLPAC and the academic units concerned how the various collections shall be arranged, catalogued and staffed.

c. Present to the University administration the needs of the various collections and shall prepare and submit library budget requests and recommendations, after consultation with the library faculty and staff and SACLPLPAC.
d. Work closely with SACLPLPAC, the office of facilities planning, with architects and academic units in developing plans for expansion, addition or remodeling of the physical plant or the utilization of space in the libraries when changes become necessary.

e. Present for action by SACLPLPAC and the vice president for academic affairs such plans for expansion and addition of buildings or other major changes in library operations.

f. Submit to the President, at the close of each fiscal year, a report on the University Libraries, summarizing the year's developments and achievements, outlining special problems as may seem appropriate, and citing the future needs of the library system.

g. Develop, with the advice of the library faculty and staff and SACLPLPAC, policies governing the day-to-day operation of the library system.

h. Make recommendations with regard to library positions, appointments, transfers, promotions, and terminations, in compliance with existing University Regulations and with a view to maintaining a qualified faculty and staff for the University Libraries.

i. Represent the University, personally or through a qualified designee, at national, state, and local library conferences, and at inter-library and inter-institutional meetings that may involve the University Libraries.

8. Changes in Instructional and Research Programs Affecting the Library.

In order to assure a proper consideration of the library costs and implications of organizational changes in the University or of the establishment of new teaching and research programs that may be contemplated, the Director of Libraries should be consulted with respect to these implications before final recommendations for such changes are made.


The Director of Libraries has the responsibility and authority as University Archivist to develop and maintain the University Archives. In the interest of assuring the proper preservation of materials pertaining to the history of the University, a copy of each publication issued by the University departments or other units shall be sent by the issuing officer to the University Archives; and no University records, whether committee minutes and reports, departmental files, photographs, architectural drawings, or recordings, shall be permanently discarded without the approval of the University Archivist or a designated representative. Inactive files may be sent to the University Archives, or the Archives
Librarian will assist departments in determining what kinds of materials should be preserved for their historical value.

[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. […] contents not shown]

(Note: This current phase of this project is to merely move out of Policy 6-300 and into this new Policy 6-100 the entire contents of existing section III-K of 6-300 which describes two research-related committees. Both committee descriptions are greatly in need of major revising, and it is contemplated that very soon as a follow-up phase, these contents will be revised.)

Policy 7-100 University Research Committees. Revision 0. Effective date May 15, 2014.

I. Purpose and Scope [reserved]

II. Definitions [reserved]

III. Policy.

[User note: As of 2014 this Policy is under examination for extensive revising. For further information contact the office of the Senate, office of the Associate Vice President for Faculty, or administrators for each of these research committees.]

A. Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee

1. The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) is federally mandated to monitor the care, treatment, housing, and use of animals in University laboratory and research programs to assure that animals are treated humanely and in accordance with the Animal Welfare Act of 1966, as amended (7 USC 2131 et. seq.), Department of Agriculture Animal Welfare Regulations, 9 CFR 2, and all other applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

2. The IACUC consists of at least six faculty and one citizen member. At least one faculty member shall be a Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, with experience or training in laboratory animal science and medicine, who has direct or delegated program responsibility for activities involving animals at the University. The citizen member shall not be affiliated in any way with the University, other than as a member of the IACUC, and shall not be a member of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the University. It is intended that the citizen member will represent general community interests in the proper care and treatment of animals. Not more than three members shall be from the same administrative unit of the University. Members shall be appointed for three-year terms by the University President, upon nomination by the Personnel and Elections Committee, with one-third of the membership changing each year. The chair of the IACUC shall be designated by the University President, upon recommendation by the Personnel and Elections Committee. The IACUC reports to the Vice President for Research.

3. The IACUC shall:
   a. Review and approve, require modifications in (to secure approval), or withhold approval of proposed research and teaching activities involving the care and use of animals to insure that the proposed activities are conducted in accordance with applicable laws and regulations;
b. Review and approve, require modifications in (to secure approval), or withhold approval of proposed significant changes involving the care and use of animals in ongoing activities to insure that the proposed changes are in accordance with applicable laws and regulations;

c. At least once every six months, review the University's program(s) for humane care and use of animals;

d. At least every six months, inspect all University animal facilities;

e. Submit reports of its evaluations of the University's programs and animal facilities to the Vice President for Research;

f. Participate in the University's submission of an annual Animal Welfare Assurance to the Office for Protection from Research Risks, National Institutes of Health;

g. Review and, if warranted, investigate concerns involving the care and use of animals at the University resulting from public complaints or from reports of noncompliance received from laboratory or other University personnel;

h. Make recommendations to the Vice President for Research regarding any aspect of the University's animal programs, facilities, or personnel training;

i. Suspend or terminate approval of activities that are not being conducted in accordance with the IACUC's requirements or that has been associated with unexpected pain or discomfort to the animals.

4. No IACUC member may participate in the IACUC's initial or continuing review of any project in which the member has a conflict of interest, except to provide information requested by the IACUC.

B. Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (General University)

1. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Research with Human Subjects (IRB) (General University) is federally mandated to monitor review and approve research involving humans as subjects in accordance with the Department of Health and Human Services, Protection of Human Subjects Regulations, 45 CFR 46, and other applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations applicable law.

2. Each IRB panel The IRB (General University) consists of at least six faculty and two citizen five members who are sufficiently qualified to execute the IRBs charge based on experience, expertise, and diversity. The IRB shall consist of members from more than one profession. The IRB shall include at least one member who is a nonscientist and at least one citizen member who is not affiliated with the University, other than as a member of the IRB, and who is not a member of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the University. IRB membership is determined consistent with federal regulations. Members shall be appointed for three-year terms. by the University President, upon nomination by the Personnel and Elections Committee, with one-third of the membership changing each year. The chair of the IRB shall be designated by the University President, upon recommendation by the Personnel and Elections Committee. The IRB reports to the Vice President for Research.

3. The IRB (General University) shall:

a. Approve research activity, specify modifications required to secure IRB approval of the research activity, or disapprove any research activity Review and approve, require modifications in (to secure approval), or withhold
approval of proposed research activities involving the use of human subjects in projects outside the health sciences to ensure that the proposed activities are conducted in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and, that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected, that adequate and informed consent is obtained, that confidentiality is maintained, and that potential benefits of the research are commensurate with the possible physical, psychological, social, and/or legal risks involved;
b. Conduct continuing review of approved protocols for purposes of renewal of the IRB approval period, at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk; Conduct continuing review of research involving human subjects Have Conduct continuing review of research involving human subjects at least once every year, and shall have authority to observe or have a third party observe the consent process and the research;
c. Suspend or terminate approval of research that is not being conducted in accordance with the IRB's requirements or that has been associated with unexpected serious harm to subjects;
d. Review and, if warranted, investigate concerns involving the use of human subjects at the University resulting from public complaints or from reports of noncompliance received from laboratory or other University personnel;
e. Consult with the University administration as necessary regarding the Multiple Project Assurance of Compliance, required by the Office for Protection from Research Risks, National Institutes of Health. Federal Wide Assurance required by the Department of Health and Human Services Office for Human Research Protections.

4. No IRB member may participate in the IRB's initial or continuing review of any project in which the member has a conflict of interest, except to provide information requested by the IRB.

C. Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (Health Sciences)

1. The Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (IRB) (Health Sciences) is federally mandated to monitor research involving humans as subjects in accordance with the Department of Health and Human Services, Protection of Human Subjects Regulations, 45 CFR 46, and other applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

2. The IRB (Health Sciences) consists of at least six faculty and two citizen members who are sufficiently qualified to execute the IRBs charge based on experience, expertise, and diversity. The IRB shall consist of members from more than one profession. The IRB shall include at least one member who is a non-scientist and at least one citizen member who is not affiliated with the University, other than as a member of the IRB, and who is not a member of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the University. In addition, one citizen member recommended by the Utah State Board of Corrections shall serve as a prisoner advocate. Members shall be appointed for three-year terms by the University President, upon nomination by the Personnel and Elections Committee, with one-third of the membership changing each year. The chair of the IRB shall be designated by the University President, upon recommendation by the Personnel and Elections Committee. The IRB reports to the Vice President for Research.
3. The IRB (Health Sciences) shall:
   a. Review and approve, require modifications in (to secure approval), or withhold approval of proposed use of human subjects in projects in the health sciences to insure that the proposed activities are conducted in accordance with applicable laws and regulations that the rights of the subjects are protected, that adequate and informed consent is obtained, that confidentiality is maintained, and that potential benefits of the research are commensurate with the possible physical, psychological, social, and/or legal risks involved;
   b. Conduct continuing review of research involving human subjects at least once every year, and shall have authority to observe or have third party observe the consent process and the research;
   c. Suspend or terminate approval of research that is not being conducted in accordance with the IRB's requirements or that has been associated with unexpected serious harm to subjects;
   d. Review and, if warranted, investigate concerns involving the use of human subjects at the University resulting from public complaints or from reports of noncompliance received from laboratory or other University personnel;
   e. Consult with the University administration as necessary regarding the Multiple Project Assurance of Compliance, required by the Office for Protection from Research Risks, National Institutes of Health.

4. No IRB member may participate in the IRB's initial or continuing review of any project in which the member has a conflict of interest, except to provide information requested by the IRB.

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. [.... contents not shown]
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: Discontinuation of Physiology Department and Degree

This proposal needs to go through:

- 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 [Signature] Date: 2/27/14

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 [Signature] Date: 2/28/14

Once the Chief Academic Officer's signature has been obtained, this approval document will be forwarded to the Office of the Academic Senate.
Institution Submitting Proposal: University of Utah

College, School or Division in Which Program/Administrative Unit Will Be Located:
School of Medicine

Department(s) or Area(s) in Which Program/Administrative Unit Will Be Located:

Program/Administrative Unit Title:
Department of Physiology, School of Medicine

Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code: ___ ___ ___ ___

Certificate, and/or Degree(s) to Be Awarded:

Proposed Beginning Date:

Institutional Signatures (as appropriate):
Department Chair

[Signature] 10/10/2014
Career and Technical Education Director

Dean or Division Chair

[Signature] 2/7/13
Graduate School Dean

Council on Teacher Education

Date:
Institution Submitting Request: University of Utah School of Medicine
Proposed Title: Department of Physiology
Currently Approved Title: School of Medicine
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: 4110 Eccles Institute of Human Genetics
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code\(^1\) (for new programs): 00.0000
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for existing programs): 26.0901
Proposed Beginning Date (for new programs): MM/DD/YEAR
Institutional Board of Trustees’ Approval Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Proposal Type (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Section #</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R401-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>R401-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.5.2</td>
<td>Minor*</td>
<td>6.1.1</td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1.1</td>
<td>New Emphasis on an Existing Degree*</td>
<td>6.1.5</td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>Certificate of Proficiency Not Eligible for Financial Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.3</td>
<td>Out-of-Service Area Delivery of Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.4</td>
<td>Name Change of Existing Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.5</td>
<td>Program Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.6</td>
<td>Program Restructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.7</td>
<td>Program Consolidation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Discontinuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Suspension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.8</td>
<td>Administrative Unit Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.9</td>
<td>Administrative Unit Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Unit Consolidation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.10</td>
<td>New Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.11</td>
<td>New Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.12</td>
<td>New Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.13</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Requires “Section VI: Program Curriculum” of Abbreviated Template

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

Signature  
Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Printed Name: Name of CAO or Designee
Program Request - Abbreviated Template  
University of Utah School of Medicine  
Department of Physiology  
02/06/2014

Section I: Request

The University of Utah School of Medicine requests permission to dissolve the Department of Physiology after the final Physiology graduate student completes his degree requirements in Spring 2015.

In October 2013 the School of Medicine Executive Committee of the College Council unanimously approved the proposal to complete the closure of the Physiology Department.

Section II: Need

In 2012, at the direction of Vivian Lee, School of Medicine Dean and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, Dean Li, School of Medicine Vice Dean for Research, began working with F. Edward Dudek, PhD, Physiology Department Chair, and Physiology Department faculty to reassign department faculty to the Departments of Internal Medicine/Cardiology, Neurosurgery, and Neurobiology and Anatomy to invigorate and strengthen neuroscience and cardiovascular research initiatives. Dr. Dudek, an internationally respected neurophysiologist, stepped down as Chair of Physiology to assume the role of Vice Chair for Research in Neurosurgery. Dr. Li and Dr. Kenneth Spitzer, Professor of Physiology, were asked to serve as Acting Co-chairs for the department.

Appointments to Internal Medicine/Cardiology were initiated for Dr. Spitzer and Dr. Michael Sanguinetti, both senior cardiovascular physiologists. Junior faculty Drs. Sharif Taha and Matthew Wachowiak were transitioned to Neurobiology and Anatomy under the oversight of the department chair, Dr. Monica Vetter, who also leads the health sciences Neuroscience initiative.

Other faculty members have since retired: Drs. William C. Michel in June 2013 and Salvatore Fidone in January 2014. Dr. Lara Gawenis is no longer with the University. In late 2013 Dr. Spitzer stepped down from his acting co-chair role to continue his research with Internal Medicine and the Cardiovascular Research Institute, leaving only Drs. Dean Li and Mary Lucero as department faculty members. Dr. Lucero is currently on a second one-year sabbatical at the American University of the Caribbean, to be completed in December 2014. Upon Dr. Lucero’s return, she will transition to another School of Medicine basic science department, most likely Neurobiology and Anatomy.

The Physiology department’s research mission has been subsumed by other departments and programs, and the transition of Physiology faculty has strengthened neurosciences and cardiovascular research initiatives and related departments and programs.

In addition, School of Medicine teaching responsibilities have been distributed across other basic science departments. The final two graduate students in the Department of Physiology are completing their PhD requirements in 2014 and 2015 respectively.
Section III: Institutional Impact

Impact on Faculty: As described above, departmental faculty have been transitioned successfully to other departments, retired or left the University. Only Dr. Lucero remains in the department, and is in a second one-year sabbatical that will end in December 2014. Upon Dr. Lucero’s return, she will transition to another School of Medicine basic science department, potentially Neurobiology and Anatomy.

Teaching Responsibilities: The teaching responsibilities of the Physiology Department have been successfully distributed to other School of Medicine departments.

Impact on Graduate Students: There are two graduate students completing their Physiology PhD requirements. One is expected to be awarded her degree in March 2014; the final student is expected to receive his degree in the Spring of 2015. These students will have continued support from their mentors and the department program coordinator (Vicki Skelton) through program completion.

Impact on Staff: Physiology staff members have transitioned to other health sciences departments over the past two years; none were terminated. Vicki Skelton is the final part-time administrative staff member and she assists Dean Li with department administrative issues. Vicki will transition to the Department of Neurosurgery in FY2015, but will maintain a small effort assignment with Physiology until the students graduate and the program is dissolved.

Impact on Existing Administrative Structures
No untoward effects on faculty, staff, or students are anticipated with closure of the department. The research programs in the departments where faculty were reassigned have been strengthened. There is no expected negative impact on existing administrative structures in the School of Medicine departments.

Section IV: Finances

No negative budgetary impact is expected; rather, the expectation is that the realignment of Physiology Department faculty in other departments has the potential to increase competitiveness for grant funding.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Vivian Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
    Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
    Dean, School of Medicine
    CEO, University of Utah Health Care

FROM: Dean Y. Li, MD, PhD
      Acting Chair, Department of Physiology
      Associate Vice President for Research and Chief Scientific Officer,
      Health Sciences
      Vice Dean for Research, School of Medicine

DATE: January 27, 2014

SUBJECT: Closout of the School of Medicine Department of Physiology, including Graduate Program, for Academic Reasons

In accordance with University of Utah Policy 6-313, I request permission to close the Department of Physiology in the School of Medicine, including the Physiology graduate program, when the final graduate student has received his degree (expected to be Spring 2015).

Impact on Faculty: Under your direction, in 2012 I began working with Ed Dudek, Department Chair, and Physiology Department faculty on reassignment to the Departments of Internal Medicine/Cardiology, Neurosurgery, and Neurobiology and Anatomy in order to invigorate and strengthen neuroscience and cardiovascular research initiatives. Dr. Dudek, an internationally respected neurophysiologist, stepped down as Chair of Physiology to assume the role of Vice Chair for Research in Neurosurgery and appointments to Internal Medicine/Cardiology were initiated for Ken Spitzer and Mike Sanguinetti, both senior cardiovascular physiologists. Junior faculty Sharif Taha and Matt Wachowiak were transitioned to Neurobiology and Anatomy under the oversight of Monica Vetter, who, as you know, leads the health sciences Neuroscience initiative.

William C. Michel and Sal Fidone have retired. Lara Gawenis no longer works at the University. Mary Lucero and I are now the only faculty members in the department, and Mary is currently in a second one-year sabbatical at the American University of the Caribbean, to be completed in December 2014. Upon Dr. Lucero’s return, she will transition to another School of Medicine basic science department, most likely Neurobiology and Anatomy.
The transition of Physiology faculty has been a success, in terms of strengthening neuroscience and cardiovascular research initiatives and the related departments and programs.

**Teaching Responsibilities:** The teaching responsibilities of the Physiology Department have been successfully distributed to other School of Medicine departments.

**Impact on Graduate Students:** There are two graduate students completing their Physiology PhD requirements. One is expected to be awarded her degree in March 2014; the final student is expected to receive his degree in the Spring of 2015.

**Impact on Staff:** Physiology staff members have transitioned to other health sciences departments over the past two years; none were terminated. Vicki Skelton is the final part-time administrative staff member. She assists me and Chris LaSalle with department administrative issues, and we plan to fully transition her responsibilities and payroll to the Department of Neurosurgery in FY2015.

**Reasons for Recommending Department/Program Closure:** Physiology Department investigators, save for Dr. Lucero, who is currently on sabbatical through December 2014, have either been integrated into other department research structures, left the University, or retired from the University over the past two years. The department’s research mission has been subsumed into other departments and programs, and there is a plan for transitioning Dr. Lucero to another department on her return to the University.

In addition, School of Medicine teaching responsibilities have been disbursed across other basic science departments, and two final graduate students are completing their PhD requirements. It is thus reasonable to plan closeout of the department and graduate program.

**Consequences of Closure:** No untoward effects on faculty, staff, or students are anticipated. The research programs in the departments where faculty were reassigned have been strengthened.

**Timeline for Department/Program Closure:** Permission is requested to close the department and program after the final PhD student completes his degree—expected to be Spring 2015.
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      Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
      CEO, University of Utah Health Care

      Dean Y. Li, MD, PhD
      Associate Vice President for Research and Chief Scientific Officer, Health
      Sciences
      Vice Dean for Research, School of Medicine

DATE: February 10, 2014

SUBJECT: Proposal to Establish a new School of Medicine Department of Population
         Health Sciences and to Discontinue the Department of Physiology in 2015

It is with great pleasure that we present two proposals for your consideration: the first to
establish a School of Medicine Department of Population Health Sciences (PHS) and the
second to discontinue the School of Medicine Department of Physiology after the final
Physiology graduate student completes his degree requirements in Spring 2015. These
two actions are proposed separately, but are presented together because they are part of a
health sciences center strategic realignment in our clinical, research and education
missions. The proposed changes position the University of Utah to lead the nation in
health care transformation both academically and operationally.

The Department of Population Health Sciences will provide a durable basic science
departmental infrastructure for faculty whose research focus is on health care delivery
and broad-based patient populations; it will provide support, expertise and mentorship for
physicians and investigators across all departments who wish to pursue research interests
and questions from their current academic homes; and, finally, it will advance the
methodological bases for improving the care of patient populations and health care
delivery.

As a major academic health sciences center, we believe we have a unique and timely
opportunity to position Utah at the forefront of health care transformation. The creation
of this new department, which will extend existing population health and health systems research expertise at the University and build further collaborations across the campus, will be key to achieving this goal.

An enormous amount of creative work has gone into planning this new department. With the guidance of a large number of stakeholders, and the overriding support of the School of Medicine faculty, we believe we are proposing a structure that balances the need for departmental autonomy with integration and collaboration across departments and programs, and shared ownership of investigative processes. We are pleased to present this proposal for your consideration.

Over the past two years, the School of Medicine Department of Physiology has been reorganized in the service of strategic issues, specifically to strengthen neuroscience and cardiovascular research initiatives and to support the evolution of physiology in each of the School of Medicine basic science departments. Only the Acting Chair and one faculty member remain in the department, with plans for transition to another department of that faculty member; and two final graduate students are completing degree requirements. Permission to dissolve this department when the final graduate student meets his degree requirements will allow us to complete this strategic reorganization.

Thank you for your review of these proposals.
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Section I: Request

The University of Utah School of Medicine (SOM) requests permission to establish a Department of Population Health Sciences (PHS).

The Department of Population Health Sciences will provide three distinct but integrated roles: First, it will provide a durable basic science departmental infrastructure for faculty whose research focus is on patient and population oriented health care. Second, and equally important, it will provide support, expertise and mentorship for physicians and investigators across all departments who wish to pursue research interests and questions from their current academic homes. Third, it will advance the methodological bases for improving the care of patient and patient population-oriented health care delivery.

Faculty Consultation
In October 2013 the School of Medicine College Council Executive Committee unanimously approved the proposal for the new department. Following Executive Committee approval, department chairs were encouraged to provide information to their faculty on this proposal.

School of Medicine Faculty Vote: Between December 16 and 20, 2013, all SOM full-time faculty (1511) were asked to vote on the establishment of a Department of Population Health Sciences. Fifty-four percent of faculty participated, with 87% voting in favor of the proposal. The email invitation to faculty to vote, including background information, appears in Attachment 1. The voting summary is provided in Attachment 2.

Section II: Need

We recognize that both population health and health systems research expertise and successful scholarly work already exist within the University of Utah, but we also recognize the urgent need to broaden this knowledge and build on expertise in some specific areas. Cultivating these significant strengths will better equip the University to meet important challenges of evolving health care systems. The proposed Department of Population Health Sciences is designed to complement, strengthen and extend the capacity for scholarship within the School of Medicine, throughout the Health Sciences Center and across the entire University of Utah.

Specifically, this new department will be a hub for education, investigation and expertise in health services, cost, quality, outcomes, and health delivery systems research with the purpose of driving health care transformation. It will facilitate increased efficiency and effectiveness of clinical operations through support of population health management and quality improvement initiatives. PHS will serve faculty, fellows, residents and students and will enable such trainees to embrace the rapidly changing challenges of health care. The PHS department will help us fulfill our commitment to the state legislature that we will prepare our students to meet the demands of a transforming health care system. In addition, PHS will make us competitive for external funding in this burgeoning field, and it will position us as leaders in transforming health care in Utah and beyond.
The Population Health Sciences Department will work with existing graduate programs to integrate educational efforts aimed at population health and will also be able to host complementary programming to contribute to this field of scholarship. This educational functioning is designed to elevate existing academic programs and contribute to the University’s impact on advancing population health by introducing emphases in areas that are currently underrepresented.

Historically, departments within the School of Medicine have followed a traditional structure of aligning along defined specialties, functions, educational and accreditation requirements. The introduction of the PHS represents a shift in this paradigm. With increasing emphases on team-based scholarship, the distinctions along these traditional academic lines are increasingly blurred, thus allowing for more collaborative approaches to the advancement of knowledge. The proposed PHS department is positioned to take advantage of this changing paradigm and provides opportunities for cross-institutional approaches in health services and health systems scholarship to meet the multi-faceted challenges of health care transformation. The PHS department represents a significant increase in the durable academic infrastructure and a contribution to the expansion of multi-disciplinary collaborations that engage clinicians and methodologists across different types of relevant academic domains.

In parallel, new practices, policies and accreditation standards are promoting integrated health systems that rely on interdisciplinary partnerships. As more inter-professional approaches to learning, innovation and care are adopted, the responsibility, accountability and authority for safety, quality, efficiency and effectiveness of patient care are shifting away from a more individual focus to one that incorporates a system-based approach; an organizational shift for academic programming addressing health systems practices and pressures is needed. Multiple elements, including the Affordable Care Act (ACA), are influencing transformation of health care systems. Payers (both public and private) are increasing the pressure on these health care systems to provide accurate and relevant data that speak to quality of care, efficiency and value.

The PHS department is poised to be at the forefront of these new health care system changes by supporting rigorous approaches to investigation and education in such areas as value-based patient outcomes, quality, new business and financial models and health care delivery. These efforts can also serve to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of University of Utah Health Care clinical operations by supporting population health management and quality improvement. A Department of Population Health Sciences will position the University of Utah to be a value-driven organization that can lead health care transformation scholarship and implementation, and define health care for the future.

Expertise and successful scholarly work in value-based outcomes, quality and health care delivery research currently exist within the School of Medicine, for example in the Epidemiology Division of Internal Medicine, in the Public Health Division of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, and in Pediatrics. However, there is a need to extend this expertise into the other divisions of Internal Medicine, for example those areas studying cancer, diabetes, heart disease and aging; into all of the surgical subspecialties; into Obstetrics and Gynecology, Orthopaedics, and the clinical neurosciences; and into the diagnostics-focused departments of Radiology and Pathology. Because of the scale and cost of what would be required, population health sciences cannot be extended throughout the School of Medicine from one of the current population health sciences-related divisions or programs. It must be extended from a new department with a goal of further expanding and enhancing existing relationships with University of Utah Health Care and across the health sciences and University. The PHS department will
serve as a hub from which to broaden knowledge and expertise, and it will significantly enhance
the School of Medicine’s academic and clinical missions and impact research and training for
the health sciences and larger institution.

The creation of the PHS department will also afford an opportunity to more effectively compete
for new federal funding from the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI) and
the CMS Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation (CMMI), agencies with increased
research funding in a time of decreased federal agency budgets.

Mission
The mission of this new department will be to provide methodologic expertise and infrastructure
that will advance capacity for population health scientists to pursue impact-driven research and
allow clinical professionals to provide better patient and population-oriented care in an
increasingly complex health care delivery system.

Department Goals
- Achieve robust academic productivity as measured by the quality and quantity of funding
  and peer reviewed scholarship;
- Serve as a central educational backbone for population health sciences for the Center for
  Clinical and Translational Science (CCTS) to help advance investigation in this area and
  support graduate education;
- Provide a hub, through collaboration with clinical departments and University of Utah Health
  Care, for innovation and expertise in health services, cost, quality, safety, outcomes, and
  health care delivery systems research within our patient population;
- Facilitate increasing interactions between clinical and basic science departments in the
  School of Medicine: the PHS will work to advance health services and systems scholarship
  by expanding epidemiology, biostatistics and population studies capabilities and providing
  an additional and more direct path for basic scientists to impact health care;
- Provide interprofessional educational opportunities for the health sciences and vested
  interests in the main campus, including the College of Social and Behavioral Science and
  the David Eccles School of Business;
- Increase the efficiency and effectiveness of clinical operations through support of population
  health management and quality improvement; and
- Serve faculty, fellows, residents, and students by being a point from which they can engage
  in addressing the rapidly evolving challenges of health care.

Department Divisions
Initially, the department will likely include the following divisions:
1. **Health System Innovation and Research (HSIR):** Rachel Hess, M.D., was recruited
   from the University of Pittsburgh to serve as the director of the Health System Innovation
   and Research Program, and will begin work at Utah March 1st. Part of the HSIR
   Program will become a division in the new PHS Department, and Dr. Hess will lead both.
2. **Cancer Population Sciences:** Huntsman Cancer Institute is an enthusiastic supporter
   of the proposed department. The immediate 5-year plan is to recruit the Senior Director
   of Cancer Population Sciences (interviews are underway), who will also be appointed as
   Division Chief. In addition, HCI is committed to three additional faculty recruitments, at
   mid to senior level. Three HCI endowed chairs have been created to support faculty
   holding these positions.
3. **Biostatistical Methods:** Key stakeholders will assist the new chair in developing a
   biostatistical methods division, a department priority.
Department Chair Recruitment and Responsibilities

Our first priority, following appropriate approvals, will be for the Dean to recruit and appoint a department chair who shares the vision for this department and who understands the importance of moving forward expeditiously. While the goals, importance, and urgency for establishing this department have been described, it will be up to the chair to implement the vision. The new chair will recruit and retain faculty, facilitate connections and partnerships with clinical and basic science departments and with University of Utah Health Care, and lead the development and implementation of the department's academic and educational programs.

Dr. Dean Li, Associate Vice President for Research for the Health Sciences, will continue to lead the effort to establish the PHS Department until such time as it is appropriate to appoint an Interim Chair. The responsibilities of the interim chair are being defined and reviewed by the Health System Innovation and Research/Population Health Sciences Advisory Committee, as well as other key stakeholders, and names of qualified candidates are being collected and reviewed. Upon appropriate governance approvals, we will be poised to appoint an interim chair. The chair (and the interim chair) will report to Dr. Vivian Lee, Dean of the School of Medicine, as is the case with all other School of Medicine departments.

A critical and early task for the new department chair will be to establish appropriate graduate programming that will build on existing resources throughout the campus and serve as a catalyst for the academic mission of the PHS. As with all School of Medicine basic science departments (which are distinct from clinical departments), the PHS department will be an investigative PhD degree-granting department. It is anticipated that a new doctoral degree in Population Health Sciences will be needed to provide advanced educational capacity in health services and health systems research, including cost, quality, safety, and outcomes for patients and populations as they interact with health care delivery systems. It is recognized that collaborative cross-departmental teaching will enrich and strengthen the educational program by tapping into the expertise that exists across our university. The goal of the doctoral program will be to provide the knowledge and skills necessary for graduates to pursue an academic career in this field and to develop leaders in health care and health care transformation. Establishing a new degree is driven by the need to respond to changes in health care and by market forces. Planning for the program will be collaborative and will have broad representation of faculty to ensure a rich and rigorous program and also to ensure that programs are complementary.

Similar Units/Programs in the State and/or Intermountain Region

Closely related to the academic scope of this proposed department is the field of Public Health. Along with the University of Utah Division of Public Health in the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, there are several other accredited public health academic units in the Intermountain region. In Utah, both Brigham Young University and Westminster College have public health programs. In the surrounding states, there are public health units in Colorado (University of Colorado, School of Public Health), Nevada (both University of Nevada Reno and University of Nevada Las Vegas have Schools of Community Health Sciences), and Idaho (Idaho State Public Health Program). The distinction between the PHS and these Council on Education for Public Health-accredited programs is that the PHS will focus on health service and health systems research and will focus educational programming on research within the scope previously described. Additionally, Oregon State University has a School of Biological and Population Health Sciences that follows a traditional public health model with a multi-disciplinary approach linking biology and behavior to population and environmental health.
Intermountain Healthcare has an *Institute for Health Care Delivery Research* that emphasizes quality and safety in health care policy and practice by serving as a model learning organization. As such, its goal is to improve quality and reduce the cost of health care services by delivering education, providing technical support, and generating/disseminating evidence. Its research mission supports operational and service excellence and process management across the Intermountain Healthcare system and with its external partners. While this program is nationally recognized for its quality and safety accomplishments, it is not part of an academic institution. However, it does provide outstanding collaborative opportunities.

**Section III: Institutional Impact**

**Impact on Enrollments in Instructional Programs of Affiliated Departments or Programs**

A number of units across the University of Utah are engaged in population or population health scholarship. After the department has been established and the department chair has been identified and recruited, the initial focus of the new chair will be to establish synergistic collaborations across units to strengthen research and educational efforts. The curriculum for a doctoral degree will be developed at that point. In collaboration with other units, that graduate program will be differentiated from existing programs and specifically designed to achieve synergies among similar programs.

**Potential areas of collaboration include:**

- Department of Family and Preventive Medicine  
  - Division of Public Health  
  - Division of Occupational and Environmental Health
- Department of Internal Medicine  
  - Division of Epidemiology  
  - Division of Genetic Epidemiology
- Department of Biomedical Informatics
- Department of Surgery  
  - Surgical Systems Innovation Research Team
- College of Pharmacy  
  - Department of Pharmacotherapy (and the Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research Center)
- Department of Pediatrics  
  - Intermountain Injury Control Research Center  
  - Other pediatric research groups – may get input from Carrie Byington
- Huntsman Cancer Institute Cancer Control and Population Sciences
- Center for Clinical and Translational Sciences  
  - Study Design and Biostatistics Core  
  - Patient Centered Research Methods Core  
  - Community Outreach and Collaboration Core
- College of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
  - Economics – especially Health Economics  
  - Family and Consumer Studies – especially Consumer and Community Studies (including health)
  - Geography  
  - Psychology  
  - Sociology – especially Population and Health emphasis
- College of Engineering  
  - Mechanical Engineering – Ergonomics and Safety
Impact on Existing Administrative Structures
The PHS department will provide an enduring departmental infrastructure to:

- Move quickly and efficiently in response to specific Huntsman Cancer Institute (HCI) and Center for Clinical and Translational Science (CCTS) requests for a central population sciences structure;
- Provide increased support to established and new population health sciences programs such as the Health System Innovation and Research Program and the Department of Surgery’s Surgical Systems Innovation Research team;
- Ensure that the University is competitive for new sources of funding (specifically the federally funded Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute [PCORI] and the CMS Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation [CMMI]) in this rapidly expanding field.

Organizational Structure
The Department of Population Health Sciences will reside in the School of Medicine. The overall School of Medicine departmental infrastructure will not change.

Faculty and Staff Changes
A Chair will be recruited, followed by recruitment of an estimated 5 to 6 faculty members over five years as well as support staff. The department will be built almost exclusively through external recruitment; there may be one or two transfers to the new department from an existing department (e.g., possibly Internal Medicine), but this would only happen with the full involvement and permission of the department chair. In addition, the PHS department will partner with clinical departments and Huntsman Cancer Institute to recruit additional population health sciences-focused clinicians and investigators. Faculty recruited through these partnerships will be housed in the partnering units, but will collaborate with PHS department faculty, thereby strengthening the PHS department, partnering department and institution.

The new department will provide investigative and educational expertise to faculty and trainees in such patient and population health care delivery focused areas as value-based outcomes, safety and quality. Mentors for trainees will be sought broadly in the health sciences and main campus. Faculty beyond the department who hold appropriate credentials—specific expertise and sufficient external funding to support trainees—may be eligible to serve as mentors.

Faculty appointments to this department, whether new faculty recruitments or adjunct appointments for faculty who hold primary appointments in other School of Medicine departments, will be managed through the School of Medicine’s ARPT process. All policies and procedures that apply across the School of Medicine will apply to this department.

Physical Facilities
- Short-term. The Department of Population Health Sciences will initially be housed in the Williams Building in Research Park.
• **Longer-term.** When construction of the new Medical Education and Discovery (MED) Building (the 521 School of Medicine replacement building) is complete, the goal is to colocate Population Health Sciences with related units, e.g., the Division of Epidemiology (Internal Medicine), the Pediatric Outcomes Research Unit, Biomedical Informatics, and the Surgical Systems Innovation Research team, to create a platform for academic investigation and health care delivery innovation.

• **HCI Cancer Population Sciences.** The Division of Cancer Population Sciences will be housed in Huntsman Cancer Institute space.

**Equipment for New Department**
Computers and office equipment will be required.

**Section IV: Finances**

The department will initially be funded with state and institutional dollars (allocation of these funds to a new department has been approved by the School of Medicine chairs). A new Department Chair will recruit 4 to 5 faculty members directly into the department over five years; he or she will also partner with clinical departments and Huntsman Cancer Institute during this same period to recruit an additional estimated 9 population health investigators (clinical departments 5-6; HCI 4). The faculty who come to the University as a result of these joint PHS/clinical department recruitments will be located in the partnering department rather than in the PHS department.

Huntsman Cancer Institute is interviewing for a Senior Director of Cancer Population Science, who will also serve as a division chief in the PHS department. HCI has also committed to three additional population science faculty recruitments that include endowed chairs.

The department will aggressively pursue external grant and contract funding from federal programs focused on population health sciences research and patient care improvements, e.g. PCORI, CMS/CMMI. PCORI and CMS/CMMI represent an island of increased federal funding opportunity in an otherwise difficult funding environment for medical science research. The expectation is that grant/contract funding will continue to increase, benefitting both the PHS department and partnering departments, and in the second five years of the department will become the predominant funding stream. **State funds allocations for any current basic or clinical department will not be diminished based on these changes.** The summary budget below includes support for a Chair and faculty recruitment described above. Support staff, including administrative and data management staff, and non-personnel costs are also included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHS Department 5 Year Budget Projection</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>5 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departmental Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>1,657,000</td>
<td>2,142,960</td>
<td>2,404,249</td>
<td>2,476,376</td>
<td>2,550,668</td>
<td>11,231,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>507,350</td>
<td>663,258</td>
<td>746,106</td>
<td>768,489</td>
<td>791,544</td>
<td>3,476,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel Expense</td>
<td>$ 2,164,350</td>
<td>$ 2,806,218</td>
<td>$ 3,150,355</td>
<td>$ 3,244,865</td>
<td>$ 3,342,211</td>
<td>$ 14,707,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-personnel Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Expenses</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Funds</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Discretionary Funds</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Costs</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-personnel Expense</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>985,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Institutional Funds</td>
<td>1,254,500</td>
<td>1,537,544</td>
<td>1,561,012</td>
<td>1,796,226</td>
<td>1,844,563</td>
<td>7,993,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>573,850</td>
<td>854,129</td>
<td>1,108,072</td>
<td>1,242,497</td>
<td>1,279,772</td>
<td>5,058,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Departments/HCI</td>
<td>546,000</td>
<td>624,546</td>
<td>676,271</td>
<td>391,142</td>
<td>402,876</td>
<td>2,640,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section V: Program Curriculum**

**Certificate, and/or Degree(s) to Be Awarded:**
A proposal to create a PhD program will be submitted separately, following approval of the Department of Population Health Sciences and with the oversight of its inaugural department chair. A PhD program will become a foundational element in the new department, and preliminary, interdisciplinary discussions are underway to develop a framework complementary to the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine’s PhD in Public Health.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Informatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurobiology and Anatomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>FPM/Division of Public Health</td>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Health Sciences Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huntsman Cancer Institute CEO and Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Clinical and Translational Science Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health System Innovation &amp; Research Program Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Campus Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interim Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, David Eccles School of Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Email invitation to faculty to vote on the proposed department, including frequently asked questions – 12/16/13
The School of Medicine seeks to establish a Department of Population Health Sciences. The transition of the Physiology Department over the past two years to strengthen team science in a Neurosciences initiative and in a Cardiovascular initiative provides the School of Medicine an opportunity to form this new Department of Population Health Sciences. As a full-time faculty member, we are seeking your vote to establish this Department of Population Health Sciences in the Fall of 2014, with voting to take place the week of December 16-20. A simple majority of votes cast will determine the outcome.

The SOM Executive Committee, which comprises the Department Chairs as well as student and house officer representatives, unanimously approved the proposal to form the Department of Population Health Sciences in October. The SOM Mission-based Management Advisory Committee approved the funds allocation model to support this department.

More information and frequently asked questions can be found in the link below. Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Dean Y. Li, M.D., Ph.D.
Associate Vice President for Research and Chief Scientific Officer, Health Sciences; Vice Dean for Research, School of Medicine; HA and Edna Benning Endowed Professor of Medicine and Cardiology

Faculty Vote on Population Health Sciences Department

The Department of Population Health Sciences will provide a durable basic science departmental infrastructure for faculty focusing exclusively on population health. But, importantly, it will also provide support, expertise and mentorship for physicians and investigators across all departments who wish to pursue studies in population health sciences from their current academic homes. It will strengthen methodologically-oriented research in the population health disciplines throughout the health sciences campus and the greater University community. We recognize that expertise and very successful scholarly work already exists in specific areas within the School of Medicine, but we also recognize that there is an urgent need to broaden this knowledge and expertise into additional existing specialties. This new Department will complement, strengthen and extend what we currently have.

The new department will be a center for education, investigation and expertise in health services, cost, quality, outcomes, and health delivery systems research. It will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of clinical operations through support of population health management and quality improvement initiatives. It will serve faculty, fellows, residents, and students and will be the point from which we transition our medical school structure to enable all our trainees to address the rapidly changing challenges of health care. We have committed to the state legislature that we will prepare our faculty, students, residents, and fellows for the demands of health care transformation, and as an organization, we are committed to providing this leadership. The Population Health Sciences department will also provide, in collaboration with the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, a broad-based graduate program that encompasses the disciplines of population health.

1. Link to FAQs  Frequently Asked Questions

2. I support the creation of a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine. *
   - Yes
   - No
   - Abstain
   - Clear

* = Required

Finish
Frequently Asked Questions:

I am an assistant professor in a basic science department. What relevance will this new department have for me?
This new department will facilitate interactions between clinical and basic science departments. It will have strong epidemiology, biostatistics and population studies capabilities and will provide a new and easier path for basic scientists to potentially impact health care. Many of the databases required for outcomes research are also valuable for developing new genetic insights and biomarkers for human diseases.

What happens to the Physiology Department?
Over the past 2 years, Physiology Department faculty members have been realigned with the School of Medicine departments of Neurobiology & Anatomy, Neurosurgery, and Internal Medicine to strengthen neuroscience and cardiovascular research initiatives. Physiology teaching responsibilities have been distributed successfully to other basic science departments.

If I am a faculty member in the Department of Internal Medicine, the Department of Surgery or any other clinical department and have an interest in population health sciences, do I have to change departments?
No. The new department can serve as an invaluable resource for you to pursue those interests while you remain in your current academic home. For some investigators, there will be opportunities to hold secondary appointments in the new department.

If I am a faculty member in a clinical department, what specific advantages will this new department afford me?
With expertise in epidemiology, biostatistics and population studies, this basic science department will be a critical partner to outcomes researchers in established divisions, such as Internal Medicine/Genetic Epidemiology, Pediatrics, and Family and Preventive Medicine. It will also provide a partnering department for the Surgical Systems Innovation Research team (SSIR) being developed by Samuel Finlayson, Chair of Surgery, and for Huntsman Cancer Institute’s new section of Cancer Population Sciences, a strategic priority as defined by Mary Beckerle, HCI CEO/Director. For other clinical departments this department will provide an opportunity to develop a population health sciences research portfolio and to participate in advancing clinical practices.

How will this new department impact the funds allocation to my current department?
We are allocating new state dollars to this department, with funding through the SOM MBM allocation model. State funds allocations will not be reduced for any current department, basic or clinical.

Are the clinical and basic science Department Chairs supportive of this new department?
Clinical department and institute leadership appreciate the current basic science department structure that affords ample opportunity for research collaboration. These same leaders have asked that the institution create an additional basic science structure to support development of population health sciences research in their departments. This new department was formed partly in response to that need but also in response to the pressures and opportunities of health care transformation.
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Faculty vote summary – 12/20/13
Populatcion Sciences Faculty Vote Brief Report

Generated: December 20, 2013 5:04 PM

Campaign Settings

Access Type: Invited
Anonymous: Yes

Invitee Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Invitees</th>
<th>Invitees Completed Questionnaire</th>
<th>Percent Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 1: Page 1

1. FAQ
   Invites Answered = 0
   Avg. Choice Number = 0.00

2. Support Population Sciences
   Invites Answered = 820
   Avg. Choice Number = 1.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. No</th>
<th>3. Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>87% (711)</td>
<td>8% (66)</td>
<td>5% (43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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History and Charge - Health System Innovation and Research/Population Health Sciences Advisory Committee
Committee History and Charge

Health System Innovation and Research (HSIR) Program/
Population Health Sciences (PHS) Department Advisory Committee
University of Utah Health Sciences

The University of Utah has substantial expertise in health systems and outcomes research, but prior to 2012 it had been siloed. At the direction of Dr. Vivian Lee, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences and Dean of the School of Medicine, key stakeholders from the health science colleges, University of Utah Health Care, the Salt Lake City VA Medical Center and Intermountain Healthcare were brought together in mid-2012 in a planning retreat to address how best to align and integrate health services research and systems across the University. A strategy for building an HSIR Program was formalized, a program mission statement developed, and the recommendation made that a program director be recruited. Dr. Dean Li, Associate Vice President for Research for the Health Sciences and School of Medicine Vice Dean for Research, serves as committee chair.

Under the leadership of a working group of the HSIR Advisory Committee, a national search for a program director was launched and was eventually completed in the Fall of 2013. Dr. Rachel Hess, from the University of Pittsburgh, was selected as the inaugural director and will assume her position at the University of Utah starting March 1, 2014.

The HSIR Advisory Committee has also established a robust mentoring program and application review process for those seeking CMS/CMMI and PCORI funding under the purview of senior directors Drs. Diana Brixner and Carrie McAdam-Marx. This mentoring program regularly brings together junior and senior investigators from across campus.

With the HSIR Program underway and a Program Director recruited, the charge of the Advisory Committee has been expanded to include advising health sciences leadership on the development of a Population Health Sciences Department, including recruitment of a department chair. This highly effective committee includes stakeholders from across the health sciences, from main campus, and from the VA Medical Center and Intermountain Healthcare. It will continue to play a pivotal role in guiding the formation of the proposed new Department of Population Health Sciences.

An HSIR/PHS Advisory Committee roster follows.

02/01/2014
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Membership - Health System Innovation and Research/Population Health Sciences Advisory Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alder, Stephen C., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Chief, Division of Public Health, Dept of Family and Preventive Medicine, School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, Susan L., Ph.D., APRN, FAAN</td>
<td>Director, PhD Program, College of Nursing, Director, Center for Clinical and Translational Science (CCTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixner, Diana I., Ph.D., RPh</td>
<td>Professor and Chair, Department of Pharmacotherapy, Executive Director, Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research Center, College of Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byington, Carrie L., M.D.</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Faculty Development, Associate Director, Children's Health, Center for Clinical and Translational Science (CCTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman, Wendy W., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor and Chair, Department of Biomedical Informatics, School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finlayson, Samuel R. G., M.P.H., M.D.</td>
<td>Professor, Claudia Y. Gates, MD, and Catherine B. Gates, Presidential Endowed Chair in Surgery, Department of Surgery, School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene, Tom H., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor of Internal Medicine, Division of Epidemiology, Director, Study Design and Biostatistics Center, Center for Clinical and Translational Science (CCTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn, Susan D., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Research Professor, Division of Physical Therapy, COH, Adjunct Professor, Nursing, DFPM, Physical Med &amp; Rehab, Senior Scientist, Institute for Clinical Outcomes Research, Vice President, Research, International Severity Information Systems, Inc., Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Brian R., M.D.</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Department of Pathology, School of Medicine, Medical Director of Informatics, ARUP Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawamoto, Kensaku, M.D., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Director, Knowledge Management and Mobilization, UUHC, Assistant Professor, Department of Biomedical Informatics, School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Dean Y., M.D., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for Research and Chief Scientific Officer, Health Sciences, Vice Dean for Research, School of Medicine, Director, Molecular Medicine Program, Professor, Department of Internal Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magill, Michael K., M.D.</td>
<td>Professor and Chair, Dept of Family and Preventive Medicine, School of Medicine, Executive Medical Director, University of Utah Health Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClain, Donald A., M.D., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for Clinical Research, Director, Center for Clinical and Translational Science (CCTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooney, Kathleen, Ph.D., RN, FAAN</td>
<td>Professor, College of Nursing, Co-leader, Cancer Control and Population Sciences Program, Huntsman Cancer Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendleton, Robert C., M.D.</td>
<td>Chief Medical Quality Officer, University of Utah Health Care, Associate Professor, Department of Internal Medicine, School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samore, Matthew H., M.D.</td>
<td>Professor, Department of Internal Medicine, Adjunct Professor, Department of Biomedical Informatics, Adjunct Associate Professor, DFPM, School of Medicine, PI, Salt Lake VA Informatics Decision Enhancement and Surveillance (IDEAS) Center and VA Consortium for Healthcare Informatics Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savitz, Lucy A., Ph.D., M.B.A.</td>
<td>Professor, Department of Internal Medicine, Adjunct Associate Professor, College of Nursing, DFPM, Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, Institute for Healthcare Delivery Research, Intermountain Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scammon, Debra L., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor, Marketing Department, David Eccles School of Business, Adjunct Professor, Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srivastava, Rajendu, M.D., M.P.H.</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, Fellow, Institute of Healthcare Delivery Research, Intermountain Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong, Michael B., M.D.</td>
<td>Chief Medical Information Officer, University of Utah, Associate Professor, Department of Internal Medicine, Adjunct Associate Professor, Department of Biomedical Informatics, School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitzman, Norman J., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor, Department of Economics, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Co-director, Health Society and Policy Program, University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Letters of Support

Health Sciences College Deans/Eccles Health Sciences Library Director
Dean, School of Dentistry                                Rena N. D'Souza, DDS, PhD
Interim Dean, College of Health                         Robin L. Marcus, PhD
Dean, College of Nursing                                  Patricia G. Morton, PhD, RN, FAAN
Dean, College of Pharmacy                                  Chris M. Ireland, PhD
Director, Eccles Health Sciences Library                  Jean P. Shipman, MSLS, AHIP, FMLA

School of Medicine Department Chairs and Division Chiefs
Basic Science Chairs (1 letter)
Biochemistry (Co-chairs)                                  Christopher P. Hill, DPhil; Wesley I. Sundquist, PhD
Biomedical Informatics                                     Wendy W. Chapman, PhD (separate letter follows)
Human Genetics                                           Lynn B. Jorde, PhD
Neurobiology and Anatomy                                  Monica Vetter, PhD
Oncological Sciences                                      Bradley R. Cairns, PhD

Clinical Chairs
Family and Preventive Medicine                           Michael K. Magill, MD
  FPM/Division of Public Health                           Stephen C. Alder, PhD
Internal Medicine                                         John R. Hoidal, MD
  IM/Epidemiology Division                                Matthew H. Samore, MD
Neurology                                                 Stefan M. Pulst, MD, Dr. Med.
Obstetrics and Gynecology                                 C. Matthew Peterson, MD
Ophthalmology/Moran Eye Center                            Randall J. Olson, MD
Orthopaedics                                              Charles L. Saltzman, MD
Pediatrics                                                Edward B. Clark, MD
Surgery                                                   Samuel R. G. Finlayson, MD, MPH

Other Health Sciences Leadership
Huntsman Cancer Institute CEO and Director                Mary Beckerle, PhD
Center for Clinical and Translational Science Directors  Don McClain, MD, PhD; Carrie Byington, MD
Health System Innovation & Research Program Director     Rachel Hess, MD

Main Campus Leadership
Interim Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Science    Cynthia Berg, PhD
Dean, David Eccles School of Business                    Taylor Randall, PhD – letter to be submitted separately as an amendment
February 5, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

RE: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Lee:

As the new Dean of the new School of Dentistry, I fully support the creation of a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine. I am in the process of building and recruiting my leadership team; a major consideration as I am recruiting faculty for the School is my strong commitment to pursue quality and outcomes research.

The new Department of Population Health Sciences will be an extremely valuable asset as we advance those research priorities. This department, and the opportunities it provides for interprofessional partnerships in research and education, illustrate the strong commitment of the Health Sciences Center to value based outcomes, high quality care and advancing the methodological bases for improving the care of patient populations. This commitment is a strength that serves our recruitment efforts well.

In summary, the Health Sciences Center provides remarkable expertise and resources for faculty, residents and students. This new department will complement the existing resources, will position us as leaders in this new academic field, and will increase our competitiveness for external funding.

Thank you for the opportunity to state my strong support for the Department of Population Health Sciences.

Best regards,

Rena D’Souza, DDS, PhD, MS
Dean, School of Dentistry
January 10, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

Re: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Lee:

I am writing to strongly endorse the establishment of the Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine.

As the Dean of the College of Health, I am thrilled to support this new department in the School of Medicine, specifically as it relates to our developing portfolio of population health sciences research. Our vision is to become one of the recognized national leaders in Health Services and Comparative Effectiveness Research related to rehabilitation and disease prevention. The support, expertise and mentorship provided by this new department will greatly enhance our ability to do so.

With expertise in epidemiology, biostatistics and population studies, this department will be a critical partner to our established outcomes researchers in the departments of Physical Therapy, Communication Sciences and Disorders, and Nutrition. Dr. Julie Fritz, a professor in the Department of Physical Therapy, is a national leader in this area and will be an obvious collaborator with the new department. In developing this new department, the University of Utah is demonstrating an institutional commitment to innovative interprofessional education, practice, and research environments, all critical to the transformation of health care. Recruitment of top tier faculty and further program development to facilitate health services research across Campus will be greatly enhanced by the new Department of Population Health Sciences. This is an area of research that is sorely lacking in the rehabilitation fields, and one that our faculty and students can capitalize on for the overall improvement of health care and cost containment.

Sincerely,

Robin L. Marcus, PhD
Interim Dean, College of Health
January 21, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

Re: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Lee:

As the Dean of the College of Nursing, I wish to express my enthusiastic support for the creation of a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine.

Much of the research done by faculty and students in the College of Nursing is population health science, so the development of this new organizational unit offers great promise to complement the research in our college. This includes research in technology-assisted models of care such as the telephone-linked system of care, developed by Distinguished Professor Kathi Mooney, currently under investigation in several large NIH-supported studies or Dr. Mollie Cummins’s AHRQ-funded studies linking Poison Control Centers and the Emergency Departments to improve the handoff of care and outcomes in children and adults who have ingested harmful substances. A few of the many examples of other relevant funded research of the College of Nursing faculty are a systems-level intervention to improve pain management in over 300 hospitals, compassionate and cost-effective hospice care in the growing number of prisoners who are approaching end of life, evaluation of interprofessional training on management of care transitions, and clinical decision support for prescribers in pediatric critical care. A growing number of the studies in the College of Nursing utilize “big data” approaches to elucidate patients at risk for adverse outcomes and the most effective nursing strategies to improve outcomes and reduce costs.

Recent initiatives in the health sciences on a national and campus level have increased the emphasis on interdisciplinary and interprofessional research, education, and practice. Virtually every current research project in the College of Nursing involves team science including investigators from multiple disciplines. Because nursing science focuses on prevention, management of symptoms that cross the traditional medical specialties, and life transitions such as end-of-life care, a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine will be a natural source of interprofessional collaborations for scientists in the College of Nursing. Doctoral students and postdoctoral trainees in the college will benefit from enhanced training opportunities and mentored experiences. We can anticipate that the quality and quantity of studies and interprofessional education will be enhanced.

As you deliberate the creation of a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine, please consider the great benefit for research, education, and practice throughout the Health Sciences campus, and even the entire university.

Sincerely,

Patricia Gonce Morton, PhD, RN, FAAN
Dean and Professor
Louis H. Peery Endowed Chair
Robert Wood Johnson Executive Nurse Fellow

Office of the Dean
10 South 2000 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-6680
801-581-3252 – Office
801-587-9818 – Fax
Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

Re: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine

January 9, 2014

Dear Dr. Lee:

I wish to express my support for the creation of a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine. As you are aware The College of Pharmacy has major programs focused on outcomes research and personalized medicine. One of the primary aims of The Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research Center is to utilize large patient population databases along with medical records to model comparative effectiveness of different therapeutics modalities. Thus, the core faculty of Clinical PharmDs, and research and tenured faculty involved in clinical pharmacy, outcomes, economics and health services research would be well complemented by physician clinicians in the field to address patient centric, personalized research questions.

Interactions with the PHS Department and the HSIR committee will strengthen our ability to recruit top notch researchers and clinicians into this field in the College of Pharmacy and to expand our expertise in PCORI, AHRQ, NIH and other federal grant opportunities. Students enrolled in our PhD program in Pharmacotherapy Outcomes Research and Health Policy will undoubtedly benefit through their interactions and collaborations with PHS faculty and students.

Sincerely,

Chris M. Ireland
Professor and Dean
L. S. Skaggs Presidential Endowed Chair for Pharmacy
January 11, 2014
Vivian S. Lee, M.D., Ph.D., M.B.A.
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University Health Care

Dear Dr. Lee,

The Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library appreciates the opportunity to express strong support for the proposed new Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine, University of Utah. In particular, we encourage the development of programs with this department which create and build on the formation and enhancement of cross-discipline synergies.

The Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library sees the need for this new department and is fully committed to supporting it, focusing on the development of the skills and expertise required to assure faculty and student success. Toward that end, Eccles Library can assist personnel within the new department with being productive and with learning new information discovery and management skills. It can offer collaborative space and interprofessional opportunities for faculty development and for team science to occur. Our research support service RISE (Research Information Services) will be available to all faculty and students within this new department as well as those who work in conjunction with the department. This service will support methodological-oriented research in the population health disciplines and can help to facilitate connections among those doing research in the areas of epidemiology, biostatistics and population studies. These services are offered to clinical and basic sciences faculty and students.

The Eccles Library expects to be able to provide required information resources in partnership with those offered by the Marriott Library. Of particular importance for this department is access to a wide variety of electronic information resources. Our three University libraries and the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC) work together to obtain access to a full range of electronic journals and databases. Eccles Library, in particular, provides access, training, and assistance on searching PubMed, environmental health, and CINAHL: The Cumulative Index to Nursing and Health Literature, and a wide range of other health resources including those geared to the lay individual (MedlinePlus). We also use an interlibrary loan service for students, staff and faculty through which access is provided to the collections of a nationwide network of health science libraries, including the National Library of Medicine. In addition, we have access to two companies that provide journal articles on demand to users' desktops within minutes.

In summary, there are significant benefits to be gained from the proposed new department; the Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library fully supports its creation.

Sincerely yours,

Jean P. Shipman, MSLS, AHIP, FMLA
Director

Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library
10 N 1900 E
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
January 27, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

Re: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences

Dear Dr. Lee:

As Chairs of Basic Science Departments in the School of Medicine, we wish to express our strong support for the creation of a Population Health Sciences (PHS) Department. This department has the potential to have a profound positive impact on research carried out in clinical departments and on University of Utah Health Care clinical operations. Just as importantly, it will facilitate increased interactions between clinical and basic science departments. The new PHS department will work to advance health services and systems scholarship by expanding epidemiology, biostatistics and population studies capabilities and will provide a more direct path for basic scientists to impact health care.

Included below are specific examples of the expected positive impact of collaborations with the PHS Department on our units:

**Biochemistry Department**: Biochemistry investigators are intimately involved in research in infectious diseases, cancer mechanisms, and in a health sciences strategic initiative surrounding metabolism/diabetes. Investigators in this department are also increasingly interested in the role of the mitochondria in multiple diseases and conditions. Understanding how discoveries that emerge from these studies can be rapidly used to alter risk stratification and delivery of current treatments, for example in advanced heart failure, will be crucial to patient care.

**Biomedical Informatics Department**: Biomedical Informatics is at the center of a reorganization of our hospital-based data system. It is clear that this data will be invaluable in identifying patterns of successes and patterns of needed improvements in various integrated practice units (service lines). To become a learning health system, such data structure and mining must be optimized to facilitate the academic and operational missions of a PHS Department in health care delivery reorganization.

**Human Genetics Department**: Every new gene discovery being unveiled by the health sciences strategic initiative Utah Genome Project must be fodder for new diagnostics. The impact of such discoveries will undoubtedly unleash new mechanistic and therapeutic work—but such genetic/genomic information will also immediately risk-stratify patients for either treatment or no treatment of a certain kind. This principle is even clearer with the cost of undiagnosed and rare
diseases, which have a disproportionate genetic underpinning and disproportionate health care costs. Through the collaboration of Human Genetics and the proposed PHS Department, these discoveries will provide a clearer path for patients and their families, who often enter an unending diagnostic odyssey.

Neurobiology and Anatomy Department: Neurobiology and Anatomy is driving a neuroscience initiative with its cognate School of Medicine clinical departments to produce a basic/translational/clinical impact on neurologic and cognitive medicine. For this initiative to be successful, it must establish a clear focus, given that neuroscience diseases have not only enormous medical costs, but also disproportionate larger economic costs. Population Health Sciences has been proposed as a critical component of the neuroscience initiative, linking basic and translational research with clinical impact and outcomes.

Oncological Sciences Department: The Oncological Sciences Department is intimately linked to the Huntsman Cancer Institute’s mission of improving cancer prevention, diagnosis, and treatment—by facilitating and housing basic, translational and cancer population science programs. The Department houses faculty who continue to discover cancer-causing genes and pathways in human populations (e.g., BRCA1 and APC), as well as faculty with laboratory programs aimed at cancer gene diagnosis/detection, functional characterization, and therapy design. We also aim to maximize the impact of such discoveries into cancer delivery. Here, faculty within the new Department of Population Sciences will collaborate with our faculty on many levels, which will enable cancer gene discovery and facilitate an understanding of cancer gene/mutation prevalence and risk within populations. The PHS Department members will also be active in defining cost effective measures to reduce the burden of cancer in populations—while carefully considering outcomes and economic issues. Population health science investigators are sorely needed in this process, but their primary appointment in Oncological Sciences is not the ideal setting, as our faculty is largely focused on laboratory programs for cancer gene discovery, characterization, and therapy design—rather than population studies—but there will undoubtedly be close collaboration and synergy.

We look forward to the opportunity to work with the faculty of this new department.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Hill, D.Phil.
Leo T. and Barbara K. Samuels Presidential Endowed Chair
Distinguished Professor and Co-Chair of Biochemistry

Wesley L. Sundquist, Ph.D.
H.A. and Edna Benning Presidential Chair and
Co-Chair of Biochemistry
Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Re: Proposed Population Health Sciences Department
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Wendy W. Chapman, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Biomedical Informatics

Lynn B. Jorde, Ph.D.
H.A. and Edna Benning Presidential Endowed Chair
Professor and Chair, Department of Human Genetics

Monica Vetter, Ph.D.
George and Lorna Winder Professor of Neuroscience
Chair, Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy

Bradley R. Cairns, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Oncological Sciences
Investigator, Howard Hughes Medical Institute
January 21, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

Re: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences

Dear Dr. Lee:

As Chair of the department of Biomedical Informatics, I am pleased to express my support for the establishment of the Department of Population Health Sciences (PHS) in the School of Medicine.

The creation of the department of PHS will provide additional opportunities for our faculty in the DBMI to participate in population’s based studies. DBMI faculty will be able to contribute our expertise in building infrastructure for data acquisition and analysis necessary for PHS research and I envision that new and interesting collaborations will develop. Of particular interest to us is the ability to develop external collaborations that include both programmatic research and innovative infrastructure development, because it is increasingly difficult for us to secure funding for just infrastructure development outside the context of specific programmatic goals. I anticipate that this will also greatly benefit the Biomedical Informatics Core of the CCTS, as we anticipate the hiring of new faculty in the new department of PHS interested in the services of this core. I also expect that selected faculty from the new department of PHS will be offered adjunct faculty status in our department, creating new opportunities for research project for our graduate students.

Overall I believe that the creation of the department of PHS will have a beneficial impact on the DBMI and I am happy to express my support for the creation of the Department of PHS in the SOM.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Wendy W. Chapman, PhD
Professor and Chair
Department of Biomedical Informatics
January 29, 2014

Dean Y. Li, M.D., Ph.D.
Associate Vice President for Research and
Chief Scientific Officer, Health Sciences
Vice Dean for Research, University of Utah School of Medicine
George and Dolores Eccles Institute of Human Genetics
Molecular Medicine
15 N 2030 E
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Re: Letter of Support for Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences,
University of Utah School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Li:

I am pleased to offer this letter of enthusiastic support for formation of the
proposed new Department of Population Health Sciences (PHS) in the School of
Medicine. This department will help position the University of Utah as a national
leader in the extremely important transformation under way in the delivery of
health care.

Health care delivery is changing more rapidly now than at any time in memory.
Because of well-recognized high cost of care in the United States, combined with
health outcomes that fall behind many other industrialized nations, we must
transform health care to provide higher value. Value must be approached from
the perspective of the care of populations in addition to our traditional focus of
care of individuals. We provide some populations comprehensive care,
everything from primary care to heart transplants. For other, regional and
supra-regional populations, we provide only very subspecialized care. But value
for either of these groups is defined as quality plus patient experience divided by
cost. Another way of describing this is that we must achieve the so called “triple
aim” in which we improve health of populations, experience care, and control
cost.

The University of Utah is well positioned nationally and internationally to lead in
this transformation. As a unified health sciences center (HSC) with an unusually
collaborative culture between the University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics, School of Medicine, and across the University, we are positioned to implement the new team-oriented approach to health care and scholarship that will characterize the transformation. We benefit from several existing building blocks in the School of Medicine in departments such as Family and Preventive Medicine, Internal Medicine, Pediatrics, and now the Department of Surgery, all of which have efforts underway in clinical research and development of health services. We have multiple new efforts across the HSC in areas such as Exceptional Patient Experience, LEAN Design, and health research training programs for faculty. I have been a part of this effort for the last decade, particularly in our primary care practice network transformation and resulting research and educational programs. More recently, I have taken on a new role in leadership with the University of Utah Health Plans (UUHP). Focused on maximizing value of care for defined insured populations such as University of Utah employees and Medicaid patients, UUHP is a key asset for accelerating transformation.

In the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, our Division of Public Health is very focused on health of communities and linkages between advanced public health and clinical health care delivery. In addition, our Division of Occupational and Environmental Health focuses on work-based populations, including work related exposures, environmental exposures, illnesses and injuries resulting from these and programs to prevent them. Our Divisions of Family Medicine and Physician Assistants focus on provision of care at the front line, population-based, community level. The new Department of Population Health Sciences will complement these efforts by increasing our capabilities in care of identified patients.

The School of Medicine is also creating other building blocks that will help make our Department of Population Health Sciences successful. Notably, of course, the Health Systems Innovation and Research (HSIR) Program will facilitate work of clinicians in health services research in departments lacking critical mass of such faculty members at the present time. The Department of Population Health Sciences incorporating the HSIR Program will build our methodical strength with faculty who can work across the health system.

In addition, both the HSIR Program and the Department of Population Health Sciences are important steps toward an ambitious vision that we are proposing to call the Institute for Health Care Transformation (IHT). The proposed IHT will work closely with HSIR Program and PHS, while serving as a gathering place and facilitator of major interdisciplinary research collaboration across University of Utah Health Care, multiple health sciences colleges, other colleges and departments at the University, and with national and international academic and corporate collaborators. Indeed IHT has already stimulated exciting new programs of research and development for new health care delivery models in partnership with our more traditional health care delivery system. Examples include research on community perceptions and desires for health care transformation, developing a new program for direct employer contracting for health care, enhancing value of the full cycle of acute care episode from initial symptom to return to base line for the patient, and integration of care across of what is now a very fragmented continuum of care for the
vulnerable elderly from hospital to skilled nursing facility, hospice and palliative care, assisted living, home health, primary care, etc. The IHT is bringing together a multitude of collaborating entities to help the University of Utah be on the cutting edge creating the new health care delivery system. The Department of Population Health Sciences will be a key asset needed for a successful transformation and leadership role for the University and IHT.

In summary, the new department is a critical next step that will further enhance the stature and essential leadership role of the University of Utah. I look forward to its prompt creation and growth.

Sincerely,

Michael K. Magill, M.D.
Professor and Chairman, Family and Preventive Medicine
Executive Medical Director, University of Utah Heath Plans
University of Utah School of Medicine
January 28, 2014

Dean Y. Li, M.D., Ph.D.,
Associate Vice President for Research and
Chief Science Office, Health Sciences
Vice Dean for Research, University of Utah School of Medicine
George and Dolores Eccles Institute of Human Genetics
Molecular Medicine
15 N 2030 E
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Dear Dr. Li:

On behalf of the Division of Public Health in the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, I am writing to express support for forming a Department of Population Health Sciences in the University of Utah School of Medicine. The need for scholarship to guide advances in health care delivery and managing patients from a population perspective is clear. This proposed department provides an opportunity for enhancing efforts in these critical areas by creating a new academic unit to facilitate expansion of relevant cross-institutional efforts. The Division of Public Health and the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine offer important collaborative resources that can both enrich the impact of this proposed department and benefit from these strengthened cross-institutional ties.

The field of Public Health is undergoing an important transformation. One relevant aspect of the emerging New Public Health is greater integration of Classic Public Health with the health care system. In this sense, the Division of Public Health offers an important complement to the mission of the proposed Department of Population Health Sciences — with Public Health originating from the community and population perspective and engaging the health care system while Population Health Sciences is starting with patient populations and extending into communities and populations. Such complementary perspectives augmented by a clear charge for Population Health Sciences to integrate scholarship efforts related to population health illustrate the potential institutional benefit that this new department provides.

Critical to the joint success of the Department of Population Health Sciences and academic units that have closely related scholarship missions, such as the Division of Public Health, will be adherence to the commitment to ‘augment and complement [existing academic units’ abilities] to strengthen their education and research programs’. Given the shared scholarly interests between this new department and other academic units, particular sensitivity will need to be exercised as the Department of Population Health Sciences becomes operational. However, given the breadth of opportunity in this area of scholarship and the clearly designated purpose of this new department, a complementary and collaborative relationship with these other units, including the Division of Public Health, can be attained.
As indicated in the Program Request, it is anticipated that this department will be developing a Doctor of Philosophy in Population Health Sciences degree. I encourage thoughtfulness in developing this degree to insure a clarified purpose that is consistent with the distinct Department of Population Health Sciences roles and that clearly complements existing graduate education in similar fields. I also encourage making efficient use of existing academic resources as the design of any additional graduate training is conceptualized.

In summary, I am pleased to offer the support of the Division of Public Health for the development and implementation of the Department of Populations Health Sciences. Linking with other academic units and finding areas of mutual benefit and collaboration will enhance the impact of this new department.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Stephen C. Alder, Ph.D.
Chief, Division of Public Health
January 23, 2014

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

Dear Dr. Lee:

I write to enthusiastically support the creation of a Department of Population Sciences in the School of Medicine. This is the next logical step in the development of health services research within the University.

As you know, our department has made a strong investment in biostatistics and other aspects of population sciences. This has resulted in robust funding in these areas and a high level of activity within the Department of Internal Medicine in various aspects of health services research. However, the absence of a well-defined Department of Population Sciences has limited our ability to recruit and further develop these programs and provide the faculty for the education of residents and students that are necessary in developing population sciences. The next logical step to address these shortcomings is to create a department that will be able to robustly recruit additional faculty and provide the math logic support necessary for development within the clinical departments, including Internal Medicine, of health services research.

I enthusiastically support the proposed department and will be happy to have Internal Medicine partner in any way with recruitment and development of faculty and graduate students to this new department.

Sincerely,

John R. Hoidal, MD
Professor of Medicine
The Clarence M. and Ruth N. Birrer Presidential Endowed Chair
Chair, Department of Internal Medicine

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

Dear Dr. Lee,

I am writing this letter in support of the proposed new Department of Population Health Sciences. The new department addresses a high priority need for the University of Utah Health Sciences Center. Population health sciences is a multi-disciplinary field that broadly encompasses methods of inquiry for examination and improvement of health in communities of individuals.

The University of Utah has experienced significant growth in epidemiology, biostatistics, and health services research in the last decade. Within the School of Medicine, the development of these disciplines has been centered in the clinical departments, particularly Internal Medicine, Family and Preventive Medicine, and Pediatrics. Establishing a new Department of Population Health Sciences will facilitate further expansion particularly in areas that are currently underrepresented such as health policy.

Establishing a Department of Population Health Sciences demonstrates the University’s recognition of the importance of population health sciences in the delivery of high quality clinical care. The commitment of resources will foster recruitment of new faculty who are leaders in methodologically-oriented research in population health sciences. The establishment of a graduate program in association with the new department will augment training opportunities for students and fellows. Faculty in the new department will contribute to education of students seeking professional degrees within the Health Sciences Center, most notably including the School of Medicine.

It is vital that the Department of Population Health Sciences work in a complementary and synergistic way with existing departments in the School of Medicine, as well as throughout the Health Sciences Center. Academic units such as the Divisions Epidemiology, Genetic Epidemiology, and Public Health which already do a substantial amount of work in the field of population health sciences should continue to be supported. It is expected that most of the faculty in the new department will be recruited from outside the University of Utah.

In summary, I enthusiastically support the creation of the Department of Population Health Sciences. I anticipate that many of the faculty members in the Division of Epidemiology will have adjunct appointments in this new department.
Sincerely,

Matthew Samore, MD
Director, Salt Lake Informatics, Decision Enhancement, and Analytic Science (IDEAS) Center
VA Salt Lake City Health Care System
The Elbert F and Marie Christensen Research Professorship
Chief, Division of Epidemiology
Professor of Internal Medicine
University of Utah
January 13, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

Re: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences

Dear Dr. Lee:

The Department of Neurology strongly supports the decision to establish a new Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine. Our department’s research and clinical efforts could greatly benefit from a basic science department that emphasizes discovery research in health system research and delivery innovation.

The Department of Neurology has already engaged in expanding research in the area of population medicine. In particular, we have used the UPDB to query familial and environmental causes of Parkinson disease and Amyotrophic Sclerosis. We very enthusiastically await the growth of this department both in terms of intellectual expertise and provision of core services. I can currently foresee at least four junior faculty members who were just hired by my department and who would like to seek adjunct appointments in the Department of Population Science.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Stefan M. Pulst, M.D., Dr. Med.
Professor and Chair
Department of Neurology
University of Utah School of Medicine
January 27, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

Re: Department of Population Health Sciences

Dear Dr. Lee:

I write to express my strong support for the decision to establish a new Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine.

The Department of Population Health will provide a durable basic science departmental infrastructure for faculty focusing on population health, and provide support, expertise and mentorship for physician investigators in our department.

We have researchers in all six divisions (Family Planning, Gynecology, Gynecologic Oncology, Obstetrics - Maternal Fetal Medicine, Reproductive Endocrinology, and Urogynecology) who will have their methodologically-oriented research enhanced by the establishment of this department.

We have 58 faculty, 6 fellows, 24 residents and many health professions students who will utilize the expertise, mentorship and infrastructure within the new department.

The epidemiology, biostatistical core and population study resources located in this department will also reduce duplication of services while enhancing the spectrum of research available at this institutional. Clearly, top-tier medical schools have recognized the need for such a resource.

In summary the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology enthusiastically support the establishment of this new department.

Sincerely,

C. Matthew Peterson, M.D.
John A. Dixon Presidential Professor and Chair
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology

Office of the Chair
30 North 1900 East, Suite 25200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84132
Phone 801-587-8303
Fax 801-585-9295
c.matthew.peterson@hsc.utah.edu
January 7, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA  
Dean, School of Medicine  
CEO, University of Utah Health Care  
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences  
University of Utah  

Subject: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine  

Dear Dr. Lee:

As Chair of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences and CEO of the John A. Moran Eye Center, I am delighted to extend my full support to the creation of a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine. I believe the new department and its expertise in and advocacy for health systems outcomes and delivery research will be a critical addition to the School of Medicine and to the broader health sciences, and will also afford opportunities for additional collaborations with main campus. Current faculty across departments will greatly benefit, as new talent in the population health sciences field will be accessible for further collaboration and discovery.

Increasingly, we have faculty working on outcomes research and interested in pursuing population studies. We also have ongoing population research that will find the expertise provided by this department as critical to their success. It has been an important need for a long time that is now being addressed. I know that we have lost some vital recruits because of our lack of support in this area to date.

You have my full support for this new department and we, as a unit, will be very pleased to see this come to fruition.

Sincerely,

Randall J. Olson, MD  
Chair, Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences  
CEO, John A. Moran Eye Center
8 January 2014

Re: Creation of Department of Population Health Sciences (PHS)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in full support of the creation of Department of Population Health Sciences (PHS). The department is needed to bring the SOM into a competitive position to develop strong clinical, health services, and population based scientific academic programs. This is an area of increasing importance to federal funding agencies (e.g., NIH, PCORI and AHRQ) at a critical time in the history of this nation’s healthcare system realignment.

As articulated by those who have conceived this new department, the PHS will be a center for education, investigation and expertise in health services, cost, quality, outcomes, and health delivery systems research. The department’s work will be both inward looking and outward facing - and in that process have the unique opportunity to transform healthcare within the University system as well as the state of Utah.

The Department of Orthopaedic Surgery has particular interest in supporting the creation of a Department of Population Health Sciences, as the nature of what we do clinically lends itself to analysis of the outcomes/cost effectiveness, and utility of interventions. A PHS department will bring together the academic expertise in epidemiology, biostatistics and population studies to help us improve our care processes and expand knowledge of outcomes for musculoskeletal care.

In summary, I want to express my full support of the creation of this new department. The potential benefits to our department, the SOM, the University and the state of Utah are outstanding.

Sincerely,

Charles L. Saltzman, M.D.
Louis S. Peery, M.D. Presidential Endowed Professor
Chairman, Department of Orthopaedics
January 8, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, M.D., Ph.D., M.B.A.
Senior Vice-President for Health Sciences
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
5th floor CNC

Dear Dr. Lee:

I am pleased to write this letter in support of the establishment of the Department of Population Health Sciences (PHS) at the University of Utah. As Chair of the Department of Pediatrics and Chief Medical Officer at Primary Children’s Hospital, I believe this department will serve faculty, fellows, residents, and students and will assist in preparing them for the demands of health care transformation.

With expertise in epidemiology, biostatistics and population studies, this basic science department will be a critical partner to outcomes researchers in the Department of Pediatrics. It will also strengthen methodologically-oriented research in the population health disciplines throughout the health sciences campus and the greater University community.

We believe this PHS Department will be an asset to the University of Utah and to our Department of Pediatrics and look forward to working with this new Department in the near future.

Sincerely,

Edward B. Clark, M.D.
Wilma T. Gibson Presidential Professor
Chair, Department of Pediatrics
Chief Medical Officer, Primary Children’s Medical Center
January 24, 2014

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

Re: New Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Lee:

I am writing to express my strong support for the formation of a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine. Last year, I accepted the position of Surgery Chair in part because of the University of Utah’s vision for health care transformation, its emphasis on health systems and health services research, and the commitment to use this research to improve patient care. These goals parallel my own interests; including health services research, education, global surgery and particularly, surgical access, quality, and outcomes.

The Department of Surgery is building a Surgical Systems Research and Innovation (SSIR) team to coalesce with Health System Innovation and Research (HSIR) Program investigators who, among many, would greatly benefit from the strengths of an academic department dedicated specifically to population health sciences.

In addition, with the support of Health Sciences Center central administration, we recently recruited Ben Brooke, MD, PhD, a vascular surgeon whose research interests include the design and execution of clinical studies to evaluate factors that influence the quality of care, patient safety, risk of readmission, clinical outcomes following cardiovascular interventions and other high-risk surgical procedures. He was recently awarded a PCORI grant to study “Patient-Centered Transitions for Episodes of Surgical Care” and heads the new Department of Surgery U-INQUIRE (Utah Intervention Quality and Implementation Research) group. The group meets bi-monthly to discuss research proposals, providing a rich forum for constructive feedback and collaboration among faculty in numerous departments throughout the University.

The resources and infrastructure provided by this new department would greatly complement departmental hiring packages; which in turn positively impact the caliber of faculty our School of Medicine departments are able to attract and recruit.
As Chair of the Department of Surgery, I lend my utmost enthusiastic support for the development of a prominent and productive Department of Population Health Sciences that will both inform our clinical practices and enhance academic productivity.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Samuel R. G. Finlayson, MD, MPH
Professor and Chair
Department of Surgery
January 17, 2014

Vivian Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah Health Sciences Center
Via email: vivian.lee@hsc.utah.edu

Dear Dr. Lee:

On behalf of Huntsman Cancer Institute (HCI), I am writing this letter to express our strong support for the establishment of a Department of Population Health Sciences within the University of Utah Health Sciences Center. HCI has been among the earliest supporters of this initiative as we believe that the establishment of this department will provide much-needed resources and specialized leadership for existing population sciences researchers at the University, and will be key to taking our population sciences programs to the next level.

As one of 67 National Cancer Institute-designated Cancer Centers in the nation, our major goal is to translate high-impact laboratory findings into clinical applications through full integration of our laboratory, clinical, and population sciences research endeavors. Our Center is organized around the theme of cancer genetics and features four robust cancer research programs that span the basic cell biology to cancer control and population sciences. Indeed, one of our nine key initiatives in HCI’s 2009-2014 strategic plan is the need to ensure full integration of our population sciences research program in the cancer center. Major goals of our population sciences-focused cancer research is to define genetic risk factors for cancer, explore how best to communicate genetic and genomic information, develop and improve adherence to cancer screening guidelines, and improve patient outcomes by, for example, addressing symptom management, survivorship, and disparities. From the perspective of HCI, the integration of robust population science in the medical research arena is essential to ensure the maximum impact of our work.

Growth of our research portfolio in cancer population sciences is a priority for HCI. This area of investigation is one of our defining signature research areas that builds on our institutional strength in genetics and our unique research assets such as the Utah Population Database and our well characterized high-risk cancer groups. In addition, a central requirement for National Cancer Institute designation as a comprehensive cancer center, the premiere national ranking, is depth and breadth of research in cancer population sciences. The development of this new Department will allow for the expansion of this critical area for HCI.

The establishment of a Department of Population Health will be critical to HCI’s mission to integrate strong training within the cancer research efforts. The new department will create a framework for development of a central program of advanced graduate training in population health sciences. The availability of such a training program will dramatically enhance HCI’s ability to recruit talented cancer population sciences researchers to our community.

There are tremendous research opportunities in cancer population sciences and HCI is committed to supporting new faculty by providing state of the art infrastructure and research space. HCI currently has a national search underway to recruit a Senior Leader of Population Sciences and essentially all of our top candidates have asked specifically about whether the institution is planning to establish an academic home for population health sciences, including cancer population sciences. I believe that the establishment of a new department that can serve as an academic hub for training and research, within the context of health sciences, will be a major attraction for recruitment of top talent in this critical area.
Strong endorsement for developing an academic home for Population Sciences in the School of Medicine was expressed by HCI’s distinguished External Advisory Board, which includes a Nobel laureate and several members of the National Academy of Science and Institute of Medicine. In their written remarks after our March 2013 meeting, they commented: “Strong consideration should be given to developing a Department of Population Sciences that would house faculty with epidemiologic, behavioral, or statistical expertise ...” Support for this recommendation will be viewed as very strong institutional support for the mission of the Cancer Center when we are competitively reviewed by the National Cancer Institute.

Finally, I believe that the University of Utah Health Sciences has the opportunity to be a major contributor to developing research based best practices in healthcare. The fact that the University of Utah is home to the Utah Population Database (UPDB), the largest and most comprehensive genealogical and population database in the world, positions us to be international leader. For more than 30 years, researchers have used this resource to identify and study families that have higher-than-average incidence of cancer or other diseases, to analyze patterns of genetic inheritance, and to identify specific genetic mutations. There are extraordinary resources on campus, and extraordinary opportunity to make major impacts on human health. Our research partners in population health sciences are key to this effort and the new Department of Population Health Sciences will create a hub for research and education that will greatly enhance our ability to recruit outstanding faculty and students, as well as enhance the impact of our research. For HCI, this department will provide a focused academic home in which many of our cancer researchers will be able to participate in graduate training and engage collaboratively with others in their disciplines who work in non-cancer disease areas.

In summary, I want to restate that HCI is in full support of the initiative to establish a Department of Population Health Sciences at the University of Utah. We believe that the establishment of this department will be essential to maintain and build upon our successes to date in this arena. Please let me know if there is any further information I can provide.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Beckerle, PhD
Ralph E. and Willia T. Main Presidential Professor
CEO and Director, Huntsman Cancer Institute
Associate Vice President for Cancer Affairs, University of Utah

Cc: Dean Li, MD, PhD,
Associate Vice President for Research and Chief Scientific Officer,
University of Utah Health Sciences Center
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

January 21, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

Re: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences

Dear Dr. Lee:

As the Program Directors of the Center for Clinical and Translational Science (CCTS), we wish to confirm our enthusiastic support for the establishment of the Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine.

The CCTS serves as a home and laboratory for those engaged in Clinical and Translational Science. We also provide a significant educational resource for our community through the Masters of Science in Clinical Investigation and through our certificate programs in Personalized Healthcare, Comparative Effectiveness, and Patient Centered Outcomes Research.

The new Department of Population Science will serve as an invaluable resource and partner for the CCTS. The goals of the new department include serving as a central educational backbone for population health sciences. The CCTS welcomes the increased capacity in Population Science methods that will come from the faculty members in the new department. These individuals will be vital as we continue to grow our education programs and develop core resources including those for health economic analysis and systematic review.

In summary, the new Department of Population Science will advance the mission of the CCTS, the Health Sciences, and the University of Utah.

Sincerely,

Donald A. McClain, MD, PhD
Program Director, Utah Center for Clinical and Translational Science,
University of Utah Health Sciences Center
Professor of Internal Medicine and Bettilyon Chair in Diabetes Research
Professor of Biochemistry
Interim Chief, Division of Endocrinology and Metabolism

Carrie L. Byington, MD
Program Director, Utah Center for Clinical and Translational Science,
University of Utah Health Sciences Center
H.A. and Edna Benning Presidential Professor of Pediatrics
Associate Vice President for Faculty and Academic Affairs
Vice Dean Academic Affairs and Faculty Development

The University of Utah
School of Medicine
Center for Clinical and Translational Science
10 N. 1900 East, rm 22
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-5890
Phone (801) 581-6736
Fax (801) 585-1461
2/4/2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

Re: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences

Dear Dr. Lee:

I am thrilled to join the University of Utah School of Medicine faculty March 1st to serve as the inaugural director of the new Health System Innovation and Research (HSIR) Program. The institution’s commitment to developing additional expertise and resources dedicated to health care delivery and patient population research, and to improving the care of patient populations, is clear and was key in my decision to move to Utah.

HSIR will focus on building the University’s health services research by connecting the University of Utah’s academic and Health Care units, and partnering with other health systems. As director of the new HSIR Program I fully endorse the creation of a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine. It is proposed that HSIR form a division in the new department. This will provide a stable academic home for the interdisciplinary work of HSIR, and position it within the larger Population Health Sciences unit.

Population Health Sciences will serve as the academic home for a variety of basic science researchers critical to the study of health care delivery and population health. These include individuals with advanced training in health policy and management, and community and behavioral health. In the current structure, these faculty are necessarily integrated into clinical departments. While close collaboration with clinicians is important, and a focus of HSIR, the clinical faculty model makes it challenging to recruit the best and brightest in these areas. The creation of a Population Health Sciences department will mitigate these challenges and allow us to ensure the University’s programs in these areas grow to be exemplary.

The scientists housed in Populations Health Sciences will be able to provide mentorship and support for physicians and clinical investigators across the institution. As I interviewed for my new role directing HSIR, I met clinical and research faculty from multiple departments in the School of Medicine. The ideas and motivation exist to reshape the health care delivery system locally and inform the
national debate, yet the mentorship and methodological expertise are not readily accessible. Population Health Sciences, and HSIR, will fill this critical gap and accelerate the development and productivity of these faculty.

In addition to applied work, Population Health Sciences, as a basic science department, will allow investigators the opportunity to develop new methods that can be used in service of its missions to study health care delivery and population health. By bringing together methodological expertise in one home, the intellectual capacity will exist not only to conduct applied research in these areas but also to advance the methods used in such research. While many of these skills exist in the University, an academic home will allow the sum to be greater than the individual parts.

The vision proposed for Population Health Sciences, and HSIR, is critical for the new models of research in this health care delivery and population health. Utah is at the leading edge of a trend exemplified by work coming out of new funding sources, such as the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI). As the recipient of one of 11 Clinical Data Research Network infrastructure contracts from PCORI, I believe strongly that the infrastructure built through Population Health Sciences is essential to support research and evaluation of new models of care necessary that are necessary to create a sustainable health care infrastructure for both the State and Nation.

Population Health Sciences is critical to ensure the success of HSIR. It provides the academic home that will allow me to recruit the leading investigators in the area of health systems innovation. I fully support its creation and look forward to playing a part in its growth as a nationally recognized Department.

Sincerely,

Rachel Hess, MD, MS
Associate Professor of Medicine, Epidemiology, and Clinical and Translational Sciences
Department of Medicine
Division of General Internal Medicine
University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine
February 6, 2014

Vivian S. Lee, MD, PhD, MBA
Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah

Re: Proposed Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Lee:

I wish to express my enthusiastic support for the creation of a Department of Population Health Sciences in the School of Medicine.

There is great strength in health in the College of Social and Behavioral Science in numerous departments in the college (Psychology, Anthropology, Family and Consumer Studies, Sociology, Economics, and Geography). As many of our faculty members focus on patient populations dealing with chronic illnesses such as diabetes and cancer as well as issues surrounding health care delivery (e.g., risk communication; patient-doctor communication), the resources of this new department will be of great interest to many graduate students and faculty members in these departments.

Further, I can imagine a number of potential collaborations among faculty members in this new department and departments in my college. The methodological and content expertise available in the department will also pave the way for PCORI funding for a number of our investigators and enhance the likelihood of their success.

I look forward to the initiation of this department and the collaborations that will be made possible among our faculty.

Sincerely,

Cynthia A. Berg
Interim Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Science
Professor of Psychology
Date: February 27, 2014

To: Ruth Watkins, Sr. Vice President
    Academic Affairs
    Barb Snyder, Vice President
    Student Affairs

From: Mary G. Parker, Associate Vice President
      Enrollment Management

Re: Academic Calendar 2014-2021

Please review the attached proposal regarding the academic calendar. Once approved by you, I will forward on to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for approval and then on to the full Senate for debate.

If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Thanks.
Memo to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
Academic Calendar

On December 02, 2013, the Academic Senate voted to eliminate Reading Day for the spring 2014 semester to support the general commencement program moving to Thursday night. In that meeting, the Senate requested a committee be established to review the academic calendar and the possibility of adding reading day back to the fall and spring semester. Mary Parker worked with the Academic Senate to put together a diverse committee from across the university that would represent the varying campus viewpoints. The committee was comprised of the following individuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Mogren</td>
<td>Faculty, Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Bartholomew</td>
<td>Interim Dean, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Gerton</td>
<td>Faculty, Physics and Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Jamison</td>
<td>Faculty, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Garvin</td>
<td>Faculty, Biomedical Informatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Parker</td>
<td>Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Ebner</td>
<td>Registrar’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Johnson</td>
<td>Registrar’s Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The members of this committee were very passionate and dedicated to identifying solutions that could be proposed to the senate. The committee felt it was important that data be utilized to support the proposal especially in regards to our PAC 12 colleagues. Attached you will find information on our PAC 12 peers. This data invoked many robust and lengthy discussions with three constant themes emerging:

1. Incorporate reading day back into the academic calendar for the fall and spring semester
2. Make sure there was a significant break between the fall and spring semesters
3. Review the possibility of moving Commencement Day to a different day, possibly Friday night with convocations on Saturday.

The committee chose to focus its efforts on the first two areas and not on moving the general commencement program. With the President just approving to permanently move Commencement to Thursday night, the committee thought it would be best to leave it alone and evaluate how that process works over the next couple of years and then possibly revisit the issue if needed. In addition, the committee had numerous conversations regarding the possibility of expanding reading day from 1 day, up to a week. However, the final decision was to leave it at one day for both semesters.

With that said, the attached academic calendar is being sent to you for approval. As previously noted reading day has been added for the fall and spring semester as well as lengthening the time between semesters.

The committee would welcome an opportunity to meet with the Executive Committee to discuss the newly proposed academic calendar and answer any questions that may arise.

Thank you,

Committee on the Academic Calendar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL CALENDAR DATES</th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER 2014</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER 2015</th>
<th>SUMMER TERM 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class schedule available</td>
<td>Monday, March 3</td>
<td>Monday, September 22</td>
<td>Monday, February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration appointments available</td>
<td>Monday, March 3</td>
<td>Monday, September 15</td>
<td>Monday, February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission/readmission deadline</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 1</td>
<td>Saturday, November 1</td>
<td>Sun., March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration by appointment begins</td>
<td>Monday, April 14</td>
<td>Thursday, November 6</td>
<td>Monday, March 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to apply for graduation</td>
<td>Monday, June 2</td>
<td>Monday, November 3</td>
<td>Mon., February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open enrollment</td>
<td>Monday, July 28</td>
<td>Monday, November 24</td>
<td>Monday, April 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Bill 60 registration</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 19</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 6</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition payment due</td>
<td>Monday, September 8</td>
<td>Monday, January 26</td>
<td>Monday, June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census deadline</td>
<td>Monday, September 15</td>
<td>Monday, February 2</td>
<td>Monday, June 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Commencement &amp; Convocation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thu-Fri, May 7-8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Friday, May 15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades available</td>
<td>Tues., December 30</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 19</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Saturday, May 23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM LENGTH CLASSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add without a permission code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to drop (delete) classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw from classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to reverse CR/NC option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exam period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST SESSION CLASSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to drop (delete) classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw from classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to reverse CR/NC option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECOND SESSION CLASSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to drop (delete) classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw from classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to reverse CR/NC option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLIDAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Day holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day holiday (observed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Day holiday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calendar subject to change without notice. For the most up-to-date information, visit [http://registrar.utah.edu/academic-calendars/index.php](http://registrar.utah.edu/academic-calendars/index.php)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GENERAL CALENDAR DATES</strong></th>
<th><strong>FALL SEMESTER 2015</strong></th>
<th><strong>SPRING SEMESTER 2016</strong></th>
<th><strong>SUMMER TERM 2016</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class schedule available</td>
<td>Monday, March 2</td>
<td>Monday, September 28</td>
<td>Monday, February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration appointments available</td>
<td>Monday, March 2</td>
<td>Monday, September 21</td>
<td>Monday, February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission/readmission deadline</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 1</td>
<td>Sunday, November 1</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration by appointment begins</td>
<td>Monday, April 13</td>
<td>Thursday, November 5</td>
<td>Monday, March 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to apply for graduation</td>
<td>Monday, June 1</td>
<td>Monday, November 2</td>
<td>Mon., February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open enrollment</td>
<td>Monday, July 27</td>
<td>Monday, November 30</td>
<td>Monday, April 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Bill 60 registration</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 18</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 5</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition payment due</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 8</td>
<td>Monday, January 25</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census deadline</td>
<td>Monday, September 14</td>
<td>Monday, February 1</td>
<td>Monday, June 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Commencement &amp; Convocation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thur-Fri, May 5-6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Friday, May 13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades available</td>
<td>Tues., December 29</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 17</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Saturday, May 21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TERM LENGTH CLASSES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add without a permission code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to drop (delete) classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw from classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to reverse CR/NC option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exam period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FIRST SESSION CLASSES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to drop (delete) classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw from classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to reverse CR/NC option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SECOND SESSION CLASSES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to drop (delete) classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw from classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to reverse CR/NC option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HOLIDAYS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Day holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Day holiday (observed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### FALL 2015 WITH READING DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUGUST 2015</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER 2015</th>
<th>OCTOBER 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
<td>23 24 25 26 27 28 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27</td>
<td>28 29 30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPRING 2016 WITH READING DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JANUARY 2016</th>
<th>FEBRUARY 2016</th>
<th>MARCH 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
<td>17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 29 30 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMER 2016 (WITH SPRING READING DAY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MAY 2016</th>
<th>JUNE 2016</th>
<th>JULY 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
<td>17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 29 30 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUGUST 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S M T W TH F S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 29 30 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| HOLIDAYS | BREAKS | ACADEMIC DATES | FINAL EXAMS | READING DAY(S) |
## 2016-2017 UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC CALENDAR

### GENERAL CALENDAR DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class schedule available</th>
<th>Monday, March 7</th>
<th>Monday, September 26</th>
<th>Monday, February 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration appointments available</td>
<td>Monday, March 7</td>
<td>Monday, September 19</td>
<td>Monday, February 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission/readmission deadline</td>
<td>Friday, April 1</td>
<td>Tuesday, November 1</td>
<td>Wed, March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration by appointment begins</td>
<td>Monday, April 11</td>
<td>Thursday, November 3</td>
<td>Monday, March 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to apply for graduation</td>
<td>Wednesday, June 1</td>
<td>Tuesday, November 1</td>
<td>Wed, February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open enrollment</td>
<td>Tuesday, July 26</td>
<td>Monday, November 28</td>
<td>Monday, April 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Bill 60 registration</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 16</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 3</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition payment due</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 6</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 23</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census deadline</td>
<td>Monday, September 12</td>
<td>Monday, January 30</td>
<td>Monday, June 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Commencement &amp; Convocation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thur-Fri, May 4-5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades available</td>
<td>Tues., December 27</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 17</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TERM LENGTH CLASSES

| Classes begin | Monday, August 22 | Monday, January 9 | Monday, May 15 |
| Last day to add without a permission code | Sunday, August 28 | Monday, January 16 | Sunday, May 21 |
| Last day to drop (delete) classes | Wed., August 31 | Wednesday, January 18 | Wednesday, May 24 |
| Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes | Tuesday, Sept. 6 | Monday, January 23 | Tuesday, May 30 |
| Last day to withdraw from classes | Friday, October 21 | Friday, March 3 | Friday, June 24 |
| Last day to reverse CR/NC option | Friday, December 2 | Friday, April 21 | Friday, July 29 |
| Classes end | Thursday, December 8 | Tuesday, April 25 | Wed, August 3 |
| Reading Day | Friday, December 9 | Wednesday, April 26 | N/A |
| Final exam period | Mon.-Fri., Dec. 12-16 | Thurs, April 27-Wed, May 3 | Thur-Fri, Aug 4-5 |

### FIRST SESSION CLASSES

| Classes begin | Monday, August 22 | Monday, January 9 | Monday, May 15 |
| Last day to drop (delete) classes | Wed., August 31 | Wednesday, January 18 | Wednesday, May 24 |
| Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes | Tuesday, Sept. 6 | Monday, January 23 | Tuesday, May 30 |
| Last day to withdraw from classes | Friday, September 16 | Friday, February 3 | Friday, June 3 |
| Last day to reverse CR/NC option | Friday, Sept. 30 | Friday, February 24 | Friday, June 17 |
| Classes end | Friday, October 7 | Tuesday, February 28 | Wednesday, June 22 |

### SECOND SESSION CLASSES

| Classes begin | Monday, October 17 | Wednesday, March 1 | Thursday, June 23 |
| Last day to drop (delete) classes | Wednesday, October 26 | Friday, March 10 | Saturday, July 2 |
| Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes | Monday, October 31 | Tuesday, March 14 | Wednesday, July 6 |
| Last day to withdraw from classes | Friday, November 11 | Friday, March 31 | Friday, July 15 |
| Last day to reverse CR/NC option | Friday, December 2 | Friday, April 21 | Friday, July 29 |
| Classes end | Thursday, December 8 | Tuesday, April 25 | Wednesday, Aug 3 |

### HOLIDAYS

| Labor Day holiday | Monday, September 5 | |
| Fall break | Sun.-Sun., Oct. 12-19 | |
| Thanksgiving break | Thurs.-Fri., Nov. 24-25 | |
| Holiday recess | Sat, Dec 17-Sun, Jan 8 | |
| Martin Luther King Jr. Day holiday | Monday, January 16 | |
| Presidents Day | Monday, February 20 | |
| Spring break | Sun - Sun, March 12-19 | |
| Memorial Day holiday | Monday, May 29 | |
| Independence Day holiday | Tuesday, July 4 | |
| Pioneer Day holiday (observed) | Monday, July 24 | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUST 2016</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER 2016</th>
<th>OCTOBER 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 29 30 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOVEMBER 2016</th>
<th>DECEMBER 2016</th>
<th>JANUARY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
<td>15 16 17 18 19 20 21</td>
<td>15 16 17 18 19 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 21 22 23 24 25 26</td>
<td>22 23 24 25 26 27 28</td>
<td>22 23 24 25 26 27 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 28 29 30</td>
<td>29 30 31</td>
<td>29 30 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JANUARY 2017</th>
<th>FEBRUARY 2017</th>
<th>MARCH 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 13 14 15 16 17 18</td>
<td>12 13 14 15 16 17 18</td>
<td>12 13 14 15 16 17 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 20 21 22 23 24 25</td>
<td>19 20 21 22 23 24 25</td>
<td>26 27 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 27 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRIL 2017</th>
<th>MAY 2017</th>
<th>JUNE 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
<td>18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
<td>18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY 2017</th>
<th>JUNE 2017</th>
<th>JULY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 29 30 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AUGUST 2017 | |
|-------------||
| 1 2 3 4 5 | |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | |
| 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 | |
| 27 28 29 30 31 | |
## 2017-2018 UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC CALENDAR

### GENERAL CALENDAR DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class schedule available</th>
<th>Monday, March 6</th>
<th>Monday, September 25</th>
<th>Monday, February 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration appointments available</td>
<td>Monday, March 6</td>
<td>Monday, September 18</td>
<td>Monday, February 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission/readmission deadline</td>
<td>Saturday, April 1</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 1</td>
<td>Thursday, March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration by appointment begins</td>
<td>Monday, April 10</td>
<td>Thursday, November 2</td>
<td>Monday, March 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to apply for graduation</td>
<td>Thursday, June 1</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 1</td>
<td>Thursday, February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open enrollment</td>
<td>Monday, July 31</td>
<td>Monday, November 27</td>
<td>Monday, April 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Bill 60 registration</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 15</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 2</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition payment due</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 5</td>
<td>Monday, January 22</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census deadline</td>
<td>Monday, September 11</td>
<td>Monday, January 29</td>
<td>Monday, June 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Commencement &amp; Convocation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thur-Fri, May 3-4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades available</td>
<td>Wed, December 27</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 15</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TERM LENGTH CLASSES

#### FALL SEMESTER 2017

- **Classes begin:** Monday, August 21
- **Last day to add without a permission code:** Sunday, August 27
- **Last day to drop (delete) classes:** Wed., August 30
- **Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes:** Tuesday, Sept. 5
- **Last day to withdraw from classes:** Friday, October 20
- **Last day to reverse CR/NC option:** Friday, December 1
- **Classes end:** Thursday, December 7
- **Reading Day:** Friday, December 8
- **Final exam period:** Mon.-Fri., Dec. 11-15

#### SPRING SEMESTER 2018

- **Classes begin:** Monday, January 8
- **Last day to add without a permission code:** Monday, January 15
- **Last day to drop (delete) classes:** Wednesday, January 17
- **Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes:** Monday, January 22
- **Last day to withdraw from classes:** Friday, March 2
- **Last day to reverse CR/NC option:** Friday, April 20
- **Classes end:** Tuesday, April 24
- **Reading Day:** Wednesday, April 25
- **Final exam period:** Thurs, April 26-Wed, May 2

#### SUMMER TERM 2018

- **Classes begin:** Monday, May 14
- **Last day to add without a permission code:** Monday, May 20
- **Last day to drop (delete) classes:** Wednesday, May 23
- **Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes:** Tuesday, May 29
- **Last day to withdraw from classes:** Friday, June 22
- **Last day to reverse CR/NC option:** Friday, July 27
- **Classes end:** Wed, August 1

### HOLIDAYS

- **Labor Day holiday:** Monday, September 4
- **Fall break:** Sun.-Sun., Oct. 9-1.
- **Thanksgiving break:** Thurs.-Fri., Nov. 23-24
- **Holiday recess:** Sat, Dec 16-Sun, Jan 7
- **Martin Luther King Jr. Day holiday:** Monday, January 15
- **Presidents Day:** Monday, February 19
- **Spring break:** Sun - Sun, March 18-25
- **Memorial Day holiday:** Monday, May 28
- **Independence Day holiday:** Wednesday, July 4
- **Pioneer Day holiday (observed):** Tuesday, July 24

Calendar subject to change without notice. For the most up-to-date information, visit [http://registrar.utah.edu/academic-calendars/index.php](http://registrar.utah.edu/academic-calendars/index.php)
## 2018-2019 UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC CALENDAR

### GENERAL CALENDAR DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER 2018</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER 2019</th>
<th>SUMMER TERM 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class schedule available</td>
<td>Monday, March 5</td>
<td>Monday, September 24</td>
<td>Monday, February 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration appointments available</td>
<td>Monday, March 5</td>
<td>Monday, September 17</td>
<td>Monday, February 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission/readmission deadline</td>
<td>Sunday, April 1</td>
<td>Thursday, November 1</td>
<td>Friday, March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration by appointment begins</td>
<td>Monday, April 9</td>
<td>Thursday, November 1</td>
<td>Monday, March 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to apply for graduation</td>
<td>Friday, June 1</td>
<td>Thursday, November 1</td>
<td>Friday, February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open enrollment</td>
<td>Monday, July 30</td>
<td>Monday, November 26</td>
<td>Monday, April 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Bill 60 registration</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 14</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 2</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition payment due</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 4</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 22</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census deadline</td>
<td>Monday, September 11</td>
<td>Monday, January 28</td>
<td>Monday, June 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Commencement &amp; Convocation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thur-Fri, May 2-3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades available</td>
<td>Thurs, December 27</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 14</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TERM LENGTH CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER 2018</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER 2019</th>
<th>SUMMER TERM 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
<td>Monday, August 20</td>
<td>Monday, January 7</td>
<td>Monday, May 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add without a permission code</td>
<td>Sunday, August 26</td>
<td>Sunday, January 13</td>
<td>Sunday, May 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to drop (delete) classes</td>
<td>Wed., August 29</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 16</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes</td>
<td>Tuesday, Sept. 4</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 22</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw from classes</td>
<td>Friday, October 19</td>
<td>Friday, March 1</td>
<td>Friday, June 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to reverse CR/NC option</td>
<td>Friday, November 30</td>
<td>Friday, April 19</td>
<td>Friday, July 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
<td>Thursday, December 6</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 23</td>
<td>Wed, July 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Day</td>
<td>Friday, December 7</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exam period</td>
<td>Mon.-Fri., Dec. 10-14</td>
<td>Thurs, April 25-Wed, May 1</td>
<td>Thur-Fri, Aug 1-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIRST SESSION CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER 2018</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER 2019</th>
<th>SUMMER TERM 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
<td>Monday, August 20</td>
<td>Monday, January 7</td>
<td>Monday, May 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to drop (delete) classes</td>
<td>Wed., August 29</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 16</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes</td>
<td>Tuesday, Sept. 4</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 22</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw from classes</td>
<td>Friday, September 14</td>
<td>Friday, February 1</td>
<td>Friday, June 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to reverse CR/NC option</td>
<td>Friday, Sept. 28</td>
<td>Friday, February 22</td>
<td>Friday, June 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
<td>Friday, October 5</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 26</td>
<td>Wednesday, June 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECOND SESSION CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER 2018</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER 2019</th>
<th>SUMMER TERM 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
<td>Monday, October 15</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 27</td>
<td>Thursday, June 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to drop (delete) classes</td>
<td>Wednesday, October 24</td>
<td>Friday, March 8</td>
<td>Saturday, June 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes</td>
<td>Monday, October 29</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 12</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to withdraw from classes</td>
<td>Friday, November 9</td>
<td>Friday, March 29</td>
<td>Friday, July 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day to reverse CR/NC option</td>
<td>Friday, November 30</td>
<td>Friday, April 19</td>
<td>Friday, July 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
<td>Thursday, December 6</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 23</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOLIDAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER 2018</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER 2019</th>
<th>SUMMER TERM 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day holiday</td>
<td>Monday, September 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall break</td>
<td>Sun.-Sun., Oct. 7-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving break</td>
<td>Thurs.-Fri., Nov. 22-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday recess</td>
<td>Sat, Dec 15-Sun, Jan 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Day holiday</td>
<td>Monday, January 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents Day</td>
<td>Monday, February 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring break</td>
<td>Sun - Sun, March 10-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day holiday</td>
<td>Monday, May 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day holiday</td>
<td>Thursday, July 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Day holiday</td>
<td>Monday, July 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calendar subject to change without notice. For the most up-to-date information, visit [http://registrar.utah.edu/academic-calendars/index.php](http://registrar.utah.edu/academic-calendars/index.php)

Last Updated 2/24/14
### FALL 2018 WITH READING DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOVEMBER 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DECEMBER 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JANUARY 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPRING 2019 WITH READING DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAY 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JUNE 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMER 2019 (WITH SPRING READING DAY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUGUST 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOLIDAYS

- Spring Reading Day
- Summer Reading Day
- Thanksgiving
- Christmas Break
- New Year's Day
- Independence Day
- Labor Day
- Memorial Day
- Martin Luther King Jr. Day
- Columbus Day

### FINAL EXAMS

- Fall Final Exams: December
- Spring Final Exams: June
- Summer Final Exams: August

### READING DAYS

- Fall Reading Days: September
- Spring Reading Days: May
- Summer Reading Days: August

---

**Calendar Notes:**

- The calendar includes important dates such as academic holidays, breaks, and exams.
- Reading days are marked in the calendar for both fall and spring.
- The calendar is color-coded to distinguish between holidays, breaks, academic dates, final exams, and reading days.
## 2019-2020 UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC CALENDAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL CALENDAR DATES</th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER 2019</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER 2020</th>
<th>SUMMER TERM 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class schedule available</td>
<td>Monday, March 4</td>
<td>Monday, September 23</td>
<td>Monday, February 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration appointments available</td>
<td>Monday, March 4</td>
<td>Monday, September 16</td>
<td>Monday, February 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission/readmission deadline</td>
<td>Monday, April 1</td>
<td>Friday, November 1</td>
<td>Sunday, March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration by appointment begins</td>
<td>Monday, April 8</td>
<td>Thursday, November 7</td>
<td>Monday, March 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to apply for graduation</td>
<td>Monday, June 3</td>
<td>Friday, November 1</td>
<td>Monday, February 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open enrollment</td>
<td>Monday, July 29</td>
<td>Monday, November 25</td>
<td>Monday, April 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Bill 60 registration</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 13</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 2</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition payment due</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 3</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 22</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census deadline</td>
<td>Monday, September 9</td>
<td>Monday, January 28</td>
<td>Monday, June 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Commencement &amp; Convocation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thur-Fri, April 30-May 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades available</td>
<td>Thurs, December 24</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 12</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TERM LENGTH CLASSES

| Classes begin | Monday, August 19 | Monday, January 6 | Monday, May 11 |
| Last day to add without a permission code | Sunday, August 25 | Sunday, January 12 | Sunday, May 17 |
| Last day to drop (delete) classes | Wed., August 28 | Wednesday, January 15 | Wednesday, May 20 |
| Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes | Tuesday, Sept. 3 | Tuesday, January 21 | Tuesday, May 26 |
| Last day to withdraw from classes | Friday, October 18 | Friday, February 28 | Friday, June 19 |
| Last day to reverse CR/NC option | Wednesday, Nov. 27 | Friday, April 17 | Thursday, July 23 |
| Classes end | Thursday, December 5 | Tuesday, April 21 | Wed, July 29 |
| Reading Day | Friday, December 6 | Wednesday, April 22 | N/A |
| Final exam period | Mon.-Fri., Dec. 9-13 | Thurs- Wed, April 23-29 | Thur-Fri, July 30-31 |

### FIRST SESSION CLASSES

| Classes begin | Monday, August 19 | Monday, January 6 | Monday, May 13 |
| Last day to drop (delete) classes | Wed., August 28 | Wednesday, January 15 | Wednesday, May 20 |
| Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes | Tuesday, Sept. 3 | Tuesday, January 21 | Tuesday, May 26 |
| Last day to withdraw from classes | Friday, September 13 | Friday, January 31 | Friday, May 29 |
| Last day to reverse CR/NC option | Friday, Sept. 27 | Friday, February 21 | Friday, June 12 |
| Classes end | Friday, October 4 | Tuesday, February 25 | Wednesday, June 17 |

### SECOND SESSION CLASSES

| Classes begin | Monday, October 14 | Wednesday, February 26 | Thursday, June 18 |
| Last day to drop (delete) classes | Wednesday, October 23 | Friday, March 6 | Saturday, June 29 |
| Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes | Monday, October 28 | Tuesday, March 10 | Wednesday, July 3 |
| Last day to withdraw from classes | Friday, November 8 | Friday, March 27 | Friday, July 12 |
| Last day to reverse CR/NC option | Wednesday, Nov. 27 | Friday, April 17 | Friday, July 26 |
| Classes end | Thursday, December 5 | Tuesday, April 21 | Wednesday, July 29 |

### HOLIDAYS

| Labor Day holiday | Monday, September 2 | | |
| Fall break | Sun.-Sun., Oct. 6-13 | | |
| Thanksgiving break | Thurs.-Fri., Nov. 28-29 | | |
| Holiday recess | Sat, Dec 14-Sun, Jan 5 | | |
| Martin Luther King Jr. Day holiday | Monday, January 21 | | |
| Presidents Day | Monday, February 18 | | |
| Spring break | | | |
| Memorial Day holiday | | | |
| Independence Day holiday (observed) | | | |
| Pioneer Day holiday (observed) | | | |

Calendar subject to change without notice. For the most up-to-date information, visit [http://registrar.utah.edu/academic-calendars/index.php](http://registrar.utah.edu/academic-calendars/index.php)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL CALENDAR DATES</th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER 2020</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER 2021</th>
<th>SUMMER TERM 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class schedule available</td>
<td>Monday, March 2</td>
<td>Monday, September 28</td>
<td>Monday, February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration appointments available</td>
<td>Monday, March 2</td>
<td>Monday, September 21</td>
<td>Monday, February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission/readmission deadline</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 1</td>
<td>Monday, November 2</td>
<td>Monday, March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration by appointment begins</td>
<td>Monday, April 13</td>
<td>Thursday, November 5</td>
<td>Monday, March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to apply for graduation</td>
<td>Monday, June 1</td>
<td>Monday, November 2</td>
<td>Monday, February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open enrollment</td>
<td>Monday, July 27</td>
<td>Monday, November 30</td>
<td>Monday, April 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Bill 60 registration</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 18</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 5</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition payment due</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 8</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 22</td>
<td>Tuesday, June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census deadline</td>
<td>Monday, September 14</td>
<td>Monday, February 1</td>
<td>Monday, June 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Commencement &amp; Convocation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Thur-Fri, May 6-7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades available</td>
<td>Thurs, December 29</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 18</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine Graduation Exercises</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TERM LENGTH CLASSES**

| Classes begin | Monday, August 24 | Monday, January 11 | Monday, May 17 |
| Last day to add without a permission code | Sunday, August 30 | Monday, January 18 | Monday, May 23 |
| Last day to drop (delete) classes | Wed., Sept 2 | Wednesday, January 20 | Wednesday, May 26 |
| Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes | Tuesday, Sept. 8 | Monday, January 25 | Tuesday, June 1 |
| Last day to withdraw from classes | Friday, October 23 | Friday, March 5 | Friday, June 26 |
| Last day to reverse CR/NC option | Friday, Dec. 4 | Friday, April 23 | Friday, July 30 |
| Classes end | Thursday, December 10 | Tuesday, April 27 | Wednesday, Aug 4 |
| Reading Day | Friday, December 11 | Wednesday, April 28 | N/A |
| Final exam period | Mon.-Fri., Dec. 14-18 | Thurs- Wed, April 29-May 5 | Thur-Fri, Aug 5-6 |

**FIRST SESSION CLASSES**

| Classes begin | Monday, August 24 | Monday, January 11 | Monday, May 17 |
| Last day to drop (delete) classes | Wed., Sept 2 | Wednesday, January 20 | Wednesday, May 26 |
| Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes | Tuesday, Sept. 8 | Monday, January 25 | Tuesday, June 1 |
| Last day to withdraw from classes | Friday, September 18 | Friday, February 5 | Friday, June 4 |
| Last day to reverse CR/NC option | Friday, October 2 | Friday, February 26 | Friday, June 18 |
| Classes end | Friday, October 9 | Tuesday, March 2 | Wednesday, June 23 |

**SECOND SESSION CLASSES**

| Classes begin | Monday, October 19 | Wednesday, March 3 | Thursday, June 24 |
| Last day to drop (delete) classes | Wednesday, October 28 | Friday, March 12 | Saturday, July 3 |
| Last day to add, elect CR/NC, or audit classes | Monday, November 2 | Tuesday, March 16 | Wednesday, July 7 |
| Last day to withdraw from classes | Friday, November 13 | Friday, April 2 | Friday, July 16 |
| Last day to reverse CR/NC option | Friday, December 4 | Friday, April 23 | Friday, July 30 |
| Classes end | Thursday, December 10 | Tuesday, April 27 | Wednesday, Aug 4 |

**HOLIDAYS**

| Labor Day holiday | Monday, September 7 | | |
| Fall break | Sun.-Sun., Oct. 11-18 | | |
| Thanksgiving break | Thurs.-Fri., Nov. 26-27 | | |
| Holiday recess | Sat, Dec 19-Sun, Jan 10 | | |
| Martin Luther King Jr. Day holiday | Monday, January 18 | | |
| Presidents Day | Monday, February 15 | | |
| Spring break | Sun - Sun, March 14-21 | | |
| Memorial Day holiday | Monday, May 31 | | |
| Independence Day holiday (observed) | Mon, July 5 | | |
| Pioneer Day holiday (observed) | Friday, July 23 | | |

Calendar subject to change without notice. For the most up-to-date information, visit [http://registrar.utah.edu/academic-calendars/index.php](http://registrar.utah.edu/academic-calendars/index.php)
### FALL 2020 WITH READING DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUGUST 2020</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER 2020</th>
<th>OCTOBER 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
<td>23 24 25 26 27 28 29</td>
<td>30 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DECEMBER 2020

|          | S M T W TH F S |  |
|----------|----------------|  |
|          | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |  |
|          | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 |  |
|          | 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 |  |
|          | 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 |  |
|          | 30 31 |  |

### JANUARY 2021

|          | S M T W TH F S |  |
|----------|----------------|  |
|          | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |  |
|          | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 |  |
|          | 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 |  |
|          | 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 |  |
|          | 30 31 |  |

### SPRING 2021 WITH READING DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JANUARY 2021</th>
<th>FEBRUARY 2021</th>
<th>MARCH 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23</td>
<td>23 24 25 26 27 28 29</td>
<td>30 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMER 2021 (WITH SPRING READING DAY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MAY 2021</th>
<th>JUNE 2021</th>
<th>JULY 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
<td>S M T W TH F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23</td>
<td>20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27</td>
<td>28 29 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUGUST 2021

|          | S M T W TH F S |  |
|----------|----------------|  |
|          | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |  |
|          | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 |  |
|          | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 |  |
|          | 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 |  |
|          | 29 30 31 |  |

**Legend:**
- **HOLIDAYS**
- **BREAKS**
- **ACADEMIC DATES**
- **FINAL EXAMS**
- **READING DAY(S)**
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Senate Committee Reports

- Academic Freedom & Faculty Rights (AFFR)
- Academic Policy Advisory Committee (APAC)
- Faculty Budget and Planning Committee (FBPAC)
- Library Policy Advisory Committee (LPAC)
- University Diversity Committee (UDC)
- University RPT Standards Committee (URPTSC)
From: Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee  
To: Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Date: March 1, 2014  
Re: Report of 2013-2014 Activities

Membership:
Margaret F. Clayton (CoN), Craig Teerlink (SOM), Andrew Franta (Humanities), Patrick Panos (Social Work), Bob Allen (Business), Donna Deyhle (Education), Todd Kramer (Social/Behavioral Science), Felicity Murphy (Quinney Law Library), Alison Regan (Marriott Library), Zak Fang (Mines and Earth Sciences), Karen Gunning (Pharmacy). Bruce Quaglia (Fine Arts) was unable to serve during the Fall 2013.

The Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights committee expresses opinions on alleged violations of the academic freedom or rights of individual colleagues, and advises the University on the revision and creation of University policies and procedures.

The Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights committee met July 9th, 2013, September 6, 2013, and October 1, 2013. During the academic year 2013-2014 we reviewed two grievances. We also reviewed the procedural flow of complaints and reaffirmed that our membership should include career line faculty. One informal conversation was held January 23, 2014 between Maureen Condic and Margaret Clayton for preliminary discussion about AFFR’s potential role and/or collaboration with a University Ombudsman. No resolution was arrived upon.

Respectfully submitted;

Margaret F Clayton, PhD APRN  
Chair, AFFR Committee
Darby Fanning conducted the meeting and all individuals in attendance were welcomed and individually introduced to the body.

Allyson Mower, Academic Senate President, proposed Darby Fanning to serve as chair for the Academic Policy Advisory Committee for the 2013-2014 Academic year. All members in attendance agreed.

The committee discussed the addition of career-line faculty serving on APAC. The following changes to the committee charge were proposed and passed by the committee:

1. The Academic Policy Advisory Committee consists of eight 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 committee tabled the discussion on the Data Management Policy until the next meeting.

The next meeting will be held on November 14, 2013 at 1p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m.
Academic Policy Advisory  
November 14, 2013

Due to a new review of changes to the Data Management Policy and the discussion outside of APAC for the Personal Information Policy to become a Rule within the Data Management Policy as opposed to a stand-alone policy, the November 14 meeting was cancelled to allow for preparation for the changes.

Academic Policy Advisory  
October 3, 2013

Attendees: Darby Fanning, Harriet Hopf, David Kieda, Ilija Miskovic, Ken Monson, Margaret Toscano

Excused: Edward Bateman, Robin Marcus, Thad Hall

Darby Fanning conducted the meeting and welcomed Dr. David Kieda, Dean of the Graduate School, who initiated a review and arrived to the meeting for background discussion and to take questions surrounding the proposed revisions to PPM 6-317 (Visiting Scholars) and PPM 6-405 (Visiting Graduate Student or Visiting Postdoctoral Scholar).

The revisions suggested are below within the text of each policy. For both documents, the committee suggested the same two changes:

1. In Section I: strike purpose and add the term “policy” since the term “purpose” is redundant.
2. In Section III, Part C: Change language to explicitly state that health care coverage will not be a benefit from the University of Utah provided to a visiting scholar (PPM 6-317) nor to a visiting graduate or post-doctoral scholar (PPM 6-405). The committee routed this language in both policies to Robert Flores of General Council to approve the wording in the document.

After the documents return from Bob Flores, APAC will route them to the Institutional Policy Committee.

Final note of meeting: The Academic Policy Advisory Committee awaits revisions to the Data Management Policy and the Personal Data Rule for further discussion and a meeting will be forthcoming for that discussion.
Policy 6-317: Visiting Scholars

I. Purpose

To state the purpose and policy and procedures for inviting Visiting Scholars to the university.

II. Definition

"Visiting Scholar" is a title conferred by the Dean of the Graduate School upon visiting persons who normally have an academic appointment at another institution or a permanent appointment elsewhere and who wish to spend at least one or more semesters on our campus. This title may also be conferred upon visiting scientists and visiting dignitaries.

III. Policy

A. A person is appointed as a Visiting Scholar by the Dean of the Graduate School. Appointments are for specified periods only. Individuals appointed to the position of Visiting Scholar receive letters of welcome from the Dean of the Graduate School.

B. Visiting Scholars are encouraged to participate in the academic and social life of the university. Visiting Scholars are therefore entitled, without charge, to audit university classes with the permission of the instructor, and to use university research equipment and computing facilities on such terms as may be agreeable to those responsible for such resources. They will receive access to on-campus parking, library, and recreational privileges, on the same basis as regular faculty members, and will also enjoy approved faculty discounts at the bookstore, and at the theatre, athletic contests, and other events.

C. Visiting Scholars are not entitled to compensation as employees of the university, are not appointed to teaching or research positions, and do not receive direct financial support either from or through the university except for one-time honorariums under special circumstances approved by the cognizant Senior Vice President. Any incidental services performed for the university by a Visiting Scholar are deemed to be performed as a volunteer.

D. The Visiting Scholar designation is not a contractual relationship, and therefore should not be used for postdoctoral fellows, for visiting professors who have teaching responsibilities, or for persons employed for a short period for the purpose of performing services for the university in return for an agreed compensation. Where compensation is contemplated, a Career-line faculty appointment or consulting contract, as may be appropriate, should be used.

E. A person who registers for regular academic credit does not qualify for appointment as a Visiting Scholar.

IV. Procedures

A. Recommendations for appointment of Visiting Scholars must be approved by majority vote of the faculty of the college, department, program, institute, or
center, which will be hosting the Visiting Scholar and providing an office space and any other support and resources promised to the Visiting Scholar. Such recommendations must carry the endorsement of the dean of the appropriate university unit and are submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School.

B. A registry of Visiting Scholars is kept by the Graduate School.

C. Appropriate University identification cards will be issued to visiting scholars to facilitate extension to them of the privileges associated with Visiting Scholar status.

D. Provision of laboratory access, computational resources, office space, or other working quarters for a visiting scholar is the responsibility of the university unit submitting the appointment recommendation, and is subject to availability of resources.

V. Contacts

A. Policy Owner:
   1. Questions about this Policy and any related Rules, Procedures and Guidelines should be directed to the Dean of the Graduate School.

Policy Officers:

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

Draft: 11/25/13

Approved: University Senate 10/6/80

Approved: Institutional Council 10/13/80

Policy 6-405: Visiting Graduate Student or Visiting Postdoctoral Scholar

I. Purpose

To state the purpose policy and procedures for inviting Visiting Graduate Students or Visiting Postdoctoral Scholars to the university.

II. Definition

"Visiting Graduate Student" or "Visiting Postdoctoral Scholar" is a title conferred by the Dean of the Graduate School upon visiting graduate students or visiting postdoctoral scholars.

III. Policy
A. A person is appointed a Visiting Graduate Student or Visiting Postdoctoral Scholar by the Dean of the Graduate School. Appointments are for specified periods only. Individuals appointed to the position of Visiting Graduate Student or Visiting Postdoctoral Scholar receive a letter of welcome from the Dean of the Graduate School.

B. Visiting Graduate Students and Visiting Postdoctoral Scholars are encouraged to participate in the academic and social life of the university. Visiting Graduate Students and Visiting Postdoctoral Scholars therefore receive library privileges, may attend the university as nonmatriculated students, and may use university research and computing facilities on such terms as are agreeable to those responsible for such resources. Library privileges are provided without charge. Visiting Graduate Students and Visiting Postdoctoral Scholars are provided University identification, and can receive access to additional university resources, such as parking and Campus Recreation Services.

C. Visiting Graduate Students and Visiting Postdoctoral Scholars are not entitled to compensation or benefits (i.e., health insurance) as graduate assistants or employees of the university, are not appointed to teaching or research positions, and do not receive direct financial support either from or through the university.

IV. Procedures

A. Recommendations for appointment of Visiting Graduate Students or Visiting Postdoctoral Scholars must be approved by majority vote of the relevant university unit. They must carry the endorsement of the deans of the appropriate university unit, and are submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School.

B. A registry of Visiting Graduate Students and Visiting Postdoctoral Scholars is kept by the Graduate School.

C. Appropriate identification cards will be issued to Visiting Graduate Students and Visiting Postdoctoral Scholars to facilitate extension to them of the privileges associated with their status.

D. Provision of laboratory access, computational resources, office space or other working quarters for Visiting Graduate Students and Visiting Postdoctoral Scholars is the responsibility of the relevant university unit submitting the appointment recommendation, and is subject to availability of resources.

V. Contacts

Policy Owner:

Questions about this Policy and any related Rules, Procedures and Guidelines should be directed to the Dean of the Graduate School.

Policy Officers:

Only the Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Sr. Vice President for Health Sciences or their designees have the authority to grant exceptions to this policy.
During the 2013-14 academic year, the Senate Advisory Committee on Budget and Planning (SACBP) considered ways to execute its mission in more concrete ways. SACBP is charged with advising the Academic Senate and ultimately the university administration about faculty concerns regarding the budget and budget process at the University of Utah. After informing ourselves about stages of the budget process and about sources and distribution of revenue, committee members decided to develop a questionnaire as a means to indicate faculty awareness of and concerns about the budget process. The Senate has approved the questionnaire (see attached), which we will distribute by email around March 17. The email will offer a web link and invite faculty to complete the survey online.

SACBP expects to complete analysis of faculty responses and compose an advisory letter to the administration by mid April, in time for the Academic Senate Executive Committee to review these materials before the year’s final meeting of the Academic Senate. The Executive Committee may wish to suggest revisions to the advisory letter.

**Provisional SACBP Agenda Items for 2014-15.**

SACBP has defined two topics to investigate next year, and of course would accept guidance from the Academic Senate and Academic Senate Executive Committee. First, we plan to study definitions of “productivity” throughout the university. We will simultaneously look at models of productivity at comparable institutions throughout the nation. We hope to discover how the university manages budgets and whether budgeting accommodates the diverse functions of different units of the university.

SACBP believes this topic continues in the spirit of the questionnaire. The questionnaire implicitly advocates some degree of transparency in the budget process, and transparency is one principle advanced by the Budget Principles and Process Working Group (chaired by Professor Henry White) assembled this year by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Ruth Watkins. SACBP supports the Budget Working Group’s principle #3, which seeks to ensure that budget allocations are transparent, documented, and accessible. Without disclosing sensitive budget information, SACBP hopes to facilitate the goal of transparency, which would increase the confidence of faculty and enhance faculty governance.

Studying definitions of “productivity” across campus will help SACBP consider how to act upon the concerns and issues revealed by responses to the questionnaire. Sr. Vice President Watkins has asked the Budget Working Group to begin to examine different budgetary models at some universities nationwide. The Budget Working Group has endorsed the principle that the “budget process supports budget model diversity,” recognizing that “different budgeting units perform different functions and
have different revenue streams and costs.” SACBP hopes to gain a sense of diversity in the budgeting process in order better to represent faculty concerns and interests to the Academic Senate and university administration. This project should help us refine our sense of the scope of SACBP’s mission.

As a second topic for 2014-15, SACBP has decided to study the percentage of operating funds budgetary units can hold in reserve. The state of Utah mandates that no more than 4% of state funds can be held in reserve. Higher portions of funds from other (non-state) sources can be held in reserve. Clinical revenue, for example, is not limited to the 4% reserve maximum. Yet department chairs and program directors from disciplines funded primarily through state funds may feel the 4% limit too restrictive. SACBP will investigate whether clear advice can be formulated and distributed about ways to establish reserves in order to enhance fiscal flexibility.

Respectfully,

Senate Advisory Committee for Budget and Planning

Enrique Aleman Howard Horwitz (chair)
Kent Lai Bub Lutz
Chris Maloney Sanja Miskovic
Allyson Mower (ex officio) Nicholas Schapper
Scott Ward
The Senate Advisory Committee on Budget and Planning consults with the university administration and represents the views and interests of the whole faculty in the administration’s long range academic budget and planning. SACBP reports to the Academic Senate. University Policy 6-002 urges SACBP to strive to persuade the administration to make critical budgetary and academic policy decisions in as open and public a way as possible. Through the following questionnaire, SACBP is trying to acquire feedback from faculty about the budget process and some initial data about faculty views of budget priorities.

1. What College are you primarily affiliated with?

College of Architecture and Planning  
College of Business  
College of Dentistry  
College of Education  
College of Engineering  
College of Fine Arts  
College of Health  
Honors College  
College of Humanities  
College of Law  
College of Medicine  
College of Mines and Earth Sciences  
College of Nursing  
College of Pharmacy  
College of Science  
College of social and Behavioral Science  
College of Social Work

2. Are you aware of the purpose of the Senate Advisory Committee on Budget and Planning

a. Yes  
b. No  
c. Until I received this survey I did not know of the existence of the SACBP.

Section A: Your current experiences and expectations with the budgetary processes at the university.

3. Are you familiar with the process of budgetary planning, such as decisions on spending priorities, in your Department/Division/Program?

a. Very familiar.  
b. Somewhat familiar.  
c. Not familiar at all.

4. Are you familiar with the process of budgetary planning, such as decisions on spending priorities, in your College/School?

a. Very familiar.  
b. Somewhat familiar.  
c. Not familiar at all.

5. Are you familiar with the process of budgetary planning, such as decisions on spending priorities, at the university level?

a. Very familiar.  
b. Somewhat familiar.  
c. Not familiar at all.
6. Do you believe that faculty should be more aware of the process of budgetary planning?
   a. Yes, very strongly.
   b. I guess so.
   c. Not really.
   d. Faculty do not need to know more about the budget process.
   Please comment if you feel that faculty need to know more about the budget process at different levels of the university (department/division/program; college/school; university as a whole).

7. How can the university administration better communicate its budgetary concerns and decisions? (Check all that apply).
   a. Town hall Meetings.
   b. Regular surveys to get input from Faculty and Staff.
   c. The university administration is doing a great job and nothing more is required.
   d. The university administration does not need to communicate with faculty about the budget process.
   Any other suggestions:_____________________________________________.

8. Do you have any specific concerns for the current budgetary planning process of the university?
   a. No.
   b. Yes and they are:____________________________________________

9. Should individual faculty be aware of sources of income for individuals/programs/ Divisions/Departments/Colleges?
   a. Yes, of course.
   b. Yes, to some extent.
   c. No.

10. Is it important that faculty who are neither department chairs, program directors, nor deans participate in the process of budgetary planning?
    a. Yes, very important.
    b. Somewhat important.
    c. Not important.
    Any specific suggestions:_____________________________________________.

Section B. Your current knowledge and opinions about the budgetary models at the university (principles and results of the budgetary processes).

11. Are you aware of the sources of income for your salary and benefits?
    a. Yes.
    b. I have a general understanding of funding sources.
    c. I have an incomplete understanding.
    d. No.
    If you wish, please provide a brief description of university funding sources, as you understand them:

12. Do you understand how resources are distributed throughout the university?
    a. Yes, I think I understand the model well.
b. I have a general understanding of funding sources.
c. I have an incomplete understanding.
d. No.
If you wish, please provide a brief description of the university budgetary model, as you understand it:

13. Do you think the university explains on its website how resources are distributed throughout the university?
   a. Yes.
   b. No.
   c. I don’t know.
   d. I don’t know where to find this information on the university website.
Please indicate if the budgetary model should be available on the university website, or by other means.

14. What portion of your department or program’s budget seems to depend on Student Credit Hour (SCH) production or productivity funds?
   a. 100%.
   b. A significant portion, but not the entirety, about 75%.
   c. SCH is one factor among others.
   d. I don’t know.
   e. I don’t know what SCH or productivity funds are.

15. Do you feel that SCH is too great a factor determining the budget of your department or program?
   a. Yes.
   b. No.
   c. SCH should form a larger factor in the determination of a department’s or program’s budget.
   d. I don’t know.
The Library Policy Advisory Committee roster is given in Appendix 1. During the academic year 2013-14 the committee met once in the fall and is planning a second meeting for the early spring.

As charted by the Academic Senate President, the Committee’s main task for this academic year was the revision of Policy 7-013: Copyright Policy: Copying of Copyrighted Works. During the summer of 2013 the co-chairs of the committee worked with the Academic Senate President and the Office of the Legal Counsel in revising the policy. The main reason for the revision was to align the policy with current US law, by explicitly including the concept of “fair use” in the University policy.

The committee was informed about the need of changing the policy and with the first draft at its fall meeting. The committee made several comments that were included in the subsequent version of the policy and instructed the co-Chairs to proceed with the approval process of the new policy. The co-chairs presented the policy to several senate sub-committees and administrators of the University. At each stage minor recommendations to improve the policy were offered and incorporated in the policy. Finally the co-Chairs presented the final policy for approval of the full senate. After senate approval the policy has received final approval.

The rest of the committee agenda was dedicated to information items. All libraries presented to the committee progress status reports and plans for future development. The committee did not find any substantive issues with the items presented.
Appendix 1

Library Policy Advisory Committee 2013-2014

Faculty:
Julio Facelli, Co-Chair, julio.facelli@utah.edu
School of Medicine
5700 HSEB, (801) 585-3791

Amelia Rinehart, Co-Chair, amelia.rinehart@law.utah.edu
Law
101 Law, (801) 581-6833

Cathryn Clayton, c.clayton@utah.edu
Fine Arts
204 DGH, (801) 585-1034

Valeri Craigle, craiglev@law.utah.edu
S J Quinney Law Library
101 Law, (801) 585-5475

John DeFord, golfcalc@aol.com
Science
201 JFB, (801) 581-8396

David Derezotes, dderezotes@socwk.utah.edu
Social Work
101 SW (801) 585-3546

Alan Dorval, alan.dorval@utah.edu
Engineering, 506E BPRB (801) 587-7631

Reid Ewing, ewing@arch.utah.edu
Architecture + Planning
235 ARCH, (801) 581-8255

Sarah Ferguson, sarah.ferguson@hsc.utah.edu
Health
1201 Beh S, (801) 581-6725

Karin Fladmoe-Lindquist, mgtkfl@business.utah.edu
David Eccles School of Business
106 KDGB, (801) 581-6506
Holly Gurgle, holly.gurgle@pharm.utah.edu
Pharmacy
201 Skaggs, (801) 585-0982

Tek Kilgore, tkilgore@shs.utah.edu
Nursing
3470 Nursing, (801) 581-6431

Howard Lehman, lehman@poli-sci.utah.edu
Social & Behavioral Science
252 OSH, (801) 581-6246

Wanda Pillow, wanda.pillow@utah.edu
Education
307 MBH, (801) 587-7819

Matthew Potolsky, m.potolsky@utah.edu
Humanities
3500 LNCO, (801) 581-5245

Courtenay Strong, court.strong@utah.edu
Mines & Earth Sciences
819 WBB, (801) 581-6136

Ex-Officio:
Allyson Mower, Academic Senate President
Alberta Comer, Director Marriott Library
Melissa Bernstein, Director SJ Quinney Law Library
Jean Shipman, Director Eccles Health Science Library
During this academic year, the University Diversity Committee [“UDC”] has undertaken four projects:

1. **Campus Climate Assessment Project**

   The UDC has worked this year with Belinda Saltiban to assist in setting up the Campus Climate Assessment project that she oversees in Undergraduate Studies. After an initial meeting in the Fall with the entire Committee, members of the UDC have continued to consult with Ms. Saltiban during the project’s initial set-up phase. Once the project has been set up, members of the UDC will be invited to join the Task Force that will conduct the project.

   In addition, the UDC has begun discussions with Ms. Saltiban and others on campus to explore whether a campus-wide climate assessment that includes not only students but also faculty and staff might be implemented.

2. **Graduate Council Redbook**

   The UDC met with the Dean and Associate Dean of the Graduate School as well as with representatives from Undergraduate Studies to discuss possible changes to the language in the Redbook that governs assessing diversity issues during Departmental Reviews. After the initial meeting, further consultations have taken place and, as a result, the diversity language in the Redbook has now been refined to require a more careful assessment of diversity issues.

3. **University of Utah Nondiscrimination Statements and Policies**

   The UDC has undertaken a careful review of the various University statements and policies that mandate nondiscrimination in all university-related endeavors. In particular, concern has arisen over inconsistencies among the statements and policies. As a result, four proposals were passed and sent to the Academic Senate aimed at aligning these regulations with one another. [The proposals are attached in Appendix A.]

4. **Utah Fight Song**

   At the behest of Social Work Professor, Joanne Yaffe, the UDC is currently conducting public hearings as to whether a proposal should be sent to the Academic Senate urging that it amend what many perceive to be sexist lyrics in the Utah Fight Song. Professor Yaffe has introduced a modified version of the song that eliminates such lyrics. Representatives of the UDC are currently meeting with various constituencies across campus to gather input before making any determination on this issue.
Appendix A

Memorandum

To: Academic Senate
From: Terry Kogan, Co-Chair
Re: Proposal to Add Terms “Sex/Gender” and “Genetic information” to University of Utah Nondiscrimination Policies
Date: February 27, 2014

The University Diversity Committee recommends to the Academic Senate that the various nondiscrimination statements and policies be amended as follows.

Proposal One:

The University of Utah “Nondiscrimination & Accessibility Statement”, which now appears on the University of Utah website, be formally adopted and incorporated as an official Policy within Part 1 “General Policies” of the system of University Regulations, appearing as new Policy 1-200.

Proposal Two:

The phrase “race, color” in the following University of Utah nondiscrimination statements and policies be replaced by the phrase “race/ethnicity, color.”

Effected policies include:

2. The OEO Office “Nondiscrimination and Disability Accommodation Statement,” published by the OEO office at [http://www.oeo.utah.edu/access/].
3. Policy 5-102 Revision 10 (Staff Employment Policy), Section IV-A.
4. Policy 6-011. Revision 1: Functions and Procedures of the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee (New location of policy effective may, 2014).
5. Policy 6-316. Revision 12 (Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities), Section 4-A-2.
6. Policy 6-400 Revision 9 (Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities—“Student Code”), Section II-E [“Freedom from Discrimination and Sexual Harassment”].

Proposal Three:

The word “gender” that now appears in Policy 6-316. Revision 12 (Code of Faculty Rights
Proposal Four:

The phrase “genetic information” be added to the following University of Utah nondiscrimination statements and policies:

1. The OEO Office “Nondiscrimination and Disability Accommodation Statement,” published by the OEO office at [http://www.oeo.utah.edu/access/].


3. Policy 5-102 Revision 10 (Staff Employment Policy), Section IV-A.

4. Policy 6-011. Revision 1: Functions and Procedures of the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee (New location of policy effective may, 2014).

5. Policy 6-316. Revision 12 (Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities), Section 4-A-2.

6. Policy 6-400 Revision 9 (Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities--“Student Code”), Section II-E [“Freedom from Discrimination and Sexual Harassment”].
March 7, 2014

MEMO TO: Academic Senate

FROM: Hank Liese, Sandra Shotwell, and Paul Jewell
       Co-Chairs, University RPT Standards Committee (URPTSC)


Meeting Schedule

The University RPT Standards Committee meeting schedule for the 2013-2014 academic year is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 20</td>
<td>January 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>February 21 (cancelled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>March 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 13</td>
<td>April 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 9 (if necessary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Departmental/College RPT Reviews

The following departmental RPT statements have come to the URPTSC this academic year and are currently under review:

1. Modern Dance
2. Theatre
3. Film & Media Arts
4. Mining Engineering
5. Libraries

Statements in the drafting stage that may come to the URPTSC this year are:

1. School of Medicine
2. Languages and Literature

The URPTSC continues to work on the following statements, with the goal of having all approved by the beginning of Fall Semester, 2014:

1. Art & Art History
2. Parks, Recreation, & Tourism
3. English
4. Math
5. Biology
6. Metallurgical Engineering
Additional URPTSC Discussion Items in 2013-2014

To date, URPTSC meeting agendas have included the following additional discussion items:

- **San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment.**
- Presentation on interdisciplinary research/scholarship by Robert Newman and Keith Bartholomew.
- The expanding role of the URPTSC, which will become the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and will review, in addition to tenure-line RPT statements, career-line appointment, retention, and promotion statements, as well Tenured Faculty Review (TFR) statements (see below).
- Proposed changes to U. Policy 6-002 (*The Academic Senate*).
- Update on the work of the new Career-line & Adjunct Faculty Task Force.
- Continuing development of an RPT template for use by departments/colleges.

Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee

Of all the Senate committees, the URPTSC is likely undergoing the most changes in regard to its roles and responsibilities. The most important changes were summarized as follows by Robert Flores in a January 17, 2014 memo to the URPTSC and the Career-line & Adjunct Faculty Task Force:

- **Expanding functions** to include not only the existing role of acting on behalf of the Senate to review and approve departmental RPT Statements (especially describing standards and procedures for tenure reviews), but also two new roles, on behalf of the Senate reviewing and approving Statements of Standards and Procedures developed by departments/colleges for **reviews of Career-line faculty** and any non-faculty instructional personnel who teach courses, and Statements for **reviews of Tenured Faculty**.

In the discussions for this second set of changes, the two Senior Vice Presidents, the Standards Committee [URPTSC], and the Executive Committee have worked out basic aspects of an arrangement for this committee and the Vice Presidents to jointly share responsibility for reviewing and approving the contents of the Statements which govern reviews of Career-line and Tenured faculty (responsibilities which under Policies 2-005 and 6-310 currently rest only with the VP—without any role for a committee representing the Senate). Revising the 6-002 description of the Committee’s functions is the first step in codifying the new shared-joint approval arrangement (and approval of this proposal for 6-002 specifically includes a charge to proceed with a second step, preparing a proposal to revise Policies 6-303, 6-310, and 2-005 to fully codify that sharing arrangement).

- **Expanding membership** to include six Career-line faculty members for the added responsibilities regarding review processes for Career-line faculty, which brings total membership to 23 faculty. Also authorizing flexible structuring into **sub-committees when appropriate** for workload circumstances.
- **Lengthening terms of members**, so each will serve a **four-year term** and can be eligible for nomination and election to a **second consecutive term**, whereas current Policy restricts each member to a single three-year term (consecutive terms prohibited). Current members have agreed these changes are needed because this committee’s responsibilities require in-depth knowledge and skills that come only with the experience gained through longer service.
February 27, 2014

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

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of City and Metropolitan Planning

Dear Vice President Watkins:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Department of City and Metropolitan Planning. 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: Nan Ellin, Chair, Department of City and Metropolitan Planning
Keith Bartholomew, Interim Dean, College of Architecture + Planning
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of City and Metropolitan Planning. The External Review Committee included:

Charles E. Connerly, PhD (Chair)
Professor, School of Urban and Regional Planning
University of Iowa

Ann Forsyth, PhD
Program Director, Master in Urban Planning
Department of Urban Planning and Design
Harvard University

David Listokin, PhD
Professor, Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy
Rutgers University

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Abby Fiat, MFA
Professor, Department of Modern Dance

Barbara Brown, PhD
Professor, Department of Family and Consumer Studies

Daniel McCool, PhD
Professor, Department of Political Science
This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study submitted by the Department of City and Metropolitan Planning, conversation with the external review committee, the reports of the internal and external review committees, the OBIA profile, and the Department Chair and Dean’s letters in response to the internal and external review committee reports.

DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The mission of the Department of City and Metropolitan Planning is to enhance the health and vitality of towns, cities, and regions through place-based and integrated approaches to quality growth, building in harmony with nature, placemaking, and capacity-building. Teaching, research and practice are all means of supporting this mission.

This is the first Graduate Council review of the Department of City and Metropolitan Planning, as it has existed in its present structure for only five years. The undergraduate program in urban planning was initially housed in the Department of Geography (as of 1978). In 2003, the undergraduate program was moved to the Graduate School of Architecture (now the College of Architecture + Planning). Shortly thereafter, a master’s degree and graduate certificate in urban planning were initiated. The Department entered a period of rapid growth and development, which was enhanced five years later. In 2008, the present configuration was formed as the programs became the Department of City and Metropolitan Planning (C&MP) and the master’s degree was labeled Master of City and Metropolitan Planning (MCMP). In 2010, this degree was accredited by the National Planning Accreditation Board. At approximately the same time, a PhD program was initiated, as was a Master of Real Estate Development (through a partnership with the David Eccles School of Business). The Department offers graduate certificates in Planning, Historic Preservation, Real Estate Development, and Urban Design. The Department has three principal research centers: the Metropolitan Research Center, Ecological Planning Center, and National Institute of Transportation and Communities (this last in conjunction with several other universities). The Department is the university home of the Center for the Living City and is affiliated with the Global Change and Sustainability Center. Three ongoing programs include the Island Press Book Series, the 10 11 12 lecture series focusing on planning and urbanism, and the Mayor’s Symposium. The self-study reports that the faculty have written or edited 40 books, published 167 articles and book chapters, delivered 40 invited talks internationally, 251 talks nationally, and hundreds of talks locally since 2006. It states that the number of students has grown from 25 to 857 in 10 years, while the faculty has expanded from 1 to 12. Undergraduate degrees began being awarded in 1978. The 2011 OBIA report indicates that 41 undergraduate and 25 master’s degrees were awarded. There are currently 19 PhD students. The first PhD degrees will be awarded in the very near future.

The Department has garnered over $15 million in grant and contract funds through 89 grants and contracts. Adjunct faculty members have garnered an additional $7 million in grant and contract funding. The Department has also received more than $600,000 in gifts and sponsorships. The OBIA profile reports that appropriated funds grew from $354,402 in 2005 to $1,605,233 in 2011. Clearly this is a highly active and rapidly expanding department. According to both the internal and external
review reports, the Department has also enhanced its quality to the point where it is highly ranked and on the verge of even higher rankings. Its goal is to be ranked as a top-20 planning program in the US. Moreover, faculty, students, and staff alike report satisfaction and positive morale.

The Department has grown rapidly during the past 10 years in terms of faculty, students, programs, productivity, centers, activities, and quality. In essence, it has energetically created a level of activity and growth by drawing on the commitment, collaboration, innovation, and good will of a limited group of faculty and staff. Much of this growth has been enabled by temporary funding. Moreover, the expansion of programs has occurred without a parallel growth in space, leading to a severe deficiency. The Department has set goals for additional growth in the future, but it is unclear how this can be realized without solving the critical space availability problem. The Department is currently facing a situation where it needs to identify the resources to sustain and enhance its level of productivity, quality, and activity or consider which priorities can be sustained without additional resources. The Department also seeks to enhance its already-strong national reputation and to strengthen its diversity. From all indications, the Department is well-poised to meet its strategic goals if adequate resources can be marshaled. However, the internal and external reviews note that the successful expansion of the Department remains “fragile” and concluded that they had the impression that “the current situation is not sustainable.”

Faculty

As of fall 2013, the Department includes 12 core faculty members, eight of whom are tenure-line faculty, while three of the others are career-line faculty, and one is an adjunct professor who is an economist in the University’s Bureau of Economic and Business Research. Two research professors are also integral to the program. According to the Department’s self-study, there are approximately 20 auxiliary faculty, who include many local planning professionals.

The faculty are very energetic, innovative, productive scholars as well as strong teachers and graduate student mentors, and are highly engaged in community activities such as community-based learning classes as well as two workshops, one of which is especially devoted to working with the west side, a largely Latino neighborhood. They are highly engaged with national and international outreach, as is clear from the hundreds of public speaking engagements they have contributed.

The internal reviewers note that “Academic Analytics ranked the faculty in the top ten of Planning PhD programs nationwide on seven distinct metrics” while the Chair’s response letter additionally reports that the Academic Analytics 2011 rankings ranked the Department as #21 in the US.

Of the core faculty members, five are women and seven are men. The two research professors are women. There are no members of underrepresented groups, though one faculty member is Pakistani. Within the auxiliary faculty, there are seven women and two Latinos, while the Department Chair specifies additional international, religious, and sexual preference diversity. The internal review report notes that many of the core faculty are nearing retirement age, adding to the urgency to attract junior faculty of high quality to maintain the current positive trajectory of the Department.
Students

According to OBIA data, there were 108 undergraduate majors in 2011, 69 master’s students and 12 doctoral students. The undergraduate student body is largely made up of local students, most of whom are male. Few members of underrepresented groups are included in the undergraduate student body.

Quality is addressed in the undergraduate program through the GPA requirement. Students must have a 2.7 GPA to enter the major and must maintain an overall 2.7 GPA or a 3.0 GPA in their major. Admitted master’s students have had above average GRE scores. A high proportion of them (approximately half) are from Utah, and the external review notes that this is a more regional pool than would be expected for a program of the stature that is desired. They note that additional recruiting on a national stage will be needed to overcome this limitation. Doctoral students are not as geographically limited, coming from across the country and including some international students. The internal review report notes that the Department has worked on a student recruiting plan, finalized in May 2012, and has been implementing the plan.

The Department has raised funds for undergraduate and master’s students’ scholarships and has funded doctoral students through one fellowship (gift from donor), assistance from the Office of Equity and Diversity, and primarily grants. The Department seeks to fund at least 8 master’s students on an ongoing basis. Both external and internal reviews note the fragile nature of the current funding of students, as it is essentially based on “soft” funding through differential, productivity, and student credit hours. They note that more mature programs typically include elements of more stable funding, which should be and is a goal of this Department.

Student satisfaction is generally high, though the internal review notes that students are aware of tensions between the Department and the School of Architecture and that students are hampered by lack of space and differential tuition. The high general satisfaction noted in the internal review results from counterbalancing of these negative attributes with a large number of positive experiences reported by the students.

Diversity

Diversity is a stated concern of the Department, the internal reviewers and the external reviewers. The internal reviewers comment on the lack of geographic diversity in the master’s students. External reviewers agree and also comment on the lack of minorities among faculty and undergraduate students. The Chair’s response points out that diversity has increased in the last two years, with 45% of applicants being female and 42% being Asian or Black. Of the 22 who entered in 2012, 7 were Asian, 1 was Hispanic/Latino, and 9 were women. She states that the applicant pool was similarly diverse in 2013, though she does not comment on the entering class. Eight of 50 undergraduate majors are minority or international students while 18 are women. The Chair’s response links diversity recruitment to a lack of resources, suggesting that resources are needed to implement a detailed recruitment plan.
Curriculum and Programs of Study

The Department offers a BA/BS, an Honors BA/BS, and a minor. These degrees have recently changed from Urban Planning to Urban Ecology as the faculty have designed an innovative curriculum emphasizing systems thinking and ecological design. The external reviewers suggest that this is beneficial to students and is consistent with the contemporary planning field.

The Department gained national accreditation for its master’s degree in planning in 2010 from the Planning Accreditation Board. The Master of City and Metropolitan Planning degree focuses on smart growth, urban design, and ecological planning. The external reviewers note that these focus areas are both current and well-aligned with the strengths of the faculty members. The Department reports that growth of this program is a strategic goal for the future. External reviewers laud the requirement that students apply theory and methods through completing a professional project.

The new Master of Real Estate Development (MRED) serves a market including mid-career real estate professionals. The MRED appears to be well-designed to educate students and require them to put their training into practice. The external reviewers praise this program both as an example of collaboration with the School of Business, and as an innovative way to serve a nontraditional student population of existing professionals. The internal reviewers do note an apparent gap in this program, and recommend that curriculum offerings should include instruction on “when not to develop—due to environmental impact, cultural reasons, or issues of social justice” to be more consistent with contemporary understandings of sustainability.

The graduate certificates in planning, urban design, real estate development, and historic preservation serve additional students while providing those students evidence of expertise.

The PhD in Metropolitan Planning, Policy and Design completes the degree offerings and draws on the faculty’s scholarship strength.

Overall, programs of study have been well-matched with faculty expertise. External reviewers praise the Department’s mentor program through which students from all programs of study are mentored by practicing planners.

Program Effectiveness -- Outcomes Assessment

During the Graduate Council review, the Department also underwent an accreditation review that required attention to outcomes assessment. After an initial phase of exit interviews, interaction with professionals, and alumni surveys that provided feedback, the Department adapted to the feedback. At this point the Department has systematically specified learning outcomes and related outcome assessment measures and is currently implementing this assessment plan. Both the internal and external reviews indicate that students are satisfied and positive about the Department, their experiences in the Department, and their prospects. The internal review report concludes “…the department is keeping in touch with both external sources of employment and internal concerns of students.”
Facilities and Resources

The Department is housed in a building designed to house the School of Architecture long before the integration of Architecture and Urban Planning. The space was designed to house 60 students and 8 faculty members rather than the 300 students, 10 staff, and 30 faculty housed in the building today. Facilities include a computer lab that is used effectively by students across the college. The Katherine W. Dumke Fine Arts and Architecture Library is housed in the Marriott Library. Staff include an administrative assistant and advisor, a grants/contract/budget officer for the college, a network manager, and an assistant computer technician. Space and staff limitations are prominently noted in the self-study and in the internal and external review reports. This situation has become a critical limitation to further growth, and possibly to maintaining current success.

The Department has developed strategic plans for new faculty and staff personnel. The plans include hiring one faculty member with funds from a gift devoted to ecological planning, replacing a position now vacated in community and economic development, and an opportunity hire for a Korean-American to enhance Urban Design and Real Estate Development certificates. Two staff members are included in the plans, as well. One is a new staff position to support the PhD program and the Metropolitan Research Center. The position was obtained and filled in August 2013. The second new staff position is designed to focus on recruiting, job placement, and alumni relations. These plans are detailed and appropriate, but will require additional resources to implement.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The Department’s faculty are exceptional. They are highly productive in terms of scholarly activity, publication, recognition in the form of awards, innovative community connections (within the University as well as local and global communities), grant activity, and teaching. Moreover, they successfully create and sustain a positive atmosphere for students.

2. The Department is clearly on a highly positive trajectory, with detailed plans presented for further growth to service this important topic of research and education. The Department Chair and the Dean are highly praised for their leadership and the success this has brought the Department over the past five years.

3. The variety of creative outreach programs and connections forged both externally and within the University are a model of excellence. The relationship with Island Press enables faculty book publications. The workshops, lecture series, and Mayor’s Symposia connect the Department with the professional community as well as neighborhood organizations, community councils, and others interested in urban planning issues. Collaboration with other units on campus has led to degrees that serve new markets.

4. The Department has developed student learning outcomes through a long-term process, initially gathering feedback and input from students, alumni, and relevant professionals and later stating clear outcomes that are currently being implemented.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Department has a critical need for additional space. It is recommended that the Department, Dean, and University Administration collaborate to find short-term, possibly temporary solutions, as well as longer-term solutions to this problem.

2. The College and University Administration should work with the Department to identify ways the Department can implement the Chair’s proposal for additional faculty and staff.

3. A more aggressive plan to enhance diversity is recommended, especially in the area of underrepresented groups among the members of the faculty. Student diversity should focus on gender and geography as well as underrepresented groups. The Department has taken actions in recruitment and has planned to employ additional resources to undertake diversity enhancement actions but needs to obtain those resources to fully realize its plans. Specifically, the requested opportunity hire would enhance diversity while an additional staff position devoted partly to diversity recruitment would provide an important resource.

4. The Department has been successful in acquiring gifts and grants, and using other soft funds to support graduate students and research centers. However, the Department needs to identify a means of transitioning to more stable funding sources.

5. While the Department has engaged in rapid growth and simultaneously developed a very strong national reputation for its strong and growing quality, maintaining this success and building upon it will require infusion of considerable University resources. While such resources should be sought from the University Administration, it may also be necessary for the Department to make judicious choices about how energies and resources are prioritized.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

Connie Bullis (Chair)
Associate Professor, Department of Communication

Tim Formosa
Professor, Department of Biochemistry

Susan Johnston
Professor, Department of Special Education

Nancy Basinger (Undergraduate Council)
Associate Director, Lowell Bennion Community Service Center
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY: With Doctoral Degrees Including MFA and other terminal degrees</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>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</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>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</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>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Masters Degrees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Bachelor Degrees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Headcount Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</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>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE from A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Salaried</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time or Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</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>Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students Based on Fall Third Week 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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Masters Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Doctoral Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department FTE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department SCH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>9,648</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>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>
<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>354,402</td>
<td>474,266</td>
<td>483,108</td>
<td>1,019,008</td>
<td>1,232,003</td>
<td>1,289,187</td>
<td>1,605,233</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 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 City and Metropolitan Planning
Graduate Council Review 2012-13

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on December 16, 2013, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of City and Metropolitan Planning. Ruth V. Watkins, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Keith Bartholomew, Interim Dean of the College of Architecture + Planning; Nan Ellin, Chair of the Department of City and Metropolitan Planning; David B. Kieda, 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 October 28, 2013. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1:** The Department has a critical need for additional space. It is recommended that the Department, Dean, and University Administration collaborate to find short-term, possibly temporary solutions, as well as longer-term solutions to this problem.

The Chair and Interim Dean, along with the reviewers and accreditors, underscored the critical need for additional space for the Department. According to the Interim Dean, the College will proceed with its fundraising efforts, aiming to receive a major naming gift in January 2014 toward the $22 million goal. For immediate needs, the College will request Capital Facilities and Remodeling funding. The College is currently exploring other options for expansion, including the Field House and other locales. It is hoped that the new Dean of the College of Architecture + Planning will fully and expeditiously pick up these efforts, along with the conversation about moving ahead to address the issues regarding the facility that were raised by the Graduate Council as well as the College’s subsequent accreditation report. The Chair and Interim Dean have done a thorough inventory and developed a long-range plan (5-10 years), including a case statement assessing projected growth and space/facility needs.

**Recommendation 2:** The College and University Administration should work with the Department to identify ways the Department can implement the Chair’s proposal for additional faculty and staff.

The Chair is working with the Interim Dean to incorporate the Chair’s proposal for additional faculty, including two opportunity hires, and staff into the College’s February 2014 budget request. The salary for Brenda Scheer will continue to come from the same source and when she leaves the U, the College will receive half of her salary to hire a new faculty member. Upon the retirement of
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Phil Emmi in December 2014, the Department will retain his line/salary and conduct a search for a replacement. From the Chair’s as well as external reviewers’ perspectives, these new hires are necessary for the Department to become a top 20 program in the US as well as to sustain their degree programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

The College is proposing to increase staff as follows: 1) a new staff position dedicated to Alumni Relations, Internships, Mentorships, Job Placement, as well as offering assistance with raising Scholarships and with Recruiting (all listed in Recommendation #2); 2) a new Assistant Dean for Research to augment and support research initiatives, and 3) an increase from 75% to 100% of the current recruitment, academic advisor, and admissions officer, Daniel Hernandez. The College will incorporate 1 and 2 in the February 2014 budget request and the SVPAA will support transitioning the position of Hernandez, who is from an underrepresented minority group, from 75% to 100%, beginning July 2014.

Recommendation 3: A more aggressive plan to enhance diversity is recommended, especially in the area of underrepresented groups among the members of the faculty. Student diversity should focus on gender and geography as well as underrepresented groups. The Department has taken actions in recruitment and has planned to employ additional resources to undertake diversity enhancement actions but needs to obtain those resources to fully realize its plans. Specifically, the requested opportunity hire would enhance diversity while an additional staff position devoted partly to diversity recruitment would provide an important resource.

The two faculty opportunity hires (see Recommendation #2) in the February 2014 budget request will contribute to increasing faculty diversity. The Department is also encouraged to take advantage of the new Graduate School diversity initiatives that will help support greater student diversity. In addition, the new Graduate Fellowship Initiative (beginning AY 2014-15), administered by The Graduate School through the College Dean’s office, could potentially be used to support greater student diversity. The Interim Dean is also investigating a public service Graduate Assistantship to provide more competitive funding for diverse student applicants. The Sr. Vice President suggested that the Chair work with Vice President Martha Bradley on recruitment efforts at SLCC. Other ways to increase K-12 exposure to Planning are also being investigated.

Recommendation 4: The Department has been successful in acquiring gifts and grants, and using other soft funds to support graduate students and research centers. However, the Department needs to identify a means of transitioning to more stable funding sources.

The Interim Dean and Sr. Vice President have developed several mechanisms for providing stable funding sources for the Metropolitan Research Center, outlined in a letter that has been shared with Professor Arthur C. Nelson. In addition, the College will incorporate into its February 2014 budget
request the new staff position to assist with generating research grants for the entire College. The budget request will also include start-up funds for online and continuing education program development, potentially providing new revenue streams. It was suggested that the Interim Dean begin a conversation with the Vice President for Research to implement a Foundations Relations office for the College.

Recommendation 5: While the Department has engaged in rapid growth and simultaneously developed a very strong national reputation for its strong and growing quality, maintaining this success and building upon it will require infusion of considerable University resources. While such resources should be sought from the University Administration, it may also be necessary for the Department to make judicious choices about how energies and resources are prioritized.

The Graduate Dean and Sr. Vice President recommend that a strategic discussion on priorities is one the Department and College should be having in an ongoing way to determine carefully which actions should come first. In order to develop its own revenue sources, and given the professional continuing education requirement, the continuing education program could generate an excellent revenue stream for supporting graduate students (as mentioned in Recommendation #4). The Sr. Vice President will provide start-up funds for this program, and will consider the other requests from the Department in the context of the 2014-15 budget cycle.

This memorandum of understanding is to be followed by regular letters of progress from the Chair of the Department of City and Metropolitan Planning 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
Keith Bartholomew
Nan Ellin
David B. Kieda

David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School
February 27, 2014
February 27, 2014

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

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Health Promotion and Education

Dear Vice President Lee:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Department of Health Promotion and Education. 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: Les Chatelain, Interim Chair, Department of Health Promotion and Education
Robin Marcus, Interim Dean, College of Health
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Health Promotion and Education. The External Review Committee included:

David A. Birch, PhD, MCHES  
Professor and Chair, Department of Health Sciences  
The University of Alabama

Susan Ward, PhD  
Professor and Chair, Department of Health and Kinesiology  
Texas A & M University

Marc A. Zimmerman, PhD  
Professor and Chair, Department of Health Behavior and Education  
School of Public Health  
University of Michigan

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Ann L. Darling, PhD  
Senior Associate Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies  
Associate Professor, Department of Communication

AJ Metz, PhD  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Educational Psychology

Christina Porucznik, PhD  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, Division of Public Health
This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study submitted by the Department of Health Promotion and Education, the reports of the Internal and External Review Committees, the OBIA profile, and the Interim Department Chair’s letter dated May 24, 2013 in response to the Internal and External Committee Reports. The Dean of the College of Health did not provide a separate response, but indicated his agreement with the Chair’s response.

DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The mission of the Department of Health Promotion and Education (hereinafter the “Department”) is “to discover, refine, and facilitate the practical application of strategies that can assist individuals, communities, and societies in adopting and maintaining healthy lifestyles.” The Department offers four degree programs in Health Promotion and Education: a BS degree, an MS degree, a PhD degree, and an EdD degree. A Health Minor and a School Health Teaching minor as well as six emphasis areas (community health, school health, consumer health, provider health, emergency medical services, and nuclear medical technology) are offered at the undergraduate level.

The Department has an Interim Department Chair who is well liked by faculty, staff, and students. The Interim Chair is a master’s level, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member who is also the Director of Emergency Medical Services. There are five tenured/tenure-track faculty members and 3 non-tenure-track members. In addition, there are five full-time and numerous part-time individuals who primarily engage in teaching activities for the Department.

The Department has a significant undergraduate teaching mission (the undergraduate degree program offered through the Department accounts for the 2nd highest proportion of student credit hours within the College), and some members of the faculty feel that this mission is misunderstood at the College level. Given the Department’s focus on undergraduate teaching, the tenured/tenure-track faculty perceive a lack of time and resources to engage in research related activities. In accordance with recommendations made at the time of the last review, the Department reduced the size of the PhD program from 21 to 16 in order to create more manageable mentorship loads.

The Department recently engaged in strategic planning with an outside expert, which resulted in three priority actions for the next 3-5 years. The priority actions included: (a) hiring and retaining 1-3 additional tenure-track faculty members, which may include a department chair; (b) engaging in efforts to increase internal and external funding; and (c) identifying and enhancing signature learning experiences in its programs.
Faculty

The Department is comprised of five tenured/tenure-track faculty members, three non-tenure-track members, and many auxiliary and part-time teaching faculty members who provide specific functions (e.g., teaching courses) for the Department.

Faculty in the Department bear a high teaching load, with tenure-track faculty teaching three classes per semester and non-tenure-track faculty teaching four classes per semester. Further, the Department has a large number of auxiliary and part-time teaching faculty. Data from student course evaluations and comments from students suggest that the Department’s faculty are actively engaged in teaching and are very committed to their students. The Internal Review Committee commended the faculty, indicating that faculty members appear to be “passionate about student success.” This commendation was echoed by the External Review Committee, who noted that “faculty members appear to be outstanding teachers.” However, the External Review Committee noted that, unless and until more tenure-track faculty are hired, enrollment may be at maximum capacity considering issues of teaching quality and budget.

Research productivity is variable among the faculty and the External Review Committee noted that the overall number of scholarly works published in peer-reviewed, mainstream health education journals by the faculty as a whole is very limited. The record of external funding in the Department is also limited with very few external research dollars among Department faculty members. The Internal and External Review Committees suggested that limitations regarding overall departmental research productivity might be alleviated if teaching loads for tenure-track faculty are reduced and additional research-focused faculty members are hired. The External Review Committee also suggested that tenured/tenure-track faculty should focus on (a) building upon their common methodologies and theoretical approaches across individual content areas in order to engage in collaborative research endeavors, and (b) conducting research and publishing in top-tier journals. This will increase the probability of obtaining external funding, recruiting faculty, and attracting excellent students.

Students

Office of Business and Institutional Analysis (OBIA) data reveal that the Department currently serves 344 majors. This represents a 64% increase since 2006. Admission is required for all tracks. The External Review Committee noted that, given the increase in enrollment in recent years, admission standards might need to be revisited and increased. Scholarships and research/teaching assistant funding in the Department are limited. Because funding offered to prospective students is low, the External Review Committee expressed concerns about the Department’s ability to recruit the best students, especially doctoral level students, from outside of Utah.

Although representation across undergraduate/graduate levels and across all emphasis areas was limited during informal discussion with review teams, students who did participate offered many positive comments and some areas of concern. Positive comments by students included: the applicability of course content to real world settings, the applied nature of
assignments/projects, assistance in finding good internships, focus on evidence based practices, and supportive faculty. Areas of concern noted by students included: scheduling courses during the middle of the day when many of the students are working, lack of clarity regarding master’s program requirements (although the students did note that a recently distributed document will help to address this problem), lack of information regarding how to prepare for the CHES exam, some redundancy across courses, uneven teaching quality across courses, and limited awareness of and/or collaboration with relevant departments, programs, and initiatives across campus.

**Curriculum**

The Department utilizes tracking sheets that identify which courses are necessary to graduate with specialization in each of the undergraduate emphasis areas. However, the Internal and External Review Committees expressed several concerns related to the clarity and consistency of documents and course descriptions. In the response to the Internal and External Committee Reports, the Interim Department Chair indicated that, since writing the self-study, the Department has addressed many of the issues raised by (a) rewriting and posting the graduate handbooks for master’s and doctoral degrees, (b) updating the Department website to increase clarity with regard to the application process, (c) reviewing and updating course descriptions to assist students in making choices among elective classes, and (d) redesigning the undergraduate Consumer emphasis.

In addition to issues related to clarity and consistency of documents and course descriptions, the Internal Review Committee noted that, given the large number of auxiliary faculty who teach courses for the Department, metrics should be developed and used in order to ensure consistency of content across instructors who teach the same course. Furthermore, the External Review Committee noted that while many classes are listed in the Department, not all classes are offered in a systematic rotation. In order to address these concerns, the Department is encouraged to ensure clarity and efficiency with regard to course offerings by developing a clear rotation schedule for all courses, reviewing the content/objectives of current courses for unnecessary overlap, and removing courses if they have not been taught in recent years.

Due to concerns regarding the ability to provide high quality mentoring, training, and experiences, the Department has not admitted new doctoral students for the last few years. The External Committee noted that the Department has recently made revisions to the PhD curriculum (e.g., allowing substitutions for prior coursework, utilizing a three article format for dissertations, etc.). These revisions should serve students well once additional tenure-track faculty members are hired and doctoral student admissions resume.

**Diversity**

According to the self-study, of the 5 tenured and tenure-track faculty, the Department includes 2 females and 1 underrepresented minority colleague in its ranks. Among the tenured/tenure-track faculty, three are tenured. There is a strong sense that increasing faculty diversity is an important goal for the Department and, in the response to the Internal and External
Committee Reports, the Interim Department Chair noted that the new faculty member that was hired after completion of the self-study is a female and expands upon the faculty diversity.

With respect to students, the Department reports 344 undergraduate majors (67% female) and 62 graduate students (75% female). The External Review Committee noted that, although many more women are enrolled as majors than men, the male/female ratio is consistent with national trends for the field. The Department reports that, in 2012, 16.2% of the undergraduate student population and 15.9% of the graduate population identified themselves as other than white. The Department noted ongoing efforts to recruit diverse students (e.g., recruitment activities at Salt Lake Community College, participation in diversity activities on campus) and stated that they are committed to expanding upon those efforts. The External Review Committee did note concerns regarding the geographical diversity of doctoral students (most are from Utah and many have degrees from the University of Utah) and stated that recruiting students outside of Utah might increase diversity as well as add new or different perspectives.

**Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment**

The Department self-study provided limited information regarding program effectiveness and outcomes assessment. Although the self-study identified several strategies for assessing program effectiveness and outcomes and included some narrative regarding changes that have been made based on assessments, the actual data obtained from these strategies was either not clearly presented or was absent. The Internal Review Committee indicated that the new Director of Graduate Studies has a goal of moving toward a more systematic evaluation of program effectiveness and outcomes assessment.

The External Review Committee noted that undergraduate student graduation rates are strong for all programs and undergraduate Community Health Students perform well on the Certified Health Education Specialist exam. However, specific information regarding the number of students who declared a major/minor/emphasis area relative to the number of students who completed the major/minor/emphasis area was not provided in the self-study. Similarly, the number of students who took the Certified Health Education Specialist exam relative to the number of students who passed the exam was not included in the self-study.

**Facilities and Resources**

The Department noted that they are currently experiencing a positive budget. The positive budget situation is a result of multiple actions by the Department, including (a) hiring an accountant who was able to streamline processes and save costs, (b) increases in funding from SCH production, (c) not filling faculty lines after retirement and using those funds to hire auxiliary faculty, and (d) increasing teaching loads for tenured/tenure-track faculty.

As noted by the External Review Committee, external funding (research grants, interdisciplinary and community-based research training grants, etc.) is a significantly underutilized resource. Efforts to expand upon external funding will require a significant
investment in the short term as well as the development of a robust research environment within the Department and will require a full-time Department Chair who can bring the academic leadership and scholarship necessary to lead the Department. Developing a robust research environment will also require more tenure-track faculty members. The current budget can support only 6 tenure-track faculty members. The External Review Committee echoed the Department’s view that a larger number of faculty members is needed to develop the types of collaborations that are needed in the current funding climate and to develop a robust research program.

The Department noted that staff support and office space is adequate for current needs. However, their ability to accommodate the space and support needs of new tenure-track faculty hires is uncertain. Although the Department has done an excellent job with the space that it has, the External Review Committee indicated that classroom space is inadequate to serve the number of students and the types of courses taught (especially as it relates to the emergency programs) and stated that “the issue of space needs attention if the program is to grow into a nationally recognized Department.”

COMMENDATIONS

1. The Interim Chair is doing an excellent job with the administrative tasks related to Department management and has been praised at many levels for his efficiency and effectiveness in this regard.

2. Teaching appears to be excellent based upon input from students to review teams and in course evaluations. Students noted and appreciated the applicability of course content to real world settings, the applied nature of assignments/projects, assistance in finding good internships, the focus on evidence based practices, and a supportive faculty.

3. The recent hire of a tenure-track faculty member who is well trained in research and who was assigned responsibilities related to the pursuit of external funding demonstrates a concerted effort to promote a culture of research within the Department.

4. Successful efforts to increase student enrollment in the Department since the last review have helped with budgetary issues.

5. There is a strong sense among the Department’s faculty that increasing student/faculty diversity is an important goal for the Department and data indicates that their efforts to date have been successful.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Department, in cooperation with the Dean of the College of Health, should take concrete steps toward realizing the vision of a new building for the College so that (a) classroom space is adequate to serve the number of students and the types of courses taught, and (b) the physical space sends a positive message about the commitment of the University to health promotion and education.

2. The Department should conduct a national search for a Department Chair who is a recognized leader and scholar. In addition to bringing an outside perspective to the Department, a new Chair will enable the current Interim Chair to focus on the Emergency Medical Services program.

3. The Department should build the tenure-track faculty to 8-10 individuals with research training and promise for or demonstration of scholarship and funding. This will likely decrease the student-faculty ratio, reduce the dependence on auxiliary and part-time teaching faculty members, increase the diversity of the faculty, and increase research productivity.

4. The Department should lower the teaching load for faculty with research expectations and increase the teaching and/or service assignments for faculty members who are less productive in the area of research.

5. In order to assess program effectiveness and outcomes, the Department should develop and use metrics to gauge progress toward specified goals. The Department should consult the numerous tools available nationally and on campus in order to identify appropriate evaluation metrics.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

Susan Johnston (Chair)
Professor, Department of Special Education

Robert Mayer
Professor, Department of Family and Consumer Studies

Heather C. Melton (Undergraduate Council)
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH PROMOTION AND EDUCATION

## FACULTY: With Doctoral Degrees Including MFA and other terminal degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full Time Tenured Faculty</th>
<th>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</th>
<th>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## With Masters Degrees

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

## With Bachelor Degrees

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

## Total Headcount Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full Time Tenured Faculty</th>
<th>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</th>
<th>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<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>Full-Time Salaried</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time or Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH PROMOTION AND EDUCATION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teaching Assistants</th>
<th>Bachelor's Degrees</th>
<th>Master's Degrees</th>
<th>Doctoral Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</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>67</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degrees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</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>246</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Masters Program</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Doctoral Program</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department FTE</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department SCH</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>30,106</td>
<td>27,654</td>
<td>27,034</td>
<td>29,014</td>
<td>33,356</td>
<td>37,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cost Study Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Study Definition</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>577,317</td>
<td>967,646</td>
<td>1,015,527</td>
<td>867,369</td>
<td>541,811</td>
<td>563,291</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Student Fte</td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>2,836</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriated Funds</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>Appropriated Funds</td>
<td>1,276,071</td>
<td>1,187,782</td>
<td>1,255,747</td>
<td>1,216,343</td>
<td>1,167,123</td>
<td>1,393,803</td>
<td>1,583,881</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 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 Health Promotion and Education
Graduate Council Review 2012-13

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on December 12, 2013, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Health Promotion and Education. Vivian S. Lee, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; Robin Marcus, Interim Dean of the College of Health; Les Chatelain, Interim Chair of the Department of Health Promotion and Education; David B. Kieda, 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 September 30, 2013. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1:** The Department, in cooperation with the Dean of the College of Health, should take concrete steps toward realizing the vision of a new building for the College so that (a) classroom space is adequate to serve the number of students and the types of courses taught, and (b) the physical space sends a positive message about the commitment of the University to health promotion and education.

All parties are in agreement about the need for new space, if not a new facility, for the Department. Because this was also the number one recommendation for another department in the College of Health in their recent Graduate Council review, the Interim Dean and Chair expressed a sense of urgency and high priority for this recommendation. The quality and future viability of both programs hinge on improving physical facilities. The Sr. Vice President noted the convergence of the facility needs for both departments and stated that there is now an institutional priority to take action. The Graduate Dean encouraged the Interim Dean to work with department chairs and Facilities Planning to develop a plan during the next year, taking into consideration the strategic vision/direction of the Department over the next 5 to 10 years. There was agreement about this action and the Interim Dean noted that the strategic planning process is currently underway. Updates will be provided in subsequent progress reports to The Graduate School.

**Recommendation 2:** The Department should conduct a national search for a Department Chair who is a recognized leader and scholar. In addition to bringing an outside perspective to the Department, a new Chair will enable the current Interim Chair to focus on the Emergency Medical Services program.

According to the Chair, a search committee has been established and a search for a full-time Department Chair is being conducted and will be concluded this year (Spring 2014). The Department seeks the strongest candidate possible in terms of leadership and scholarship;
however, due to budget constraints, financial support for this position is a large concern. The Sr. Vice President will consider intervening if salary once again becomes a deciding factor in attracting a top candidate and stated that there are opportunities for a new chair to define how the department will look in the future (with pending retirements and other impending changes). It was noted that the Department is in a unique position to reinvent itself in terms of increased collaboration between the College of Health and the health care delivery system, which would provide more funding opportunities for the Department in the form of more diverse funding sources, including clinical funding.

**Recommendation 3:** The Department should build the tenure-track faculty to 8-10 individuals with research training and promise for or demonstration of scholarship and funding. This will likely decrease the student-faculty ratio, reduce the dependence on auxiliary and part-time teaching faculty members, increase the diversity of the faculty, and increase research productivity.

Instead of building the tenure-track faculty to 8-10, the Interim Dean believes an increase of three tenure-track faculty over the next five years is feasible. The Chair reports making progress on this recommendation; by pooling scarce uncommitted resources, the Department was able to hire an assistant tenure-track professor last year. The longer-term plan is funding based, and the Interim Dean is considering four ways of increasing funding: hardening productivity money, increasing funds flow from clinical services (as discussed in Recommendation #2), proposing an increase in the base budget, and extramural funding. Regular progress reports addressing these efforts will be made to The Graduate School.

**Recommendation 4:** The Department should lower the teaching load for faculty with research expectations and increase the teaching and/or service assignments for faculty members who are less productive in the area of research.

To address this recommendation, the Chair and Interim Dean noted that a differential workload policy was instituted last year (college-wide). This has been useful to the Chair in attempting to deal effectively with the issue of lowering teaching loads for junior research active faculty and increasing them for those who are less productive. In addition, a policy regarding the quality of teaching is currently being created by the College Council, using the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) as a resource. The Graduate Dean also encouraged the Chair to use the CTLE as a resource for faculty who need assistance with improving their teaching. The quality of teaching is a primary concern for all parties. The Chair also depends on the 5-year tenure review, which was cited as a useful and effective process for the evaluation of teaching as well as research productivity.
Recommendation 5: In order to assess program effectiveness and outcomes, the Department should develop and use metrics to gauge progress toward specified goals. The Department should consult the numerous tools available nationally and on campus in order to identify appropriate evaluation metrics.

The Chair reported that this task has partially been assigned to the Graduate and Undergraduate Committees to address this year (2013-14). The original exit survey sent to all graduating students has already been redesigned and it is the Chair’s intention to continue to make progress on this recommendation. The Chair will consult with the Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis (OBIA) for assistance with data on graduation rates, and although this has not proven effective in the past, clarification of the definition of a major could help in honing the data. The Interim Dean noted a need to define the metrics currently being used in order to make effective changes. The Chair will work with his committees and OBIA to accomplish this and will report progress in the regular follow-up reports to The Graduate School. At the graduate level, the Chair reports having improved the Department Website and revising guidelines for master’s/PhD students. To improve communication, as well as tracking of graduate student progress and graduation rates, the Graduate Dean suggested regular town hall meetings and seminar/colloquia. Interim Dean Marcus noted the need for substantial financial resources for the Department to attract and retain PhD students and to improve PhD completion rates. The Graduate School, as mandated by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, will be stepping up its efforts to track progress on all departments’ assessment of program effectiveness and outcomes now through 2015.

This memorandum of understanding is to be followed by regular letters of progress from the Chair of the Department of Health Promotion and Education 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
Robin Marcus
Les Chatelain
David B. Kieda

David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School
February 27, 2014
March 3, 2014

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

RE: Graduate Council Review  
Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy

Dear Vice President Lee:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy. 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: Monica Vetter, Chair, Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy  
Sheryl A. Scott, Associate Chair, Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy
The Graduate School – The University of Utah

GRADUATE COUNCIL REPORT TO THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND THE ACADEMIC SENATE

October 28, 2013

The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy. The External Review Committee included:

Carol Gregorio, PhD (Chair)
Professor, Departments of Cell Biology and Anatomy
Director, Molecular Cardiovascular Research Program
University of Arizona

Paul C. Letourneau, PhD
Professor, Department of Neuroscience
University of Minnesota

David W. Raible, PhD
Professor, Department of Biological Structure
University of Washington

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Kristen A. Keefe, PhD
Professor, Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology
Director, Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Neuroscience

Richard A. Normann, PhD
Professor, Department of Bioengineering

Gary J. Rose, PhD
Professor, Department of Biology
This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study submitted by the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy, the reports of the internal and external review committees, the OBIA profile, and the Department Chair’s letter dated June 2013 in response to the internal and external review committee reports. The Dean of the School of Medicine did not provide a separate response, but indicated her agreement with the Chair’s response.

DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy (previously Anatomy Department) was renamed in the early 1990s to better reflect its range of research and teaching activities. Since that time the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy has been led by Drs. Thomas N. Parks (1992-2007) and Monica Vetter (Interim 2008-2009, Chair 2010-present). Dr. Parks remains on the faculty and serves as the Vice President for Research for the University of Utah.

After Dr. Vetter took over the position of Chair, she was confronted with several problems and challenges: a declining tenured faculty number, decrease of graduate student enrollment by about 50% over the period from 2007-2011, and aging facilities in which the Department was housed. Both the external and internal reviewers expressed in their reports the opinion that Dr. Vetter has risen to the challenge, and that the Department has undergone a very positive regeneration under her capable leadership. She was recently successful in completing several strategic hires, including spousal hires with positions in other departments, and has set up a culture of being equitable and even-handed with the concerns of the Department as her foremost priority. She has been helped by senior faculty, including Sheryl Scott as the Associate Chair, and Gary Schoenwolf as a leader in mentoring initiatives.

Faculty

Since the last Graduate Council review seven new professors have been added to the Department faculty, including one senior faculty and four junior faculty hires, and two faculty transfers from the Physiology Department. Concurrent with this major faculty recruitment effort, the Department facilities underwent a major $7 million renovation and upgrading of space in the Wintrobe Building. This 17,000-square-foot remodeling project has resulted in the creation of modern and spacious laboratory facilities for 11 faculty members. The two faculty members transferred from the Department of Physiology are located in the brand new Sorenson Molecular Biotechnology Building. The new faculty members appear to be well integrated into the Department. Each new faculty member has active mentorship by the senior faculty, and was provided with the resources and lab space needed for them to be successful.

Faculty Profile - At the present time the Department is composed of 18 tenure-track faculty (6 Assistant Professors, 3 Associate Professors, 9 Professors) and 4 full-time research/lecturer-track faculty. The department also has 18 adjunct faculty members and truly encourages their participation in many Departmental activities, including recruiting, teaching, mentoring, and
participation in Research in Progress (RIPs) forums. Adjunct faculty who are members of clinical departments add essential clinical perspectives to the Department’s research portfolio that emphasizes the forward, long-term planning of the Department.

Research and Scholarship - Faculty scholarship is considered excellent. Most faculty members have active research programs with funding and a solid record of publications. Faculty members whose time is dedicated to education have recently published textbooks and are actively developing educational media. The four new junior faculty were recruited from top institutions, and have received highly competitive and prestigious awards from several different foundations. Over the period from 2008-2012, the faculty generated an annual average of $3 million, with an impressive overall funding of $4.2 million in 2012. From 2006 until now, the tenure-track and research faculty have published an average of 29 PubMed listed research papers per year. About half of these publications were in journals with impact factors greater than 5, indicating the quality of this scholarly output. Over this period, a number of individual faculty members have collaborated to publish 8 books, with significant authorship by Dr. Morton.

Students

There are presently 12 graduate students in the Department, and this number has dropped from a peak of 22 students in 2007. These graduate students are either in the Interdepartmental Neuroscience Program or the Neurobiology and Anatomy branch of the Molecular Biology umbrella program. The graduate students are well supported intellectually and recognize that they have a guaranteed stipend and benefits from the Department for five years, even if their PI loses funding for them. They are well integrated into the Department and feel that their opinions matter. Current graduate students participate in the recruitment of new graduate students and in the recruitment of new faculty. They are given many opportunities to present their research findings both within the Department at a regular Research in Progress (RIP) forum and at national meetings. The Department provides funds to assist in attending meetings. The RIP is well attended by faculty, and immediately after a RIP presentation the student presenter receives feedback from two faculty mentors; this demonstrates the commitment by the faculty to graduate education. All students must pass a qualifying exam consisting of writing and orally defending an NIH/NRSA proposal, and write and defend their PhD dissertations. Since the last formal review of the Department, 24 doctoral dissertations in Neurobiology and Anatomy and 7 doctoral dissertations in Neuroscience have been completed by students in the Department.

Diversity

Faculty Diversity - The Department has 5 female tenure-track faculty and 2 female research track faculty. Female faculty members are represented at all ranks, including Department Chair and Associate Chair. The Department sought to ensure that qualified minority and female candidates were on the short list, and that the best of these were interviewed for the faculty position. Several female candidates were interviewed in each of the Department’s national searches in 2010-11 and 2011-12. One minority candidate was offered an interview in 2011-12, but this was declined due to other offers. Two of the 5 external tenure-track hires in the past three years have been women, one appointed as Assistant Professor and one as Professor with tenure. The Department does not have
underrepresented minorities on the faculty, but have made it a priority to seek qualified candidates in their searches. In summary, the Department has made an appropriate effort to recruit a diverse faculty; however, the diversity with respect to underrepresented minorities is poor, reflecting thus the state of the field as a whole.

**Student Diversity** - The Department does not admit graduate students directly but through the Molecular Biology and Neuroscience programs. Both programs are committed to the recruitment of minority students. The programs send emails and/or brochures to students on the Western Name Exchange, McNair Scholars, MARC Scholars, students who attended the California Forum for Diversity in Graduate Education, and students who self-identify as underrepresented on GRE tests. On average, graduate students in the Department are roughly equally divided between male and female and between domestic and international, although the exact ratio fluctuates from year to year. Of the students who completed their dissertations since the last review, 12 were male and 20 were female.

The Bioscience Programs (Molecular Biology and Biological Chemistry) also run 3 summer research programs, with one focused on minority undergraduate students (Utah Research Access for Minorities Program, URAMP). In the past few years faculty in the Department have supervised at least 4 Native American students and 4 other minority students in summer programs.

**Curriculum**

All faculty members in the Department teach graduate and School of Medicine courses, but the teaching loads are not uniformly shared. The Department has responsibility for two of the core courses for first-year students in the Interdepartmental Program in Neuroscience and plays a major role teaching first- and second-year medical students and first-year dental students. The faculty also run the anatomy and histology laboratories. As usual for anatomy departments, the faculty in the past had been responsible for teaching the medical courses in anatomy, neuroanatomy, embryology and histology. The School of Medicine has gone through the national accreditation process, and in concert the curriculum has undergone a rapid and substantial overhaul in the recent past. Unfortunately, an overemphasis on administrative control has minimized faculty involvement in reorganizing and executing the new curriculum. Many of the faculty members feel disenfranchised from this important activity, in which they formerly took much pride. The student evaluations of faculty teaching indicate that the instructional level is high, and several faculty members have received awards for their teaching and mentoring skills. Graduate students are being well mentored and have exposure to various alternative careers via notable venues, such as “Career Day,” which is organized by the students and held every other year.

**Program Effectiveness -- Outcomes Assessment**

As is common good practice in graduate programs, the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy assesses student progress in achieving the stated learning objectives of the PhD programs through the use of various evaluations/exams throughout the student's tenure in the Department. These evaluations/exams include oversight by and regular meetings with the dissertation supervisory committee, a preliminary/qualifying exam, a dissertation proposal presentation and
meeting, and preparation of a written dissertation and oral defense of the dissertation work. Another aspect of the evaluation is the RIP series in which each student presents his/her research progress each year to the entire faculty. Two faculty members (not necessarily from the student's dissertation supervisory committee) are assigned to the student and provide independent feedback to the student on their research and presentation skills.

Outcomes Assessment Feedback - Student progress toward published learning objectives is assessed via the above procedures with program-level oversight provided by the Director of Graduate Studies, Dr. Scott. Students not meeting milestones are asked to meet more frequently with their dissertation committee. Also, formal course evaluations are in place for both professional and graduate courses, with processes in place for review of those evaluations and implementation of changes to improve course effectiveness. The Director of Graduate Studies also holds an "exit interview" with students graduating with their PhD degree.

Degree Completion Data - The completion rate for students entering the program during the decade from 2000-2010 is very high, at approximately 94%. The time to degree on average over that same period is 6.1 years to the time of defense, which is slightly higher than the national average reported for Neuroscience/Neurobiology and Cell and Developmental Biology programs (~5.7 years). The post-graduation employment of the 32 students graduating since the last review is strong, with 97% in science-related careers or seeking additional related professional training (MD, JD, MST in biostatistics). Longer-term outcomes of the program’s graduates were not included in the self-study, nor were they available on the Department's website.

Facilities and Resources

The recently renovated departmental laboratory space in Wintrobe Hall is modern, functional, well planned, strategically-assigned and flexible, with room for growth. As mentioned above, junior faculty members are logically situated next to more established faculty; this maximizes daily mentorship, intellectual exchange and sharing of resources. Renovations encouraged interactions between adjacent laboratories and have obviously assisted with recruitment of new faculty.

Operating Budget Issues - Presently, the operating budget is seen as adequate to support the needs of the Department; however, because of changes in new allocations for teaching in the School of Medicine, there has been fluctuation in the Department budget in the recent past. At this time, the Chair has successfully negotiated for reinstatement of lost funds for teaching efforts; however, stable funding from state and curriculum funds for faculty salaries will need to be a priority to allow for effective planning and management by the Department and successful fulfillment of its missions.

Physical Facilities - Since the last review, renovation of the Wintrobe Building has provided ~17,000 ft² of modern laboratory space for the Department, as well as shared work space for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows working on papers. Additionally, faculty are housed in the Sorenson Molecular Biotechnology Building, the Eccles Institute of Human Genetics, and the School of Medicine. Although current space is thus adequate, the noncontiguous nature of the space creates challenges to Department cohesiveness and effectiveness. Particularly with respect to the graduate program, noncontiguous space may challenge attempts to promote cohesion among the graduate students and a sense of belonging on the part of the students to the Department vs. just to a
particular laboratory. Some faculty and students in the Department are associated with the Molecular Medicine Program. Others have been associated with the Brain Institute, although the nature of future engagements with the Brain Institute, given its reorganization, is currently unclear.

**Staff Support** - Currently, there are three administrative office personnel and one IT staff member. Two of the three administrative staff members are at 0.75 FTE. Staff duties have been clearly delineated by Dr. Vetter, and she holds regular meetings with the staff, which has improved Departmental function. The faculty universally identified the need for greater staff support in the area of pre- and post-award grants management. There also was mixed sentiment about additional staff support to handle purchasing for labs in the Department. Faculty also felt that current staffing levels and schedules, at times, left the office closed during the workday. Faculty also expressed some concern over strict division of labor among the office staff, as the result has been that if the designated staff member was not available, no one else could address their need.

**COMMENDATIONS**

1. Dr. Vetter has done an outstanding job leading the Departmental recovery from several unfortunate losses with new faculty recruiting and support for current faculty. Her leadership was a deciding factor in persuading several faculty recruits to choose the University of Utah. Four excellent junior faculty members and one senior faculty member were recruited as a result of this effort. The transfer of Drs. Wachowiak and Taha from the Physiology Department has brought the Department back to size and strength. This is regarded as a major accomplishment.

2. In spite of general difficulty in securing federal support for research and training of graduate students, the faculty has managed to remain competitive in securing funding. The Department has a solid focus in neuroscience and is poised to be a leader in the growth of neuroscience and its translational application at the School of Medicine.

3. The Department has historically been heavily involved in teaching in the School of Medicine curriculum, and in spite of recent changes in the direction of the curriculum, the Department continues its significant role in both School of Medicine teaching and in the teaching of graduate level courses.

4. Faculty investment in graduate education, as evidenced by high completion rate, time to degree, and overall faculty involvement in mentoring through the RIP and other Department activities with graduate students, is to be commended.

5. The space allocated to the Department faculty has recently been renovated and now provides excellent relatively contiguous facilities for faculty and students for the conduct of research activities.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Department does not have a long-term strategic plan. It is recommended that the Department faculty generate a long-range strategic plan that articulates the research focus for the pending searches as well as plans for promoting interactions with clinical departments.

2. It is recommended that the Department be given more involvement in determining teaching assignments in the Medical and Dental Schools’ curricula. A mechanism by which junior faculty can learn effective teaching techniques from existing course masters needs to be put in place. It is also recommended that contractual agreements be established by the administration with the Department with respect to Medical and Dental School teaching, thus helping to establish bridge funding for faculty between grants for graduate student training.

3. While the newly renovated Departmental research space is considered outstanding, the main Department offices are inadequate and currently housed in a building slated for demolition. As School of Medicine space planning goes forward, a plan for truly contiguous space for all Departmental labs and offices should be a priority. It is also recommended that attention be given to and resources be made available to improve the infrastructure for animal and core facilities.

4. It is recommended that training experiences for students be enriched by the addition of new formal and/or informal Departmental activities that will encourage interactions between the students from the Molecular Biology and Neuroscience programs. The Department should further clarify the outcome assessment feedback process, establish the procedure for students who do not successfully meet program guidelines, and lower the time-to-PhD to no more than 5-6 years. Similarly, specific efforts should be developed to track postdoctoral progress and to establish resources for career mentoring.

5. Because the Department does not have any staff available to assist the faculty in grant proposal preparation and management of their research grants, it is recommended that at least one more staff position be created to fill this important need. It is also recommended that the existing staff rearrange the hours they are working such that staff will be available to the faculty during the full working day. The job assignments and duties currently assigned to the staff should be coordinated with the future vision and growth of the Department.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

Vladimir Hlady (Chair)
Professor, Department of Bioengineering

Connie Bullis,
Associate Professor, Department of Communications

Winston C. Kyan
Assistant Professor, Department of Art and Art History
DEPARTMENT OF NEUROBIOLOGY AND ANATOMY

<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><strong>FACULTY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Doctoral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**With Masters Degrees – NONE**

**With Bachelor Degrees – NONE**

Faculty Degrees represent total number of degrees awarded per faculty member
Full time faculty is > .75 fte

**TABLE 1: FACULTY HEADCOUNT (data calculated by OBIA)**
DEPARTMENT OF NEUROBIOLOGY AND ANATOMY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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><strong>Number of Graduates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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><strong>Number of Students Based on Fall Third Week Semester Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Masters Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Doctoral Program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department FTE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department SCH</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>4,666</td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Total Department FTE divides undergraduate sch by 15, graduate sch by 10

**TABLE 2: STUDENTS (data calculated by OBIA)**

Note the significant change in SCH starting in 2009 and continuing in 2010 is due to transformation of the medical curriculum, which began in 2009. The curriculum moved from department course-based teaching to an integrated curriculum. Our faculty did not change their total hours of teaching, and in fact taught more. The SCH was just calculated differently, and apparently not multiplied by the total number of students in the medical class (currently 82).

These student numbers are based on when thesis was released, while the numbers we provide later counted the students as receiving their degrees in the semester they defended.
TABLE 3: FINANCIAL ANALYSIS (data calculated by Mission-based Management)

Explanation of data and variances:

- Grant data in the table is only shown for the main department OrgID. Across all OrgIDs the department grant revenue for FY12 is $4,215,871 direct costs (plus F&A = $5,764,914). This includes VA support, as well as grants for department faculty in the Brain Institute and the Molecular Medicine Program.
- The state allocation has increased in the past few years largely due to the impact of the new medical curriculum on curriculum funds and Mission-based Management (MBM) distribution for the department.
- Fund 2000 has increased because of setup funds and faculty development funds for several new faculty.
• The Dean/SrVP support represents setup funds for recruitment of new faculty members.
• There is an apparent decrease in revenue from grants from FY11 to FY12. One faculty member’s grants (Yost) are now administered through the Molecular Medicine Program and will be listed under the Molecular Medicine OrgID, although his primary faculty appointment is in our department. We also lost three funded faculty members in FY12. These changes are partially offset by multiple awards to new faculty in FY12. Grant revenue is expected to grow with the recruitment of additional faculty who joined in FY13, and with the transfer of two funded investigators from the Physiology Department.
• Scholarship/fellowship expenses dramatically decreased in FY12 since the Developmental Biology Training Grant, which is currently directed by Dr. Joseph Yost and Dr. Richard Dorsky, is now listed under the Molecular Medicine OrgID. The grant has been successful renewed and will continue to be led by department faculty.
Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy
Graduate Council Review 2012-13

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on February 24, 2014, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy. Vivian S. Lee, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; Monica L. Vetter, Chair of the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy; Sheryl A. Scott, Associate Chair of the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy; 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 October 28, 2013. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1:** The Department does not have a long-term strategic plan. It is recommended that the Department faculty generate a long-range strategic plan that articulates the research focus for the pending searches as well as plans for promoting interactions with clinical departments.

The Department held a retreat in 2010 to plan for impending changes. At that time it was decided that the pending faculty searches (seven new positions have been filled in the last three years) would be strategically focused on developing research strength in neuroscience. This decision has proved to be very effective and is aligned with the vision and goals of the Sr. Vice President, the Chair, and the existing faculty. According to the Chair’s response, “Now that the composition of the department has significantly changed we will revisit this [strategic plan] and in the coming year [2014/15] will develop a strategic plan for the next 5 years.” The Graduate Dean requests that the new strategic plan should incorporate the most recent and planned changes in the Health Sciences buildings and infrastructure. The last strategic plan was done long before the current plans were developed, and so it is becoming increasingly urgent to revisit the department's strategic plans in light of these new developments. The new strategic plan will be provided in upcoming update reports to The Graduate School.

**Recommendation 2:** It is recommended that the Department be given more involvement in determining teaching assignments in the Medical and Dental Schools’ curricula. A mechanism by which junior faculty can learn effective teaching techniques from existing course masters needs to be put in place. It is also recommended that contractual agreements be established by the administration with the Department with respect to Medical and Dental School teaching, thus helping to establish bridge funding for faculty between grants for graduate student training.
According to the Chair, the Department faculty understand the shift toward a more centralized curricular planning model and are on board with the transformation of how teaching assignments are planned and made. They have an elected member on the School of Medicine Curriculum Committee, where their views are represented. Contractual agreements, as recommended by the reviewers, are not possible; however, the Department maintains a major teaching role in both the Medical and Dental Schools. Currently, there is an initiative to appoint a Director of Medical Education (a new position) who will be a liaison to the Medical and Dental School and will provide guidance on moving toward more innovative pedagogy within the schools. The Sr. Vice President is supportive of enhancing medical education and invites a plan that will lead the way to innovation in the delivery of medical education.

Recommendation 3: While the newly renovated Departmental research space is considered outstanding, the main Department offices are inadequate and currently housed in a building slated for demolition. As School of Medicine space planning goes forward, a plan for truly contiguous space for all Departmental labs and offices should be a priority. It is also recommended that attention be given to and resources be made available to improve the infrastructure for animal and core facilities.

The Department is enjoying the benefits of the newly renovated research space and is involved in space planning initiatives to prepare for the demolition of the main School of Medicine and MREB Buildings (where department offices are now located). They are actively involved in determining the best long-term solutions to provide updated contiguous space for labs and offices. The retrofit of the Biopolymers Building, including animal and core facilities, is a priority and should be completed in the next few years. The Chair views all of the new facilities and renovations of existing ones as opportunities to promote and increase interaction and collaboration among faculty and students in other clinical departments [as mentioned in Recommendation #1].

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that training experiences for students be enriched by the addition of new formal and/or informal Departmental activities that will encourage interactions between the students from the Molecular Biology and Neuroscience programs. The Department should further clarify the outcome assessment feedback process, establish the procedure for students who do not successfully meet program guidelines, and lower the time-to-PhD to no more than 5-6 years. Similarly, specific efforts should be developed to track postdoctoral progress and to establish resources for career mentoring.

The Department has increased its activities to engage students and postdocs in interactions. The journal club in particular has become so popular that it is now being considered as a new course. It was noted that the junior faculty’s involvement in this activity and others has been stellar. The Director of Graduate Studies has recently updated the Department’s policies on students who do not complete the program successfully; these policies are available in the online student handbook. The Department is committed to re-invigorating a postdoctoral liaison to mentor and assist postdocs with career development.
This memorandum of understanding is to be followed by regular letters of progress from the Chair of the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy 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
Monica Vetter
Sheryl A. Scott
David B. Kieda
Donna M. White

David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School
March 3, 2014
March 3, 2014

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

RE: Graduate Council Review
Nursing PhD and Gerontology MS Programs – College of Nursing

Dear Vice President Lee:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Nursing PhD and Gerontology MS Programs in the College of Nursing. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Graduate Council, the Program Profiles, 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: Patricia G. Morton, Dean, College of Nursing
Ginny A. Pepper, Associate Dean for Research, College of Nursing
Barbara L. Wilson, Associate Dean for Academic Programs, College of Nursing
Margaret F. Clayton, Director, PhD Program
Kara B. Dassel, Director, Gerontology Interdisciplinary Program
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Nursing PhD Program and the Gerontology MS Program in the College of Nursing. The External Review Committee included:

Gail M. Houck, PhD, RN, PMHNP  
Program Director, Post-DNP Program  
School of Nursing  
Oregon Health Sciences University

Therese S. (Terry) Richmond, PhD, CRNP, FAAN  
Andrea B. Laporte Endowed Professor of Nursing  
School of Nursing  
University of Pennsylvania

Karen A. Roberto, PhD  
Director, Center for Gerontology  
Director, Institute for Society, Culture and Environment  
Virginia Tech University

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Mark A. Munger, Pharm.D.  
Professor of Pharmacotherapy, and  
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, College of Pharmacy

Julie Fritz, PT, Ph.D., ATC  
Professor of Physical Therapy
This report of the Graduate Council is based on the Self-Study submitted by the College of Nursing (3/2013), the report provided by the External Review Committee (visited 3/21-22/13), the report from the Internal Review Committee (submitted 4/22/13), and a response letter from the Dean of the College of Nursing. Note that the latter was provided July 10, 2013 by the former Dean, Dr. Maureen Keefe, who retired July 31, 2013, and was replaced by the current Dean, Dr. Patricia Morton.

COLLEGE PROFILE

Program Overview

The College of Nursing (CoN) opened in 1948 and currently offers five degree programs: a BS in Nursing, an MS in Nursing, an MS in Gerontology, a Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP), and a PhD in Nursing. This review includes evaluation of two of these five programs: the MS in Gerontology and the PhD in Nursing. Timelines for reviewing the remaining programs remain under consideration by the relevant administration officials.

The PhD program was initiated in 1977 and has had over 160 graduates. Outcomes have been quite strong, with graduates populating a range of academic and clinical positions nationwide. The MS/certificate program in Gerontology (currently administered by the Gerontology Interdisciplinary Program or "GIP") has a complex history, starting as a consortium among five institutions in 1972, moving from the Division of Continuing Education to the College of Nursing in 1982, beginning to offer the MS degree in 1993, and taking on its current form and name in 2006. Nearly 100 MS degrees have been granted, as well as over 500 certificates in Gerontology. Perhaps related to these different histories, the two programs had somewhat different reviews, revealing quite different strengths and weaknesses for these components of the CoN. While both internal and external reviewers cited a number of issues requiring attention, especially for the GIP, the letter from the Dean provides substantive responses to most of these items, including detailed and compelling actions already taken or planned. The general impression is therefore one of a College with diverse missions whose components have had differing successes and challenges, but with an administration willing to accept criticism and adapt accordingly in substantive ways. It remains only to insure that some of the more substantial issues are addressed as planned.

Reviewers generally praised both programs for the quality of their faculty’s scholarship and the importance of the training provided for maintaining health within our population. Some issues of faculty mentoring and governance, student advising, student recruitment, overall diversity among students and faculty members, and stability of current programs were raised and should be addressed to the extent possible, although it is recognized that some of these problems are endemic to the field and may not be easily solved, and others have already been addressed prior to the preparation of this report.
Faculty

The CoN had a total faculty comprised of 103 members in 2012, with 27 in the tenure track (12 tenured), 49 full-time, and 27 in part-time clinical or research tracks. Two-thirds of the faculty members hold doctoral degrees. 21 of the 27 core members of the PhD program faculty and 3 of the 7 core members of the GIP faculty are in the tenure track. 25 of the 27 PhD program core faculty list doctoral degrees, as do 4 of the 16 GIP faculty members (3/7 of the core, 1/9 of the adjunct members).

Dr. Margaret Clayton is the current Director of the PhD program, having recently taken full control after a period of co-Directorship with the previous Director, Dr. Susan Beck. Both review teams noted how smoothly the transition was made due to thoughtful planning, grooming of a successor, and overlap between outgoing and incoming administrations. The Director of the PhD program reports to the Associate Dean for Research and PhD programs (Dr. Ginette Pepper), who then reports to the Dean of the CoN. Collaboration among faculty members is optimized in areas of strength through the organization of four Research Innovative Teams that also provide focus in particular topics areas. A robust system of mentoring is described for various areas of career development including monitoring of progress towards various career benchmarks such as submission of grants, timely publication, and advising regarding the importance of balancing research, teaching, and administrative contributions. The system of faculty governance includes various metrics for accounting for the value of individual contributions; some adjustments to the system were suggested by the external reviewers, but these were considered to be minor issues. Overall, this set of faculty members is described as an integrated, highly functional, well balanced, and effective group.

The GIP faculty was described in somewhat less functional terms. Perhaps most concerning is the report that much of the curriculum is delivered by adjunct faculty who are given a high degree of latitude for course content development. Coupled with this is the observation that there is little opportunity for these members of the faculty to interact with the core members or with one another. Together, this invites a lack of coherence for the curriculum, possibly the source of the confusion regarding expectations reported by at least some GIP students. Finally, there were some reports that the GIP in general was not well-integrated into the rest of the CoN, and that this group did not feel fully appreciated, at least partly due to the lack of a director with the same stature as the directors of the other programs. The Director of the GIP (Katarina Felsted at the time of the reviews) reports directly to the Dean of the CoN, as one of eight members of a group at this level of administration that includes three Assistant Deans, two Associate Deans, and two Division Chairs. As the Directors of the other programs within the CoN report to Associate Deans, it appears that the GIP Director has a higher profile position than the other programs, but concerns were focused on the appointment of a recent graduate of the CoN (MS, 2010, University of Utah) in the Clinical track to this position, with the perception that this did not provide the GIP with a sufficiently strong advocate.

These descriptions raise significant concern about the GIP as a component of the CoN, but these concerns are somewhat assuaged by the response of the Dean. She notes that many of the issues regarding the number of courses taught by adjunct faculty members and their control
of course content have been addressed, and she describes several initiatives aimed at increasing cohesion of the core and adjunct faculty. Further, the issue of the stature of the Director of the GIP has been addressed in two ways, first by conducting an external search resulting in the hiring of a PhD-level co-Director (Dr. Kara Dassel), and second by having Katarina Felsted, whose only deficiency is universally agreed to be the lack of a doctoral degree, enroll as a student to obtain this degree. Again, the overall impression is of an administration engaged in finding problems "in-house" and actively seeking solutions rather than waiting for an external audit to identify these issues. While the concerns raised about the faculty in the reviews remain somewhat troubling and are worthy of further consideration, it is encouraging to see so much progress being made towards solving these problems in a short amount of time.

**Students**

The PhD program currently has about 55 students, with a similar number of students in the GIP (about equally distributed among those seeking a master’s degree, a graduate certificate, or an undergraduate certificate). The PhD students reported a high degree of satisfaction with the program, particularly with the mentoring and flexibility provided. There was some indication that clinical duties and the need to obtain financial support outside the program limited the opportunity for research, but the recent funding of a T32 training grant from the NIH is expected to alleviate this problem somewhat. The awarding of a new T32 should also be taken as a strong indicator of the high quality and reputation of this program.

With respect to the quality of the PhD students, the external reviewers stated that "the GRE profile would not compare well to other top-ranked PhD programs in nursing" and recommended increasing the entrance requirements for the program. The Dean responded that GRE values among matriculated students are higher than noted by the reviewers, are increasing, and in any case do not serve well as an indicator of success. She argues that use of the GRE as one indicator of quality remains appropriate for now but notes that this policy needs to be reassessed periodically to insure that this metric is valuable and to maintain parity with peer institutions. This seems to be an appropriate stance.

**Curriculum**

Both the PhD and GIP curricula are praised for their innovative use of distance learning and the flexibility this provides. The disadvantages of this approach include the risk of loss of cohesion among the students, confusion regarding requirements and expectations, and lack of integration with other units of the University that are not yet as advanced in their use of this technology. Each of these problems has been encountered to varying degrees in the PhD and Gerontology programs, but the trajectory is clearly towards greater use of this technology globally, so these can be considered to be the growing pains of a program that adopts new ideas ahead of the average. The PhD curriculum was redesigned for the 2013-2014 academic year, so no outcomes are available, but the reviewers note that the new program "is clearly thought out, logical in its sequence, and provides appropriate support to assist students moving through the program." The program is notable in its use of topic cohorts and synchronous distance learning
technology. The simultaneous matriculation of small groups dedicated to a particular topic such as oncology depends on gaining applications of sufficient quantity and quality in a target area rather than forming a less coherent group at a preset calendar periodicity. This system allows tight cohesion among the group and coherence of their education. The cohesion is maintained by having all students attend a "virtual classroom" at the same time but from different locations. These features are highly innovative and place this program at the forefront of educational technology for PhD programs. Asynchronous versions of distance learning, in which students interact individually with content on a web site without the benefit of simultaneous peer interaction, are also used but seem to garner less praise and may not be as effective. In any case, the CoN is at the forefront of testing these methods, so it seems inappropriate to criticize them for an inability to fully integrate their offerings into the other aspects of training because other units of the University are not using these tools at all.

The GIP also makes use of distance learning, but here the same degree of coherence has not been achieved. One fundamental issue with this model is that students seeking very different outcomes (MS degree, graduate certificate, undergraduate certificate) attend many of the same courses with one another, even though their backgrounds and needs differ significantly. While some effort to adjust expectations for the different groups is reported, this structure is inherently difficult to plan and administer. This is likely to be the source of some of the confusion reported by students regarding the GIP curriculum and may require more than additional advising to fix. Counterbalancing this conclusion, it must be noted that the system serves three very different student populations with individually valid needs in a flexible manner; any solution to the problem of tailoring content to individual groups needs to attempt to retain the value the current system provides to these separate groups without discarding the benefit of the overlap.

As described above, the GIP has been criticized by the reviewers for failing to take ownership of the curriculum, instead allowing adjunct faculty to design course content as well as to provide it. The Dean notes that this practice is being reined in, but this is a crucial point and must be followed up with strong action. It is essential to the coherence of the curriculum that its content be centrally planned and administered as a unit. As part of this issue, the external reviewers suggested that the GIP maintains too many course offerings in too many topic tracks, and that reducing these offerings would be an effective way to make the program more coherent. It seems reasonable to ask that the need for course offerings be evaluated from this perspective. In agreement with this conclusion, the Dean notes that a task force of GIP faculty and students has been formed to review the courses offered. This seems like an appropriate move to address this problem.

Diversity

Diversity has been and remains a problematic issue for the CoN, although recent efforts may be showing some progress at the level of incoming students. Lack of diversity among the members of the faculty, however, has not yet been impacted. The 27-member core PhD faculty is dominated by Caucasian (96%) and females (88%), with the 40 members of the PhD and GIP faculty including only one non-Caucasian. The reviewers and the Dean differ on whether the single Asian faculty member should be considered an underrepresented minority, but all agree
that more effective measures need to be taken to broaden the diversity of the faculty. A similar skewing is seen among the students, with the vast majority being Caucasian females. The Dean notes in her response that three faculty members from underrepresented minority groups have recently been added to the tenure-track, including a Hispanic woman, a Native American woman, and an Asian woman. She also notes that there have been successful attempts to recruit underrepresented minorities as postdoctoral fellows, but while this establishes a pipeline with the potential to provide a more diverse faculty, these efforts have not yet been followed by success in recruiting these individuals to join the CoN faculty here. Further outreach will be required to solve this long-term problem.

The reviews raised two additional issues of diversity that are less typically addressed in these reports and seem beyond the scope of this evaluation. First is the issue of academic pedigree. While it is broadly considered to be important to maintain a range of perspectives among members of a faculty, it is not clear that this cannot be achieved by hiring products of local training, nor is it clear that this is a criticism that can be simply quantified or how it can be addressed. Second is the issue of the relatively advanced age of the matriculated students, where the "post-degree" career time is raised as the issue that might drive the value of the education provided. This seems beyond the control of the CoN and a topic difficult to address morally or legally. The Dean notes in her response that recent cohorts have been significantly younger than those mentioned by the reviewers, and she acknowledges that more needs to be done to engage younger students to solve the national shortage of faculty members in this area.

Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

The PhD program describes a system for tracking graduates and assessing career outcomes, and maintaining compliance with T32 funding will require adherence to this plan. The reviewers uniformly praise the placements of the former students, so the assessment is both robust and positive. Assessing the effectiveness of the GIP has been more problematic, with mixed reviews by students and little data regarding placement or satisfaction of employers with the certificate or master’s degree holders produced. In her response letter the Dean acknowledges this shortcoming and outlines plans to increase the monitoring of courses and of graduate outcomes to assess program effectiveness.

Facilities and Resources

A full renovation of the CoN building was completed in 2010, resulting in a facility that is broadly praised as spacious, well-designed, and functional. Retirements of several faculty members are anticipated, which will necessitate hiring to replace these members and succession plans to allow smooth transitions in leadership roles. Recent limitations on salaries and start-up packages for new hires may have diminished the attractiveness of faculty positions in the CoN; if this trend is not reversed it may be difficult to retain important faculty members as well as to replace them at a comparable level of quality. Additional resources may therefore be required for retention and recruitment of faculty, as well as for maintaining the quality of the staff.
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COMMENDATIONS

1. The PhD program is innovative, flexible, and responsive to the needs of the students. This is a model program recognized nationally for its quality and outcomes. The use of synchronous learning in a virtual classroom setting is particularly praised as a method for maintaining coherence of instruction while allowing flexibility of training sites, thereby significantly increasing the target population for training.

2. The GIP offers training in an important health care topic with a high degree of flexibility to a broad range of students.

3. The varied and robust mentoring systems for the faculty and students in the PhD program are well-designed and well-administered.

4. The Administration of the CoN is recognized for providing continuity in succession of key positions, willingness to seek out areas requiring improvement, and to accept criticism and act effectively to find solutions to problems.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Mechanisms should be sought to enhance gender and ethnic diversity at every stage of training in this profession, with special emphasis on adding diversity to the faculty.

2. The number and variety of courses offered within the GIP should be evaluated to minimize reliance on adjunct faculty and maximize the coherence of the program. To the extent that use of adjunct faculty is deemed necessary and appropriate, the content of each course should be evaluated to insure that it is driven by explicit curricular goals and not by the expertise or preference of the faculty member. Interactions among adjunct and core faculty members should be increased to promote the goal of coherence, as well.

3. Mechanisms for evaluating individual courses and for assessing outcomes at the end of the programs should be enhanced, with particular attention devoted to assessing how degrees and certificates awarded by the GIP are perceived by graduates and their employers.

4. Negotiations with administration should begin to identify adequate resources to provide for planned or anticipated retirements among the faculty. Retaining current faculty and providing for smooth transitions in the future will necessitate maintaining current competitive salaries and providing adequate start-up packages.
Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

Tim Formosa (Chair)
Professor, Department of Biochemistry

Nan Ellin
Professor, Department of City and Metropolitan Planning

Robert N. Mayer
Professor, Department of Family and Consumer Studies
### Table 1. Department Financial Analysis

<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><strong>College of Nursing</strong></td>
<td>3,528,189</td>
<td>5,693,109</td>
<td>5,789,379</td>
<td>5,988,382</td>
<td>4,389,543</td>
<td>6,311,701</td>
<td>0</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>12,912</td>
<td>14,545</td>
<td>14,392</td>
<td>13,179</td>
<td>12,578</td>
<td>12,690</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Student FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>7,378,107</td>
<td>7,989,262</td>
<td>8,453,387</td>
<td>8,726,322</td>
<td>8,897,543</td>
<td>9,003,590</td>
<td>9,851,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Gerontology Faculty and Student Headcount 2005 - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gerontology</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><strong>FACULTY: With Doctoral Degrees including MFA and other terminal degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Masters Degrees</strong></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>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Bachelor Degrees</strong></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><strong>Total Headcount Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</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>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Salaried</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</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>Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students Based on Fall Third Week Semester Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Master’s Program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. PhD Faculty and Student Headcount 2005 - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PhD Program</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><strong>FACULTY: With Doctoral Degrees Including MFA and other terminal degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Masters Degrees</strong></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><strong>With Bachelor Degrees</strong></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><strong>Total Headcount Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</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>Full-Time Salaried</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time or Auxiliary Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants</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><strong>Number of Graduates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students Based on Fall Third Week Semester Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Doctoral Program</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department FTE*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department SCH</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>2,786</td>
<td>3,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total Department FTE includes DNP and PhD students
College of Nursing  
Nursing PhD and Gerontology MS Programs  
Graduate Council Review 2012-13

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on February 10, 2014, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the College of Nursing PhD and Gerontology MS Programs. Vivian S. Lee, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; Patricia G. Morton, Dean of the College of Nursing; Ginny A. Pepper, Associate Dean (Research) of the College of Nursing; Barbara L. Wilson, Associate Dean (Academic Programs) of the College of Nursing; Margaret F. Clayton, Director of the PhD Program; Kara B. Dassel, Director of the Gerontology Interdisciplinary Program; 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 November 25, 2013. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1:** Mechanisms should be sought to enhance gender and ethnic diversity at every stage of training in this profession, with special emphasis on adding diversity to the faculty.

The Dean and program directors are fully committed to enhancing gender and racial/ethnic diversity among students, where there has been some progress (underrepresented students now make up 20% of the PhD program), and on the faculty, where efforts have been less successful.

**Initiatives to increase student diversity:** The PhD program has appointed a recruitment task force, which has minority faculty representation. The plan includes recruiting minority students from historically Black colleges and universities and from undergraduate programs at more diverse institutions. The Gerontology Interdisciplinary Program (GIP) has worked with the Assistant Dean of The Graduate School to obtain lists of qualified potential candidates and is following up with a targeted marketing campaign for these students.

**Initiatives to increase faculty diversity:** The PhD program has recently made offers to underrepresented postdoctoral candidates and is focusing on recruiting minority PhD students in hopes that some of them might become potential qualified candidates for future faculty positions. The directors of the GIP and the PhD will work with the new VP for Inclusion to continue and enhance their efforts. The GIP and PhD programs will monitor and evaluate the relative success of their strategies annually at the end of each academic year. Regular reports on progress to this and the other recommendations will be submitted to the Graduate School.
Recommendation 2: The number and variety of courses offered within the GIP should be evaluated to minimize reliance on adjunct faculty and maximize the coherence of the program. To the extent that use of adjunct faculty is deemed necessary and appropriate, the content of each course should be evaluated to insure that it is driven by explicit curricular goals and not by the expertise or preference of the faculty member. Interactions among adjunct and core faculty members should be increased to promote the goal of coherence, as well.

Since the review, the GIP has created a committee to review the curriculum and the curricular goals of the program. Changes have been made and will begin to be implemented in 2014/15. Changes include eliminating GIP adjuncts and consolidating courses, with a temporary suspension of emphases for this year. The committee made the decision to focus on the core curriculum so as not to dilute the coherence of the curriculum. Given these changes, the Director believes there is adequate faculty to deliver quality and rigor in the curriculum. Reports on the results of these changes will be included in the regular updates to the Graduate School.

Recommendation 3: Mechanisms for evaluating individual courses and for assessing outcomes at the end of programs should be enhanced, with particular attention devoted to assessing how graduates and their employers perceive degrees and certificates awarded by the GIP.

The GIP and PhD programs are actively assessing how the degrees and certificates awarded are perceived by graduates and their employers. A database has been developed for the purpose of collecting and tracking data and collecting information from alumni and employers. Graduate Dean Kieda suggested that program directors use the data they collect to identify trends and issues that could indicate the need for further curricular changes or adaptations. This idea was well received by the program directors and will be implemented.

Recommendation 4: Negotiations with administration should begin to identify adequate resources to provide for planned or anticipated retirements among the faculty. Retaining current faculty and providing for smooth transitions in the future will necessitate maintaining current competitive salaries and providing adequate start-up packages.
As a result of budget constraints, there are currently no vacant lines. There are, however, impending retirements to plan for and this presents a challenge for the College as the directors strategize to maintain continuity. The Dean is in negotiation with the Sr. Vice President to seek additional funding for three years to make start-up packages more competitive. The issue of competitive salaries remains unresolved as there is no commitment from the administration to assist with improving the low (50th percentile nationally) salaries in the College of Nursing. The new Dean addressed the issue by speaking to the need for strategic prioritization, innovation (such as sharing faculty across programs), and implementing some new cultural practices in regard to advising students to enter academe sooner in their careers. The Dean has requested a salary study to provide important context for these programs during the upcoming budget cycle and will work closely with the Office of Advancement to raise funds for new faculty positions. The Dean also has made faculty funding a priority goal for the coming fiscal year.

This memorandum of understanding is to be followed by regular letters of progress from the Dean of the College of Nursing to the Dean of the Graduate School. Letters will be submitted until all of the actions described in the preceding paragraphs have been completed.
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David B. Kieda  
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David B. Kieda  
Dean, The Graduate School  
March 3, 2014
February 12, 2014

President David W. Pershing  
University of Utah  
201 Presidents Circle, Room 203  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dear President Pershing:

It is my pleasure to inform you of the affirmative recommendation of the University of Utah Distinguished Professors that Ellen Bromberg be appointed Distinguished Professor of Modern Dance, Chris Ireland be appointed Distinguished Professor of Medicinal Chemistry, Gary Keck be appointed Distinguished Professor of Chemistry, Timothy Smith be appointed Distinguished Professor of Psychology, and Hong Yong Sohn be appointed Distinguished Professor of Metallurgical Engineering. The Distinguished Professors met on February 12, 2014 at 12:00 noon to consider nominations received. The nominees were selected from an outstanding pool of candidates. A majority vote was cast in support of the five nominees.

Upon your approval of these recommended appointments, we will report them to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and to the Board of Trustees at their next meeting.

Sincerely yours,

Ruth V. Watkins  
Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs

Approved:

David W. Pershing, President  
2/13/2014
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 28, 2014

TO: Ruth V. Watkins, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Janet Lindsley, University Teaching Committee Chair

SUBJECT: 2014 Early Career Teaching Awards Recipients

The University Teaching Committee is pleased to announce the recipients of the Early Career Teaching Award for 2014. The recipients are:

Beverly Brehl          Assistant Professor (Lecturer)
Kyle Dawson           Assistant Professor
Alf Seegert           Associate Professor (Lecturer)
Courtenay Strong      Assistant Professor

Family & Consumer Studies
Physics & Astronomy
English
Atmospheric Sciences

The recipients were selected from an outstanding pool of eight nominees with less than eight years of teaching service at the University of Utah.

The four award winners will be recognized at the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence in the Sill Center. The date of the event has yet to be determined. Once the date has been decided, if your schedule permits we hope you will be able to attend.

Please forward the selection of the 2014 Early Career Teaching Award recipients to the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees for their approval.

Approved:

Ruth V. Watkins, Sr. VP for Academic Affairs        3-4-14

David W. Pershing, President        3-5-2014
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 24, 2014

TO: Ruth V. Watkins, Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Janet Lindsley, University Teaching Committee Chair

RE: Calvin S. and JeNeal N. Hatch Prize in Teaching

It is with great pleasure to inform you that the University Teaching Committee has selected Theresa Martinez, Associate Professor of Sociology as the 2014 recipient of the Calvin S. and JeNeal Hatch Prize in Teaching.

The Hatch Prize in Teaching is awarded annually to an outstanding faculty member of the University of Utah who has distinguished him or herself in teaching through unusual motivation and stimulation of students to seek greater learning, unusual concern for students, noteworthy expertise in a given field of study, and other exemplary contributions to university education.

Please forward the selection of Associate Professor Martinez to the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees for their approval.

Thank you.

Approved:

Ruth V. Watkins, Sr. VP for Academic Affairs

[Signature]

Date

2-24-14
Honors and Awards to members of the University Community

Annika Pecchia-Bekkum, a 2013 graduate of the University of Utah and current graduate student, has been awarded a prestigious Gates Cambridge Scholarship to pursue a Ph.D. in medical science at the University of Cambridge. She is the second Gates Cambridge Scholar for the University of Utah, and the first to have completed undergraduate degrees at the U. Pecchia-Bekkum graduated from the University of Utah summa cum laude earning both an honors bachelor’s degree in English in 2012 and an Honors bachelor’s degree in chemistry in 2013. She is currently working on a Ph.D. in chemistry at the U. Gates Cambridge Scholarships are highly competitive awards for graduate study at the University of Cambridge. Awarded to the “most academically brilliant and socially committed young people in the U.S.,” according to a release from Gates Cambridge, only 40 scholarships are granted each year. The scholarship covers three years of graduate tuition at Cambridge, plus a yearly stipend of $22,000.