ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA
May 5, 2014

1. CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 p.m. in 1750 HSEB
2. MINUTES: April 7, 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. SPECIAL ORDERS – Annual Elections
   a. Election of Senate President-elect (Bios) 5
   b. Election of Senate Executive Committee
   c. Election of Senate-elected Committees (instructions for online voting)
9. NOTICE OF INTENT
   a. Revisions to Policy 6-203 and 6-201 7
10. DEBATE CALENDAR
    a. Faculty Review Standards Regulations, Policy 6-303, 6-310, & Rule 6-310 21
    b. Proposal for BA Program Consolidation of Middle East Studies 73
    c. Proposal for Second Language Teaching and Research Center (L2TReC) 78
    d. Athletics Advisory Committee Charter Revisions 99
    e. Honors Integrated Minor in Ecology & Legacy 106
    f. Discontinue Communication Minors and Teaching Degrees 117
    g. Proposal for a Combined BS/MS in Chemistry 121
    h. New Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy 134
    i. Dual Degree for MRED and JD 158
    j. New emphasis in Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner 168
11. INFORMATION CALENDAR
    a. Student Textbook Savings Committee Report 175
    b. Rule 5-200B Paid Time Off (PTO), Holidays, and Other Paid Leave for University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics Staff Members 229
    d. University Professor for 2014-2016 239
12. NEW BUSINESS
    a. April 2014 President’s Report 242
    b. Announcement of President-Elect and Executive Committee
13. ADJOURNMENT
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
April 7, 2014

Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate, held on April 7, 2014, was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by Allyson Mower, Senate President. The meeting was held in Eccles Institute of Human Genetics Auditorium.

Present: David Ailion, Peter Alfeld, Chrisoula Andreou, A.K. Balaji, Tim Benvegnu, Lyda Bigelow, Michael Blomgren, Kelly Bricker, Nilufer Cagatay, Kate Canas, Tully Cathey, Thomas Cheatham, Marcus Chen, Robin Craig, Alison Denyer, Justin Diggle, Maria Dobozy, Megan Dolle, Randy Dryer, Florence Fernandez, Ole Fischer, Michael Free, Frances Friedrich, Caren Frost, Disa Gambera, Jennifer Garvin, Franz Goller, Joan Gregory, Gary Grikscheit, Thad Hall, Glen Hanson, Mary Elizabeth Hartnett, Leanne Hawken, Rachel Hayes-Harb, Tom Henderson, David Hill, Lynn Hollister, Thunder Jalili, Anne Jamison, Peter Jensen, Christian Johnson, William Johnson, Bradley Katz, Evert Lawton, John Longino, Gary Lowder, William Lowrance, Erminia Martinez, Duncan Metcalfe, Meredith Metzger, Jill Moriearty, Alfred Mowdood, Patricia Murphy, A. Chris Nelson, Ingrid Nygaard, Sam Ortiz, Patrick Panos, Janiece Pompa, M. Pollie Price, Bruce Quaglia, Mariana Ramiro, Reva Rauk, Lorie Richards, Stephanie Richardson, Steve Roens, Gerald Root, Gary Rose, Paul Shami, Debra Simmons, Gregory Smoak, David Stevenson, David Temme, Rachel Wootton, Joanne Yaffe, Jingyi Zhu,


Excused with Proxy: Michelle Hofmann, Krystal Mourman for Brandon Jennings, Bob Nelson for Xan Johnson, Tom Richmond for Joel Miller, Therèse de Raedt for Matthew Potolsky, Michael R. Dean for Clough Shelton

Others: Michael Deans, Tim Ebner, Marilynn Paine, Ted Pysher, Justin Spangler, Donna White

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

Request for New Business
The following items of New Business will be discussed:
• Resolution for Beverly Brehl
• Proposal for Formation of an Academic Senate Committee on Investment Responsibility
Consent Calendar
No resignations retirements, and faculty and administrator appointments

Executive Committee Report
Steve Alder, Academic Senate President-elect, provided a summary of the Executive Committee meeting held March 17, 2014.

Report from Administration
President David Pershing gave an update to the Senate on campus activities. Three main buildings are currently under construction: School of Dentistry, Student Life Center and S. J. Quinney College of Law. Construction on the Business Loop Parking Terrace and the Northwest Parking Terrace will begin in May 2014. The University did receive the funding approval from the State of Utah to finish the infrastructure project and construction will continue on main campus through the year. For updates on construction projects you can visit the Facilities Management website.

Community Engagement day will be held April 10th. This event helps the University connect with the community through a variety of constructive projects and initiatives. On Saturday, April 12th the U will celebrate 100 years of Piano with a Grand Centennial Celebration Concert featuring current students, distinguished alumni, and faculty. Commencement will be held on May 1 at 6:30 pm in the Huntsman Center. Alex Smith will be the guest speaker. College Convocations will be held on May 2nd with the exception of Social Behavioral Science, College of Law and School of Medicine. For specific times please visit the Commencement Ceremonies website.

Report from ASUU
Sam Ortiz, ASUU President spoke to the Academic Senate regarding ASUU activities. Justin Spangler was introduced to the Senate; he will serve as the ASUU President for the 2014-2015 Academic Year. ASUU will be partnering again with the Marriott Library for Geek Week. The activities begin April 21 and end on April 25. The Senate expressed its appreciation to Sam Ortiz for his service as ASUU President.

Notice of Intent
Robert Flores presented Policy Updates to 6-303, 6-310 and rule 6-310. 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. The motion to move the item to debate made by Jill Moriearty and seconded by Bruce Quaglia. Motion did not pass and will go to the Debate calendar in May.

Debate Calendar
Academic Governance Policies, 6-001, 6-300, 6-003, 6-015, 7-100 were presented by Robert Flores. The first phase of this project was approved in spring 2013. This second phase will include reorganized content for 6-001 including descriptions of academic departments, free standing divisions, and colleges currently located in Policy 2-004. 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. The motion to approve with recommendation to correct the library reference and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Randy Dryer. Motion passed unanimously.

Dean Li presented the proposal to close out Department of Physiology. The School of Medicine is requesting permission to dissolve the Department of Physiology after the final Physiology graduate student completes his degree requirements in Spring 2015. The College Council unanimously approved the proposal in October 2013. Starting in 2012 faculty were reassigned to the Departments of Internal Medicine/Cardiology, Neurosurgery, and Neurobiology and Anatomy to invigorate and strengthen neuroscience and cardiovascular research initiatives. 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. The final two graduate students in the Department of Physiology are completing their PhD requirements in 2014 and 2015. The motion to approve the Proposal to close out the Department of Physiology and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Will Lowrance. Motion passed with eight abstentions.

The Proposal to create Population Health Sciences was presented by Dean Li. 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, 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. It is recognized that both population health and health systems research expertise and successful scholarly work already exist within the University of Utah, but 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 motion to approve and forward the Proposal to create Population Health Sciences to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Randy Dryer. Motion passed with three abstentions.

Mary Parker presented the Academic Calendar 2014-2021. The main changes for the calendar are to incorporate reading day back into the academic calendar for the fall and spring semester, a significant break between fall and spring semester, and review of possibility of moving commencement day to a different day. Because commencement has recently been moved it was
decided to not move commencement at this time. *The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Peter Jensen. Motion passed.*

**Information Calendar**
The Scholarship program was presented by Mary Parker. A new Scholarship office has been set up to help with the scholarship process. The biggest change will be that all scholarships will be disbursed through one office and to help standardize this process. This process will be in place for Fall 2014.

The yearly Senate Committee reports were presented to the Academic Senate with no recommendations or objections.

The following items were accepted by the Academic Senate and will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees:
- Graduate Council Review Department of City and Metropolitan Planning
- Graduate Council Review Department of Health Promotion and Education
- Graduate Council Review Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy
- Graduate Council Review Nursing PhD and Gerontology MS Programs
- 2014 Distinguished Professors
- 2014 Early Career Teaching Awards Recipients
- Calvin S. and JaNeal N. Hatch Prize in Teaching

**New Business**
Joan Gregory presented the Proposal for Formation of an Academic Senate Committee on Investment Responsibility. This committee would provide a structure for fostering dialogue, and help the University make responsible investment decisions that promote sustainability; make recommendations to fund decision-makers on socially and environmentally responsible investment opportunities and practices across asset classes; be separate from the University’s Investment Advisory Committee; be drawn from multiple sectors of the University community providing educational experiences for involved students, faculty, alumni and staff. The committee would consist of 6 faculty, 4 students, 2 staff, and 2 ex-officio. The committee will submit a report at the first Senate meeting in September 2014 and a quarterly report thereafter. *The motion to approve was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Jennifer Garvin. Motion passed with two abstentions.*

Stephanie Richardson presented a Resolution for Beverly Brehl. *The resolution was approved by acclamation.*

**Adjournment**
Meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Shawnee Worsley
Dr. William P. Johnson

While I provide information about myself below in an attempt to prove my competence, probably most useful to share first are my goals regarding the Senate. My overall goal as Senate President will be to preserve representation of faculty interests in administrative decisions related to our academic mission. Four specific goals include: 1) assisting in the transition toward greater transparency in resource distribution across campus; and 2) assisting in the transition away from funding formulas that discourage interdisciplinary course development across colleges; 3) continuing the efforts to simplify populating senate committees; 4) aligning college councils and senate representatives to promote cross fertilization between college council and senate activities.

About my background: I am a Professor in the Department of Geology & Geophysics with an adjunct position in Civil & Environmental Engineering. My B.A. (Geology) and M.S. degree (Earth Science) are from Whitman College (1983) and Dartmouth College (1986), respectively. My Ph.D. degree (Civil Engineering) is from the University of Colorado (1993). My research focuses on the physics and chemistry of natural water treatment by filtration in granular aquifers (groundwater) with extension to the fate and transport of trace elements, and the partitioning behavior of organic compounds in aquatic systems. I have been principal investigator on more than ten federally funded research grants (predominantly National Science Foundation), and I’ve led more than five state-funded projects examining the fate and transport of selenium and mercury, and other trace elements in the Great Salt Lake and surrounding wetlands. I’ve worked closely with my students to produce eighty five peer reviewed publications in top-tier journals, with over 2200 citations of this work to date and an H-index of 26. I serve on review panels for multiple programs within the Engineering and Earth Sciences Directorates of the National Science Foundation, including Chemical, Biological and Engineered Transport Systems, Hydrologic Sciences, and the Center for Environmental Implications of Nanotechnology. I’ve directed five Ph.D. completions, yielding tenure-track faculty positions at City College of New York, Beijing University (2), National Polytechnic University Ecuador, and Brigham Young University. I’ve directed more than 25 M.S. completions.

Notable administrative experience includes revitalizing the Geological Engineering degree program (1996-2002), serving on the FASB design committee (2006-2009) including establishing Two Creeks Coffee as the nerve center of north campus, Academic Senate Executive Committee (2011-2014), Associate Chair Geology & Geophysics (2013-present), and developing novel extracurricular courses such as the Sustainability Practicum (2006-2009) and Ecuador Study Abroad “Environmental Conflict: Water Quality Impacts of Mining in Ecuador (2009-present).
V. Kim Martinez is an Associate Professor of painting and drawing in the Department of Art and Art History, University of Utah, since fall 2001. She received her terminal degree from The School of the Art Institute of Chicago. Her fellowships include: The Sara Lee Foundation, Ragsdale, Vermont Studio Center, Bemis Center for Contemporary Art, Social and Public Arts Resource Center, The School of the Arts Institute of Chicago George L. & Ann Roman Siegel Foundation, and International Iron Casters. Awards from the University of Utah include the John R. Parks, Tanner Humanities Center Professors Off-Campus and the Distinguished Innovation and Impact Award. Martinez’s commitment to university shared governance philosophy is reflected by her membership in the University Academic Senate and Executive Committee, Teaching Committee, and Dee Council. In 2006 she received the College of Fine Arts, Faculty Excellence Award in Teaching, Research, and Service. Martinez is the recipient of the 2003 Salt Lake City Mayors Visual Artist Award, recognizing her community involvement and contribution to the Utah Department of Corrections, Veterans Administration, Utah Hispanic Women’s Association, First Step House and Art Access/Art Positive! Community grants include: The National Endowment for the Arts “Challenge America”, Utah Transit Authority, City of South Salt Lake, Salt Lake County, Primary Children’s Medical Center, State of Utah Division of the Blind and Visually Impaired, the University of Utah Housing & Residential Education and the School of Medicine.
MEMORANDUM

Date: March 4, 2014 [Updated March 8, 2014][Updated March 27, 2014]
[Updated April 18, 2014]

To: Prof. Julio Facelli
   Prof. Amelia Rhinehart
   Senate Advisory Committee on Library Policy

From: Dave Kieda, Dean, The Graduate School
      Kelly Harward, Thesis Editor, The Graduate School

Subject: Request for revision to University Policies 6-203 and 6-201 to clarify University of Utah graduate thesis publication and embargo policies

University Policy 6-203 outlines The Graduate School's general requirements for the graduate degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Included in this policy (Sec. III.F) is a description of the options for fulfilling the publication requirement for the dissertation. University Policy 6-201 describes the general requirements for the graduate degree of Master of Science and Master of Arts.

There are several editorial changes that are necessary for University Regulations to comply with present practice. For example, University Policy 6-203 currently provides several publication options for the PhD degree. One of the publication options listed in the current regulation 6-203, University Microfilms, has changed its name to ProQuest LLC. The name of the graduate school dissertation handbook (Handbook for Theses and Dissertations) needs to be updated. In addition, recent changes of policy at ProQuest will now allow students to permanently embargo the release of their dissertation through a direct request to ProQuest LLC, without approval by the University or The Graduate School. Currently, 6-203 Sec III-F indicates the requirement that dissertations must be published, but provides no guidance regarding under what conditions the publication of the thesis may be embargoed, how long it may be embargoed, nor does it describe any mechanism for the student to request an embargo on the release of their thesis from the University.

The publication requirement of the doctoral dissertation lies at the very center of our academic ideals. Research and creative activities accomplished in the pursuit of the doctoral degree should be widely available to both the academic community and the general public. The availability of this work serves to allow greater recognition of these accomplishments and allows other scholars to build new discoveries and works upon the accomplishments of the dissertation, thereby increasing the value of the doctoral dissertation. The public availability also serves as a public record of the student's achievements during their graduate career.

Under certain circumstances, it is reasonable to embargo the publication of the thesis for a fixed duration. A student may wish to publish some part of their (or their entire) dissertation through a commercial publisher, in which case open access to the dissertation
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may compromise their ability to negotiate with the publisher. Some dissertations may contain technical or scientific descriptions that may compromise the ability of the student (or University) to secure intellectual property rights through a patent. Consequently, University Policy publication requirements should provide the ability to request an embargo for a fixed duration in order to protect the author's ability to publish and/or patent the contents of their doctoral dissertation.

In order to address these concerns, we have met with the Library Policy Advisory Committee and have drafted changes to University Policy 6-203 in order to conform to present practice:

1) Update the name of University Microfilms to ProQuest Information and Learning
2) Update the name of University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts to ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts International
3) Update the name of The Graduate School's Handbook for Theses and Dissertations

In order to define a policy regarding the ability of the student to embargo the release of their doctoral dissertations, we propose to add specific language to University Policy 6-203 Section III.F detailing the maximum embargo duration, and the ability to request additional extension of the embargo. The three-year duration of the embargo is generous but fair; most institutions allow embargos of 2 years or less. In order to maintain some flexibility in the implementation of the embargo policy, we will provide specific details in The Graduate School's Handbook for Theses and Dissertations regarding the circumstances when an embargo will be allowed and the procedure for requesting the embargo.

In reviewing University Policy 6-203 we also reviewed University Policy 6-201 and requested the explicit mention of the option to archive Master's Degree dissertations and creative works in the University of Utah Digital Library. Students already have this option, but we felt it was important to provide a voluntary incentive in University regulations for increased use of this service.

March 8, 2014 Update: At the request of Julio Facelli and LPAC, the following clarification is added to this request to clarify the choice of the 3 year time limit on the publication embargo:

*The standard maximum embargo duration at most other institutions is 2 years, then a one-time request for an additional 2 years is also possible, allowing a maximum total of 4 years.*

*The length of the embargo is set by the time necessary to prepare and submit the work to either a patent application, or for a mainstream publication. For patents, it is fairly common for the patent application to take 6-12 months, so the 2 year timeframe (including option for renewal) would be adequate.*

*A short search of the internet reveals publication of books in mainstream press takes 9-15 months after the manuscript reaches the editor's desk in final form. Adding in a year to prepare the manuscript before submission places the timeframe well over the 2 year mark. Consequently, it would be expected that the 2-year extension could be regularly exceeded.*
The proposed three year timeframe for the revised policy was therefore selected with the intent to provide a generous enough time frame for submission of a manuscript to a publisher without having to request an extension. This should cover the legitimate need of all doctoral students in most cases. In extreme cases, the student could petition for an additional extension, but it is not guaranteed.

March 27, 2014 update: At the request of the Graduate Council meeting March 24, 2014, the following changes have been made:

1) The reference to the exact name ProQuest Information and Learning has been removed and replaced with a University approved electronic thesis and dissertation database which refers to the specification of ProQuest Information and Learning in The Graduate School’s Handbook for Theses and Dissertations. This was incorporated to allow for future changes in the University approved publisher without requiring a formal revision of University Regulations.

2) The negotiations of extension of the embargo are made with the Dean of The Graduate School, not with The Graduate School.

3) The reference to ProQuest Dissertation Abstracts International has been shortened to Dissertation Abstracts International so future changes in product name will not require a formal revision of University Regulations.

4) Fixed a couple of capitalization errors.

April 18, 2014 update: At the request of the IPC meeting April 18, 2014, the following changes have been made to this request letter:

1) In order to comply with current University definitions and practice, the term University Policy has been substituted for the term Policy and Procedures Manual (PPM) in all correspondence.

2) The Senate Advisory Committee on Library Policy, and the Institutional Policy Committee, have reviewed and communicated their support of the proposal.
Policy 6-203: Graduate Studies and Degrees, Doctor of Philosophy
Revision 5. Effective Date: [upon final approval]

I. Purpose and Scope

(Reserved)

II. Definitions

(Reserved)

III. Policy: General Requirements and Provisions for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The Doctor of Philosophy degree is awarded for high attainment in an advanced specialized field of study. It requires competence in independent research and an understanding of related subjects. This degree is not awarded simply for the fulfillment of residence requirements and the accumulation of credits.

A. Study Requirements

Candidates for the Ph.D. degree must ordinarily complete not less than three full years (six semesters) of approved graduate work, inclusive of work for the master's degree. More time may be required. In truly exceptional cases, a shorter period of time in graduate work may be approved by the dean of the Graduate School. At least one year of the doctoral program must be spent in full-time academic work at the University of Utah, defined as two consecutive semesters of registration for at least nine hours. Noninteractive distance or telecourses do not satisfy the residency requirement. (Normally, no more than six semester hours of high quality work may be transferred from another institution.)

B. Time Limit

The time limit for completing a Ph.D. degree is determined by individual departmental policy approved by the Graduate Council. Requests to exceed established time limits must be recommended by a candidate's supervisory committee and approved by the departmental director of graduate studies and the dean of the Graduate school. Students whose studies have been interrupted for long periods of time and who have been granted extended time to complete their degrees may be required to complete additional courses, to pass examinations, or otherwise to demonstrate that they are current in their field.

C. Supervisory Committee
A committee of three or five faculty members is appointed to supervise a student's graduate work. One or more members of the supervisory committee shall be appointed from another department where such appointments will enhance the ability of the committee to supervise the student's work. The supervisory committee is responsible for approving the student's academic program, preparing and judging the qualifying examinations, approving the dissertation subject and final dissertation, and administering and judging the final oral examination. The chairperson of the supervisory committee normally directs the student's research and writing of the dissertation. The final oral examination may be chaired by any member of the supervisory committee consistent with departmental policy. Decisions concerning program requirements, examinations, and the dissertation are made by majority vote of the supervisory committee.

Supervisory committee members should be members of the University faculty, including regular tenure-line, career-line, visiting, or adjunct, and research faculty (See Policy 6-300). They should hold an academic or professional doctorate, and should have demonstrated competence to do research, scholarly, or artistic work in the general field of the student's studies. Appointments to graduate supervisory committees of persons who do not meet these requirements must be recommended and justified by the director of graduate studies of the department and approved by the dean of the Graduate School.

It is the student's responsibility to initiate a request for a supervisory committee. The department chairperson or director of graduate studies, depending on departmental policy, appoints the chairperson and the committee members subject to approval by the dean of the Graduate school. All University of Utah faculty members (including tenure-line and career-line regular, clinical, and research faculty) are eligible to serve as supervisory committee chairpersons consistent with individual departmental regulations. In special cases faculty holding only visiting or adjunct appointments in the University may be chairpersons if recommended by the department and approved by the dean of the Graduate School.

D. Language Requirements

Whether foreign language proficiency is required of candidates is determined by departmental policy. Where such proficiency is required, it must be certified by
the Graduate Language Committee. In some instances, language proficiency may be certified by individual departments if appropriate procedures have been approved in advance by the Graduate Language Committee. In most cases, however, fulfillment of the language requirements must be certified by the Graduate Language Committee. The Graduate Language Committee certifies language proficiency on the basis of special examinations or academic courses completed in the language. Detailed regulations concerning language requirements are published in the Bulletin of the University of Utah Graduate School.

E. Qualifying Examination

Written and oral qualifying examinations (preliminary examinations) are required of each candidate. The nature and format of these examinations are established by individual departments subject to approval by the Graduate Council. At the discretion of the student's supervisory committee, an examination or parts of an examination may be repeated only once.

Qualifying examinations normally are prepared, administered, and evaluated by the student's supervisory committee. However, a department has the option of appointing a departmental examination committee which administers the qualifying examinations and ensures that examinations are properly prepared and evaluated.

F. Dissertations

The candidate must submit a dissertation embodying the results of the scientific or scholarly research or artistic creativity which gives evidence of originality and ability in independent investigation and is a contribution to knowledge or the creative arts. The dissertation must show a mastery of the relevant literature and be presented in acceptable style. The style and format of the dissertation are determined by departmental policy and registered with the Thesis Editor, who approves the style and format of the individual dissertations in accordance with departmental policy. The dissertation is approved by the student's supervisory committee.

The doctoral dissertation is expected to be available to other scholars and to the general public. As copyright holders, it is the responsibility of all doctoral candidates to arrange for the publication of their dissertations. The University accepts three alternatives for complying with the publication requirements:
1. The entire dissertation may be published and distributed by a publisher of
the candidate's choice, exclusive of vanity publishing.

2. The entire dissertation may consist of an article or articles accepted for
publication in approved scholarly journals.

3. The dissertation may be microfilmed by University Microfilms and
included in a University-approved electronic thesis and dissertation
database for public sale and the University of Utah Digital Library for
public access, either immediately or after an embargo period not to exceed
3 years. Embargo periods exceeding 3 years may be requested, but they
are subject to negotiation with the Dean of the Graduate School.

Regardless of the option used for meeting the publication requirement, an
abstract of each dissertation is to be published in University Microfilm’s
Dissertation Abstracts International.

Detailed policies and procedures concerning the publication requirement and
other matters pertaining to the preparation and acceptance of the dissertation are
contained in A Handbook for Style and Format Guide for the Preparation and
Presentation of Theses and Dissertations published by The Graduate School.

G. Final Examination

A final oral examination must be passed before graduation. The examination
must follow receipt of the dissertation by the supervisory committee. The
committee schedules and announces a public oral examination at which the
candidate must defend the dissertation. The final oral examination may be
chaired by any member of the supervisory committee consistent with
departmental policy.

In order to guarantee graduation in a particular semester, the candidate must
submit a copy of the dissertation for format approval to the thesis and
dissertation editor four weeks prior to the last day of classes of that semester.
The copy submitted for format approval must be defended and fully approved
by the supervisory committee and the final reader of the dissertation.

H. Registration

The candidate must register for a minimum of 14 credit hours of Thesis
Research (7970 Thesis Research-Ph.D.). The candidate must be regularly
enrolled at the University for three or more credit hours during the semester in which the final oral examination is taken.

I. Exceptions

Individual student exceptions to the general requirements for the Ph.D. as stated herein must be approved by the dean of the Graduate School upon the recommendation of the student's supervisory committee and the respective director of graduate studies or department chair. The Graduate Council may approve departmental or programmatic exceptions to the minimum residency requirements and proposals for new programs or academic offerings using distance learning technologies and/or off-campus sites, as provided by Graduate School policy.

[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 (reserved)
B. Procedures (reserved)
C. Guidelines (reserved)
D. Forms (reserved)
E. Other related resource materials (reserved)

V. References:

(Reserved)

VI. Contacts:

The designated contact officials for this Policy are:
A. Policy Owners (primary contact person for questions and advice): Dean of the Graduate School.

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 delegate, 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 6-203 effective 9/15/2008, formerly known as PPM 9-9.3, and previously as Faculty Regulations Chapter IX - Section 9.

Revision history:

Current version: Revision 5. Approved by Academic Senate [__??]. Approved by Board of Trustees [__??], with effective date of [__??]

Earlier Revisions

Revision 4 [link to copy marked outdated]. Effective dates July 10, 1995 to [__??] Approved: Academic Senate 6/19/95

Approved: Board of Trustees 7/10/95

Editorially revised: 6/12/96
Policy 6-201: Graduate Studies and Degrees, Master of Arts and Master of Sciences

1. Purpose and Scope
   a. (Reserved)

2. Definitions
   a. (Reserved)

3. Policy: General Requirements and Provisions for the Master of Arts and Master of Science Degrees
   a. Candidates for the master's degrees must devote a minimum of 30 semester hours to graduate courses and thesis. Where appropriate, upper division courses may be taken if approved by the student's supervisory committee and the dean of the Graduate School. At least 24 semester hours must be in resident study at the University of Utah and a minimum of 20 semester hours must be in course work with the balance in thesis. Noninteractive distance or telecourse do not satisfy the residency requirement. The candidate is required to maintain a "B" average or better.
      a. Supervisory Committee
         a. Unless otherwise approved by the Graduate Council, a supervisory committee consisting of three faculty members is to be appointed no later than the second semester of a student's graduate work. It is the student's responsibility to initiate a request for a committee in writing. The department chairperson nominates the committee members, one of whom is nominated as chairperson, and the dean of the Graduate School make the appointment.
         b. The committee consults with the student in planning his/her degree program, master's examinations, and thesis research.
c. If a supervisory committee finds a graduate student's preliminary work deficient, the student may be required to take supplementary undergraduate courses for which graduate credit will not be allowed.

b. Major Field

   a. A candidate must pursue a course of study consisting of not less than 12 semester hours of course work, excluding thesis, in the candidate's department. In addition, 8 to 12 hours of course work are elected. All course work planned must be approved by the student's supervisory committee.

c. Time Limits

   a. All work offered for the master's degree must be completed within four consecutive calendar years. The dean of the Graduate School can modify or waive this requirement in meritorious cases on recommendation from the student's supervisory committee.

d. Application for Candidacy

   a. During the second semester of graduate work, a student should file with the chairperson of his/her supervisory committee an Application for Admission to Candidacy for the master's degree. After completion of 75% of course work, the formal Application for Admission to Candidacy for the master's degree should be reviewed by the supervisory committee for approval and then forwarded to the Graduate School for approval by the dean. The application must reach the Graduate School office by the last day of the semester preceding the semester of graduation.

e. Transfer Credit

   a. A student who has done graduate work of high grade in another institution of recognized standing may transfer up to six semester hours' credit for such work if it is approved by the student's supervisory committee. However, when a graduate of the University of Utah duly registered for the master's degree is advised by the supervisory committee to pursue studies for a period of time at another institution because of special facilities available there, such period of study may be considered as residence work toward the degree, provided the arrangement is approved in advance by the dean of the Graduate School.

f. Examinations: Thesis Option
a. Final Thesis Defense: The required final examination for the M.S. or M.A. thesis option is an oral defense of the thesis. The defense date is set by the supervisory committee and is open to the public. At least three weeks before this final oral examination, the student should submit an acceptable thesis draft to the committee chair; committee members should receive copies at least two weeks before the examination date. After the oral presentation, a question and answer period must be allowed. At the conclusion of the public participation, the committee may excuse the public and conduct further questioning on the thesis and related topics. The outcome of the thesis defense is reported to the Report of the Final Oral Exam and Thesis for the Master's Degree form.

b. Comprehensive Examination: In addition to the required thesis defense, departments may or may not require a comprehensive examination of M.S. and M.A. candidates in the thesis option. Each department establishes its own policy on the structure of the examination (i.e., written, oral, both; conducted by supervisory committee or uniform departmental exam). The exam may be taken early in the program as a comprehensive qualifying exam, or late in the program as a final comprehensive exam separate from the thesis defense.

g. Examinations: Nonthesis Option

a. Alternatives to the thesis are permitted by some departments. These alternatives may consist of course work only or involve an independent project. In either case, a final exam that covers breadth and integration of material in the field is required. The examination may be written, oral, or both, and conducted by the supervisory committee or the department. For project-oriented master's degrees a public oral defense of the project serve as final examination. At its discretion, the supervisory committee may elect to excuse the public from the defense in order to pursue additional questions related to the student's project and field of study. The supervisory committee of the student completing a nonthesis master's degree must sign and submit the Report of the Final Examination for the Master's Degree form to the Graduate Records Office. This form is due by the last day of the semester in which the student expects to graduate. Students may elect to publish and archive their independent project in the University of Utah Digital Library.
a. Candidates for the Master of Arts degree must demonstrate language competence in at least one foreign language at the level of "standard proficiency." Each candidate's major department will determine the foreign language in which he/she is required to demonstrate competence. However, departments may establish additional language requirements for the Master of Arts degree. There is no university-wide language requirement for the Master of Science degree, but departments may establish a language requirement for the Master of Science degree.

i. Thesis Regulations

a. The thesis must represent from 6 to 10 credit hours of the work completed for the degree. The form and distribution for the thesis and abstract as well as the use of restricted data are determined by the Graduate School and published in A Handbook for Theses and Dissertations, available in the Thesis Office. The format of the thesis must be approved by the Graduate School thesis and dissertation editor, Room 208 Building 44.[KH1]

j. Exceptions

a. Individual student exceptions to the general requirements for the master's degree as stated herein must be approved by the dean of the Graduate School upon the recommendation of the student's supervisory committee and the respective director of graduate studies or department chair. The Graduate Council may approve departmental or programmatic exceptions to the minimum residency requirements and proposals for new programs or academic offerings using distance learning technologies and/or off-campus sites, as provided by Graduate School policy.

4. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources

a. Rules

b. Procedures

c. Guidelines

d. Forms

e. Other related resource materials

5. References:

a. (Reserved)
6. Contacts:

   a. Policy Owner:
      
         a. 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.

7. History: Approved:

   a. Academic Senate 11/4/02

   b. Approved: Board of Trustees 12/9/02
Proposal for revising Regulations on Faculty Review Standards and Procedures:  
Policy 6-303, Policy 6-310, and Rule 6-310 (IDTP)

Update for Senate meeting of May 5, 2104.

This proposal was presented to the Academic Senate April 8, 2014 as a Notice of Intent Calendar item. Senate members were invited to discuss with their constituents and submit any feedback by April 16 to allow discussion of the feedback at meetings of the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and the Senate Executive Committee, so that any resulting refinements of the proposal could be included for the Senate May 5th agenda, for Debate and voting on approval.

Three comments were received. None stated any concerns or made any suggestions about those parts of the three Regulations that are encompassed within the original proposal. Suggestions were made that certain other parts of the Regulations (not within the scope of this current proposal) should be reviewed by the Standards Committee next year for possible revision. Those included (i) possible revisions to the methods of conducting absentee voting in Retention, Promotion, and Tenure cases (Policy 6-303), (ii) possible revisions to the time frames for department chairs and deans to add their recommendations on formal Retention, Promotion, and Tenure reviews (also Policy 6-303), and (iii) possible revisions to focus attention more fully on how faculty in the Research category are to be evaluated during reviews (Policy 6-310). These ideas will be considered by the Standards Committee next year as part of the planned further work on those two Policies (plans alluded to in the “User Notes” which are to be embedded in each of the Policies as part of this current proposal).

Based on that feedback formally solicited and received, no significant concerns about any of the contents of the current proposal have been identified, and no suggestions of any amendments to the proposal have been brought to attention, and accordingly none were discussed with either the Standards Committee or the Executive Committee.

If there any such concerns or suggestions not previously communicated, Senators are asked to raise them prior to the May 5 meeting so that processing of this agenda item can proceed as quickly as possible (given the very lengthy agenda and multiple major items up for consideration in addition to this proposal). Comments or concerns may be given to:

Hank Liese (co-chair of the Faculty Review Standards Committee)  hank.liese@socwk.utah.edu  
5-6935
Bob Flores (proposal drafting person in chief) —  robert.flores@law.utah.edu  1-5881
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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].

(EndNote 1: Adaptation for variations in organizational structure.)

(EndNote 2: [NEW] Adaptation for The University of Utah Libraries.)

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 ranks, 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 awarded 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 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 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 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 regulartenure-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.]

[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 regulartenure-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 committee, 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 regulartenure-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.
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 person 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 (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 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-
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); and 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></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Triggered-b,c</td>
<td>End of Probation, or see U-Policy 6-311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Probationary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involved parties:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Include in File</th>
<th>Include in File</th>
<th>Include in File</th>
<th>Include in File</th>
<th>Include in File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External reviewers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As per departmental rule-a</td>
<td>As per departmental rule-a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program, if appropriate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department RPT</td>
<td>Representation-d</td>
<td>Yes</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>
<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>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Receives report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate includes in file: (minimum requirements)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Includes in File: (minimum requirements)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Include in File</th>
<th>Include in File</th>
<th>Include in File</th>
<th>Include in File</th>
<th>Include in File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAC report</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Letters (could</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As per</td>
<td>As per</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past Reviews and Recommendations-e</td>
<td>Academic program report</td>
<td>Comments from others</td>
<td>Student Course Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be internal to University but external to department)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>departmental rule-a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>departmental rule-a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></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 6-302-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 and 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 6-011-002-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 6-010-002-Section 10-III-F-1-a-ii.
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 outside 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.
I. 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-IIII-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 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 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 – (FootNote 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 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)

V. References:
   (Reserved)

VI. Contacts:
   The designated contact officials for this Policy are:
   A. Policy Owner (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 delegate, 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
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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 categories 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-appointing” 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 rules shall be established at the college level and be applicable college-wide 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 evaluation 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 when 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 submitted to the cognizant senior vice president for approval and Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee. In its role in approving such 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 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 delegee, with assistance of the Institutional Policy Committee, to have the following roles and authority, as provided in University Rule 1-001:

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

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

University Rule 1-001-III-B & E

VII. History:
   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 2.

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.
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Section I: Request

Since 1984, the University of Utah has offered five Middle East Studies (MES) degrees, MES, and MES / Arabic, MES / Hebrew, MES / Persian and MES / Turkish. Students complete the same area studies course requirements for all MES degrees in addition to language courses in one of the four ME languages. The College of Humanities, where MES is housed, requests the consolidation of the existing five degrees into a single MES degree with an emphasis in one of the four ME languages to be entered on students’ transcripts. This consolidated degree in Middle East area studies will align with the other interdisciplinary international degrees in Asian, International and Latin American Studies, and with similar degrees offered across the U.S. All current students will be moved to the new degree name: Middle East Studies.

The consolidation of the MES degrees was discussed with faculty affiliated with the MEC in a Spring 2013 meeting. In Fall 2013, the description of the consolidation was sent to faculty with the request to inform the Acting Director of the MEC of any objections to the change. Of the 10 affiliated and currently active faculty, eight responded expressing full support; no faculty member expressed any objections.

Section II: Need

Two considerations motivate the request to eliminate the four MES language degrees. First, although the University currently lists four separate degrees, MES / Arabic, MES / Hebrew, MES / Persian and MES / Turkish, they are in fact been area studies degrees with a language emphasis that includes two 3000-level language courses. In other words, the consolidated degree more appropriately reflects the nature and current practices of the MES program. In addition, the request accounts for limited student demand and number of degrees awarded for certain languages over the past five years. Between 2008 and 2013, 10-14 ME degrees were awarded annually with about 8 degrees each year in Arabic and 3-4 in Persian, and only 4 each in Hebrew and Turkish over this entire time period. It is not feasible to maintain five different degrees for such a small number of graduates; moreover, limited resources may not actually permit us to offer all four languages in the future. Students will select a language for their MES degree according to availability, and in consultation with the advisor.

We intend to continue the MES degree with different language options and plan to promote the degree with a more accessible and simplified DARS that is in line with the other interdisciplinary and international majors at the University of Utah.

Section III: Institutional Impact

There is not institutional impact from associated with this change.

Section IV: Finances

No costs or savings are associated with the proposed change.
Middle East Studies Major With Arabic, Hebrew, Persian or Turkish Emphasis
Worksheet

Name: ___________________________________  Student ID: ________________________

Email: ________________________________  Minor(s): ______________________________

### Language Coursework (14-15 credits)
Arabic, Hebrew, Persian or Turkish Emphasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 2010</td>
<td>Intermediate I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2020</td>
<td>Intermediate II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 3600/3610</td>
<td>Intermediate Conversation I or II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 30xx</td>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 30xx</td>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area Studies Coursework (7 courses)
Up to 2 foundational courses (usually 1000 or 2000 level) and
At least 2 courses at 4000 or 5000 level
*Chosen in consultation with MES Advisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. 1/2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 4/5000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 4/5000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Credits for MES Major**  37

All courses must be completed with a C or better.

Major Approved: ______________________________________
                                            Signature of Advisor  Date
January 17, 2014

To: The University of Utah Undergraduate Council

From: Mark Bergstrom, Acting Dean

Re: Support for Consolidation of Middle East Studies Degrees

I write in support of the Middle East Studies (MES) program’s request to consolidate its existing five degrees into a single degree. This change will bring the MES degree into curricular alignment with similar interdisciplinary or international degrees offered across campus.

As Professor Watzinger-Tharp, MES Program Director, points out in the request, four of the five degrees currently offered are language specific. The existence of language specific degrees compels the MES program to the four degree-specific languages (Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, Turkish) from 1000 to 3000 levels even if student interest does not justify it, or when resources are limited.

Students graduating with a MES degree will be able to maintain their language emphasis, which will be reflected on their transcript. I am confident this change will not have a negative impact upon current students. Establishing the single MES degree and allowing student interest and demand to establish specialized emphases follows the same curricular basis of degrees in International Studies, Asian Studies, Latin American Studies, and Peace and Conflict Studies.

Streamlining the MES program degrees is administratively and economically justified and has no impact upon educational opportunities currently available to students. I strongly encourage your support.

Thank you for your attention.

[Signature]

MB/ jd
Council Approval

Note: This form is intended to track the progress of a proposal (whether from Academic Affairs or Health Sciences) through the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils.
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Cover/Signature Page - Abbreviated Template/Abbreviated Template with Curriculum

Institution Submitting Request: University of Utah
Proposed Title: Second Language Teaching and Research Center (L2TReC)
Currently Approved Title: Second Language Teaching and Research Center
School or Division or Location: College of Humanities
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: N/A
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code¹ (for new programs): 16.0199
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for existing programs):
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regents' General Consent Calendar Items</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>R401-5 OCHE Review and Recommendation; Approval on General Consent Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1 (CER P) Certificate of Proficiency*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3 (GCR) Graduate Certificate*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1 Out-of-Service Area Delivery of Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Requires "Section V: Program Curriculum" of Abbreviated Template

Chief Academic Officer (or Designee) Signature:
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[Signature]
Date: 02/12/14

Printed Name: Name of CAO or Designee

[Signature]

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

The University of Utah requests final approval for the Second Language (L2) Teaching and Research Center (L2TReC), for which three-year provisional approval was granted by the State Commissioner for Education effective March 1, 2012. L2TReC provides a focal point for L2 research initiatives, profiles the university’s unique strengths in foreign language education, aligns the institution explicitly with state foreign language initiatives1, and positions the institution for greater external funding opportunities. L2TReC’s primary activities are in three areas: research, pedagogy, and outreach.

Feedback on the Center’s mission and activities was gathered throughout the Center’s first year of operation and informed revisions to the proposal. This revised proposal was circulated to the faculty in the Department of Languages and Literature on October 10th with an invitation from AVP Amy Wildermuth for faculty to submit feedback and comments to her by October 18th. She reports that she received no responses.

Section II: Need

Language centers that enhance and support L2 research, teaching and learning are the hallmark of institutions known for their excellence in these areas: the Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) at the University of Minnesota; the Texas Language Center at the University of Texas at Austin; the Language Center at Stanford; the Center for Applied Language Studies at the University of Oregon; and the Center for Language Studies at Brigham Young University, to name just a few. In establishing L2TReC, housed in the College of Humanities, the University of Utah joined the ranks of top institutions of higher education, which provide infrastructure dedicated to the support of L2 research and teaching. Since receiving provisional approval status, L2TReC has established itself as a cutting edge hub for research into second language acquisition and L2 pedagogy, a provider of quality language instruction for the larger community, and a dedicated partner to the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) immersion education and teacher training endeavors.

L2TReC is committed to initiating, supporting and seeking funding for a broad range of research on Second Language Acquisition and L2 Pedagogy. This mission is unique on the University’s campus. L2TReC supports basic science research, applied research, and projects that address the interface between the two. It is committed to facilitating research by undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty of all ranks and appointment types. It actively seeks and values research collaborations both within and beyond the University.

Sharing our expertise in L2 pedagogy and supporting L2 initiatives that further the University’s globalization

1 Utah Senate Bill 41, International Education Initiative, addresses the importance of dual immersion programs and critical languages.
Section III: Institutional Impact

Research

L2TReC provides a unique focal point on campus for faculty, students, and community members who share an interest in Second Language Acquisition research (SLA). Faculty and students with similar research interests currently work in units across campus but lack a shared intellectual (and physical) space to exchange ideas. Similarly, there has been no established mechanism for supporting the expansion of such research into the larger community. Through a variety of programming, L2TReC promotes SLA research and encourages intellectual exchange and cross-fertilization of ideas. We host a brown bag series, help sponsor research laboratory exchanges for students (Spring 2013 with the University of Alberta and Indiana University; Fall 2013 with Concordia University), run a research working group open to all language instructors, fund student research mini-grants, and support conference attendance that facilitates research dissemination.

L2TReC is initiating a large-scale project to develop the first tagged, searchable, digital corpus of L2 speech and writing with coverage of multiple languages other than learner English. This project capitalizes on Utah’s unique foreign language profile. In addition to regular classroom learners, its demographics and educational initiatives provide study populations for two additional L2 learning contexts: adults who have acquired a second language through immersion as a result of missionary service abroad and K-12 school-based immersion learners (in Chinese, Spanish, French, Portuguese, and soon German programs). L2TReC has dedicated a half time research position to this project and is seeking seed grant funding from the VP for Research to construct a sample of the corpus structure. This sample will be used to clarify and justify support requests in subsequent funding proposals to NSF (Linguistics Division), USOE and others. The resulting corpus will be unique in scope and will constitute an invaluable research tool for the SLA community. Its being housed at the University of Utah will result in heightened visibility for the University and its L2 initiatives.

Finally, L2TReC provides grant management support for faculty or students who obtain funding for research consistent with its mission.

Pedagogy

All regular University language instruction is housed in the Department of Languages and Literature. L2TReC administers courses for non-matriculated students (e.g., intensive courses for military linguists)
and courses for professional programs at a program’s request (e.g., Spanish for Medical Professions taught
in the School of Nursing). L2TReC has the ability to provide training and professional development
opportunities for L2 instructors, and to promote related curriculum development and assessment. As noted
above, in its first year, L2TReC ran an ACTFL OPI Familiarization workshop; summer teacher workshops
for Spanish and French teachers, and dual immersion teacher training. L2TReC is also a recognized leader
in technology-enhanced teaching. We have the capacity to support (and have done so) fully online
language courses, blended courses, and courses in some of the less commonly taught languages offered
in conjunction with other institutions both abroad (Nahuatl with Instituto Zacatecas, México) and nationally
(Quechua with Arizona State University).

L2TReC’s co-directors have leading roles in the organizations that drive pedagogical change in our field:
the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL), the Modern Language Association (MLA),
the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the College Board’s Advanced
Placement (AP) program. Their combined expertise ensures L2TReC’s activities and programming are
informed by the latest developments in the field.

Outreach

L2TReC’s outreach goals are a function of its research and pedagogy missions. It serves as a source of
information on the latest developments in SLA research and on innovations in L2 pedagogy and curriculum
development. Sponsored research projects are featured on our website and affiliated researchers present
regularly both locally, nationally and internationally (Utah Foreign Language Association Conference, South
West Conference on Language Teaching (SWCOLT), Modern Language Association, Second Language
Research Forum, New Sounds, ACTFL, and EuroSLA). Through L2TReC’s collaborations with USOE, the
University has assumed a more significant position in state foreign language initiatives (e.g., teacher
workshops). L2TReC has also established relationships with other important stakeholders such as the Utah
Cryptologic Team (with whom L2TReC successfully competed for a Language Training Center Grant
administered by the Institute for International Education ($250,000)), and the Utah Governor’s Office for
Economic Development.

Administrative Structure

L2TReC has an administrative structure modeled on Title VI National Language Research Centers across
the country. Co-Directors Drs. Hacking and Rubio (Department of Languages and Literature) are
responsible for providing leadership, conceptualizing the overall mission, and ensuring the integrity of
L2TReC activities. They each receive one course release and an administrative salary supplement for this
commitment. Dr. Hayes-Harb (Department of Linguistics) serves as Associate Director for Research. In this

---

2 National Capitol Language Resource Center, Georgetown University, George Washington
University & Center for Applied Linguistics; The Center for Advanced Language Proficiency
Education and Research, Pennsylvania State University; The Center for Advanced Research
on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota; Language Acquisition Resource Center, San
Diego State University; Center for Language and Education Research, Michigan State
University; Center for Educational Resources in Culture, Language, and Literacy, University of
Arizona
role she ensures the development and viability of L2TReC research in SLA. Dr. Watzinger-Tharp (Department of Languages and Literature/Department of Linguistics) serves as Dual Immersion Liaison. She guides L2TReC in activities connected to the State Office of Education’s Dual Immersion Program in Utah schools. She chairs the Dual Language Immersion Research Group, with representation from all institutions of higher education in the state and the USOE. Neither of these positions is compensated. L2TReC has an Advisory Board with representation from the Department of Languages and Literature, other units at the University of Utah, the Utah State Office of Education, the Utah Governor’s Office for Economic Development, the Salt Lake School District, and the National Security Agency (see Appendix A for complete list). The Advisory Board meets twice yearly at the end of the fall and spring semesters. Its role is to provide strategic direction, evaluate program effectiveness and to provide input on language needs related to their constituencies. In addition to the biannual meetings, Board members are invited to provide input throughout the year. Board members have directly facilitated key L2TReC activities to date (e.g., ensuring active cooperation from Utah Cryptologic Team in securing the LTC grant and in shaping pedagogy education workshops to fit teacher needs).

L2TReC has support from 1) one full time Administrative Officer (responsible for managing the center’s budget; coordinating funding commitments with other programs (e.g., Asia Center and Latin American Studies); assisting co-directors with grant applications and grant management); and managing the daily operations of the Center; 2) a .5 FTE Research Analyst to support L2TReC’s development of a large-scale tagged, searchable, digital corpus of L2 speech and writing with coverage of multiple languages other than learner English. In addition, L2TReC has a number of work-study hourlies who handle basic reception duties (phones, copies, errands, etc.).

L2TReC shares two further staff positions with other international programs in the CoH. 1) An Educational Technologist who is responsible for facilitating the design and implementation of technology-enhanced courses, and who maintains the website for L2TReC. 2) A K-16 coordinator who serves as the main liaison between the College’s international programs and the state’s public schools including the Dual Language Immersion programs.

L2TReC received a CF&R grant to remodel space on the first floor of LNCO. The suite (1930 LNCO) consists of a reception area, four offices, and an AV equipped meeting room. No other facilities or equipment are needed at this time.

Section IV: Finances

Final approval of L2TReC will not impact its current funding model. L2TReC has a hard budget which covers 1 staff position (AO as outlined in the prior section). L2TReC has the necessary soft funding commitments and/or grant funding to support the remaining staff positions. Final approval of L2TReC will not have a negative budgetary impact on other programs or units within the institution.

Competing for external grants is a top priority for L2TReC. We have just been awarded a $250,000 grant from the Institute of International Education (IIE) to create a Language Training Center that will provide training in eight languages to the Utah Cryptologic Team. This team is comprised of close to 1,400 government employees from various branches who require annual language training including members of the 300th Military Intelligence Brigade (Linguist); 19th Special Forces Group; Utah National Guard Counter Drug Task Force; 169th Intelligence Squadron; Reach Language Support Program; and Utah Regional
Operations Center. This grant has the possibility of renewal for two further years. Working in partnership with USOE we have submitted an application to the US Department of Education for a $2.5 million grant in the Continuous Improvement in Education Research (NCER-CIRE) competition. If awarded, the grant will be used to study the effects of language proficiency on academic achievement of Dual Language Immersion students for a period of four years. We have also submitted a grant application in response to the Flagship Proficiency Assessment Initiative (PI: L2TReC Co-Director, Fernando Rubio; Co-PI Department of Languages and Literature, Chair, Katharina Gerstenberger). The grant proposes a partnership between the University of Utah and Salt Lake Community College to normalize and institutionalize sustainable language proficiency assessment practices within and across our institutions, to align and articulate transfer and placement policies for language courses, to use assessment data to inform language program curricula, and to disseminate findings for the benefit of the wider teaching and research communities. Funding requested is $512,000 over two years.

Future grant seeking plans include applications to support the digital L2 corpus project (described in research section above). We have applied for an internal seed grant to support a pilot study that will provide the necessary preliminary data to support grant applications for the corpus project.

Section V: Program Curriculum

All regular language courses (to meet the university’s BA language requirement and/or to meet L&L degree requirements) are taught in the Department of Languages and Literature. L2TReC may administer language courses outside these areas in consultation with the Advisory Board which includes two members of the Department of Languages and Literature. As noted above, L2TReC is currently responsible for staffing and supervising two Spanish for Medical Professions courses offered by the School of Nursing. L2TReC has teamed up with Academic Outreach and Continuing Education (AOCE) to offer online beginning Spanish courses through AOCE’s Lifelong Learning program (the Department exercised its right of first refusal, choosing not to offer these courses). In spring 2013 L2TReC offered the first Massive Online Open Course (MOOC) offered by the University of Utah with a second MOOC scheduled for release in Spring 2014.

Under the auspices of the recently awarded Language Training Center Grant, L2TReC will design and deliver 160-hour courses (a mixture of face-to-face and online) for military linguists in Arabic, Chinese, Farsi, French, Korean, Pashto, Russian, and Spanish between November 1, 2013 and September 30, 2014. L2TReC consults with faculty in the Department of Languages and Literature regarding these courses; A subset of the military linguists request course credit and in agreement with tenure line faculty in the relevant language three credits are granted upon successful completion of the 150-hour course. Each language section determines the appropriate course number for this purpose (e.g., SPAN 3580 – Contemporary Issues; FRNCH 3910 – Special Topics).
Second Language Teaching Research Center  
FY15 Budget Details

### Soft Funding

**Soft Funding/COH**
- Research Analyst Support-DO (2:3) 5,000
- Research Analyst Support-Linguistics (2:3) 15,000

**Soft Funding/Non-COH**
- VP Pershing (NPS funds) 11,564
- Rubio & Hacking 10th Month Support (LTC Grant Offset) 10,925
- F&A from LTC Grant 4,928
- Admin Manager Salary Offset (LTC Grant) 5,765
- Instructional Technologist Salary Support (LTC Grant) 16,000
- USOE Teacher Workshop Support 20,000

---

**Total Soft Funding**: 89,182

### Soft Expenditures

**I. Personnel Expenditures**
- Research Analyst 20,000
- Rubio & Hacking half 10th Month (50% each) 10,925
- Instructional Tech (Shared w/ AC & LAS; plus 10% hard) 16,000
- Work-Study Assistants 3,000

---

**II. Non-Personnel Expenditures**
- Teacher Workshops 20,000
- Travel 4,000
- Operational 10,000
- Center-Sponsored Guest Lectures 3,750

---

**TOTAL SOFT EXPENDITURE**: 87,675

### Carry Forward, June 30, 2015

---

**1,507**

---

### Additional Budget Notes
1. One (1) full-time Administrative Manager is 100% hard-funded
2. One (1) full-time Instructional Technologist is 10% hard-funded (+ 40% LTC grant and 50% Asia Center and Latin American Studies)
3. Hacking and Rubio are both hard-funded
### UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
**IIE FUNDING - DETAILED BUDGET**  
**10/1/2013 - 9/30/2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Role on Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Instructors @ $5,500</td>
<td>Language Teachers (160 hr sequence)</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubio, Fernando</td>
<td>Co-PI and Assessment Leader</td>
<td>$12,375</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacking, Jane</td>
<td>PI and Pedagogy Expert</td>
<td>$10,556</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Catherine</td>
<td>Program &amp; Budget Manager</td>
<td>$5,765</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garn, Rimma</td>
<td>Instructional Trainer</td>
<td>$2,024</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Technologist</td>
<td>Online instructional support</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$129,220</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRINGE BENEFITS</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>$11,550</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garn, Hacking, Rubio, Scott</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>$11,366</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologist</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>$5,920</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$28,836</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAVEL</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Washington DC Meeting</td>
<td>LTC Annual Meeting (2 individuals)</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,800</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks/supplemental material</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full OPIc Assessment Tests</td>
<td>75 pre and 75 post-course tests</td>
<td>$9,300</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPIc to Advanced Assessment Tests</td>
<td>95 pre and 95 post-course tests</td>
<td>$9,120</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$23,220</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SUBTOTAL DIRECT COSTS | | **$184,076** | |
| MODIFIED TOTAL DIRECT COSTS | | **$184,076** | |
| TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS | 35.70% | $65,715 | |

**TOTAL AWARD AMOUNT:**  
$249,791

---

**BUDGET NOTES**

1. Instructional cost for 3 Arabic courses, 1 Chinese course, 2 Farsi courses, 2 French courses, 1 Korean course, 3 Pashto courses, and 3 Spanish courses. Total projected number of DoD students is 240. Each course consists of two sequences; the first 90 hours are intensive classroom instruction followed by 70 hours of additional online work guided and monitored by the same instructor(s). The instructors used are experienced part-time salaried, non-benefitted employees (the fringe listed represents mandatory payroll taxes and deductions) and are paid on a per course basis. Two instructors may be assigned to team teach a course but total instructional cost per course would remain as budgeted. Course rate includes prep and student feedback.

2. Co-PI Fernando Rubio will be responsible for the pre and post-class language assessment process and the instructional technologist. Dr. Rubio's institutional salary is based on his current 2012-13 salary. Dr. Rubio's work on the grant will be covered by a course release.

3. PI Jane Hacking will be responsible for coordinating the instructors and the overall management and performance of the grant project. Dr. Hacking's salary is based on her current 2012-13 salary. Dr. Hacking's work on the grant will be covered through a course release.

4. Program and Budget Manager Catherine Scott will be responsible for all budgetary matters including project management, payroll, expenditures, and providing data for quarterly reports.

5. Rimma Garn will provide group training to the instructors on how to teach to a military constituency as well as one-on-one support as needed.

6. The instructional technologist will work with language faculty to facilitate the integration of technology in their teaching by creating online modules to complement and supplement regular face-to-face instruction. The technologist will work intensively with the instructors on the 70-hour online component.
7. The University of Utah uses rates of 37% for full-time faculty and staff and 14% for part-time employees for estimating direct fringe benefit costs on grant applications. The university's memo on the treatment of fringe benefits can be accessed at http://fbs.admin.utah.edu/download/guidelines/FringeBenefitRate.pdf

8. Travel cost (for 2 individuals) is based on airfare @ $772.70/flight (with travel dates of Feb 9/Feb 11, 2014), 2 nts. hotel at GSA rate of $184/night, GSA per diem rate of $71/day, plus allowance for ground transportation costs. All costs follow University of Utah travel policy (which uses GSA per diem rates) for Washington, DC in February.

9. Funding for textbooks and teaching materials to supplement the available textbooks and materials provided by our DoD partners. Textbooks will be returned at the end of a course for use by additional students.

10. Pre and post-language assessment is an essential component of the grant. All DoD participants will take pre and post-DLPT tests at no cost to the grant. Pre and post-OPIcs are budgeted into the grant for DoD participants who provide linguist support to in-country missions. Per our partner units these languages are Arabic, French, Korean and Spanish. DoD students will be assigned to either the full OPIc or the OPIc to Advanced test based on their ILR score.

The University of Utah's NICRA agreement is available at http://fbs.admin.utah.edu/download/mgt/2009_04_Negotiation_Agreement.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>ILR Level</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Date Begin</th>
<th>Date End</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>UU Course Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td>2/2+</td>
<td>Mullahkhel</td>
<td>11/4/2013</td>
<td>11/22/2013</td>
<td>LNCO 1930</td>
<td>LANG 4900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2/2+</td>
<td>Claros</td>
<td>11/4/2013</td>
<td>11/22/2013</td>
<td>OSH 112/LNCO 1930</td>
<td>SPAN 3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>2/2+</td>
<td>Abdel Baki</td>
<td>1/13/2014</td>
<td>1/31/2014</td>
<td>LNCO 1930</td>
<td>ARAB 3020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>2/2+</td>
<td>Eldredge</td>
<td>1/27/2014</td>
<td>1/14/2014</td>
<td>OSH 112/LNCO 1930</td>
<td>KOREA 4900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2+/3</td>
<td>Orcutt</td>
<td>2/18/2014</td>
<td>3/7/2014</td>
<td>LNCO 1930</td>
<td>SPAN 3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>Orcutt</td>
<td>4/7/2014</td>
<td>4/25/2014</td>
<td>LNCO 1930</td>
<td>SPAN 3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>2+/3</td>
<td>Alzoubi</td>
<td>4/28/2014</td>
<td>5/16/2014</td>
<td>LNCO 1930</td>
<td>ARAB 3020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2/2+</td>
<td>Safargalina</td>
<td>5/12/2014</td>
<td>5/30/2014</td>
<td>OSH 112/LNCO 1930</td>
<td>RUSS 4580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>Alzoubi</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
<td>7/18/2014</td>
<td>LNCO 1945</td>
<td>ARAB 3020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2+/3</td>
<td>Kerr</td>
<td>7/7/2014</td>
<td>7/25/2014</td>
<td>LNCO 1930</td>
<td>CHIN 4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>Lair</td>
<td>7/7/2014</td>
<td>7/25/2014</td>
<td>OSH 112/LNCO 1945</td>
<td>FRNC 3910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>Alavi</td>
<td>7/28/2014</td>
<td>8/15/2014</td>
<td>OSH 1945/LNCO 1930</td>
<td>PERS 3020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Current L2TReC Advisory Board

Mary Burbank  
Urban Institute for Teacher Education  
College of Education University of Utah  
Mary.burban@utah.edu

Richard Chi  
Department of Language & Literature  
University of Utah  
r.chi@utah.edu

Sophia DiCaro  
Deputy Director, Utah Governor’s Office of Economic Development  
801-538-8823  
sdicaro@utah.gov

Isaebl Dulfano  
Department of Languages & Literature  
University of Utah  
801-581-7561  
isabel.dulfano@utah.edu

Rebecca Horn  
Director, Latin American Studies Program  
801-581-5294  
rebecca.horn@history.utah.edu

Howard Lehman  
Director of the International Leadership Academy  
Department of Political Science  
University of Utah  
801-581-6246  
lehman@poli-sci.utah.edu

Dessie Olson  
World Language Specialist, Salt Lake School District  
dessieolson@slcschools.org

Gregg Roberts  
World Languages Specialist  
Utah State Office of Education  
801-538-7743  
gregg.roberts@schools.utah.gov

Janet Theiss  
Director, Asia Center  
University of Utah  
801-585-6477  
janet.theiss@utah.edu

David Winberg  
Director, National Security Agency, Utah  
(801) 432-4820  
david.winberg@us.army.mil

Ex-officio Members

Jane Hacking  
L2TReC Co-Director  
801-581-6688  
j.hacking@utah.edu

Fernando Rubio  
L2TReC Co-Director  
801-581-4610  
fernando.rubio@utah.edu

Rachel Hayes-Harb  
Associate Director for Research, L2TReC  
Department of Linguistics  
hayes-harb@linguistics.utah.edu

Johanna Watzinger-Tharp  
Dual Immersion Program Liaison  
801-581-6214  
j.tharp@utah.edu
In response to the request from Senate President, Allyson Mower, to provide more details on current L2TReC activities, we submit the following addendum for consideration.

- **Grant Activity**
  
  **Awarded**
  
  **Language Training Center (LTC) $249,791.00**
  
  L2TReC received one of nine LTCs funded under a Department of Defense initiative with accredited U.S. colleges and universities established in 2011. The grant funds intensive language courses (150 hours) for military linguists who already have high levels of language proficiency. In this first year of the grant we are offering 15 courses in the following languages: Arabic, Chinese, French, Korean, Pashto, Persian, Russian, and Spanish. A subset of the military linguists request course credit and with agreement from Department of Languages & Literature tenure line faculty in the relevant languages, 3 credits are granted upon successful completion of the 150 hours.

  **Great Ideas in the Humanities, College of Humanities $10,049.00**
  
  **Language Learner Corpora – A Workshop for Researchers and Practitioners**
  
  Funding awarded to run a two-day workshop (April 11-12, 2014) to introduce researchers and language teachers to the discipline of corpus linguistics specifically as it pertains to learner corpora—collections of oral and/or written productions by learners of a second language. Workshop presenters: Dr. Mark Davies (BYU); Dr. Tony McEnery (Lancaster University, UK); Dr. Fanny Meunier (Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium).

  **VP for Research Funding Incentive Seed Grant Program $10,465.00**
  
  Funding awarded to compile a pilot version of a multilingual, error and linguistically annotated learner corpus as a base for second language acquisition research. This pilot version will be used at the Learner Corpus Workshop in April and will inform our application, detailed below, to the NSF, Linguistics Division (July 2014).

- **Under Review**
  
  **Department of Education: Institute of Education Sciences $2,498,743.00**
  
  L2TReC in collaboration with the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) has requested funding for a project to study the effects of language proficiency on academic achievement of Dual Language Immersion (DLI) students. This 4-year grant would provide funding to 1) conduct a fidelity implementation study to measure the reliability of the DLI model across sites; 2) develop and implement a model to accurately and reliably measure the growth in student proficiency in the second language of instruction; 3) measure the potential correlation between changes in L2 proficiency levels and achievement in core content areas; and 4) determine and develop curricular and pedagogical shifts that respond to local conditions and data while improving fidelity to the DLI model alongside student language proficiency and content area achievement.
In Preparation
National Science Foundation, Linguistics Division (July 15, 2014 deadline)
Multilingual Corpus of Second Language (L2) Speech and Writing
Utah is at the forefront of a national effort to increase the number of proficient speakers of second languages. Meeting this demand requires research into how this proficiency develops. We are requesting funding for two related projects: a) to create a large-scale, tagged, and searchable digital corpus of L2 spoken and written language, and b) to conduct an accompanying research project to demonstrate how the corpus will facilitate and advance Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research.

- Outreach & Support Activity

February 2013. 2-day Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) familiarization workshop with close to 40 participants from K-20 institutions across the state.

July 2014. In collaboration with the Department of Languages and Literature, coordinated Summer Language Teacher Immersion Workshops for French and Spanish high school teachers.


January 2014. 2-day Oral Proficiency Interview workshop for Portuguese instructors that was attended by faculty from the U of Utah, BYU, USU, UVU and the USOE.

March 2014. Presentations at the 25th Annual Language Conference hosted by the 300th Military Intelligence Brigade

April 2014. 2-day workshop for teachers and researchers on the use of learner corpora.

April 2014. Lecture by Professor Tony McEnery (Lancaster University, UK), Talking about Islam: 16 years of press and public reaction to Muslims in Britain, a corpus based approach.

October 2014. L2TReC and the Utah State Office of Education will host the Fifth International Conference on Language Immersion Education. The conference will bring together researchers, practitioners, administrators and policy makers interested in immersion education. In addition to plenaries, symposia and presentations, attendees will be able to visit Utah dual language immersion schools and participate in professional workshops. (http://l2trec.utah.edu/conference/index.php)

Ongoing. As a collaborative effort among L2TReC, the Asia Center, the Latin American Studies Program and the Department of Languages and Literature, L2TReC coordinates the administration of oral proficiency tests at the end of the BA language requirement (2020) and at the end of the language major for the following languages: Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish.
To: Undergraduate Council
   Graduate Council

From: Amy Wildermuth, Associate Vice President for Faculty

Date: September 26, 2013

Re: Materials Collected for the L2TReC Proposal

Last spring, I was asked to collect materials from the Department of Languages and Literature about the L2TReC proposal. I have provided those in this file. I want to emphasize that the materials were collected before the revised proposal for the center was completed. It is my understanding that the comments you find in this file were considered and they informed the revisions to the version of the proposal that you are reviewing.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.
October 8, 2013

Dear Members of the Faculty Senate:

I am writing in support of Dr. Jane Hacking’s and Dr. Fernando Rubio’s proposal to create a Second Language Teaching and Research Center (L2TReC). As you are aware from the supporting documentation, L2TReC received provisional approval in March 2012 and is now applying for permanent approval in a format different from the original one that takes into consideration the input received from faculty in the Department of Languages and Literature. The main change is that all language instruction and coordination formerly housed in Languages and Literature will return to the Department together with the budget lines attached to these activities.

L2TReC will serve three important purposes:

First, its members will engage in grant writing in the field of Second Language Acquisition and L2-Methodology; they will also seek funding toward the delivery of language instruction to populations that are not served by the Department’s teaching mission. L2TReC’s recent success in winning an IIE-grant to teach military linguists is a case in point. Writing and obtaining grants is central to the University’s mission and I very much applaud and support L2TReC’s efforts to that purpose.

Second, L2TReC will facilitate and strengthen research collaborations within and beyond the University of Utah in Second Language Acquisition and L2-Methodology for faculty as well as students. L2TReC is well positioned to offer workshops and seminars to interested instructors and researchers, serving the community of those dedicated to language teaching and research. I am also very pleased to support L2TReC’s proposed goal of organizing and hosting national and international conferences on topics related to L2. Planning for an important conference in 2014 is already well under way, destined to enhance our University’s visibility and prestige.

Third, L2TReC will provide and coordinate outreach within the State of Utah, in particular in the area of dual immersion. This is an increasingly important focus in K-12 education in Utah and L2TReC will serve the mission of the College of Humanities and the University by strengthening and coordinating collaborations across different types of institutions. The Department of Languages and Literature stands to benefit from L2TReC’s proven expertise and its deep connections to the K-12 community as well as USOE.

As Chair of the Department of Languages and Literature I look forward to cooperating with L2TReC, working together to advance our shared mission of offering high quality language instruction here at the University of Utah and to pursue the research that guides these efforts. Drs. Rubio and Hacking, as well as the additional faculty mentioned in the proposal, enjoy national and international visibility and recognition in Second Language Acquisition and I have every reason to believe that they will lead L2TReC to success.

The proposal has my full support and I look forward to a collaborative and productive relationship with my colleagues in L2TReC.

Sincerely,

Katharina Gerstenberger
Chair, Languages and Literature
October 24, 2013

Jane Hacking  
Fernando Rubio  
Co-Directors  
Second Language Teaching and Research Center  
1930 LNCO  
CAMPUS

Dear Directors Hacking and Rubio,

I am writing to express enthusiastic support for the proposal to establish permanent center status for the Second Language Teaching and Research Center (L2TReC). As Director of the Latin American Studies Program, I have collaborated with L2TReC on various initiatives and consider it central to efforts to internationalize campus and to support statewide efforts related to international education, in particular, second language acquisition.

L2TReC supports second language acquisition programs on campus and beyond in several critical ways. First, it received a highly competitive grant ($250,000) from the Institute for International Education to create a language-training center for US government employees who require annual language training (the Utah Cryptologic Team). This project fits a core element of L2TReC’s mission: to provide language instruction outside the University of Utah campus. Also, with the creation of L2TReC, the Utah State Office of Education at long last has a partner at the flagship public institution of higher education in the state to support its initiatives in second language acquisition, including dual immersion, currently offered in Utah schools in Chinese, Spanish, Portuguese, and French.

On campus, L2TReC can coordinate proficiency assessment for students in language programs, an increasingly critical component of international education nationwide. L2TReC also facilitates the use of technology in language instruction, an approach absolutely critical for Less Commonly Taught Languages, which typically enroll few students and lack a large pool of well-trained instructors. In the last two years, L2TReC piloted courses in Nahuatl and Quechua, two of the most important indigenous languages of Latin America, through distance-learning platforms. This new curriculum offered University of Utah students instruction in indigenous languages of Latin America for the first time, enhancing the Latin American Studies Program and the undergraduate curriculum and student experience.
In view of these critical roles, I strongly support the proposal to establish permanent status for L2ReC. It is ideally situated to support teaching and research related to second language acquisition on campus and across the state.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rebecca Horn
Director
October 23, 2013

To University of Utah Committee,

I would like to express my strong support as the World Language & Dual Language Immersion Specialist at the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) for the Second Language Teaching and Research Center (L2TReC) at the University of Utah.

The Utah Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program is funded through a Utah Legislative Initiative and is currently being offered in 92 elementary schools and 6 secondary schools statewide. The program has been tremendously successful! The USOE is grateful for the collaborative efforts of the L2TReC in the development of a second language assessment model based on language proficiency. Also, the USOE and L2TRec are currently working on a program fidelity plan. Simply speaking, without the L2TReC the future growth and quality of Utah Dual Language Immersion program would be in jeopardy. The USOE is committed to expansion of DLI and World Language education in the State of Utah K-16 system. The USOE pledges continued institutional support for future collaborations with the L2TReC through ongoing funding granted in Utah Senate Bill 41 (2008), International Education Initiative – sponsored by Senator Howard A. Stephenson.

In addition, the USOE is proud to collaborate with the L2TReC in hosting the 5th International Immersion Conference, October 16-18, 2014 in Salt Lake City, Utah. Furthermore, even with state funding it is imperative that additional funding be secured at the national level for the development of DLI curriculum, assessment, program evaluation, and DLI teacher preparation. This goal of additional national resources will only be obtained if the USOE has a partner the quality of the L2TReC at the University of Utah.

Finally, the USOE is confident that the important enhanced models of second language instruction, curriculum, assessment and research developed as a result of the partnership with the L2TReC will have a significant impact not only in Utah but also throughout the entire nation.

Sincerely,

Gregg Roberts

World Language & Dual Language Immersion Specialist
Utah State Office of Education
October 22, 2013

To: The University of Utah Undergraduate Council

From: Robert Newman, College of Humanities

Re: Support for Final Approval of the Second Language Teaching and Research Center (L2TReC)

As Dean of the College of Humanities, I write in support of the Second Language Teaching and Research Center's (L2TReC) application for final approval. Provisional approval was granted in March 2012. The Center is, and will continue to be, housed in the College of Humanities. During its temporary approval status, L2TReC, with the support of the College of Humanities, has vigorously pursued its research and outreach missions. Its success to date suggests a continued strong presence and contribution to the University and to the broader community.

A key component of L2TReC's mission is to provide a hub for cutting edge research into Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and second language teaching. Through its network of affiliated faculty and its support of a variety of events and programming, L2TReC supports and informs constituencies interested in all aspects of SLA. L2TReC also serves language-learning needs for other units on campus, including teaching Spanish courses in the School of Nursing, providing language assessment for the Asia Center and for Latin America Studies, and teaching online courses for Continuing Education.

A further crucial contribution is the role LTRc plays in aligning the University with the international goals and initiatives of the State of Utah in such areas as Dual Language Immersion, community based second-language instruction, and teaching critical languages to military units in Utah. For example, L2TReC will host the International Bilingual Education Conference, in conjunction with the Utah State Office of Education, in October 2014. This conference will bring approximately 1000 educators from around the world to Salt Lake City. In support of its teaching of non-matriculated students, L2TReC was recently awarded a $250,000 three-year renewable grant from the Institute of International Education to teach eight critical languages to the 300th Military Intelligence Brigade. Such activities both serve the State of Utah and profile our strengths to a larger audience.

The existing administrative staff and space are sufficient to support the operations of L2TReC, which will require no new funding from the university.

In short, there is ample need for LTRc and the award of formal center status will contribute to the University's international initiatives and will provide significant benefits to faculty, students, and the community.

Thank you for your attention.

RN/jd
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Purpose

The Athletics Advisory Council (AAC) is established as a policy recommendation and review body for intercollegiate athletics. The purpose of the AAC is to advise the President and the Athletics Director in achieving the mission of the Athletics Department.

The AAC recommends policies that are intended to guide the President and the Athletics Director, but does not have any authority to administer the operation or activities of the Athletics Department. In carrying out its responsibilities, the AAC will submit a written annual report to the President, the Academic Senate, and the Athletics Director by October 30 of each academic year.

Responsibilities

The AAC shall assist the Athletics Department in the periodic review of any and all aspects dealing with the academic preparation and performance of student-athletes and in making recommendations for program improvement. The AAC shall also assist the Athletics Department in the annual review of any and all aspects dealing with Title IX compliance and gender equity and/or minority opportunities among student-athletes as well as among Athletics Department staff and coaches.

In conjunction with the President and the Athletics Director, the AAC shall identify its objectives for each academic year. The President or the Athletics Director may make direct requests to the AAC regarding projects to be undertaken. The Chair of the AAC will determine whether the AAC, as a whole, will address the issue or whether a working group should be assembled.

AAC Charter 2
Membership

The eleven (11) voting members of the AAC shall include:

-Seven faculty members as follows:

  One faculty member appointed by the President to serve as the University Faculty Athletics Representative.

  Two faculty members appointed by the President.

  Four faculty members recommended by the Personnel and Elections Committee for appointment by the President.

  The above faculty members shall be appointed for three-year rotating terms with the possibility of reappointment.

  Two of the above faculty members shall be appointed Chair and Vice Chair by the President with advice from the Athletics Director. It is desirable that the Chair have previous AAC experience to assure continuity from year to year. Chair and Vice Chair appointments are for two-year rotating terms with the possibility of reappointment.

-Three students recommended by the President of ASUU and the Athletics Director for appointment by the President. At least one but not more than two of the three students shall be a student-athlete. Student members shall be appointed for one-year terms with the possibility of reappointment.

-One representative of the University Board of Trustees appointed by the Chair of the Board of Trustees. The representative of the Board of Trustees shall be appointed for two-year term with the possibility of reappointment.

Every effort shall be made to assure that the above 11 voting members of the AAC reflect the diversity of the campus community. This responsibility falls on the different individuals or groups who appoint or recommend members of the Council. To facilitate this process, the AAC Chair will advise the Personnel and Elections Committee and the ASUU of the need for diversity on the Council. This will be accomplished in writing on an annual basis during the appointment process.
Ex officio non-voting members of the AAC, with the right to the floor and to introduce motions, shall include:

- The Athletics Director (or designee)
- The Senior Women’s Administrator for Athletics
- The Dean of Students

Responsibilities of the AAC Chair and Vice Chair

The AAC Chair shall have the following responsibilities:

- Prepare agendas and conduct all meetings of the AAC.
- Schedule regular meetings of the AAC.
- Appoint the chair and membership of all AAC “working groups” as needed. With the approval of the President and the Athletics Director, individuals outside the AAC may be asked to serve on working groups as appropriate.
- Report to the President and the Athletics Director on all actions taken by the AAC.
- Work in conjunction with the Chairs of working groups to ensure completion of assigned responsibilities.
- Submit a written annual report to the President, the Academic Senate, and the Athletics Director by October 30 of each academic year. Attend Executive Committee and full Academic Senate meetings as needed in conjunction with this report.
- Maintain regular contact with the President of the Academic Senate to facilitate and ensure effective communication between Athletics, Compliance, and the Academic Senate.

The Vice Chair shall represent the Chair in his/her absence on all above responsibilities.

Meetings

Regular meetings of the AAC shall be held during each term of the academic year. Additional meetings may be called as necessary at the request of the President or the Athletics Director.

A quorum shall consist of a simple majority of the AAC voting membership.
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Purpose

The Athletics Advisory Council is established as a policy recommendation and review body for intercollegiate athletics. The purpose of the AAC is to advise the President and the Athletics Director in achieving the mission of the Athletics Department.¹

The AAC recommends policies that are intended to guide the President and the Athletics Director, but does not have any authority to administer the operation or activities of the Athletics Department. In carrying out its responsibilities, the AAC will submit a written annual report to the President, the Academic Senate, and the Athletics Director by October 30 of each academic year.

Responsibilities

The AAC shall assist the Athletics Department in the periodic review of any and all aspects dealing with the academic preparation and performance of student-athletes and in making recommendations for program improvement. The AAC shall also assist the Athletics Department in the annual review of any and all aspects dealing with Title IX compliance and gender equity and/or minority opportunities among student-athletes as well as among Athletics Department staff and coaches.

In conjunction with the President and the Athletics Director, the AAC shall identify its objectives for each academic year. The President or the Athletics Director may make direct requests to the AAC regarding projects to be undertaken. The Chair of the AAC will determine whether the AAC, as a whole, will address the issue or whether a working group should be assembled.

¹ See addendum 1: Mission Statement of the University of Utah Athletics Department
Membership

The eleven sixteen (1116) voting members of the AAC shall include:

- Seven Nine faculty members as follows:
  - One faculty member appointed by the President to serve as the University Faculty Athletics Representative.
  - Two faculty members appointed by the President.
  - Four faculty members Six faculty members recommended by the Personnel and Elections Committee for Appointment by the President.

The above faculty members shall be appointed for three-year rotating terms with the possibility of reappointment.

Two of the above faculty members shall be appointed Chair and Vice Chair by the President with advice from the Athletics Director. It is desirable that the Chair have previous AAC experience to assure continuity from year to year. Chair and Vice Chair appointments are for two-year rotating terms with the possibility of reappointment.

- Three students recommended by the President of the ASUU and the Athletics Director for appointment by the President. At least one, but not more than two of the three students shall be a student-athlete. Student members shall be appointed for two-year rotating terms with the possibility of reappointment.

- Two representatives of the University Alumni Association appointed by the UUAA Executive Director with the approval of the Alumni Board of Directors. Alumni representatives are appointed for two-year rotating terms with the possibility of reappointment.

- One Two representatives of the University Board of Trustees appointed by the Chair of the Board of Trustees. Representatives of the Board of Trustees shall be appointed for two-year rotating terms with the possibility of reappointment.

Every effort shall be made to assure that the above 16 voting members of the AAC reflect the diversity of the campus community. This responsibility falls on the different individuals or groups who appoint or recommend members of the Council. To facilitate this process, the AAC Chair will advise the Personnel and Elections Committee and the ASUU of the need for diversity on the Council. This will be accomplished in writing on an annual basis during the appointment process.
Ex officio non voting members of the AAC, with the right to the floor and to introduce motions, shall include:

- The Athletics Director
- The Senior Women’s Administrator for Athletics
- The Dean of Students

The Vice President for University Relations

The Athletics Director

The Senior Women’s Administrator for Athletics

The Dean of Students

The Dean of the College of Health

The Assistant Athletics Director for Compliance

A member of the General Counsel to the President

Responsibilities of the AAC Chair and Vice Chair

The AAC Chair shall have the following responsibilities:

- Prepare agendas and conduct all meetings of the AAC.

- Schedule monthly meetings of the AAC and any additional meetings as necessary.

- Appoint the chair and membership of all AAC “working groups” as needed. With the approval of the President and the Athletics Director, individuals outside the AAC may be asked to serve on working groups as appropriate.

- Appoint the chair and membership of the Finance Committee, the Chair and membership of the Equity and Diversity Committee, two faculty members of the Athletics Academic Standards Committee, two faculty members of the Compliance Committee and all AAC task forces with the advice of the Athletics Director.

- Report to the President and the Athletics Director on all actions taken by the AAC.

- Work in conjunction with the Athletics Director to coordinate and implement the functions of the AAC.
- Work in conjunction with the Chairs of working groups to ensure completion of assigned responsibilities.

- Submit a written annual report to the President, the Academic Senate, and the Athletics Director by October 30 of each academic year. Attend Executive Committee and full Academic Senate meetings as needed in conjunction with this report.

- Maintain regular contact with the President of the Academic Senate to facilitate and ensure effective communication between Athletics, Compliance, and the Academic Senate.

The Vice Chair shall represent the Chair in his/her absence on all above responsibilities.

- Work in conjunction with the Chairs of the standing committees and task forces to ensure completion of assigned responsibilities.

- Submit a written annual report to the President, the Academic Senate, and the Athletics Director by October 30 of each academic year.

The Vice Chair shall represent the Chair in his/her absence on all above responsibilities.
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Meetings

Regular monthly meetings of the AAC shall be held during each term of the academic year. Any additional meetings may be held as necessary at the discretion of the Council or at the request of the President or the Athletics Director.

A quorum shall consist of a simple majority of the AAC voting membership.
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Section I: Request

The proposed Integrated Minor in Ecology and Legacy is a plan of study designed for undergraduate Honors students to fulfill both general education and core Honors requirements through an intensive, placed-based study.

1.1 Program Purpose:

The 18-credit hour integrated minor builds on current Honors courses, as well as other standing courses at the University, and allows students to fulfill Honors humanities, science, art and social science requirements around a focused theme. The proposed largely-block structure allows more flexible scheduling options (on-line and summer) for fulfilling Honors and general education requirements and will be especially attractive to science, engineering and dance majors who have highly scripted fall/spring courses of study. In addition, this flexible scheduling will allow more students to engage in intensive interdisciplinary studies. Finally, the program will fulfill the Honors mission (and the University's mission) to promote global education by asking students to think beyond the immediate ("the now and the local") in order to consider long-term and long-distance influence and consequence. Students in this course will engage long-term and long-distance questions around the theme: "What will my legacy be and how do I live my life now to better ensure my legacy comes to be?"

1.2 Program Description:

The local becomes global in an 18-credit hour Honors Ecology and Legacy Minor, 12 credits of which will be earned during an intensive 6-week summer block. (3 credits will be earned the semester prior to the 6-week block and 3 credits will be earned the semester after the block. See below for course requirements). Course enrollment will be capped at 15-18 students.

This program packages core honors and general education requirements together in a summer block in a way that will allow students, especially those in the sciences and engineering with scripted fall and spring schedules, to fulfill graduation requirements in a meaningful way in the summer.

The six-week summer block will be strongly place-based at the University of Utah, The Great Salt Lake, Centennial Valley, Montana and the Peninsula Valdez, Patagonia, Argentina. Students will use science, arts and the humanities to critically think about interactions between humans and the more-than-human world. First coined by philosopher David Abrams (Spell of the Sensuous, 1997), the more-than-human flags the way that humans are immersed in a living world, and indeed how humans move through the world -- not apart from it -- but through interaction within it. To this end, the lenses of ecology will be used to illuminate humanities texts and humanities texts will be used to add philosophical and ethical dimensions to ecology field studies. That is, through studying theories of ecology, animal behavior and human
behavior/personal choices, art, literature and history, we will identify the ways in which we are dependent on, and responsible for, the future health and long-term productivity of our ecosystems.

The semester after the 6-week summer block, each student will enroll in Honors 3420, an upper CW Honors writing course. As the major project for the course, each student will provide a well-researched, referenced and thoughtful answer to the question: “What will my legacy be and how do I live my life now to better ensure my legacy comes to be?”

The program will explicitly make connections between ecosystems in the western USA and in Patagonia, Argentina thereby allowing students to understand broad patterns, similarities and differences in arid, rich, but sensitive landscapes, across cultural and political spectrums.

We will use the following three locations that have marked similarities and differences:

**The Great Salt Lake, Utah.** Students will explore the cultural, technological, economic, and ecological intersections occurring in their “back yard” in order to construct broad-based thinking about human legacies in the complex and diverse ecosystem of The Great Salt Lake. The lake and desert region is not only a local phenomenon but produces products that are circulated globally (e.g., brine shrimp, salt, migratory birds). The past, present and future of the lake area can be traced through indigenous and settler dwellings, from resource extraction (e.g. salt extraction, Bingham Mine), to military dwelling (e.g. Wendover) to artistic expression (e.g. art works such as Spiral Jetty, Sun Tunnels, the Center for Land Use Interpretation (CLUI), petroglyphs), and to the journeys and meanderings of tourists and travelers (Saltair and Blackrock). We have found that few U students, even those who have grown up in Salt Lake City, have explored the Great Salt Lake and learned of its fascinating ecological, geological and human history. We see this as an opportunity to connect the local with the global, to link the immediate west to broader western issues and then to international ones.

**Centennial Valley, Montana.** The University was recently gifted the Taft/Nicholson Environmental Humanities Center in Centennial Valley, Montana, just west of Yellowstone. The Center abuts a National Wildlife Refuge and constitutes a living laboratory for biological field study conjoined with issues involving land management, species preservation within competing habitants, and historical investigation of human settlement and uses of the valley, an ideal setting for exploring cost/benefit legacy projects.

**The Peninsula Valdez, Chubut, Argentina.** The Peninsula is a 1400 square mile peninsula on the Atlantic Coast of Argentina. The site is listed as a World Heritage Site by UNESCO because of the unique group of marine mammals and birds that live on the peninsula or migrate there on an annual basis. Most notable of these are the Southern Right Whales, which come to the Peninsula to give birth and breed during the months of July-December. In addition, the Peninsula is used by orca whales, sea lions, elephant seals, fur seals and penguins, as well as a large number of migratory shorebird species. The mainland area is inhabited by rheas, guanacos and maras, as well as domesticated sheep and goats. Culturally, the area is home to large estancias where gauchos (Argentine cowboys) tend their herds of sheep.

At the Peninsula Valdez, animals (including humans) meet at the interface between terrestrial and marine existences. In addition to individual animal behavior projects, we will highlight and discuss cultural intersections (Latin, European, American), economic intersections (historically, whaling, industrial fishing, artisanal fishing, salt industry, aluminum industry, and tourism), as well as those that often exist between scientists and humanists. Finally, we will examine intersections/tensions between for-profit ecotourism
companies and not-for-profit conservation organizations.

1.3 Advisement and Governance:

Oversight of the Honors curriculum is provided by the Honors College Policy Board. This integrated minor was further reviewed by the Honors College advisors and staff, Dean Newman and Dean Torti. The Honors Policy Board, which consists of faculty and administrators from across departments and disciplines across the University, approved this minor on **February 19th, 2014**.

1.4 Program Requirements for the Minor

**Objectives:** Create a program that provides 15-18 Honors students with a way to complete their core Honors general education requirements in a summer block structure through interdisciplinary studies of ecology and the humanities in a local and international context.

**Entrance Requirements:** Acceptance into the Ecology and Legacy Minor is based on an application and interview process. The student must be an Honors student in good standing in the Honors College and at the University. Rising sophomores, juniors and seniors will be eligible to apply.

**Program Advertisement:** The course will be advertised to all Honors students during summer orientation 2014 and at the beginning of fall semester 2014 in order for students to be aware of the opportunity and plan their general education courses accordingly. We expect that this minor will be especially relevant to science, engineering and dance majors who have little or no time in their first year schedules to take general education or honors courses. We will specifically target this group of students through information sessions and personalized emails to major lists.

The required courses are listed below.

**Spring semester (prior to summer block)**

GEOG 3670 Geography of Latin America (on-line existing course), IR credit (3 credits)

**6-week summer block (July 1-August 15)**

HONOR 2109: Intellectual Traditions: Through an Ecological Lens (HF) (6 credits) (Dr. Robert Newman)

HONOR 3820: Critical Landscapes: the politics of land use in contemporary art. (FA/SB) (3 credits) (Dr. Monty Paret)

HONOR 2700 Comparative Ecology: Species Interactions. New course to be developed. (SF) (3 credits) (Dr. Sylvia Torti and Dr. Luciano Valenzuela)

**Fall Semester upon return**

HONOR 3420: Writing the 100-Year Legacy (CW) (3 credits) (Dr. Andy Hoffman)

Total Credit Hours—18 Credit Hours
Section II: Need

The highly specialized nature of education means that we are short-changing our future leaders. We know that solutions to our most complex human environmental and economic challenges will come from collaborations across disciplines and integrative approaches to problem solving. Undergraduate education in the 21st century must include opportunities for students to simultaneously develop and practice scientific/quantitative literacy as well as historical, cultural, artistic, and political literacy.

Currently, despite the fact that there are over 500 Honors students majoring in science or engineering, there are few study abroad programs to serve this population. Perhaps not surprisingly, few science students participate in study abroad, despite an interest on the part of students to do so (personal conversations, Sylvia Torti, with Honors biology students). In addition, very few programs at the University explicitly bring scientists and humanists together to investigate and explore complex ecotone issues that arise through interactions between humans and other organisms. This program will provide an interdisciplinary opportunity for students broadly interested in issues related to ecology, animal behavior, and research methods, conservation, environmental humanities, creative writing, as well as social and political issues related to place-based conservation, ecotourism and economic sustainability.

At the completion, students will have completed both the Honors core requirements (2 Intellectual Traditions and 1 Honors writing) as well as 5 of 7 required Honors courses for the Honors Baccalaureate Degree.

Section III: Institutional Impact

This interdisciplinary approach, which merges biology, the humanities and arts around ecological, place-based concerns, will spur a more-focused undergraduate approach that merges theory and practice while bringing cultural, literary and historical contexts to bear on practical scientific issues. It also provides students an international experience, thereby combining and enhancing the various approaches our campus is taking to elevate undergraduate excellence. It will be led and taught by experienced and well-published professors (three of whom are deans). Deans Torti and Newman are presently seeking donor support to offset some of the costs of the program in order to open it up to worthy students from all economic backgrounds.

No new resources will be required in the administration or advising of the program.

Sustainability of the program, once established, is expected because there are already a number of professors able and willing to be part of this minor. The Intellectual Traditions courses can be taught by professors in the departments of English, Philosophy, Sociology, especially those already associated with the Environmental Humanities program. In fact, the new director for Environmental Humanities, whose home is the Honors College, is slated to teach this course in the future. The introductory ecology course can also be taught by a number of professors in the Department of Biology, including solely by Dr. Valenzuela who will continue to hold dual positions at the University of Utah and the University in
Argentina. One of the reasons why this minor is so attractive is that it capitalizes on an established global connection that already exists between the Department of Biology and Argentine marine scientists, many of whom have earned their PhD’s from the University of Utah or other institutions in the USA. In addition to Dr. Hoffman, the honors writing course could be taught by other honors writing professors or again, professors currently associated with the Environmental Humanities program.

Section IV: Finances

Student fee: approximately $5000/student. Efforts are being made to raise private funds to off-set the costs of this course.

Faculty salaries will come from the current Honors operating budget. Advising will be done through the Honors College.

Section V: Program Curriculum

All Program Courses (with New Courses in Bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 3670</td>
<td>Geography of Latin America</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONOR 2109</td>
<td>Intellectual Traditions: Through an Ecological Lens</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONOR 3820</td>
<td>Critical Landscapes: the politics of land use in contemporary art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONOR 2700</td>
<td>Comparative Ecology: Species Interactions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONOR 3420</td>
<td>Writing the 100-Year Legacy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track/Options (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Credits</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HONOR 2109: Intellectual Traditions: through an Ecological Lens  
Dr. Robert Newman

This is a new section of Honors Intellectual Traditions to be developed and taught by Dean Robert Newman. (Note: 6 credits of Intellectual Traditions are required of all Honors students and meet the Humanities general education requirement for graduation). This 6-credit IT course will examine classical through contemporary texts dealing with perspectives on nature as science, spirit, quest, and commodity. Beginning with Lucretius and Aristotle, the class will read excerpts from Darwin, Dickinson, Emerson, Muir, Merwin, Oliver, and Singer. Melville's *Moby Dick* will be investigated as an ecological novel in preparation for the Patagonia portion of the class and will be supplemented by Bruce Chatwin's *In Patagonia*. Terry Tempest Williams' *Refuge* will be read in conjunction with the Salt Lake portion and Jack Turner's *The Abstract Wild* in conjunction with the Montana portion. Both Williams and Turner will guest lecture during the course. Carolyn Merchant’s seminal feminist critique *The Death of Nature* will be used as a key theoretical text throughout and will be supplemented by philosophical and practical considerations of environmental conflict and resolution, climate change, and issues of speciesism. The course will be inquiry based and will emphasize close readings of literary texts as well as ecological sites.

HONOR 2700: Comparative Ecology and Species Interactions  
Drs. Sylvia Torti and Luciano Valenzuela

This new Honors course will be developed and taught by Dean Torti in conjunction with Dr. Luciano Valenzuela, *Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires* and Department of Biology, University of Utah. This lower level science general education course will introduce students to the field of ecology, ecosystems, global change as well as animal behavior, cost/benefit analyses related to the animal ecology (foraging, migration and reproductive “decisions”). Students will learn theories/models used in ecology and animal behavior and then apply these models to field projects. Students will learn to critically analyze how conflicting and beneficial interactions among species (including humans) are developed, established and persist in different ecosystems. In addition, they will also consider the development of energy resources and industries, such as fishing, mineral extraction, ecotourism, agriculture and hunting. Texts will include (but not be limited to) excerpts from Darwin’s *Voyage of the Beagle* and *Origin of the Species*, *Among Whales* Roger Payne (in English and Spanish), *Animal Behavior* by John Alcock (10th
Cetacean Societies: Field Studies of Dolphins and Whales (which covers the history of cetacean science, importantly the old techniques, and then focuses on 4 different species, including social behavior. http://www.amazon.com/Cetacean-Societies-Studies-Dolphins-Whales/dp/0226503410). Ecology: From Individuals to Ecosystems by Begon et al. and original scientific papers. In addition, Dr. Vicky Rowntree (Dept of Biology) and Dr. Jon Seger (Dept of Biology) will be guest lecturers in the course. They have worked in Patagonia for many years and actively publish their work. Students will read primary literature published by these scientists and have the opportunity to visit their laboratory on campus.

HONOR 3820: Critical Landscapes: the politics of frontier land use in contemporary art (FF/SB)  
Dr. Monty Paret  
Land Art and Environmental Art have become elastic categories covering a wide range of artistic practices from the earthworks and environmental actions of the 1960s and 1970s to the “experimental geographies,” mappings, land modifications and community based participatory projects of recent contemporary art. This course considers the historical specificity and aesthetic, conceptual and political stakes of land and environmental art of the 1960s and 70s, as well as the very differently motivated land-based practices of contemporary artists and collectives who have negotiated the legacy of this earlier work.

More specifically, the politics of land use—from sustainability and economic isolation to environmental justice and global resource circulation—have become dominant themes in art since the 1990s. Artists and collectives have used performative strategies to engage the lived social and economic realities of specific geographical sites, or addressed the politics of representation through mapping and other investigations of the relationship between landscape and power. Some negotiate the legacy of 1960s-70s land art or the conditions of the contemporary global art world, while others actively eschew art world reference points, choosing instead to position their work relative to alternative spheres such as government land management agencies or the disciplines of cultural geography and urban planning. This critical mass of land-based practices, key to the geopolitics of the past two decades, constitutes a significant development in contemporary art that has occasioned an important body of scholarship, itself often borrowing theories and methods from diverse disciplines. Particular attention will be given to the Great Salt Lake and Great Basin region with case studies on: Robert Smithson’s Spiral Jetty; Nancy Holt’s Sun Tunnels; projects of The Center for Land Use Interpretation; artist and geographer Trevor Paglen’s Blank Spots on the Map, and SMUDGE studio’s Repository: A Typological Guide to America’s Ephemeral Nuclear Infrastructure.

HONOR 3420: Writing the 100-year Legacy (CW)  
Dr. Andy Hoffman  
Writing the 100-year Legacy is designed to be an interdisciplinary and creative approach to ways of thinking about and addressing major concerns in Environmental Humanities and Policy, Economics, and Ecology in the context of Sustainability and Social Justice. This class, which carries Honors upper level writing credit, will develop and employ critical thinking, inquiry and analysis, written communication and teamwork. Analytical techniques practiced and employed include reduction, synthesis, dialectical reasoning, and systems thinking among others. We will begin by exploring the question of what it is to “flourish” and how we might work embrace the theme as a life goal. We will also take a close look at
Environmental Philosophy, Aesthetics, and Spirituality in the context of what the students have learned thus far in their integrated minor. A good deal of our reading will be devoted to sustainability and themes such as resiliency, population, water, food, energy, health, transportation, and education. Finally, we will take note of Triple Bottom Line analysis and how such a holistic approach offers guidelines in addressing economic, social, and environmental impacts businesses, institutes, and organizations have on a given community and on the future. Student writers will engage in an extensive written research project “My 100-year legacy.” This project will evolve out of integration of prior minor courses, additional research and extensive writing paper. Possible texts to be used (will be refined depending on rest of integrated minor texts) When Women Were Birds, Terry Tempest Williams, The Upcycle, William McDonough, et al., Flourishing, John Ehrenfeld and Andrew Hoffman, Spiritual Ecology, Llewellyn Vaughan-Lee, Nature’s Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems, Gretchen Daily, ed.
February 7, 2014

Dr. Ann Darling  
Senior Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies  
Undergraduate Studies  
Sill Center  
SLC, Utah 84112

Dear Dr. Darling:

I am writing to enthusiastically support the proposal for an Integrated Minor in Ecology and Legacy located in the Honors College at the University of Utah. This proposed minor embodies our core objectives in terms of the revitalization of General Education on our campus—it is an integrated pathway through General Education, it includes coursework that is thematically linked and a capstone experience that is place based, interdisciplinary and comparative, it builds a powerful learning community of scholars and will be taught by inspiring and talented faculty.

As an approach, the proposed minor is innovative, forward thinking and creative. Beyond what it will help us do in terms of the renewal of General Education engaging students in meaning-making and culturally relevant and important study, it will contribute to our goals in terms of the Plan to Finish campaign and its objective of creating more flexible scheduling and alternative coursework formats to serve the needs of students living in a more complex world than ever before.

I think this proposed minor is exemplary and represents a key collaboration between the Honors College and the College of Humanities for interdisciplinary work and General Education that is located in the real world. I give it my most enthusiastic endorsement.

Best regards,

Martha Bradley-Evans  
Senior Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs  
Dean of Undergraduate Studies

[Signature]
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: Discontinue Communication Minors and Teaching Degrees

This proposal needs to go through:

- Undergraduate Council [X]
- Graduate Council [ ]
- Both Approvals [ ]
- Grad Approval/Undergrad Notification [ ]

This proposal has been approved by:

Chair of Undergraduate Council [Signature] Date: 3/15/2014

Chair of Graduate Council [Signature] Date:

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: 3-14-14

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 Request: University of Utah
Currently Approved Titles: Communication Discontinuation Requests: Communications Composite Teaching BA/BS; Teaching Speech Minor; Minor in Communication – Interpretation; Minor in Communication – Speech Communication
School or Division or Location: College of Humanities
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: Department of Communication
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP Code (for existing programs): 09.0101
Institutional Board of Trustees’ Approval Date:

Proposal Type (check all that apply):

<table>
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<tr>
<th>SECTION NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>Minor*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Emphasis*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Administrative Unit Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td>Conditional Three-Year Approval for New Centers, Institutes, or Bureaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3</td>
<td>New Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1</td>
<td>Out-of-Service Area Delivery of Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
<td>Program Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3</td>
<td>Name Change of Existing Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4</td>
<td>Program Discontinuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5</td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Chief Academic Officer (or Designee) Signature:
I certify that all required institutional approvals have been obtained prior to submitting this request to the Office of the Commissioner.

______________________________ Date: MM/DD/YEAR

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

The Department of Communication seeks to discontinue the following programs, effective Academic Year 2014-2015: Communications Composite Teaching BA and BS; Teaching Speech Minor; Minor in Communication – Interpretation; Minor in Communication – Speech Communication.

Faculty consultation: Communication Department faculty voted January 10, 2014, and February 6, 2014, to support these discontinuations. The College of Humanities Curriculum Committee voted January 22, 2014, to support these discontinuations. In an attached memorandum, College of Humanities Acting Dean Mark Bergstrom provided his support for these discontinuations on February 13, 2014.

Section II: Need

The Department’s primary reasons for seeking these administrative changes are lack of student involvement and lack of resources.

The Communications Composite Teaching BA and BS and Teaching Speech Minor are not supported by personnel. There are currently no full-time Communication faculty specializing in the pedagogy of the discipline; thus, there is no one to teach the courses that formerly supported the major and minor. The Department’s academic advisors are not specifically trained to assist students with teaching requirements. In addition, it is apparent that neither the major nor the minor fully prepares students to meet the minimum requirements to teach in Utah public schools.

The other minors represent an area (Interpretation) in which faculty no longer specialize and a major (Speech Communication) that was discontinued effective Academic Year 2012-2013.

Because these programs remain in the University Catalog, the Department sees a need to formally discontinue them to avoid confusion.

Section III: Institutional Impact

Institutional impacts are expected to be minimal. Prospective students have other options within the University. For example, the Utah State Office of Education has advised that the teaching program offered in the Department of English can prepare students to teach Speech. There is currently one student declared under the Communication Department’s Teaching Speech minor, and this student has applied to graduate in Spring 2014. The other programs have been inactive for some time, so their discontinuation is not expected to have an impact.

Section IV: Finances

No financial impacts are anticipated as a result of this change.
To: The University of Utah Undergraduate Council

From: Mark Bergstrom, Acting Dean

Re: Support for Discontinuation of Inactive Programs in Communication

I support the Department of Communication’s request to discontinue these inactive programs effective Academic Year 2014-2015:

- Communications Composite Teaching B.A. and B.S.
- Minor in Speech Teaching
- Minor in Communication – Interpretation
- Minor in Communication – Speech Communication

The Department’s reasons for seeking these administrative changes are lack of student involvement and lack of resources. In teaching, for example, there are currently no Communication faculty specializing in the pedagogy of the discipline. The Department has only two academic advisors for more than 850 declared majors, and neither advisor is specifically trained to assist students with teaching requirements. The teaching major, teaching minor, and two inactive minors remain in the University Catalog, however, so the Department sees a need to formally discontinue them to avoid confusion.

Institutional impacts are expected to be minimal. Prospective students have other options within the University, including other teaching majors, other teaching minors, and the Communication Department’s Media Studies Minor. In terms of impacts, no students are declared in the Minor in Communication – Interpretation and Minor in Communication – Speech Communication. There is currently one student declared under the Communication Department’s Teaching Speech minor, and this student has applied to graduate in Spring 2014. No financial impact is anticipated as a result of this change.

Thank you for your attention.
Council Approval

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

Date: 3/25/14

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

Date: 4-3-14

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 Request: University of Utah
Proposed Title: BS/MS Combined Program in Chemistry
Currently Approved Title:
School or Division or Location: College of Science
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: Department of Chemistry
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for new programs):
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for existing programs): 40.0501
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<table>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
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<td>Emphasis*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>(CER P) Certificate of Proficiency*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>(GCR) Graduate Certificate*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>New Administrative Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Unit Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Unit Restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Unit Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td>Conditional Three-Year Approval for New Centers, Institutes, or Bureaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3</td>
<td>New Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1</td>
<td>Out-of-Service Area Delivery of Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
<td>Program Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3</td>
<td>Name Change of Existing Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4</td>
<td>Program Discontinuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5</td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Administrative Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

______________________________
Signature

______________________________
Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Printed Name: Name of CAO or Designee
Department of Chemistry
Combined B.S./M.S. Program

Section I: Request

The Department of Chemistry in the College of Science at the University of Utah requests permission to establish a combined BS/MS degree program in Chemistry. The faculty in the Department of Chemistry discussed and developed this proposal over the course of several meetings that initially involved a subgroup of faculty and finally the full faculty. All tenured and tenure track faculty were given the opportunity to vote on the adoption of this program at a faculty meeting held on October 8, 2013. The final vote for adoption of a BS/MS program in Chemistry was 25 in favor, 0 not in favor with 2 abstentions.

Section II: Need

Recent studies have shown that the most successful undergraduate educational experience usually includes a component of original research. By becoming involved in undergraduate research, students not only develop creatively but they also hone critical thinking, problem solving and communication skills. Along these lines, as one of the premier public institutions in the Western United States, the University of Utah offers a number of unique research opportunities to undergraduate students. While many of our undergraduates take advantage of these opportunities, with their heavy work and class load, more do not. This is unfortunate and in our current, highly competitive environment, no longer good enough. Thus, through the program outlined below, we propose to provide students with enhanced educational opportunities through an accelerated BS/MS degree program in Chemistry. This program will provide an opportunity and mechanism for students to receive a more in-depth and focused chemical education then they would receive over the course of obtaining their BS degree and will better prepare our students for careers in industry, for entry into professional schools or Ph.D. programs. The central role that Chemistry plays in all areas of science and technology makes this proposal timely.

The proposed degree program is intended to attract qualified undergraduate students into the graduate program early, decrease the time required to obtain an MS degree, and to involve students in research early in their careers. The proposed combined degree program is designed to be completed by students in five years and to culminate with simultaneous conferral of the Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees.

As envisioned, students in the BS/MS program will begin their required research project and complete a portion of their MS courses after their junior year. Minimum requirements will include:

1. That the student complete the normal course load for both the BS and MS degrees in Chemistry (122 and 30 credit hours, respectively).
2. That the students apply for admission into the program by April 1 of their junior year. Applications for entry into the program will be processed through the Graduate Admissions Office and requirements for the combined BS/MS program will be consistent with the requirements for the normal MS program. Notification of acceptance into the program will take place before May 1 of their junior year.
3. Upon acceptance into the program students will be expected to complete the program within 2 years.
4. A student will submit a detailed research plan to his/her Advisory Committee on or before May 1 of the 4th year.
5. Transfer of the student from undergraduate to graduate status occurs after the completion of 122 hours of qualified studies.
(6) The BS and MS degree will be conferred simultaneously following the completion of the program. No student will be awarded a separate MS degree in Chemistry without satisfying all requirements for the BS degree.

(7) Students wishing to exit the combined program can apply qualifying coursework toward the traditional BS requirement without penalty.

Procedures
1. Application for admission to BS/MS program will be submitted at the end of a student’s junior year. This application will be processed and decisions made at the departmental level (this is consistent with current admission policies). Entering students must have at least a 3.0 cumulative GPA.
2. Students must be enrolled as Chemistry majors at the time of applying for the BS/MS degree option.
3. The student will apply for graduate status during the semester in which 122 credit hours are completed and will follow the regular University of Utah Graduate School application process. All university requirements for graduate admissions must be met except posting of undergraduate degree. (Note: On the referral sheet that the department returns to graduate admissions, the department will note that the student has been accepted to the combined BS/MS program. Graduate Admissions will then approve admission without the BS completed.)
4. No course can be counted toward both degrees.
5. Students will choose a research advisor before December 1 of their senior year or the semester after being admitted into the program.
6. Students will choose an Advisory Committee before February 1 of their senior year. The committee will consist of 2 faculty members in chemistry (1 of whom will be the student’s advisor).
7. Students will write a short report detailing their project.
8. Students will present and defend their project at the end of their 5th year.
9. The Department will ensure that all requirements are met for each degree. Courses taken for the graduate degree will not be eligible for graduate credit until the requirements for both degrees are satisfied. Each degree will be awarded when all work is completed.

66% by 2020

This proposal promises to help meet the Governor’s call that 66% of the citizens of Utah have a post secondary degree in several ways: First, engaging students in original research is now an established method of motivating them to complete their degree. Second, this proposal will expedite the time to advanced degrees. Third, we believe that this program will be attractive to students who might not otherwise be come to the University of Utah. Once these students are here, there is strong likelihood that they will (a) graduate and (b) work in Utah employed in companies that need their technology skills.

Section III: Institutional Impact

We anticipate that a combined BS/MS degree will be attractive to students and will likely result in increased enrollment in the Chemistry program. As a combined BS/MS program is somewhat unique in a Chemistry program at a Research I institution, we believe that this program will attract well-qualified students who might otherwise go to other institutions. As other similar combined BS/MS programs exist at the University of Utah, procedures to institute this program will not necessitate changes in existing administration within the University. As no new courses or research programs will be needed to accommodate this program, no changes in faculty, staff, or physical facilities will be required. No student will be adversely affected by this change as students can complete his or her BS degree without penalty.

Section IV: Finances
No costs are anticipated to result from this program. In the event that the number of chemistry majors increases as a result of instituting this program, we anticipate that the cost per degree will decrease. In addition to this, we anticipate that this program will expedite the time to degree thus decreasing the overall cost.

**Supplemental Information for Combined BS/MS Degree Program in Chemistry**

**Additional Information Explaining Program Need:**
The current degree requirement for the BS degree in Chemistry provides a solid foundation for an MS degree student. While there is no reduction in credit hours associated with the combined degree program, the program will provide several notable benefits to Chemistry students.

a. The combined degree program will encourage qualified students in the BS degree program to begin taking graduate level classes towards the MS degree while still enrolled in the BS degree program.

b. The combined BS/MS degree program will provide undergraduate students with the opportunity to interact more closely with faculty and to be mentored by more senior graduate students.

c. The proposed program will allow the Department to provide a structure to encourage high quality undergraduate students to get involved in research.

d. The proposed program will be unique among Research 1 institutions in the Pac 12 and will provide us with a competitive advantage.

**Additional Information Explaining Procedures for Application and Admission:**

a. Application for admission to BS/MS program will be submitted at the end of a student’s junior year.

b. Application process, requirements and evaluation will be consistent with the criteria for the tradition MS Chemistry as follows:

   - Minimum 3.0 cumulative GPA
   - Three letters of recommendation
   - Essay explaining why the student is applying for BS/MS degree program
   - CV
   - Graduate School online application with fee

Other Admission Requirements:

a. All application processing and recommendations for admission will be made in the Department of Chemistry under the authority of the Program Director responsible for the BS/MS degree program.

b. Students must be enrolled as a Chemistry major at the time of applying for the BS/MS degree option.

c. All university requirements for graduate admissions must be met except posting of undergraduate degree.

d. Recommendations for admission will be made by the Department of Chemistry to the Graduate School by May 1st of each year.

**Section V: Program Curriculum**

*Note: there are no proposed changes in the undergraduate or graduate curriculum to complete the BS/MS degree*

1. **Bachelor of Science in Chemistry Requirements**

**University Requirements:** 122 Hours (at least 40 upper division), DV, IR, WRTG, GEN ED

A. Chemistry Core Courses (required of all majors):

   - CHEM 1210, 1220 General Chemistry I, II (4, 4) both SF (or 1211/1221 honors versions)
   - CHEM 1215, 1225 General Chemistry Lab I, II (1, 1) (or 1240/1241 honors versions)
   - CHEM 2310, 2320 Organic Chemistry I, II (4, 4) (or 2311/2321 honors versions)
   - CHEM 2315, 2325 Organic Chemistry Lab I, II (2, 2)
   - CHEM 3000 Quantitative Analysis (4) QI, CW
CHEM 3060 Quantum Chemistry and Spectroscopy (4) QI
CHEM 3100 Inorganic Chemistry (5)
Math and Physics Core (required of all majors):
MATH 1210, 1220 Calculus I, II (4, 4) or MATH 1250 AP Calculus I (4) all QR
MATH 2210 Calculus III (3) or MATH 1260 AP Calculus II (4) both QR
PHYS 2210, 2220 Physics for Scientists and Engineers I, II (4, 4) (or 3210/3220 honors versions)
PHYS 2215, 2225 Physics Laboratory for Scientists and Engineers I, II (1, 1)

A. Chemistry, Professional Emphasis (Certified by the American Chemical Society)
Core courses, plus:
MATH 2250 Differential Equations and Linear Algebra (4) (or 2270 and 2280)
MATH 3150 Partial Differential Equations for Engineering Students (2)
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4) QI
BIOL/CHEM 3510 Biological Chemistry I (3)
Ten hours of laboratory courses selected from the following:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2) CW
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)
BIOL/CHEM 3515 Biological Chemistry Lab (3) or 3525 Molecular Biology of DNA Lab (3)
CHEM 4800 Undergraduate Research (max. 2 counted) or CHEM 4999 Honors Thesis/Project (3)

B. Chemistry, Biological Emphasis (Certified by the American Chemical Society)
Core courses, plus:
BIOL 2020 Principles of Cell Biology (3) or BIOL 2021 Principles of Cell Science (4)
BIOL 2030 Genetics (3)
BIOL/CHEM 3510 Biological Chemistry I (3)
BIOL/CHEM 3515 Biological Chemistry Laboratory (3) or 3525 Molecular Biology of DNA Lab (3)
BIOL/CHEM 3520 Biological Chemistry II (3)
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics & Chem. Kinetics (4) QI or CHEM 3090 Phys. Chem. Life Sci. (4) QI
Complete Five (5) or more additional semester units selected from approved Biology courses numbered 3000 or higher (see the General Catalog or advisor). Selected chemistry graduate level courses, and courses from other bio-related departments, may be used to fulfill this requirement with the prior approval of the chemistry advisor.
Complete two of the following half-semester lab courses:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2) CW
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

C. Chemistry, Business Emphasis
Core courses, plus:
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4) QI
or CHEM 3090 Physical Chemistry for Life Sciences (4) QI
Complete two of the following lab courses:
CHEM 3200 Advanced Radiochemistry with Lab I (3)
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2) CW
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)
Twelve or more units selected from the College of Business (other classes may be allowed with prior approval of the chemistry advisor).
ACCTG 2600: Survey of Accounting (3)
MGT 3000: Principles of Management (3) or MGT 3680: Human Behavior in Organizations (3)
FINAN 3000: Fundamentals of Investing (3) or FINAN 3040: Financial Management (3)
MKTG 3000: Marketing Vision (3) or MKTG 3010: Principles of Marketing (3)

D. Chemistry, Chemical Physics Emphasis
Core courses, plus:
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4) QI
MATH 2250 Differential Equations and Linear Algebra (4) (or 2270 and 2280)
MATH 3150 Partial Differential Equations for Engineers (2)
MATH 3160 Complex Variables for Engineers (2)
MATH Elective: 3 or more units selected from the following:
MATH 3070 Applied Statistics I (4)
MATH 4500 Intro. to Applied Analysis (3)
MATH 3300 Lab in Computational Science (3)
MATH 4510 Intro. to Topology and Geometry (3)
MATH 4200 Intro. to Complex Variables (3)
MATH 4600 Math. in Physiology and Medicine (4)
Complete two of the following lab courses:
CHEM 3200 Advanced Radiochemistry with Lab I (3)
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2) CW
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)
Six or more units selected from the following half-semester classes:
CHEM 7000 Introduction to Quantum Mechanics I (2)
CHEM 7040 Statistical Thermodynamics (2)
CHEM 7010 Introduction to Quantum Mechanics II (2)
CHEM 7050 Classical Thermodynamics (2)
CHEM 7020 Introduction to Spectroscopy I (2)
CHEM 7070 Chemical Kinetics (2)
CHEM 7030 Introduction to Spectroscopy II (2)
CHEM 7080 Chemical Dynamics (2)

E. Chemistry, Geology Emphasis
F. Core courses, plus:
G. CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4) QI
Complete two of the following half-semester lab courses:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2) CW
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

_Sixteen or more units selected from the following:_

GEO 1110 Introduction to Earth Systems (3)
GEO 1115 Laboratory for Introduction to Earth Systems (1)
GEO 3060 Structural Geology and Tectonics (3)
GEO 3080 Earth Materials I (4)
GEO 3090 Earth Materials II (4)
GEO 4100 Petrography and Petrogenesis (3)
GEO 5450 Ore Genesis and Mineral Exploration (3)
GEO 5660 Geochemistry (3)
GEO 5670 Isotope Tracers in Earth Science (3)

Selected chemistry courses may be substituted with prior approval of the chemistry advisor.

F. **Chemistry, Materials Science and Engineering Emphasis**

G. **Core courses, plus:**

H. MATH 2250 Differential Equations and Linear Algebra (4) (or 2270 and 2280)
I. CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4) QI

_Complete two of the following lab courses:_

CHEM 3200 Advanced Radiochemistry with Lab I (3)
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2) CW
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

_Fifteen or more units selected from the following:_

MSE 2010 Introduction to Materials Science and Engineering (4)
MSE 3010 Materials Processing Lab (3)
MSE 3210 Electronic Properties of Solids (3)
MSE 3310 Introduction to Ceramics (3)
MSE 3410 Introduction to Polymers (3)
MSE 5011 Adv Mtrls Tech: Experiment, Theory & Characterization (2)
MSE 5032 Advanced Thermodynamics (3)
MSE 5034 Kinetics of Solid-state Processes (3)
MSE 5040 Introduction to Modern Biomaterials (4)
MSE 5470 Polymer & Organic Materials for Renewable Energy Application I (3)

G. **Chemistry, Mathematics Emphasis**

_Core courses, plus:_

CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4) QI
MATH 2250 Differential Equations and Linear Algebra (4) (or 2270 and 2280)
MATH 3150 Partial Differential Equations for Engineers (2)
MATH 3160 Applied Complex Variables (2)

_MATH Elective: Three or more units selected from the following:_

MATH 3070 Applied Statistics I (4)
MATH 4500 Intro. to Applied Analysis (3)
MATH 3300 Lab in Computational Science (3)
MATH 4510 Intro. to Topology and Geometry (3)
MATH 4200 Intro. to Complex Variables (3)
MATH 4600 Math. in Physiology and Medicine (4)

Complete two of the following lab courses:
CHEM 3200 Advanced Radiochemistry with Lab I (3)
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2) CW
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

Six or more units selected from the following:
MATH 5010 Introduction to Probability (3)
MATH 5600 Survey of Numerical Analysis (4)
MATH 5080 Statistical Inference I (3)
MATH 5610 Introduction to Numerical Analysis I (4)
MATH 5090 Statistical Inference II (3)
MATH 5620 Introduction to Numerical Analysis II (4)
MATH 5210 Introduction to Real Analysis (4)

H. Chemistry, Teaching Emphasis

Core courses, plus:
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4) QI
or CHEM 3090 Physical Chemistry for Life Sciences (4) QI

Complete two of the following lab courses:
CHEM 3200 Advanced Radiochemistry with Lab I (3)
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2) CW
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)
EDU 1010 Introduction to Teaching (3)
ETHNC 2550 – 2590 (3) Ethnic American Experiences (Choose one; some are HF or BF, all DV)
ECS 3150 Multicultural Education (3) DV
ELP 3410 Education Law (3) or ED PS 3030 Research & Inquiry (3)
PSY 1230 Psychology of Adolescents (3) BF or PSY 3220 Childhood and Adolescent Development or FCS 5230 (3) Adolescent Development in the Family or ED PS 5050 Life Span
Development (3) EDU 5170 Secondary Science Methods (3) or 5375 Science Methods (3) CHEM 5380 Special Topics in Modern Chemical Education (TA service via Distance Education, 2) or PHYS 3949 Special Lab Topics (1) or an elective having prior approval from the chemistry advisor.

2. Master of Science in Chemistry Requirements

Research (12 credit hours)
• Thesis Research (12)

Courses (18 credit hours from the following list)

Research Ethics
• Phil. 7570 Case Studies in Research Ethics (1)
Graduate Seminar
• Chem 7800, 7810, 7820, 7840 or 7870 Graduate Seminar (2)
Laboratory Classes (maximum of 4 credits)
  • Chem 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2)
  • Chem 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
  • Chem 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
  • Chem 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

Physical Chemistry
  • Chem 6810 Nanoscience: Where Biology, Chemistry and Physics Intersect (2)
  • Chem 7000 Quantum Chemistry I (2)
  • Chem 7010 Quantum Chemistry II (2)
  • Chem 7020 Introduction to Spectroscopy I (2)
  • Chem 7030 Introduction to Spectroscopy II (2)
  • Chem 7040 Statistical Thermodynamics (2)
  • Chem 7050 Classical Thermodynamics (2)
  • Chem 7060 Statistical Mechanics (2)
  • Chem 7070 Chemical Kinetics (2)
  • Chem 7080 Chemical Dynamics (2)

Inorganic Chemistry
  • Chem 7100 Principles of Inorganic Chemistry (2)
  • Chem 7110 Inorganic Mechanisms (2)
  • Chem 7120 Physical Inorganic Chemistry (2)
  • Chem 7130 Solid-State Chemistry (2)
  • Chem 7150 Bioinorganic Chemistry (2)
  • Chem 7160 Organometallic Chemistry (2)

Organic Chemistry
  • Chem 7200 Contemporary Organic Synthesis I (2)
  • Chem 7240 Physical Organic Chemistry I (2)
  • Chem 7250 Physical Organic Chemistry II (2)
  • Chem 7270 Organic Spectroscopy I (2)
  • Chem 7280 Organic Spectroscopy II (2)
  • Chem 7290 Organic Chemistry of Materials (2)

Biological Chemistry
  • Chem 7430 Chemical Biology of Proteins and Nucleic Acids (2)
  • Chem 7450 Biophysical Chemistry (2)
  • Chem 7460 Protein Chemistry (2)
  • Chem 7470 Nucleic Acid Chemistry (2)

Analytical Chemistry
  • Chem 7500 Angular Momentum Theory and Applications in Chemistry and Physics (2)
  • Chem 7520 Computational Chemistry (Quantum) (2)
  • Chem 7530 Molecular Simulations (2)
  • Chem 7700 Analytical and Chemical Measurements I (2)
  • Chem 7710 Analytical and Chemical Measurements II (2)
  • Chem 7720 Separations (2)
  • Chem 7730 – Electrochemistry (2)
  • Chem 7750 Information Processing in Analytical Chemistry (2)
  • Chem 7760 Instrumentation Electronics (2)
  • Chem 7770 Optical Spectroscopy (2)
  • Chem 7780 Surface Chemistry (2)
### Year 1 Fall
- Chem 1210 General Chemistry I (4)
- Chem 1215 General Chemistry I Lab (1)
- Math 1210 Calculus I (4)
- WRTG 2010 (3)
- Fine Arts Elective (FF, 3)
- 15 credits

### Year 1 Spring
- Chem 1220 General Chemistry II (4)
- Chem 1225 General Chemistry II Lab (1)
- Math 1220 Calculus II (4)
- Humanities Elective (3, HF)
- American Institutions (AI, 3)
- 15 credits

### Year 2 Fall
- Chem 2310 Organic Chemistry I (4)
- Chem 2315 Organic Chemistry I Lab (2)
- Phys 2210 Physics for Scientists I (4)
- Phys 2215 Physics for Scientists I Lab (1)
- Math 2210 Calculus III (3)
- Fine Arts Elective (FF, 3)
- 17 credits

### Year 2 Spring
- Chem 2320 Organic Chemistry II (4)
- Chem 2325 Organic Chemistry II Lab (2)
- Phys 2220 Physics for Scientists II (4)
- Phys 2225 Physics for Scientists II Lab (1)
- Math 2250 Diff. Eq. and Linear Alg. (4)
- 15 credits

### Year 3 Fall
- Chem 3000 Quantitative Analysis (CW, 4)
- Chem 3060 Quantum Chem. Spec. (QI, 4)
- Chem 3100 Inorganic Chem. (5)
- Math 3150 Part. Diff. Eq. For Engineers (2)
- CHEM 4800 Undergraduate Research (2)
- 17 credits

### Year 3 Summer
- CHEM 4800 Undergraduate Research (2) 2 credits

### Year 3 Spring
- Chem 3070 Thermo. and Chem. Kinetics (QI, 4)
- Chem 5720 Adv. Physical Lab (2)
- Chem 5730 Adv. Inorganic Lab (2)
- Humanities Elective (3, HF)
- Social/Behavioral Science Elective (3, BF)
- 16 credits

### Year 4 Fall
- Chem 3510 Biological Chem. I (3)
- Chem 5710 Adv. Organic Lab (2)
- Chem 5380 Spec. Top. Mod. Chem Ed (1)
- Chem 5750 Adv. Chem. Biology Lab (2)
- Thesis Research (1)
- Humanities Elective (3, HF)
- Upper Division International (3, IR)
- 15 credits

### Year 4 Spring
- Chem 5700 Adv. Analytical Lab (2)
- Chem 3200 Radiochemistry (3)
- Chem 7270 Organic Spec. I (2)
- Chem 7470 Nucleic Acid Chemistry (2)
- Thesis Research (1)
- Social/Behavioral Science Elective (3, BF)
- Diversity (3, DV)
- 16 credits

### Year 5 Fall
- Chem 7240 Physical Organic Chem I (2)
- Chem 7250 Physical Organic Chem II (2)
- Chem 7200 Organic Synthesis I (2)
- Thesis Research (4)
- Chem 5550 Chemical Safety (1)
- Phil 7570 Research Ethics (1)
- 12 credits

### Year 5 Spring
- Chem 7210 Organic Synthesis II (2)
- Chem 7160 Organometallics (2)
- Chem 7820 Organic Seminar (2)
- Thesis Research (6)
- 12 credits

BS degree includes everything through year 4 except thesis and 7000 level classes. MS degree includes everything else

**BS: Total Credits Required = 122 (122 are required); MS: Total Credits Required = 30 (30 are required)**

**Upper Division Credits (for BS) = 45 (40 are required)**
MEMORANDUM

To: COS Admissions, Standards and Degree Committee
From: Cynthia J. Burrows, Chair
Date: November 21, 2013
Subject: Proposal for a BS/MS Degree in Chemistry

I enthusiastically endorse the proposed accelerated BS/MS Chemistry degree program. With this program I believe that we have an opportunity to both attract new students and to better educate our current undergraduates. Anecdotally, a survey of one of our 3000 level chemistry classes indicated that a majority of the students would be interested in this program.

The proposed program would not be difficult to adopt. The proposed program will utilize resources that are already at our disposal and will not require the development of a new curriculum or the hiring of faculty or administration. While a BS/MS would be unique for a Chemistry department at a major research institution, there is precedent for a BS/MS program at the University of Utah, for example in the College of Engineering.

Finally, I anticipate that there will be a need for the well-trained scientists that graduate from this program as the technology sector in the state continues to grow and generate high paying jobs.
December 9, 2013

Dr. David B. Kieda  
Dean of the Graduate School  
302 PARK  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dear Dean Kieda:

I strongly support the institution of a new accelerated BS/MS degree program in Chemistry, as described in the enclosed proposal. This program would support the changing educational profile of the Department of Chemistry, emphasizing a more in-depth chemical education and satisfying our students' increased desire to participate in hands-on, impactful research projects at earlier stages in their education.

The Department of Chemistry's unanimous support for this program indicates that the program will be valuable from both an educational and research perspective. Students of the program would graduate with higher degrees, be better prepared for industry positions and Ph.D. programs, and, while at the University of Utah, would contribute to ongoing research projects in the Department of Chemistry.

You will also be pleased to know that the proposed degree would leverage existing resources, and would not require any new investment from the Department, College, or University. Additionally, as this degree is simply an integration of existing BS and MS programs, it would require no changes in class offerings, faculty, or curricula.

If approved, this program would be the only combination Chemistry BS/MS degree in the PAC-12, granting a significant competitive advantage to the University of Utah. If implemented, this program would no doubt attract more and better qualified students to the Department of Chemistry.

For these reasons, the Department of Chemistry's proposal has my support and the support of the College of Science. If you have any questions about this proposal, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Pierre V. Sokolsky  
Dean, College of Science, and  
Distinguished Professor of Physics & Astronomy
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: New Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy

This proposal needs to go through:

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

This proposal has been approved by:

Chair of Undergraduate Council

Date: 3/13/2014

Chair of Graduate Council

Date: 3/25/14

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

Date: 4/3/14

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 Request: David Eccles School of Business
Proposed Title: Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management
Currently Approved Title: Department of Management
School or Division or Location: David Eccles School of Business
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: Department of Management
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code1 (for new programs): 52.0201
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for existing programs): 52.0201
Proposed Beginning Date (for new programs): 07/01/2014
Institutional Board of Trustees’ Approval Date: TBD

Proposal Type (check all that apply):  

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

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

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

____________________________________
Signature
Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Printed Name: Name of CAO or Designee

---

1 CIP codes must be recommended by the submitting institution. For CIP code classifications, please see http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55.
Program Request - Abbreviated Template
Formation of the Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy
David Eccles School of Business
January 23, 2014

Section I: Request
Members of the Department of Management request the following actions: The formation of a new department, Entrepreneurship and Strategy; The transfer of tenure of Professors Jay B. Barney, Lyda Bigelow, Karin Fladmoe-Lindquist, William S Hesterly, William S Schulze, and Todd R. Zenger from the Department of Management to the newly formed Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy, the transfer of non-tenured faculty appointments to Robert Wuebker (tenure-track), Bonita Austin (career-line), Abe Bahksheshy (career-line), Barclay Burns (career-line) and Jeffery Nielsen (career-line), and the transfer of supervision over existing Entrepreneurship Major and Entrepreneurship Minor programs from the Department of Management to the Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy. This request is made following a period of careful deliberation and is supported by the existing tenure and tenure-track faculty of the Department of Management. We believe the creation of the new Department will allow for better development of existing and emerging programs in Entrepreneurship (e.g. Entrepreneurship Major and Minor, Interdisciplinary Certificate in Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurship & Society BLOCK U program). The new department will also promote effective hiring and development.

Section II: Need
Recognized as one of the best states for entrepreneurs, Utah regularly tops the list as the best state in which to do business by Forbes magazine. This is particularly noteworthy given a broader national trend where entrepreneurship has become much more important to economic growth and job creation. This growing importance is reflected in a 2011 survey of 476 prospective MBA's in 79 countries where, for the first time, entrepreneurship placed in the top five in a list of sought-after curriculum content. Demand for instruction in entrepreneurship, whether as majors, minors, certificates, and other short programs have increased dramatically in the last few years.

The David Eccles School of Business is developing a unique campus environment to enhance and expand the student experience in entrepreneurship. A number of student experiences available through the
recently approved Lassonde Institute provide University of Utah students a set of experiential opportunities that is, arguably, unmatched at other universities. In the planning stage is the creation of the Lassonde Living and Learning Center which will combine 400 units of student housing with 20,000 square feet of entrepreneurial and innovation space we are calling the “Student Garage.” The combination of residential space with a dedicated facility for students to tinker, invent, and launch companies will create valuable learning experiences that cannot be found anywhere else. At the same time that the University of Utah has been establishing a national reputation in its student programs, it has collected a group of internationally recognized scholars at the intersection of entrepreneurship and strategic management. The desire by researchers and students to have a hands-on, dynamic learning experience has resulted in an environment where students, scholars, and entrepreneurs come together in the classroom and other venues to cultivate a unique entrepreneurial community. The effectiveness of these efforts is attested to by David Eccles School of Business programs that ranked in The Princeton Review and Entrepreneur magazine’s Top 25 entrepreneurial programs. Our goal is to increase the University of Utah’s international standing in research at the same time that we enhance student engagement and outcomes in entrepreneurship and strategic management.

Establishing a new department in Entrepreneurship and Strategy will serve these goals by facilitating more specialization and focus in curriculum and program development. Presently, the Management Department includes scholars from Organizational Behavior and, Entrepreneurship and Strategy, disciplines that differ dramatically in disciplinary orientation and pedagogical approach. Faculty in organizational behavior view such journals as the Journal of Applied Psychology, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Psychological Science, and Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes among others as top-tier outlets for their research. The most prestigious top-tier outlets for entrepreneurship and strategy scholars include Strategic Management Journal, Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, Management Science, Journal of Economic Behavior in Organizations, Journal of International Business Studies, and Journal of Business Venturing as well as disciplinary journals in sociology and economics. Organizational Behavior and Strategy also focus on different levels of analysis (individual and group versus firm, market, and industry for Entrepreneurship and Strategy), and utilize different research methods, designs, techniques and traditions. These differences materially influence decision-making within the Department. Retention, promotion, and tenure decisions are a case in point. It is incumbent on every faculty to render a carefully considered decision before any vote for retention, promotion, and tenure, yet the diversity of
research represented within the Department makes it difficult for members in different disciplines to effectively evaluate candidates. Hiring decisions also require disciplinary expertise that, again, is not common across department membership.

The disciplines represented within the existing department also differ greatly with respect to pedagogical traditions. Experiential learning in organizational behavior pedagogy relies heavily on in-class exercises, in addition to case discussion, where the goal is to reveal information about individual students and strengthen their skills at individual and group decision making and group and organization management. In contrast Strategy scholars rely heavily on the case method and discussion-based learning. Finally, experiential learning in entrepreneurship consists of field-testing of business concepts and, in many cases, the sale of actual products. Diversity in pedagogical traditions thus also makes it challenging for Department members to share and leverage pedagogical expertise across the Management Department as a whole.

As a result of these issues, members of Department of Management voted in March 2013 to support the creation of a new department to focus on entrepreneurship and strategic management within the David Eccles School of Business. Members believe the new department will allow for the alignment of research interests within each unit (The Department of Management and the Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy). This vote took place after extensive deliberations within the Department and College. Several meetings, as well as the final vote, were facilitated by Vice President Wildermuth. With the formation of the new department, scholars in organizational behavior and organization theory will be united around a common academic heritage in psychology and organizational behavior, a common set of journals and conferences, and a common set of research methods, techniques, and traditions. Pedagogical traditions will also be re-aligned. Scholars in Entrepreneurship and Strategy share a common disciplinary heritage in economics, read and review for a common set of journals, and share a common interest in organization and market-level phenomenon. Entrepreneurship and Strategy scholars also share a common interest in the emergence of new ventures and in the creation of new sources of economic wealth – questions that are not addressed in organizational behavior research. The new department will also allow for the alignment of incentives and the marshalling of the resources required to support new programs in entrepreneurship. These include the creation of an Interdisciplinary Certificate in Entrepreneurship, a new campus-wide program that was approved in Fall 2013, the “Entrepreneurship and Society” BLOCK U program that was
first offered in Fall 2013, and an interdisciplinary minor in Poverty Studies, a new program that will be offered Fall 2014.

The trend toward the separation of the Department of Management is evident at many Tier 1 Universities, including the Darden School at the University of Virginia, Purdue, Michigan, Minnesota, Stanford, UCLA, Berkeley, University of North Carolina, Washington University at St Louis, and Northwestern. Separation is also evident at other large schools, that are organized into semi-autonomous groups or divisions within a single Management Department; e.g., Wharton, NYU, and Texas.

Section III: Institutional Impact

The creation of a Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy requires the following accommodations:

- The formation of a new department, Entrepreneurship and Strategy
- The transfer of tenure of Professors Jay B. Barney, Lyda Bigelow, Karin Fladmoe-Lindquist, William S Hesterly, William S Schulze, and Todd R. Zenger (anticipated) from the Department of Management to the newly formed Department of Entrepreneurship & Strategy
- The transfer of affiliation of the following career line faculty to the new Department: Abe Bakhsheshy, Barclay Burns, Bonita Austin, & Jeffery Nielsen,
- The transfer of supervision over the existing Entrepreneurship Major, Entrepreneurship Minor and Interdisciplinary Certificate in Entrepreneurship programs from the Department of Management to the Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy.
- The transfer of supervision over a number of existing management classes from Management to the Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy. Those with the designation ENTP and STR would be transferred to the new department. Those courses with the prefix MGT will remain under the supervision of the Management Department. Representatives from the two groups appointed by the Dean of the David Eccles School of Business approved the assignment of classes reported in Appendix A.
- The appointment of a Department Chair for Entrepreneurship and Strategy
- The reclassification of several courses from MGT to ENTP or STRAT (these new subject headers have already been approved and will be effective 2004-15).
- The appointment of Entrepreneurship and Strategy Department members to the following School committees: College Council, Executive Education, Graduate and Undergraduate Curriculum
Committees, Ph.D. Committee, Research Committee. This request is consistent with The David Eccles School of Business charter, which allows each department representation on the above committees.

**Department Membership:**

Members of Entrepreneurship and Strategy
Tenure (track) Faculty:
Presidental Professor Jay Barney
Professor William Hesterly
Professor William Schulze
Professor Todd R. Zenger
Associate Professor Lyda Bigelow
Assistant Professor Robert Wuebker

Also, Todd Zenger, a professor at Washington University- St. Louis has accepted an offer to join the School’s faculty on July 1, 2014 (pending RPT approval, background check, etc.) at the rank of Professor.

Career-line Faculty:
Professor Lecturer Abe Bahksheshy
Assistant Professor/research Barclay Burns
Assistant Professor/lecturer Bonita Austin
Assistant Professor/lecturer Jeff Nielsen
Members of the Department of Management
Tenure (track) Faculty:
Presidential Professor Arthur Brief
Professor Jack Brittain
Professor Kristina Diekmann
Professor Harris Sondak
Associate Professor Brian Bonner
Associate Professor Kristin Smith-Crowe
Assistant Professor Flannery Stevens
Assistant Professor Elizabeth Tenney (new hire pending background check, Trustee approval etc.)

Career-line Faculty:
Associate Professor/Lecturer Katherine Canas
Assistant Professor/Lecturer Georgi Rausch
Assistant Professor/Lecturer Cole Holmes
Assistant Professor/Lecturer Lee Boam

Pedagogy
The proposed departments have agreed to supervision of their respective majors and electives. Please see Appendix A for a listing of the allocation of existing classes across Departments.

Please see Appendix B for description of Entrepreneurship Major & Minor, Interdisciplinary Certificate in Entrepreneurship, Business & Society Block U Program, as well as ancillary programs; e.g., The Foundry.

Advising
Student advising within the David Eccles School of Business is centralized and should not be affected by the creation of the new Department. Both the Organizational Behavior and Entrepreneurship and Strategy areas have their own faculty advisors to PhD students. Thus, student advising for Ph.D students will not be affected by the change.
Staff
One administrative assistant will be required to support the new Department. In the short-term, the budgetary impact will be negligible since the Management Department has been served by three administrative assistants. The Entrepreneurship and Strategy Department will require no additional funds for an administrative assistant.

Section IV: Finances
Dean Taylor Randall has committed the financial resources required to support the new Department. They are as follows:

- .50 FTE for an Administrative Assistant (no net additional costs)
- Startup costs associated with the creation of new department (letterhead, new materials for Advising and classroom support, and other associated expense).
- The Management Department will incur no new costs.
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# APPENDIX A: REALIGNMENT OF COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Prefix</th>
<th>New Prefix</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship And Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>Principles Of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>3410</td>
<td>Business Law: The Commercial Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>3430</td>
<td>International Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>Managing And Working In Groups And Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>Human Behavior In Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>3681</td>
<td>Honors Human Behavior In Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>Fundamentals Of Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>Business Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>3810</td>
<td>Business And Professional Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>4560</td>
<td>Small Business Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>4860</td>
<td>Managing Organizational Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt/Strat</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>International Management (cross listed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>4999</td>
<td>Management Honors Thesis/Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>Leading through emotional intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5510</td>
<td>Principles Of Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5520</td>
<td>Human Resource Development: Hr In Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5530</td>
<td>Competitive Advantage Through Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5590</td>
<td>Managing The Global Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>5700</td>
<td>Strategic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>5701</td>
<td>Honors Strategic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5710</td>
<td>Managing Organizational Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>5750</td>
<td>Profiles In Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>5760</td>
<td>Management Of Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>5765</td>
<td>Engineering And Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>5770</td>
<td>Business Discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>5780</td>
<td>Managing The Growing Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5810</td>
<td>Managing Diversity In Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5820</td>
<td>Consulting For Not-For-Profit Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5830</td>
<td>Leadership, Power, And Supervisory Behavior In Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5850</td>
<td>Current Topics In Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>5850</td>
<td>Management Of Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>5860</td>
<td>Entrepreneur Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5880</td>
<td>Management Department Daniels Fund Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiatives Internship Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>5910</td>
<td>Special Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6050</td>
<td>Laying The Foundations Of Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6051</td>
<td>Managing And Leading Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6052</td>
<td>Business Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6053</td>
<td>Advanced Writing For Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6054</td>
<td>Advanced Public Speaking For Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6070</td>
<td>Competitive Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6071</td>
<td>Competitive Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6150</td>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management In High Performance Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6151</td>
<td>Team Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6153</td>
<td>Negotiations And Conflict Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt/Strat 6154</td>
<td>Competitive Advantage Through Human Resources (cross listed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6155</td>
<td>Communications And Interpersonal Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6156</td>
<td>Advanced Leadership: Problem Solving In Business Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6170</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6171</td>
<td>Managing In The Global Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6175</td>
<td>Leading Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6253</td>
<td>Negotiations And Conflict Management Ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6310</td>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6500</td>
<td>Managerial Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6510</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6520</td>
<td>Enhancing Creativity In Business Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt/Strat 6530</td>
<td>Competitive Advantage Through People (cross listed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6540</td>
<td>Business Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6545</td>
<td>Leading Responsibly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6570</td>
<td>Power And Politics Within Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6580</td>
<td>Managing Groups And Teams: Advanced Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6590</td>
<td>Managing The Global Workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6710</td>
<td>Strategy And Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6720</td>
<td>Applications Of Business Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6730</td>
<td>Mergers, Acquisitions, And Alliance Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6740</td>
<td>Strategic Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6750</td>
<td>Business Turnarounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6765</td>
<td>Engineering And Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6780</td>
<td>Consulting To Not-For-Profit Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Mgt 6790</td>
<td>International Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6791</td>
<td>Global Strategic Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Strat 6792</td>
<td>Applied International Management &amp; Regional Contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt Entp 6810</td>
<td>Venture Foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Course Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>6820</td>
<td>Venture Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>6830</td>
<td>Applied Venture Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>6840</td>
<td>Venture Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>6850</td>
<td>Current Topics In Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>6860</td>
<td>Lassonde Venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>6890</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Field Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>6910</td>
<td>Special Study For Master's Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>6970</td>
<td>Thesis Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Entp</td>
<td>6980</td>
<td>Faculty Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7100</td>
<td>Research Design: Validity &amp; Methodological Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>Cross-Discipline Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices And Theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7310</td>
<td>Writing For Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>Seminar: Strategic Management Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>7610</td>
<td>Seminar: Strategic Management Theory Ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>7620</td>
<td>Special Topics In Strategic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>Seminar: Research Foundations Of Organizational Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7810</td>
<td>Seminar: Topics In Ob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7820</td>
<td>Seminar: Organization Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7910</td>
<td>Special Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7920</td>
<td>Directed Summer Phd Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7970</td>
<td>Thesis Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7980</td>
<td>Faculty Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>7990</td>
<td>Continuing Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Entrepreneurship Major

Overview

The undergraduate entrepreneurship major prepares students to follow trends, identify emerging opportunities, and pursue those possibilities through the creation of new products and services and/or with the creation of one’s own company. Students with an interest in entrepreneurship have the opportunity to hone their skills in business plan competitions and programs offered by the Pierre Lassonde Entrepreneur Center, or to immerse themselves in the Foundry – our pre-seed business incubator program.

Entrepreneurship Major Courses

The entrepreneurship major consists of four defined major sequence courses, one entrepreneurship elective requirement (see options below), one Global Perspectives I course, which must be taken within the School of Business; and one Global Perspectives II course, which will also satisfy the university International Requirement (IR).

Required courses include:

MGT 3700/5000 – Fundamentals of Entrepreneurship The purpose of this class is to examine entrepreneurship and the various ways in which it shapes the lives of individuals. This investigation occurs on three levels. First, students take a high-level conceptual look at entrepreneurship as a phenomenon and learn what it is, why it exists, and how it influences the fabric of everyday life. Second, instructors take a hands-on approach that is focused on teaching students to think like an entrepreneur. Lastly, since entrepreneurship is a team sport, instructor’s help students develop the networking skills they need to assemble a team, and the managerial skills needed to create and launch a business.

(MGT 3700 Typically offered: Spring/Fall - subject to change) - (MGT 5000 offered every semester)

FINAN 5300 – New Venture Finance This course will cover topics involved with raising capital for new and growing businesses. Topics include venture capital, private placements, initial public offerings (IPOs), mezzanine debt, preferred stock, warrants, and other forms of new venture financing. (Typically offered: Spring/Fall - subject to change)

MGT 5770 – Business Discovery The objective of this class is to lead each student, either individually or as a member of a team, through the practical experience of creating and rigorously testing the viability of a proposed business. The course begins with a review of different business models – ways of doing business – and then challenges each student to develop a viable business concept. A hands-on, team-based approach in which proposed ideas are refined, tested, and refined over successive stages is employed. Students often go on to further refine and test their ideas in the Foundry. Students also often compete in business plan...
competitions or engage in other activities sponsored by the Lassonde Center. (Typically offered Spring/Fall).

MKTG 4700 – Entrepreneurial Marketing The objective of this class is to prepare the student to successfully market new products and services. Students will be expected to learn the elements of the marketing plan, and to be able to craft an effective marketing plan for a variety of types of products and services. This class takes a hands-on approach, team-based approach, in which you are expected to design the studies and conduct the research needed to support a given plan. The class concludes with a presentation of your marketing plan to the class and invited professionals. (Typically offered Spring only – subject to change).

Upper Division Entrepreneurship Elective Options:

Note: Elective offerings vary from year to year and are concentrated in fall and spring semesters. The semesters indicated below are subject to change. For this reason, a planning session with an advisor is recommended upon admission to the major.

ACCTG 5310 – Taxation
ACCTG 5350 – Taxes and Management Decisions
ACCTG 5610 – Financial Reporting
ACCTG 5620 – Financial Statement Analysis
FINAN 5881 – Managing the Venture Process (Honors students only)
MKTG 4720 – Personal Selling
MGT 4560 – Small Business Management (suggested)
MGT 5750 – Profiles of Leadership
MGT 5850 – Special Topics: Profiles of Entrepreneurship
MGT 5850 – Special Topics: Management of Innovation
(If MGT 5850 taken for 1.5 credits, another 1.5 credits will need to be taken to satisfy a Management major elective course)

Entrepreneurship Major Application

Students interested in applying for the Entrepreneurship major will do so after being admitted to upper division and completing ECON 2010, MGT 3680, and MGT 3810 (or WRTG 3016 if taken prior to Fall 2012 (CW)). The admission committee considers the grades earned in these courses when reviewing student applications. Major applications can be found on the main School of Business website: www.business.utah.edu via “Undergraduate” -> “Advising” -> “Forms” -> “Application for Major Status in Entrepreneurship” (Major application details are subject to change).

Course Sequencing

Below are two suggested sequences of entrepreneurship courses once a student has been admitted to the entrepreneurship program. Individual schedules may vary based on previous coursework.
Four-semester course sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Semester 3</th>
<th>Semester 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGT 3700 – Entrepreneurship (Sp/Fall) OR MGT 5000 (Sp/Su/Fall)</td>
<td>MKTG4700-Entrepreneurial Mkgt (Sp)</td>
<td>ENTR Upper Division Elective (from approved list on page 1)</td>
<td>Global Perspectives II/ University International Requirement – (any University IR) see approved list on the “Class Schedule” for the respective semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives I</td>
<td>FINAN 5300 - New Venture Finance (Sp/Fall)</td>
<td>MGT 5770 – Business Discovery (Sp/Fall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One from the following: BUS 2900, ACCTG 5140, FINAN 4550, MKTG 4840, MGT 3430, MGT 4900, OIS 5620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three-semester course sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Semester 3</th>
<th>Semester 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGT 3700 – Entrepreneurship (Sp/Fall) OR MGT 5000 (Sp/Su/Fall)</td>
<td>MKTG4700-Entrepreneurial Mkgt (Sp)</td>
<td>ENTR Upper Division Elective (from approved list on page 1)</td>
<td>Global Perspectives II/ University International Requirement – (any University IR) see approved list on the “Class Schedule” for the respective semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives I</td>
<td>FINAN 5300 - New Venture Finance (Sp/Fall)</td>
<td>MGT 5770 – Business Discovery (Sp/Fall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One from the following: BUS 2900, ACCTG 5140, FINAN 4550, MKTG 4840, MGT 3430, MGT 4900, OIS 5620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Organizations and Opportunities

Case Competition Club is open to both undergraduate and graduate students. The club fields teams for prestigious case competitions all over the US, and hosts competitions on campus. In case competitions, DESB students have the opportunity put themselves into real world business situations, compete with students from other universities, and network with business professionals. The case competition is a great learning experience that hones students’ analytical and presentation skills, and lets DESB students apply a wide variety of business concepts. Student teams prep for competitions with the help of dedicated faculty members from all the DESB departments as well as students from previous years’ competitions. Faculty Adviser – Asst. Professor Bonita Austin

David Eccles School of Business Daniels Ethics Case Competition is a case competition solely for DESB undergraduate students. The competition encourages students to consider how businesses can act ethically despite having to operate with scarce resources. In the DESB Daniels Ethics competition, student teams face challenging ethical dilemmas and determine how managers can address these dilemmas while upholding their personal and company values. Student teams are encouraged to take advantage of faculty and peer coaching on ethical
frameworks, ethical decision-making, and case analysis. The competition judges are business professionals. Faculty Adviser – Asst. Professor Bonita Austin

Society for Human Resource Managers (SHRM) University of Utah Chapter is part of the world’s largest association devoted to human resource management. SHRM has more than 250,000 members in over 140 countries and 450 student chapters on university campuses. SHRM gives students an opportunity to meet regularly with local human resource professionals, learn about current industry issues and best practices, and network within the HR community. In addition to hosting guest speakers, chapters organize company tours, student conferences, workshops, and social events. Faculty Adviser – Dr. Darrell Coleman

Lassonde Entrepreneur Institute provides real world business experience to help young entrepreneurs understand and assume the risks of business ownership and management. Through this educational process, the Lassonde Institute hopes to inspire entrepreneurs to continue their education not only today but continually so they may be better prepared for tomorrow’s market. Student competitions run by the Lassonde Center include: Utah Entrepreneur Challenge, which inspires competitors from across Utah to write a full business plan for a chance to win $40,000; Opportunity Quest, a business summary competition for students across the state in which winners advance to the Utah Entrepreneur Challenge; and TechTitans, an idea competition for students from all disciplines. More information on the Lassonde Institute is available at: http://www.lassonde.utah.edu Director – Troy D’Ambrosiso

The Foundry is a community of like-minded students who want to launch a business and learn leadership skills that will last a lifetime. The Foundry offers an entrepreneurial practicum, providing hands-on business training by bringing entrepreneurs’ creative business ideas to reality, as well as providing a peer-reviewed forum for students, who give one another feedback and assistance through the trials of a start-up company. More information about The Foundry is available at: http://www.business.utah.edu/the-foundry Faculty Adviser - Dr. Rob Wuebker

University Venture Fund is the largest student-run private equity fund in the United States. It is an independent venture capital firm committed to improving the quality of entrepreneurial education for a diverse group of students at its participating universities. The fund is a collaborative effort among students, universities, and the professional investment community. Students raise capital, perform due diligence on venture capital opportunities, and make investments. Each year UVF hosts the University Private Equity Summit where business students from around North America gather to share best practices and learn from investment industry professionals. More information can be found online at: www.uventurefund.com Executive Director – Tom Stringham

Career Services

Success on the job market requires early preparation; therefore students should begin investing in career skills as early as the freshman year. Campus Career Services (801-581-6186) and the Business Career Management Center (801-581-3061) assist students in understanding vocational options, finding internships, and preparing for a successful career. Dana Sowby in Campus Career Services works closely with management majors.
**Internships for Major Credit**

The management internship allows declared management students the opportunity to learn new skills and gain career experience. Before students apply to the internship, they must complete MGT 3680 and confirm a GPA ≥ 3.3. Students who meet these requirements and are interested in completing an internship for course credit should contact Dana Sowby, dsowby@sa.utah.edu, at Career Services.

**Expected Learning Outcomes**

Expanded knowledge – A thorough understanding and critical analysis of the functional areas of business combined with an appreciation of the wisdom gained by studying a broad range of academic disciplines and by interacting with a diverse student body and faculty.

1. Effective communication – An ability to write and speak clearly and to work within group settings in order to effectively accomplish personal and professional goals.
2. Professional integrity – Guidance on the importance of values and ethics in business, which, in turn, helps students develop their own sense of professional integrity.
4. E-business savvy – A foundation in the business of technology and an ability to use technology for knowledge and analysis.
5. Entrepreneurial spirit – A provision of the right mix of traditional classroom experience and new venture idealism applied to small and large corporate settings.

**Outcome Assessment**

1. Expanded knowledge: the primary measures used for assessment in this area are student scores on ETS Business Major Exam. Our goal is that 50 percent of our students score in the top 25 percent nationally and 80 percent of University of Utah Entrepreneurship students score in the top 50 percent nationally.
2. Effective Communication: this is assessed through selected writing and presentation assignments. Communication specialists assess both writing and presentation skills against rubrics established in the School. Our goal is that 80 percent of our students can meet the medium standards in the rubrics.
3. Professional integrity: this is assessed through the ethics portion of the ETS Business Major Exam. Our goal is for our students to score above the national average on this section.
4. Global perspective: this is assessed via the ETS Business Major Exam. Our goal is for our students to score above the national average on this section.
5. E-Business Savvy: all business students must pass a test on information technology before admittance into upper division classes.
6. Entrepreneurial Spirit: We measure the number of students who participate in Lassonde Institute activities such as the Foundry, Tech Titans, etc. We also track start-ups, revenue generated from student-founded startups, and jobs formed from student-founded startups. We expect all entrepreneurship majors to have hands-on involvement in one or more of the above programs.
APPENDIX C: Entrepreneurship Minor
(Open to business and non-business majors)

Prerequisites
___ ACCTG 2600: Survey of Accounting
___ BUS 1050: Foundations of Business
___ ECON 2010: Microeconomics
___ IS 2010: Computer Essentials
___ OIS 2340: Business Statistics
___ B or better in one of the following:
    MATH 1050: College Algebra
    MATH 1090: College Algebra for Business
    MATH 1100 or higher

Core Courses*
___ FINAN 3040: Financial Management
___ FINAN 5300: New Venture Finance
___ MGT 5000: Foundations of Entrepreneurship
___ MGT 5770: Business Plan Development
___ MKTG 4700: Entrepreneurial Marketing
    (Prerequisite MKTG 3010)

Expected Learning Outcomes
1. Students gain exposure to fundamentals in the different business fundamentals.
2. Students gain fundamentals in planning, financing, marketing, and managing new ventures.

Outcomes Assessment
1. Business Fundamentals: Students achieve passing grades on final exams in the prerequisite business classes (ACCTG, BUS, IS, OIS).
APPENDIX D: Interdisciplinary Certificate in Entrepreneurship

The David Eccles School of Business offers an undergraduate Interdisciplinary Certificate in Entrepreneurship designed for non-business majors. The Certificate’s innovative and highly collaborative curriculum is intended to complement any major, and teaches students how to create, test, and launch new ventures.

The David Eccles School of Business has expertise in teaching entrepreneurship and has distilled lessons from its nationally ranked programs to create the need of the creative non-business student. The partner college will draw on faculty and alumni resources to create classes that focus on the particular challenges and opportunities faced in each field or profession. Our goal is to graduate students who are better positioned for success following graduation.

Required Courses
MGT 1010 – Entrepreneurship & Society
MGT 1020 – Entrepreneurship and the Scientific Method
MGT 2010 – Entrepreneurship and Finance
MGT 2020 – Entrepreneurship and Marketing
Two courses with a business emphasis from another college.
ENTP 5770 – Venture Discovery (Capstone)
APPENDIX E: BLOCK U: Entrepreneurship & Society

A wealth of studies from around the world document an astonishing fact: at least half of you WILL BE an entrepreneur for some period of time in your life. Many of you will be self-employed and work as artists, contractors, consultants, or in other professions. Others will start and operate a small business with three to five employees. On average, about 1/3rd of those who try will succeed in establishing an “on-going business.” If you are interested in understanding yourself and society through the lens of entrepreneurship, this BlockU is for you.

Your BlockU experience is designed to help you be successful taking 15 credit hours per semester — which will help you finish your degree sooner! In many cases, participating in two consecutive BlockU semesters will clear your General Education requirements. You will be enrolled in a small learning community course and two additional required courses. These courses are taught by exceptional faculty who will help you integrate your learning experiences. You will have access to peer mentors, a dedicated advisor, a dedicated librarian, and a student success advocate.

To learn more about BlockU or to schedule an appointment with the Entrepreneurship & Society BlockU Advisor, please contact Lena May-Fraser at lena.mayfraser@utah.edu.

Step 1:
Sign up for the Entrepreneurship & Society BlockU Seminar plus the 2 other required courses.
Contact Andrea Haag at blocku@utah.edu for the MGT 1015 class number.

Classes
MGT 1020  Entrepreneurship & Society BlockU
ECON 2010  Principles of Microeconomics
COMM 3030  Communication & Social Responsibility

Step 2:
Select 2 additional courses from the General Education options. See your advisor.
January 23, 2014

David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School
302 Park Building
201 South Presidents Circle
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9016

Dear Dean Kieda,

I am writing in support of the formation of a new department within the David Eccles School of Business. Specifically, we propose to split our current Management Department and form a new Entrepreneurship & Strategy Department. I concur with the justifications for the new department that are outlined in the proposal. An Entrepreneurship and Strategy Department is highly synergistic with the emphasis on innovation and entrepreneurship at the levels of the State, University, and School. The proposed department also aligns well with the mission and activities of the Lassonde Institute. A department dedicated to entrepreneurship and strategy will likely enhance our ability to attract and develop outstanding scholars in these areas. A second reason for the split is that the Management Department has evolved into an aggregation of scholars that belong to somewhat disparate disciplines. They differ in disciplinary training (e.g. psychology versus economics and sociology), research methods, and pedagogical approaches. Splitting the Management Department into two more specialized departments will likely result in better hiring in both areas as well as more effective development of faculty and curricula.

The Management Department went through a lengthy process in 2012-13 that involved reviewing their organizational structure and the structural options available to the Department. Vice President Wildermuth and I were both extensively involved in facilitating these discussions. At the end of this process, members of the Management Department overwhelmingly agreed that splitting off the Entrepreneurship and Strategy faculty into a new department was the best option. The curriculum of the two groups is already quite distinct with the requirements for our Entrepreneurship major falling completely in the courses taught by E&S faculty while those required for the Management major fall mostly within what will be the Management Department following the split.

Both of the departments should be strong departments following the split. Stellar senior faculty form the core of each. In the E&S group, particularly, we have an opportunity to form one of the best faculties in the world. Jay Barney is one of the five most cited scholars in the world, and Todd Zenger (who has accepted an offer to join us July 1 from Washington University-St. Louis) is also widely acknowledged as one of the very best scholars in his field.
The budgetary implications of the split are minimal. We will not have to add any administrative support. Some of the current administrative assistants will be reassigned from Management to E&S and will not require replacement. All departments within the School rely upon centralized admissions, advising, and career counseling. Thus, there should be little impact to our cost in these areas. We will have two department chairs where before we had one. However, we have recently focused on restructuring the chair role to focus more on faculty development and less on other administrative activities. Each faculty member will now have a chair who is more familiar with the individual faculty member’s area of research and teaching. Thus, our hope is that faculty development will be enhanced by the formation of the new department.

In summary, I strongly support the formation of the Entrepreneurship & Strategy Department. I believe that the new department will strengthen what is already a world class platform of programs and curriculum in the areas of entrepreneurship and strategy.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Taylor Randall
Dean, David Eccles School of Business
January 23, 2014

David B. Kieda
Dean, The Graduate School
302 Park Building
201 South Presidents Circle
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9016

Subject: Letter of Support for Formation of Entrepreneurship & Strategy Department

Dear Dean Kieda,

I am writing in support of the proposal to form a new department in Entrepreneurship and Strategy. There is a close relationship between the activities of the Lassonde Institute and the scholarly and curricular efforts of the faculty who will be part of a proposed E&S Department. Both organizations focus on business startups as well as managing innovation. I see clear synergistic advantages to having both an E&S Department and the Lassonde Institute. The Lassonde Institute provides many hands-on opportunities for faculty and students while the proposed E&S Department would focus more on the academic side of entrepreneurship and innovation. Moreover, the efforts of the Lassonde Institute provide a fertile ground for faculty members interested in entrepreneurship and innovation.

The new Department also fits well with the economic goals and climate of Utah. Given the relative absence of large corporations in Utah, starting successful new businesses is particularly crucial to our economic future. Having a department that is focused on this essential activity promises to accelerate the efforts of the Lassonde Institute in developing entrepreneurs.

The E&S faculty have impressive credentials in areas that overlap with the Institute's mission. I am confident that the mutual benefit to both the Lassonde Institute and the proposed Entrepreneurship and Strategy Department will come to fruition.

Sincerely,

Troy D'Ambrosio
Executive Director
Lassonde Entrepreneurship Institute
www.lassonde.utah.edu
David Eccles School of Business
105 Ft. Douglas Blvd
Salt Lake City UT 84113
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The S.J. Quinney of Law and the David Eccles School of Business are proposing a dual Master of Real Estate Development (“MRED”)/J.D. program. Both schools believe that the combination of these two degrees is quite synergistic and exemplifies the best in cross-disciplinary education. Although many of the graduates will work in a variety of business settings, the field of real estate development in particular is very legal and contract intensive. Both a law graduate and an MRED graduate who takes advantage of the MRED/JD dual program will have a much greater understanding of both real estate development practices and the legal issues and problems involved in this area. Because the proposed program is a “dual” program that permits a student to seek both the MRED and JD simultaneously, both schools do not anticipate that the proposal will require any additional administrative structures, or faculty.

SECTION I: THE REQUEST

The S.J. Quinney College of Law and the David Eccles School of Business request approval to offer a dual Master of Real Estate Development/J.D. degree, effective Fall 2015.

The faculty of the School of Business approved the dual MRED/JD program proposal, as set out immediately below, on February 21, 2014. Attached is a letter of support from the Dean of the School of Business for the proposal.

The College Council of the College of Law approved the adoption of the dual MRED/J.D. program, as set out immediately below, on November 5, 2013. Attached is a letter of support from the Dean of the College of Law for the proposal.

Dual MRED/JD Program Proposal

a. Reduction in Overall Credit Requirement

The J.D./MRED program is based on the assumption that, because there is complementary intellectual benefit from studying law and real estate in a coordinated program, a student enrolled in the dual degree program should be allowed to earn both degrees in less time and with a lower overall credit requirement than were that student enrolled in each school or program independently. Accordingly, students enrolled in the dual degree program may count up to 12 credit hours of College of Law class work towards fulfilling the 42 credit-hour requirement of the MRED degree, and may count up to 12 credit hours of MRED class work towards fulfilling the 88 credit-hour requirement of the J.D. degree. Upon completion of both programs, the student earns two separate degrees, a J.D. degree awarded by the College of Law and an MRED degree awarded by the School of Business. Tuition is due to the respective college from which credit is granted.

In order for the MRED Program to facilitate the reduction in overall credit requirements, the following courses, which total 12 credit hours, are waived for J.D. students enrolled in the J.D./MRED program: (1) the Land Use Law course (3 credit hours); (2) the Due Diligence course (3 credit hours) and (3) six elective credit hours. Alternative courses may be waived with MRED program director approval.
Because the overall credit requirements for both degrees are reduced by 24 credit hours, a student enrolled in the dual degree program can expect to complete the two degrees in approximately 8 semesters of full-time study. However, as noted in Section c. below, an MRED student who enrolls in the law program after matriculating in the MRED program will have limitations imposed on those MRED credit hours that can count towards the law degree.

b. Application to the J.D./MRED Dual Degree Program

Applicants interested in this program must submit separate admission applications to the College of Law and to the Business School. Each program has its own independent admissions standards, and admission to one program does not ensure admission to the other.

Applicants interested in pursuing the J.D/MRED dual degree are encouraged to apply to both programs at the same time. Nonetheless, a law student may apply to the MRED program (and thus be eligible to earn a dual degree) prior to completion of the first year of law school. As noted in Section c. below, an MRED student who enrolls in the law program after matriculating in the MRED program will have limitations imposed on those MRED credit hours that can count towards the law degree.

c. Completion of First Year at the College of Law as Prerequisite for Law Credit for MRED courses.

The College of Law will not give law credit for an MRED course unless the applicant has first successfully completed the first year at the College of Law. This prerequisite means that applicants who start the dual degree program by doing work in the MRED program before completing the first year of law school must delay taking the specific MRED courses they intend to count towards their 12 hours of law credit until after they complete the first year of law school.

The College of Law strongly recommends that an applicant not take any MRED courses during the first year of law school. The first year of law school is demanding.

d. Enrollment in the J.D./MRED Dual Degree Program and Appointment of Faculty Advisors in Both Programs.

A student who has been admitted to both the J.D. and MRED programs and who wishes to pursue the dual degree program opportunity must file a Dual Degree Enrollment Form with the Registrar of each program. Upon filing this form and its being approved by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the College of Law and the MRED Program Director in the School of Business, an Advisor will be appointed in each program to assist the student in planning an overall program of study that takes advantage of the goals of the dual degree program.

e. Requirements for Cross-Over Course Credit.

To earn academic credit towards a law degree for coursework completed in the MRED program: (1) an MRED course must be pre-approved by the College of Law Faculty Advisor, and that approval must be indicated on the “Request to Count MRED Course Credit Toward J.D. Degree” Form; and (2) the student must receive a grade of 3.0 (“B”) or higher in the course.

To earn academic credit towards the MRED degree for coursework completed in the College of Law: (1) the course may not be part of the law school’s first-year curriculum; (2) the student must receive a grade of 3.0
("B") or higher in the course; and (3) the course must be approved by the MRED Academic Advisor. A list of pre-approved law school courses follows.

Corporate Financial Transactions (loan documentation), Drafting Contracts, Business Organizations (deals with organization of different forms of business), Drafting – Real Estate, Business Planning, Real Estate Transactions and Finance, Federal Income Tax (cover depreciation, 1031, 1033, gains and losses from sale of property), Partnership Tax, Corporate Tax, Conservation Easements, Land Use Control, Outdoor Recreation Law, Environmental Law, Environmental Conflict Resolution, Environmental Practice (clinic), Trust & Estates, Estate Planning, Seminar-Takings, Water Law. This list is subject to change due to changes in curriculum and scheduling.

f. Notification to Associate Dean for Academic Affairs of Enrollment Only in MRED Courses

A student in the J.D./MRED Dual Degree Program who during any semester is enrolled only in MRED courses shall notify the law school’s Associate Dean for Academic Affairs of that fact.

g. Notification to MRED program Advisor of Enrollment Only in College of Law Courses

A student in the J.D./MRED Dual Degree Program who during any semester is enrolled only in College of Law courses shall notify the MRED Program Advisor of that fact.

h. College of Law Seminar Paper Requirement

The College of Law requires that every student complete a seminar. This requirement will not be waived for students in the J.D./MRED Dual Degree Program, and no MRED research paper will satisfy this law school requirement.

i. Professional Projects Class

The MRED Program requires that every student complete the Professional Projects or Capstone class. This requirement will not be waived for students in the J.D./MRED Dual Degree Program, and no JD research paper or project will satisfy this business school requirement.

j. Completion of Both Programs Required for Award of Each Degree

A student enrolled in the J.D./MRED Dual Degree Program who wishes to count credits taken in one program toward fulfilling the degree in the other program, must complete all requirements of both programs before either degree will be awarded. In the event a student elects to pursue a single degree after being accepted into the dual degree program, both the law school and the business school must be notified and all of the requirements of the elected program must be met.

SECTION II: NEED

The S.J. Quinney College of Law and the David Eccles School of Business believe that a dual degree program in which students may earn both the Juris Doctor (JD) and MRED degrees in four years will be an important complement to both schools' programs. Recognizing the close relationship between the business and legal communities, the program helps real estate developers, business managers, corporate counsel and lawyers understand one another's concerns, constraints, and objectives in real estate development.

The combination of these two degrees is quite synergistic and exemplifies the best in cross-disciplinary education. Although the graduates will work in a variety of business settings, the field of real estate development in particular is very legal and contract intensive. Both a law graduate and an MRED graduate
who takes advantage of the MRED/JD dual program will have a much greater understanding of both real
estate development practices and the legal issues and problems involved in this area.

There has been a recent increase in demand by students wanting to take courses in both programs. Law
students, for example have been increasingly taking courses offered by the MRED program. Alumni involved
in both the College of Law and the School of Business have also been highly supportive of the dual degree
concept and believe that there will be demand for the program.

SECTION III: INSTITUTIONAL IMPACT

The existing institutional and administrative structures at both the College of Law and School of Business are
prepared to support the proposed dual degree program. Already, both the College of Law and the School of
Business offer dual degrees that have not resulted in any substantive increase in the need for resources.
Currently, the College of Law has the following dual degree programs: J.D./M.B.A., J.D./M.P.A., J.D./M.P.P.
and J.D./M.S.W. The School of Business has the following dual degree programs: MBA/MS, MBA/JD and
MBA/Master of Healthcare Administration.

The schools anticipate that from past experience, no new organizational structures will be needed to deliver
the program. Both schools believe that it has the institutional, organizational and administrative structures in
place to absorb the additional students that will enter the respective schools because of the dual degree
option. From past experience, there is only a nominal amount of additional work on the part of the marketing,
admissions and advising personnel at the respective schools to support the new dual degree program.

For the same reasons expressed immediately above, each school has sufficient faculty, staff, classroom space
and equipment to support the proposed dual degree program. Please see the attached letters of support from
the deans of both the College of Law and the School of Law. Also attached are letters from the College of Law
Law Library and the J. Willard Marriot Library that affirm that no additional library resources will be required.

SECTION IV: FINANCES

Both schools believe that providing this dual degree will potentially result in increased enrollments for both
schools, although due to the specialized nature of the program, this increased enrollment may be relatively
modest. As discussed immediately above, the College of Law and the School of Business do not anticipate
any additional costs for implementing the program (other than nominal additional costs incurred by marketing,
admissions and advising personnel). Both schools anticipate that each has the administrative capacity to
absorb any of this additional administrative work.
March 17, 2014

Graduate Council
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Faculty Senate
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Re: Letter of Support for Dual Masters of Real Estate Development ("MRED")/J.D. Program

Dear Colleagues:

Thank you for the opportunity to express my support for the proposed dual MRED/J.D. program. The College of Law believes that this will meet a growing interest in real estate on the part of our law students. We also believe that the real estate courses that the law students will take at the business school will enhance their legal education and lead to greater employment opportunities.

The combination of these two degrees is quite synergistic and exemplifies the best in cross-disciplinary education. Although many of our graduates will work in a variety of business settings, the field of real estate development in particular is very legal and contract intensive. A law graduate who takes advantage of the MRED/JD dual program will have a much greater understanding of real estate development practices and issues, enabling her to better anticipate potential legal issues and problems.

Our assessment about the proposed program has also been echoed by several or our alumni. They see the dual degree as very innovative and a terrific addition to our curriculum.

Representatives from the College of Law and the School of Business have been in discussion about the program since last spring and have thoughtfully developed its structure and purpose. The law faculty and our college council have also carefully vetted the proposal and have unanimously approved it.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Adler
March 12, 2014

Graduate Council
Academic Senate Executive Committee
Faculty Senate

Re: Dual Juris Doctorate and Master of Real Estate Development Degree Proposal

To Whom It May Concern:

Over the past several months the David Eccles School of Business (DESB) and the S.J. Quinney College of Law have been collaborating on a proposal for a dual Juris Doctorate (JD) and Master of Real Estate Development (MRED) degree. The proposal has been reviewed and vetted by the MRED program director, the DESB finance department chair, the associate dean over graduate affairs, the DESB Graduate and College Councils, and was approved unanimously by the DESB faculty. The unanimous approval was due to several factors, including the following:

- Synergy between the legal and real estate professions
- Financial benefit to students interested in obtaining both degrees
- Enhanced appeal of both programs
- Potential for increased enrollment with little, if any, additional cost
- Demand from current students

Based on the foregoing factors, the dual JD/MRED degree has my full endorsement.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Taylor Randall
March 13, 2013

Graduate Council  
Faculty Senate  
201 S. Presidents Cir. RM 302  
University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dear Council,

The University of Utah Marriott Library is pleased to offer support for the proposed dual MRED/J.D. program. Because the curriculum supporting the program will principally be from existing courses, our current collections should already have sufficient size and depth to satisfy the needs of most students and faculty within the dual program.

The Marriott Library’s collection of scholarly books provides excellent and ongoing support for these areas, and the Library counts over fifty journals in our holdings dealing with real estate business or real estate law. We also subscribe to many databases that will support the dual program, such as Business Source Premier, LexisNexis, the Legal Collection Database, Scopus, Standard & Poor’s NetAdvantage, the Avery Index, Greenfile, Sociological Abstracts, TRID, and the Web of Knowledge.

Additionally, we continue to encourage faculty to work with subject librarians to build up collections in support specific disciplines. We are usually able to order any books necessary to support classes and faculty research. We can also modify our journal subscriptions to reflect current teaching and research needs. As the scholarly communication landscape continues to evolve, new options for information access often exist beyond traditional book purchases and journal subscriptions. We would be pleased to work with faculty to identify and evaluate the most efficient and effective means available to provide the information needed by faculty and students in the MRED/J.D. program.

Librarians also offer class presentations and one-to-one consultations with students and faculty and can help those in the dual program to find the most relevant sources for their classes and research.

We look forward to working with the faculty and students in this new program.

Yours truly,

Rick Anderson  
Associate Dean  
J. Willard Marriott Library

Catherine Soehner  
Associate Dean  
J. Willard Marriott Library
March 17, 2014

Graduate Council
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Faculty Senate
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Re: Letter of Support for Dual Masters of Real Estate Development (“MRED”)/J.D. Program

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am writing to express my support for the proposed dual MRED/J.D. program. I know that the faculty of the law school supports the dual degree program and believes that it will provide a valuable educational opportunity to students interested in both law and real estate.

I am confident that the law library will be able to meet the resource needs of students and faculty involved in this program.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Melissa J. Bernstein
Library Director and Professor of Law
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Section I: Request

The College of Nursing (NURS) at the University of Utah proposes that the following emphasis be transferred from a Master’s of Science (MS) degree to the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degree and transcripted as such.

Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner

The DNP degree will soon be the required degree for clinically practicing advanced practice nurses (APRNs). The American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) has mandated that the current level of preparation necessary for advanced nursing practice be moved from the master's degree to the doctoral level by the year 2015. The institute of Medicine’s 2002 report on Health Professions Education recommended strategies for restructuring all clinical education in the health professions to be consistent with the principles of 21st century health systems. These recommendations stress that health science students and all working professionals develop and maintain proficiency in 5 core areas: delivering patient-centered care, working as part of interdisciplinary teams, practicing evidence-based medicine, focusing on quality improvement, and using information technology. In compliance with these national standards, The University of Utah College of Nursing has led the State of Utah and Intermountain West by designing curriculum and programs of study so that the DNP is the terminal degree for nursing students who study advanced practice.

Doctoral level education prepares individuals for advanced nursing roles in a variety of specialty tracks. Graduates with a Doctor of Nursing Practice will:

- Use advanced knowledge and skills to develop/implement and advanced nursing role in a specialized area.
- Integrate advanced knowledge and skills to provide high quality care for individuals, families, and population groups.
- Exercise leadership to influence positively the development, implementation, and evaluation of health care delivery and health policy.
- Demonstrate professionalism as evidenced by participation and leadership in professional organizations, community service, and commitment to lifelong learning.
- Promote interdisciplinary collaboration toward the improvement of health care delivery, education, research, and service.

DNP Requirements include the following:

- 9 semesters of full-time study
- Estimated 75 to 90 credits (from one of the specialty tracks)
- Approximately 1000 hours of practicum and residency experience
All students who are currently in the Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner emphasis as a Master’s of Science degree will be grandfathered to continue their education and receive the Master of Science degree with an emphasis in Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner. The last cohort of students to enter the Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner emphasis as a Master’s of Science degree began the program Fall 2013.

The College of Nursing accepted the first cohort of Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner emphasis as a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree Fall 2013. Therefore we are asking for a retroactive approval for this emphasis.

Section II: Need

Changing the Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner emphasis from a Master’s of Science degree to a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree keeps the University of Utah, College of Nursing within the mandate from the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN).

Section III: Institutional Impact

This area of emphasis was originally set up as a Master in Science degree. It has currently been modified and approved by the College of Nursing Masters and DNP Curriculum Committee to include the requirements for a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree. This area of emphasis has been in place for the Master of Science. Therefore, adding this area of emphasis as a DNP degree will have no impact to the College of Nursing or the University of Utah.

Section IV: Finances

There will be no financial impact on the College of Nursing or the University of Utah. Adding this area of emphasis will allow for more efficient and accurate record keeping for the purposes of student services, accreditation, and grant writing.

Section V: Program Curriculum

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

All Program Courses (with New Courses in Bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Prefix and Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6000</td>
<td>Evidence Based Practice I</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6007</td>
<td>Advanced Pathophysiology Across the Lifespan</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6060</td>
<td>US Health Care: Systems &amp; Policy</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6300</td>
<td>Foundations of Individual Psychotherapy</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6004</td>
<td>Introduction to Information &amp; Information Tech</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6310</td>
<td>Mood and Anxiety Disorders</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6316</td>
<td>Child/Adolescent Mental Health Assessment and Treatment</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6355</td>
<td>Advanced Pathophysiology of Mental Illness</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6001</td>
<td>Professional Role and Collaboration</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6006</td>
<td>Advanced Pharmacotherapeutics Across the Lifespan</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6772</td>
<td>Quality Improvement in Health Care</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7020</td>
<td>Advanced Physical Assessment &amp; Health Promotion Across the Lifespan</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6240</td>
<td>Clinical Genetics</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7025</td>
<td>Introduction to Epidemiology &amp; Population Science</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7340</td>
<td>Group &amp; Family Therapy</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7360</td>
<td>Mental Health Assessment &amp; Therapeutic Modalities in the Elderly</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6322</td>
<td>Serious &amp; Persistent Mental Illness</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7320</td>
<td>Psychiatric/Mental Health Practicum I</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7500</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Practice II</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug Ut School on Alcohol &amp; Other Drug Dependencies</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 6369</td>
<td>Advanced Psychopharmacology</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7325</td>
<td>Psychiatric/Mental Health Practicum II</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7701</td>
<td>DNP Scholarly Project I</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7015</td>
<td>Leadership &amp; Advocacy</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7330</td>
<td>Psychiatric/Mental Health Practicum III</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7361</td>
<td>Advanced Topics in Mental Health</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7702</td>
<td>DNP Scholarly Project II</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUHSC 6700</td>
<td>IPE Simulation of Ambulatory Patient Care</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUHSC 6800</td>
<td>IPE Disaster Preparedness &amp; Response</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7335</td>
<td>Psychiatric/Mental Health Practicum IV</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7510</td>
<td>Social Context of Medicine &amp; Public Health</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 7703</td>
<td>DNP Scholarly Project III</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total 82**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elective Courses</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track/Options</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Credits 82**
Program Schedule

Fall
NURS 6000 Evidence Based Practice I
NURS 6007 Advanced Pathophysiology Across the Lifespan
NURS 6060 US Health Care: Systems & Policy
NURS 6300 Foundations of Individual Psychotherapy

Spring
NURS 6004 Introduction to Information & Information Tech
NURS 6310 Mood and Anxiety Disorders
NURS 6316 Child/Adolescent Mental Health Assessment and Treatment
NURS 6355 Advanced Pathophysiology of Mental Illness

Summer
NURS 6001 Professional Role and Collaboration
NURS 6006 Advanced Pharmacotherapeutics Across the Lifespan
NURS 6772 Quality Improvement in Health Care
NURS 7020 Advanced Physical Assessment & Health Promotion Across the Lifespan

Fall
NURS 6240 Clinical Genetics
NURS 7025 Introduction to Epidemiology & Population Science
NURS 7340 Group & Family Therapy
NURS 7360 Mental Health Assessment & Therapeutic Modalities in the Elderly

Spring
NURS 6322 Serious & Persistent Mental Illnesses
NURS 7320 Psychiatric/Mental Health Practicum I
NURS 7500 Evidence-Based Practice II

Summer
Alcohol/Drug Ut School on Alcohol & Other Drug Dependencies
NURS 6369 Advanced Psychopharmacology
NURS 7325 Psychiatric/Mental Health Practicum
NURS 7701 DNP Scholarly Project I

Fall
NURS 7015 Leadership & Advocacy
NURS 7330 Psychiatric/Mental Health Practicum III
NURS 7361 Advanced Topics in Mental Health
NURS 7702 DNP Scholarly Project II
UUHSC 6700 IPE Simulation of Ambulatory Patient Care
UUHSC 6800 IPE Disaster Preparedness & Response

Spring
NURS 7335 Psychiatric/Mental Health Practicum IV
NURS 7510 Social Context of Medicine & Public Health
NURS 7703 DNP Scholarly Project III
March 17, 2014

David Kieda, Dean
The Graduate School
302 Park Building
University of Utah (CAMPUS)

Dean Kieda:

Please find enclosed a proposal from the College of Nursing requesting a program change from master’s emphasis to Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) emphasis for our Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner program. The faculty within the College of Nursing have reviewed and unanimously endorsed this proposal within our standing committee structure in 2007. The DNP program for all Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN) programs has been presented and approved throughout the University system and approved by the Board of Regents in April, 2007. Approval for this specific program of study was obtained from the MS & DNP Program Committee in November, 2012.

Since 2007, we have transitioned each of our six APRN programs from the master to the DNP degree. This is the last program to make the transition and the only program that has required a separate Graduate Council approval process in order to change.

This proposal is based on a thoughtful consideration of the health care market, potential students, other stakeholders and employers projected needs. This move to the DNP as entry into practice is supported by the Institute of Medicine and the American Association of Colleges of Nursing recommendations to increase the educational level of the nursing workforce and accelerate their educational trajectory.

Please let me know if you need any additional information as the Graduate Council reviews the program change materials,

Sincerely,

Patricia Gonce Morton, PhD, RN, FAAN
Dean and Professor
Louis H. Peery Endowed Chair
Robert Wood Johnson Executive Nurse Fellow
Recommendations to
Save on Student Textbook Costs

Prepared by

The Adhoc Senate Committee on
Student Textbook Savings

April 27, 2014
Executive Summary

The cost of college textbooks is an unreasonable burden on many students, and adds considerably to the expense of their education. The difficulties that many students experience in paying for course materials can significantly affect their success as students. Student surveys indicate that about 70% of students have elected to forego purchasing a required textbook during their college career; and, about 30% report they frequently do so. Student surveys have also found that 49% of students take fewer courses per semester due to high textbook costs, 27% of students drop a course because of a high-cost textbook, and 17% of students fail a course due to their inability to afford the required textbook.

The cost of textbooks has gained national attention in recent years. The Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA), passed by the 110th U.S. Congress, includes several provisions relating to textbooks. In addition, a number of state legislatures, including that of Utah, have undertaken aggressive action to lower textbook costs. Numerous universities and colleges around the nation have initiatives in place to save students money on textbooks.

In 2013, the University of Utah Academic Senate, under the leadership of Allyson Mower, established the AdHoc Senate Committee on Student Textbook Savings to explore ways of saving University of Utah students $500 per year on textbooks. The Committee examined available research, compiled institutional data, conducted a student survey, and formulated recommendations which are summarized below in order of the time and effort required to implement them.

1. **Move toward using low-cost versions of existing materials.** Immediate savings on student textbook costs can be realized by promoting practices that allow students to use less expensive textbook options, such as used textbooks, rental textbooks, and library copies. Raising awareness of textbook costs and alternative options is critical, and requires support by the administration and libraries. Faculty cooperation will also play a large role.

2. **Encourage the adoption of available open course materials.** Textbook costs can be lowered by promoting the use of free, open textbooks and other open educational resources (OER), instead of requiring students to purchase commercial textbooks. Administrative and library support is needed to assist faculty in the adoption of OER.

3. **Support the development of new open course materials.** Textbook costs can be lowered by creating free, open textbooks specifically written for courses offered at the University of Utah. An example of success in this regard is “Open2010”, an open textbook for WRTG 2010, that currently saves an estimated $500,000 per year on textbook costs. The faculty’s willingness to author open textbooks coupled with administrative support is needed.

4. **Create a university body to realize the long-term vision.** The University should create a new administrative position or assign responsibility to an existing administrator with authority to oversee the implementation of the above recommendations. A standing committee with representation from the relevant stakeholders (students, faculty, librarians, bookstore staff, etc.) should also be created.
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2 Purpose

The AdHoc Senate Committee on Student Textbook Savings was formulated in December 2013 by the Academic Senate, under the leadership of Allyson Mower, with the charge of recommending ways to save students at the University of Utah $500/year on textbooks. The Committee was asked to report back to the Academic Senate Executive Committee on April 21, 2014. The Committee met a total of nine times during the Spring semester of 2014. This report represents the outcome of those discussions.

3 Introduction

The college textbook market is unique to most other markets in that the primary consumers (students) do not actually choose the product that they purchase. Textbook publishers do not market their products directly to their consumers, but rather to faculty who are responsible for deciding which materials are required by students. Publishers often provide free samples to faculty to promote their products. Because faculty do not actually purchase these products, a disconnect tends to exist between faculty and students with regard to the economics of the textbook industry. Unlike a typical market, no checks and balances exist between consumers and providers in the textbook industry. In this manner, students constitute a captive market, which has lead to a dramatic inflation of textbook prices by publishers. As shown in Figure 1, new textbook prices have risen at a rate of about 6% per year, compared to overall consumer prices that have only increased by about 2% per year (GAO, 2013). This translates into an 800% increase in textbook costs over the past 30 years, which is a faster rate than medical services at 575%, new home prices at 325%, and the consumer price index at 250%, based on data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (Perry, 2012).
Interestingly, five textbook companies control more than 80% of the $8.8 billion textbook publishing market, giving them near market monopoly and protecting them from serious competition (Allen 2013b). In 2012, the top three textbook publishers, McGraw-Hill, Wiley, and Pearson, had profit margins of 25%, 15%, and 10%, respectively (Band 2013). In the past decade, the profit margin of firms in the publishing sector has increased 2.5%. Without the ability of students to choose more affordable options, publishers are able to drive textbook prices higher without fear of repercussion. There are few other organized markets in the United States that are similar, prescription drugs being one.

In order to institute cost savings on textbooks, it is important to understand several interrelated issues including: (i) the different modalities that exist for distributing curricular materials, (ii) the resources available for obtaining educational materials, (iii) the influence of technological advances on education, (iv) student behaviors and attitudes about textbooks and textbook costs, and (v) faculty behaviors and attitudes about textbooks and textbook costs. Table I lists common options for obtaining curricular materials. Although students may lower their costs by purchasing used textbooks, digital textbooks, or renting materials, the price of new textbooks often sets the cost of these other items. For example, college bookstores typically sell used books for about 75% of the new print price (GAO 2005).

Bookstores may acquire used textbooks either by buying used textbooks back from students
Table 1: Common Options for College Course Materials. [Taken from GAO (2013)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Supplemental material</th>
<th>Interactive system</th>
<th>Customized textbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td>New print (including loose-leaf and other lower-cost options)</td>
<td>Used print</td>
<td>Digital book (including PDFs and books for e-readers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery channel</td>
<td>Campus bookstore (online or physical store)</td>
<td>National online retailer</td>
<td>Other bookstore (not school-affiliated)</td>
<td>Open-source provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction method</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Borrow</td>
<td>Download free of charge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or from the wholesale market. In the case of the former, bookstores may offer as much as 50% of the new textbook cost (regardless of whether the student originally purchased the textbook new or used) if faculty plan to reuse the textbook in the future (University of Wisconsin, 2007). Under this scenario, it is possible then for a student to pay a net cost of 25% of the new textbook price. However, if a faculty member chooses not to reuse a textbook or fails to notify the bookstore in a timely manner regarding textbook selection, then the bookstore will pay less for that particular used textbook. In this situation, the bookstore may offer only the general wholesale price, which usually ranges from 5% to 35% of the new textbook price (GAO, 2005), or may not buy the used book at all.

The approach of this Committee was to identify a number of strategies that could save students money on textbooks. These strategies are organized in Section 7 according to time and effort to implement. The final recommendations are similar to those outlined by Senack (2014) following his analysis of college student survey data obtained by the Student PIRG as discussed in Section 5.2.2. The strategies requiring the least effort leverage available resources that could have an immediate impact on textbook cost savings to students at the University of Utah, and involve better communication of textbook pricing information to both students and faculty. Recommendations of ways to improve communication at the University of Utah are presented in Section 7.1.

Strategies requiring more time and effort focus on a shift toward the development and adoption of open educational resources (OER) at the University of Utah. OER includes “open
4 Interest

There has been much interest in the topic of textbook costs both on a local and national level. This section describes local interest in the present Committee, national media coverage of textbook prices, political interest in textbook and OER legislation, and initiatives at other universities to save students money on textbook costs.

4.1 Local Interest

The Salt Lake Tribune published an article in December, 2013 about the Committee; quotes from two Committee members, Rachel Wooton and David Wiley, were included (Whitehurst, 2013). The Daily Utah Chronicle also published an article about the Committee in January, 2014 that described the goals of the Committee and included several quotes from Rachel Wooton and Allyson Mower, Senate President (Turner, 2014).

Drs. Carol Diener, Professor Emeritus of Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana – Champaign, and Ed Diener, Alumni Distinguished Professor of Psychology (Emeritus), University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, contacted Allyson Mower, Senate President, about their interest in the Committee. The Dieners are founders of the Diener Education Fund ([http://nobaproject.com/about-noba](http://nobaproject.com/about-noba)), a non-profit organization with the mission of reinventing higher education to serve the changing needs of students and professors. Currently, their work is focused on the Noba Project, which is an open and free online platform that provides high-quality, flexibly structured textbooks on educational materials.

The Diener’s met with the Committee on March 19, 2014 to share their experiences writing an open-source textbook for an introductory psychology course. The book has already been completed; but, they were struggling with low adoption rates. They are in the process of employing the following strategies to try to increase adoption rates: (i) providing active learning exercises, (ii) developing companion materials such as a test bank of questions, powerpoint slides, classroom activities, (iii) offering rewards to students who use the book and post a youtube video. They also discussed the possibility of adding quizzes at the end
of each module so students could self-assess their learning.

The Committee Chair also received a personal email from Jay Jordan, Associate Professor, Department of English and University Writing Program, who recently co-authored an open textbook entitled “Open2010” for WRTG 2010 (the required first-year writing course). Dr. Jordan coordinated WRTG 2010 for 4 years. He graciously shared some of his personal experiences writing an open textbook. Dr. Jordan decided to write “Open2010” to make the distribution of WRTG 2010 resources more efficient, and because he was aware of rising textbook costs as well as the never-ending cycle of new editions being printed by publishers (even if the new content is minimal). Dr. Jordan indicated that he was not directly compensated for his efforts, though the Director of the Writing Program was extremely supportive. Because he served as coordinator of WRTG 2010 at the time, Dr. Jordan was released from regular teaching obligations, which helped him complete the open textbook project in a timely manner. Dr. Jordan noted that when he undertook the project, he had already checked off his requirements for tenure. He advocates that “faculty who are thinking about such projects should DEFINITELY consult with their directors/chairs about compensation, grad/UG assistants, release time, and RPT implications.”

Dr. Jordan also commented on the subsequent adoption of “Open2010” and impact to students. All new instructors for WRTG 2010, must use “Open2010” during their first semester. Thereafter, instructors of WRTG 2010 may choose from an approved list of textbooks, which includes “Open2010”. Dr. Jordan consulted with the current coordinator of WRTG 2010, Casey Boyle, and together, they estimate that about 110 sections of WRTG 2010 (out of a total of 124 sections offered during the 2013–14 academic year), or about 2,530 students, currently use “Open2010”. In the other sections of WRTG 2010, where instructors require commercial textbooks, the cost of those textbooks can range from $75–$135. Therefore, one can claim that “Open2010” results in a cost savings totaling over $500,000 per year.

Drs. Jordan and Boyle were asked to comment on the main reason that instructors choose not to use “Open2010”. They said that some instructors switch back to a commercial textbook because of familiarity and prior experience using a particular commercial textbook. However, this percentage appears to be small. Nearly all of the first-time instructors within the past two years continue to teach with “Open2010”. Instructors who have abandoned commercial textbooks to adopt “Open 2010” do so because they are interested in drawing from shared materials generated in the colloquium. The colloquium is a semester-length, graduate course (2 credit hours) that is required of all first-time instructors in the Writing Program. The colloquium includes a weekly meeting, during which the course coordinator may cover a variety of topics ranging from general pedagogical questions to specific lessons/assignments in “Open2010” to assigned readings from literature on composition pedagogy and theory.

The fact that nearly 90% of the sections for WRTG 2010 are currently using “Open2010” makes a strong argument that institutional investment in open resources could play a large role in solving the problem of high textbook costs over the long-run. In other words, the experience with “Open2010” suggests that, if professors are supported in creating open materials needed for a course, future offerings will likely adopt them (when given that option).
4.2 National News Coverage

This section provides a short review of some of the press surrounding textbook costs and online alternatives to traditional education. This, in no way constitutes an exhaustive review of the national news coverage on this issue, but simply indicates that the cost of textbooks is a hot topic in society right now.

Just last month, CNN.com posted an article entitled “How some colleges are offering free textbooks” (Grinberg 2014). This article describes the concept of open-source textbooks and notes several different resources for aiding in the adoption process. The article quotes a number of students who have benefited from the switch to open textbooks, as well as several faculty from various universities, including one member of this Committee (David Wiley). Scott Roberts from University of Maryland said, about the open textbook movement, that “this removes a major barrier to access for students who already are at a greater risk for underperforming”.

A recent article from the U.S. News and World Report (Bidwell 2014) reported on the struggle of college students with high textbook prices. This article referenced findings from a student survey that is discussed in more detail in Section 5.2.2. An article last year from U.S.A. Today (Schick and Marklein 2013) reports that students are saying “no” to costly textbooks in a variety of ways, according to data released from a survey by the Book Industry Study Group. In that survey, 34% of students reported downloading course content from unauthorized websites, which was up from 20% in 2010. In addition, 31% of students said they photocopied or scanned pages from other students’ books, which was up from 21% in 2010. The article also cites a 2012 study by the National Survey of Student Engagement that found one in four first-year students and one in three seniors frequently did not purchase required course material due to cost.

In 2012, Time magazine and The New York Times both published articles about Massive Open Online Courses, MOOCs (Pappano 2012; McCracken 2012). Whereas traditional online courses charge tuition and limit enrollment, MOOCs are usually free and massive. The enrollment for a single MOOC course is typically on the order of tens of thousands or more. MOOCs do not offer credit and therefore do not count toward a degree, though certificates may be granted by the instructor for successful completion. Nevertheless, the demand for learning in this new style is overwhelming. In fact, a company called “Coursera”, a non-profit MOOC provider run by a professor from Stanford, claimed that it had reached 1.7 million members in its first 10 months of operation. Most courses being offered in the MOOC format are developed by university faculty and represent adaptations of actual courses offered at those universities.

4.3 Textbook and OER Legislation

Policy and legislation around textbooks and open educational resources have gained national momentum in the recent years. A little over five years ago, the United States Congress enacted the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) that includes several provisions to ensure students have access to information about selected course materials (Public Law
110–315, 110th U.S. Congress). In accordance with HEOA, when publishers provide faculty with information about textbooks and supplemental materials, they are required to provide the price at which those products would be made available to the school’s bookstore (20 U.S.C. §1015b(c)). Publishers are also required to provide a description of the revisions made between current and prior editions of a given textbook. In addition, schools are required to disclose information on textbooks to students and campus bookstores (20 U.S.C. §1015b(d),(e)). To the maximum extent possible in their online course schedules, schools are required to provide the International Standard Book Number (ISBN) and retail price for the required and recommended materials for each course listed in the schedule. HEOA also encourages schools to provide information to students about institutional textbook rental programs, buyback programs, and any other cost-saving strategies (20 U.S.C. §1015b(f)).

The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) conducted a small study to examine how a select number of schools were implementing the HEOA textbook information provisions (GAO, 2013). Four of the schools in the study provided textbook information to students by adding links from their school’s online course schedule. In some cases, these links would redirect the user to the bookstore’s website that lists textbook information for each course. One school had modified their course schedule in order to provide textbook information directly on the course schedule webpage. One student commented that it was useful to have course and textbook information in one place. A key element in this system is having appropriate deadlines for textbook selection by faculty. Students interviewed in the study reported that they benefit from having timely and reliable textbook information. Students also said that they use ISBNs of required textbooks listed on their bookstore’s website to research textbook prices in order to find the most cost effective option.

Since HEOA, several states have taken an aggressive approach to lowering textbook costs through legislation/policies specifically related to OER. Below are those bills that have been enacted in 2012. Note, there are several other bills and policies that were proposed but did not pass (see http://www.openaccesstextbooks.org/legislation.html).

- Florida, House Bill 5201: requires the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) to “promote and provide recommendations concerning the use and distribution of open-access textbooks and educational resources as a method of reducing costs, and work with postsecondary educational institutions to develop a standardized process for the review and approval of open-access textbooks.” FLVC coordinates the state’s postsecondary education distance learning courses and degree programs, and is overseen by the Chancellors of the Florida State University System and Florida College System.

- Washington, House Bill 2337: requires the superintendent of public instruction to take the lead in developing openly licensed courseware aligned with the common core state standards.

- California, Senate Bill 1052: requires the California Open Education Resources Council to establish a competitive request-for-proposals process in which faculty or other parties would apply for funds to produce high-quality, digital open source textbooks for 50
lower division courses with the highest enrollment in the public postsecondary schools. The bill also requires the Council to promote strategies for using open source textbooks.

- California, Senate Bill 1053: provides for the establishment of the California Digital Open Source Library that will serve as a repository for open source material and manage a website for students, faculty, and staff to easily find, adopt, utilize, or modify course materials for little or no cost.

- Utah State Office of Education: the USOE is remixing and/or creating new open textbooks in language arts, math, and science for grades 6-12 and encouraging all districts/schools in the state to adopt these books. The USOE is also sponsoring informational meetings and professional development designed to help faculty successfully implement open textbooks.

- Oregon, House Bill 4058A: the Higher Education Coordinating Commission will convene a work group to examine and recommend adoption strategies for making textbooks more affordable to students at all post-secondary schools in Oregon.

At the federal level, U.S. Senators Dick Durban (D-IL) and Al Franken (D-MN) introduced a bill in November, 2013 known as the “Affordable College Textbook Act” that would direct the Secretary of Education to make competitive grants to institutions of higher education to support pilot programs that expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students (http://beta.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/senate-bill/1704).

4.4 Initiatives at Other Institutions

There are numerous universities and colleges around the nation that have recent initiatives related to textbook cost savings, especially the adoption of open educational resources. In some cases, these initiatives were originally developed by students who brought the issue of textbook costs to the attention of faculty and administrators. Some examples in this category include “The Maryland Open-Source Textbook Initiative” (http://m.diamondbackonline.com/news/local/article_220ab632-1415-11e3-8930-0019bb30f31a.html?mode=jqm) and the “Tacoma Community College OER Project” (http://open.tacomacc.edu).

Increasing the use of open textbooks on college and university campuses, however, relies on the existence of high-quality open textbooks. In order to be a viable option in the classroom, open textbooks must adhere to the same high standards of quality set by publishers of commercial textbooks. Although it may not be intuitive, faculty and universities alike can benefit from assuming roles as publishers of textbooks and developers of e-learning environments (Moxley, 2013). There are some free content-management systems, such as Joomla, Drupal, or WordPress, coupled with inexpensive web hosting packages that can assist faculty in building communities around educational materials. Tools and resources to aid in self-publication, however, are somewhat lacking. Therefore, funds are needed to create incentives for faculty to write and review open textbooks, pay for editorial/publication services, and support the development/maintenance of web-based repositories. The burden of this expense is currently falling on the shoulders of individual institutions, though state legislation (and
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possibly federal legislation in the near future) are assisting as well as some philanthropic organizations. Note, [MIT] (2014) claims that their open courseware costs from $10,000 to $15,000 per course. For comparison, the cost of self-publishing a book with professional help lies in the range $3,800 to $38,000 per book (Sattar, 2013). Academic monographs can be professionally published for $8,000 to $15,000; but, textbooks are often more expensive because they contain a lot of images, tables, sidebars, etc.

Two institutions spearheading the development and promotion of open textbooks are University of Washington and Rice University. The Washington Open Course Library ([http://opencourselibrary.org](http://opencourselibrary.org)) is jointly funded by the State of Washington and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and includes open textbooks for the 81 highest enrolled courses in Washington’s community and technical colleges. The program received an initial investment of $1.8 million and, to date, has saved students $5.5 million (Allen, 2013a). Because the materials created by the program are “open”, the savings will continue to grow.

Rice University started the ambitious “OpenStax College” program with the goal to provide free textbooks to 10,000,000 students. OpenStax College receives funding from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Laura and John Arnold Foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 20 Million Minds Foundation, and Rice University. In order to reach its goal, OpenStax College is marketing its open textbooks to college instructors around the country. Richard Baraniuk, founder and director of the Connexions platform that runs OpenStax College, said in a recent interview (Cherry, 2012), “We’re providing things like exam copies for instructors to look at the books so they can adopt them. And just like the publishing companies, we’ve put in place the exact same development process that involves professional writers, peer review, testing in the classroom, copy editing, graphics, etc. The goal of OpenStax College is really to create textbooks that are a high-quality, viable alternative to the publishers’ books … We’re spending hundreds of thousands of dollars per book … But the payoff is that if these initial five books that we’re releasing get even just 10 percent of the college market, that small investment could save students over $90 million in the next five years.”

The School of Business at Virginia State University (VSU) conducted an experiment whereby open source textbooks were implemented in eight core business courses at once (Kinchehlo, 2010). The remarkable aspect of the experiment is that the faculty pulled this off in three months time, basically by spending the entire summer writing course content. The effort was spearheaded by Dean Mirta Martin who wanted “to create a model of access and affordability”. In order to expedite the process of open textbook adoption, VSU partnered with Flat World Knowledge, an open source textbook publisher. Flat World Knowledge offered the Business School a bulk rate of $20 per student per course that allowed students to download digital textbooks, study guides, audio versions and iPad edition, a bundle that would normally cost $100. Early feedback was reported to be overwhelmingly positive. One of the main factors that the school will be looking at is whether the adoption of open textbooks has any effect on classroom retention, and eventually graduation rates. In speaking about the experiment, Dr. Martin stated that “I believe at Virginia State University we had the perfect storm: an incredibly supportive administration, an enthusiastic faculty, a persuasive
champion, students who were ready for change, and a revamped curriculum we could all believe in”. She hopes to deliver all of the Business School’s 30 courses digitally within 18 months.

There is another business model for reducing textbook costs based on university-level subscriptions of commercial textbooks. Indiana University started a project two years ago that requires students enrolled in certain courses to pay a material fee, which grants them access to an electronic copy of the assigned commercial textbook (or other materials) for the course (Young, 2011). Indiana has agreements in place with McGraw-Hill and a number of other publishers that supply these e-textbooks amongst other digital features, such as online quizzes. Since the university is buying in bulk for many students, the publishers have agreed to offer them a discount, the savings of which gets passed to the students. The university’s vice president for information technology, who is leading the project, said that students save more money than if they purchased a new print book and resold it back to the bookstore at the end of the semester. Participation by faculty in the program is optional — so far, 22 courses have joined the project. The assessment data (from student surveys) indicated that 60% of students preferred the e-textbooks to the traditional print copies; though, satisfaction varied widely between courses. About 55% said they read less of the e-textbook than they would have from a print copy; while 22% said they read more from the e-textbook. Note, students do not own these e-textbooks; they only have access as long as they are enrolled at the university.

5 Data

The estimated national annual average cost for books and supplies at public institutions of higher education is $1,200 (College Board, 2013). According to the National Association of College Stores, however, the expenditures on textbooks are declining, down about 5% from four years ago (Schmidt, 2012). This is believed to be due to students relying more and more on used books, textbook rentals, and digital resources; but, it could also indicate a shift in the types of materials that are being assigned by faculty.

5.1 Textbook Costs at the University of Utah

The Committee compiled estimates of textbook costs for the most popular majors at the University of Utah, as well as the most popular courses, as measured by number of degrees and enrollment, respectively. Enrollment and degree data for 2013 were supplied by the Office of Institutional Budget and Analysis (OBIA, 2013); textbook price information was supplied by the Campus Bookstore. Table 2 lists the price of new textbooks for each of the most popular courses at the University of Utah, rounded to the nearest dollar. If a course is taught in the fall and spring, the enrollment numbers reflect the total number of students for both semesters. The range of prices exist because (i) different sections of the same course may have different textbook requirements depending on the instructor, or (ii) students can choose additional options. In some cases, classes may require a response clicker, which costs $53.35. Clicker cost has been included into the textbook cost for the classes that require
Table 2: Textbook costs for the most popular undergraduate courses in 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course number</th>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>enrollment</th>
<th>clicker</th>
<th>Textbook Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>new used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG 2010</td>
<td>Intermediate Writing</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$0–$98 $7–$74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 1210</td>
<td>General Chemistry I*</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$225 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1010</td>
<td>Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$251 $188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 1700</td>
<td>American Civilization</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$80–$89 $60–$67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1050</td>
<td>College Algebra</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$140 $105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 1210</td>
<td>Principles of Biology</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$152–$273 $57–$106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 1050</td>
<td>Foundations of Business</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$79 $59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 2010</td>
<td>Computer Essentials</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$189 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 2010</td>
<td>Princ of Microeconomics</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$229 $187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1210</td>
<td>Calculus I*</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$101 $76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTR 1020</td>
<td>Sci Fndtn Nutr &amp; Health</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$104 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 2100</td>
<td>Hist of Rock’n Roll</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$117 $88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCTG 2600</td>
<td>Survey of Accounting</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$229 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1220</td>
<td>Calculus II*</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$101 $76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1060</td>
<td>Trigonometry</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$114 $105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 1010</td>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$101–$189 $76–$119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 2325</td>
<td>Human Anatomy</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$362 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 1215</td>
<td>General Chemistry Lab I</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$213 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 3600</td>
<td>World Music</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$149 $112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 1220</td>
<td>General Chemistry II*</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$225 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 1236</td>
<td>Survey of Jazz</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$131 $98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 2420</td>
<td>Human Physiology</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$145–$194 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 2210</td>
<td>Physcs For Scien &amp; Eng I</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$73–$201 $22–$55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

them, though students can use the same clicker for multiple classes. The textbook for MATH 1060 is listed as optional. Note, many sections of WRTG 2010 utilize “Open2010”, in which case the cost of the textbook would be $0 for the students in those sections. The courses with an asterisk are part of a series with a single textbook required for the series. There are nine courses in this list requiring textbooks that cost over $200. The most expensive textbook on this list is that for BIOL 2325, Human Anatomy at $362.

Table 3 lists the total cost of textbooks for the top five undergraduate degrees plus Mechanical Engineering, which is included for comparison purposes. Data for both new print books and used rental books are given. Note, the estimates in Table 3 were obtained by cross-referencing the courses listed in the DARS Report for the respective majors with the required textbooks for each of those courses. Since some flexibility exists in “elective” courses for each major, the total dollar amount for textbooks will necessarily vary somewhat from student to student. Table 3 shows that, of the majors listed, new textbooks for Psychology will cost students the most money, about $1,150 per year assuming students graduate in four years; while, new textbooks for Economics will only cost the students $740 per year. Also, Table 3 shows that
Table 3: Total estimated textbook costs for several popular majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Textbook Cost</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new</td>
<td>used</td>
<td>rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (BS)</td>
<td>$4,610</td>
<td>$2,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (BA)</td>
<td>$4,730</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Communication</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and Sport Science</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development and Family Studies (BA)</td>
<td>$3,730</td>
<td>$2,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development and Family Studies (BS)</td>
<td>$3,810</td>
<td>$2,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics (BA)</td>
<td>$2,945</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering (BS)</td>
<td>$3,530</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

students can reduce their textbooks costs by about 50% if they purchase the used rental option, rather than new. It would be interesting to calculate the dollar amount students spend on textbooks for the general education requirements versus those specific to their major.

5.2 Student Behaviors and Attitudes about Textbooks

5.2.1 2014 U of U Student Textbook Survey

The Committee put together a survey on textbook costs that was administered to students at the University of Utah (see the Appendix for a copy of the survey questions). There were 667 respondents out of a total of 7346 students who received the survey via email. The survey sample was stratified by gender. The number of students that received the survey was as follows: 346 professional students from Law, Medicine, Dental, 2000 graduate students, and 5000 undergraduates; of the undergraduates, equal proportions (1250 each) were sent to Freshman, Sophomore, Juniors, and Seniors. This yielded a 9.1% response rate. The percentage of respondents from each college are displayed in Figure 2. These numbers are consistent with the percentage of students enrolled in each college, as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 4 shows the histogram of the amount of money students spend on textbooks each semester. These data indicate that the average amount of money students spend on textbooks at the University of Utah is about $427/semester or about $850/yr. This value is consistent with the cost for books and supplies of $1000/yr as listed by the University administration (OBIA, 2013). The discrepancy might be attributed to cost saving strategies employed by students, as discussed further below. The outliers in Figure 4 might be due to students misreading the question as money spent on textbooks each year rather than each semester. Students indicated that their most expensive textbook cost about $200 on average. Figure 5 shows the relationship between the college of the students’ major(s) and the amount of money spent on textbooks. The data indicate that students in the colleges of Dentistry, Law, and Social Work incur the highest textbook costs; while, students in the colleges of Architecture & Planning, Education, and Mines & Earth Science pay the least for textbooks.
Figure 2: Response from U of U Student Survey to the question “What is the College of your major(s)?”

Figure 3: Percentage of all University of Utah students enrolled in each college (undergraduate + graduate), based on Fall 2013 enrollment numbers.
Figure 4: Histogram of the amount of money students spend on textbooks each semester.

Figure 5: Average amount of money students spend on (i) all of their textbooks each semester, ●, and (ii) their most expensive textbook this year, ■, divided according to the college of the students’ major(s).
Figure 6 shows the various ways that students save money on textbook costs. The most popular method is purchasing used books, with 81.4% of respondents indicating that they utilize this method. The next most popular method was purchasing textbooks online at the lowest price, with 78.25% of respondents utilizing this method. Note, the Campus Bookstore provides a web resource for comparing prices between several different online providers such as Bookbyte, Amazon, ValoreBooks, AbeBooks, Alibris, amongst others. Over 65% of students said that they do not purchase optional textbooks. Less than half of the students (about 43%) said that they rent textbooks. About one quarter of the students would purchase an ebook if available; and, a similar number indicated that they use free copies from the library. The other methods of saving money were borrowing, sharing with a friend, and using a free online resource.

Figure 7 shows the number of times that students have chosen not to purchase a textbook because of its cost. Perhaps the most disturbing result is that nearly 75% of students have chosen not to purchase a textbook at some point during their college career. Furthermore, almost 12% frequently do so (7 or more times). This is bound to have a negative impact on students’ ability to learn the course material and successfully complete the course objectives, although the students were not asked to comment on this in the survey. Figure 8 shows how difficult it is for students to afford textbooks each semester on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 6 (very). The results indicate that 68% of students have a difficult time affording textbooks. Within this group, 19% find it “very” difficult (scale rating of 6 out of 6) to afford textbooks; while, another 20% find it “moderately” difficult (scale rating of 5 out of 6).

Correlations between several variables indicated that the average amount paid for textbooks per semester is positively correlated with the difficulty of affording books (0.24) and the number of times students have skipped buying textbooks (0.13). There does not seem to be a clear relationship between the students’ perceived ability to afford textbooks and the actual amount of money spent on textbooks, see Figure 9. Across the board, students in every college on average found textbooks “somewhat” to “very” difficult to afford. As expected, the number of times students have skipped buying books is positively correlated with their year in school (0.19). There were no other significant correlations between the variables tested and gender, age, or year in school.

Figure 10 illustrates the likelihood of students to use the following types of methods to access a required textbook for class: buy new print, buy used print, textbook rental, physical copy at the library, online copy at the library, buy ebook, and borrow from someone else. The results indicate that students are overwhelmingly most likely to purchase a used print copy of a required textbook and least likely to purchase a new print copy. The likelihood of using a rental textbook was relatively flat, i.e., equal percentages were both least likely and most likely to use this modality. Over 30% of respondents were least likely to use either physical or online copies at the library. The aversion to using physical copies at the library could be attributed to the fact that the majority of students commute to campus, so accessing physical materials at the library may not be convenient for many students. However, students’ aversion to using online copies of textbooks at the library was surprising. This may be due to a misconception that online materials can only be accessible if the
Figure 6: Response from U of U Student Survey to the question “How do you save money on textbook costs?”
Figure 7: Response from U of U Student Survey to the question “Over the time you have been at the University of Utah, how many times have you chosen not to purchase a textbook because of its cost?”

Figure 8: Response from U of U Student Survey to the question “On a scale from 1 to 6 with ‘1’ being not at all difficult to ‘6’ being very difficult, please rate how difficult it is for you to afford textbooks each semester.”
Figure 9: Average affordability divided according to the college of the students’ major(s), with '1' being not at all difficult to afford to '6' being very difficult to afford. The horizontal dashed line represents a response of 3.5, which may be interpreted as the neutral response, i.e., not necessarily difficult to afford but not necessarily easy either.

In addition, the survey found that students are somewhat less inclined to use an ebook (25% said they were least likely to use this modality, while 10% said they were most likely). The finding in regard to ebooks seems to follow national trends. A recent article in The Digital Reader reports (based on data by the Book Industry Study Group) that only 6.25% of students used digital textbooks in 2011 and only 6.5% used them in 2012 (Hoffelder, 2013b). One reason for the low adoption rates of digital textbooks is the marginal cost savings. A study by Bowker Market Research reported that the average price of a paper textbook (both new and used) was $65 in 2012; while, the average price of a digital textbook was $61. A big drawback of digital textbooks is that students cannot easily resell them.

5.2.2 2014 U.S. PIRG Student Survey

The Student Public Interest Research Group (PIRG) conducted a survey of 2,039 college students from more than 150 different universities nationwide in the fall 2013 (Senack, 2014). The survey found that the average student spends as much as $1,200 per year on textbooks. Of the students surveyed, 65% decided against buying a book required for a class due to the high cost. Moreover, nearly all of the students in this category were concerned that their
grade would suffer because of it. Almost half of the students surveyed said that the cost of textbooks affects their decision on how many classes and which ones to take each semester. In many cases, these decisions end up prolonging the time to graduation. The study also found that 82% of students felt that they would do significantly better in a course if the textbook was available free online and buying a hard copy was optional. This constitutes a recent shift in student attitude. In the past, students have been somewhat wary of digital alternatives (Allen, 2010); however, the survey revealed that students are more interested now in exploring the use of technology and moving away from the traditional textbook market. The article concludes by stating that “if every student at the University of Wisconsin-Madison were assigned just one open textbook each semester, it would generate over $6 million in student savings in just one year.”

5.2.3 2012 Florida Student Textbook Survey

This purpose of this survey (Florida Virtual Campus, 2012) was to examine students’ choices behind textbook acquisition and students’ attitudes about textbook costs. The survey included 20,000 respondents representing students from all of the state universities in Florida and over 75% of its colleges including community colleges. The survey was conducted by the Florida Distance Learning Consortium (FDLC) as a follow-up to a survey administered in 2010. Both surveys were in response to a mandate in 2009 by the Florida Legislature (Section 1004.091(2), Florida Statutes) to promote the use of open access textbooks as a means of reducing textbook costs. In parallel with the 2012 student survey, the FDLC also
conducted a survey of Florida’s postsecondary faculty to understand the climate for OER.

Results concerning the financial burden of textbooks costs on students are similar to those from the PIRG study described in the previous section. Specifically, 54% spent more than $300 on textbooks for the Spring 2012 term and 19% spent more than $500. In addition, 63% of Florida students reported not purchasing the required textbook because of cost and almost one-quarter reported doing without on a frequent basis. In some cases, the high cost of textbooks caused significant consequences, including students not registering for a course (45%), taking fewer courses per semester (49%), and dropping a course (27%). Of the respondents, 17% said that their inability to afford the required textbook for a given course had caused them to fail that course.

Students used a variety of ways to save money on textbooks. The most popular cost saving method employed by 63% of Florida students is buying (selling) used copies from (to) the campus bookstore. Another popular method is buying from a source other than the campus bookstore (78%). Nearly half of the students (43%) shared textbooks with classmates as a means of reducing costs. Interestingly, a large portion of Florida students (74%) reported that they would rent textbooks if it saved them money; and, 20% said that they used a reserve copy from the campus library. However, nearly half of the students (47%) responded that they did not know whether their campus library provided textbooks for checkout (in print and/or digital formats).

Students were asked about the reasons why they may not be interested in using digital textbooks. Nearly three-quarters of Florida students said that they liked a print copy to write in and highlight text. About 60% said that digital textbooks are inconvenient to read; and, about half said that, with digital textbooks, it is difficult to move between different sections/pages of the book. Seventy percent of respondents indicated that having lifetime access to digital textbooks in their major area of study was important to very important; however, lifetime access to other textbooks was considerably less important.

Florida students were generally unaware of OER and their potential to save money. Almost three-quarters of respondents had never heard of open textbooks, and more than two-thirds had never heard of open courseware. Encouragingly though, 61% reported that they would be willing to pay a modest open textbook materials fee ($5–$10) to support the authoring/editing of open textbooks.

5.2.4 Piracy

A recent article in The Digital Reader discusses the issue of textbook piracy amongst college students [Hoffelder, 2013a]. The article cites a 2013 report by the Book Industry Study Group (BISG) based on results from a survey on student attitudes. In the survey, a larger percentage of students reported downloading pirated course content from an unauthorized web site compared to previous surveys (34% in 2013 versus 20% in 2010). In addition, the percentage of students who reported that they photocopied or scanned chapters of textbooks belonging to other students rose to 31% from 21% in 2010. The assumption is that students are driven to such measures as piracy due to their inability to afford high textbook costs.
5.3 Faculty Behaviors and Attitudes about Textbooks

5.3.1 2013 GAO Study

The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) was directed by HEOA to examine the implementation of new textbook provisions, as described in Section 4.3. GAO interviewed representative groups of faculty from a small sample of postsecondary schools in the United States, and found that the availability of textbook information as mandated by HEOA had little effect on their college textbook selection decisions (GAO, 2013). Faculty indicated that they choose the most appropriate materials for their courses over pricing and format considerations. One group of faculty stated that quality and relevance of the materials are key factors. Another group said that important considerations are whether the level is suitable for the students likely to enroll in their class and comprehensive enough to cover the content in their class. Faculty tend to consider pricing and format options only after they have identified the most appropriate course materials. GAO also interviewed some national campus retailers, who said that faculty do inquire about cost-saving options like digital formats and textbook rentals, but only after they have identified the best materials for a given course. Representatives of two campus bookstores and a faculty group indicated that online interactive systems that include a combination of instructional material, adaptive homework questions, exams, worksheets, or tutoring programs, are becoming more popular.

According to the GAO review, although faculty decisions concerning textbook selections have not changed much in response to publisher practices, faculty groups indicated that they were more aware of the affordability of textbooks than they used to be. A faculty group from one of the public schools expressed strong interest in finding textbook options that saved students money. This same group said that they put books on reserve in the library and use the same textbook multiple semesters, which allowed students to buy used versions at a reduced price. Faculty from one of the public schools also said that their school’s guidelines encourage them to consider the price of course materials in making their selection decisions. One professor interviewed in the study said that he wrote his own lab manual for his course, which saved students about $50–$60. A music professor said that he taught his entire course by assigning links to websites with free online videos.

5.3.2 2010 Florida Faculty Survey

The Florida Distance Learning Consortium (FDLC) conducted a survey of higher education faculty and staff in 2012 (Florida Campus Survey, 2012) in order to assess the OER climate in Florida’s postsecondary schools. Over 2500 respondents from 8 of Florida’s 11 state universities and 22 of its 28 community colleges and state colleges participated in the survey. One of the key findings was that many faculty are unaware of textbook prices. Just over half (52%) of the respondents indicated that they were always aware of the prices of the textbooks they assign. In addition, nearly one-quarter (23%) of respondents did not know whether their campus library provided a copy of their textbook for check out.

Although nearly three-quarters of respondents had heard of open textbooks, only 6% reported actually using part or all of an open textbook in one or more of their courses. In
terms of choosing an open textbook, the top ranking factor was “pertinence of the content to the objectives of the course”; and, the second highest ranking factor was “accuracy of spelling, grammar, and facts”. In deciding to use an open textbook, respondents ranked the following as most important: “currency of information” (75%), “desire to reduce costs to students” (67%), “accuracy of spelling, grammar, and facts” (64%), and “scope of coverage” (60%). Respondents also indicated that “time to find, review, and select open textbooks” was important, but less so than the others mentioned. In terms of deciding to author an open textbook, respondents ranked the following as most important: “time to develop an open textbook” (88%), “support from administration (e.g., financial support or release time)” (63%), “assurance of professional editing” (60%), and “availability of co-authors” (57%).

Many faculty perceived themselves as being likely to use OER in the future. Almost three-quarters of respondents answered that they were either somewhat likely or very likely to use a portion of an open textbook. The same percentage indicated they would use other types of OER. More than a third of respondents said that they were somewhat to very likely to author a portion of an open textbook, although relatively few (3%) had actually done so. A likely barrier to authorship, though, is the lack of institutional support. For example, only 7% of respondents indicated that the creation of open textbooks would be considered as a criterion for promotion and tenure at their institution.

### 6 Available Resources

There are a number of existing resources that faculty and students can leverage in order to increase student savings on textbook costs. These are discussed below.

#### 6.1 Campus Bookstore

The Campus Bookstore is non-profit, independent book retailer that is dedicated to working with both faculty and students to identify and stock the most cost-effective textbook options possible. Important information relevant to textbook cost savings are listed below.

1. Each department on campus has an assigned textbook buyer. This buyer can assist instructors in determining the most cost-effective means of providing required, recommended, or optional course materials.

2. The Bookstore’s website [www.bookstore.utah.edu](http://www.bookstore.utah.edu) offers a variety of helpful resources.

   (a) Textbook adoptions can be submitted online. This provides confirmation that the adoption has been entered. It also notifies the adopter if the book is an old edition or out-of-print. Note, adoptions are due March 1 (Summer), April 15 (Fall), and October 15 (Spring). Adopting early gives the Bookstore access to the highest supply at the lowest demand, which allows Bookstore staff to buy at better prices.

   (b) Instructors are able to check the Bookstore’s prices by looking up their courses as if shopping for their books.
(c) Instructors can access the list of books being rented in the store, which may differ from the online rental options. That information can then be added to a syllabus.

(d) Prior to buyback, a list of books being bought for resale in the store is posted online. Students will receive more money for books that are re-used for the coming semester. Therefore, it is important that faculty adhere to the adoption deadlines stated above.

3. The Campus Store has partnered with Verba Compare to show a price comparison chart on our website. This allows students to find the best available price directly from the University’s site. Students can access this tool through the a link at the top of the home page for the Course Schedule or directly from the Bookstore site (www.bookstore.utah.edu) by clicking on Textbooks→CourseMaterials from the menu. Figure 11 shows the front-end of the Verba compare tool with a textbook from a course in Mechanical Engineering selected. When the button labeled Get Course Materials is clicked, a new window is created with price comparisons as shown in Figure 12. Rather than directing students to search online for the best deal, instructors can recommend the Bookstore’s website as the primary resource. Note, the two students on the Committee indicated that they frequently use this resource. However, none of the faculty on the Committee were aware of this resource.

4. Along with Verba Compare, the Campus Store has partnered with Verba Compete. This allows the textbook buyers to identify the books that can be priced more com-

![Image](image-url)

Figure 11: Snapshot from the Campus Bookstore website showing the front-end of the Verba Compare tool. One textbook from Mechanical Engineering has been selected.
Figure 12: Snapshot from the Campus Bookstore website Verba Compare tool that lists prices from different retailers for the selected textbook.
petitively with the online marketplace.

5. The Campus Store has been working with the university to establish a payment plan for textbooks. On the payment plan a student would be able to get all assigned materials at the start of the semester and pay for them in installments before the semester ended.

### 6.2 Open Educational Resources

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation provides the most commonly cited definition of open educational resources (OER):

OER are teaching, learning, and research resources that reside in the public domain or have been released under an intellectual property license that permits their free use and re-purposing by others. Open educational resources include full courses, course materials, modules, textbooks, streaming videos, tests, software, and any other tools, materials, or techniques used to support access to knowledge.

While the term “open” is losing a specific meaning in the public sphere due to its overuse and misuse in marketing, the term retains a clear definition in the field of open educational resources. In this context, “open” refers to content that is licensed in a manner that provides users with the right to make more kinds of uses than those normally permitted under the law, and these copyright permissions are granted to users free of charge. The primary permissions or usage rights associated with “open” are expressed in the “5Rs Framework:

1. Retain — People and institutions have the right to make, own, and control copies of the content (e.g., download, duplicate, store, and manage)

2. Reuse — People and institutions have the right to use the content in a wide range of ways (e.g., in a class, in a study group, on a website, in a video)

3. Revise — People and institutions have the right to adapt, adjust, modify, or alter the content itself (e.g., translate the content into another language)

4. Remix — People and institutions have the right to combine the original or revised content with other open educational resources to create something new (e.g., incorporate the content into a “mashup”)

5. Redistribute — People and institutions have the right to share copies of the original, revised, or remixed versions of the content with others (e.g., give a copy to a friend)

Individuals and organizations have created over 500 million open educational resources through funding from private philanthropy, state and federal grants, and venture investment. Some of the best-known collections of OER focused on higher education include:

- Open Textbooks — OpenStax College publishes a wide range of open textbooks suitable for adoption in high enrollment general education courses. [http://openstaxcollege.org/](http://openstaxcollege.org/)
• Open Textbooks — Flat World Knowledge published a wide range of open textbooks suitable for adoption in business classes and high enrollment general education courses before changing business models. ([http://saylor.org/books/](http://saylor.org/books/))

• Open Video — Khan Academy provides thousands of brief instructional videos on STEM topics. The site also provides interactive, mastery-based mathematics practice. ([http://khanacademy.org/](http://khanacademy.org/))

• Open Simulations — Nobel Prize winning physicist Carl Wieman designed this collection of simulations to help students deepen their understanding of STEM topics. ([http://phet.colorado.edu/](http://phet.colorado.edu/))

• Open Courseware — MIT OpenCourseWare provides access to syllabi, reading lists, and practice exams for over 2000 courses offered by MIT. ([http://ocw.mit.edu/](http://ocw.mit.edu/))

• Open Textbook Reviews — The Open Textbook Library at the University of Minnesota provides peer reviews of open textbooks authored by post-secondary faculty. ([http://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/](http://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/))

In every case, the textbooks, videos, simulations, and other open educational resources provided by these and other organizations are completely free to use, and faculty, students, and staff have free permission to engage in the full set of 5R activities with these materials.

There are certainly challenges in realizing widespread adoption of OER. For example, faculty indicated a concern about OER quality because of the uncertainty around the peer review process ([Florida Campus Survey, 2012](http://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/)). Although several organizations have established criteria for reviewers to use while evaluating open textbooks (e.g., College Open Textbooks, MERLOT, Saylor Foundation, and Textbook Equity), no single authoritative standard yet exists. ([Vukovic, 2009](http://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/)) suggested that peer reviews are “an important mechanism for quality assurance” of OER. Engaging the editorial services of a university press is one way to solve the issue of quality assurance. An example of this in practice is the University Press of Florida which publishes the Orange Grove Texts Plus (OGT+) imprint and pays qualified faculty to review the open textbooks. Questions remain in terms of how such services can be funded, obtained, and orchestrated. Possibilities include private funding, legislative funding, student fees, institutional support, and academic professional organizations.

There is also an emerging support marketplace for faculty and institutions looking to use OER effectively and at scale. While OER are (by definition) free to use, organizations like Lumen Learning provide technical and other support services for users of OER in the same way that companies like Red Hat provide technical and other support services for users of open source software.

In addition, the Committee Chair received an unsolicited personal email from the Apple Account Executive for the University of Utah (Tyler Hammond) listing a number of OERs compatible with Apple products, such as “iTunes U”, “iBooks Author”, etc. This may be a potential resource for those faculty planning to adopt OERs and is noted here as such.
6.3 Library

Librarians personally assist faculty with locating and procuring resources for courses and could be a useful conduit through which to spread awareness of and build interest in open courseware, open access textbooks, and other initiatives recommended by this Committee. The Library regularly hosts or provides training, seminars, and webinars on research tools and methods. Library workshops could be offered on how to best leverage and select open courseware or open access resources. The Library will explore ways to make students and faculty more aware of its capabilities and ensure that existing services are utilized fully.

The Library spends approximately $1,000,000 per year on books, music, video resources, and other similar materials; and, last year the Marriott Library spent over $100,000 on acquiring materials specifically requested by students and faculty. Therefore, many textbooks and assigned readings are already held by University libraries, some in print and some in digital form. It has been standard practice in University libraries to not purchase many textbooks, especially in disciplines outside of mathematics and engineering. Buying textbooks on a large scale is not a viable option for university libraries, particularly at large research universities. The library at the University of Illinois in collaboration with the Illini Union Bookstore aimed to provide at least one copy of textbooks for every class. Unfortunately, this endeavor failed completely [Laskowski 2007]. At Virginia State University, the library has reserve copies of textbooks for basic general education courses, such as Biology, History and Psychology. At the University of Wisconsin - Madison, the library sponsors a program to place the highest cost textbooks on reserve. Other libraries have focused on working with faculty to identify, purchase and place on reserve all recommended and optional textbooks (but not required textbooks). The Marriott Library is open to exploring how a portion of its budget may be used to help reduce textbook costs to students at the University of Utah.

The Marriott Library provides access to electronic textbooks when available, though the collection is limited since many publishers choose not to sell electronic versions of core textbooks to libraries. The Library has acquired collections from a number of providers, such as Knovel Engineering, Safari Technical Books, and APA Books. The Library also has purchased many individual titles and collections from various ebook aggregators, including ebrary, EBL, and Ebsco. All of these works can be found using the Usearch catalog.

The Library’s Espresso Book Machine can automatically print, bind, and trim books and can be used to make low cost reprints available on demand to faculty and students. It can create a 300 page book in about seven minutes. For example, this machine may be used to print a hard copy of an open textbook, which may prove useful if the University moves toward adopting more OERs in replacement of commercial textbooks.

The Library also provides many databases and journals which are suitable for use as course materials or for student research. Library resources effectively support non-traditional, inquiry-based models of teaching and learning such as resource-based learning, cognitive apprenticeship, problem-based teaching, learning by design, capstone programs, and project-
based learning.

Interlibrary Loan / Document Delivery and Suggest a Purchase services allow students and faculty to request books, media, sheet music, and other resources not held by University libraries.

Any course materials may be placed on reserve, and some resources can be made available in electronic format by the libraries to ensure the widest possible availability to students.

The library is also willing to explore partnerships with various campus entities to ensure that education about and use of new cost-saving resources can reach the widest possible audience and be delivered in an effective manner. The library has experience hosting a variety of content and could work with groups on campus, such as Teaching and Learning Technologies, to devise effective ways of providing electronic resources to students.

6.4 Copyright Policies

Faculty members who wish to move away from required textbooks may need to become educated in the copyright laws and policies that determine what and how they may provide materials to students. In many cases, faculty may not be aware of approaches and strategies that allow them to provide students with free forms of content while they remain in compliance with copyright policies. In this section of the report, a brief overview of copyright policy is provided followed by a list of specific strategies that may serve to reduce faculty reliance on expensive textbooks.

Overview: Copyright and Fair Use

Copyright is intended to protect authors’ rights for creative and (selected) intellectual works. Authors (also often called “creators” in copyright law) are given the exclusive rights to perform (and authorize others to perform) certain actions regarding the works, specifically to:

- Reproduce/copy the work
- Develop derivative works
- Distribute copies of the work
- Perform the work in public arenas
- Publicly display the work

Copyrighted works include (but are not limited to):

- Books (including textbooks)
- Plays or other dramatic works
- Music
- Dance/choreography
- Movies, videos, images, pictures
Although copyright laws originally were intended to protect creators' interests and to provide them sufficient time to profit from their work, the duration of copyright protection has increased dramatically from its inception to current implementation (from 14 years to 100 years). However, even under the current (lengthy) duration of copyright protection, copyrighted works can be utilized for certain purposes under what is termed “Fair Use” policy.

Fair Use policy spells out limitations to creators’ exclusive rights to their works, specifically when the copyrighted works are being used for transformative purposes of commentary, criticism, or parody. Fair Use guidelines (Section 107 of the U.S. Copyright code) provide four considerations that must be analyzed when determining if usage of a copyrighted work falls within the fair use guidelines:

- **Purpose of the usage.**
  - Educational and nonprofit uses are more likely to be Fair Use. Commercial use is not.
  - Fair Use is likely when the copyrighted work is used for critique, commentary, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research.
  - Transformative use — where something new is produced — is a favorable factor in determining Fair Use.
  - Use should be limited in scope, duration, access (e.g., not openly available to a broad audience for long periods of time).

- **Nature of the copyrighted work.**
  - In general, factual or academic works are more commonly seen as falling within Fair Use guidelines as compared to creative works (e.g., movies). However, exceptions do exist to this criterion.
  - Use is more likely to be Fair Use if the copyrighted work has been published previously.

- **Amount and centrality of the copyrighted work used.**
  - Amount is considered relative to the work as a whole; usage includes only limited and reasonable portions.
  - The portion of the copyrighted work used is not the central portion of the work as a whole.
  - The amount used is only what is needed (e.g., entire movies are not posted if only a short clip is needed).

- **Effect of the use on the market value of the copyrighted work.** (This can include the potential market value of the work in addition to the current or actual market value.)
  - The use of the copyrighted work will not impact its potential value in the marketplace.
A legal copy of the copyrighted work is used as the source for delivery.

Reasonable steps are taken to prevent unauthorized usage of the work that could reduce its value (i.e., steps to prevent use beyond the intended purpose and audience).

The use will give proper attribution to the copyrighted work.

Understanding Fair Use Guidelines: Helpful Materials and Questions

Instructors who wish to make materials available to their students under Fair Use guidelines should consult the University of Utah copyright policy online (http://regulations.utah.edu/research/7-013.php). University policies must be respected in all provisioning of instructional materials. Faculty also should consider the following questions, as published by the American Library Association (http://librarycopyright.net/resources/exemptions/), before making materials available to their students under Fair Use guidelines:

- Is the copy to be used a legal copy?
  - Answer must be “yes” for Fair Use

- Will the copyrighted work be used for face-to-face teaching activities of a nonprofit institution in a classroom or similar place devoted to instruction?
  - If yes, the work may be used under Fair Use guidelines

If the work is to be utilized online...

- Will the copyrighted work be displayed or performed as part of mediated online instructional activities of a governmental body or an accredited nonprofit educational institution?
  - Answer must be “yes” for Fair Use

- Is online access to the display or performance restricted to students officially registered in the course or to employees of governmental bodies as a part of their official duties or employment?
  - Answer must be “yes” for Fair Use

- Was the copyrighted work produced or marketed primarily for a use OTHER than for performance or display as part of mediated online instructional activities?
  - Answer must be “yes” for Fair Use

- Has the content under consideration for use been selected by the instructor or at his/her discretion?
  - Answer must be “yes” for Fair Use

- Is the content under consideration for use directly related to the learning goals of the course?
  - Answer must be “yes” for Fair Use
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- Is the display of the work(s) under consideration for use in an amount comparable to that which is typically displayed in the course of a live classroom session?
  
  ○ Answer must be “yes” for Fair Use

- Is the to-be-shared content a performance (in part or in full) of a non-dramatic literary or musical work?
  
  ○ If yes, acceptable as Fair Use

- If the content is something other than a non-dramatic literary or musical work, are reasonable and limited portions used?
  
  ○ If yes, acceptable as Fair Use

- If you are planning on streaming audio or video content and the existing media is an analog copy (e.g., VHS, LP), is one of the following two statements true? A digital version of the work is unavailable for purchase in an unused copy. Or, the digital version that is available is subject to technological measures that are designed to prevent it from being copied.
  
  ○ If yes, acceptable as Fair Use

Strategies for Reducing Materials Costs under Educational Fair Use Guidelines and U Policy

- Always use CANVAS when making copies available to students in a course.
  
  – This limits (to a reasonable degree) the distribution of your materials to registered students enrolled in your course. Password protection provides a reasonable security measure to restrict access to the copied content.

- Provide limited amounts of content from multiple sources in order to comply with Fair Use guidelines and to cover course content. You may provide small portions of many different resources in order to cover course content while remaining within Fair Use guidelines.
  
  – For example, professors may provide students with a copy of one chapter from several different editions of a textbook or from several (complementary) textbooks instead of assigning the purchase of a single textbook.
  
  – Examples of acceptable amounts of copyrighted content include:
    
    ○ Up to 10% or 1,000 words (whichever is less) of a copyrighted text work. Typically, one chapter from a textbook is acceptable.
    
    ○ Up to 10%, not more than 30 seconds, of music and lyrics from an individual musical work.
    
    ○ Up to 10% or 3 minutes (whichever is less) of a copyrighted motion media work.
    
    ○ No more than five images from a single artist or photographer; No more than 10% or 15 images (whichever is less) from a published collection of works.
• Use screen capture software (e.g., Jing, Camtasia) to record portions of movie/films rather than circumventing “Digital Rights Management” (DRM) restrictions for copyrighted films and movies. Screen capture videos can be provided to students via CANVAS for review, analysis, and critique.

• Consult the Marriott Library’s copyright expert to get guidance on specific scenarios:
  Allyson Mower, Scholarly Communications and Copyright Librarian. Email: allyson.mower@utah.edu. Phone: 801-585-5458

7 Recommendations

Based on the research conducted by the Committee as described above, several recommendations to help students save costs on textbooks are put forward in the following subsections. These recommendations are ordered in terms of increasing time and effort required to implement them.

7.1 Move toward using low-cost versions of existing materials

Immediate savings on student textbook costs can be realized by promoting practices that allow students to take advantage of less expensive options that are available for existing materials assigned in popular university courses. These options include: used textbooks, rental textbooks, ebooks, and library copies. Below are specific recommendations for the different members of the university community.

1. Action Items for Administration

The Administration can support this recommendation by providing institutional resources that help increase faculty awareness of textbook prices and options. This educational campaign should involve creative methods to disseminate textbook information beyond the routine solutions such as brochures (University of Wisconsin 2007). To be most effective, strategies should refrain from requiring faculty to seek out information on their own, but should target faculty directly by providing textbook price information in ways that seamlessly integrate with typical course preparation methods employed by faculty. In this manner, the information is more likely to reach a larger number of faculty, thereby having greater impact on cost-savings. Ideas along these lines are proposed below.

(a) Update the online course schedule to include textbook price information that is readily visible when clicking the link for a given course number.

In compliance with HEOA (as described in Section 4.3), the University of Utah provides textbook price information through the online course schedule. Currently, this information is accessible via a link at the top of the page listing the courses offered by each department/program, as shown in Figure 13. In the opinion of this Committee, the placement of this link is obscure, which means
Figure 13: Screen shot of the current online course schedule, showing the location of the link where students/faculty can obtain textbook price information. The Committee proposes that this information be linked to the actual course number.

that faculty are unlikely to be aware it exists. Whereas, students typically access the same information directly through the Campus Bookstore website (see Section 6.1 and Figure 11). Therefore, in order to increase faculty awareness of textbook selection and prices for various options, the Committee proposes that this information be linked to the course number directly, as illustrated in Figure 14. Faculty typically click the course number links to check on the enrollment status of the courses to which they are assigned. If textbook information were listed along with enrollment numbers for each course, faculty would readily see it, thereby considerably raising awareness of textbook costs and alternate options.

(b) Email department chairs at the beginning of each semester with a report listing the textbook price information for all departmental courses, and encourage the
Figure 14: One possible way to modify the webpage listing the enrollment for a given course (in this case MATH 1010) to show textbook prices. Ideally, this page would also include reference information for the required textbook (name, author, publisher, edition, ISSN), and possibly also state whether or not the library owned a copy.

Web-based software should be developed that will send an automatic email directly to department chairs regarding textbook selection and prices for the upcoming semester. The email could include a reminder of the institution’s strategic goal with regard to cutting textbook costs (see Section 7.4). The email would ask department chairs to share this information with their faculty, either verbally at a faculty meeting or digitally by posting it on their department web page.

(c) Add a question on the standard student course evaluation forms regarding the cost of course materials compared to their perceived value in meeting the course objectives.

This is another way of providing feedback to faculty about textbook costs. The exact wording of this question should be determined by a follow-up committee (see Section 7.4).

(d) Update the resource information on syllabus design provided by the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence [https://utah.instructure.com/courses/148446/wiki/syllabus-design](https://utah.instructure.com/courses/148446/wiki/syllabus-design) to include language about textbook selection.

Course syllabi should indicate other ways in which the material in the required textbook(s) could be accessed. For example, can the required textbook be ac-
cessed free via the library’s collection? Or, are students permitted to use an older edition? Providing this information directly in the syllabus could help students make lower-cost textbook choices.

2. **Action Items for Library**

(a) Create a web page containing a list of textbooks organized by discipline that are contained in the library’s collection, and make this information readily available to students and faculty via the library’s website. This is currently being done at the University of Michigan for engineering textbooks (http://www.lib.umich.edu/art-architecture-engineering-library/winter-2014-engineering-textbooks-online).

(b) Create a brief online guide for faculty illustrating how Fair Use policies may be utilized to provide free educational material to students in their courses.

For example, faculty may scan one chapter from a given textbook and upload it to CANVAS for the students in their course to access. If there are multiple editions of a textbook, faculty could scan a different chapter from each edition and upload those to CANVAS. In some cases, this may be sufficient to cover all of the objectives in the course, such that students do not need to purchase any additional materials for the course. Librarians can assist faculty in putting together these materials and ensuring that Fair Use policies are met. Faculty may also need assistance with screen capture software, as described in Section 6.4. How-to guidelines and technical support by the library staff to assist faculty in using these types of tools would be extremely useful.

3. **Action Items for Faculty**

In order for used textbook, rental textbook, ebook, and library copies to be viable options for students, faculty must change their behavior and attitudes toward textbook selection.

(a) Become more aware of actual prices for the various textbook options.

Ideally, this information will be made readily available to faculty via the two mechanisms proposed above under Recommendations 7.1.1.a and 7.1.1.b.

(b) Respond promptly to Bookstore requests for textbook selections.

The Campus Bookstore operates under several deadlines that are crucial to its business function. In order to stock shelves in time for the beginning of the semester, the Bookstore requires textbook selections from faculty several months prior to the first day of class (see Section 6.1 for dates). Also, students receive a higher rate of return during buyback for books that will be re-used in the coming semester(s). Therefore, faculty that adhere to the adoption deadlines posted by the Bookstore and reuse the same textbook edition over consecutive semesters can have a significant impact on textbook cost savings to students.

(c) Include information in the course syllabus on alternative (lower cost) ways to access the required course materials, e.g., via the library collection, CANVAS
postings (within Fair Use policies), free online resources, and/or older editions of the textbook if permitted.

(d) Leverage Fair Use policy to provide free or lower-cost versions of materials that can be uploaded to CANVAS (see Recommendation 7.1.2.b. above and Section 6.4).

(e) Refrain from the use of custom textbooks that cannot be sold back to the Bookstore.

(f) Refrain from adopting new editions of a textbook when they are first released.

Students benefit from being able to purchase lower-cost used textbooks, which is only possible if an instructor uses the same textbook repeatedly. Since new editions of textbooks often contain only minor updates, faculty should consider simply using older editions of the same textbook unless the textbook changes are substantial and central to the quality of the information being covered.

(g) If adopting a new edition of a textbook, consider permitting students to use older editions.

In the process of adopting a new edition of a textbook, faculty should ask the publisher to identify the revised material (publishers are required to provide this information according to HEOA). Faculty could then leverage Fair Use policy (see Section 6.4) to scan up to 10% of the new edition and post that material on CANVAS (the library can assist with this). This would allow students using older editions to still benefit from some or all of the revised material in the new edition.

(h) Consider putting a personal print copy of the required textbook on reserve at the library for the semester.

If faculty own more than one personal copy of the required textbook, they might consider putting one of those copies on reserve in the library for the semester so students can access it freely. At the end of the semester, the library simply returns the textbook back to the faculty — it does not become part of the regular collection.

(i) Request library collections to purchase the electronic version of a required textbook.

Since the library will not be able to afford the purchase of print and/or electronic copies of textbooks for all courses, this recommendation is not a viable long-term solution. If the library becomes inundated with such requests, then a policy will have to be put in place to prioritize these purchases.

4. Action Items for Students

Student survey data indicate that a majority of University of Utah students are most likely to buy used textbooks and shop online for the lowest textbooks costs (see Section 5.2.1). Although these practices definitely contribute to notable cost savings, other strategies have been less widely utilized. Those that offer potential are listed below.
(a) Organize a campus student textbook exchange program (through ASUU) or consider utilizing an online textbook exchange program such as [https://www.post-yourbook.com](https://www.post-yourbook.com).

(b) Consider purchasing rental books for courses not in one’s major field of study.

(c) Consider selling books back to the Bookstore.

(d) Consider purchasing ebooks, when cheaper.

(e) Utilize free online copies of textbooks from the library when available.

In order to inform students which textbooks are available through the library’s collection, the Campus Bookstore could include an indication on their Verba Compare site with a link to the appropriate library page (see Recommendation 7.1.2.a. above).

### 7.2 Encourage the adoption of available open course materials

Textbook costs can be lowered by promoting the use of free, open textbooks and other open educational materials, instead of requiring students to purchase commercial textbooks. This section focuses on strategies to promote the adoption of existing open educational resources. Note, the current data (see Section 5.3) suggest that faculty are unlikely to move to open materials unless they are able to author or access materials that are more customized for their courses/curricula. Below are specific recommendations for the different members of the university community.

#### 1. Action Items for Administration

In order to facilitate the use of more open textbooks in courses at the University of Utah, it is necessary to provide institutional support to assist faculty in adopting available open course materials. Two possible ideas are listed below.

(a) Create an internal source of funding, similar to the University Teaching Assistant Program through the Graduate School or the Hybrid Course Development Grant through Teaching and Learning Technologies, to support the adoption of open course materials.

Funds would support activities related to the adoption of existing OER materials, such as identification of appropriate materials for a given course and modifications to course content needed in order to align the materials with course objectives (and vice versa). Other universities have begun offering similar types of funding opportunities. Two examples may be found through the respective library websites at Kansas State University [https://www.lib.k-state.edu/open-textbook](https://www.lib.k-state.edu/open-textbook) and Oregon State University [http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/oregon-state-university-open-textbook-request-proposal](http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/oregon-state-university-open-textbook-request-proposal).

(b) Create a new position in the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence or in the Library for a campus OER coordinator, whose dedicated role is to assist faculty in identifying and compiling open source material for specific courses.
2. Action Items for Library

(a) Create and maintain an OER web site for the University that is accessible via a “Quick Link” on the Marriott Library’s home page.

This web site should contain a list of open textbooks and open courseware materials that are organized in such a way to help facilitate the adoption of OER by faculty. The Marriott Library might consider emulating websites developed by other university libraries, such as that by the University of Minnesota (http://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/) or the University of Massachusetts (http://guides.library.umass.edu/content.php?pid=87648&sid=4778756).

(b) Leverage the expertise of librarians with specific subject matter knowledge to consult with faculty in finding and adopting open materials that are well-aligned to course goals and subject area needs.

Since the selection of an open textbook can be daunting for many faculty, it would be helpful to have campus resources to assist with this process. Since many librarians have degrees in areas outside of library science, they can assist faculty in identifying potential OER materials for courses aligned with their area of technical expertise. Ideally, librarians would work together with the campus OER coordinator (see Recommendation 7.2.1.a. above) and would interface with the libraries’ OER website (see Recommendation 7.2.2.a. above). One idea would be to target the adoption of open textbooks in the most popular courses (see Table 2), by finding librarians with subject matter expertise in those courses and sending them to the faculty responsible for teaching those courses to provide individual or group consultation in adopting open materials.

(c) Create some educational materials or a short training course to teach best practices for reading and annotating digital textbooks.

Based on responses from the survey (see Section 5.2.1), students on average do not appear to be comfortable with the tools and practices of reading digital textbooks. Giving them the skills needed to work with digital materials effectively could increase their willingness to try this cost-saving method.

3. Action Items for Faculty

(a) When teaching a course for the first time, consider adopting an open textbook from the beginning, and taking advantage of open courseware to prepare lecture content.

(b) Consider revising current courses to allow for the adoption of available open textbooks or open courseware solutions instead of relying on commercial textbooks.

(c) Work in teams with other faculty to develop shared open materials for courses.

(d) Use existing online resources to review available open materials authored by others.

(e) Consider the use of non-textbook materials that are available online, including articles, videos, simulations, etc., to support course objectives.
4. Action Items for Students

(a) Get comfortable reading/annotating digital textbooks.

One finding in a recent student survey by the Book Industry Study Group is that students’ willingness to adopt digital formats increases significantly with exposure (BISG 2013).

(b) Seek out help from the library in order to access digital material from the libraries’ collection and learn best practices for reading digital textbooks (see Recommendation 7.2.2.c).

7.3 Support the development of new open course materials

“It would be almost ironic, if it weren’t terribly sad, that universities need to pay traditional academic publishers like Elsevier millions of dollars each year to purchase access to publications written by their own faculty members.” (Moxley 2013) This section focuses on strategies to promote the development of new open educational resources. Below are specific recommendations for the different members of the university community.

1. Action Items for Administration

(a) Create a source of institutional funding to pay for the development of new open textbooks.

A possible source of government funds to support the development of open textbooks is the “Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education” (http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/fipse/index.html). However, it is likely that a large grant from a philanthropic organization will be needed in order to support the development of a significant number of open textbooks. One strategy might be to target the development of new open textbooks for the courses that satisfy the general education requirements, since this will have the biggest initial impact for Utah students. A good example of a successful enterprise in open textbook development and promotion is Rice University’s OpenStax College, described in Section 4.4. Another possibility is to institute an OA textbook fee that students pay per credit hour in order to help finance the use of open textbooks at Utah.

(b) Promote the development of custom open textbooks for the most popular undergraduate courses with the largest enrollment.

Based on the data from Table 2 the courses with the highest enrollment and highest textbook cost are Algebra (MATH 1010, 1050), Trigonometry (MATH 1060), General Chemistry (CHEM 1210, 1215, 1220), Principles of Biology (BIOL 1210), Principles of Microeconomics (ECON 2010), and Survey of Accounting (ACCTG 2600). Investment in open course materials for these courses would have a significant impact.

(c) In terms of promotion and tenure, consider authoring open educational resources as evidence of scholarly accomplishment.
2. Action Items for Faculty

(a) Negotiate with department chairs for release time dedicated to authoring open textbooks and/or developing other open materials.

(b) Collaborate with other faculty to identify shared materials needs that could be addressed by common open materials.

(c) Develop a strategic plan for moving from publisher-supplied textbooks to low-cost or open materials by the year 2020.

7.4 Create a university body to realize long-term vision

It is proposed that the University create a new administrative position, or assign responsibility to an existing administrative position, that will oversee university accountability of textbook costs and lead the movement toward utilizing more open educational materials on campus. It is important that this person have the necessary authority to implement recommendations and affect real change on campus in terms of textbook cost savings. This person would also establish a standing committee on “Textbook Costs and Open Courseware” (or other relevant name to be determined) populated by representative stakeholders, e.g., faculty, students, bookstore staff, librarians, etc. At some point, this standing committee should evaluate whether it could become part of an existing center on campus, such as the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence, or whether to propose the formation of a new center.

Some ideas on the possible role of this standing committee are:

- develop an institutional policy regarding textbook costs that emphasizes a university-wide strategic plan to be cognizant of textbook costs and to continue to explore ways to reduce those costs,
- brainstorm ways of effectively communicating the recommendations to faculty as stated in the previous sections,
- make funding awards for the internal grant competitions suggested in Sections 7.2 and 7.3
- conduct a survey of University of Utah faculty to better understand the climate for OER on campus,
- work with faculty/departments to facilitate the adoption of open textbooks in high-impact courses,
- work with the libraries to prioritize the purchase of electronic textbooks, if there are not enough funds to cover all such requests,
- research possible sources of external funding to support the development of OER at the University of Utah, and
- given enough interest, assemble a team of faculty to write a proposal to seek external funding for the development of OER at the University of Utah.
8 Conclusions

Rising textbook costs are a significant problem at universities nationwide and the University of Utah is no exception. Survey results from the University of Utah show that students find it difficult to pay for their books and that many students have decided not to buy textbooks for classes due to high costs. This creates a clear and significant barrier to fulfilling the University of Utah’s mission to cultivate an “academic environment in which the highest standards of intellectual integrity and scholarship are practiced” (see http://admin.utah.edu/office_of_the_president/university-mission-statement).

The University should be proactive in addressing the problem of textbook costs by investing in short- and long-term solutions necessary to improve the affordability and accessibility of course materials (see Section 7 of this report). Short-term solutions focus on moving toward using low-cost versions of existing materials (see Section 7.1) and can be implemented with modest commitments of administrative support, departmental buy-in, library services, and faculty effort. Based on the data in Table 3, students could save almost $500 per year on textbook costs (which was the original goal of this Committee) by simply purchasing used rental options of required textbooks. The key to realizing this cost savings in practice is for faculty to refrain from adopting new editions of textbooks unless they are crucial to meeting the course objectives. This allows students to buy used at less expensive rates and sell back at higher rates. Even though students may want to keep permanent copies of some textbooks in their major field of study for future reference, substantial cost savings is possible by exploiting the used textbook market.

Long-term solutions undoubtedly will include substantial use of open course materials that are developed locally as well as by external entities (see Sections 7.2 and 7.3). Locally-developed open course materials will require financial investment to fund faculty authoring of such materials; however, locally-developed open course materials are likely to meet the specialized needs and rigorous standards of specific courses and programs at the University of Utah. Based on the responses from students in the student survey conducted by the Committee, it is reasonable to claim that, if every undergraduate student at the University of Utah were assigned just one open textbook each year that replaced their most expensive commercial textbook, $4.9 million in student savings could be generated in a single year.

The Committee urges the University to develop a long-range, strategic plan for funding and incentivizing the development and adoption of open course materials at the University of Utah. A central component of this plan will be the identification of a University body (either a new position or a position in the existing University leadership; see Section 7.4) who will provide oversight and accountability for campus entities engaged in activities related to reducing textbook costs and moving toward open course materials. It is also recommended that this administrative person formulate a standing committee comprised of representative stakeholders (students, faculty, bookstore staff, librarians, etc.) to assist in implementing and evaluating the strategic plan. The development and adoption of a strategic plan with administrative oversight will represent a significant and important investment in making higher education affordable, accessible, and equitable for our students.
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10 Appendix

The appendix includes a copy of the online student survey about textbook costs that was sent from ASUU to a random sample of students at the University of Utah, as described in Section 5.2.1.
Hello University of Utah Students,

ASUU is working with many organizations on campus to decrease textbook costs for students at the University of Utah. As students, we know this is an important issue to many of you and would love your help in figuring out the best ways to decrease student textbook expenses. This survey is anonymous and should take just 3-5 minutes to complete. Your feedback will be a critical part of our recommendations for the University of Utah.

To access the survey please click here. If the survey does not open automatically, please copy and paste the following link to your internet browser's address bar:

http://www.studentvoice.com/p/?uuid=2645773983c743368b34819d6d17be1&p=1

Any additional feedback, questions, or suggestions may be sent to Rachel Wootton, ASUU Director of Academic Affairs, at rwootton@asuu.utah.edu.

Thank you so much for your help and have a great rest of your semester!

Best,
Sam Ortiz
Student Body President

Distribution of this message was approved by Mary G. Parker,
Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, University of Utah
Phone (801) 581-3490, 201 S. Presidents Circle, Room 206,
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
Question 1
On average, approximately how much money do you spend on textbooks each semester? (Please use whole numeric values only; Round to the nearest dollar-- do not use cents. e.g., $1,000.00 = 1000)

Question 2
Approximately how much did you spend on your most expensive textbook this academic year? (Please use whole numeric values only; Round to the nearest dollar-- do not use cents. e.g., $1,000.00 = 1000)

Question 3
How do you save money on textbook costs? (Check all that apply)
- Rent textbooks
- Purchase used textbooks
- Borrow textbooks
- Buy textbooks online at lowest price
- Use/purchase an ebook if available
- Utilize free online resources
- Do not purchase textbooks listed as optional
- Share textbooks with one or more friends
- Use a library/reserve copy
- N/A: I don’t employ any methods to save money on textbooks
- Other:

Question 4 - 8
For each device, please check which of the following best applies to you:

Own
**Question 9**

Do you use any of the above devices to access online or electronic textbooks?

- Yes
- No

**Questions 10 - 16**

On a scale from 1-6, with 1 being "Least Likely" and 6 being "Most likely", please rate how likely would you be to use each of the following methods to access a required textbook for class (assuming each were available).

1. Least Likely
2.
3.
4.
5.
6. Most Likely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buy new (print) textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy used (print) textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbook rental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical copy at the library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online copy at the library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy ebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borrow from someone else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 17**

Don't own but have access

Don't have access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer/laptop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPad/iPhone (or other iOS device)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Android device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows phone/tablet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-reader (e.g., Kindle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over the time you have been at the University of Utah, how many times have you chosen not to purchase a textbook because of its cost?

- 0
- 1-2
- 3-4
- 5-6
- 7+  

On a scale from 1 to 6 with "1" being not at all difficult to "6" being very difficult, please rate how difficult it is for you to afford text books each semester.

- 1 Not at all
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6 Very
Question 19

What is the college of your major(s)? (Check All that Apply)

- Architecture and Planning
- Business
- Dentistry
- Education
- Engineering
- Fine Arts
- Health
- Humanities
- Law
- Medicine
- Mines & Earth Science
- Nursing
- Pharmacy
- Science
- Social & Behavioral Science
- Social Work
- Undeclared

Question 20

What is your current year in school?

- First Year/Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate Student

Question 21

Please select your current enrollment status:

- Full-time
Question 22
Did you transfer into this institution?
- Yes
- No

Question 23
What is your gender identity?
- Female
- Male
- Transgender
- Self-identified gender (please specify):
  - [ ]
- Prefer not to respond

Question 24
What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)
- Asian
- Black/African American
- Latino/a/Hispanic/Chicano/a
- Middle Eastern
- Native American/American Indian
- Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian
- White/Caucasian
- Self-identified Race (please specify):
  - [ ]
- Prefer not to respond

Question 25
Are you an international student (holding a SEVIS visa group: F1, F2, J1, J2, BE, BP, B1, B2, WB, WP)?
- Yes
- No

Question 26
Do you consider yourself a Veteran?

- Yes
- No

What is your age?

Select Answer

© 2012 Campus Labs. All rights reserved.
Interim Rule R5-200B: Paid Time Off (PTO), Holidays, and Other Paid Leave for University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics Staff Members. Revision 1. Effective date [upon final approval].

I. Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this Rule is to implement Policies 5–200 (Leaves of Absence – Health Related), 5–201 (Leaves of Absence – Non–Health Related), 5–300 (Holidays), and 5–301 (Vacation Leave), and align the paid time off, holidays, and other paid leave practices for staff employees of the University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics (“UUHC“) with the practices of peer health care institutions and the needs of hospital and clinic operations while creating flexibility for a diverse workforce, allowing employees to own all of their accrued time and reducing unscheduled absences. This Rule applies only to staff employees of the University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics. Regulations governing all other University employees (including all University Faculty, all non–faculty academic employees, and Staff employees of all units other than UUHC) are provided in Rule 5–200A (Scope, Eligibility and Limitations for Leaves of Absence – Health–Related); Policy 5–201 (Leaves of Absence – Non–Health–Related); Rule 5–300A (Scope, Eligibility and Limitations for Holidays – University Employees Other Than UUHC); and Rule 5–301A (Scope, Eligibility, and Limitations for Vacation Leave – University Employees Other Than UUHC).

II. Definitions

A. The definitions provided in Policy 5–001, Employee Definitions, apply for purposes of this Rule, including these defined terms: Employee, Benefits–eligible Position, Full–time Equivalent (FTE), Staff Member, Exempt (Salaried) Position, Non–exempt (Hourly) Position, and Temporary.

B. Paid Time Off (“PTO“): PTO refers to accrued time, not including paid Holidays, that may be used by employees for any personal reason, including but not limited to observance of holidays, vacation, sick
leave or other health related absences. PTO will also include holidays and provided under this Rule incorporates and substitutes for the paid vacation and sick leave provided to non–UUHC employees of the University under other Regulations, and incorporates and substitutes for the Annual Personal Preference Holidays (which for non–UUHC employees are included as paid Holidays under Policy 5–300), which will not be provided separately. (This Rule does not however, affect UUHC holiday pay practices.)

C. Extended Sick Leave (“ESL”): ESL refers to sick leave accruals earned during UUHC employment prior to the October 1, 2012 date of initial implementation of this PTO Rule.

D. Holiday (“HOL”): refers to the benefit of paid days provided to UUHC employees as designated paid holidays observed by the University of Utah, as described in Policy 5–300 (but for purposes of this Rule for UUHC employees not including Annual Personal Preference Holidays).

III. Rule

A. Paid Time Off (PTO) Benefits.

1. PTO Eligibility: UUHC Employees are eligible for PTO benefits if they hold Benefits–eligible positions at not less than 0.75 FTE. UUHC Employees in Temporary positions, or whose permanent assignment is for less than .75% FTE of full-time, are not eligible for PTO benefits.

2. PTO accrual rates:
   a. Eligible Employees accrue PTO benefits monthly, at rates determined by the Employee’s position, years of service (rates increase in five–year steps), and FTE of the employee position.
   b. The applicable rates for 1.0 FTE positions are shown in Table 1 below. The PTO accrual rates in the preceding section designate the PTO earned by employees working 1.0 FTE.
c. Eligible employees working less than 1.0 FTE, but at least 0.75 FTE will accrue amounts prorated by their FTE.

d. Eligible employees working .50 to .74 FTE will accrue amounts up to 96 16 hours annually prorated by their FTE.

3. **Annual PTO carry-over limits.**

   a. The maximum PTO accrual that may be carried over to each new calendar year by UUHC Managers, Directors and Executive Directors is 600 hours (15 weeks for a full-time employee). **Any hours that exceed 600 hours at the end of the calendar year will be cashed out and paid to the employee.**

   b. The maximum PTO accrual that may be carried over to each new calendar year by all other UUHC Staff Members is 520 hours (13 weeks for a Full-time Employee). **Any hours that exceed 520 at the end of the calendar year will be cashed out and paid to the employee.**

4. **PTO during leaves.** PTO benefits continue to accrue during leaves of absence with pay, but not during leaves of absence without pay.

5. **ESL Eligibility:** UUHC staff members employed at the time this PTO rule is implemented are eligible for transfer of their sick leave balances to ESL. Employees hired after PTO implementation, including former UUHC employees rehired after PTO implementation and employees who transfer to UUHC after PTO implementation from non-UUHC positions with the University, will not be eligible for ESL. ***[Drafting note: this is being moved below to III-E along with all other information about ESL, and then revised as shown there.]***

B. **Holiday (HOL) Benefits.**

   1. **HOL Eligibility:** Employees in positions of .50 FTE or greater (20 hours per week or more) are eligible for paid Holiday benefits.
2. **HOL Accrual Rates**: Holiday benefits (for all categories of eligible UUHC employees) are based on the University's approved list of ten designated holidays (governed by Policy 5–300), thereby accruing at the rate of ten days (80 hours) per year for positions of 1.0 FTE, and prorated accordingly for positions at a lower percentage of FTE (e.g., 40 hours annually for a .5 FTE position).

C. **Table of PTO Accrual Rates, PTO Accrual Limits, and annual Holidays**:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exempt/Non-Exempt Staff (rates for 1.0 FTE)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service in Years</td>
<td>Service in Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>0 – 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>61 – 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 +</td>
<td>121 +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers/ Directors (rates for 1.0 FTE)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Years</td>
<td>Service in Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>0 – 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>61 – 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 +</td>
<td>121 +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXEMPT/ NON-EXEMPT STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Years</th>
<th>Service-in Months</th>
<th>Hours Earned per</th>
<th>Hours Earned per</th>
<th>Days Earned per</th>
<th>Maximum Accrual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PTO Accrual:

1. PTO benefits continue to accrue during leaves of absence with pay, but not during leaves of absence without pay.

2. The PTO accrual rates in the preceding section designate the PTO earned by employees working 1.0 FTE. Eligible employees working less than 1.0 FTE, but at least 0.75 FTE will accrue amounts pro-rated by their FTE.

3. Eligible employees working .50 to .74 FTE will accrue amounts up to 96 hours annually pro-rated by their FTE. The maximum PTO accrual that may be carried over to each new calendar year by exempt and nonexempt UUHC staff is 520 hours (13 weeks for a full-time employee).

4. The maximum PTO accrual that may be carried over to each new calendar year by UUHC Managers, Directors and Executive Directors is 600 hours (15 weeks for a full-time employee).

D. PTO and HOL and ESL Use and Cash Out:

1. Eligible staff members are encouraged to take time off and are expected to arrange absences in advance with their
supervisors according to approved departmental standards in order to prevent disruption of departmental operations.

2. **As more fully described in definition II.D above, PTO may be used for any personal reason, including vacation or any purposes described in Rule R5–200A.**

3. **An employee eligible for and requesting leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (“FMLA”) must substitute any accrued PTO for unpaid leave taken under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) as described in Rule R5–200A 5–200B for an equivalent period of unpaid FMLA leave according An Employee eligible for Holiday pay who works on any designated Holiday shall receive equal time off which shall be scheduled at the mutual convenience of the employee and UUHC unit, which should be scheduled within the same pay period, if possible, and if not then within the same calendar year. And if such rescheduling is not completed within that year, then that time will be cashed out and paid to the employee at the end of the calendar year.**

4. **An employee with ESL may substitute ESL for unpaid FMLA leave after having used 40 hours of PTO (pro-rated by FTE) in connection with the FMLA leave occurrence.** *Drafting note: moved below to III–E along with all other information about ESL.*

4. **Eligible staff members Employees are entitled upon separation from Benefits–eligible employment to payment for accrued unused PTO and Holiday leave benefits.**

5. **Eligible staff members Employees will also be given an annual option to receive payment for either 40 up to a maximum of or 80 PTO hours, provided that they will have a PTO balance of at least 120 hours remaining (pro-rated by percentage of FTE) after the cash out remaining after the cash out per UUHC PTO Guidelines.**

No payment will be made for unused ESL at any time. *Drafting note: moved below to III–E along with all other information about ESL.*
6. In the event a UUHC employee transfers to a non–UUHC position with the University, PTO will be paid and/or transferred in accordance with Rule 5–301A. In the event a Non–UUHC employee transfers to a position with UUHC, vacation will be paid, lost and/or transferred to PTO in accordance with relevant sections of Rule 5–301A.

F. Holidays

Employees in positions of 0.50 or greater (20 hours per week or more) are entitled to 80 hours of holiday time per year based on their FTE.

{Drafting note: moved to above along with other information about Holidays}

E. Extended Sick Leave (ESL).

1. **ESL Eligibility**: UUHC staff members employed at the time this PTO Rule was initially implemented (October 1, 2012) are eligible for transfer into ESL of their sick leave balances to ESL which had accrued up to that date (but no further sick leave accrued from that date or later). Employees hired after on or after that date of PTO implementation, including former UUHC employees rehired after PTO implementation and Employees who transfer to UUHC after PTO implementation from non–UUHC positions with the University, will not be eligible for ESL.

2. 2. An Employee with ESL may substitute ESL for unpaid FMLA after having used 40 hours of PTO the allotted time requirement set by the University of Utah Hospital and Clinics (pro–rated by FTE) in connection with the FMLA leave occurrence.

3. No payment will be made for unused ESL at any time.

F. Other Paid Leave:

1. **Funeral Leave:**

   a. Employees in positions at 0.75 FTE or greater (30 hours per week or more).
b. **Paid funeral leave** up to three working days not counted against PTO bank.


2. **Jury or Witness Duty:**

   a. Available to Employees required to be absent from work because of an official requirement to appear for jury service or a subpoena to appear as a witness at a trial, deposition, or other official proceedings.

   b. **Staff members** Employees who are requested to report for jury or witness duty will be paid for the FTE of their normal workday. To receive this pay, the Employee must turn the jury or witness duty payment received into the Employee's manager who will then send the check directly to the appropriate cashier or cash custodian. The payroll reporter will then add the jury duty hours into the Kronos time card to cover the time the Employee was on jury or witness duty.

3. **Annual Military Training:**

   a. Available to Employees who are members of the National Guard or any organized reserve branch of the United States uniformed services.

   b. **Paid leave for** up to fifteen (15) working days per year for time spent for annual training at annual encampments or rifle competitions or other duties in connection with the reserve training and instruction requirements of the United States uniformed services or National Guard.

   c. Does not include active military duty, which is unpaid.

---

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

IV. Policies, Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources
A. Policies
   Policy 5–200, Leaves of Absence (Health–Related)
   Policy 5–201, Leaves of Absence (Non Health–Related)
   Policy 5–300, Holidays
   Policy 5–301, Vacation Leave Policy

B. Rules
   Rule 5–301A: Scope, Eligibility, and Limitations for Vacation Leave – University Employees
   (Other than UUHC Staff)

C. Procedures
D. Guidelines
E. Forms
F. Other related resource materials

V. References (Reserved)
   Policy 5–200: Leaves of Absence (Health Related)
   Policy 5–201: Leaves of Absence (Non Health Related)
   Rule 5–200A: Scope, Eligibility and Limitations for Leaves of Absence (Health–Related)
   Policy 5–300: Holidays and Holiday Premium Pay
   Policy 5–301: Vacation Policy

VI. Contacts
   The designated contact officials for this Policy are:
   A. Policy Owner (primary contact person for questions and advice): the University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics’ Director of Employee Relations.
   B. Policy Officers: the Senior 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 which reference materials are helpful in understanding the meaning and requirements of particular Policies... ." University Rule 1-001-III-B & E

VII. History:
   This Rule was first put into effect by the University's President as Interim Rule R5–200B, (also R5–201, R5–300, R5–301) on September 10, 2012. It will be presented for consideration by the Academic Senate in due course. Background

   [Drafting note: will update the history after Revision 1—the permanent version of the Rule, is finally approved].
Report of Senate Activities for AY 2013-2014

- Held nine Senate meetings
  - four on main campus, five on health sciences
    - incorporated career-line faculty at Jan 2014 meeting
  - two orientation sessions
  - two CHC hearings
  - two AFFR grievance hearings
  - countless Senate committee meetings (see committee reports)
- Heard ~53 proposals with the most in May and the least in February
  - four degrees
  - five certificates
  - three emphases
  - three new departments
  - four new centers/institutes
  - ~20 policy updates/introductions
  - four discontinued degrees and one department
  - three name changes
  - two academic calendars
  - two resolutions
- Created five ad hoc committees
  - Student Textbook Savings
  - Faculty and Student Response Pool
  - Learning Enhancement & Outcomes Assessment
  - Anti-Vehicle Idling
  - Committee on Investment Responsibility
- Reduced by half the number of university committees the Senate office populates
- Developed a governance website with cheesy videos
- Formalized degree and policy approval workflow
- Introduced e-governance software
- Reinvigorated College Councils in the governance system
- Organized a 100-year anniversary party
- Read the rules and followed most of them
MEMORANDUM

To: Ruth Watkins, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Ann Darling and Steve Roens, Senior Associate Deans, Office of Undergraduate Studies

Date: February 13, 2014

Re: University Professor for 2014-2016

I am very pleased to forward to you the Undergraduate Council’s recommendation for appointment to the special rank of University Professor for the 2014-2016 academic years. From a field of outstanding applicants, the Council has selected two candidates, Professor Erik Brunvand from the School of Computing and Professor Matthew Potolsky from the Department of English. In the judgment of the Undergraduate Council which served as the selection committee, Professors Brunvand and Potolsky are both eminently qualified for the rank of University Professor.

The rank of University Professor offers faculty who have attained unusual distinction in undergraduate teaching the opportunity to launch a new project that will make significant differences in our students’ educational experiences. This project should reflect the rich traditions of inquiry or creative activity found in one or more of the four areas that constitute the Intellectual Explorations component of our students’ General Education studies, as well as courses that satisfy the University’s graduation requirements.

Professor Brunvand proposes to develop a course “tentatively titled Explorations in Digital Media” that will introduce students from across campus to a variety of digital media subjects that also involve computation.” He plans to “emphasize hands-on projects that include both programming and physical/electronic artifacts.” This will introduce students to computing and increase their technological fluency through digital media projects rather than engineering projects. “It is also a way to expand students’ ideas about technology in the arts and how arts and technology interact in our modern world. In addition, Professor Brunvand plans to use the University Professorship to revise the first draft of a book entitled Fundamentals of Physical Computing for Programmers into a completed textbook that will complement his new course. Finally, he proposes to organize a series of lectures and demonstrations to be delivered by a slate of national and international speakers related to experimental digital media that will be open to the campus community and that will most likely be tied into the Creative Campus Initiative.
Professor Brunvand’s background, teaching and research make him well-suited to design and teach the proposed course. He has demonstrated the expertise, and judging from his student evaluations, significant success, in presenting the kind of material he proposes to include in the course. He has already worked with computer applications and the arts in a course he developed in conjunction with a faculty member from the Art Department focused on kinetic arts, bringing computer-controlled movement to art projects. In the words of one of his references, “He is a perfect fit for the description: he is an excellent teacher who crosses conventional boundaries, emphasizes interdisciplinarity, and reflects a strong interest in liberal education.”

Professor Potolsky proposes a project that would focus on the development of a course that examines ideas about secrecy and transparency across disciplines. The course will begin with students reading texts on secrecy and transparency, from the stories of Pandora and Eve to classic studies by Simmel, Canetti and Foucault. Students “will discuss the way ideas of secrecy have changed over time, and chart theories of transparency from Enlightenment philosophy to modern groups like WikiLeaks and the Sunlight Foundation.” After this introduction, the course will explore a variety of topics including childhood secrets, family secrets, religious secrets (which will include reading Sophocles’s Oedipus the King and the Gospel of Mark). The course will then consider political secrets, examining the history of ideas about state secrets and conspiracy theories, culminating with a focus on the concept of privacy.

The project will also include a series of lectures given by University faculty around the topics introduced in the course as well as visits by specialists two or three times a semester to speak to a broad audience of students and faculty on a range of topics related to secrecy and transparency.

Professor Potolsky’s background, teaching and research also make him well-suited to design and teach the course he proposes. For the past fourteen years he has been teaching a course on literary secrets and is currently writing a book based on the course. The proposed course will broaden the focus of this original course. The recipient of several teaching awards, Professor Potolsky is clearly successful in the classroom. One of his references described him as “an outstanding scholar and award-winning teacher with a demonstrated record of commitment to undergraduate education.”

We request your assistance in forwarding the nomination of Professors Brunvand and Potolsky to the Board of Trustees for their consideration and approval.

Thank you for your assistance and for your support of the University Professorship.

Enclosures

cc: President David Pershing
Martha Bradley, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Richard Brown, Dean, College of Engineering
Mark Bergstrom, Acting Dean, College of Humanities
Ross Whitaker, Director, School of Computing
Barry Weller, Chair, Department of English
Honors and Awards to Members of the University Community

1. The Professional MBA program at the University of Utah’s David Eccles School of Business jumped 12 positions in the annual U.S. News and World Report’s part-time MBA rankings released last month. U.S. News and World Report ranked the program as No. 52, up from 64 in last year’s ranking. The program was ranked No. 7 in the west. The U.S. News part-time MBA ranking is based on five factors: average peer assessment score (50 percent of the overall score); average GMAT and GRE scores of part-time MBA students entering in the fall of 2013 (15 percent); average undergraduate GPA (5 percent); work experience (15 percent); and the percentage of the fall 2013 MBA enrollment that is part-time (15 percent).

2. Adam Douglass, Ph.D., assistant professor of neurobiology and anatomy, has received a 2014 Sloan Research Fellowship. He is among the 126 American and Canadian researchers who will receive $50,000 to further their research. The prestigious awards identify scientists and scholars early in their careers with the potential to become future leaders in their field. Dozens have gone on to win a Nobel Prize and other awards. Douglass studies how dopamine influences behavior using a genetically-encoded, fluorescent voltage indicator on larval zebrafish. The simple fish are in their first week of life. Their transparency works well with optical research techniques.