ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA
October 5, 2009

1. CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 p.m. in the C. Roland Christensen Center, room 115.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 31, 2009

3. REQUEST FOR NEW BUSINESS:
a. White Paper: Student Evaluations – Stephanie Richardson

4. CONSENT CALENDAR:
a. Appendix I: Resignations, Administrative and Faculty Appointments
b. Appendix II: Auxiliary and Limited Term Appointments
c. Appendix III: Emeritus Appointments [additional distributed at meeting]

5. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT:

6. REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATION:

7. REPORT FROM ASUU:

8. NOTICE OF INTENT:
a. Revision of Policy 6-401 re University Student Media Council

9. DEBATE CALENDAR:
a. Proposed Sustainability Research Center
b. Proposed Center for Ecosystem and Global Change
c. Proposed Restructure of the Departments of Ballet and Modern Dance
d. Proposed Professional Doctorate in Occupational Therapy

10. INFORMATION CALENDAR:
a. Graduate Council Reviews:
   • Department of Bioengineering
   • Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
   • Department of Educational Leadership and Policy
   • Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
   • Department of Human Genetics
   • Department of Linguistics
   • Department of Languages and Literature (2006)
   • Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology (2006)
   • Middle East Center (2007)

11. NEW BUSINESS:

12. ADJOURNMENT:
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES  
August 31, 2009

Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate, held on May 4, 2009 was called to order at 3:03 pm by James A. Anderson, Senate President. The meeting was held in room 220 Aline Wilmot Skaggs Building.

Roll:

Excused: Richard Barton, George Cassiday, Bruce Landesman, Edward Levine, Brad Lundahl, Lor Randall, Bam Dev Sharda

Ex-officio: A. Lorris Betz, Paul Brinkman, Robert Flores, John Francis, James Graves, Nancy Lines, Paul Mogren, David W. Pershing, Richard Sperry, Raymond Tymas-Jones, Octavio Villalpando, Chuck Wight, Michael K. Young

Others: Ann Floor, Nancy Staggers, John F. Hurdle, Eric Hunter

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of May 4, 2009 were unanimously approved following a motion from Larry Devries which was seconded by Connie Bullis.

Request for New Business
There was no new business.

Consent Calendar
The resignations, retirements, faculty appointments, auxiliary, and limited term appointments, appearing in the Appendices received unanimous approval to forward to the Board of Trustees following a motion from Larry Devries and seconded by Connie Bullis.
Executive Committee Report
Jim Metherall, Executive Committee Secretary, summarized his written report of the June 1 and August 24, 2009 Executive Committee meetings.

Report from Administration
President Michael Young delivered the State of the University immediately following the Senate meeting.

Report from ASUU
President Tayler Clough reported that ASUU is working on to major initiatives. The first is a Community Mentoring Program which will enlist 14 graduate students to work with students in grades 9-12 to help them prepare for college and completing college admission applications. Secondly, the Student Fee Committee is working with vice presidents and looking at how students fees are being used. In conclusion, he solicited faculty to forward him any concerns with ASUU.

Notice of Intent
There were no items.

Debate Calendar
Nancy Staggers and John Hurdle gave a précis of the proposed request to change the name of the existing Biomedical Informatics Graduate Certificate and expand it to include Nursing Informatics students, faculty and to allow interdisciplinary growth into the future. The generic title will be more inclusive and accommodate a broader range of disciplines beyond health sciences. *A motion from Larry DeVries to approve the request and forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval was seconded by Mollie Poynton and was unanimously approved.*

Dean Jim Graves represented the College of Health’s proposed request for an Undergraduate Minor in Health. It is designed for students entering into careers other than health, promotion and education, who wish to have formally-recognized educational preparation in health. The minor will offer undergraduate students content in the areas of public health, positive behavior change and healthy lifestyles. It would also serve as an ideal complement to existing B.S. programs beyond the college in Psychology, Anthropology, Sociology, Political Science, and Communication with no additional resources being required. *A motion from Seth Welborn, seconded by Todd Kramer, to forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval received unanimous approval.*

Eric Hunter from the National Center for Voice and Speech, gave a short synopsis of the proposed request to bring the well-established entity that has served the nation as a major resource back to the University of Utah. NCVS was conceived as “a center without walls” in 1990 from a National Institute of Health grant on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders and was organized on the premise that a consortium of institutions is better able to acquire and maintain resources to fulfill the global mission of voice awareness than a single organization to understand and promote the best use of the human voice and speech. The objective is not only to re-engage the University but to house their headquarters in the State of Utah can allow it to become the national focal point for advocacy in effective voice and speech use. Utah’s interest in
public speaking and singing is extraordinary in and human resources are unmatched along the Wasatch Front, both for research and for dissemination of information to the public. Voice is a small part of many disciplines including the colleges of health, medicine, fine arts, engineering, and science. Several concerns were voiced in a lengthy question and answer session centered around the financial future and direct oversight. A motion from Larry DeVries which was seconded by Jessieann Hibbard, to forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval passed with some reservations.

Information Calendar
The Executive Committee approved several items during the summer months while acting on behalf of the Senate. Included were: 1) the Undergraduate Council’s request to approve a proposal from the Department of Art and Art History to have emphasis areas listed on students’ transcripts; 2) the modification of five policies to accommodate gender identity and gender expression for non-discrimination; 3) a policy to expand reduced tuition to domestic partners; 4) a Master of Real Estate Development and a Graduate Certificate in Real Estate Development from the Business School; and 5) a degree for a Joint Master of Public Administration and Master of Public Health. Also approved was a rule for on-line voting, and the announcements of three new deans: Taylor Randall for the School of Business, Charles Wight for the Graduate School, and David Rudd for Social and Behavioral Science.

The Undergraduate Council’s reviews of the Ethnic Studies Program, and the International Studies Program, were reviewed in the August 24 Executive Committee and approved.

The Graduate Council’s reviews of: 1) the School of Music; 2) the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering; 3) the Department of Communication; 4) the Department of Physiology; 5) the Department of Pathology; and 6) the Master of Statistics Program were reviewed in the August 24 Executive Committee and approved.

The annual reports from six of the Senate Committees including Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights, Academic Policy Advisory Committee, Faculty Budget and Planning Committee, Library Policy Advisory Committee, University Diversity Committee and the University RPT Standards Committee were accepted in the August 24 Executive Committee.

The President’s Report and the Honors and Awards were listed for information only.

Jim Metherall as Executive Committee Secretary, and Robert Flores as Parliamentarian, were approved in the August 24 Executive Committee.

New Business
There was no new business

Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Lines
ADDENDUM

APPENDIX I

RESIGNATION & APPOINTMENTS

Resignation

1. Dr. Anupam Verma, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Pediatrics, effective August 23, 2009.

Administrative Appointments

1. Dr. Timothy Ameel, Chair, Department of Mechanical Engineering, effective August 1, 2009.

2. Dr. Chris M. Ireland, Interim Dean, College of Pharmacy, effective October 1, 2009.

3. Dr. Lynn B. Jorde, Chair, Department of Human Genetics, effective September 1, 2009.

4. Dr. John Mauger, Associate Vice President, Health Sciences Special Projects, effective October 1, 2009.

5. Dr. Douglas Kip Solomon, Chair, Department of Geology and Geophysics, effective July 1, 2009.

Faculty Appointments

ENGINEERING

1. Dr. Kim Hanseup, Assistant Professor of Electrical & Computer Engineering, effective September 1, 2009.

B.S., 1997, Seoul National University
Ph.D., 2006, University of Michigan
MEDICINE

2. Dr. William O. Brant, Assistant Professor of Urology, effective September 15, 2009.
   B.A., 1991, Dartmouth College
   M.A., 1993, University of Washington
   M.D., 1999, University of California

3. Dr. Christi Joy Inman, Instructor in Pediatrics, effective September 1, 2009.
   B.S., 1998, University of California
   M.S., 2003, University of Washington
   M.D., 2009, Drexel University

4. Dr. Richard D. King, Assistant Professor of Neurology, effective September 1, 2009.
   B.S., 1994, Texas A&M University
   M.D., 2002, Baylor College of Medicine

5. Dr. Lauren E. Schrock, Assistant Professor of Neurology, effective September 1, 2009.
   B.A., 1998, Saint Olaf College
   M.D., 2003, University of Iowa

PHARMACY

6. Professor Joanne F. Lafleur, Assistant Professor of Pharmacotherapy, effective July 1, 2009.
   This supersedes her appointment as Research Assistant Professor of Pharmacotherapy.

SCIENCE

7. Dr. Gordon B. Thomson, Professor with tenure of Physics, effective September 1, 2009.
   B.S., 1965, Illinois Institute of Technology
   M.A., 1968, Harvard University
   Ph.D., 1972, Harvard University

SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

8. Dr. Claudia Geist, Assistant Professor of Sociology, effective January 1, 2010.
   B.A., 1998, Universitat Mannheim
   M.A., 2001, Indiana University
   Ph.D., 2008, Indiana University
APPENDIX II

AUXILIARY FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Auxiliary Faculty Appointments

HEALTH


   B.A., 2003, Dalhousie University
   M.L.I.S., 2008, Dalhousie University

2. Dr. John R. Graham, Assistant Professor (Lecturer) of Health Promotion & Education, effective August 16, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.A., 1973, Utah State University
   M.E.D., 1977, Utah State University
   D.Phil., 2007, University of Utah

3. Professor Kasey Mitchell, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Occupational Therapy, effective August 16, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.S., 1996, Utah State University
   M.O.T., 2001, University of Puget Sound

4. Dr. Beverly Hyatt Neville, Assistant Professor (Lecturer) of Health Promotion & Education, effective August 16, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

   M.S., 1994, University of Utah
   Ph.D., 2009, University of Utah

HUMANITIES

5. Mr. Hossam Eldin Ibrahim Ahmed, Instructor (Lecturer) in Languages & Literature, effective August 16, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.A., 1997, Alexandria University
   M.A., 2007, University of Utah
LAW

6. Mr. Benjamin C. McMurray, Adjunct Assistant Professor in the College of Law, effective July 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2011.
   
   B.A., 2000, Brigham Young University  
   J.D., 2003, Brigham Young University

   
   B.S., 1986, University of Utah  
   M.A., 1989, University of Utah  
   J.D., 1993, University of Utah

MEDICINE

18. Dr. Joan M. Bloom, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective September 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.
   
   B.S., 1981, John Carroll University  
   M.D., 1985, Ohio State University

9. Dr. Barbara E. Chadwick, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Pathology, effective September 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.
   
   B.A., 1995, Andrews University  
   M.D., 2004, Loma Linda University

10. Dr. Lisa J. Samson–Fang, Adjunct Associate Professor of Psychiatry, effective July 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010. This is in addition to her appointment as Associate Professor (Clinical) of Pediatrics.

11. Dr. Timothy Farrell, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Internal Medicine, effective September 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.
   
   B.A., 1998, Dartmouth College  
   M.D., 2004, University of Massachusetts

12. Dr. Abdallah G. Kfoury, Adjunct Associate Professor of Internal Medicine, effective October 5, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.
   
   B.A., 1983, American University of Beirut  
   M.D., 1987, American University of Beirut
13. Dr. Elicia Williams-King, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Internal Medicine, effective September 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.S., 1994, Texas A & M University
M.D., 2000, University of Texas

14. Dr. Gordon K. Mack, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Pediatrics, effective September 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.S., 1987, University of Saskatchewan
M.D., 1994, University of Saskatchewan

15. Dr. Lindsay Malechek, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective August 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.S., 1998, Westminster College
M.D., 2003, University of Utah

16. Dr. Christopher P. Nielson, Adjunct Professor of Internal Medicine, effective October 5, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.S., 1973, University of California
M.D., 1978, University of California

17. Dr. Lida J. Ogden, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective August 16, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

M.D., 1998, Universidad De Concepcion

18. Dr. Mahtab Sohrevardi, Adjunct Instructor in Internal Medicine, effective October 5, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

M.D., 1994, Tehran University

19. Dr. Cristina C. Sullivan, Adjunct Instructor in Anesthesia, effective July 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.A., 1999, University of Oregon
M.D., 2004, University of Utah

20. Dr. Kelly L. Thomas, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective September 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.S., 2000, Montana State University
PHARMACY


Pharm.D., 2003, University of Iowa

SCIENCE

22. Dr. Maritza L. Sirvent, Visiting Professor of Mathematics, effective August 16, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.A., 1982, Universidad Nacional Autonoma
Ph.D., 1989, University of Utah
To: Academic Senate Members  
From: James Anderson, President  
Subject: Revision to Policy 6-401  
Date: September 24, 2009

Attached is the proposal for revising a part of University Policy 6-401. It takes two actions: It (a) decommissions the Student Publications Council and the Student Broadcast Council and (b) creates the Student Media Council.

The revision developed out of a changing technology environment that has created new forms and opportunities for students to develop creative, informative, and strategic work. These new opportunities fit awkwardly at best under the existing two-council system. It also developed from the need to create a stable funding base with a more streamlined and transparent system for student support.

The policy revision comes to you as a recommendation from the University of Utah Media Education Task Force appointed by President Young.

The task force report and the recommended Student Media Council Policies and Procedures as developed by the task force are available for review on the Academic Senate website. Neither the report nor the policy and procedures document are part of the revised policy but are the historical record of its development and a parallel action called for by the Trustees respectively.
Policy 6-401. Revision 1  2  Effective date: [immediately upon approval by Trustees]

I. Purpose & Scope (Reserved)

II. Definitions (Reserved)

III. Policy

{Drafting note: For purposes of the current proposal--- the only substantive changes being proposed are in parts III- E & F (as now being renumbered), clearly shown in bold markings. There are no substantive changes currently proposed for parts III-A through D (only non-substantive reformatting, as marked, solely to conform with the University’s new standard formatting template.) However, the Institutional Policy Committee informs that another project is currently underway which will likely later result in a proposal to revise the substance of parts A through D. That separate project is being managed through the office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and interested parties may wish to contact that office for commentary on that project.}

A. Section 1. General Regulations

All students and student organizations of the University are required to comply with the Student Code, and the rules, regulations, and laws governing the University.

B. Section 2. Associated Students of the University of Utah

The organization known as the Associated Students of the University of Utah is the official student organ of the University. Its constitution and amendments thereto must be approved by the student body and the Board of Trustees. At least three (3) weeks prior to the meeting at which a constitution or amendment thereto is to be submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval, the appropriate officer of the Associated Students of the University of Utah shall file a copy of the said constitution or amendment with the faculty-student Committee on Student Affairs. The Committee on Student Affairs shall consider the constitution or amendment and at least one (1) week before the next meeting of the Board of Trustees transmit the same together with their recommendations to the president of the University of Utah. The president of the University shall transmit the proposed constitution or amendment to the appropriate committee of the Board of Trustees with his recommendations for the committee’s consideration and recommendation to the board. The proposed constitution or amendment shall be submitted to the Board of Trustees of the University of Utah and approved by the board before it is submitted to a general referendum of the student body.

C. Section 3. Apportionment Board

The Apportionment Board shall control the apportionment of funds of the Associated Students of the University of Utah.

D. Section 4. Student Affairs Committee

1. A.  Purpose
The Committee on Student Affairs is a committee of students and faculty with the responsibility of developing and implementing policies pertaining to student life in relationship to the University. As a policy making body, the committee formulates regulations and procedures relating to student activities and organizations for approval by the Board of Trustees. As a policy implementing agency, the committee administers and applies such policies. Specific authorities and responsibilities of the committee include those set forth in the paragraph on Authority and Responsibility.

2. B. Membership

2. B.1. The voting membership includes:

2. B.1.a. ASUU President

2. B.1.b. The three (3) members of ASUU Organization Boards.

2. B.1.c. Three (3) students at large.

2. B.1.d. Three (3) faculty members.

2. B.1.e. Dean of students.

2. B.1.f. Director of the University Union and Student Activities.

2. B.2. The non-voting membership includes:

2. B.2.a. The executive secretary.

3. C. Membership Selection and Organization

3. C.1. Membership selection shall be as follows:

3. C.1.a. The ASUU president, ASUU Organizations Board members, the dean of students, and the director of the University Union and Student Activities are appointed to the committee by virtue of their office.

3. C.1.b. The three (3) students at large are appointed in accordance with ASUU's policies and procedures.

3. C.1.c. The three (3) faculty members are appointed by the University president upon recommendation of the University Senate Executive Committee.

3. C.1.d. The executive secretary shall be a member of the dean of students staff appointed by the dean.

3. C.2. Chairman Selection

The Chairman shall be elected from the committee’s membership by the voting members of the committee.

3. C.3. Terms of office shall be as follows:
i. Faculty members shall serve a twelve-month term beginning in September of that school year.

ii. Organizations Board members shall serve as active voting members for their term of office.

iii. Students at large shall serve as active voting members for a term of office corresponding to that of the Organizations Board members.

iv. The ASUU president shall serve during his term of office beginning the day he takes office.

d. Holdover Membership

Outgoing Organizations Board members shall serve as ex officio non-voting members for a three-month term beginning in April and ending in June.

4. Authority and Responsibility

a. The committee has the authority to promulgate rules and regulations implementing the Student Code, Article IV, "Student Government and Student Organizations."

i. Pursuant to University Regulations, the committee shall receive and review any proposed amendment to the ASUU Constitution and forward the amendment and the committee's recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

ii. The Committee shall establish policies and procedures for the maintenance of the University register of organizations.

b. The committee has the authority to promulgate rules and regulations implementing the Student Code, Article V, "Speaker Policy."

c. The committee has the authority to promulgate rules and regulations implementing the Student Code, Article VII, "Distribution of Handbills, Posting of Notice, and Solicitation of Funds."

d. The committee has the authority to promulgate rules and regulations implementing the Student Code, Article VIII, "Demonstrations."

e. The committee has the authority to promulgate rules and regulations implementing the Student Code, Article IX, "Student Housing."

f. The committee has the responsibility under the provision of the Student Code, Article XIII, "Implementing Rules and Regulations:

i. to publish written notice concerning a proposed enactment of any implementing rule or regulation pursuant to requirements or authorizations contained in the Student Code;

ii. to promulgate rules or regulations consistent with the provisions of the Student Code;
iii. to notify the Board of Trustees of the proposed rule or regulation at least sixty (60) days prior to the rule or regulation taking effect.

g. The committee has the authority and responsibility under the provisions of the Student Code, Article XIV, “Amendments:”

i. to propose amendments to the Student Code;

ii. to receive and review any proposed amendment to the Student Code;

iii. to transmit to the Board of Trustees the proposed amendment together with a report explaining the same and fairly and impartially summarizing the views and positions expressed by the various members of the University community.

h. The committee has the responsibility to publish annually a Policies and Procedures Manual containing all rules, regulations and procedures of general policy for the supervision of student activities and organizations.

i. The committee delegates its responsibility of implementing and enforcing its policies and procedures to the executive secretary of the committee, the ASUU Organizations Board and the ASUU Judiciary.

j. The committee is responsible to the president through the vice-president for student affairs.

E. Section 5. Student Press

The student press shall be free of illegal censorship. Editors, managers, and other employees of student publications shall not be dismissed or suspended solely because of student, faculty, administration, alumni, or community disapproval of content or editorial policy; provided, however, that sanctions may be imposed on editors, managers, and other employees of student publications by the Publications Student Media Council in accordance with previously established written policies, procedures, and implementing guidelines previously approved by the Board of Trustees and in effect at the time the cause for imposition of such sanctions occurred.

Section 6. Publications Council

The Publications Council is the publisher of all student publications supported entirely or in part by student activity fees and shall have authority, with the approval of the Board of Trustees to establish general publication policies and procedures with respect to such matters as subject matter coverage, distribution, the sale of advertising space, the right of access to be accorded diverse viewpoints, and the right to respond or reply to previously published material. The Publications Council shall not, however, have jurisdiction over those publications that are related to the disciplines and concerns of a particular college or department. The Publications Council shall have the custody of, and
administrative authority over, budgeted funds allocated to publications within its jurisdiction and shall have the responsibility to account to the Board of Trustees for the expenditure of such funds and for the audit and control of their financial accounts. The Publications Council shall select editors of such publications; the general criteria to be followed in making such selections shall be announced in advance and made available to all students.

Section 7. Student Broadcast Council

The Student Broadcast Council is responsible for all student broadcasting supported entirely or in part by student fees and shall have the authority, with the approval of the Board of Trustees to establish general broadcasting policies and procedures with respect to such matters as subject matter coverage, the sale of advertising time, the right of access to be accorded diverse viewpoints, and the right to respond or reply to previously aired material. The Student Broadcast Council will also establish, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, bylaws for its own governance, including the matter in which members of the Broadcast Council will be selected. The Student Broadcast Council shall not, however, have jurisdiction over KUER, any other administratively managed radio station or broadcasting related to the disciplines and concerns of a particular college or department. The Student Broadcast Council shall have the custody of, and administrative authority over, budgeted funds allocated to broadcasting within its jurisdiction and shall have the responsibility to account to the Board of Trustees for the expenditure of such funds and for the audit and control of their financial accounts. The Student Broadcast Council shall select managers of broadcasting; the general criteria to be followed in making such selections shall be announced in advance and made available to all students.

F. Student Media Council

The Student Media Council ("Council") is hereby established. The Council oversees all University-wide student media outlets, related services, and business functions supported entirely or in part by student media fees. The Council shall have authority, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, to establish general policies and procedures regarding editorial, production, marketing, promotional, advertising, and business operations, as well as the makeup and operations of the Council. Such policies and procedures shall comply with applicable University Regulations and laws and ensure the protection of academic, creative, and journalistic freedom. The Council is committed to innovation, open governance, and the primacy of student involvement. The Council shall have the custody of, and administrative authority over, budgeted funds allocated to publications, broadcasts, and strategic communication agencies within its jurisdiction and shall have the responsibility to account to the Board of Trustees for the expenditure of such funds and for the audit and control of their financial accounts.
IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources.  [Reserved]

V. References: [Reserved]

VI. Contacts [Reserved]

VII. History

Renumbering. Renumbered as Policy 6-401 September 15, 2008, formerly PPM 8-11, formerly University Regulations Chapter XI.

A. Current version—Revision 2: Effective date [____]. Date approved by Academic Senate [____]. Date approved by Board of Trustees [____].

Background information for Revision 2. [____ link]

B. Earlier versions:

Revision 1 [link]: Effective dates April 9, 1990 to [ ]____. (Editorially revised June 17, 1999).

Revision 0: Effective dates June 19, 1989 to April 9, 1990

{Explanation:
This proposal is ancillary to and accompanies the proposal to make major revisions to U-Policy 6-401. If adopted, those changes to 6-401 will eliminate the former Publications Council and replace it with the new Student Media Council. The existing version of 1-007 (the University Speech Policy) has two references to the old Publications Council (by that name). To avoid inconsistency among the new 6-401 and 1-007, it is proposed that 1-007 be revised to make use of the new name--- the Student Media Council. No other changes are proposed for 1-007.}

[Note: due to the length of other sections of 1-007, which are not proposed to be revised, their contents are not shown here. The entire contents may be seen at the University Regulations Website http://www.regulations.utah.edu/general/1-007.html ]

Policy 1-007: University Speech Policy. Revision 5–6

.... Title II: General Policies
.....

L. Student Publications
   Student publications supported by University funds or student fees, other than those publications sponsored by a college or department, may be regulated by the Publications Student Media Council pursuant to rules and regulations, consistent with these regulations, of the Publications Student Media Council. In the case of student publications sponsored by a college or department, the publication shall be regulated, in accordance with the policies consistent with these regulations, by regulations adopted by the college or department.

....

[Additional material—not part of the Policy.
Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources (Reserved)

References: (Reserved)

Contacts:
Policy Officers: _________
Policy Owners: _________

History: Renumbering: Renumbered as Policy 1-007 effective 9/15/2008, formerly known as PPM 8-9, and as University Regulations Chapter IX.+++.


B. Earlier versions:
Revision 5: Effective dates ______ to _______. (Editorially revised June 12, 2008)
Revision 4: Effective dates March 17, 1999 to ______.
Revision 3: Effective dates ______ to ______.
Revision 2: Effective dates ______ to ______.
Revision 1: Effective dates ______ to ______.

---end--
To: Academic Senate Members  
From: James Anderson, President  
Subject: Comment on the Proposed Ecosystem and Global Change Center and the Sustainability Research Center  
Date: September 24, 2009

As part of the process of certifying the proposals for these separate centers for the Senate agenda, the Executive Committee expressed concerns about the funding for the centers and the overlap of interests.

The funding issue was clarified in letters from David Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Thomas Parks, Vice President for Research. I direct your attention to those letters at the end of each proposal.

In response to the Executive Committee’s concerns about overlap, duplication, and unnecessary competition, the principals of the two centers developed a comparison of the activities and interests to be pursued by each center. It follows this memo.
A Comparison of Proposed Centers: Ecosystem and Global Change Center and the Sustainability Research Center*

Submitted by members of the Ecosystem and Global Change Center (EGCC) with input from Kent Udell, Director of the Sustainability Research Center (SRC)

Similarities
- Both centers focus on interdisciplinary research, spanning across colleges.
- Both centers have interests in sustainability and climate change research.
- Both centers consider ecosystems to be core areas of research interest.
- Both centers expect to derive operational expenses from overhead on research administered through the centers.
- Both centers have research interests in anthropogenic climate impacts.

Differences in focii
- The EGCC has a central focus on understanding the fundamental science and mechanistic bases of how complex ecological systems work, whereas the SRC focuses on the technical, economic, social and behavioral aspects of sustainability.
- EGCC will often use “field sites” as research laboratories, requiring productive working group interactions with the state’s primary land management and regulatory agencies (e.g., BLM, USFS, DOD, Utah Divisions of Wildlife, Environmental Quality, etc.), whereas the SRC’s interest is in establishing interactions with industrial and foundation entities.
- The EGCC will engage in faculty building in those areas of clear interdisciplinary interests through initiatives such as the Science Initiative and EPSCoR, whereas the SRC will coordinate sustainability-related research activities and team building with existing faculty at the UU, USU, and BYU.
- The EGCC will provide a home and framework for distributed environmental sciences field research station activities under a united University umbrella (e.g., Entrada, Range Creek, and NEON). The SRC may maintain research at locations where major field demonstrations of renewable energy technologies are being conducted.
- Only a fraction of the EGCC interests are in the area of sustainability, whereas the SRC is focused on issues pertaining to sustainability on topics such as energy production and use, economics of material processing, anthropogenic disruptions of ecosystems, ethical allocation of limited natural resources, and behavioral changes necessary for sustainable living.
- The EGCC sees as part of its mission to provide a foundation for interdisciplinary graduate recruitment and training.
15 April 2009

David W. Pershing
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
205 Park
Campus

Dear Vice President Pershing,

Enclosed is the proposal for the University of Utah Center for Sustainability which was approved with revisions by the Graduate Council on September 29, 2008. Included in this packet are the proposal and signature page.

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

Sincerely,

David S. Chapman
Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies
Dean, The Graduate School
I. REQUEST
We request the establishment of the University of Utah Sustainability Research Center. The Sustainability Research Center will be an incubator for creating a cadre of researchers, citizens, educators, business leaders and community leaders who can play key collaborative roles in transforming how we use the Earth’s resources and share them with both current and future generations. By working together across disciplinary boundaries we will ensure that the next generation of decision-makers will have the skills and capacities needed to effect significant changes in the way natural systems and resources are used and affected. Tackling the challenges of the 21st century requires a systemic understanding of the problems and a capacity to disseminate real-world solutions to decision-makers living in similar circumstances around the world.

Mission Statement
“Fostering a more sustainable future through interdisciplinary research, education and outreach.”

The Center will provide a new foundation of support and training, based on philanthropic and corporate funding, for interdisciplinary teams of U of Utah researchers who are currently working independently or who are affiliated with existing Centers and Institutes. Discussions with prospective sponsors, and review of major gifts made to other universities for sustainability-related research centers, reveal the sponsors’ strong desire to foster interdisciplinary teaming that transcends the usual disciplinary boundaries and leads researchers into uncharted territory that can spawn new integrative solutions to pressing societal problems. Thus, we are convinced that philanthropists and corporations who currently provide only limited support for narrowly-defined research projects are ready to make major contributions to a Center that can incubate new interdisciplinary research themes in the sustainability arenas that directly address their economic, social and environmental concerns. Furthermore, our conversations with prospective sponsors indicate that they want to support a pan-campus, facilitative entity that transcends the traditional boundaries found between campus Colleges and fosters broadly interdisciplinary research teams with members drawn from all sectors of the campus community.
We infer from our investigations that the absence of a pan-campus Sustainability Research Center at the U of Utah limits access to the interdisciplinary, sustainability-related funding being harvested by other universities that have created similar Centers. Thus, the Center will create a unique U of Utah environment for facilitating and supporting the collaboration of researchers drawn from Colleges, Departments, Centers and Institutes who would not otherwise meet nor be able to access the new sources of funding hovering on the horizon. The collaborations fostered by the Center are expected, in turn, to generate innovative thought and research ideas that would not otherwise occur without the broadly interdisciplinary teams to be incubated by the Center.

Much work is needed to prepare faculty and students drawn from differing cultures of research and scholarship to work together and to actively collaborate with philanthropists and corporations. Thus, a principal role for the Center staff is to attract and administer the funding needed to foster the interdisciplinary collaborations that are not otherwise supported at the U of Utah. We anticipate that Center staff will assist U of Utah researchers to become increasingly competitive in applying for the sustainability-related, interdisciplinary funding that might flow along the usual pathways from more traditional research sponsors (e.g., federal agencies such as NSF, NIH, EPA, DOE, etc.) to Colleges, Departments, Centers and Institutes, without passing through the Center.

Although the Center will provide human and financial support for developing proofs of concept and preparing proposal submissions to traditional research sponsors that provide indirect costs, the Center will not receive any of the returned overhead to be generated from funded grants and contracts. Rather, the Center is expected to derive its long-term support primarily from philanthropic and corporate gifts that do not generate returned overhead. Funding generated by Center staff will primarily be used to: 1) seed the exploratory efforts of new interdisciplinary research teams, 2) provide the professional development and training needed for faculty and graduate students to develop interdisciplinary teaming skills and relationships, 3) foster direct collaboration between U researchers, Center sponsors and local community partners, and 4) facilitate formal and informal opportunities for identifying new, broadly interdisciplinary research targets in the sustainability arena. Funds contributed to the Center are expected to augment and enhance existing funding sources, rather than divert or reduce funding already accruing to Colleges, Departments, Centers and Institutes.

A principal goal of the Center staff will be to identify and foster research and learning programs of mutual interest to Center sponsors and U of Utah researchers. That goal will be met by collaboratively expanding upon existing research capacities and moving in new, imaginative directions. Current research initiatives that might form the foundation for new research themes include, but are not limited to, the following:

1) Green Technology Development
Existing U of Utah research in renewable energy, alternative fuels, carbon sequestration, environmentally benign products, and green building design, provides a wealth of opportunity for new technology development. U of Utah researchers are actively working on sustainability technologies with substantial commercialization potential including: hydrogen production and storage for fuel cells, converting lignin to liquid hydrocarbon biofuels, smart thermosiphons for seasonal underground thermal energy storage, efficient solar cells, new battery technology and waste heat acoustic conversion. The Center will
provide the financial and teambuilding support needed to further develop these concepts and expand the array of technologies of potential value to Center sponsors and others.

2) Science-Policy Challenges at the Energy-Water Nexus
Inextricable and reciprocal linkages exist between two essential resources; water and energy. Being able to recognize, analyze and account for these linkages is critical if we are to prepare our global society for resilience in the face of looming concerns regarding scarcity in water and energy. Trends of concern at the water-energy nexus include: 1) a growing proportion of water consumption for energy production, and 2) growing communities in arid regions which compete for water among with other communities, energy developers and agricultural industries. With financial and facilitative support from the Sustainability Center, energy and water researchers at the U of Utah can develop innovative new programs of collaborative research to produce the knowledge needed for a sensible and fair water policy evolution.

3) Metropolitan Sustainability
An existing, multi-disciplinary faculty team (the Synergy-funded Ecosystems + Health + Built Environment initiative) provides a strong research foundation for assessing how interrelated social, health and environmental aspects of rapid population growth in Utah affect, and are affected by: human behavior, urban microclimate, weather, urban/rural policy-making, air quality, human health, medicine, hydrology, carbon cycles, urban growth dynamics, ecosystem health and climate. The soon-to-be-created Metropolitan Research Center will provide important capacity in helping to create the data, research products, and insight needed to support local metropolitan decision- and policy-making.

4) Ecosystems of Utah and the Western United States
The center will engage community partners (corporations, philanthropists, government agencies, non-governmental organizations, citizens) and University of Utah faculty and students in collaborative, interdisciplinary research, education and community outreach within Utah and the Western U.S. Impacts caused by population growth and widespread development of water, energy, minerals and other natural resources are readily manifest in the declining quality and health of air-sheds, water-sheds and ecosystems of the Western U.S. Actively engaging students, members of Utah communities, and informal educational organizations at the University (e.g., Red Butte Gardens, Utah Museum of Natural History) in the Center’s education and outreach activities will foster the ability to anticipate and avoid the negative consequences of resource development and urban growth.

5) Communicating Research Results & Fostering Sustainable Behavior
Communicating results of Center research to sponsors, research partners and the citizens of Utah requires innovative approaches for visualizing policy outcomes and inviting the stakeholder input needed to instigate behavior change. Principles and methods drawn from behavioral psychology, marketing, computer visualization, community-based social science, human health, medicine, public policy, law, urban design, architecture, and other disciplines are ready to be integrated by broadly interdisciplinary research teams.

II. NEED
Rationale
The advent of the 21st century is accompanied by enormous challenges for the human community. The global population is predicted to rise from 6.7 billion to more than 9 billion, with the bulk of the increase occurring in developing countries that are rapidly increasing their per capita natural resource use. Communities will become increasingly concentrated in urban centers that rely upon food, water, energy and resources derived from afar. Petroleum may decline in importance as a principal energy source and will likely lose its standing as a key source of plastics and fertilizers. The finite limits of metallic and other minerals will become increasingly evident. National and international programs intended to counter climate change will affect energy strategies and limit carbon emissions. Arid regions of the world, including Utah, will bear the brunt of a warming climate with increased threat of severe drought, shifting agricultural options and increased summer cooling requirements. Increased emissions of solid, liquid and gaseous wastes will place human health at increasing risk. An ethical approach to equity and social justice demands that the human community, principally those living in the developed countries, change direction to better preserve resources and ecosystems for future generations. Adjusting to these challenges requires a whole-system understanding of the social, economic, environmental and political dynamics that interact at the local, national and global scales.

Yet we are only just beginning to prepare citizens, educators and political leaders to learn about, and make, the critical personal choices and policy decisions required to work towards a more sustainable future. Fostering this preparation requires the supportive environment and resources of a pan-campus Sustainability Research Center that can facilitate and incubate interdisciplinary research involving a multi-college mix of faculty, students and off-campus partners.

**Demand**

Rio Tinto|Kennecott expressed strong interest in supporting a Sustainability Research Center at the U of Utah. Rio Tinto|Kennecott is particularly interested in providing the corporate leadership needed to catalyze funded partnerships with other corporations concerned about the diminishing availability of natural resources, degradation of natural environments and the implications for changing the social fabric of Utah communities. Given current trends observed in attracting sustainability-related research funding to other institutions, we are convinced that additional corporate sponsors will wish to provide the new sources of funding needed to support integrative efforts of the Sustainability Research Center. Additionally, the recent focus on the funding of alternative energy research through the government stimulus package presents an opportunity for the U to foster new research projects and expand existing research programs.

U of Utah faculty members are increasingly interested in developing broadly interdisciplinary research projects within a sustainability-related framework. Engineering faculty wish to link their solutions-oriented research to problems of global importance. Humanities and social science faculty want to better understand the technical issues that lead to controversy and uncertainty in decision- and policy-making. Although agency funding for broadly interdisciplinary research is growing, U of Utah researchers can be more competitive if their interdisciplinary efforts are incubated and sustained during gaps in agency funding. Although members of the Ecosystems + Health + Built Environment initiative joined forces to build the necessary capacity, it has been difficult to maintain participation in the absence of consistent funding that supports research teams with multiple investigators drawn from diverse colleges.
Founding the Sustainability Research Center is expected to attract the new philanthropic and corporate gifts needed to instigate and help maintain interdisciplinary research programs that would not otherwise develop.

Students interested in moving the University, and various communities, towards a more sustainable future worked closely with faculty, staff and members of the local community to generate interest in, and approval for, the newly-formed University of Utah Office of Sustainability. This effort coincides with growth in the number of U professors who are developing and delivering sustainability-related courses and preparing proposals for both undergraduate and graduate Certificates in Sustainability Studies. Increasing interest in alternative fuels, conservation, CO₂ sequestration, and other green technologies is causing a number of U of Utah faculty members to pursue sustainability-related research. A Sustainability Research Center will provide an otherwise absent platform for integrating these related interests, and will provide a catalyst for developing innovative academic, outreach, and research programs at the University of Utah. Deans from the School of Medicine and the Colleges of Engineering, Architecture+Planning, Humanities, Law and Social & Behavioral Sciences have already endorsed the founding of a Sustainability Research Center.

III ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND IMPACTS

Management Plan

A small management team can facilitate new programs of interdisciplinary, solutions-oriented research while helping faculty teams from across campus access new sources of philanthropic and corporate funding. In the first phase of operation, Center staff will comprise a full-time Development Officer, a part-time Director, and a full-time Center Manager/grant writer. The initial Center staff will: 1) work with founding sponsors to catalyze major gifts from a growing number of prospective community partners, and 2) oversee the distribution funds from founding sponsors. It is critical that the Development Officer begin working immediately to instigate a national search for the gifts needed to make the Center sustainable. The Director will report directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and work closely with two oversight committees; an Executive Steering Committee of Academic Deans and an Advisory Board comprising representatives of the funding partners and researchers from the Colleges actively participating in the Center. Faculty from the Colleges of Architecture+Planning, Business, Engineering, Health, Humanities, Medicine, Mines & Earth Sciences, Law, Science and Social & Behavioral Sciences are likely to be active in the first phase of operation. Dr. Kent Udell, Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering, will serve as the first Center Director. Udell will be responsible for facilitating the various collaborative partnerships, ensuring a smooth start-up for the Center, overseeing the work of the Development Officer and guiding the transition to a full-staffed office as funding increases. Udell can provide about 0.2 FTE to 0.3 FTE of effort during the initial phase of Center operation.

The second phase of Center operation would begin when funding provided by the sponsors can support meaningful incubation of new collaborative research programs, begin building a sizeable endowment and support a full-time management team (Director, Center Manager, Development Officer and Administrative Assistant). The Director will report directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and work closely with the Executive Steering Committee and the Advisory Board. The Development Officer will be responsible for maintaining a steady stream of philanthropic and corporate funding. The Director will work on
refining the vision for the Center, and managing the Center’s facilitative capacity. The Center Manager will perform the day-to-day tasks of building interdisciplinary research teams, facilitating collaborative research partnerships, assist in grant writing and implementing outreach programs. In the long term, the Center team should remain small and focus on facilitating research performed by faculty situated in diverse Colleges, Departments, Centers and Institutes rather than attempting to build a Center-based research team.

The Sustainability Research Center management team will: 1) help faculty and students initiate and tackle an increasingly broad range of interdisciplinary research topics and community outreach, 2) foster and support innovative academic programs, 3) facilitate interdisciplinary career development for faculty, and 4) actively engage growing numbers of students in community-based research and service learning. Center emphases and priorities will be revised as each significant increment of funding is obtained and as new partners ask new questions. The Center team will work closely with the Lowell Bennion Community Service Center to engage students in service-learning projects with corporate and government sponsors. Partners in informal education efforts will include Red Butte Arboretum, Utah Museum of Natural History, Wallace Stegner Environmental Center, and the Utah Science Center.

Individual faculty members drawn from the following academic units have already expressed interest in accessing the opportunities that might be afforded by a Sustainability Research Center.

- Architecture
- Biology
- City & Metropolitan Planning
- Civil & Environmental Engineering
- Chemical Engineering
- Communication
- Economics
- Family & Consumer Studies
- Family & Preventive Medicine
- Geography
- Geology & Geophysics
- History
- Law
- Marketing
- Mechanical Engineering
- Metallurgical Engineering
- Medicine Geography
- Pediatrics
- Pharmacology & Toxicology
- Philosophy
- Political Science
- Psychology

The Center will coordinate, facilitate and enhance collaborations between researchers affiliated with existing (and proposed) Centers, Institutes and Initiatives that may include, but are not restricted to:

- Ecosystems + Health + Built Environment (EHBE) Initiative
- Utah Traffic Lab
- DIGIT-Lab
- Metropolitan Research Initiative
- Energy & Geoscience Institute
- EcoChildren’s Environmental Health Initiative
- Ecosystems and Global Climate Center
- Institute for Clean and Secure Energy
- Scientific Computing Institute
- Environmental Studies
- Office of Interdisciplinary Studies
- Center for Water, Ecosystems and Climate Studies
- Hinckley Institute of Politics
- Center for Public Policy Administration
Location
During the first phase of operation, the Development Officer, manager and Director will be housed in the College of Engineering. It is anticipated that a new physical location, closer to the center of the U of U campus, will be identified as the Center activities grow.

Consultation with Relevant or Similar Units across the Utah System of Higher Education
The U of Utah Office of Sustainability is facilitating multi-campus discussions regarding campus sustainability and sustainability-related research across the Utah System of Higher Education. To our best knowledge, research Centers or Institutes similar to the proposed Sustainability Research Center neither exist, nor are they being planned, elsewhere in Utah.

Impact on Existing Degrees, Courses or Curriculum
The primary impact of the proposed Center on existing academic functions will be to provide undergraduate and graduate students with opportunities to participate in research programs or learn about the research results in classroom settings. A key outcome of a Center with pan-campus perspective will be to infuse sustainability principles and interdisciplinary thinking into all undergraduate and graduate academic programs. Achieving this result is one stipulation that must be fulfilled to meet the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment signed by President Michael K. Young on Earth Day 2008.

Practices Elsewhere
Although many sustainability-focused academic centers and institutes are emerging, few institutions have elected to integrate the full spectrum of sustainability, metropolitan planning, urban engineering, marketing, geospatial analysis, human health, behavior change, energy resources management, ecology, natural science, law, and public policy in the way that we envision for the University of Utah Sustainability Research Center. Names used by broadly interdisciplinary centers/institutes addressing related sustainability goals include the following:

- “Global Institute of Sustainability”, Arizona State University
- “Graham Environmental Sustainability Institute”, University of Michigan
- “Climate and Sustainability Institute”, UC San Diego
- “Environment and Sustainability Initiative”, UC San Diego
- “Center for Environmental Research and Education”, University of Maryland
- “Center for Sustainable Urban Development”, Columbia University
- “Center for Interactive Research on Sustainability”, University of British Columbia
- “The Mascaro Sustainability Initiative”, University of Pittsburg
- “Golisano Institute for Sustainability”, Rochester Institute of Technology
- “Center for Sustainable and Integrated Built Environment Research”, Stanford
- “Woods Institute for the Environment”, Stanford
- “Center for Sustainability”, Penn State
• “Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment”, University of Wisconsin-Madison
• “Center for Sustainability”, Kansas State University
• “Sustainable Resource Center”, UC Los Angeles
• “Center for Sustainability”, Aquinas College
• “Center for Sustainable Environments”, Northern Arizona University
• “Applied Sustainability Center”, University of Arkansas
• “Center for Sustainable Communities”, Temple University

IV. FINANCES
Facilities and Equipment

No research equipment is required to support the proposed Center except that which already is, or will be, situated in the participating Colleges, Departments, Centers and Institutes. During the start-up phase the College of Engineering will provide office space, furniture, IT support, payroll/purchasing support and access to standard office equipment.

Generating and Managing Center Funds

Rio Tinto|Kennecott’s (RT|K’s) interest in supporting a Sustainability Research Center at the U of Utah instigated this proposal. Although originally intending to provide a major founding gift, RT|K’s priorities have temporarily shifted to focus on supporting other initiatives. In the interim, however, we continue to work closely with RT|K to catalyze the interest of other corporate sponsors and philanthropists. Once the Center is approved, RT|K has agreed to work with us in convening a summit of local business leaders to kick-off a focused discussion of the issues and problems that are their greatest concern. Over the past year these leaders have seen a roller-coaster-like rise and fall in petroleum prices, a devastating decline in economic health, rising unemployment, continued concern about the lack of access to health care for all and a global-scale reverberation of events occurring both within and outside the U.S. At the same time, there is a growing realization that business leaders will be required to operate in a carbon constrained future brought about as new policies are implemented to aggressively reduce the greenhouse gas emissions causing climate change. Working with this group, we expect them to identify specific questions of collective interest that will provide rallying points for U researchers drawn from diverse Colleges, Departments, Centers and Institutes. As the business leaders’ concerns are highlighted, we will show how their financial support for the Center will catalyze the integrative problem solving research needed to deal with the complexity of these interdependent challenges. In short, we aim to use the summit as a key tool for instigating one or more founding gifts for the Center.

In anticipation of an initial founding gift, Senior Vice President Pershing has agreed to provide a start-up contribution to support a full-time Development Officer and Center Manager/Grant Writer. Small operational expenses and the travel funds needed to support development efforts will be drawn from the founding gift on an as-needed basis. Once approval to create the pan-campus interdisciplinary Center for sustainability-related research is obtained, we can unequivocally explain the University’s commitment to creating the research teams that will tackle problems to be identified by Center sponsors.

Once a founding gift is obtained, the Center Development Officer will work with the Director and Center Manager to map out and implement an aggressive strategy for generating
major gifts from prospective philanthropic and corporate sponsors. While preparing this proposal, several prospective sponsors indicated their interest in supporting the goals of a Sustainability Research Center that would have a truly pan-campus presence and could facilitate the emergence of the new research teams needed to address issues of concern to the sponsors.

As the funding base for the Center grows, Center staff and the Advisory Board, with input from the Executive Steering Committee of Deans, will work with the sponsors to identify how Center funds can be best used to tackle questions of common interest and greatest concern. We envision that sponsor funding will support nascent research teams created and nurtured by the Center, rather than supporting individual researchers or pre-existing teams working on research programs that fail to address issues of primary interest to the sponsors. As prospective research targets are clarified with the sponsors, Center staff will circulate calls for researchers to contribute their expertise to the teams needed to tackle the specified problems. Center staff will facilitate the process of team formation and provide the support needed to create viable research plans that will address priorities expressed by the sponsors. The Center will also entertain proposals to support new interdisciplinary research teams that can show how their collective capacity can be used to successfully tackle questions posed by the sponsors. The disbursement of Center funds will be jointly determined by Center staff, the Advisory Board and Center sponsors. The Executive Steering Committee of Deans will provide the oversight needed to ensure that the sponsors’ priorities are being honored while hewing to the academic mission of the University and maintaining communication with the Departments, Centers and Institutes of each College participating in the Center. Principal criteria to be used in awarding Center funds will include the following:

- Prospective awardees will have participated in Center hosted workshops designed to; 1) build the capacity for operating effectively in broadly interdisciplinary teams, and 2) explain issues of primary concern to Center sponsors,
- Proposals for funding must clearly show how the efforts of an interdisciplinary research team will respond directly to the interests of the sponsors and produce meaningful results over a specified time period,
- Recipients of Center funds must commit, during the period of Center-funded research, to participating in team-specific workshops aimed at maximizing the interdisciplinary effectiveness of each team while helping them to achieve the jointly agreed upon research goals.

Department(s) or Area(s) in Which Program/Administrative Unit Will Be Located: Office of David Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Program/Administrative Unit Title: Center for Sustainability

Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code: __________

Certificate, Diploma and/or Degree(s) to be Awarded: not applicable

Proposed Beginning Date: upon final approval by the Utah State Board of Regents

Institutional Signatures (as appropriate):

Craig Forster, Director, Office of Sustainability
Craig Forster, Director, Office of Sustainability
September 11, 2008

Brenda Scheer, Dean, College of Architecture + Planning
Brenda Scheer, Dean, College of Architecture + Planning
9/11/03

David S. Chapman, Dean, The Graduate School
David S. Chapman, Dean, The Graduate School
6/1/09

David W. Pershing, Chief Academic Officer
David W. Pershing, Chief Academic Officer
6/8/09

Michael K. Young, President
Michael K. Young, President
6/24/09
September 14, 2009

Dr. Kent Udell  
Joseph Merrill Engineering Building  
50 Central Campus Drive, Room 2110  
CAMPUS

Dear Kent,

Thank you for your willingness to take on the leadership of the new Sustainability Research Center. This is an exciting opportunity, and I hope that it will grow into a major research effort at the University of Utah.

I understand that the primary purposes of this center are to secure public and private funding for research in the sustainability area and to coordinate these efforts across the campus so that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

We know that large, interdisciplinary research efforts require internal support during their start-up phase, and Vice President Parks and I are willing to provide such funding for the first three years as follows:

- 0.33 academic year FTE for the director’s salary
- Partial support (salary and associated benefits up to $50,000) for a grant writer  
  $5,000 per year for operational expenses

I am hopeful that by the end of the 2012 academic year, the center will be able to qualify for a 15% return of the overhead generated by its grants and that these funds will then provide you the resources you need to sustain the necessary infrastructure. As you know, the criteria for receiving this return are as follows:

- The Graduate Council and the University of Utah’s Board of Trustees have formally approved the Center.
- The Center is highly interdisciplinary and involves active participation by faculty in multiple colleges.
The Center’s grants and contracts are producing at least $1.5 million per year in returned overhead.

The Center reports directly to a vice president and is providing major research opportunities in a critical area for the faculty.

Thanks again for your willingness to provide leadership here.

Sincerely,

David W. Pershing
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Distinguished Professor of Chemical Engineering

cc: Vice President Tom Parks
    Dean Brenda Sheer
    Dean Rich Brown

bcc: Paul Brinkman
     Sandra Hughes
September 9, 2008

Professor Craig Forster  
Director, Office of sustainability  
University of Utah

Dear Professor Forster:

I am pleased to write this letter of support for your draft proposal to create a Center for Sustainability at the University of Utah. I readily see the merit of using the Center to help instigate solutions-oriented, interdisciplinary research by a unique partnership of citizens, researchers, educators, business leaders and community leaders. Tackling sustainability-related issues requires the Center, and its funding partners, transcend walls between disciplines and generate new interdisciplinary research programs that would not otherwise be possible.

Your proposal to create a well-funded Center that, with the right management team in place, has good potential for facilitating and supporting new research partnerships which could easily include a number of researchers from the College of Health. I am particularly interested in the potential of sustainability to impact health and well-being. Using the Center as an incubator for sustainability-oriented interdisciplinary research has real potential to create the innovative approaches needed for society to adjust to the rapidly changing social, political, economic and natural environments that we see unfolding around us.

The Center for Sustainability at the University of Utah has my complete support and and I look forward to seeing your proposal approved in the near future. I also welcome the opportunity to represent the College of Health on the Center’s Executive Steering Committee. Best wishes obtaining approval for the Center.

Sincerely,

James Graves, Ph.D.  
Dean, College of Health
September 9, 2008

Professor Craig Forster
Director, Office of sustainability
University of Utah

Dear Professor Forster:

I am pleased to write this letter of support for your draft proposal to create a Center for Sustainability at the University of Utah. I readily see the merit of using the Center to help instigate solutions-oriented, interdisciplinary research by a unique partnership of citizens, researchers, educators, business leaders and community leaders. Tackling sustainability-related issues requires the Center, and its funding partners, transcend walls between disciplines and generate new interdisciplinary research programs that would not otherwise be possible.

Your proposal to create a well-funded Center that, with the right management team in place, has good potential for facilitating and supporting new research partnerships which could easily include a number of researchers from the College of Health. I am particularly interested in the potential of sustainability to impact health and well-being. Using the Center as an incubator for sustainability-oriented interdisciplinary research has real potential to create the innovative approaches needed for society to adjust to the rapidly changing social, political, economic and natural environments that we see unfolding around us.

The Center for Sustainability at the University of Utah has my complete support and and I look forward to seeing your proposal approved in the near future. I also welcome the opportunity to represent the College of Health on the Center’s Executive Steering Committee. Best wishes obtaining approval for the Center.

Sincerely,

James Graves, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Health

JEG:ap

Office of the Dean
250 S. 1850 E. Rim 200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-0920
Phone (801) 581-6878
Fax (801) 581-6820
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September 8, 2008

Professor Craig Forster  
Director, University of Utah Office of Sustainability  
1901 E South Campus Drive, Room 1024  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dear Professor Forster:

I am pleased to write in support of your proposal to establish a Center for Sustainability at the University of Utah. As Associate Vice President for Interdisciplinary Studies, I readily see the merit of using the Center to facilitate interdisciplinary research by a unique partnership of citizens, researchers, educators, business leaders and community leaders. Tackling the broad arena of sustainability-related issues requires that the Center, and its funding partners, work to collaborate across disciplines, coordinate with existing interdisciplinary programs, and to generate new interdisciplinary research programs. Your proposal to create a well-funded Center that, with the right management team in place, has good potential for facilitating and supporting new research partnerships that could easily include a number of existing interdisciplinary programs within the College of Humanities and throughout the University. Using the Center as an incubator for sustainability-oriented interdisciplinary research has real potential to create the innovative approaches needed for society to adjust to the rapidly changing social, political, economic and natural environments that we see unfolding around us.

I fully endorse the current vision of a Center for Sustainability at the University of Utah and look forward to seeing this proposal approved in the near future. I welcome the opportunity to represent the College of Humanities on the Executive Steering Committee that will comprise Deans from the various participating colleges.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Newman
Dean, College of Humanities  
Associate Vice President for Interdisciplinary Studies
September 10, 2008

Craig B. Forster, Director
Office of Sustainability
Annex D Wing, Rm. 1024

Dear Professor Forster:

Thank you for sending me your draft proposal to create a Center for Sustainability at the University of Utah. I readily see the merit of using the Center to help instigate solutions-oriented, interdisciplinary research by a unique partnership of citizens, researchers, educators, business leaders and community leaders. Tackling the broad arena of sustainability-related issues requires the Center to work aggressively with its funding partners and internal collaborators to transcend walls between disciplines and generate new interdisciplinary research and teaching programs that would not otherwise be possible. You are proposing to create a well-funded Center that has excellent potential for facilitating and supporting new research partnerships that could easily include a number of researchers from this College. The Center has true potential to create the innovative approaches needed to help our society adjust to the rapidly changing social, political, economic and natural environments that are unfolding around us. As you know, many challenges remain. The Center will need capable leadership, a clear vision, strong ties to internal and external stakeholders, funding, and credibility. We wish you well.

I fully endorse the current vision of a Center for Sustainability at the University of Utah and look forward to seeing this proposal approved in the near future. I welcome the opportunity to represent the College of Social and Behavioral Science on the Executive Steering Committee that will include deans from participating colleges.

Please keep me apprised of your progress in obtaining approval for the Center, and let me know how and when we can help.

Sincerely,

J. Steven Ott, Ph.D.
Dean

College of Social and Behavioral Science
260 S Central Campus Dr Rm. 205
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-0150
(801) 581-8620
September 5, 2008

Dr. David Chapman
Dean
Graduate School

Dear Dr. Chapman and the members of the Graduate Council:

On behalf of the College of Architecture + Planning I would like to convey my strong support for the establishment of the Center for Sustainability. At my College, many faculty are already engaged in this important issue in research, teaching and civic engagement. I believe the value of the Center will be in its ability to magnify these efforts and instigate solutions-oriented, interdisciplinary research by a unique partnership of citizens, researchers, educators, business leaders and community leaders. Tackling the broad arena of sustainability-related issues requires that the Center, and its funding partners, aggressively work to transcend walls between disciplines and generate new interdisciplinary research programs that would not otherwise be possible. We are looking forward to using this collaboration tool and to using the Center as an incubator for sustainability-oriented interdisciplinary research that has real potential to create the innovative approaches needed for society to adjust to the rapidly changing social, political, economic and natural environments that we see unfolding around us. In particular we are interested in leveraging the Center for Sustainability in our metropolitan research program, which is just getting underway and will benefit greatly from collaborative partnerships.

I am also pleased to commit the College of Architecture + Planning as a physical home for the Center, and limited office support, during the start-up period. I am also committed to active leadership and engagement on the Executive Steering Committee that will comprise Deans from the various participating colleges.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brenda Scheer
Dean, College of Architecture + Planning
15 April 2009

David W. Pershing  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
205 Park  
Campus

Dear Vice President Pershing,

Enclosed is the proposal for the Center for Ecosystem and Global Change which was approved by the Graduate Council on March 30, 2009. Included in this packet are the proposal and signature page.

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

Sincerely,

David S. Chapman  
Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies  
Dean, The Graduate School
Program/Administrative Unit Title: Center for Ecosystem and Global Changes Sciences

Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code: 

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

Proposed Beginning Date: January 1, 2009

Institutional Signatures:

Neil Vickers, Chair, Department of Biology

Pierre Sokolsky, Dean, College of Science

David Chapman, Dean, Graduate School

Thomas Parks, Vice President for Research

Michael Young, President, University of Utah

Date

11/11/08

11/12/08

4/15/09

4/16/09

4/19/09
Proposal to Establish the
Ecosystem and Global Change Center

Originally Submitted March 18, 2009
Revised September 2009
Based on requests from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

Submitted by
Representing the Department of Biology
David Bowling, Associate Professor of Biology
Donald Feener, Professor of Biology
John Sperry, Professor of Biology

Representing the College of Science (on the proposed Executive Committee)
M. Denise Dearing, Professor of Biology
James Ehleringer, Distinguished Professor of Biology

Representing the College of Mines and Earth Sciences (on the proposed Executive Committee)
Thure Cerling, Distinguished Professor of Geology and Geophysics

Representing the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (on the proposed Executive Committee)
Tom Painter, Assistant Professor of Geography

Founding Faculty

College of Science
Fred Adler, Mathematics
David Bowling, Biology
Phyllis Coley, Biology
Dale Clayton, Biology
Denise Dearing, Biology
James Ehleringer, Biology
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Thomas Kursar, Biology
Jon Seger, Biology
John Sperry, Biology
Sylvia Torti, Biology

College of Engineering
Steve Burian, Civil & Environ. Engineering
Eric Pardyjak, Mechanical Engineering
Christine Pomeroy, Civil & Environ. Engr

College of Mines & Earth Science
Frank Brown, Geology & Geophysics
Thure Cerling, Geology & Geophysics
Diego Fernandez, Geology & Geophysics

John Horel, Atmospheric Sciences
Randy Irmis, Geology & Geophysics
Paul Jewell, Geology & Geophysics
William Johnson, Geology & Geophysics
Kip Solomon, Geology & Geophysics
Court Strong, Atmospheric Sciences

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Andrea Brunelle, Geography
Philip Dennison, Geography
Richard Forster, Geography
James O’Connell, Anthropology
Mitchell Power, Geography
Dennis O’Rourke, Anthropology
Thomas Painter, Geography
Section I: Request

This is a request to form an interdisciplinary Ecosystem and Global Change Center at the University of Utah. We are at an unprecedented time in history where regional and global environmental changes are significantly impacting natural and managed ecosystems, and rural and urban landscapes. These changes are occurring at many spatial scales, from local to regional to global. Interdisciplinary approaches are needed to investigate and resolve issues related to the sustainability of ecosystems, their sensitivity to change, and their capacity to continue to provide the goods and services upon which our society depends.

Major environmental issues, whether subtle or abrupt, pose challenges to Utah ecosystems; yet they also provide economic opportunities for Utah today. These issues include climate change, changing water availability, increased fire frequency, new infectious diseases, invasive species, urbanization, and pollution. Notable recent examples on the minds of Utah citizens include the impacts of the massive Milford Flat Fire of 2007 and resulting dust, the continued spread of cheatgrass and related wildfire risk on our rangelands, the emergence of Sin Nombre hantavirus and West Nile virus as health risks, the invasion of Quagga mussels into our recreational waters, and increased pollution problems such as air quality along the Wasatch or elevated mercury levels across the state. Ecosystem and global change sciences involve integrative studies of the biological, physical, and chemical aspects of processes; humans are an important aspect of these dynamics. A new emphasis on ecosystems and global changes is needed now at the U to address these environmental issues for the benefit of Utah’s citizens in the coming years.

The formation of a campus-wide Ecosystem and Global Change Center and related investment in research, graduate education, and outreach activities is important and timely for the University of Utah. The Center will focus on scientific research to improve our understanding of how environmental changes impact the functions, characteristics, dynamics, and sustainability of natural and human-built ecosystems, as well as the goods and services that natural systems provide to society. The Center will provide the interdisciplinary environment for training future generations of researchers to address critical societal issues, and provide a rich body of knowledge to guide decisions of land-managers and policy makers in Utah and elsewhere.

The specific objectives of the Center are to promote

- Collaborative interdisciplinary research in ecosystem and global change sciences and broadly in environmental sciences at scales from local to regional to global;
- Collaborative interdisciplinary research to understand impacts of different environmental changes on natural, managed, and human-built systems, including rural and urban regions;
- Graduate and possibly undergraduate training in ecosystem science, particularly at the interfaces between existing U of U departments and training programs;
- Communications in science through scientific and public seminars and community outreach;
- And to coordinate and help manage field stations and infrastructure critical to interdisciplinary research in the broad environmental sciences.
This proposal is submitted by Biology faculty, faculty of the initial Executive Committee, and 26 faculty from 4 Colleges included as founding members of the center. In addition to information in Appendix 1 and the list of faculty on the cover page, we expect that additional faculty with scientific interests from across the University will become affiliated with this Center, including (but not limited to) faculty from

- Science (Biology, Chemistry, and Mathematics Departments)
- Mines and Earth Sciences (Atmospheric Science and Geology & Geophysics Departments)
- Social and Behavioral Sciences (Anthropology and Geography Departments)
- Engineering (Civil & Environmental and Mechanical Engineering Departments)

Section II: Need

At present, there is no campus-wide Center at the University of Utah to bring together the diverse interests in ecosystem and global change sciences. Intellectual pursuits in research, education, and outreach span traditional scientific interests in several colleges across campus, including the Colleges of Science, Mines and Earth Sciences, Engineering, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. The Ecosystem and Global Change Center will fill a critical need by fostering research and training to address the scientific issues of our time related to adaptability, dynamics, functioning, resilience, sensitivity, and sustainability of both natural and human-built systems as they respond to regional and global environmental changes. Dust, water, invasive species, and maintaining a healthy atmosphere for our citizens are but a few of the multidisciplinary interests. The Center will be a focal point for integrated interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research in areas of broad ecological interest.

By focusing on natural-, managed-, and human-built systems, and on the impacts of environmental changes on these systems, the Ecosystem and Global Change Center will complement environmentally focused efforts on campus now in Law (Wallace Stegner Center for Land, Resources, and the Environment), Humanities (Environmental Humanities Graduate Program), the Social Sciences (Environmental Studies Program), Architecture & Planning (Center for Metropolitan Planning), the proposed Center for Alternative Energy, and the proposed Sustainability Research Center. Productive overlap among centers in areas of common interest will benefit the University whenever the opportunities arise. While these complementary Centers and Programs already exist on campus, there has not yet been an effort to address needs for research, training, and outreach in the sciences and none other has been proposed.

The University has recognized the need to encourage new opportunities in ecosystem and environmental sciences. A recent review of the Biology Department in March 2008 requested by Senior Vice President David Pershing and conducted by Dean David Chapman’s Office highlighted the need to allow existing faculty to develop new initiatives to promote, encourage, and expand interests, including the formation of “an interdisciplinary global environment center with broad university support.” This request to form the Ecosystem and Global Change Center is a direct response to that review and its recommendations.
There is only one Center similar to the proposed Ecosystem and Global Change Center within the Utah System of Higher Education. The similar entity is the Ecology Center at Utah State University (http://www.usu.edu/ecology/). The Ecology Center at USU lists more than 60 faculty from 8 biologically related departments as members of that Center. We envision a center at the University of Utah that is complementary, yet more interdisciplinary, extending beyond the traditional boundaries of ecology. We have had discussions over the past two years with USU Trustee Professor James MacMahon, Director of the Ecology Center, on ways the proposed Ecosystem and Global Change Center at the University of Utah and the Ecology Center at USU can productively interact and cooperate to further Ecosystem and Global Change Sciences between our universities and within the Utah State System of Higher Education. Cooperation across major universities is particularly important as we seek very large-scale and long-term ecosystem and environmental projects in Utah that require a cadre of ecological and environmental faculty/expertise that exceed the capacities of either institution (such as the regional Great Basin component for the National Ecological Observatory Network, http://www.neoninc.org/, the Urban Long-term Research Area (ULTRA) activity from the NSF), and EPSCoR Track 1 proposals.

Section III: Institutional Impact

Creation of the Ecosystem and Global Change Center will have positive impacts on research, graduate and undergraduate training, and outreach activities at the University of Utah. By serving as a focal point to foster and encourage interdisciplinary research in the broad areas of ecosystem and global change sciences, environmental science, and global change studies, the Center will facilitate first-class research that brings together faculty from different academic units on campus to collaborate on large-scale interdisciplinary studies that cannot typically be conducted within a single academic discipline. With a Center that focuses on the edges of traditional departments and builds on the interactions, we anticipate development of research and training efforts that bring together different teams of faculty and students to work on large-scale ecosystem and environmental opportunities.

Our goal is to establish, at the University of Utah, a Center that is internationally recognized for excellence in interdisciplinary ecosystem and global change sciences, with a core of expertise that can be drawn upon by the citizens, industry, and government of Utah. Examples of university institutes, schools, and centers that embrace a similar concept to ours include the Nicholas School of the Environment at Duke University (www.nicholas.duke.edu), the Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (http://www.ies.wisc.edu/), and the Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences at the University of Colorado (http://cires.colorado.edu/).

The need to develop a setting for coordinated interdisciplinary efforts in ecosystem and global change research has emerged through discussions between faculty and the higher administration at the University of Utah. For example, several memos from the administration accompanied the Spring 2008 Biology Task Force Report that was conducted by Dean David Chapman’s Office. These encouraging memos from Senior Vice President David Pershing, Dean of Science Pierre Sokolsky, as well as the Biology Task Force Report, implied a commitment for resources to
foster development of an interdisciplinary center to address broad environmental issues, such as the proposed Ecosystem and Global Change Center. While this may not be the best economic time to expect immediate and full implementation of the proposed Center and all of its activities, we believe it is important to define the elements that are necessary to move from concept to a fully functioning center.

We see several areas where current and future investments by the higher administration and external sources can help launch this center; those discussions will be independent of this request to form a center. Some limited investments now, and others eventually, are needed to successfully establish this new center. These investments should be based, in part, on University expectations of the anticipated returned overhead from external funding and by donor gifts to the center. Activities requiring funds will include:

- First-year graduate student support to attract the best students nationally and to establish a cadre of interdisciplinary graduate students (we have approached Dean Wight in this issue)
- Faculty lines (eventually) and hiring of a senior faculty member to lead the center (eventually)
- Support staff for accounting and program coordinator needs
- Partial salary support for a center director for partial relief of departmental teaching duties
- Funds to invest in programmatic activities
- Ability to participate in fund raising activities with Central Development to further natural and human-built ecosystem and global change science goals

We anticipate that, in addition to Founding faculty participants in the new center, additional new faculty will eventually be needed to fulfill the scientific vision of the Center. These new faculty will come from a combination of strategic hires by participating departments and, as funding becomes available, the addition of new faculty lines into areas that represent the interfaces between existing departments. EPSCoR, a potential statewide Science Initiative, and USTAR represent some of the opportunities where we expect to seek funds for new faculty lines. To ensure long-term viability of interdisciplinary research associated with the Center, we propose to develop a model whereby teaching, tenure, and promotion/tenure decisions would be determined at the departmental levels but that baseline funding for faculty positions affiliated with the Center would remain with the Center. We understand this is how the Ecology Center at USU maintains its programmatic control over retaining long-term interdisciplinary development. We also understand that this model may already exist for some centers at the University of Utah. We envision the eventual hiring of a senior faculty member to lead the Ecosystem and Global Change Center; for the time being, existing faculty will share that burden.

At present there are limited funds available to launch this center. Staff development of this center can take place in steps and is independent of this request to form a center. We propose to capitalize on an existing organizational administrative structure and infrastructure, ORG ID 00982 (Biology/Ecosystem), to launch the Ecosystem and Global Change Center. The University administration is willing to commit funds to help support salaries for the initial, essential staff lines to support the center (0.5 FTE accounting, 0.5 FTE program coordinator; see support letter). Funds to fill out these staff lines will need to be considered from returned overhead funds.
as this center develops. Initially, we propose that the center be physically located within the Biology Department, but alternative space may be available in other parts of the campus. It is anticipated that as the center develops space issues to support its anticipated faculty, research projects, and related activities will need to be addressed in separate discussions with the higher administration.

Attracting the best possible graduate students is key to developing strong research programs. A national graduate student-recruiting program is essential as demonstrated by many other interdisciplinary programs across campus that recruit in a united manner to attract the best graduate student applicants. First-year graduate student recruitment and stipend funds are needed to attract the best students with interdisciplinary ecosystem and global change sciences interests. We believe that the breadth of an Ecosystem and Global Change Center will be reflected in the students that we can attract to Utah. Here we model our approach after the existing first-year graduate programs on campus that have been instrumental in developing other interdisciplinary areas at the University (e.g., based on the molecular biology, neuroscience, and biochemistry models). We seek first-year support from the higher administration for students entering into a program that we anticipate would grow from 10 to 20 first-year students over time (a model whereby these funds can come from overhead is viable). Year two and later stipend funds and degree requirements for students would be handled at the departmental levels and inter-departmental graduate training programs, similar to other existing interdisciplinary graduate programs at the University of Utah. The new 5-year interdisciplinary NSF graduate training program (Think Globally Learn Locally, TGLL), awarded to the Departments of Biology, Geology & Geophysics, and Atmospheric Science, serves as but one example of how we see interdisciplinary graduate student support emerging after year 1. The critical University investment in first-year graduate students is needed to attract the very best of the graduate students for faculty in all departments associated with the Center.

As part of our first year’s effort, we will broaden our faculty support base and establish a first-year curriculum to be associated with this graduate training effort (see Appendix 3). We anticipate that six students will enter into the program in its first year of operation (2010-2011) and that 20 students would enter into this program by year 3 of the program. Four students entered in Fall 2009 as part of our TGLL efforts this year (2009-2010) in a pilot effort. Establishing a first-year curriculum is an essential first step. We propose that the first-year curriculum be built on two previous efforts by Biology, Geology & Geophysics, and Atmospheric Sciences to develop an interdisciplinary curriculum. These are the funded NSF graduate training program (Think Globally Learn Locally, TGLL) and the as-yet unfunded DoE graduate training program (Water Ecology Hydrology Training, WEHT). Both include (a) courses taken in different departments to broaden a student’s horizon, (b) interdisciplinary concept-methodology courses (e.g., Stable Isotope Ecology), and (c) common training experiences (such as participation in the K-12 (TGLL) and/or participation in a multi-disciplinary water research project (WEHT) at Red Butte Canyon, Range Creek, or Entrada Field Stations. In addition, students would participate over their five years in a fall seminar targeted for their stage of training. This would include training in presentations, research design, research critique, developing technical writing skills, and life after graduate school. The common themes in this graduate training effort are developing interdisciplinary training, learning about the
synergistic advantages of melding different perspectives and approaches, and ensuring a world-class research experience.

Faculty members of the Center that are also part of the interdepartmental TGLL Steering Committee will initially handle the first-year graduate student awards. In the first year (2009-2010), we have made first-year awards to four outstanding applicants where the attractiveness of the Center first-year award was effective in attracting the very best students from participating departments to pursue graduate studies at the University of Utah. By the second year, we anticipate that a web-based interdepartmental recruiting structure will be in place where students can apply for admission through the Center or through individual departments for admission to the University, similar to the existing Molecular Biology Graduate Recruiting Program.

Separate from the proposal to establish this center, we are negotiating with the higher administration for support of the center based on overhead generation. We will encourage faculty with Center-related grant applications to submit them through the Center, with funds to be used to support program coordinator and accounting staff needs, to assist in set-up packages of new faculty, to partially support key infrastructure needs, to provide seminar and annual meeting opportunities for students and faculty, and to promote Center activities. A letter of support from the higher administration of the University is attached to this application.

The ability to participate in fundraising activities with the Central Development Office is critical if we are to identify giving opportunities for building, equipment, programmatic needs, and graduate student training. We have assurance that Central Development Office will work with the Ecosystem and Global Change Center to identify appropriate fundraising opportunities.

With the development of an interdisciplinary center that incorporates different academic departments and colleges, it is critical to ensure that a governance structure is established that meets the requirements of these departments and colleges, as well as the higher administration. “Buy in” is needed across the campus from the beginning. In that regard, we propose organizational and governance guidelines for this center:

- The center will report to the Vice President for Research;
- A four-member Executive Committee will initially direct the Center over its first two years. The members will be Jim Ehleringer (Biology, first-year lead), Denise Dearing (Biology), Tom Painter (Geography), and Thure Cerling (Geology and Geophysics). The Executive Committee will have oversight responsibilities for essential activities of the center, including large financial decisions, interfacing with the departments and higher administration, engaging faculty, and coordinating graduate student recruitment; this Executive Committee will meet at least monthly;
- The Center will be guided by a 12-member Steering Committee composed of faculty members from each of the departments that participate the center; this Steering Committee will meet at least quarterly;
- A graduate recruitment committee expanding on the faculty from the existing WEST and TGLL interdepartmental graduate recruitment committees (currently lead by Don Feener).
Interdisciplinary interactions will be enhanced and expanded by the Center. An essential element of this Center is to provide an interdisciplinary environment for both research and graduate educational training. In this regard, the Ecosystem and Global Change Center will enhance opportunities at the University through:

- The development of a 1st-year graduate training program to foster interdisciplinary research and training opportunities; this program may be identified as the “Ecosystem and Global Change Sciences Interdisciplinary Graduate Program” and will provide essential first-year baseline educational training;
- A required interdisciplinary lecture- and laboratory-based curriculum for all incoming graduate students into the program to include expected participation by faculty associated with the Center;
- Website describing research, training, and educational opportunities as well as the key analytical, modeling, and field facilities to attract large-scale interdisciplinary research and training opportunities

Several mechanisms will facilitate interdisciplinary interactions, including

- A weekly interdisciplinary seminar program to attract the best scientists in the field and open to both the University and the public.
- An annual meeting and workshop bringing together undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty
- Functioning as a coordinating service for interdisciplinary activities in association with related centers such as the Wallace Stegner Center, the Environmental Humanities Program, the Metropolitan Planning Center, and the proposed Sustainability Research Center.

Undergraduate participation will be encouraged through opportunities for hands-on laboratory and field research experiences, development of instrument-based and modeling laboratory courses, and eventually a certificate program in Environmental and Ecosystem Sciences.

As this Ecosystem and Global Change Center develops over time, we anticipate additional future developments that will relate to both policy issues and to forging strong interactions and linkages with Centers at the University of Utah that focus on topics such as Law, Business, Sustainability, Economics, and Health.

Section IV: Finances

A world-class Ecosystem and Global Change Center, with its research and training efforts, cannot be developed without an initial financial investment by the State and by University of Utah. We recognize that the timing is poor with respect to the University’s financial and State’s economic conditions. However, a program can be created that develops over time as the University and State have available resources. The creation of this Center now is for the University to be well positioned as opportunities emerge in the near future. The University of Utah has an excellent faculty to initially launch the Center, but an investment in new faculty and facilities will be required over time for the center to realize its potential and for the Center to be able to attract the larger-scale, integrated research and training opportunities that are becoming
available. Even in these challenging economic times, universities across the country continue to invest heavily in the scientific areas of ecosystem and global change research and training. This is because major research universities realize the importance of understanding how environmental changes, such as climate change, land-use change and urbanization, will impact our nation’s ecosystems, our economies, society, and the world we live in. The basic research and educational training that emerge from forming these centers and investing in interdisciplinary research and training provide the critical information that society, land managers, and policy makers need to move forward. This interdisciplinary training creates the learning and training environment necessary to develop the leaders and researchers of the next generation.

The development of this center can take place in steps.

1. First, we propose to capitalize on an existing organizational administrative structure and infrastructure, ORG ID 00982 (Biology/Ecosystems), to launch the Ecosystem and Global Change Center. Salaries for the initial, essential staff lines to support the center (0.5 FTE accounting, 0.5 FTE program coordinator) are to be initially provided by the University administration. Funds to fill out these staff lines will need to be considered later as this Center develops.

2. We propose that the center initially be physically located within the Biology Department, although it is anticipated that as the center develops over the next decade a new or different building may be required to support its anticipated faculty, research projects, and related activities.

3. First-year graduate student recruitment and stipend funds will be used to attract the best students with an interdisciplinary interest in a broad educational and research opportunity.

4. An administrative partial return of overhead funds on grants submitted through the center will provide a foundation to help with programmatic development and faculty equipment set-up needs.

5. Lastly, we anticipate that additional faculty lines will eventually be needed to fulfill the scientific vision of the center. These new faculty will come from a combination of strategic hires by participating departments and, as funding becomes available through different opportunities, the addition of new faculty lines into areas that represent the interfaces between existing departments.
Appendix 1

Meetings have been held with the Deans of the College of Sciences, College of Mines and Earth Sciences, and College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. All have been supportive and letters of support have been submitted to the Graduate School to accompany this application.

Meetings have been held with the faculty in the Departments of Anthropology, Atmospheric Sciences, Biology, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Geography, Geology, and Mathematics. All have been supportive and several have contributed letters of support to the Graduate School to accompany this application. Many faculty were interested in becoming founding members of this center once it is approved; many of those same individuals have voiced their support by indicating a desire to be a founding member of this center.

Appendix 2

Examples of interdisciplinary efforts that relate to the kinds of activities that would be promoted and encouraged by development of the Ecosystem and Global Change Center.

1. National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), an NSF-sponsored long-term (30+ years) ecological - environmental monitoring, modeling, and research network operating at a national scale; 4 of the 60 tower sites are located in Utah. To be built in 2011-2013.

2. Urban Long-term Research Area (ULTRA), an NSF-sponsored long-term ecological - environmental monitoring, modeling, and research site for linking natural-, physical-, and social-scientists to study urban ecosystems and their interactions with adjacent wildland ecosystems. RFP anticipated in 2011; pilot proposal submitted.

3. Water-Ecology-Hydrology–Training (WEHT), a Department of Education sponsored graduate training program to link natural and physical scientists in several departments to focus on water-related issues. Initial grant application declined; resubmission expected in 2010.

4. Think Globally, Learn Locally (TGLL), an NSF-supported graduate student training grant linking graduate students from four departments with Salt Lake City Schools K-12 education with a focus on environmental and global changes that are occurring. Funded.

5. Coordinating the development of the EPSCoR Track 1 proposal: “How will Utah’s future be influenced by the interactions among water, energy, and the atmosphere?”; this brings together faculty from the colleges of Science, Engineering, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Mines and Earth Sciences.

6. Many additional interdisciplinary collaborations among faculty in different departments exist that fall under the ‘ecosystem’ umbrella, such as

   - **hanta virus studies** – Dearing (Biology), Adler (Math), Cova (Geography)
   - **dust and snowmelt** – Bowling (Biology), Ehleringer (Biology), and Painter (Geography)
   - **atmospheric deposition of mercury and other heavy metals** – Johnson (Geology and Geophysics), Perry (Atmospheric Sciences), Naftz (USGS)
Appendix 4

Sample year 1 curriculum based on existing courses

We expect that the proposal for 1st-year curriculum will undergo changes as the various faculty meet to plan this effort in Fall 2009, once the center is initially approved. Presented below is an initial overview of one possibility. While the objective is to provide a cohesive interdisciplinary training to all students, we recognize that some differentiation of specialized courses may be required as students focus in the natural, physical, and/or social-science emphases to meet different departmental needs.

This initial program for the founding faculty of the center to consider reflects the need to establish basic knowledge for all students in the biological, chemical, and physical processes of the integrated Earth system, and the need to develop quantitative skills. This consists of a full 1st year, with 2 additional 1h seminars in year 2. The remainder of the students’ coursework will be worked out with their respective departments and graduate supervisory committees.

Science Core Courses (all students take these 3 courses during yr 1)
BIOL 5490    Ecosystem Ecology (3h)
GEO 6660    Introduction to Geochemistry (3h)
ATMOS 6030   Earth Climate System (3h)

Quantitative Electives (each student selects 1 course during yr 1, depending on natural-, physical-, or social-science focus)
ATMOS 6040    Environmental Statistics (3h)
GEO 5500    Numerical Methods in Geosciences (3h)
GEOG 6140    Methods in Geographic Information Systems (4h)

Professional Development Seminars* (4 total, one per semester, first 2 years)

A. Scientific Communication (1h)
   Grant proposal and manuscript writing, university and national meeting speaking, constructive criticism and reviewing the works of others (e.g., Bio-Boot Camp, BIOL 7964)
B. Scientific Research (1h)
   Planning, experimental design, maintaining records, databases, etc.
C. Scientific Ethics (1h)

• **tamarisk beetle ecology** – Ehleringer (Biology), Hultine (Biology), Dennison (Geography)
• **urban ecology** – Dennison (Geography), Ehleringer (Biology), Nelson (Metropolitan Planning Center), Burian (Civil and Environmental Engineering)
Topics will include collaboration, plagiarism, conflicts of interest, human (IRB) and animal (IACUC) research, permitting

D. Life After Graduate School (1h)
  Career options and alternatives, postdoctoral and professional development, government-based and NGO-based funding, budgeting time, managing a team effort, balancing work and personal life, etc.

*initially these would be taught in the existing Special Topics framework
September 10, 2009

James Ehleringer, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor
Department of Biology
University of Utah

Dear Jim:

Thank you for your willingness to lead the effort to create an Ecosystem and Global Change Center. This is an exciting initiative that I hope will grow into a major interdisciplinary research effort at the University of Utah.

My understanding is that one major purpose of the center is to promote interdisciplinary research in 1) ecosystem and global change sciences, and 2) the impacts of different environmental changes on natural, managed, and human-built systems. The other principal goals of the center are to 1) provide graduate (and perhaps undergraduate) training in ecosystem science, 2) communicate ecosystem research to professional and public audiences, and 3) assist in management of Utah field stations and infrastructure needed to achieve the research goals of the center.

With the understanding that large interdisciplinary research efforts require internal support during their start-up phase, Senior Vice President Pershing and I are willing to provide such funding to the center for the first three years as follows:

- 0.5 FTE in accounting support and 0.5 FTE in program coordinator support
- Three graduate fellowships of $15,000 each per year

I am hopeful that, by the end of the 2012 academic year, the center will be able to qualify for a 15% return of the overhead generated by its grants and that these funds will then provide you with the resources needed to sustain the necessary infrastructure. As you know, the criteria for receiving this overhead return are:

- The Graduate Council and the university’s Board of Trustees have formally approved the center
- The center is highly interdisciplinary and involves active participation by faculty in multiple colleges
- The center’s grants and contracts are producing at least $1.5 million per year in returned overhead
- The center reports directly to a Vice President and is providing major research opportunities in a critical area for the faculty
Thank you again for your willingness to lead this important effort.

Sincerely,

Thomas N. Parks, Ph.D.
Vice President for Research

David W. Pershing, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
January 21, 2009

Dr. Fred Rhodewalt
Associate Dean
The Graduate School
Room 302 John R. Park Bldg.
U of U Campus

Dear Associate Dean Rhodewalt:

This letter is to confirm my strong support for the proposed *Ecosystems and Global Changes Center*. Major environmental issues need to be confronted in a multidisciplinary fashion with researchers from the Colleges of Science, Mines and Earth Sciences, Engineering, and Social and Behavioral Sciences working together. This is also the right time for this center in terms of accessing significant federal funding, as projects such as NEON are coming to the fore. A strong research effort, headed by faculty in this center, will also guarantee a strong graduate and undergraduate, science-based training program in ecology, something that has not existed at this university in a significant way previously. The development of the Entrada Ranch site as field station for environmental and other studies will also, I believe, benefit strongly from the existence of this center. The proposed center will also satisfy the need, identified in the recent review of the Biology Department, to promote and encourage this area of science.

Starting up this center during a period of economic downturn and budget cuts is of course a challenge, but I believe that it is necessary if the university wants to fully participate in the many opportunities that will be available in the near future in global ecology, global warming and other initiatives that the federal government has indicated will be high priority. I am thus very encouraged that David Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, has committed some funds to support graduate students for this center in the next year. While the Dean's Office cannot make a specific commitment at this time to graduate students and other support, pending the size of the future budget cuts, we will make every effort to find resources to provide at least minimal, additional graduate student support for the next year. I will also work with the Biology Department and Senior Vice President Pershing to identify ways to hire new faculty in this area.

I would like to emphasize again my strongest support for the creation of this center and congratulate the founding faculty members for moving this forward at this time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Pierre V. Sokolsky
Dean, College of Science, and
Professor of Physics
Distinguished Professor David Chapman  
Dean, Graduate School,  
University of Utah  

January 16, 2009  

Dear Professor Chapman,  

I have been asked by Distinguished Professor of Biology James R. Ehleringer and colleagues to prepare a letter of support to accompany his proposal to form a new Ecosystem and Global Change Center at the University of Utah. I understand that the Graduate Council will consider the proposal for this new center in the near future.  

In my capacity as Chair of the Department of Biology, I offer my enthusiastic support for the new center. This initiative is being advanced primarily by an energetic group of biology faculty. I understand that they have reached out to other academic units on campus in order to develop an interdisciplinary center that stretches across departments and colleges at the University. In my opinion, such an effort is long overdue.  

Given the level of involvement of biology faculty in the proposed center, the Department of Biology will provide assistance with staff support (program coordination, administration and accounting). Those staff will continue to be accommodated within space assigned to the department. Additionally, biology will be actively seeking to recruit graduate students who have the potential to participate in the recently funded TGLL K-12 NSF grant (P.I. Professor Don Feener). It is expected that there will be some overlap between TGLL graduate fellows and biology faculty who are participating in the new center. The Department of Biology will offer a full year of support to incoming 1st year graduate students in exchange for a single semester teaching assistantship. Thus, these students will enjoy a full semester without teaching obligations during which time they will be able to fully focus on establishing their research projects.  

It seems reasonable to anticipate that between two and five graduate students will be admitted every year through biology’s graduate recruitment efforts into TGLL and/or the proposed Ecosystem center. The total number will vary depending upon the number of open slots in biology’s graduate program and the availability of support. I realize that there is some ambiguity here, but this is simply a reflection of the current instability in the state-supported component of our budget. This in no way diminishes my ardent support for the proposed center which I believe is essential if the University is to position itself appropriately for future funding opportunities in the general area of ecosystem and environmental biology.
I understand that Senior Vice President David Pershing has also offered to provide some additional funds to assist with the support of 1st year graduate students affiliated with the center. Thus, in spite of the poor economic outlook, there is strong institutional support for the proposed center. The Department of Biology is committed to assisting the biology faculty involved in building the foundation for a center that I fully expect to flourish by bringing new educational, training, research and funding opportunities to the University of Utah.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Neil J. Vickers
Professor and Chair

Tel: (801)-585-1930
Fax: (801)-581-2174
vickers@biology.utah.edu
To: David Chapman; Dean, Graduate School  
From: James O'Connell; Distinguished Professor, Anthropology; Director, Archaeological Center

Date: 12 Nov 08

Re: Proposed Center for Ecosystem and Global Change Sciences

I write in support of the proposed CEGCS. Its focus on environmental science broadly defined and its deliberately interdisciplinary, cross-college structure speak to a definite need on the campus, one that is certain to become more salient in the near term. Its statement of overall goals is well formulated; its organizational framework appears to be sound; its proposed budget is reasonable; its requirements for funding from central administration are fairly modest. From my perspective and that of the research group I supervise, it seems likely to provide a venue for productive interaction on matters of general interest, especially on issues involving climate change - past and ongoing - and human reactions thereto. I respectfully urge you to give this proposal your most serious consideration.

xc: JS Ott; Dean, Social and Behavioral Sciences  
E Cashdan; Professor & Chair, Anthropology
10 November, 2008

Dr. David S. Chapman, Dean
The Graduate School
Park Building
University of Utah, CAMPUS

Dear Dave,

I am writing to express my strong support for the Center for Ecosystem and Global Change Sciences proposed by Professors Ehleringer, Cerling, Dearing, Sperry, and Bowling, all of whom have appointments in the Department of Biology. I believe that this center will promote interdisciplinary studies, because it is organized to be rather inclusive, drawing its faculty from four colleges. No one should now doubt that the human population has reached numbers that require sharp attention to environmental problems, yet the University of Utah currently has no organization that can bring diverse scientific expertise together to study these problems. This is a problem that is pointed out in the proposal, and, although not stated, deprives the University of a considerable number of students who have interest in ecological studies—these students instead opt to study at Utah State University.

Of particular importance in my mind is the need for long-term monitoring in Utah, similar to the monitoring of temperature that you have established at several sites. The sort of information that must be collected lends itself naturally to undergraduate and graduate instruction and research. Further, the long-term nature of ecological studies should allow ample opportunity to learn what works and what does not. The proposers are all very intelligent individuals who will not fail to abandon unpromising avenues of instruction and research—instead, they will identify and follow the routes of most likely to yield the greatest payoff in terms of readying the next generation of scientists to deal with environmental and ecological problems. Not surprisingly their aims are high—"to establish…a center that is internationally recognized for excellence in interdisciplinary environmental science… ."

Given the economic shocks of the last few weeks, it may be difficult to provide all of the support that is suggested, but I think that this center is important enough that the University should certainly try to do so, even if it is scaled back somewhat. As the applicants are intent on establishing a center of this kind, it may be possible to provide some of the faculty positions through replacing faculty who retire from interested departments with individuals whose expertise and interests fit with those of the proposed center. Some items are handled quite easily—no one should dissuade this group from requesting fund from anywhere. Ideas for organization of the proposed center seem quite sensible to me, and appear designed to be inclusive.

A center for ecological studies is long overdue on this campus, and as stated above, establishing one has my strongest support.

Yours,

Francis H. Brown, Dean
November 3, 2008

David S. Chapman
Dean, University of Utah Graduate School
Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies
Professor of Geology & Geophysics

Dear Dean Chapman,

The purpose of this letter is to provide my support for the Biology Department’s effort to create a multi-college Center for Ecosystem and Global Change Studies. This center creation is timely and appropriate for a large group of researchers on the University of Utah campus who are engaged in related research. As a professor in the College of Engineering, I believe that this proposed center will have wide reaching benefits across campus. The College of Engineering has a number of faculty including myself that would be interested in participating and leading efforts in such a center.

The formation of the Center for Ecosystem and Global Change Studies will provide a mechanism for interdisciplinary research that has been lacking on campus. A clear example of the need for such a center is evident in the composition of many of my PhD student’s supervisory committees. These committees often have faculty from Biology, Urban Planning, Meteorology, Civil and Environmental Engineering and Chem/Fuels Engineering. I also regularly serve on other PhD committees in similar departments. These students are reaching beyond their departments for expertise that is relevant to their research. The Center for Ecosystem and Global Change Studies will provide a mechanism that will facilitate these types of interaction.

The center will also facilitate research funding opportunities. I have participated in past projects such as the Urban Trace Gas Emissions Study (UTES) that would have greatly benefited from such an organization. In the near future, the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON) and other related projects will benefit. The Center for Ecosystem and Global Change Studies will specifically benefit my interest in studying energy, water and trace gas balances in urban areas and understanding linkages to urban ecology. My research group continues to maintain an Eddy Flux tower monitoring CO2 fluxes in the Salt Lake Valley that has benefited from equipment and expertise from present and past researchers from the Biology Department. I am in the process of preparing a multi-disciplinary NSF CNH proposal (follow-up to UTES) to continue funding this tower and to develop additional social and behavior science relationships that will lead to improved understanding of urban water and energy use.
In summary, I am a very supportive and willing contributor to the proposed center. I believe the *Center for Ecosystem and Global Change Studies* will directly benefit my researcher activities as well as others in the College of Engineering and will lead to the creation of important infrastructure that will benefit the society and policy makers grasping to make complex decisions in this area in the future.

Sincerely,

Eric R. Purdyjak, Ph.D.
Associate Professor – Environmental Fluid Dynamics Lab
Department of Mechanical Engineering
pardyjak@eng.utah.edu
(801) 585-6414.
December 6, 2008

Graduate School, University of Utah

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter concerns dissolution of the Center for Water, Ecosystem, and Climate Science (CWECS). The center was developed in 2005 in response to requests by my colleague Jim Ehleringer to formalize the team of researchers I had organized for proposing the Great Salt Lake Hydrologic Observatory (GSLBHO). The proposal was to be submitted to NSF via the Consortium of Universities for the Advancement of Hydrologic Science, Incorporated (CUAHSI) which was leading a national campaign for the hydrologic observatories. Jim felt strongly that a center was needed to act as the umbrella for the GSLBHO and the expected National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON) organizing efforts.

Shortly following approval of CWECS, the CUAHSI national campaign for developing hydrologic observatories was suspended. In response, I further focused my efforts on developing a research project regarding selenium cycling in the Great Salt Lake. I organized a team of researchers from the University of Utah, USGS, Utah State University, Weber State University, and CH2M Hill, Inc. The Utah Department of Environmental Quality funded a $1.8 million project conducted by CWECS and CH2M Hill, and this project was completed in 2008 with more than ten publications in press and seven reports completed. I also established an ICP-MS center with majority capital funds from College of Mines & Earth Sciences, minor capital funds from the College of Science, and major operating funds from the College of Mines & Earth Sciences and the CWECS project. This center now serves clients from several colleges on campus, as well as off-campus clients.

Jim now proposes a new center with very similar characteristics to CWECS. I have asked Jim why he hasn't promulgated his efforts through CWECS, and his response is that CWECS lacks activity, which clearly is a highly unfair characterization given that CWECS was formed at Jim's behest, and yet although NEON has moved forward significantly during the period 2006-2008, Jim has not used CWECS as an umbrella for NEON organizing activities. CWECS cannot function as proposed if Jim will not support it, and I am not interested in competing with Jim in developing centers. Given this context, it seems to me that the most sensible action is to dissolve CWECS. The ICP-MS laboratory will continue to be administered and supported by the College of Mines & Earth Sciences and Department of Geology & Geophysics.

Although it is not clear to me why Jim did not simply develop his own center in the first place, it is likely a matter of Jim altering his strategy in response to his changing perceptions of long term advantages for building a lasting legacy, in which case I have no desire to thwart Jim's efforts.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William P. Johnson, Ph.D.
Professor
Geology & Geophysics
September 10, 2008

Dean David Chapman
Graduate School
Park Building 302
Campus

Dear Dean Chapman:

I am pleased to support the proposed Center for Ecosystem and Global Change Sciences. It will help coordinate and integrate research, education and outreach activities that will examine and influence how environmental changes are and will impact ecosystems and the goods and services they provide to society. Tackling the broad spectrum of ecosystem-related issues will require the Center to work aggressively with its funding partners and internal collaborators to transcend walls between disciplines and generate new interdisciplinary research and teaching programs that would probably otherwise not be possible. The Center has excellent potential for facilitating and supporting new research partnerships that could easily include researchers from this college. The Center has the potential to foster the innovative approaches needed to find answers to questions that will help our society adjust to the rapidly changing social, political, economic and natural environments that are unfolding around us.

As you know well, many challenges remain for the Center. It will not succeed without major new external funding, capable leadership, and strong ties to internal and external stakeholders. We wish the new leadership well.

I understand the argument that the Center should remain narrowly focused in its formative years, but I continue to urge the proposers to quickly expand their vision beyond the physical sciences. The Center needs to include faculty with social science and public policy expertise in particular. In order for the Center to achieve its mission, it must address issues related to the complex problems of changing human behavior and implementing public policy changes for the improvement of society. Research alone will not produce societal change. Limiting participation now to the physical sciences may make it difficult to change the culture of the Center later.

I enthusiastically endorse the proposed Center for Ecosystem and Global Change Sciences with the cautions noted above. Please let me know how and when we can help.

Sincerely,

J. Steven Ott, Ph.D.
Dean

College of Social and Behavioral Science
260 S Central Campus Dr Rm 205
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-0150
(801) 581-8620
R401 Information Calendar Item
Proposal for Restructuring and name change to Existing Academic Unit(s)
Restructure the Departments of Ballet and Modern Dance into one Administrative unit as the School of Dance.

Section I: The Action

The Departments of Ballet and Modern Dance are proposing to restructure the current Departments into one stronger and more substantial unit, the School of Dance. This restructuring mirrors the advances in dance education across the country as well as the evolving nature of the art form itself. This action will allow the University of Utah to remain competitive with other universities on the national level as well as to retain and strengthen our position as leaders in the national and international dance education field. This proposal was vetted by both faculties and in a joint faculty meeting on May 12, 2009 unanimously approved as a change that will strengthen dance at the University of Utah.

Section II: Need

The current structure of two separate departments representing very closely related areas of interest served the University at one time, however that model has become outdated and is now hindering the individual departments from greater growth and opportunities. The world of dance has changed so dramatically in recent years that the current structure does not fully serve our students or faculty. Graduates entering the professional dance world are expected to be proficient in both classical and contemporary dance styles, in addition to a wealth of related knowledge and skills. The combined strengths of our faculty will enable our students to excel in this arena and will also offer opportunities beyond the scope of either individual department.

There are currently no other peer institutions in the country with a structure similar to our current structure. The most common model is a single school or very large department, under whose guidance individual areas of expertise flourish. In fact, the National Association of Schools of Dance only offers one accreditation to individual institutions. When the University of Utah gained accreditation from this national organization it was as a University – not two separate departments. Similarly, the American College Dance Festival Association, one of the most recognized national organizations for furthering collegiate dance, also only allows one membership per institution.

Each of the Departments of Ballet and Modern Dance carries a rich history of excellent training, producing high caliber performers, choreographers and teachers. This proposal to restructure as
a School of Dance will maintain the integrity and tradition of two separate degree programs – a BFA in Ballet and a BFA in Modern Dance – while affording the possibility of additional degree offerings. For example, dance education has broadened to include work in somatics studies including, Bartenieff, Alexander, Feldenkrais and Pilates techniques as well as Laban Movement Analysis. A separate degree track combining studies in ballet, contemporary dance, somatics and pedagogy could prepare graduates for professional careers in dance medicine and education. Perhaps the most compelling reason for this change is to keep pace with the ever-changing world of professional dance. Sharing faculty resources across departments within the School of Dance will provide a richer education for our students and a more fertile environment for inter-departmental collaborations.

*School* carries a connotation of higher level/quality activity than does the word *Department* within the academic dance community. The external image of the departments would be significantly enhanced by this change in nomenclature and structure. While we regularly recruit very high caliber students to both departments, this change will allow us to broaden the pool of applicants – many of whom are looking for programs of study where they can pursue training in numerous dance traditions. This is especially true at the graduate level.

In addition to the sound pedagogical foundations for this restructuring, the creation of a new School of Dance could be very enticing to potential donors who want to become a part of such a progressive move in dance education at the University of Utah.

Many of our peer institutions have already changed to School status to keep pace with national trends in dance education, these universities include:

- Arizona State University – School of Dance
- University of Arizona – School of Dance
- Florida State University – School of Dance
- Ohio University – School of Dance
- University of Oklahoma – School of Dance
- University of the Arts, Philadelphia – School of Dance
- CALARTS, California Institute of the Arts - The Sharon Disney Lund School of Dance
- University of North Carolina School of the Arts – School of Dance

Other universities have formed schools combining dance with another strong Fine Arts Department, these include:

- San Francisco State University – School of Music and Dance
- San Diego State University – School of Music and Dance
- University of Houston - School of Theatre and Dance
- University of Florida - School of Theatre and Dance
- University of South Florida - School of Theatre and Dance
- Kent State - School of Theatre and Dance
- University of Oregon - School of Music and Dance
In 2001 the former Department of Music at the University of Utah successfully changed their name and status to the School of Music for many of the same reasons articulated in this proposal for the School of Dance. In the Music proposal they cited “external image” as one of the driving reasons for change. The School of Music has found the change to a School to have a very positive effect on the caliber and number of incoming students – at both the undergraduate and graduate level. This change has also provided a clearer administrative structure within the School.

Section III: Institutional Impact

Changing the infrastructure of the Ballet and Modern Dance Departments to one School of Dance will offer enormous potential for future degree offerings combining the resources of these two dynamic departments. The departments currently share a facility and several employees. The institutional impact on available resources would, for the most part, be an economical move. More importantly however would be reinforcing the presence and prestige of the University of Utah in the national and international dance community.

The programs in each department are based on strong fundamentals that recognize each discipline’s specific requirements, while looking to the other for collaboration and inspiration. We would be proud to have both programs under one administrative “roof,” contributing to one common goal: We are committed to creating an educational community in its finest form: one which invites diversity, embraces ambiguity, welcomes creative conflict, practices honesty, honors risk and experiences humility.

Administratively, there would be one Retention, Promotion and Tenure document for the School of Dance for all faculty members. Current practice in the departments is to have members from each of the faculties sit on reviews for any single faculty member in either department, so one RPT committee would not present a drastic change from current practice. There will be one administrative Director of the School with subsequent part-time chairs/heads of Ballet and Modern. These modifications to current administration of Ballet and Modern would allow for faculty in leadership roles at the individual discipline levels to maintain active teaching, research and service profiles.

Degrees offered would remain a BFA in Ballet, BFA in Modern Dance, MFA in Ballet and MFA in Modern Dance awarded by the University of Utah School of Dance.

Section IV: Finances

There are many instances where this change will actually save money for the current Departments. There are several positions shared by the two units and there are several other positions that could also be shared. As a single School, there will be additional possibilities to create more efficient uses of faculty resources e.g., one Director of Graduate Studies instead of two, one RPT Chair, one RPT Committee, etc. The only additional monies required will be used to create a Director line for the School. The reporting structure will change slightly, again to be more efficient, with one Director reporting directly to the Dean of the College of Fine Arts rather than two separate chairs.
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**University of Utah**
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Date 9-4-09
Chuck Wight, Dean  
Graduate School  
302 Park  
Campus  

Dear Dean Wight,

It is with enthusiasm that I submit this letter of support for the proposal to create a School of Dance at the University of Utah. As you know, this reconfiguration would be a structural merger of the current Departments of Modern Dance and Ballet. The exact design of the merger has not yet been determined but Chairs and faculty members of both Departments have had several comprehensive retreats to discuss and form preliminary plans for the creation of the School of Dance and there is a high level of excitement and positive momentum toward that goal.

As the Chair of Modern Dance, I am very supportive of this initiative. I view the change in administrative structure, curricular design, and student and faculty interaction in aesthetic and philosophic diversity as a positive. The concept of Dance as a unified discipline is one that is philosophically and conceptually aligned with the current mission of the Department of Modern Dance. My concerns, and though they are limited in scope I do have some, relate mainly to the efficiency and productivity in the reconfiguration process that lies ahead. I am confident that with skillful astute leadership and the facilitation of a cooperative process, those concerns will subside.

Dean Tymas-Jones has consistently been clear about his vision and desire for a School of Dance to be greater than the sum of the two parts that will form it. I share his vision and believe that dance training and education at the University of Utah, including both modern dance and ballet, will be strengthened by this proposed change.

The faculty and staff members in the Department of Modern Dance voted unanimously to support the change from two Departments to a unified School. This vote took place on May 12, 2009 during an inclusive retreat where all tenure/tenure track, relevant auxiliary faculty, and staff were present.

At the suggestion and direction of Vice President and Dean, Raymond Tymas-Jones, I have conducted numerous telephone interviews with notable and informed colleagues across the nation who provided valuable input on the question of whether they thought forming a School of Dance was a good idea or not and if, in their opinions, this shift would strengthen the existing dance programs, which enjoy very high profile excellent national rankings as separate departments. Here is a partial list of the individuals with whom I spoke: Douglas Sonntag, Head of the Dance Program for the National
Endowment of the Arts; Stephen Koplowitz, Dean of Dance at California Institute of the Arts; James Sutton, Professor of Ballet at NYU TISCH (*Professor Sutton is currently on a sabbatical and has been researching cross-training – i.e. the practice of training in both contemporary dance and ballet); Zvi Goltheimer, Artistic Director of ZVI DANCE in NYC; Robert Moses, Artistic Director of Robert Moses KIN Dance Company in San Francisco; Carol Walker, Professor Emeritus and former Dean of Dance at SUNY Purchase; Sharon Vasquez, Dean of Dance at Wayne State University. Without exception, all of these notable dance professionals from both modern and ballet backgrounds enthusiastically supported the creation of a School of Dance.

Here are a few quotes from the conversations I had with these colleagues:

Having two separate departments is no longer a good academic or creative model for the university. It's based on all sorts of outmoded ideas of what dance is.

Cross-pollination is a sign of the times. There is no reason not to do this.

This merger would launch Dance at the U. of U. into the stratosphere! You want to make the strongest Dance program you can.

Forms melding is always a good thing. It is all about moving forward. No one is standing still on either form.

Giving students more range can’t harm them.

A School of Dance would, I believe, undoubtedly provide a more current, relevant, and comprehensive educational experience for students of dance at the University of Utah. The additional opportunities that will be available are immense and compelling particularly in light of the state of the dance profession in America and the world today. That profession is diverse and demands that dancers have expertise in multiple dance genres. Currently, although the Department of Modern Dance has made great strides toward providing more ballet, jazz, African, and other dance technique training, the merger with the Department of Ballet would provide even more opportunities for access to elite ballet training for dance students. Also, ballet students definitely need more elite training in contemporary dance, which the Department of Modern Dance has to offer. This is a win-win proposal, one that will not only serve the students but will also serve the faculty. This creation of a School of Dance will propel Dance at the University of Utah into the future with increased stature and viability.

The logistical benefits of combining Departments in terms of administrative operations are being assessed and in some cases implemented (i.e. a unified administrative office staff has been created). There have been and will continue to be financial, cost effective benefits.
As Chair, I am convinced that the formation of a School of Dance will have a positive impact on students, faculty, administration, and provide a vision for the future of dance at the University of Utah. I am excited to move forward with the creation of a School of Dance and appreciate your consideration of the proposal that has been set forth by Dean Tymas-Jones. Please contact me if you need any further information from Modern Dance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Donna M. White, Chair
July 16, 2009

Dr. Charles A. Wight, Dean  
Graduate School  
201 S. President’s Circle Rm 302  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9016

Dear Dean Wight,

It is my understanding you have met with Dean Raymond Tymas-Jones and Associate Dean Brent Schneider concerning a proposal to have our two departments, The Department of Ballet and The Department of Modern Dance be under the rubric of The School of Dance.

I support the proposal of Dean Tymas-Jones and joined my faculty and the Modern Dance faculty in our unanimous vote for this change May 12, 2009.

We were fortunate to have Bruce Marks as a facilitator for our discussions. Mr. Marks is able to address the value of this change because his dancing career was in both ballet and modern dance. He has served as an Artistic Director of three companies and is in demand for national and international competitions. This global exposure gives him a unique understanding of the current dance world. He supports the idea of The School of Dance as presented by Dean Tymas-Jones.

Dean Tymas-Jones clearly stated the development of this change would be the creative vision of the ballet and modern dance faculty members. Our minds will need to be open to these creative visions.

Some ideas for growth that influenced my vote are as follows:

- *The School of Dance* will be more attractive to donors
- Greater visibility with lower advertising cost
- Greater efficiency by having one staff assigned over both budgets (just established) and possible other staff changes may prove advantageous.
- Added personnel as proposed could be a strength, for instance:
  - One chair with two directors would divide the operating load, providing greater concentration of current dance trends and student needs.
    - Chair: be responsible for budget, fund raising, important University and College meetings
    - The Directors (their title has not been established) of each department would be responsible for faculty and student issues.
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- Some faculty could teach for both departments in courses such as:
  - Kinesiology
  - Music for dancers, teachers and choreographers
  - Conditioning, Wellness and Ballet injuries
  - Jazz
- A few students are requesting a mixed dance degree this might be arranged similarly to a University Studies degree

I believe the founders of our Departments, Dr. Elizabeth Hayes and Dr. William F. Christensen, would be proud of our openness to constantly embrace growth that will benefit our students. I hope we will receive the approval needed to go forward with this exploration.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Bené Arnold, Interim Chair
Department of Ballet
Office of the Dean

July 25, 2009

Chuck Wight
Dean of the Graduate School
302 Park Bldg., 201 S Presidents Circle
Salt Lake City, UT  84112-9016

Dear Dean Wight,

I am writing to convey my full support for the proposal from the Departments of Ballet and Modern Dance to change their administrative and academic structure to reflect their current stature at the national and international level in dance education and the growth in the individual departments. The proposal to create a School of Dance at the University of Utah will facilitate the trajectory planned for the future.

This restructuring of dance at the University has been discussed since I arrived on campus four years ago as the Associate Vice President for the Arts and Dean of the College of Fine Arts. I am excited by the process the departments have taken, with my full support, to move this agenda item forward. The School of Dance will place the long-standing tradition of excellence in dance on this campus on par with the establishment of the School of Music in our College and schools of dance at major universities across the country.

The School structure will offer the opportunity to broaden the definition of dance at the University of Utah beyond the current offerings, use the talents of current faculty members in new programs, course offerings and degree tracks, which will engage a wider population of dance students and faculty alike and establish the University among the leaders of dance education. Experts in the dance field in both academic and professional arenas have also vetted this proposal; all have voiced strong support and encouragement for the proposed restructuring to move forward.

Again, I offer my unconditional support of this proposal and thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Raymond Tymas-Jones
Associate Vice President for the Arts
Dean of the College of Fine Arts

College of Fine Arts
375 S. 1530 E.  Rem 250
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
(801) 581-6764
FAX (801) 585-3066
Division of Occupational Therapy 
in the 
College of Health

Professional Doctorate 
In 
Occupational Therapy 
(OTD) 
Proposal 
2009
Section I: The Request

University of Utah requests approval to offer the Doctor of Occupational Therapy degree (OTD) effective Summer 2010. This program has been approved by the institutional Board of Trustees on (date pending).

Section II: Program Description

Complete Program Description:
The proposed professional doctorate in Occupational Therapy (OTD) will be offered within the Division of Occupational Therapy to individuals who have already earned a degree in occupational therapy from an entry-level educational program accredited by the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE). In addition, applicants to this program will have successfully passed the national certification for occupational therapist board examination, and will have practiced as an occupational therapist for at least two years. The proposed OTD program will have two paths for entry – one for those individuals whose entry-level occupational therapy degree was at the Bachelor’s degree level, and one for those individuals who earned their entry-level occupational therapy degree at the Master’s degree level. The focus of the professional doctorate in occupational therapy (OTD) is to in part, provide clinicians with a stronger, more up-to-date theoretical base; advance their leadership skills; as well as to provide them with knowledge and skills in evidence-based research related to their chosen area of emphasis.

The occupational therapy literature has identified several reasons why the OTD is needed: there is a need to create a cadre of advanced clinicians based on strengthening theoretical underpinnings that are capable of contributing to the evidence-base in the field; there is a need for competent leadership to meet the challenges of a continually evolving healthcare system; there is a growing expressed need within all of the health professions to produce individuals with advanced degrees, and there is a national shortage of doctorally-prepared faculty to educate future generations of occupational therapy practitioners. There are currently only nineteen educational institutions in the U.S. offering professional doctorates in occupational therapy; included in that group are the University of Southern California, Tufts University, Creighton University, and Boston University. Summarily, the purpose of the professional doctorate in occupational therapy is to offer “a successful and accepted degree structure for the preparation of advanced practitioners. It creates a clinical scholar who can autonomously operate as a change agent in health care systems and sensitively interpret the human condition presented by patients. The professional doctorate bears serious consideration in occupational therapy as an educational option.” (Pierce & Peyton, 1999, p. 70)

The Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) has developed doctoral degree-level educational standards, separate from the standards for Master's degree level programs for occupational therapists. The occupational therapy profession moved to the entry-level of Master's degree 2005 and since that time there has been a demand and an increase of professional doctorate programs being developed. Some educators are calling for the
occupational therapy profession to move to an entry-level doctorate, mirroring the changes that have already occurred in Pharmacy, Physical Therapy, and Audiology (Smith, 2007). This call is also based on the increase of knowledge that needs to be mastered to stay competent in a field as broad-based as occupational therapy. “Developing leaders in practice is one of the reasons why OTD programs were established. Offering doctoral programs in practice makes occupational therapy competitive with other health professions, such as physical therapy, pharmacy, and even clinical nursing, all of which have launched practice-based doctoral programs.” (Strzelecki, 2009)

The entry-level degree program in occupational therapy that leads to the Master’s in Occupational Therapy (MOT) degree will not change at the University of Utah as a result of developing and implementing the OTD program. However, the proposed program will be a way for University of Utah graduates to continue to advance their education which ultimately will lead to strengthening the occupational therapy profession in Utah. The currently accredited entry-level Master's Degree in Occupational Therapy (MOT) at the University of Utah will continue; this program began admitting students in 1999 and currently graduates up to 30 students annually. The University of Utah's program is the only entry-level program in the state of Utah for an occupational therapist; there are currently no other accredited institutions in Utah offering a professional doctorate. The proposed OTD program has been designed in response to several needs: there is a national shortage of doctorally prepared faculty throughout the U.S., there is a possibility that the occupational therapy profession may move to an entry-level doctoral level in the next decade, and, there has been an expressed demand for years now by practicing occupational therapists within the state and in neighboring states to develop an accessible post-professional program. This degree will also strengthen the existing Master’s of Occupational Therapy (MOT) level program and help the Division related to increased research capability and service provision to the community.

The proposed OTD degree will admit students with either a bachelor’s degree or master’s degree in occupational therapy. These degrees must be from an ACOTE accredited program and will insure that that the basic tenets and educational level of occupational therapy have been met. There will be two tracks offered to obtain the proposed program degree; common to both tracks will be a requirement for a minimum of two years of clinical experience prior to entering the program, the doctoral level courses which will total 36 credits, including foundational courses, core curricular courses, a specialization area of emphasis chosen by the student in collaboration with the faculty, and a capstone project that will serve as the culminating project which will demonstrate the student's level of scholarship (See Appendix E). Students who apply to the program who have earned a Bachelor’s degree in occupational therapy will take an additional 24-36 credits of coursework, evaluated on a case-by-case basis upon review of the student’s transcript(s). Since it is anticipated that most of the students seeking the OTD at the University of Utah will be working professionals who are either place-bound, time-bound, or both, the program will be offered primarily through distance education technology.

Although residency for clinical doctorates is not formally required, given that this degree will substantially be an on-line format, the Division of Occupational Therapy will require students to come to campus at least once a year for a multiple day seminar. The seminar will focus on educational components that are more appropriately delivered face to face as well as team
The capstone project will be the final qualifying exercise for the OTD degree. This capstone project will integrate, synthesize, and apply the knowledge and skills acquired during doctoral coursework into a scholarly project designed by the student to meet his or her professional goals in an area of clinical practice. The student will design a project in one of the program’s areas of specialization that reflects both the purpose of the OTD Program, as well as the student’s proposed innovation in practice. Based on the topic, a project committee chair within the Division of Occupational Therapy will be assigned to provide guidance. Students will prepare and defend their proposal before a committee in Capstone Class I (OC TH 7400). During Capstone Class II (OC TH 7450) the students will carry out the action or program proposed during Capstone I. For example, if a student has proposed a college course, during the Capstone II course, the student will implement the course or part of it. Or, if a student proposed a specific research study, he or she would collect the data that was proposed and complete the study. If, for example, a student proposed a justification and plan to change policy at the state level the action proposed would be presented formally to appropriate policy makers in the hopes the action would be taken. The major outcomes for Capstone II are: a) the implementation of the proposal approved of in Capstone I, b) collection of data regarding the action, program, or study, c) analysis of this data, and, d) a discussion of how these results contribute to the advancement of the occupation in society, occupational science, or occupational therapy knowledge base. The other requirement that must be met is that the students will disseminate their results to the appropriate audience through presentations at the state and/or national level, peer reviewed publications and/or implementation of the project. Students will defend their final project before their committee.

The advisory committee will consist of three members. Two of the members must be from the Division of Occupational Therapy with the Chair of the committee being a full-time faculty member — either regular faculty or graduate school approved clinical full-time faculty. The third member will be chosen based on area of expertise as it relates to the project.

**Purpose of the Degree:**
The purpose of the proposed OTD program is to provide a professional doctorate curriculum to practicing occupational therapists with the goal in mind of expanding their knowledge, skills and experience to enable them to become clinical scholars who will continue to autonomously function as occupational therapists within their scope of practice, contributors to the evidence-based literature that drives practice, and leaders in the profession. This proposal to develop an OTD is driven by the increasing body of knowledge needed to be a scholar in the field as well as a pressing national and regional need to develop a professional doctorate program in occupational therapy. The Division of Occupational Therapy is the natural venue given the fact it is currently the only accredited occupational therapy program in the state of Utah. There are
no other accredited educational programs in Utah or surrounding states that offer professional doctorates in occupational therapy. Although Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions located in Provo, Utah does offer a professional doctorate in occupational therapy (OTD) program, it is not yet accredited by a regional or national accrediting body recognized by the United States Department of Education, but is a Candidate for Accreditation through the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, according to their website. There are currently nineteen professional doctorate programs in the U.S., but the closest programs to Utah are located in California (University of Southern California), Nebraska (Creighton University), and Oklahoma (University of Oklahoma).

The expected outcomes for this program align with the doctoral level outcomes developed by the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) and are listed below:

1) EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE (EBP): Graduates of the University of Utah OTD program will be able to apply, evaluate, and synthesize evidence-based practice to create a specific program and/or intervention to promote efficacious, client-centered, and culturally relevant practice. This exceeds the ACOTE doctoral degree level standard of "demonstrates thorough knowledge of evidence-based practice". Examples of measurement of outcome achievement include case presentations, submission of scholarly papers summarizing EBP, clients' goal attainment scales, and client satisfaction surveys.

2) OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY THEORY: Graduates of the University of Utah OTD program will be able to use knowledge of current theoretical and practice models to articulate and improve service provision, and/or policies in response to society's evolving and changing occupational needs. This addresses the ACOTE doctoral degree level standard of "be prepared to articulate and apply occupational therapy theory and evidence-based evaluations and interventions to achieve expected outcomes as related to occupation". Evidence of successful achievement of this outcome will include: active engagement in class discussions, ability to summarize and critically evaluate readings, and individual assignments focusing on critical analysis of theories.

3) ADVOCACY: Graduates of the University of Utah OTD program will be able to influence policy, practice, and education by being advocates for occupational therapy for individuals, populations, organization, and for the profession. This meets the ACOTE doctoral degree level standard of "be prepared to advocate as a professional for the occupational therapy services offered and for the recipients of those services". Successful achievement of this outcome will be measured by engagement in community-based or institutional-based project in which there will be a demonstration of the graduate's ability to act as a change agent through tangible recommendations for suggested changes and enlisting support from others.

4) LEADERSHIP: Graduates of the University of Utah OTD program will demonstrate leadership skills through the assumption of leadership roles at local, national, and/or international levels within the occupational therapy profession and broader health arenas. This aligns with the ACOTE established doctoral degree level standard of "demonstrate active involvement in professional development, leadership, and advocacy". Achievement of this outcome will be
measured through assumption of leadership roles in local, state, national, and/or international professional associations.

5) EDUCATION: Graduates of the University of Utah OTD program will be able to develop and implement educational experiences for professional education, specific clients, populations, settings, and/or the general public through the application of learning theory and educational design principles. This exceeds the ACOTE doctoral degree level standard that states that the OTD graduate should "be prepared to be a lifelong learner and keep current with evidence-based practice". Examples of successful attainment of this outcome include the ability to design and deliver an educational experience, as well as collect, reflect, and analyze feedback from learners.

6) OCCUPATIONAL JUSTICE: Graduates of the University of Utah OTD program will be able to address individual, institutional, and societal issues in health and with marginalized populations in order to promote occupational justice. This addresses the ACOTE doctoral degree level standard of "demonstrating in-depth knowledge of delivery models, policies, and systems related to the area of practice where occupational therapy is currently practiced and where it is emerging as a service. Evidence of attainment of this outcome will be the inclusion of occupational justice principles into a student’s program design.

7) RESEARCH: Graduates of the University of Utah OTD program will be able to increase the body of knowledge in occupational therapy practice through the preparation and dissemination of scholarship in the student's chosen area of emphasis. This correlates with the ACOTE doctoral degree level standard that states that a graduate must "be prepared to be an effective consumer of the latest research and knowledge bases that support practice and contribute to the growth and dissemination of research and knowledge". Examples of accomplishment of this outcome will be through the submission of articles for publication in refereed publications, as well as submission of proposals for presentation at conferences, professional meetings, and other interdisciplinary venues.

8) CULMINATING PROJECT: A critical component of this OTD program will be the student's capstone project which will be evidence of the programmatic outcome of completion of a culminating project that reflects competency in the student's chosen area of emphasis. This reflects the ACOTE doctoral degree level standard which states that the graduate can relate theory to practice and demonstrate synthesis of advanced knowledge in a practice area through completion of a culminating project. Successful completion of the capstone project, including the graduate's defence of their work, will be the measurement of this outcome.

Institutional Readiness:
The entry-level program in the Division of Occupational Therapy within the College of Health at the University of Utah has been in existence since 1999. The program most recently went through accreditation in 2008 and was granted a full ten-year continuation of accreditation with no deficit areas. Up to 30 students are admitted each year into the three year program; pass rates on the National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy (NBCOT) for the past 5 years are at 97% for first time test takers, with the overall pass rate at 100%; the program's reputation leads many area employers to actively seek out graduates. The Chair of the Occupational Therapy Program, Dr. JoAnne Wright has been with the program since its inception and she will
provide leadership to the proposed OTD program as well. There will be no adverse impact on
the existing entry-level program; if anything, the programmatic resources will be of mutual
benefit to each other.

The Dean of the College of Health and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences as well as
the College of Health Curriculum Committee have approved the degree and believe that the
Division of Occupational Therapy has the capacity to offer this degree at this time.

Faculty:
Five of the Division faculty members have earned doctorates, and two additional faculty
members are in the process of completing their doctoral education. All faculty in the Division are
full-time; three are on tenure lines, and the remaining five are on clinical, non-tenure lines. The
Division of Occupational Therapy currently has one vacant faculty line which will be filled by
the time the proposed OTD program starts. Courses in the proposed OTD program will be taught
by existing faculty or by adjunct faculty who will be sought out for their particular area of
expertise and national reputation. Since it is anticipated that the proposed OTD program will be
offered primarily through on-line technology, the existing faculty will be taking courses in the
next year to obtain or sharpen their skills in distance education technology. See Appendix C for a
listing of faculty and their respective qualifications to teach in this program.

Staff:
Existing support staff will be utilized to assist with the development of administrative aspects of
this program. This includes a full-time administrative assistant, and a .75 FTE clerical assistant.
There may need to be a realignment of work schedules and responsibilities of existing staff in
order to accommodate the anticipated programmatic growth. Once the program is established, it
may be necessary to hire a .5 FTE clerical assistant. The resources are available to do so if the
need arises.

Library and Information Resources:
The current library infrastructure will be able to support the OTD program and therefore, we do
not anticipate needing additional library resources. Because the library has the breadth of
resources and services, they can provide the needed level of support to clinical doctorate
students. They have provided a letter of support to this end.

The use of synchronous on-line instruction through Adobe Connect has been/is being considered
for classes that would benefit from face to face, on-line interaction. This web-based application
is cost effective and can be set up easily. Other courses will be provided through Blackboard
Vista and will be asynchronous. The TACC center will be used by faculty as they develop their
courses as well as the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence. Many of the faculty have
used Blackboard Vista and are comfortable with the various formats that can be used to provide
quality education. This program has been discussed with them and they are enthusiastic about
assisting in its development.
Admission Requirements:
All applicants to the OTD program will have:

1. A master's degree in occupational therapy, or a baccalaureate degree in occupational therapy;
2. A completed University of Utah application to Graduate School;
3. A completed Division of Occupational Therapy application to OTD Program;
4. Official transcripts from all previous educational institutions;
5. A minimum cumulative grade point average in prior course work of 3.0 on a 4.0 scale;
6. An essay outlining professional goals;
7. A minimum of two years of practice experience;
8. Results of the most recent Graduate Record Examination (taken within the last 5 years) indicating a combined score of at least 1,000;
9. Three professional references from individuals who can describe the applicant’s potential for success in a doctoral level program;
10. A current copy of resume/CV; and,
11. Verification of a license as an occupational therapist and initial NBCOT certification.

Student Advisement:
Existing full-time faculty will be available to advise OTD students, it is anticipated that this will take the form of mentoring, rather than the usual advisement that accompanies entry-level education.

Justification for Graduation Standards and Number of Credits:
The proposed professional doctorate program is 36 credits in length for those students who have earned an entry-level degree at the Master’s degree level, which consists of foundational coursework, core coursework, and elective courses designed by the student and faculty advisor in a emphasis area that will also relate to the capstone and research project. The proposed professional doctorate program for students whose entry-level occupational degree was at the Bachelor’s degree level will complete an additional 24 – 36 credits, depending on the outcome of their transcript evaluation. Both groups of students will complete a research based project as a part of the degree and defend as part of the process.

It should be noted for clarification that the Masters of Occupational Therapy (MOT) currently awarded at the University of Utah requires 111 credits (8 semesters cohort model) for completions - 24 of those hours are devoted to full time internship. The purpose of the entry-level bachelor’s or master’s level degree at this level is to provide all the requisite knowledge and skills at the generalist level. The philosophical basis of the proposed OTD is that this advanced clinical degree will build upon the clinicians’ occupational therapy degree and experience and provide them an educational opportunity to become more specialized in their chosen area of emphasis. As part of the admissions process, the clinician must demonstrate that they have a defined area of interest or emphasis.
The credit hours required by this degree will assist the currently-in-practice clinician to advance their abilities and deepen their knowledge in an area of occupational therapy. To this end, the OTD does not require “clinical” hours as a part of the degree but is more focused on the development of the thought processes and experiences needed to develop the critical thinking skills, specialization, and advanced leadership abilities related to practice. This is consistent with the other post-professional OTD’s offered at this time around the country. Having said this, much of the course work will focus on the clinical aspects of occupational therapy and the development of clinicians so that their practice in the clinical realm will be at a higher more advanced level.

External Review and Accreditation:
The Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) has developed standards for doctoral-level programs. Currently there is a voluntary accreditation offered for post-professional programs although standards have been created. None of the nineteen post-professional occupational therapy programs in the U.S. have sought elective accreditation as yet, we are exploring this option but have decided to wait until the accrediting body provides more information before the Division of Occupational Therapy pursues formal accreditation for this degree.

Projected Enrollment:
* Note that this does not refer to FTE's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student Headcount</th>
<th># of Faculty</th>
<th>Student-To-Faculty Ratio</th>
<th>Accreditation Req’d Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 *</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4 *</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6 *</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6 *</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6 *</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expansion of Existing Program:
This is not an expansion of an existing program.

Section III: Need
Program Need:
There is a pressing need for the profession of occupational therapy to develop advanced educational programs in order to move the profession forward. Some of these documented needs include a national shortage of doctorally-trained faculty, an urgent need to expand the profession's evidence base, a critical call for strong leadership to insure that the profession of occupational therapy continues to be able to collaborate with other professions within the health care arena, the continually changing health care delivery system in the U.S., and the emergence of refugee, immigrant, and minority populations within the U.S. that need culturally relevant interventions.

Labor Market Demand:
The entry-level occupational therapy program at the University of Utah has been producing competent graduates who are in demand from area health care facilities. U.S. News and World Report has just labeled occupational therapy a "recession-proof career" (U.S. News & World Report, 2008) and the U.S. Department of Labor projects growth in the occupational therapy profession as follows: "Employment is expected to grow much faster than average and job opportunities should be good, especially for therapists treating the elderly. Employment of occupational therapists is expected to increase 23 percent between 2006 and 2016, much faster than the average for all occupations. The increasing elderly population will drive growth in the demand for occupational therapy services". (U.S. DOL, 2009) Students entering the OTD program will be working professionals; attainment of their advanced degree will most likely lead to their advancement into managerial and administrative positions. In addition, graduates of this program will most likely be able to fill existing vacancies in entry-level OT educational programs as adjunct faculty. These needs projections are compiled from local, state, and national data, and job placement information, as well as, the types of jobs graduates have obtained from similar programs.

Student Demand:
A survey was developed in the fall of 2008 and widely distributed to current students, area practitioners, alumni of the program, and occupational therapists from neighboring states. One hundred thirty-five surveys were returned, with more than half indicating a desire to enroll in an OTD program within the next year. Others indicated a desire to return to pursue an advanced degree in 5+ years.

Similar Programs:
There are no other OTD programs at any of the accredited Universities in the State of Utah.

Collaboration with and Impact with Other USHE Institutions:
There is no intentional collaboration with other USHE institutions.
Benefits:
The University of Utah will benefit from developing this program as it will increase the number of courses taught. It will increase the amount of research being done through the Division of Occupational Therapy, thus highlighting this institution as a premier occupational therapy educational program. It will benefit the community at large and consumers in that therapists will obtain more theoretical and skill based knowledge that they can apply while providing occupational therapy services. It will also increase the leadership skills of existing practitioners in the state of Utah, plus serve to increase the pool of doctorally prepared practitioners who can move into vacant adjunct faculty positions both here and faculty positions throughout the U.S.

Consistency with Institutional Mission:
The fundamental mission of the Occupational Therapy program is consistent with that of the University and the College of Health. The program seeks to transmit, discover and investigate knowledge--both old and new--related to occupation, occupational therapy, occupational science and society in general and to provide the highest quality education to students of occupational therapy and occupational therapy practitioners, based on contemporary theory, practice and technologies.

The program seeks to provide service to the academic, professional and general communities in which the Occupational Therapy Program is involved and address the needs for occupational therapy in the community, state and region. This will be accomplished by educating both entry-level practitioners and doctoral level occupational therapists and providing consultative, advocacy, leadership and disability prevention services to the community.
Section IV: Program and Student Assessment

Program Assessment:
Programmatic evaluation will be accomplished through tracking applications, admission, retention, and successful completion of OTD. Student satisfaction surveys, exit interviews, and alumni surveys will also be utilized to monitor satisfaction with program.

Expected Standard of Performance:
After research and faculty driven discussion the areas of performance and standards have been set. Each course will have built into the standards of performance for that particular content area. These are based on critical needs related to the prime content areas more fully described in a different section of this document. In review they are: Evidence-Based Practice (EBP); Occupational Therapy Theory; Advocacy; Leadership; Education; Occupational Justice; and Research. Prior to registering for the Capstone courses (OC Th 7400 and 7450) students will be evaluated as to their progress to date in the program by a faculty committee. Once approved to continue the student may then register for the Capstone series. This capstone project is a critical and defining component of the Division of Occupational Therapy’s OTD program. It is designed to provide evidence of the programmatic outcome by completion of a culminating project that reflects competency in the student's chosen area of emphasis.
# Section V: Finance

## Financial Analysis Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project FTE Enrollment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per FTE</td>
<td>8,538</td>
<td>8,538</td>
<td>8,538</td>
<td>8,538</td>
<td>8,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Headcount</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Projected Tuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Tuition</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87,318</td>
<td>183,368</td>
<td>288,804</td>
<td>303,244</td>
<td>318,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Projected Tuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition to Program</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34,507</td>
<td>72,633</td>
<td>114,397</td>
<td>120,116</td>
<td>126,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5 Year Budget Projection

### Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>38,520</td>
<td>77,040</td>
<td>115,560</td>
<td>115,560</td>
<td>115,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>12,712</td>
<td>25,423</td>
<td>38,135</td>
<td>38,135</td>
<td>38,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>$51,232</td>
<td>$102,463</td>
<td>$153,695</td>
<td>$153,695</td>
<td>$153,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Appropriation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocations (SCH)</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>34,200</td>
<td>51,300</td>
<td>51,300</td>
<td>51,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition to Program</td>
<td>34,587</td>
<td>72,633</td>
<td>114,397</td>
<td>120,116</td>
<td>126,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$51,687</td>
<td>$106,833</td>
<td>$165,697</td>
<td>$171,416</td>
<td>$177,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue-Expense</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>$4,370</td>
<td>$12,002</td>
<td>$17,721</td>
<td>$23,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Budget Comments:**
The project enrollment is for 10 students to start the program each year so that there will be a maximum of 30 students after the initial 3 year startup. We do not expect students to enroll full time. The FTE enrollment is calculated by each student taking 6 credits which equates to .6 FTE per student. This is then multiplied by the expected student enrollment for each year. The projected tuition amount is based on tuition rates for 2008-2009. Since we do not know the percentage of increase for tuition we estimated a 5% increase for each year including year 1. The amount is for a student taking 6 credits per semester for 3 semesters.

**Funding Sources:**
The OTD program will be funded through differential tuition and productivity funds based on student credit hours (SCH). Differential tuition is prorated at $183/credit hour and is based on 6 credits per semester. This totals $1,098 per student per semester. SCH is calculated at $95 per credit hour.

**Reallocation:**
This program will be supported through internal reallocation.

**Impact on Existing Budgets:**
There will be no adverse financial impact on the existing MOT program budget. With differential tuition, and an increase in student credit hours, there will be additional revenue being generated through the addition of this OTD Program.
## Appendix A: Program Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Requisite Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 6250</td>
<td>Applied Statistics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 6000</td>
<td>Research in Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 6060</td>
<td>Foundational Theories</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTG 7060</td>
<td>Scientific Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Departments</strong></td>
<td>Electives and/or additional courses</td>
<td>11-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>24-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7020</td>
<td>Occupational Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7060</td>
<td>Advanced Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7130</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Adult Learning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7150</td>
<td>Culture and Occupation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7240</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7270</td>
<td>Program Development/Grant Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7300</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Practice and Research I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7350</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Practice and Research II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7400</td>
<td>Capstone I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7450</td>
<td>Capstone II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elective Courses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Academic Program/Department Courses or Programs</strong></td>
<td>(possible # of credits in right column)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 6350</td>
<td>Disability Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 6860</td>
<td>Disability Studies Forum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 6720</td>
<td>Immigration &amp; Resettlement: Interdisciplinary &amp; Community Perspectives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7950</td>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7940</td>
<td>Special Topics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7970</td>
<td>Clinical Problems in OT</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC TH 7982</td>
<td>Special Workshops</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Practice in Special Ed. <strong>OR</strong> Family &amp; Consumer Studies <strong>OR</strong> Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology Interdisciplinary Program</td>
<td>3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emphasis Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Trends in Practice with Children &amp; Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program &amp; Policy Development &amp; Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WRTG 7060 Scientific Writing (3)

Prerequisite: Graduate standing required.
Designed to help graduate students in the sciences develop the skills needed for scientific research and communication. Provides students with the opportunity to write in the variety of forms that they are likely to encounter in their professional lives (i.e. memos, proposals, reports, presentations) in a scientific context.

PSY 6250 Applied Statistics

Prerequisite: college-level intermediate algebra (or higher level math class).
A graduate-level examination of statistical procedures commonly used in the health, social and behavioral sciences. Topics include: sampling distributions, probability, confidence intervals, t tests, ANOVA, correlation, regression, nonparametric statistics, data transformations, and the logic of null hypothesis significance testing.

OC TH 6000 Research in Occupational Therapy (3)

This course studies the descriptive, comparative, and evaluative research methods (including qualitative and quantitative) as they apply to medical, social, and basic science relevant to occupational therapy practice. Goal of the course is to encourage students to incorporate research and its outcomes into practice. Students will be required to critically analyze professional literature as well as develop a pilot project.

OC TH 6060 Foundational Theories in Occupational Therapy (3)

The history, philosophy, and integration of major theoretical frameworks and models associated with occupational therapy practice are discussed in this course. Clinical reasoning is explored as an underlying foundation to therapeutic practice.

OC TH 7020 Occupational Science (3 Cr.)

This course will use seminal literature, both current and historical, to explore current issues, controversies, and alternative interpretations of Occupational Science and to examine the emergence and evolution of Occupational Science worldwide. The temporal, spatial, physical and contextual aspects of occupation will be explored. The relationships of occupation to health, well-being and adaptation through the ICF and other models of participation will be considered. The relationship of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy, and occupation-based practice will be explored.

OC TH 7060 Advanced Theories in Occupational Therapy (3 Cr.)

The course will review the historical foundations of occupation as the central paradigm of the profession. Students will learn to analyze the major conceptual models and supporting theoretical
and evidence based research, including the Model of Human Occupation, Occupational Adaptation, Ecology of Human Performance, and the Person – Environment – Occupation Model. The concept of participation is discussed as a key component of health according to the International Classification of Functioning (ICF) (World Health Organization) and a major outcome of the Occupational Therapy Practice Framework. Students will also select, analyze and apply other practice models and research that will relate to case studies, and in particular, a case from their own area of practice.

**OC TH 7130  Academic & Clinical Teaching in Occupational Therapy (3 Cr.)**

This course will focus on the development of teaching and learning skills applicable across a variety of settings. Principles of adult learning theory will be explored in detail as they relate to academic and clinical education. Students will learn the process of instructional design including developing a syllabus, course objectives, assessment instruments and grading criteria. Students will develop teaching skills appropriate for varying audiences (students, peers, clients) and the type of setting (academic, clinical, and professional conferences/workshops). Mechanisms to enhance both presentation and delivery of material will be emphasized, along with learning different formats using advanced technology. Opportunities to receive and provide feedback to others will be provided.

**OC TH 7150  Culture and Occupation (3 Cr.)**

The influence of culture upon occupational roles and performances is examined in this course where learners will be required to explore culture at multiple levels. They will examine their own culture and its impact on their practice; the culture of their clients and its impact on health beliefs, practices and occupations; the professional culture of occupational therapy; and societal influences on occupational choice. The concept of cultural competence and its characteristics will be examined in relationship to the learners' practice. Occupational justice will also be discussed as it relates to societal needs.

**OC TH 7240  Leadership (3 Cr.)**

This leadership course is designed to explore leadership using past experiences, contemporary leadership theories and experiential exercises to move the student from where they are as a leader forward to become a stronger change agent who is knowledgeable about how systems and policies are developed using theories. Content will look at personal leadership style as well as applied leadership, change theory, entrepreneurial skills and innovative practice.

**OC TH 7270  Program Development/Grant Writing (3 Cr.)**

This course is designed to give students skills related to all components of developing and evaluating a proposal for new services. Understanding the implications of different demographic and societal trends on populations will be used to generate ideas for new programming. The primary assignment for this course is the completion of a program proposal. This proposal will include a completed needs analysis, an evidence-based literature review, and an in-depth description for a new occupation-based program of services, including finances, marketing, and
program evaluation. Along with learning how to write a successful proposal, students will gain knowledge and skills to obtain funding through a variety of sources. Each student must include a request for funding in the proposal to an appropriate funding agency, (i.e., foundation, grant competition) that is consistent with that funding agency’s specifications.

OC TH 7300  Evidence-Based Practice and Research I (3 Cr.)

This is the first of two courses that emphasize integrating research and occupational therapy practice. The course is designed to develop skills with identifying key words and accessing appropriate data bases for carrying out an evidence-based inquiry. Throughout the course, students will read and critically evaluate peer-reviewed qualitative and quantitative articles, in terms of research design, trustworthiness, validity, and reliability, respectively. Through this process, students will gain and apply their knowledge of interpreting statistics as well. Students will be introduced to the critically appraised topic (CAT) process and will demonstrate basic proficiency with synthesizing the best evidence from both qualitative and quantitative studies. Students will be expected to frame their findings from evidence-based inquiry in terms that clients and lay persons can understand.

OC TH 7350  Evidence-Based Practice and Research II (3 Cr.)

Prerequisite: OC TH 7300-Evidence-Based Practice and Research I

This is the second of two courses that increase understanding and application of research and background information to address occupational therapy evidence-based questions and/or programmatic outcomes. The structure of the course provides opportunities to further understand and analyze both quantitative and qualitative research designs. Students will understand how research designs and methods relate to research questions and to the information available. This course will also involve increased application of database skills and synthesis of information as evidenced by completion of a scholarly paper as background and preparation for the Capstone 1 project.

OC TH 7400  Capstone I (3 Cr.)

Prerequisites: OC TH 7300-Evidence-Based Practice and Research I, and OC TH 7350-Evidence-Based Practice and Research II, and OC TH 7270-Program Development/Grant Writing; Permission of the Division.

This course is designed to integrate knowledge and skills acquired during doctoral coursework with a scholarly project designed by the student to meet his or her professional goals. Upon completion of 12 credits in the OTD program, each student will identify a relevant and contemporary issue that bears further study. After further study of the evidence and literature relevant to the topic, the student will write a paper that proposes systematic action to be taken with that topic that will lead to a meaningful outcome. The proposal can focus on the development of a new occupational therapy intervention program, the design of a research study, design of a college level course, program evaluation, or recommendations for institutional policy change. Based on the topic, a project committee chair within the Division of Occupational Therapy will be assigned to provide guidance with completion of the proposal. Students will
prepare and then defend their proposal before a committee. Completion of Capstone I is required before registering for Capstone II.

**OC TH 7450 Capstone II (3 Cr.)**

**Prerequisites: OC TH 7400-Capstone I, OC TH 7300-Evidence-Based Practice and Research I, and OC TH 7350-Evidence-Based Practice and Research II, and OC TH 7270-Program Development and Grant Writing; Permission of the Division.**

For completion of this course, students will carry out the action or program proposed during Capstone I. For example, if a student has proposed a college course, during the Capstone II course, the student will implement the course or part of it. Or, if a student proposed a specific research study, he or she would collect the data that was proposed and complete the study. If, for example, a student proposed a justification and plan to change policy at the state level the action proposed would be presented formally to appropriate policy makers in the hopes the action would be taken. The major outcomes for Capstone II are a) the implementation of the proposal approved of in Capstone I, b) collection of data regarding the action, program, or study, c) analysis of this data and d) a discussion of how these results contribute to the advancement of the occupation in society, occupational science, or occupational therapy knowledge base. In addition to completion of a formal paper, students will disseminate their results to the appropriate audience through presentations at the state and/or national level, peer reviewed publications and/or implementation of the project. Students will defend their final project before their committee. Regular meetings will be held with advisors during the process.

**Pre-Requisite Courses for OTD Program (for BS to OTD track):**

**WRTG 7060 Scientific Writing (3)**

Prerequisite: Graduate standing required. Designed to help graduate students in the sciences develop the skills needed for scientific research and communication. Provides students with the opportunity to write in the variety of forms that they are likely to encounter in their professional lives (i.e. memos, proposals, reports, presentations) in a scientific context.

**PSY 6250 Applied Statistics**

Prerequisite: college-level intermediate algebra (or higher level math class). A graduate-level examination of statistical procedures commonly used in the health, social and behavioral sciences. Topics include: sampling distributions, probability, confidence intervals, t tests, ANOVA, correlation, regression, nonparametric statistics, data transformations, and the logic of null hypothesis significance testing.

**OC TH 6000 Research in Occupational Therapy (3)**

This course studies the descriptive, comparative, and evaluative research methods (including qualitative and quantitative) as they apply to medical, social, and basic science relevant to occupational therapy practice. Goal of the course is to encourage students to incorporate research
and its outcomes into practice. Students will be required to critically analyze professional literature as well as develop their own research project.

**OC TH 6060 Foundational Theories in Occupational Therapy (3)**

The history, philosophy, and integration of major theoretical frameworks and models associated with occupational therapy practice are discussed in this course. Clinical reasoning is explored as an underlying foundation to therapeutic practice.
Appendix B: Program Schedule

The following schedule is a suggested schedule for students wishing to attend year round and take 6 credit hours per semester.

**Master's to OTD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC TH 7020 - OS</td>
<td>OC TH 7060 – Adv Theory</td>
<td>OC TH 7270 - Program Dev/Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>OC TH 7130 - Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>OC TH 7150 – Culture &amp; Occupation</td>
<td>OC TH 7300 - EBP/Research II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>OC TH 7350 - EBP/Research II</td>
<td>OC TH 7400 - Capstone I</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC TH 7240 - Leadership</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>OC TH 7450 - Capstone II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Courses 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electives 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Credits 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bachelor’s to OTD** (Transitional time-limited track)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSY 6250 Applied Statistics</td>
<td>WRTG 7060 Scientific Writing</td>
<td>Research Methods 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>OC TH 6060 Found. Theories</td>
<td>OC TH 6000 Research in OT</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>OC TH 7020 - OS</td>
<td>OC TH 7060 - Adv Theory</td>
<td>OC TH 7270- Prog Dev/Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC TH 7130 – Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>OC TH 7150 – Culture &amp; Occupation</td>
<td>OC TH 7300 - EBP/Research II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>OC TH 7350 - EBP/Research II</td>
<td>OC TH 7400 - Capstone I</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC TH 7240 - Leadership</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>OC TH 7450 - Capstone II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Requisites 24-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Courses 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electives 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Credits 60-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(minimum required pre-requisites; additional electives may be required based on individual review of past educational experiences)
Appendix C:

The Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) has developed Standards for a Doctoral-Degree-Level Educational Program for the Occupational Therapist (ACOTE, 2006). The Preamble for these Standards states:

“The rapidly changing and dynamic nature of contemporary health and human services delivery systems provides challenging opportunities for the occupational therapist to use knowledge and skills in a practice area as a direct care provider, consultant, educator, manager, leader, researcher, and advocate for the profession and the consumer.” (ACOTE, 2006, page 1)

The specific areas of competencies for professional doctorate programs are as follows:

FOUNDATIONAL CONTENT REQUIREMENTS:
Program content must be based on a broad foundation in the liberal arts and sciences. A strong foundation in the biological, physical, social, and behavioral sciences supports an understanding of occupation across the life span. Coursework in this area must facilitate development of the following competencies:

- Articulate the influence of social conditions and the ethical context in which humans choose and engage in occupations;
- Demonstrate the ability to use technology in screening, evaluation, intervention, and data analysis as appropriate for the area of practice;
- Demonstrate knowledge and appreciation of the role of socio-cultural, socioeconomic, diversity factors, and lifestyle choices in contemporary society;
- Demonstrate knowledge of global social issues, along with prevailing health and welfare needs;
- Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of human development throughout the life span (infants, children, adolescents, adults, and elderly persons, and,
- Apply quantitative statistics and qualitative analysis to interpret tests, measurements, and other data.

BASIC TENETS OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY:
Program content in this area focuses on the history, philosophical base, and theoretical foundations of the profession of occupational therapy. Coursework in this area aims to facilitate the development of the following competencies:

- Explain the meaning and dynamics of occupation and activity, including the interaction of areas of occupation, performance skills, performance patterns, activity demands, context(s), and client factor;
- Apply theoretical constructs to evaluation and intervention with various types of clients and practice contexts, including population-based approaches, to analyze and effect meaningful occupation
- Articulate to consumers, potential employers, colleagues, third-party payers, regulatory boards, policymakers, other audiences, and the general public both the unique nature of occupation as viewed by the profession of occupational therapy and the value of occupation to support participation in context(s) for the client;
• Articulate the importance of balancing areas of occupation with the achievement of health and wellness, and explain the role of occupation in the promotion of health and the prevention of disease and disability for the individual, family, and society;
• Analyze the effects of physical and mental health, heritable diseases and predisposing genetic conditions, disability, disease processes, and traumatic injury to the individual within the cultural context of family and society on occupational performance, and,
• Analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and apply models of occupational performance and theories of occupation.

SCREENING, EVALUATION, AND REFERRAL:
The process of screening, evaluation, referral, and diagnosis as related to occupational performance and participation must be culturally relevant and based on theoretical perspectives, models of practice, frames of reference, and available evidence. In addition, this process must consider the continuum of need from individuals to populations. The program must facilitate development of the following competencies:
• Use standardized and non-standardized screening and assessment tools to determine the need for occupational therapy intervention. Select appropriate assessment tools based on client needs, contextual factors, and psychometric properties of tests. These must be relevant to a variety of populations across the life span, culturally relevant, based on available evidence, and incorporate use of occupation in the assessment process. These include, but are not limited to, specified screening tools, skilled observations, assessments, checklist, occupational histories, consultations with other professionals, and interviews with the client, family, significant others, and community;
• Interpret criterion-referenced and norm-referenced standardized test scores based on an understanding of sampling, normative data, standard and criterion scores, reliability, and validity. Consider factors that might bias assessment results, such as culture, disability status, and situational variables related to the individual and context; and,
• Articulate screening and evaluation processes for a practice area. Use evidence-based reasoning to analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and diagnose problems related to occupational performance and participation.

INTERVENTION PLAN: FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION:
The process of formulation and implementation of the therapeutic intervention plan to facilitate occupational performance and participation must be culturally relevant; reflective of current occupational therapy practice; based on available evidence; and based on theoretical perspectives, models of practice, and frames of reference. In addition, this process must consider the continuum of need from individuals to populations. The program must facilitate development of the following competencies:
• Use evaluation findings to diagnose occupational performance and participation based on appropriate theoretical approaches, models of practice, frames of reference, and interdisciplinary knowledge. Develop occupation-based intervention plans and strategies (including goals and methods to achieve them) based on the stated needs of the client as well as data gathered during the evaluation process in collaboration with the client and others. Intervention plans and strategies must be culturally relevant, reflective of current occupational therapy practice, and based on available evidence.
Select and provide direct occupational therapy interventions and procedures to enhance safety, wellness, and performance in activities of daily living (ADL), instrumental activities of daily living (IADL), education, work, play, leisure, and social participation through the therapeutic use of occupation.

Provide development, remediation, and compensation for physical, cognitive, perceptual, sensory (e.g., vision, tactile, auditory, gustatory, olfactory, pain, temperature, pressure, vestibular, proprioception), neuromuscular, and behavioral skills.

Demonstrate care coordination, case management, and transition services in traditional and emerging practice environments

Modify environments (e.g., home, work, school, community) and adapt processes, including the application of ergonomic principles

Design, fabricate, apply, fit, and train in assistive technologies and devices (e.g., electronic aids to daily living, seating systems) used to enhance occupational performance.

Provide design, fabrication, application, fitting, and training in orthotic devices used to enhance occupational performance and training in the use of prosthetic devices, based on scientific principles of kinesiology, biomechanics, and physics.

CONTEXT OF SERVICE DELIVERY:
Context of service delivery includes the knowledge and understanding of the various contexts, such as professional, social, cultural, political, economic, and ecological, in which occupational therapy services are provided. Competencies in this area should include:

- Critically evaluate and address the various contexts of health care, education, community, political, and social systems as they relate to the practice of occupational therapy;
- Critically analyze the current policy issues and the social, economic, political, geographic, and demographic factors that influence the various contexts for practice of occupational therapy;
- Integrate the current social, economic, political, geographic, and demographic factors to promote policy development and the provision of occupational therapy services;
- Advocate for changes in service delivery policies, effect changes in the system, and identify opportunities to address societal needs;
- Critically analyze the trends in models of service delivery and their potential effect on the practice of occupational therapy, including, but not limited to, medical, educational, community, and social models, and,
- Use national and international resources in making assessment or intervention choices, as well as contribute to the development and implementation of international occupational therapy education, research, and practice.

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT:
Leadership and management skills include principles and applications of leadership and management theory. OTD programs are designed to produce leaders in the profession, and therefore, the following competencies must be developed:

- Demonstrate leadership skills in the ability to plan, develop, organize, and market the delivery of services to include the determination of programmatic needs, service delivery options, and formulation and management of staffing for effective service provision.
• Demonstrate leadership skills in the ability to design ongoing processes for quality improvement (e.g., outcome studies analysis) and develop program changes as needed to ensure quality of services and to direct administrative changes.
• Demonstrate knowledge of and the ability to write program development plans for provision of occupational therapy services to individuals and populations
• Identify and adapt existing models or develop new service provision models to respond to policy, regulatory agencies, and reimbursement and compliance standards.

RESEARCH:
Application of research includes the ability to read, understand, and conduct research that affects practice and the provision of occupational therapy services. The program must facilitate development of the following competencies:
• Articulate the importance of research, scholarly activities, and the continued development of a body of knowledge relevant to the profession of occupational therapy;
• Select, apply, and interpret basic descriptive, correlational, and inferential quantitative statistics and code, analyze, and synthesize qualitative data;
• Demonstrate the skills necessary to design a research proposal that includes the research question, relevant literature, sample, design, measurement, and data analysis;
• Design and implement a research study that evaluates clinical practice, service delivery, and/or professional issues;
• Write scholarly reports appropriate for presentation or for publication in a peer-reviewed journal;
• Demonstrate an understanding of the process of locating and securing grants and how grants can serve as a fiscal resource for research and practice, and,
• Complete a culminating project that relates theory to practice and demonstrates synthesis of advanced knowledge in a practice area.

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS, VALUES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES:
Professional ethics, values, and responsibilities include an understanding, appreciation of, and commitment to the ethics and values of the profession of occupational therapy. The OTD program must facilitate development of the following competencies:
• Demonstrate advocacy by participating in and exploring leadership positions in organizations or agencies promoting the profession (e.g., American Occupational Therapy Association, state occupational therapy associations, World Federation of Occupational Therapists, advocacy organizations), consumer access and services, and the welfare of the community, and,
• Promote occupational therapy by educating other professionals, service providers, consumers, third-party payers, regulatory bodies, and the public.
Appendix D: Faculty (in reverse alpha order)

JoAnne Wright, PhD, OTR/L, CLVT, Division Chair and Professor (Clinical): Dr. Wright is the Developer/Chair of the Division of Occupational Therapy, College of Health at the University of Utah. Dr Wright received her undergraduate degree from the University of Utah College of Health, Department of Health Education. She received her Master of Science Degree in Occupational Therapy from Tufts University and her Ph.D. in Occupational Science, as well as a Graduate Certificate in Gerontology, from the University of Southern California. Dr. Wright has been a faculty member at the University of Southern California as well as graduate advisor at Western Michigan University and has worked extensively in student education. She has been an occupational therapist for over 20 years and is also a certified low vision therapist (CLVT). She is an adjunct professor in the Department of Health Promotion and Education, the Center for Aging and the College of Nursing Gerontology Certificate Program. Dr. Wright brings to this project strong leadership skills and a background working with a variety of clients and students.

Yda Smith, MOT, OTR/L, ABD, Assistant Professor (Clinical): Professor Smith received her OT degree at the University of Puget Sound. She has been a full-time faculty member with the Division of Occupational Therapy at the University of Utah for the past ten years. She is also Faculty Director for University Neighborhood Partners – Hartland Partnership, providing student-based services to assist recently arrived refugees adjust to life in America. She is currently working on a dissertation through the Department of Education, Culture and Society looking at the experiences of the Somali Bantu during their refugee resettlement process in Salt Lake City. Yda has recently received an Interdisciplinary Teaching Seed Grant Award from the office of Interdisciplinary Studies and a course development grant from the International Exchange Committee at the University of Utah.

Pollie Price, PhD, OTR/L, Assistant Professor: Dr Price earned her research doctorate from the University of Southern California Department of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy in 2003. Dr. Price is in her fifth year of the tenure process. Dr. Price has successfully taught graduate students for the past 6 years at the University of Utah. Prior to that, she has had faculty and adjunct appointments at the University of Southern California Department of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy, University of Kansas Medical Center Occupational Therapy Program, California State University-Dominguez Hills, and has guest lectured at the University of Florida Department of Occupational Therapy, Gainesville, Florida, and Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions Transition to OTD Program, Provo, Utah. Areas of teaching expertise include research and professional connections between research, theory, best practice and education; group process; and adult rehabilitation. She has also helped to develop the University of Utah Graduate Certificate Program in Disability Studies, and co-developed and co-teaches the core interdisciplinary core course.

Tina McNulty, PhD, OTR/L, Assistant Professor: Dr. McNulty is currently an assistant professor at the University of Utah. She has worked for ten years as an educator at Colorado State University, University of New Mexico, and Pacific University in Oregon. Prior to working in academia, she worked for ten years in geriatric rehabilitation and in adolescent and adult psychiatry programs as licensed occupational therapy. Dr. McNulty has published articles focused on estimating home safety from the hospital setting, implementation of fall reduction
strategies with well community-dwelling older adults, functional concerns of older adults with and without depressive symptoms, and time use of women who are homeless living in an emergency shelter for survivors of domestic violence. She has also published an article about the use problem-based learning to promote professional reflection and growth. She is currently investigating potentially modifiable lifestyle factors in persons with Parkinson’s disease, i.e., time use, perceptions of occupational challenges, and level of resilience.

Louise Dunn, ScD, OTR/L, Assistant Professor: Dr Dunn earned her research doctorate from Boston University in 2005. She is on a tenure track and successfully has taught graduate students for the past five years at the University of Utah. Her areas of expertise include pediatrics, evidence based practice, research, and group process. She redesigned three of the pediatric courses, developed a service-learning component for the pediatric coursework, designed two of the research courses, and successfully facilitated discussions groups for two evidence-based practice courses at Boston University.

Donna Costa, DHS, OTR/L, FAOTA, Professor (Clinical): Dr Costa has an earned professional doctorate from the University of Indianapolis in Occupational Therapy, as well as a Master’s degree in Health Care Administration from the New School of Social Research in NY, and dual baccalaureate degrees in Occupational Therapy and Psychology from the University of Buffalo. She is currently a Professor (Clinical) at the University of Utah, also holds an adjunct teaching appointment in the College of Nursing, and is a faculty member in the Center on Aging. Dr. Costa is a Fellow of the American Occupational Therapy Association and is the author of two books on fieldwork education published by AOTA Press, as well as numerous articles. She was formerly the Chair of the Occupational Therapy Program at Stony Brook University in NY where she developed and obtained grant funding for an OTA to OT Career Laddering Program leading to the BS/MS degrees.

Beth Cardell, MS, OTR/L, Assistant Professor (Clinical): Professor Cardell received her OT degree from Misericordia University and a masters degree in Health Promotion and Education from the University of Utah. She has been full-time faculty with the Division of Occupational Therapy at the University of Utah since 2003. Her teaching interests include evaluation methods with the adult population, cognition, anatomy and neuroanatomy, and activity analysis. Beth received certification as a Higher Education Teaching Specialist in 2007 and is currently pursuing her PhD in the Department of Health Promotion and Education. Her research interests include the health of people with chronic disabilities, adjustment to sudden onset disability, and resilience.
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Appendix E: Schematic of Proposed OTD Program
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Certificate, Diploma and/or Degree(s) to be Awarded: Professional Doctorate of Occupational Therapy (OTD)

Proposed Beginning Date: May 2010 (Summer Term 2010)

Institutional Signatures (as appropriate):

Department Chair

Dean or Division Chair

Career and Technical Education Director

Graduate School Dean

Chief Academic Officer

President

September 11, 2009

Date
March 20, 2009

James E Graves, Dean
College of Health
HPR-N 200
CAMPUS

Dear Dean Graves

Please find enclosed with this letter the formal proposal from the Division of Occupational Therapy requesting your support for the new clinical doctorate in occupational therapy (OTD). We are hoping to roll this out—pending the needed approvals—Spring of 2010.

You are aware of the faculty's support and interest in moving ahead with this proposal to offer to interested clinicians the chance to increase their knowledge base related to important foundation and leadership skills in occupational therapy. This is also supported by the market we intend to serve. This information was gathered through a survey this past year. Currently, there are no other OTD programs currently being offered in the state of Utah from any accredited Universities. This degree will not only benefit people living along the Wasatch Front but because it is will be delivered in an on-line format, it will make this type of education accessible to anyone in the state or in other states. The Division will house this degree and as we anticipate filling the final open tenure track line, there will be sufficient faculty to carry this program forward. We will also use some existing classes to provide some of the coursework. We as a Division have given it a great deal of thought. Dr Donna Costa has headed up the task force comprised of other faculty members to develop this degree. It has been a thoughtful process and we believe this degree will benefit the Division, the College and the University as a whole as well as the students who enroll in this degree program.

The proposal has been approved by the curriculum committee in the College. Thank you for your willingness to support this degree. Let me know what I can do to help move this proposal through the appropriate approval process. I am willing to meet with anyone along the way if questions arise.

Sincerely,

JoAnne Wright, PhD, OTR/L, CLVT
Chair and Professor (clinical)
March 25, 2009

A Lorrie Berr, MD, PhD,  
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences  
Building 550, Fifth Floor  
University of Utah  

Dear Dr. Berr,  

Enclosed for your review and approval is a proposal from the Division of Occupational Therapy in the  
College of Health, requesting a post-professional, clinical doctorate in occupational therapy (OTD).  
This proposal has been approved by the College of Health Curriculum Committee and has my  
enthusiastic support as Dean.  

Dr. JoAnne Wright (Division Chair) clearly states the rationale for the new degree in her letter to me and  
in the body of the proposal. The Division has mounted a very successful entry-level master's degree and  
now that the faculty are more mature, it is time for the Division to assist those practicing clinicians in the  
community to add to their knowledge base. It is also an important next step for the continued growth of  
this strong academic unit. The format is consistent with that described in the Board of Regents  
Policy Section 10.4 Approval of New Programs, Program Changes and Discontinued Programs.  

No related degree offering currently exists at the University of Utah or at any other USHE accredited  
school in the State. The goal of the degree is to develop clinical scholars and leaders committed to  
adding to the evidence-based practice literature. This degree would be an online degree and will benefit  
thousands of therapists across the Wasatch Front, throughout the State and the western region. Currently there are 19  
OTD programs in the United States.  

As is standard, following your approval, the proposal will be reviewed by the Graduate Council,  
University Senate Executive Committee, University Academic Senate and Board of Trustees prior to  
submission to the State Board of Regents for final approval. A preliminary proposal has already been  
sent to Graduate School Dean, David Chapman, as an information item and to solicit suggestions as  
needed.  

I urge your favorable consideration of this proposed post-professional clinical doctorate, the OTD, in  
the College of Health.  

Sincerely,  

James E. Graves, PhD  
Dean and Professor  

[Signature]  

[Approved by Curriculum to Graduate Council] 

[Signature]  

[Date: 3-27-09]
March 20, 2009

Donna M. Costa, DHS, OTR/L, FAOTA
Professor (Clinical)
Division of Occupational Therapy
University of Utah, College of Health
520 Wakara Way
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Dear Professor Costa:

The Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library is pleased to write a letter of support for the proposal for a professional doctorate in Occupational Therapy, College of Health. I feel certain that the Marriott Library, Quinney Law Library and specifically the Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library are able to provide services for the program and that current collections and resources (databases and electronic or print journals/monographs) are adequate to support the program as proposed. Our interlibrary loan services can rapidly obtain materials not owned from libraries all over the country.

Librarians and staff can provide customized training to program participants to help faculty and students succeed in their use of the information resources, as well as assistance in integrating innovative technology tools into the classroom experience (e.g., the use of Tablet PCs, handheld devices, course management tools, blogs, wikis, etc.) Faculty are encouraged to integrate library instruction into their course work, and the libraries hope that we can contribute to your program’s success in this manner.

The libraries have supported the University community with adequate resources, services and technologies for many years and will continue to do so. We are pleased to provide support for the Doctoral Program in Occupational Therapy at the University of Utah and are especially pleased that your program intends to encourage students to increase the body of evidence-based literature. If I can provide further information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Jean P. Shipman
Director

University Health Sciences Center
University of Utah
Eccles Health Sciences Library
19 North 1900 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-5861
(801) 581-8771
FAX: (801) 581-3632
March 18, 2009

JoAnne Wright, PhD, OTR/L, CLVT
Chair and Associate Professor
Division of Occupational Therapy
CAMPUS

Dear Dr. Wright:

I am writing in support of your post-professional OTD program. Having reviewed your proposal and recognizing the need for this degree in your profession I commend you on your due diligence and program preparation. I can attest to the community interest for such programs as ours in the Department of Physical Therapy has been very successful and our colleague clinicians have greatly appreciated the University of Utah offering them this important educational opportunity.

I appreciate your leadership with this endeavor. This type of degree demonstrates the element of the mission of the University of Utah to “serve the people of Utah and the world through the ... application of knowledge; through the dissemination of knowledge by teaching ... and through community engagement.” I realize that the need for this type of degree opportunity is also recognized by some other prestigious universities across the country. A few of those that I am aware of where such a degree exists include: the University of Southern California, Loma Linda University, Colorado State University, Boston University, Tufts University, the University of Oklahoma, and Washington University in St. Louis. I applaud you and your colleagues for your efforts to improve clinical scholarship in occupational therapy. All of health care is in need of this kind of transition as the expectations of society for a higher level of clinical decision making from all health care providers increases. I also see this program helping produce clinical leaders in the occupational therapy profession both in Utah and regionally.

I look forward to hearing of the success of this program and wish you the best with this undertaking.

Sincerely,

R. Scott Ward, PT, PhD
Professor and Chair
Department of Physical Therapy
MEMO

Donna M. Costa, DHS, OTR/L, FAOTA
Professor (Clinical)
Division of Occupational Therapy
University of Utah, College of Health
520 Wakara Way
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Dear Dr. Costa,

I am pleased to be writing this letter of support for the Division of Occupational Therapy’s proposal to offer an Occupational Therapy Doctorate (OTD). I hope that the Graduate Council and others will find this be a necessary and relevant addition to graduate programs at the University Utah. There is a need in most health professions to offer advanced degrees in order to increase the level of evidence-based practice, as well as provide leadership, the context of dynamic health care needs and demographic challenges in our society. I am aware of the shortage of doctorally-prepared faculty in the occupational therapy profession, and so this proposed program will help address this shortage.

One of the tracks in the OTD proposed program is “Optimal Aging” and I am delighted that the Division of Occupational Therapy has chosen to include this in their list of areas of specialization. Students who elect to take this track will select electives from the established Gerontology Interdisciplinary Program offered through the College of Nursing. This is a positive sign and concrete evidence of “building bridges” across campus which can maximize the use of existing resources and support the critical need for the OTD on our campus.

I look forward to increasing our collaboration with the Division of Occupational Therapy and to the potential growth in research in topics related to aging. I am in complete support of this opportunity for students and I believe it will add to the flagship reputation of our university.

Sincerely,

Scott D. Wright, Ph.D.
Director and Associate Professor
Gerontology Interdisciplinary Program
College of Nursing

3/27/09

---

10 South 2000 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-0860
Phone (801) 581-0190
Fax (801) 581-9538
www.uh.edu/gerontology
August 19, 2009

David W. Pershing
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
205 Park Building
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Bioengineering

Dear Vice President Pershing:

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

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

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Richard D. Rabbitt, Chair, Department of Bioengineering
    Richard B. Brown, Dean, College of Engineering

The Graduate School
302 Park Building
201 South Presidents Circle Room 302
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9016
(801) 581-7642 • FAX (801) 585-6748
www.gradschool.utah.edu
April 7, 2008

The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Bioengineering.

External Review Committee:

Warren M. Grill, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Biomedical Engineering
Duke University

Andrew D. McCulloch, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair of Bioengineering
University of California San Diego

John J. McGrath, Ph.D.
Professor and Head of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering
University of Arizona

Internal Review Committee:

Dr. Mary Beckerle
Professor
Executive Director, Huntsman Cancer Institute

Dr. Maureen Condic
Associate Professor
Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy

Dr. Henry White
Professor
Department of Chemistry
This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study report submitted by the Department of Bioengineering, and the reports of the external and internal review committees. No comments/responses to the external or internal reports were received by the Chair of the Department of Bioengineering or the Dean of Engineering.

I. DEPARTMENTAL PROFILE

**Program Overview**
The Bioengineering Department is in the College of Engineering. At the graduate level, the department offers Masters (ME and MS) and PhD degrees. A major development has been the successful establishment of a Bioengineering undergraduate degree program that attracts many of the top students in the College of Engineering. Traditional strengths have been in the areas of medical devices, bioinstrumentation and biomaterials.

The department is one of the older and better established bioengineering programs in the nation. It is the highest ranked engineering department at the University of Utah, and has consistently ranked among the top 10-15 graduate programs in the discipline nationwide. Its growth was spurred significantly during the early 1990s by a Development Award from the Whitaker Foundation. In most respects the department is in healthy shape. However, maintaining and improving the department will require focused vision to continue to compete effectively during a time when many institutions are making unprecedented investments in Bioengineering. Identifying the research challenges and capitalizing on opportunities, such as the USTAR initiative, must be a priority for continued growth and excellence in bioengineering.

**Faculty**
The department comprises 14 tenure-track faculty with a good distribution across full (6), associate (4) and assistant (4) professors. The 14 regular faculty members correspond to an equivalent 10 FTE positions, the remaining FTEs due to joint appointments with other University departments. The department also contains 23 research faculty and 34 adjunct positions. Of the total 71 faculty, seven (9.6%) are women and two (2.8%) are minority. A greater effort at junior recruitment would help to increase faculty gender diversity and create a larger group of female faculty mentors for women students. The use of joint and adjunct appointments has been viewed as an asset to increase the interdisciplinary breadth and collaborative research and teaching. The ability to maintain a large number of adjunct faculty is strongly dependent on the federal research budget and may come under strain if federal research expenditures continue to decline. Other potential liabilities are less control and a mission that could be potentially driven more by external forces. Careful weighing of both the pros and cons of joint appointments is needed with regard to the long-term role of the department at the University.

The faculty are engaged and committed to the educational and research mission of the Department. The teaching load of the faculty is similar to that of other bioengineering departments. Several faculty members are recognized national leaders in their research areas, and the research productivity of the faculty is strong. There is a sense of teamwork and collegiality between faculty, staff, and students that contributes to high morale. There is uniformly strong support and praise of the Chair.
Students
The representation of women in the Bioengineering program has averaged ~30% over the last 7 years with an increasing trend in more recent years. Efforts to attract minority students have been made through the College of Engineering Outreach and Diversity Office. On average 2-5 minority students are admitted each year.

Undergraduate
An undergraduate program was initiated in 1999. The department has done a good job of managing undergraduate enrollments and meeting enrollment targets and currently admits approximately 40 students per year. Times to completion of the undergraduate degree are comparable with other engineering programs nationwide. The quality of undergraduate students in the department is exceptionally high.

Graduate
The Bioengineering graduate program is highly competitive, ranking in the top 10-18 programs nationally. The department successfully attracts good graduate students who are enthusiastic about the program and active in research. To recruit more or higher caliber students will be difficult without providing more first-year student support that does not obligate new graduate students to a particular research advisor. Faculty and graduate students alike were well aware of this problem. The close ties of the University of Utah Bioengineering department with biomedical and bioengineering industries are a clear asset to the students.

The lack of funding to support the stipends of first year graduate students is a concern. Students universally noted that guaranteed funding for five years was a major factor in their decision to come to Utah. A limited number of fellowships are available for outstanding students. Faculty expressed concerns that the student stipends are not standardized, making financial competition for students a concern, particularly for junior faculty.

Curriculum and Programs of Study
Undergraduate
The undergraduate curriculum is well-designed and includes 14 core courses and 5-6 technical electives (total 125 CHs). Courses are organized to emphasize group learning by the students, a progressive approach. The elective structure of the undergraduate program permits students to select from a variety of specialized tracks. However, while this flexibility is appealing, students felt that the benefits of more formal program tracks would outweigh some loss of flexibility by facilitating progress toward degree completion.

Undergraduates have outstanding opportunities to participate in research, although, the broad dispersion of the faculty limits the degree to which undergraduates can easily access the faculty.

Graduate
Graduate students are required to complete a core curriculum of 6 semester courses (16 CHs), and subsequently elect to follow a specialized track. Courses cover the wide range of faculty research interests represented in the department. Some students would prefer to be able to make an earlier commitment to specialization and felt that a more structured track system would
facilitate that goal. Students expressed some concern regarding the availability of advanced (7000 level) coursework. The qualifying examination is specific to the student’s track, and is taken generally at the beginning of the third year.

The diversity of faculty research interests is a strong asset of the graduate training program, with a particular strength being the relationships many of the faculty have developed with both medical and industry collaborators. The students commented very favorably that the relationship of the Bioengineering department to the hospital, particularly to the Orthopedics division, provides a strong training opportunity.

A high quality internship program that could provide a substantial and diverse pool of opportunities for student internships would complement the strong curricular offerings and enhance employment prospects. Current offerings were described as minimal.

**Programs Effectiveness – Outcomes Assessment**

*Undergraduate*

The achievements of the undergraduates, as measured by admission to medical and professional graduate programs, are exceptional (60% progressing to graduate studies)

*Graduate*

A significant proportion of Master’s (38%) and Ph.D. (29%) students continue on in industry following graduation. By most metrics, graduate student outcomes meet high national standards.

**Facilities and Resources**

The Bioengineering Department is split across multiple buildings across campus. The facilities, especially in the Biomedical Polymers Research Building are good, and this arrangement has enabled faculty with common research interest to reside adjacent to one another. However, this distributed department limits interaction among the faculty, scattered administration for graduate and undergraduate training and the physical separation between classroom and teaching lab facilities, administrative offices and faculty labs. Growth of the program is currently constrained by lack of available laboratory space, which may limit highly qualified recruits.

There exists only a bare minimum of administrative and instructional support staff for the educational and research programs. The chair has no administrative assistant. An increase in support staff would reduce missed opportunities (e.g. training grants applications, development efforts, alumni tracking), and will be essential for stability as the faculty grows.

**II. COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Commendations**

1. The Department has consistently ranked among the top 10-15 graduate programs in the discipline nationwide.

2. The Bioengineering faculty is nationally recognized for their scholarship. Strong extramural funding and publication records speak to the quality of the research in the department.
3. The graduate curriculum is highly effective and attracts and the program has well qualified and enthusiastic students. The curriculum is highly effective and students have access to a wide array of interdisciplinary research opportunities. Ph.D. enrollment has increased with no decrease in student quality.

4. The Department has developed a very successful bioengineering undergraduate program, and continually implements new initiatives to broadened and improve the skills of their students.

5. The governance structure of the Department is effective, resulting in a collegial and supportive environment for faculty, students and staff. Junior faculty receive support and mentoring. The dedication and commitment of the professional staff to the education and research programs is genuine and noteworthy.

6. Translational research is strong, which positions the Department well to capitalize on USTAR funds for senior interdisciplinary recruitments.

**Recommendations**

1. **Strategic Plan.** The Department should develop a strategic 5-10 year plan to identify areas of emphasis and a unifying and focused vision. The Department will likely have opportunities to expand its faculty ranks in the near future, e.g., USTAR. However, alternate avenues for hiring should continue to be pursued. Junior recruitments offer more opportunity to diversify with respect to female and minority faculty and may allow more latitude to follow the departments vision. For new appointments, competitive start-up packages must be generated to attract distinguished faculty since competition is at an all time high. Also, the faculty should carefully consider joint versus regular appointments in determining the future autonomy of their department.

2. **Teaching facilities.** Growth of the faculty could enable growth in the student body and therefore the strategic planning must also consider potential growth of the training programs. An increase in undergraduate numbers particularly will require an increase in teaching laboratory space, facilities and support. A decrease in lab requirements in the curricula should not be entertained since that would jeopardize prospects for accreditation.

3. **Graduate Program.** The Department should identify means to provide stipends to first-year graduate students. The limited ability of the Department to offer unrestricted first-year support causes the department to miss out on many top students. Faculty should be encouraged to submit proposals for training grants and fellowships and mechanisms to reassign available TA funds into first-year graduate student stipends could be considered. The faculty should ensure standardization and publication of the qualifying examination requirements, to alleviate the perceived concerns of the graduate students.

4. **Undergraduate Program.** Adding more structure, such as more formal program tracks, to the undergraduate curriculum should be considered —students felt that the benefits of structure would outweigh some loss of flexibility by facilitating progress toward degree completion. The department should foster undergraduate participation in departmental activities, should consider
centralized training, office-hour, and the establishment of communal areas to provide opportunities to interact with faculty and other students, and should encourage active student participation in the Student Chapter of the Biomedical Engineering Society.

5. **Student Internship Program.** It is recommended that the Department establish a student internship program. Both undergraduate and graduate students currently lack assistance with placement and such a program would greatly complement the curriculum and provide visibility to the Department.

6. **Administrative support.** More administrative staff support is needed to maintain the substantial educational and research efforts of the department. The Department Chair should work with the Dean to assess support staff needs and if necessary redeploy staffing within the college to ensure that faculty and student growth is matched with an equitable level of staff support.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council:

Nicola Camp (Chair), Biomedical Informatics
Steven Bealer
Mary Jane Taylor
Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Bioengineering
Graduate Council Review 2006-2007

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on 3 June 2008, concluding the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Bioengineering. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Richard B. Brown, Dean of the College of Engineering; Richard D. Rabbitt, Chair of the Department of Bioengineering; David S. Chapman, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on 28 April 2008. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1: Strategic Plan. The Department should develop a strategic 5-10 year plan to identify areas of emphasis and a unifying and focused vision.

The college dean stresses that the Bioengineering Department has done excellent planning. However, the department is currently working from a strategic plan developed in 2004 that needs to be revised to accommodate the USTAR initiative and specific growth areas in the department. Discussion of a new strategic plan will take place during a retreat scheduled for Fall 2008.

Recommendation 2: Faculty Hires. The Department will likely have opportunities to expand its faculty ranks in the near future, e.g., USTAR. However, alternate avenues for hiring should continue to be pursued. Junior recruitments may offer more latitude to follow the department’s vision (as determined in #1), and the opportunity to diversify with respect to female and minority faculty (an issue that needs to be given attention). For new appointments, competitive start-up packages must be generated. Attention should be paid to the balance of regular to joint appointments to ensure the continued autonomy of the department.

The department will address faculty hiring issues as part of its upcoming strategic planning. In addition, the USTAR initiative includes an incentive plan for hiring women and minority faculty. The issue of joint appointments is not currently viewed as a concern by the department with regard to maintaining its autonomy. However, the department is cognizant of the autonomy issue and will strategize to maintain department strength when it enters into collaborations with outside partners.

Recommendation 3: Teaching Facilities. Increasing the faculty could enable growth in the student body and therefore the strategic planning must also consider potential growth of the training programs. An increase in students, particularly undergraduates, will require an increase in teaching laboratory space, facilities and support. A decrease in lab requirements should not be entertained, since that would jeopardize prospects for accreditation.
The department believes that existing space is adequate to meet growth projections. It is also remodeling the design lab to add teaching space.

**Recommendation 4: Graduate Program.** The Department should identify means to provide stipends to first-year graduate students. The limited ability of the Department to offer unrestricted first-year support causes the department to miss out on many top students. Faculty should be encouraged to submit proposals for training grants and fellowships. The faculty should ensure standardization and publication of the qualifying examination requirements, to alleviate the perceived concerns of the graduate students.

The department would like to have a first-year funding program similar to the combined Molecular Biology program. At this time they are submitting training grants that, if successful, would provide support for first-year students. The goal is to fund 30 first-year students. The Graduate School has agreed to help draft a proposal to create a plan for funding first-year students.

With regard to standardizing qualifying exam requirements, the department plans to create a web-based graduate student handbook which will provide uniform and consistent information regarding the exam.

**Recommendation 5: Undergraduate Program.** Additional structure, such as more formal program tracks, to the undergraduate curriculum should be considered, as students felt the benefits of structure would outweigh some loss of flexibility by facilitating progress toward degree completion. The Department should foster undergraduate participation in departmental activities, encourage active student participation in the Student Chapter of the Biomedical Engineering Society, and explore ways to improve access and interaction between students, faculty and staff given the multi-disciplinary and dispersed nature of the department.

The department believes that the tracks as they are now defined allow students to graduate on time. With regard to building an undergraduate community, the Department has assigned a faculty member to serve as advisor to the Student Chapter of the Biomedical Engineering Society. It is also working on ways to congregate faculty for the purpose of allowing faculty-student interactions.

**Recommendation 6: Student Internship Program.** It is recommended that the Department establish a student internship program. Both undergraduate and graduate students currently lack assistance with placement and such a program would greatly complement the curriculum and provide visibility for the Department.

Information about internships is now placed on the department webpage.
Recommendation 7: Administrative Support. More administrative staff support is needed to maintain the substantial educational and research efforts of the department. The Department Chair should work with the Dean to assess support staff needs and if necessary redeploy staffing within the college to ensure that faculty and student growth is matched with an equitable level of staff support.

The College of Engineering is working to provide better grant accounting support for the department. Additionally, if the department’s growth plan is realized, the added overhead will support additional staff.

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

David W. Pershing
Richard B. Brown
Rick Rabbitt
David S. Chapman
Frederick Rhodewalt

David S. Chapman
Associate VP for Graduate Studies
Dean, The Graduate School
August 19, 2009
### Department Review by Academic Year

**College of Engineering: Bioengineering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Headcount - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Professors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructors</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Expenditures - Source: OBIA 'B' tables, Updated annually during Spring term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Expenditures (Department)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Expenditures (College)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Credit Hours (Budget Model) - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Summer term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Division</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Division</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Undergraduate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Graduate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Graduate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Graduate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course / Instructor Evaluations - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Courses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Instructors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Courses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Instructors</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled Majors - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Majors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Majors (including Intermediate)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor's</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 28, 2009

A. Lorris Betz
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
5th Floor, Clinical Neurosciences Center
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders

Dear Vice President Betz:

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

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

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Bruce L. Smith, Chair, Dept. of Communication Sciences and Disorders
James E. Graves, Dean, College of Health
The Graduate School – The University of Utah

GRADUATE COUNCIL REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION SCIENCES AND DISORDERS

February 23, 2009

The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders. The External Review Committee included:

Dr. John Bernthal
Chair, Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders
University Nebraska-Lincoln

Dr. Robert H. Margolis
Professor, Department of Otolaryngology
University of Minnesota

Dr. Carol Stoe-Gammon
Professor, Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences
University of Washington

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Dr. Johanna Watzinger-Tharp
Associate Professor, Department of Languages and Literature

Dr. Joanne Yaffe
Associate Professor, College of Social Work

Dr. Marshall E. Smith
Associate Professor, Department of Otolaryngology

This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study report submitted by the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, the results of the internal and external review committees, and comments from Dr. Bruce L. Smith, Professor and Chair of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, and Dr. James E. Graves, Dean of the College of Health.
DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders is in the College of Health. The department offers a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) or Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in Speech and Hearing Science. The B.S./B.A. degrees are designed to prepare students for graduate study in speech-language pathology or audiology. The department offers four graduate programs including a Master of Science (M.S.) degree in Speech-Language Pathology, a Master of Arts (M.A.) degree in Speech-Language Pathology, a Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.), and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Speech-Language Pathology or Audiology. The M.S., M.A., and Au.D. degree programs are designed to prepare students for clinical practice in a variety of service settings. The Ph.D. program is a research degree intended to prepare individuals for research and academic careers. The department also administers a Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinic that provides diagnostic and treatment services to individuals along the Wasatch Front.

The department reports significant progress in addressing several recommendations it received during the 2002 Graduate Council review. These include (1) hiring an established scholar to assume the department chair position, (2) strengthening faculty at the senior associate level through promotion and hiring, (3) establishing the Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.) program, (4) developing courses to address new standards of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, (5) obtaining adequate space to house the Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinic, and (6) obtaining additional space to house doctoral students. Several recommendations from the 2002 Graduate Council report are in need of additional attention based on the information provided in the department’s self-study report. These include (1) more fully developing the Ph.D. degree, (2) obtaining research and training grants to support and enhance the Master and Ph.D. degree programs, and (3) developing a plan to recruit students and faculty from traditionally underrepresented groups.

Faculty

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders has 9.5 tenure track and 6.25 non-tenure track faculty lines. Two of the tenure track lines were being searched at the time the department submitted its self-study report. Since that time, one assistant professor has been hired and there is an ongoing search for a senior faculty member in audiology. Of the current tenure track faculty members, one is a professor, five are associate professors, and three (including a new hire in Speech-Language Pathology as of August 2008) are assistant professors. The average time in service for the associate professors is 6.2 years (2 -12 years). The two most senior associate professors have been encouraged to prepare their papers for consideration for promotion to the rank of professor. One assistant professor is in his third year, one is in her second year and the other just began her position in the fall of 2008. There are five male and four female tenure track faculty members and among them are seven Caucasians, one Korean, and one Asian-American. The non-tenure track faculty consists of one male and six females, all of whom are Caucasian.
The faculty members in the department are well respected scholars and clinicians. The evidence suggests that they publish regularly and several have obtained extramural funding to support their research and training activities. The members of the faculty participate in a significant number of service activities within the university and their professional organizations.

Students

In 2006-2007 the department awarded 33 bachelor degrees, 29 master degrees, and two doctoral degrees. The department had a total of 68 pre-major and undergraduate students, 55 master students, and 23 doctoral students during the same period. The number of students enrolled in the B.S./B.A. degree programs decreased by 42% (27) between 2005 and 2007. No explanation was offered in the self-study report for this decline. Enrollment in the department’s graduate programs has remained relatively stable over the last three academic years. The number of students in the M.S./M.A. degree programs in Speech-Language Pathology and the Au.D. degree program are comparable. The number of students in the Ph.D. program is very small (2 to 3 students per year). The department appears to attract highly qualified students to its programs. The overall acceptance rates for the M.S./M.A. and Au.D. degree programs is 75%, with the majority of applicants coming from the state of Utah. The majority of master students complete their programs within two years, Au.D. students complete their programs in four years, and Ph.D. students finish within five to seven years.

The available data suggests that students are generally satisfied with the quality of their education and the level of support that they receive from faculty members. However, some concerns were raised about the level of coordination and linkage between the didactic coursework and laboratory and field experiences. For example, students in speech-language pathology reported that the evidenced-based practices taught in courses were not always implemented in the clinic. In addition, students enrolled in the Au.D. program expressed concerns that some coursework was taught by faculty members who do not have strong backgrounds in clinical audiology.

The number of master and doctoral students receiving financial support is extremely small. The department offers six to seven scholarships per year from departmental endowments ranging from $500 to $5,000 per year. A grant from the Utah State Office of Education provides support to 10 M.S./M.A. students each year who are interested in working in the public schools following graduation. Additional support is available to a limited number of students through faculty research and training grants.

Curriculum

The undergraduate major in Speech and Hearing Science has two emphasis areas including Speech-Language Pathology and/or Audiology, and American Sign Language. The emphasis in Speech-Language Pathology and/or Audiology is intended to prepare students to pursue master or doctoral degrees. The curriculum appears to provide students with a solid foundation for advanced graduate study. However, there may be a need to develop laboratory experiences in some areas (e.g., phonetics, anatomy and physiology, acoustics) to enhance the quality and effectiveness of students’ preparation. The emphasis area in American Sign Language
has been suspended due to the small number of students applying to the program, competition from another program at Utah Valley University, and the department's inability to recruit and hire a faculty member who can assume responsibility for the program. At the time of the review, a decision regarding the future status of the program was on hold until the search for a faculty member in Speech-Language Pathology was completed.

The curriculum in M.S./M.A. degree programs in Speech-Language Pathology is strong and meets all of the academic and clinical requirements for the Certificate of Clinical Competency – Speech-Language Pathology issued by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). Graduates of the program also meet the requirements of the Utah State Office of Education to provide speech-language pathology services in the public schools. The department's self-study identified several areas of needed improvement in the curriculum including Autism, augmentative communication, language and literacy, and bilingualism. Students are currently not required to complete a qualifying examination to advance to candidacy, although the department is exploring qualifying exam options that may be put in place in the future. The curriculum includes both thesis and nonthesis options to complete the degree program. The nonthesis option requires students to complete additional clinical and/or research experiences.

The Au.D. curriculum is sufficient to prepare students in all of the important areas of clinical practice. Graduates of the program meet the clinical requirements for the Certificate of Clinical Competency–Audiology issued by ASHA and the requirements of the Utah State Office of Education to provide audiology services in the public schools. However, there is a need to strengthen the clinical experiences in specific areas including psychoacoustics, advanced electrophysiology, and amplification. In addition, there is a need to broaden the program so that students can take course work in other academic units, especially the Medical School.

The curriculum in the Ph.D. degree program is adequate to prepare students for academic and research positions. Like the Au.D. degree program, the quality of the Ph.D. curriculum would be improved by requiring students to take relevant course work from outside of the department.

**Program Effectiveness and Outcome Assessment**

The department uses a variety of measures to assess program effectiveness including student course evaluations, student exit interviews, and the Praxis exams in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology. The Praxis exams are required by ASHA in order for graduates to obtain a Certificate of Clinical Competency in Speech-Language Pathology or Audiology. The self-study included mean course and instructor ratings for undergraduate and graduate courses for the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 academic years. The mean ratings were above 5.0 (on a six-point scale) in all areas. Data for the 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 academic years were not reported. The response rates for the student exit interviews were small but students were consistently positive about the quality and effectiveness of their preparation—data for the Praxis exams in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology was available for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 academic years. Pass rates for the exams were 100% in both areas. Program completion rates in Speech-Language Pathology averaged 90% (88 – 93%) between 2004 and 2007. All of the graduates obtained employment in the profession following graduation. An average of 96%
(88-100%) of the students in Audiology successfully completed their programs during the same period. All of the graduates obtained employment in the profession following graduation.

Facilities and Resources

The faculty and staff in the department are housed on the 12th and 13th floors of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Building. The Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinic is located in Research Park. The teaching and research facilities appear to be adequate to meet student and faculty needs. Office space in Social and Behavioral Sciences would benefit from refurbishing and student and faculty access to the 12th and 13th floors can be problematic because of poor elevator service. An additional concern relates to the considerable distance between the academic and clinical faculty and functions, and the separation of the department from the College of Health. Students and faculty have adequate access to computers. However, not all of the computers in the department meet information technology’s recommended guidelines for computer replacement.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The department has strong academic and clinical faculty.

2. The department is recruiting high quality students and provides adequate support to allow them to successfully complete their programs.

3. The degree programs are effective in preparing students to meet state and professional certification and licensure requirements.

4. Graduates of the degree programs are successful in obtaining a variety of clinical and academic positions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The department should develop contingency plans to assure the long-term viability of the Doctorate in Audiology (Au.D.) degree program if it is unable to identify and hire a senior tenure-track faculty member with significant clinical experience.

2. The curricula in the M.S., M.A., and Au.D. degree programs should be reviewed to assure that students are provided adequate laboratory and practicum experiences.

3. The department should review the linkage between didactic courses and clinical and practicum experiences to evaluate whether professionals in working field settings are consistently implementing evidence-based practices. Where necessary the department should take steps to align the practices used in clinical and practicum sites with the content presented in courses. This may require putting formal procedures in place that support collaboration between course instructors, clinical faculty members, and cooperating professionals.
4. The department should explore partnerships with other colleges, schools, and departments to identify areas of collaboration and cooperation that could expand course offerings to students.

5. The continued success of the M.S., M.A., Au.D., and Ph.D. degree programs hinges upon developing multiple sources of support for graduate students. The department should develop a comprehensive plan for expanding student support that includes internal and extramural funding opportunities, continuing education, and community outreach programs.

6. It was recommended in the 2002 Graduate Council Report that the department take steps to increase diversity among students, faculty, staff, and clients. The department's self-study report indicates that little progress has been made in achieving this goal. The department should develop and implement a specific plan to achieve appropriate diversity among its student body, faculty, staff, and clients. The Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity is committed to this goal and may provide useful ideas and strategies in this regard. The use of annual progress reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the department to work effectively towards this goal.

**ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW**

1. In 2008-09, one of the department's senior associate professors initiated the process to be promoted to the rank of professor.

2. The undergraduate emphasis in American Sign Language has been discontinued, inasmuch as the faculty member hired for Fall 2008 does not have expertise in that area.

3. The faculty member hired for Fall 2008 has a primary focus in Autism and augmentative communication, and thus provides expertise in two areas that the department wanted to cover.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

John McDonnell (Chair), Department of Special Education
Jay Mace, Department of Meteorology
Kevin Rathunde, Department of Family and Consumer Studies
Memorandum of Understanding  
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders  

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on 5 May 2009, concluding the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders. A. Loris Betz, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; James E. Graves, Dean of the College of Health; Bruce L. Smith, Chair of the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders; David S. Chapman, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on 23 February 2009. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1: The department should develop contingency plans to assure the long-term viability of the Doctorate in Audiology (Au.D.) degree program if it is unable to identify and hire a senior tenure-track faculty member with significant clinical experience.

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD) implemented a plan to manage the Au.D. program in light of the fact that budget constraints have prohibited the hiring of a senior tenured faculty with clinical experiences. The Au.D. program is now being coordinated by the audiology clinic director, who is a Ph.D. level person. The department reports that the arrangement is working well at this time. Although it would be ideal to have a tenure-track faculty member in this position, the need is not as urgent as it was previously because junior faculty in the area are developing and will be able to staff the position in the future.

Recommendation 2: The curricula in the M.S., M.A., and Au.D. degree programs should be reviewed to assure that students are provided adequate laboratory and practicum experiences.

The Department has completed a review of its degree programs with regard to its laboratory and practicum offerings. It has addressed this recommendation by hiring an individual to teach their laboratory courses.
Recommendation 3: The department should review the linkage between didactic courses and clinical and practicum experiences to evaluate whether professionals in working field settings are consistently implementing evidence-based practices. Where necessary the department should take steps to align the practices used in clinical and practicum sites with the content presented in courses. This may require putting formal procedures in place that support collaboration between course instructors, clinical faculty members, and cooperating professionals.

The Department reports that linking didactic instruction and evidence-based practice to clinical and practicum experiences is a challenge for the field. The Department plans to address this issue by having tenure-track faculty teach seminars for clinical faculty which will be formalized in upcoming years. They also will consider integrating clinicians into coursework.

Recommendation 4: The department should explore partnerships with other colleges, schools, and departments to identify areas of collaboration and cooperation that could expand course offerings to students.

Although the Department faculty do participate in collaborative activities, they view the recommendation to expand course offerings as impractical within the constraints of the present curriculum.

Recommendation 5: The continued success of the M.S., M.A., Au.D., and Ph.D. degree programs hinges upon developing multiple sources of support for graduate students. The department should develop a comprehensive plan for expanding student support that includes internal and extramural funding opportunities, continuing education, and community outreach programs.

The Department plans to consider the following actions in order to expand graduate student support: They will consider converting auxiliary faculty funds to TAs, including more RA support in grant submissions, and implementing differential tuition from clinics to support students.
Recommendation 6: It was recommended in the 2002 Graduate Council Report that the department take steps to increase diversity among students, faculty, staff, and clients. The department’s self-study report indicates that little progress has been made in achieving this goal. The department should develop and implement a specific plan to achieve appropriate diversity among its student body, faculty, staff, and clients. The Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity is committed to this goal and may provide useful ideas and strategies in this regard. The use of annual progress reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the department to work effectively towards this goal.

Although the Department has made some progress in terms of faculty diversity they have been less successful in their attempts to increase student diversity. They plan to implement the following steps in order to address this concern:

• Work with Office of Diversity to obtain scholarship funding to recruit/retain students.

• Work more closely with Associate Dean of the College of Health to capitalize on existing programs in the College directed at minority students.

• Work with Center for Ethnic Student Affairs (http://web.utah.edu/cesa/) to develop targeted mailings and/or special recruitment seminars.

• Obtain information from Graduate School, the Office of Diversity, and other appropriate groups regarding “success stories” on campus and programs that such departments have implemented.

• Avoid “reinventing the wheel” by assessing plans and accomplishments at other universities related to diversity recruiting and associated success stories.

• Encourage faculty to be more proactive in contacting prospective minority students from their classes, professional meetings they attend, and so forth.

• Consult with CSD faculty to develop departmental objectives with regard to recruiting minority students.

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

A. Lorris Betz
James E. Graves
Bruce L. Smith
David S. Chapman
Frederick Rhodewalt

David S. Chapman
Associate V.P. for Graduate Studies
Dean, The Graduate School
June 4, 2009
### College of Health: Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders

#### Faculty Headcount - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Research Expenditures - Source: OBIA 'B' tables, Updated annually during Spring term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (Department)</td>
<td>$136,601</td>
<td>$74,703</td>
<td>$102,656</td>
<td>$111,442</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (College)</td>
<td>$782,461</td>
<td>$641,896</td>
<td>$598,244</td>
<td>$905,508</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Credit Hours (Budget Model) - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Summer term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Graduate</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Course / Instructor Evaluations - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Courses</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Instructors</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Courses</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructors</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Enrolled Majors - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Majors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Majors (Including Intermediate)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Degrees Awarded - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4/14/2008
August 19, 2009

David W. Pershing
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
205 Park Building
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review
   Department of Educational Leadership and Policy

Dear Vice President Pershing:

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

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

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: David J. Sperry, Interim Chair, Dept. of Educational Leadership and Policy
    Michael L. Hardman, Dean, College of Education
The Graduate School – University of Utah

GRADUATE COUNCIL REPORT TO THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND THE ACADEMIC SENATE

May 26, 2009

The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy.

The external reviewers were:

Margaret Grogan, Ph.D. (committee chair)
Dean, School of Educational Studies
Claremont Graduate University

Sharon Conley, Ph.D.
Professor, Graduate School of Education
University of California, Santa Barbara

Susan Komives, Ed.D.
Professor, Department of Counseling & Personnel Services
University of Maryland

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Don Strassberg, Ph.D.
Professor, Dept. of Psychology

Rick Green, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Dept. of Political Science

Marissa Diener, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Dept. of Family & Consumer Studies

This report by the Graduate Council’s ad hoc review committee is based on the Department’s self-study, the report of the internal review committee, the report of the external review committee, and responses from the Department Chair and the Dean of the College of Education.
DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy offers graduate education in effective organization of education and educates graduates to become school or college administrators, professors of educational leadership, and policy makers in government or private education agencies. The program enjoys a national reputation in the field of educational administration.

The department offers three M.Ed. programs, one for K-12 Administration, and two relatively new offerings with emphases in Student Affairs in higher education settings and Teacher Leadership. The department offers both a professional Ed.D. and a research focused Ph.D. There is also a joint Ph.D.-M.P.A program with the Center for Public Administration and Policy. The department also houses the Utah Education Policy Center, and is the current home for a leading scholarly journal in the field.

Faculty

The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy has 10 tenured or tenure track faculty, two clinical faculty, and several adjunct faculty. There has, since the last review, been a high degree of faculty turnover, which includes the hiring of 8 new faculty members. Several department members also hold senior administrative positions in the University, which results in decreased time in the department. Despite the effects of this loss of faculty time on the department’s workload, the faculty maintains a strong focus, morale, and sense of stability, as well as a collegial atmosphere with mentoring and support of junior faculty. Many, including junior faculty, are visible national leaders, with internal and external awards and grants, and active research agendas. The leadership of the department chair is recognized by faculty, students, and staff.

Faculty have a broad range of interests, from policy, leadership, economics, and organizational theory, to critical race theory, social justice, diversity, equity, and multiculturalism. There are few, however, with expertise in higher education administration, a problem given the increasing student interest in the Student Affairs emphasis.

Seven of 11 tenure track and clinical faculty are women. The faculty is racially diverse; currently 27% are faculty of color (2 Latino, 1 Chinese American, and 8 Caucasian,); the department anticipates the arrival, in the 2009-2010 academic year, of a senior tenured faculty member who is African-American.
**Students**

The department currently has 146 graduate students enrolled: 74 in the master’s programs, 39 Ph.D. students and 33 Ed.D. students. Most students are working professionals and thus are part-time. The department does offer some graduate assistantships with tuition waivers, scholarships, and two fellowships.

There are few students of color in the K-12 master’s programs, reflecting the lack of diversity in the state’s school districts. The department has some targeted recruitment strategies for these programs, where a faculty member is charged with actively seeking out women and teachers of color to interest them in the department. Other emphases in the department are more successful in recruiting a diverse student body. Approximately 30% of the students overall are students of color, and 53% are women. Among Ph.D. students 4 of 7 first year students are students of color, and 44% of the first year cohort in the Higher Education master’s program are students of color.

The department has three off-campus satellite sites, a distance program at the Dixie site in St. George, and another program for rural school districts in Price, to serve outreach students.

**Curriculum**

The department offers a large number of degree programs relative to the size and availability of the faculty. External reviewers found the curriculum to be sufficiently broad and comparable to the curricula of other leading programs in the field. Some concern was voiced that courses offering a general orientation to leadership and governance were lacking. Social justice issues are threaded throughout the curriculum, and the robust social justice curriculum and research agenda were praised by reviewers. However, reviewers also noted concerns about classroom and group dynamics that need to be addressed in order to allow for fruitful discussion about social justice policy and its implications in education and leadership.

Some programs, such as the K-12 Administration and Teacher Leadership, face some competition from other institutions in the state. The Student Affairs emphasis does not and has grown substantially, in part because of recruitment, demand, and assistantships provided by the University’s Office of Student Affairs. The distance cohort in southern Utah is aimed at recruiting for the K-12 programs.

The department has made good progress in developing distinctions between the practice-oriented Ed.D. and the research-oriented Ph.D., and is making efforts to ensure that the Ed.D. program is relevant for practice-focused students. Additional efforts were suggested to fully differentiate these programs.
Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

The department tracks information on student admissions, enrollment by program area, performance assessments, completion rates, and time-to-degree. Plans to develop assessment processes for various competency outcome measures, required in accreditation processes, have been slowed by faculty turnover and search processes. Master’s students in all programs appear to be making timely progress toward degree completion. The completion rate for Ph.D. students is relatively low at 25% and the time to completion tends to be long, reflecting the fact that most students are working full-time. The Ed.D. program has a higher completion rate than the Ph.D. students but the time-to-degree nonetheless reflects the full-time employment of most students. Graduates are appropriately employed in their respective fields.

Facilities and Resources

Long-time senior faculty have experienced salary compression, and summer salary support is threatened in the current budget climate. This may force more reliance on adjuncts, which in turn may have adverse effects on the quality of courses (in respect to the research expertise that students value in regular faculty). There are insufficient resources for adequate stipend support to enable students to pursue their degrees on a full-time basis or to facilitate competitive recruitment.

The current physical facility is inadequate, but space has been allocated for the UEPC elsewhere. A new College of Education facility is being planned and fundraising is underway.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The department is consistently ranked as an outstanding one in the U.S. and has national visibility and reputation for excellence.

2. Department faculty have high research productivity, teaching awards, national recognition, and a commitment to mentoring junior faculty. Shared leadership among senior faculty has provided time for scholarship for junior faculty.

3. The leadership of the department chair is specifically commended for support, responsiveness, and commitment.

4. The new master’s program in Student Affairs is innovative, responsive to previous reviews, and will fill needs in higher education. The cooperation with the University’s office of student affairs is commendable.

5. The department is commended for its laudable social justice focus and commitment to increasing ethnic diversity. These core values permeate classes, research hiring, and recruitment.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Department should develop a strategic plan to address future additional budget cuts, the low enrollment in the Teacher Leadership program, funding for doctoral students, and the need for sufficient faculty to provide necessary breadth in the Higher Education programs.

2. The Department should continue its efforts to develop assessment processes for competency outcome goals for all programs and develop appropriate measures or indicators of goal accomplishments, including the final integrative papers.

3. The department should examine the issue of faculty workloads, particularly in light of the loss of faculty to central University positions. Curricular offerings could be evaluated to see whether course content in leadership, governance, and administration might be co-taught in other departments and colleges, which might help alleviate faculty workloads.

4. The department should strengthen its laudable focus on social justice by ensuring opportunities for robust but sometimes contentious discourse.

5. The department should examine its two doctoral programs to ensure that the distinction between practice- and research- oriented doctorates is clear and ensure that students are advised into the appropriate program for their interests. This evaluation should include examination of the time-to-degree and completion rate for Ph.D. students and developing a plan for improving this experience.

ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW

1. The department chair, Dr. Pounder, has resigned and an interim department chair is being sought from within the faculty.

2. A faculty retreat has been planned to consider necessary conditions for success for Ph.D. students.

3. A new senior faculty hire will target increasing enrollment in the Teacher Leadership program.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council

Patricia Murphy (Chair), Nursing
Ann Marie Breznay, Marriott Library
Paolo Gondolo, Physics
Memorandum of Understanding  
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy  
Graduate Council Review 2008-2009

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on August 11, 2009, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy (ELP). David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Michael L. Hardman, Dean of the College of Education; David J. Sperry, Interim Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy; Charles A. Wight, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on May 26, 2009. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1:** The department should develop a strategic plan to address future additional budget cuts, the low enrollment in the Teacher Leadership program, funding for doctoral students, and the need for sufficient faculty to provide necessary breadth in the Higher Education programs.

The department has drafted a budget reduction plan in anticipation of reductions in funding for the 2010-2011 academic year. With regard to Teacher Leadership program enrollments, the chair reports that a new faculty member has accepted the task of recruitment and enrollment for this program. It is anticipated that the program will eventually be highly subscribed; however, if viable enrollments are not attained the department will consider closing the program. Funding for Ph.D. students is a particular challenge in this department. The typical student is employed full-time and is unlikely to accept a stipend that pays approximately one-quarter to one-third of his or her current salary. That circumstance notwithstanding, the department recognizes the need to increase the number of teaching and research assistantships available to doctoral students. The dean is considering reallocation of ELP’s budget to support additional stipends. The dean is also creating a grant incentive program to seed efforts to gain external funding. Finally, with regard to the need for additional faculty in the Higher Education programs, the department will search for one new faculty member in the Higher Education area during the 2009-2010 academic year and hopes, pending budgetary constraints, to fill a second position in the next year or two.

**Recommendation 2:** The department should continue its efforts to develop assessment processes for competency outcome goals for all programs and develop appropriate measures or indicators of goal accomplishments, including the final integrative papers.

The chair will include a discussion of this issue at the department’s fall retreat and provide a plan by the end of the Fall ’09 semester. At present, the department collects most of the data required to assess its programs but must identify additional data as well as establish a process for using the data to inform action.
Recommendation 3: The department should examine the issue of faculty workloads, particularly in light of the loss of faculty to central University positions. Curricular offerings could be evaluated to see whether certain content in leadership, governance, and administration might be available in other departments and colleges, which might help alleviate faculty workloads.

At present only one faculty member serves in central administration, and thus the chair does not view out-of-department service as an issue. The chair identifies the major issue in workload equity as stemming from understaffing in the Higher Education program. The addition of faculty in this area (see Recommendation 1) should alleviate workload issues in the department.

Recommendation 4: The department should strengthen its laudable focus on social justice by ensuring opportunities for robust but sometimes contentious discourse.

The faculty is committed to the social justice focus. The chair plans to hold discussions with faculty concerning ways of maintaining an open climate in the classroom.

Recommendation 5: The department should examine its two doctoral programs to ensure that the distinction between practice- and research-oriented doctorates is clear and ensure that students are advised into the appropriate program for their interests. This evaluation should include examination of the time-to-degree for Ph.D. students and developing a plan for improving this experience.

The department has instituted a capstone project requirement for Ed.D. students that differs significantly in format and content from a Ph.D. dissertation. Capstone projects provide students with opportunities to apply leadership and inquiry knowledge and skills to problems of practice or policy issues. They include a written report and an oral presentation. Capstone projects may be a(n): a) Policy Report or Inquiry Brief, b) Program or Policy Evaluation, c) Implementation Project, or d) School or Organizational Improvement Plan. Department faculty are in discussions to more precisely define the elements of a legitimate capstone experience.

This memorandum of understanding is to be followed by annual letters of progress from the chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy to the Dean of the Graduate School. Letters will be submitted each year until all of the actions described in the preceding paragraphs have been completed.

David W. Pershing  
Michael L. Hardman  
David J. Sperry  
Charles A. Wight  
Frederick Rhodewalt

Charles A. Wight  
Dean, The Graduate School  
August 19, 2009
### College of Education: Educational Leadership & Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Headcount - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Expenditures - Source: OBIA 'B' tables, Updated annually during Spring term.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (Department)</td>
<td>$4,005</td>
<td>$3,753</td>
<td>$3,740</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$136,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (College)</td>
<td>$208,512</td>
<td>$94,226</td>
<td>$39,424</td>
<td>$160,345</td>
<td>$139,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Credit Hours (Budget Model) - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Summer term.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Graduate</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>2,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course / Instructor Evaluations - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Courses</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Instructors</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Courses</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructors</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolled Majors - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Majors</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Majors (Including Intermediate)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees Awarded - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 26, 2009

David W. Pershing  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
205 Park Building  
Campus  

RE: Graduate Council Review  
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Dear Vice President Pershing:

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

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

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight  
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Marc Bodson, Chair, Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Richard B. Brown, Dean, College of Engineering  

Approved  
Please forward  
9/3/09
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering.

The external reviewers were:

Mark Horowitz, Ph.D.
Professor, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
Stanford University

George Haddad, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
University of Michigan

Constantine A. Balanis, Ph.D.
Professor, Electrical Engineering
Arizona State University

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Dwayne Westenskow, Ph.D.
Professor, Dept. of Anesthesiology

Z. Valentine Vardeny, Ph.D.
Distinguished Professor, Dept. of Physics

Richard Forster, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Dept. of Geography

This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study report submitted by the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, the reports of the external and internal review committees, and comments by the Chair of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Dean of the College of Engineering.
DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) Department is in the College of Engineering. At the undergraduate level, the department offers B.S. degrees in Electrical Engineering or Computer Engineering. The program in Computer Engineering is jointly offered with the School of Computing. At the graduate level, the department offers a Ph.D. program in Electrical Engineering; a research-oriented M.S. degree that requires the students to write a thesis; a non-thesis M.S., degree; a non-thesis Master of Engineering (M.E.) degree; and a course-only Degree of Electrical Engineer (E.E.). Combined B.S./M.S. and B.S./M.E. programs are also offered.

The ECE Department is currently 65th in national ranking, up from 73rd last year, but down from a best ranking of 51st within the past 5 years. Increasing national ranking to a “top 40” research department will require an effective strategic plan. Further capitalizing on opportunities, such as the USTAR initiative, fostering a strong research culture and diversifying research revenue will aid development towards this goal.

Faculty

The Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering comprises 22 regular, tenure-track faculty including 11 full professors, 5 associate professors and 6 assistant professors. These 22 faculty comprise 18.3 FTE. This represents a significant expansion over the last 5 years, including 10 new hires compared to only 2 faculty that retired or left the program. The department also includes 19 auxiliary, non-tenure faculty. Of the total faculty, there are 3 women and one faculty with minority origin. Aims to increase low female and minority representation have included advertising positions in minority outlets and retaining a female faculty member on the recruiting committee at all times.

The faculty research areas are divided into four groups: Microwave and Optics, Electronics and Semiconductor Devices, Signals and Systems, and Computer and Digital Design. Beyond these four basic groups, Power Systems has been identified as a resurgent area by both faculty and students. The department chair has already begun to address this need by successful fundraising with industrial partners and targeting a new hire in this field.

Recent faculty hires have been excellent. The addition of very productive young faculty has tripled the department research funding. The addition of further USTAR faculty members will likely continue this trend. Developing a strong research culture that broadens across the entire faculty would be desirable.

The faculty has a strong commitment to teaching, although a model to further revise teaching load based on research load should be considered. The formalized mentoring program for young faculty is a model that could serve as a successful example to other departments. Overall, the department chair has succeeded in creating an excellent departmental environment.
Faculty are extremely content, and there is a real sense of “team” and collegiality among faculty, staff, and students.

**Students**

 Approximately 146 graduate students and 275 undergraduate students are currently enrolled in the ECE program. There is concern regarding declining undergraduate enrollment and difficulty recruiting graduate students. Both of these are national issues. The self-study gives no details of the composition of this student body with regard to sex or minority status. Diversity was simply described as low.

**Undergraduate**

 Undergraduate student advising is excellent due to a staff member specifically assigned to this role, and consequently, there is very high student satisfaction with the undergraduate program.

 A faculty member in the department leads the effort towards undergraduate recruitment for the entire College of Engineering, including outreach and diversity efforts. For example, visits to MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement) groups in high schools are conducted that particularly focus on increasing the number of underserved ethnic minority and all female students who may pursue careers in mathematics, engineering, and science areas. Nonetheless, diversity remains low.

**Graduate**

 The number of U.S. applicants is very small and the foreign application pool is shrinking. Decrease in foreign students is a national trend due to increased opportunities in home countries and increased difficulty with student visas.

 A limited number of graduate fellowships exist. Additionally, teaching and research assistantships exist, based on excellence as ranked by the department’s Graduate Committee. There are not enough TA fellowships (~36/year) to provide support of all new graduate students during their freshman year. RA positions are available, but are less well suited for new graduate students who have heavier class loads and are not well-acquainted with the faculty to be able to appropriately match expertise and interests. Student stipends are not standardized.

**Curriculum and Programs of Study**

 The faculty are clearly diligent at reviewing and revising their labs and courses, and being available to help students. This effort was reflected by positive student comments regarding the curricula.
Undergraduate

The undergraduate curriculum for the B.S. in Electrical Engineering or Computer Engineering requires 122 total credit hours. The curricula are quite rigid, making it difficult for students to graduate in 4 years unless they know they will major in ECE when they enter as a freshman. In addition, the freshman classes for ECE and Computer Science are not the same, despite the fact that the B.S. in Computer Engineering is jointly offered with the School of Computing, which appears suboptimal.

Graduate

The graduate curricula require 32 course credit hours for the M.S. and M.E. degrees, 62 credit hours for the E.E., and 42 course credit hours for the Ph.D. Degree requirements for the M.S. (thesis option) and Ph.D. have been recently revised. The non-thesis Master of Engineering (M.E.) degree allows students to move more efficiently toward Ph.D.s and better serves the continuing education needs of the engineering workforce. In general, the graduate students appear to appreciate these changes.

Programs Effectiveness –Outcomes Assessment

The ECE department uses a variety of surveys and sources on a yearly basis to assess program effectiveness and outcomes and to assign departmental action items to address issues arising. Sources of information include: faculty advisors who work with students on a one-on-one basis; summaries of exit surveys; exit group discussion; responses to Alumni surveys; and employment/employer satisfaction measures. Individual issues and other summaries are passed to the relevant committee that formulates new action items which are discussed at departmental faculty meetings. In line with new University policy, mid-program assessments have also now been implemented.

A significant majority of the students who achieve ECE major status eventually graduate. Slow progress through the program is contributed to the fact that a large portion of the students work and several take leave for religious reasons.

Facilities and Resources

The department is mainly housed in the Merrill Engineering Building. The offices for two of the new hires are in the adjacent Warnock building, although there is no laboratory space for them there. At this time there are no particular space issues. However, if the department is successful in further hires, space will become an issue. Construction of the Sorensen Building, which will house a number of the USTAR faculty, will start soon and may satisfy future need for space for hires brought in via the USTAR initiative.
Department operations are underfunded. There is currently no support for proposal preparation, research accounting, etc. To increase national ranking the department will need to develop more research funding and the chair has little ability to move the department in new directions without a larger operations budget. The lack of funds appears to be partly due to an earlier budget cut and a departmental decision to remove operations funds as a budget line-item and to use money from open lines to fund their operations budget. Some support for financial administrative staff can be gained from the college (50% of salary and benefits of relevant staff) in a college-wide effort to encourage research activities. However, the dean has suggested that ECE may need to give up an open line to regenerate the required operating budget.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The chair has done a great job managing the department. The faculty, staff and students are all happy with the environment in the department. The faculty/staff working relationship is excellent.

2. The formalized mentoring program for young faculty is a model that could serve as a successful example to other departments.

3. The faculty has grown from 12.3 to 18.3 FTE over the past 5 years. Recent faculty hires through the USTAR initiative have been very impressive. Three new faculty are currently funded by USTAR. A fourth is anticipated.

4. Research funding has increased from $1.3M to $4.6M over the past 5 years, in large part due to new hires.

5. The department has a strong commitment to teaching and is extremely responsive to feedback from students. There is very high student satisfaction with both the undergraduate and graduate programs.

6. Student advising is excellent.

7. The department has spent effort to improve the diversity of its student body by creating new programs that have received outside funding for diversity outreach recruitment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Hire a chair who can help broaden the research culture in the department. Hiring an external chair could bring the necessary new perspective; however, it is also important that the strong sense of community in this department is not compromised.

2. Develop a strategic plan with specific goals to help move the department up in national ranking. Areas of weakness and strength that respectively increase and decrease the
metrics used for ranking score should be identified and tracked. An advisory committee of industrialists and/or academics should be put in place.

3. Improve the diversity of the student body and the faculty. Mechanisms have been put in place to increase diversity in the student body, however, it is unclear whether these efforts are being successful (no details given). The department, in conjunction with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity, should formulate and implement efforts to recruit women and minority faculty members and students in order to achieve appropriate diversity. The use of annual reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the department to work effectively toward this objective.

4. Continue the positive trajectory in research funding. Funding should come from a broader base of the faculty. Currently one faculty member brings in about one half of all the research funds.

5. Continue efforts to increase undergraduate and graduate recruiting.

6. Consider revision of the first year undergraduate curricula to better coordinate across Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering, with other programs in the college and in related fields. This will allow for a broader group of engineering freshmen that can major in ECE, although this will require coordination at the college level. First year requirements for Computer Engineering and Computer Science should be more aligned.

7. Re-establish a department operations budget. There is a need for a financial administrator (50% of which could be funded by the College), increased first-year fellowship funds, and discretionary funds to provide a way to create and seed new programs that can build the department’s stature. Standardizing graduate RA rates should be considered.

**ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW**

1. The department developed a new poster aimed at continuing efforts to improve graduate recruiting, and participated in the graduate student visitation day organized by the college.

2. The department is currently reviewing applications for a faculty position in Power Systems. The faculty have voted to extend an offer to a strong candidate. An introductory course in this area was developed and taught Fall 2008. Plans are to continue and broaden this new emphasis area.

3. A mechanism is in place for the college to fund 50% of necessary financial administrative staff. The dean is prepared to share the support of more financial administrators as the department’s needs grow.
4. Negotiations are underway with a strong external candidate for chair of the department. The candidate has broad support among the faculty.

5. New ranking (announced end of April 2009) ranks the department at 57.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council:

Nicola Camp (Chair), Biomedical Informatics
Paolo Gondolo, Physics
Kevin Rathunde, Family and Consumer Studies
Stephanie Richardson, Nursing (Undergraduate Council Representative)
July 6, 2009, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Richard B. Brown, Dean of the College of Engineering; Marc Bodson, Chair of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering; Charles A. Wight, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on May 26, 2009. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1:** Hire a chair who can help broaden the research culture in the department. Hiring an external chair could bring the necessary new perspective; however, it is also important that the strong sense of community in this department is not compromised.

The Dean of the College of Engineering reports that he is in negotiations with an outside chair candidate and is optimistic that this person will accept his offer and be in place for the beginning of Fall semester 2009.

**Recommendation 2:** Develop a strategic plan with specific goals to help move the department up in national ranking. Areas of weakness and strength that respectively increase and decrease the metrics used for ranking score should be identified and tracked. An advisory committee of industrialists and/or academics should be put in place.

The Department intends to begin the planning process during Fall semester 2009 after the new chair is in place. The new strategic plan will be submitted to the Graduate School by June 30, 2010. It is noted that the most recent US News and World Report ranking rates the Department 57th, up from 73rd in 2006.

**Recommendation 3:** Improve the diversity of the student body and the faculty. Mechanisms have been put in place to increase diversity in the student body; however, it is unclear whether these efforts are being successful (no details given). The department, in conjunction with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity, should continue to formulate and implement efforts to recruit women and minority faculty members and students in order to achieve appropriate diversity. The use of annual reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the department to continue to work toward this objective.
Led by Professor Cynthia Furse from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, the College of Engineering is engaging in an NIH-supported program aimed at increasing participation by underrepresented minorities and women at both undergraduate and graduate levels. The Department is collecting data on women and minorities for both undergraduate and graduate enrollments in order to have benchmarks against which to compare the efficacy of their recruitment and retention programs.

**Recommendation 4: Continue the positive trajectory in research funding.** Funding should come from a broader base of the faculty. Currently one faculty member brings in about one half of all the research funds.

The Department is broadening faculty participation research funding activities. In addition, the Department has hired several new faculty who will bring funding with them. It is noted that even without the one high fund-producing faculty member, the Department has achieved a 50% increase in research funding over the past five years.

**Recommendation 5: Continue efforts to increase undergraduate and graduate recruiting.**

The Department and College are undertaking several efforts to increase undergraduate and graduate applications and recruits. In combination with Professor Furse’s grant mentioned in Recommendation 3, the College has begun an initiative to increase graduate applications. They have generated and distributed advertising literature and have sponsored a campus visitation day. At the undergraduate level, the College provides undergraduate scholarship matches to incentive departmental recruiting. The Department has created a new poster to publicize their program. The chair reports that the Department has recently seen an increase in the quality if not quantity of graduate applications.

**Recommendation 6: Consider revision of the first year undergraduate curricula to better coordinate across Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering, with other programs in the college and in related fields.** This will allow for a broader group of engineering freshmen that can major in ECE, although this will require coordination at the college level. First year requirements for Computer Engineering and Computer Science should be more aligned.

The Dean strongly supports this recommendation and formed a committee to propose a common first-year curriculum. All first-year students now enroll in ELEAP, where they have the opportunity to learn about all subfields of engineering. At present, some departments have agreed to accept other departments’ first-year courses, while other departments are reluctant to do so. The Dean will continue to investigate options for the School of Computing and the ECE Department to share common first-year courses.
Recommendation 7: Re-establish a department operations budget. There is a need for a financial administrator (50% of which could be funded by the College), increased first-year fellowship funds, and discretionary funds to provide a way to create and seed new programs that can build the department’s stature. Standardizing graduate RA rates should be considered.

The Dean currently supports 50% of a financial administrator. The Department plans to hire a proposal development administrator who will also be supported 50% by the College. The new chair will look at the operations budget issue and consider reallocating funds for this purpose, including the option of using productivity funds for operations.

This memorandum of understanding is be followed by annual letters of progress from the chair of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering to the Dean of the Graduate School. Letters will be submitted each year until all of the actions described in the preceding paragraphs have been completed.

David W. Pershing
Richard B. Brown
Marc Bodson
Charles A. Wight
Frederick Rhodewalt

________________________________________
Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
August 26, 2009
### Department Review by Academic Year

#### College of Engineering: Electrical & Computer Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Headcount - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Research Expenditures - Source: OBIA 'B' tables, Updated annually during Spring term. | | | | |
| Research Expenditures (Department) | $2,001,498 | $1,988,648 | $3,150,732 | $3,442,240 | $4,503,135 |
| Research Expenditures (College) | $37,632,398 | $31,084,369 | $41,161,348 | $41,052,044 | $44,256,824 |

| Student Credit Hours (Budget Model) - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Summer term. | | | | |
| Lower Division | 1,617 | 1,529 | 1,463 | 1,370 | 1,294 |
| Upper Division | 2,984 | 3,568 | 3,999 | 2,927 | 2,995 |
| Total Undergraduate | 4,601 | 5,097 | 5,461 | 4,297 | 4,289 |
| Basic Graduate | 1,644 | 1,138 | 1,043 | 1,042 | 1,136 |
| Advanced Graduate | 746 | 971 | 1,302 | 978 | 1,153 |
| Total Graduate | 2,390 | 2,109 | 2,345 | 2,020 | 2,289 |

| Course / Instructor Evaluations - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term. | | | | |
| Undergraduate Courses | 4.81 | 4.77 | 4.81 | 4.83 | NA |
| Undergraduate Instructors | 4.92 | 4.94 | 4.96 | 5.01 | NA |
| Graduate Courses | 4.80 | 4.99 | 4.51 | 4.87 | NA |
| Graduate Instructors | 5.07 | 5.22 | 4.73 | 5.01 | NA |

| Enrolled Majors - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term. | | | | |
| Pre-Majors | 173 | 157 | 133 | 125 | 103 |
| Full Majors (including Intermediate) | 206 | 202 | 196 | 171 | 153 |
| Master's | 147 | 92 | 77 | 73 | 76 |
| Doctoral | 29 | 36 | 44 | 54 | 61 |

| Degrees Awarded - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term. | | | | |
| Bachelor's | 0 | 0 | 3 | 66 | 66 |
| Master's | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 40 |
| Doctoral | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 |
September 3, 2009

A. Lorris Betz
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
5th Floor, Clinical Neurosciences Center
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Human Genetics

Dear Vice President Betz:

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

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

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Mark F. Leppert, Chair, Department of Human Genetics
David J. Bjorkman, Dean, School of Medicine
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Human Genetics.

The External Review Committee included:

   Dennis Drayna, Ph.D.
   National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders
   National Institutes of Health

   Lee Niswander, Ph.D.
   Department of Pediatrics
   University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center

   Terry Orr-Weaver, Ph.D.
   Whitehead Institute
   Department of Biology
   Massachusetts Institute of Technology

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

   Dennis O'Rourke
   Professor, Department of Anthropology

   David Blair
   Professor, Department of Biology

   Kenneth Horch
   Professor, Department of Bioengineering

This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study report submitted by the Department of Human Genetics, the results of the external and internal review committees, and comments from Dr. Mark Leppert, Co-Chair of the Department of Medical Genetics, and Dr. David Bjorkman, Dean, School of Medicine.
DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Department of Human Genetics in the School of Medicine, founded in 1985, aims to provide outstanding graduate training in genetics, with special emphasis on human and developmental genetics. Graduate study in the Human Genetics Department originates with the Molecular Biology Graduate Program, which coordinates recruiting and admissions, and provides the first year of graduate education. After that initial year, students select their thesis lab and, should they choose to work with a Human Genetics faculty member, join the department.

After the first year of graduate study in the Molecular Biology program, students move on to a series of graduate courses for advanced graduate students, a teaching assistantship, passing the Ph.D. preliminary exam, and demonstrating their ability in independent scientific research. A Master's degree option is available for students who complete only the first year and complete a qualifying exam.

Faculty

The Human Genetics Department includes 19 tenure-track faculty, 6 non-tenure research faculty, and 8 adjunct faculty members. Of the tenure-track faculty, 5 are Assistant Professors, 6 Associate Professors, 5 full Professors, and 3 are Distinguished Professors. Seven of this group have been hired within the past five years. There are 14 male and 5 female faculty members and no minority faculty. The non-tenure track and adjunct faculty consist of 10 males, 4 females, and no minorities. The faculty overall is highly respected and highly visible. The faculty is actively engaged in research, publishes widely, and has been successful in obtaining outside funding including prestigious Pew and Searle Scholar awards and RO1 awards from NIH, and Dr. Mario Capecchi's Nobel Prize.

Though new faculty hires have strengthened an already high quality faculty, since the last review in 2000 the department has not successfully recruited new faculty in the area of human genetics, a traditional strength of the department. The faculty in place are seen by students as enthusiastic and supportive.

Students

In 2007-2008, the department awarded five master's degrees and five Ph.D. degrees. From 1998-2002, approximately a dozen doctorates were awarded annually. Reviewers have noted, however, a decline in both the number of graduate students and the funding available to them. The department guarantees student support for a maximum of six years, through research grants and funding to attend scientific meetings. Students are expected to apply for fellowships and grants, in part to train them to think of their projects in terms of fundable research projects.

Students generally are positive about the department, noting its enthusiastic faculty, strong research, and highly successful graduate venues such as the departmental research-in-progress talks and journal club.
Of the 20 students currently in the program, only five are women. The department self-study reports a concerted effort in programs to recruit individuals from minority or underrepresented programs. The department additionally supports efforts of the Graduate School and the School of Medicine to recruit, and to bring underrepresented students into research laboratories to engage students and encourage their interest in pursuing careers in the biomedical sciences.

Curriculum

The first year of study is administered through the Molecular Biology program of core courses, which provide an overview of human genetics approaches and tools. Following the initial year, students join a laboratory and the department. Human Genetics Department students then complete additional coursework and Advanced Special Topics courses selected, in consultation with their faculty mentors and supervisory committees, from a variety of offerings. Some concerns were raised by both internal and external committees about the "divide" between human and developmental genetics, and the impact of such on availability of courses for students and subsequent balance and integration in terms of both curriculum and research opportunities.

Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

The department defines one measure of student success as the ability of graduates to continue in successful scientific careers after leaving the University. Other benchmarks such as peer-reviewed publications or average time to complete the Ph.D. are not noted, nor are data available on the number of students who leave the department prior to completion of the Ph.D.

Facilities and Resources

The department occupies four floors of the Eccles Institute of Human Genetics research building, which houses research labs, offices, instrument and procedure rooms and atrium space used by students for study and interaction with others in an informal setting. The department has ready access to classroom and seminar rooms, a computer lab and 16 communal core facilities such as robotics and electron microscope facilities.

Actions Taken Since the Last Review

Internal reviewers note that the department deserves commendation for their substantive response to the suggestions of the last graduate council review. The department has appointed permanent co-chairs, hired additional new faculty, improved communication and linkages with other relevant programs, and added or modified graduate course offerings.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The department has made significant progress in addressing and implementing the recommendations received during its last Graduate Council review.
2. The department has excellent co-chairs, a very strong faculty of active researchers, and recruiting efforts that have brought in new young developmental genetics faculty to strengthen an already high quality faculty.

3. Department morale is very high. Graduate student satisfaction is high. The productive faculty has received numerous awards for research and teaching.

4. The department has a framework of multiple collaborations with, for example, clinical departments and with the Molecular Biology Program graduate program. Access to new technologies is provided through School of Medicine cores, an administrative structure which provides increased efficiency while reducing departmental costs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Faculty Recruitment: Acknowledging the department's efforts to date, continue to focus on faculty recruitment, particularly in the area of human genetics, to build on the department's long-standing reputation as a national center of genetics research.

2. Human/Developmental Genetics: Make efforts to address the perceived gap between developmental and human genetics, which, though more clear among the faculty, results particularly in graduate student confusion. Create a strategic plan to assess the direction of the department's programs and research and the long-term balance between human and developmental genetics.

3. Graduate Students: Focus attention on graduate student recruitment, increasing departmental funds available for training students, identifying additional sources of stable funding for graduate students, and providing better tools and training for teaching assistants.

4. Diversity: The Department should formulate and implement efforts to recruit minority and female faculty and students to achieve appropriate diversity among its body. The Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity is committed to this goal and may provide useful ideas and strategies in this regard. The use of annual progress reports to the Graduate School should be considered as a way to encourage the department to work effectively towards this goal.

ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW

1. The department has worked on creating meaningful scientific relationships between research and clinical faculty.

2. Adjunct faculty with expertise in human genetics has been added to help with teaching.

3. A new Human Genetics Interest group has been established to highlight research in human genetics.
4. The School of Medicine is working diligently to recruit female faculty members throughout the School.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council

Ann Marie Breznay (Chair), Marriott Library
John McDonnell, Special Education
Robert Young, Architecture + Planning
Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Human Genetics
Graduate Council Review 2007-2008

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on June 30, 2009, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Human Genetics. A. Lorris Betz, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; David J. Bjorkman, Dean of the School of Medicine; Mark F. Leppert, Chair of the Department of Human Genetics; David S. Chapman, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on April 27, 2009. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1: Faculty Recruitment:** Acknowledging the department’s efforts to date, continue to focus on faculty recruitment, particularly in the area of human genetics, to build on the department’s long-standing reputation as a national center of genetics research.

The Department’s efforts to recruit faculty into the human genetics area have been met with mixed success. The chair reports that over the past few years they have made offers to three candidates in the human genetics area and were successful in recruiting only one. However, the Department was successful in hiring three adjunct faculty who can provide teaching in the human genetics track. In addition, they have assisted other departments within the School of Medicine with recruiting human geneticists. The chair states that the boundaries between human genetics and developmental have blurred as the field advances. For example, the Department currently has made offers to two developmental geneticists, one who studies zebra fish and melanoma and the other who conducts research on mouse models of early heart disease. The Department contends that a more appropriate distinction is between basic and translational and/or disease genetics. The Department has the goal of increasing the developmental genetics faculty’s attentiveness to clinical research and to increase ties to researchers working in clinical areas.

**Recommendation 2: Human/Developmental Genetics:** Make efforts to address the perceived gap between developmental and human genetics, which, though more clear among the faculty, results particularly in graduate student confusion. Create a strategic plan to assess the direction of the department’s programs and research and the long-term balance between human and developmental genetics.

As stated in the response to Recommendation 1, the Department believes that the distinction between human and developmental genetics is not as meaningful as is the distinction between basic and applied disease focused research. The effort will be to provide more emphasis on the latter.
Recommendation 3: Graduate Students: Focus attention on graduate student recruitment, increasing departmental funds available for training students, identifying additional sources of stable funding for graduate students, and providing better tools and training for teaching assistants.

Three efforts are being undertaken with regard to this recommendation: 1) the Department has improved its website with the intent of generating more graduate applications, 2) it has included graduate student stipends in its development efforts, and 3) the Graduate School will coordinate Directors of Graduate Studies from the six programs that receive their students through the Combined Program in Molecular Biology to examine the adequacy of this program as a feeder source.

Recommendation 4: Diversity: The Department should formulate and implement efforts to recruit minority and female faculty and students to achieve appropriate diversity among its body. The Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity is committed to this goal and may provide useful ideas and strategies in this regard. The use of annual progress reports to the Graduate School should be considered as a way to encourage the department to work effectively towards this goal.

The Department reports that progress in this area has been slow because of the relatively few women and underrepresented minorities with appropriate training. Although the Department has made some progress with regard to the hiring of women faculty (in 2009, 5 of 19 tenure track faculty are women compared to [need number] of 13 in 2001, the date of the last review), the department remains committed to using all available resources to increase gender and minority representation in their faculty and student applicant pools. The School of Medicine is working diligently to remove institutional barriers to the hiring and retention of women and minority faculty.

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

A. Lorris Betz
David J. Bjorkman
Mark F. Leppert
David S. Chapman
Frederick Rhodewalt

David S. Chapman
Assoc. V.P. for Graduate Studies
Dean, The Graduate School
September 3, 2009
August 31, 2009

David W. Pershing
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
205 Park Building
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Linguistics

Dear Vice President Pershing:

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

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

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Edward J. Rubin, Chair, Department of Linguistics
    Robert D. Newman, Dean, College of Humanities
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Linguistics.

The external reviewers were:

Silvina Montrul, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Dept. of Linguistics and Dept. of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Joe Pater, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Dept. of Linguistics
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Rex A. Sprouse, Ph.D.
Professor, Dept. of Second Language Studies and Dept. of Germanic Studies
Indiana University

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Lori Kowaleski-Jones
Associate Professor, Dept. of Family and Consumer Studies

Peregrine Schwartz-Shea
Professor, Dept. of Political Science

Bruce L. Smith
Professor, Dept. of Communication Sciences and Disorders

This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study report submitted by the Department of Linguistics, the results of the external and internal review committees, and comments from Professor Edward Rubin, Chair of the Department of Linguistics.
DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

From its beginning in 1963 as a program created in cooperation with the departments of English, Anthropology, and Languages, the Department of Linguistics, formally started in 1991, now offers the B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees, two minors (in Linguistics and ESL Teaching) and two Certificates (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages and a Certificate in the Revitalization of Endangered Languages and Cultures). The department provides significant support and courses to other programs, notably Cognitive Science, International Studies, the Utah ESL Dual (K-12) Certification for public school teachers, and the Conditional Admission program for international students. It engages in significant outreach efforts on American Indian reservations and around the world, and supports the College of Humanities' Center for American Indian Languages (CAIL) in its efforts.

Faculty

The Linguistics Department consists of 9.5 FTE tenure-track faculty in 12 tenured/tenure-track positions, plus one non tenure-track lecturer. The faculty is 50% male, 50% female, with one faculty member identifying as Hispanic. In a recent faculty search, the department made an effort to increase the number of applicants from underrepresented populations. Faculty teaching and research covers a diverse list of areas within a relatively small number of faculty, and the challenge of determining future growth areas has caused some degree of tension and disagreement among the faculty. Additional faculty in phonology and syntax would strengthen core programs in linguistics as well as position potential partnerships on campus; strengthening the applied linguistics area would ensure that programs such as the endangered language emphasis within the Center for American Indian Languages (CAIL) would continue to develop. While acknowledging the rich possibilities for future directions, the faculty agreed to focus on phonology in its next hire, in part to free other faculty to focus more in applied linguistics areas. However, funds committed to previous hires, coupled with the current weak fundraising environment, means the department is somewhat hampered in its ability to move forward in either area. Philosophical differences about the future of the department among some faculty members hamper the overall group's ability to move forward.

Students

The department currently has 43 undergraduate majors, 19 pre-majors, 31 master's, and 17 doctoral students. Undergraduate students have the opportunity to work as research assistants at the CAIL to gain hands-on experience working with linguistic data and to promote an interest in a career in linguistics. Applied Linguistics graduate students express satisfaction with the program and, in particular, the teaching opportunities in both the undergraduate program and in courses taught abroad; however, General/Theoretical Linguistics graduate students have more limited opportunities. Both undergraduate and graduate students express satisfaction with the program and are positive about their experiences within the department. A newly developed
Graduate Handbook was in part completed to assist students in navigating through the program. In general, students do not feel they are adversely affected by faculty disagreements.

Curriculum

Reviewers noted the rich array of linguistics courses offered given the relatively small size of the department. They also noted as a serious flaw, however, the fact that many courses were offered in tandem: the same course, in the same session, but differently numbered for undergraduates and graduate students. External reviewers were concerned with the number of distinct degree programs at the M.A. level, fearing that this would lead to overspecialization at the M.A. level. There are concerns that both populations are underserved by this approach.

Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

The department gathers data on degree completion and placement and conducts exit interviews with its undergraduate majors. Since the doctoral program is so new—only one student has graduated from it as of yet—no data are available. The department is now assessing its delivery of ESL and TESOL programs to determine whether these generate a reasonable amount of credit hours. Outcomes in general, however, show a student population which is satisfied with the program, the teaching, and their learning.

Facilities and Resources

The department still does not have sufficient space to house everyone. Though most of the faculty is housed in LNCO, others still are housed in other areas on campus. The separation makes it particularly difficult for graduate students to be able to interact as a community of learners.

The number of staff has not increased over time, despite the steady growth of programs, grants, and other tasks, leading to an overworked staff.

The operating budget is insufficient for current activities; its reserves are exhausted, and current budget realities mean additional infusions from either the college or the university are increasingly unlikely. As a result, the faculty is actively engaged in seeking additional sources of funding through online course development and contracts and collaborations, as well as through including additional funding requests in outside proposal applications.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The chair has articulated a clear vision and direction for the department, and has engaged faculty in serious discussion about the future.
2. Recent hires have brought additional strength and prestige to a department which already has faculty with international reputations within their subdisciplines.

3. The department engages undergraduate and graduate students in research efforts through CAIL, and supports this institution's important mission.

4. The department has added a Ph.D. program, as recommended in its previous Graduate Council Review.

5. Students at all levels report a high degree of satisfaction with their training and education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The faculty and chair should work together to further define and clarify a unified vision for future direction of the department's programs. As part of this, the department should evaluate its curriculum to focus course offerings, graduate assistantships, and areas of emphasis.

2. The department should work with the university to review and reduce the number of undergraduate and graduate courses in the same classroom, even if the result is fewer courses offered.

3. To further focus the department's areas of emphasis, the department should consider collaborating with the College of Education for the K-12 certification, and continue to examine offerings in other areas which might dilute the focus of the department.

4. The department must evaluate its revenues and expenses and carefully align those in support of the department's unified vision, making strategic changes as needed.

5. The department should offer no more than 2 M.A. tracks.

6. The department should continue to pursue the hiring of a new colleague in phonology, despite the current very considerable budgetary constraints,

ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW

The faculty has met and agreed to the following actions:

1. To concentrate its efforts on eliminating "twinned" classes.

2. To work to establish an equitable allocation of shared resources among all students.

3. To examine, with the College of Education, potential modifications to their joint ESL Teaching minor.
4. To continue to work toward consensus on a joint vision for the department's future, including streamlining program offerings and planning strategic faculty hires, and examining staff support challenges, while attending carefully to budget considerations.

5. To pursue a means of providing, in one M.A. Applied program, the range of specializations covered in the current three tracks

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council

- Ann Marie Breznay (Chair), Marriott Library
- Chris Lippard, Film Studies
- Sally Planalp, Communication
Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Understanding
Graduate Council Review 2008-2009

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on August 24, 2009, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Linguistics. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Robert D. Newman, Dean of the College of Humanities; Edward J. Rubin, Chair of the Department of Linguistics; Charles A. Wight, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on May 26, 2009. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1: The faculty and chair should work together to further define and clarify a unified vision for future direction of the department’s programs. As part of this, the department should evaluate its curriculum to focus course offerings, graduate assistantships, and areas of emphasis.

The department has begun to work on a strategic plan that will define its mission and direction. The discussion involves a reorganization and consolidation of areas of emphasis and a realignment of undergraduate and graduate curricula to fit the new organization of the department. Because these discussions have been contentious for the faculty in the past, the chair has brought in a facilitator who worked with the faculty at their fall retreat and who will continue to assist the department as it develops its plan over the 2009-2010 academic year.

Recommendation 2: The department should work with the university to review and reduce the number of undergraduate and graduate courses in the same classroom, even if the result is fewer courses offered.

Although the department appreciates the value of this recommendation, it is concerned about the potential adverse impacts of reduced student credit hours and funding. The chair has charged the undergraduate and graduate committees with reviewing their respective curricula and preparing a report with proposals to reduce the “twinning” of undergraduate and graduate courses. The report will be completed by the end of October 2009 and brought to the full faculty in November.

Recommendation 3: To further focus the department’s areas of emphasis, the department should consider collaborating with the College of Education for the K-12 certification, and continue to examine offerings in other areas which might dilute the focus of the department.

As a result of faculty discussions described in the response to Recommendation 1, the department has begun working to consolidate programs, with course migrating to the College of
Education. The chair reports that there is emerging agreement among the faculty on the continuation and development of three areas: General Theoretical Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, and Language Documentation/Language Revitalization. The ESL Dual (K-12) Endorsement program will be phased out in the Department of Linguistics as it moves to the College of Education.

Recommendation 4: The department must evaluate its revenues and expenses and carefully align those in support of the department’s unified vision, making strategic changes as needed.

The chair and Executive Committee have worked together to find ways to balance revenues and expenses including reorganizing staff, increasing opportunities for advanced graduate students to teach undergraduate classes, increasing graduate teaching loads from three to four courses per year (with an increase in stipends). The Executive Committee will continue to develop proposals on these issues during Fall semester 2009.

Recommendation 5: The department should offer no more than 2 M.A. tracks.

The Graduate Committee is working on a plan to phase out one track and collapse the Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Foreign Language Applied degrees into one program. The plan will address curricular changes associated with such a reorganization.

Recommendation 6: The department should continue to pursue the hiring of a new colleague in phonology, despite the current very considerable budgetary constraints.

The department will initiate a search in Fall 2009 for an assistant professor in the area of phonology. The department will attempt to increase the applicant pool with respect to diversity by advertising in appropriate venues and making direct contact with other linguistics programs. The ideal candidate will be an individual who can interface with the research programs of the current faculty.

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

David W. Pershing
Robert D. Newman
Edward J. Rubin
Charles A. Wight
Charles A. Wight
Frederick Rhodewalt

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
August 31, 2009
### Department Review by Academic Year

#### College of Humanities: Department of Linguistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Headcount - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Research Expenditures - Source: OBIA 'B' tables, Updated annually during Spring term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (Department)</td>
<td>$94,671</td>
<td>$97,195</td>
<td>$64,919</td>
<td>$155,096</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (College)</td>
<td>$348,623</td>
<td>$323,327</td>
<td>$373,885</td>
<td>$315,415</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Credit Hours (Budget Model) - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Summer term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>2,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>2,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>4,557</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td>5,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Graduate</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Course / Instructor Evaluations - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Courses</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Instructors</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Courses</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructors</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Enrolled Majors - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Majors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Majors (including Intermediate)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Degrees Awarded - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 19, 2009

David W. Pershing
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
205 Park Building
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Languages and Literature

Dear Vice President Pershing:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council's 2006 review of the Department of Languages and Literature. The Graduate School recently discovered that the approval process for this review was not completed. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Graduate Council, the Academic Profile, and the Memorandum of Understanding resulting from the review wrap-up meeting.

In order to finalize this review, I request that you forward it to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next meeting of the Senate.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Fernando Rubio, Chair, Department of Languages and Literature
Robert D. Newman, Dean, College of Humanities
The Graduate Council has completed a review of the Department of Languages and Literature. The external reviewers were:

William F. Edmiston, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures
University of South Carolina

Dagmar Lorenz, Ph.D.
Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Germanic Studies
University of Illinois at Chicago

Yasu-Hiko Tohsaku, Ph.D.
Professor
Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies
University of California at San Diego

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah was composed of the following individuals:

David Dynak, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Theatre

Edward Epstein, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Political Science

John McCullough, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Anthropology
This report of the Graduate Council’s Ad Hoc Review Committee is based on the Program Self-Study, Reports of the External and Internal Review Committees, and a response letter from the Chair of the Department of Languages and Literature.

DEPARTMENTAL PROFILE

Overview

The Department of Languages and Literature is the “largest and most diverse” department in the College of Humanities. The department offers undergraduate majors and minors in Chinese, Classics, French, German, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish (and a teaching major in Spanish). Additionally, courses are taught in Arabic, Modern Greek, Hebrew, Italian, Korean, Persian, Portuguese, Turkish, American Sign Language, and Navajo. A Master of Arts degree is offered with the following areas of specialization: Comparative Literature, French, German, and Spanish. A Master of Arts in Language Pedagogy (M.A.L.P.) is offered with the following areas of specialization: French, German, and Spanish. Finally, a Ph.D. is offered with specializations in Comparative Literature, German, and Spanish. These degrees prepare students to work in academic and nonacademic settings including but not limited to teaching, international relations, business, law, translation, and interpreting.

The department structure includes a Chair, Associate Chair, Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Undergraduate Studies, eight Section Heads, and three TA Faculty Coordinators. The department is organized into sections by language. Sections with “degree offerings” have a section head who oversees administrative and academic affairs for that section in consultation with the faculty. The specific role of the section head varies across sections. It appears that the division of the department into sections has created “administrative and programmatic challenges to the department: some have been successfully addressed over the years while others persist” (Self-Study, p. 4). Additionally, this structure has contributed to the large administrative load carried by many of the faculty.

The department was last reviewed in 1997 (report dated June, 1998). At that time, the first three recommendations were related to 1) improving communication and cooperation among the faculty, 2) addressing the budget deficit in the department, and 3) re-evaluating and strengthening the graduate programs. A review of the Self-Study as well as the reports of the internal and external review committees suggests that additional work needs to be done in terms of Recommendation #1. For example, problems were cited with regard to departmental governance, faculty morale, and cooperation and communication between sections and between the chair and faculty. With regard to Recommendation #2, although budget issues have continued since the last review, with assistance from the Dean and the Senior Vice President, the department will no longer be in deficit by the end of 2005-2006. The department has outlined a plan (described in the Self-Study) to increase departmental resources in an attempt to prevent future fiscal shortages. A number of steps have been taken to address Recommendation #3 including 1) curricular changes, 2) creation of student forums for research presentations, 3) inviting distinguished faculty from other universities to campus for lectures, 4) increasing graduate recruitment outside of Utah, and 4) instituting the Comparative Literature program, to name a few. The final two recommendations (e.g., maximize the development and use of
technology and staff support for the Language Resource Laboratory and address deficiencies in library holdings in Languages and Literature) have been adequately addressed.

The department provides an important service to the University related to the two-year language requirement for undergraduates. There appears to be a conflict between roles the department plays in providing language courses for undergraduates to meet this requirement and development of graduate programs and faculty research productivity. According to the Self-Study, this department is among the highest “SCH producers” in their college. At the same time, is has difficulty supporting instructional costs of auxiliary faculty needed to cover the necessary course offerings.

**Faculty**

When the Self-Study was completed, the department had 36 tenure-track faculty, including 11 full professors, 14 associate professors, and 11 assistant professors. Additionally, 15 full-time adjuncts/lecturers and 6 part-time instructors were on faculty. Three retirements will be occurring over the next several years. The faculty is diverse in terms of gender, age, and ethnicity. According to the outside reviewers, in terms of quality of scholarship, the current faculty compare “favorably with that of other language departments in the country” (External Review, p. 2). Additionally, the faculty appear to be strong teachers (nine have received distinguished teaching awards since 1997) with most also having “respectable” records of publication. The faculty represent a variety of disciples and research interests. According to the external reviewers, although under-staffing is a problem for all sections, some of the “less commonly taught” sections such as Hebrew and Persian need an additional faculty member to meet course demands.

Reportedly, faculty morale has improved as a result of recent salary adjustments, but issues related to departmental governance continue to contribute to dissatisfaction among faculty. Additionally, according to the report of the external review committee, there is tension in the department related to differences across sections in the allocation of resources and unevenness of teaching loads (e.g., sections offering a large number of courses focusing on lower level language instruction may be limited in literature and culture teaching opportunities). Sections generating the highest SCHs feel “exploited” as they are supporting sections that teach a smaller number of students. Other morale problems exist among professors at the associate level, related to changes in expectations regarding research productivity. This is especially problematic for those faculty in sections with heavy lower level teaching loads and other service responsibilities who now “feel left out of the new reward and recognition structure” (External Review, p. 2). However, these resentments were voiced in sections with lower enrollments as well. Loss of faculty (i.e., moving to other departments as well as leaving the University) seems to be related to many of the problems discussed above. Since 1997, three faculty members transferred to Linguistics and 18 left the University (due to departures and terminations) (Table 2.1.2 Self-Study). Finally, the department has lost nine positions (from 45 to 36) since 1996-1997, (including the three that transferred to the Linguistics Department). The reductions resulted from budget cuts and other fiscal constraints (Self-Study, p. 9).
Students

Interviews with students suggested an overall satisfaction with level of instruction and interactions with faculty.

Undergraduates: From 2000 through 2005 (the most recent available data to the ad hoc committee), the number of undergraduate majors in any given year averaged 206.4 (range: 164 to 254 per year). Across the same time period, the number of B.S./B.A. degrees conferred by Languages and Literature in any given year averaged 146.5 (range: 128 to 162). The number of full majors over the period increased by 55%. The number of graduates over the period increased by 27%.

Undergraduate students expressed concern about class sizes (too large) and limited course offerings. They would appreciate additional extracurricular and academic opportunities designed to bring language majors together. Finally, they complained about lack of information about scholarship and study abroad opportunities.

Graduates: From 2000 to 2005, the number of master’s students has increased from 27 to 38, but the number of doctoral students has decreased from 24 to 18. While the number of degrees awarded each year to master’s students has increased over this same time period, the number of doctoral degrees awarded appears to be declining.

Graduate students expressed satisfaction with their overall academic experience as well as their teacher training. They would appreciate more information on career options, professional issues, and about the University in general. While many of the students (both undergraduate and graduate) appear to be recruited more locally, in the last 5 years more graduate students have been recruited nationally and internationally.

The department has a well-developed program for training TAs that appears to be successful based on feedback from undergraduates regarding teaching in the Department.

Curriculum

According to the external reviewers, the program requirements and class offerings are similar to other universities across the country.

Program Effectiveness - Outcome Assessment

The outcome procedures to assess student progress include proficiency tests to assess language competency (B.A. Foreign Language Assessment), a capstone course for undergraduates, and comprehensive exams for graduate students. Classroom observations and student course evaluations are used to assess teaching of TAs. Traditional procedures (i.e., teaching evaluations, annual reviews, professional and scholarly accomplishments) are employed to assess the quality of the department. The department uses the results of the Foreign Language Assessment to modify instructions of 1st and 2nd year language students. Since the review was completed, the Chair has created a Task Force on Assessment with the charge of developing and
implementing an outcome assessment plan. They are focusing on 1) 1st and 2nd year language instruction and 2) development of an exit survey for undergraduates.

**Facilities and Resources**

The facilities (including classrooms, department offices, media and meeting rooms, etc.) housing the department were described as excellent. Some problems were expressed concerning operations and maintenance issues. The DiBona Center for Educational Technology is well maintained (by IT staff) and well used by students. Finally, the support staff appear to be competent and able to work together to carry out their administrative and student-related activities.

**COMMENDATIONS**

1. The department provides an important service to the university in terms of undergraduate teaching. Students (undergraduate and graduate) expressed satisfaction with the quality of teaching in the department, reinforcing the strong emphasis the department has placed on teaching in the past.

2. The department has been successful in recruiting and hiring well-qualified, new faculty.

3. The TA training program developed by the department is outstanding and can serve as a model for other programs across the country.

4. The Chair and Dean have worked together to solve the budget problems that have plagued the department at least since the last review.

5. The Chair is attempting to address problems with the department such as low salaries and “insularity” by reaching out to other centers within the University and College. She is developing a systematic merit system, descriptions for various positions (e.g., Director of Graduate Studies) as well as policies that can be implemented fairly across sections (e.g., providing a reader when enrollment in a class reaches 50). Finally, she is changing the focus from teaching to research, which is in line with expectations at a Doctoral/Research-Intensive University.

6. The department has initiated an outcome assessment plan.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Consideration should be given to restructuring the department so as to improve faculty retention, morale, cooperation, and communication across the current sections. The assistance of a facilitator(s) from outside the department who can provide input regarding restructuring as well as address issues related to retention, morale, collegiality, and communication in the department might also be considered.
Action Since Completion of the Review:  
The department has entered into discussions with the Dean regarding structural alternatives.

2. The department should continue to work with the Dean to monitor the departmental budget.

3. Policies and procedures pertinent to administrative roles and responsibilities at the departmental and section levels should be delineated.

4. The department should work towards decreasing class size and setting enrollment caps at 22 students (The Modern Language Association recommends a cap of 20).

5. A new faculty hire should be considered in Spanish because this section supports those with lower enrollments. A senior level hire is important to assist the overburdened junior faculty in that section.

Action Since Completion of the Review:  
The department has requested a new senior position in Spanish

6. The faculty should work together to develop a long-term plan for the department in terms of goals, future hires, and development opportunities, etc. Specific topics for discussion might include but are not limited to 1) the need for increasing faculty lines in Japanese and Chinese, 2) reconsideration of reduction of FTE in Hebrew and Persian, 3) development initiatives to increase graduate student scholarships, and 4) increasing outreach activities to alumni and the community in general.

7. Develop a workshop or course for graduate students focusing on professional issues (e.g., professional organizations, job opportunities in the profession, research expectations for university faculty, publication of scholarly work, teaching expectations, the disciplines within a larger professional context, etc.).

Action Since Completion of the Review:  
The Graduate Committee has developed a workshop to address professional issues and has conducted two workshops; Fall 2005 and Spring 2006.

8. Conduct departmental meetings with undergraduates at appropriate points in their program to discuss study abroad opportunities, job opportunities, graduate school opportunities, application procedures, etc.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council:

Kathy L. Chapman (Chair), Communication Sciences and Disorders
Bill Hesterly, Management
Joan Stoddart, Eccles Library
Craig Denton (Undergraduate Council), Communication
Memorandum of Understanding  
Department of Languages and Literature  
Graduate Council Review 2005-2006

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on August 29, 2006, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Robert D. Newman, Dean of the College of Humanities; Mushira Eid, Chair of the Department of Languages and Literature; David S. Chapman, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on May 8, 2006. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1**: Consideration should be given to restructuring the department so as to improve faculty retention, morale, cooperation, and communication across the current sections. The assistance of a facilitator(s) from outside the department who can provide input regarding restructuring as well as address issues related to retention, morale, collegiality, and communication in the department might also be considered.

The Department faculty, in collaboration with the Dean of the College of Humanities (serving as a facilitator) has begun discussions about restructuring the Department. The Dean has been meeting with a five-member faculty committee to explore possible alternatives to the current chair/multiple sector heads structure. These discussions were shared with the faculty at the Department’s Fall, 2006 retreat. The Department, with the assistance of the Dean, intends to develop a restructuring plan over the 2006-2007 academic year. The Department is also conducting a national search for senior professor to become chair of the department in Fall, 2007. The goal is have the plan in place prior to the beginning of the new chair’s term. Although the plan requires full development, the Department is exploring a structure that would create a Language Training sector and a Literature and Culture sector overseen by the chair and two associate chairs.

**Recommendation 2**: The department should continue to work with the Dean to monitor the departmental budget.

The budget deficit has been resolved with the assistance of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. However, the Department must strive to address remaining structural issues in the department’s budget that make it susceptible to future deficits. The Department is encouraged to explore ways to increase auxiliary faculty, particularly “lecturer” faculty, in order to meet teaching demands in a cost effective manner.
Recommendation 3: Policies and procedures pertinent to administrative roles and responsibilities at the departmental and section levels should be delineated.

This recommendation will be addressed by the department restructuring described in the response to Recommendation 1.

Recommendation 4: The department should work towards decreasing class size and setting enrollment caps at 22 students (the Modern Language Association recommends a cap of 20).

The Department is investigating creating additional class sections taught by graduate teaching assistants. A concern is that the sections be economically sustainable within the Department’s budget structure.

Recommendation 5: A new faculty hire should be considered in Spanish because this section supports those with lower enrollments. A senior level hire is important to assist the overburdened junior faculty in that section.

The department has requested a new senior position in Spanish. The Dean supports the request but funds are not currently available to permit such a hire. Decisions about this position will be delayed until the chair search is completed and the department restructuring is in place. In the interim, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs has provided time limited, financial support to hire a lecturer in Spanish.

Recommendation 6: The faculty should work together to develop a long-term plan for the department in terms of goals, future hires, and development opportunities, etc. Specific topics for discussion might include but are not limited to 1) the need for increasing faculty lines in Japanese and Chinese, 2) reconsideration of reduction of FTE in Hebrew and Persian, 3) development initiatives to increase graduate student scholarships, and 4) increasing outreach activities to alumni and the community in general.

As noted in Recommendation 1, the department is in the process of developing a long-term plan and will consider these issues as part of their deliberations. However, the Dean of Humanities indicates that a reconsideration of the current allocation of FTEs to the Hebrew and Persian sectors will not be part of those deliberations.

Recommendation 7: Develop a workshop or course for graduate students focusing on professional issues (e.g., professional organizations, job opportunities in the profession, research expectations for university faculty, publication of scholarly work, teaching expectations, the disciplines within a larger professional context, etc.).

The departmental Graduate Committee has developed a workshop to address professional issues and has conducted two workshops: Fall 2005 and Spring 2006.
Recommendation 8: Conduct departmental meetings with undergraduates at appropriate points in their program to discuss study abroad opportunities, job opportunities, graduate school opportunities, application procedures, etc.

The department hopes to hire an undergraduate advisor to address the advising issues raised in this recommendation.

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

David S. Chapman
Mushira Eid
Robert D. Newman
David W. Pershing
Frederick Rhodewalt

David S. Chapman
Assoc. V.P. for Graduate Studies
Dean, The Graduate School
# Book Review by Academic Year

## College of Humanities: Department of Languages and Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Expenditures - Source: OBIA 'B' tables, Updated annually during Spring term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (Department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Credit Hours (Budget Model) - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Summer term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course / Instructor Evaluations - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled Majors - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Majors (including Intermediate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 19, 2009

A. Lorris Betz
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
5th Floor, Clinical Neurosciences Center
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology

Dear Vice President Betz:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council's 2006 review of the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology. The Graduate School recently discovered that the approval process for this review was not completed. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Graduate Council, the Academic Profile, and the Memorandum of Understanding resulting from the review wrap-up meeting.

In order to finalize this review, I request that you forward it to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next meeting of the Senate.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: William R. Crowley, Chair, Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology
    John W. Mauger, Dean, College of Pharmacy
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology. The external reviewers were:

James P. Kehrer, Ph.D.
Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology
University of Texas, Austin

I. Glenn Sipes, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Pharmacology
University of Arizona

Nancy R. Zahniser, Ph.D.
Department of Pharmacology
University of Colorado Health Sciences Center

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Salvatore Fidone, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Physiology

Raymond Kesner, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Psychology

John Weis, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Pathology

This report of the Graduate Council's Ad Hoc Review Committee is based on the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology's (DPT) self-study, the report of three external reviewers, the report of three internal reviewers, as well as responses to those reports jointly from the chair of the department and the Dean of the College of Pharmacy.
OVERVIEW

Pharmacology deals with the properties and effects of drugs and how they interact with living systems. Toxicology is concerned with toxicities of drugs and other chemicals and the demonstration of the safety and hazards of such substances.

The Department offers instruction in pharmacology and toxicology. Its teaching and research activities range from understanding molecular mechanisms of drug action and/or chemical toxicity to assessment of human exposures to environmental pollutants. The faculty teach pharmacy, medical, and graduate students; offer M.S., Ph.D., M.D./Ph.D. and Pharm.D./Ph.D. degrees; conduct innovative research programs that are well-funded; and provide service to the university, the nation, and the discipline. In addition to the department-based graduate program, faculty participate in the interdisciplinary graduate programs in Neuroscience, Molecular Biology, and Biological Chemistry, and the M.D./Ph.D. program. No undergraduate degree is offered by the Department.

Teaching and research capabilities of the department are enhanced by the facilities of the Center for Human Toxicology, and the Anticonvulsant Drug Development Program.

Faculty

The DPT consists of 16 full-time academic faculty (9 full professors, 6 associate professors, and 1 assistant professor) and 15 full-time research faculty (2 full research professors, 3 research associate professors, and 10 research assistant professors). One tenured faculty member retired in 2004-05. State support for the academic faculty totals $1.4M. The department chair, William Crowley, was hired in 1999.

The DPT addressed a number of issues related to research faculty in 2003. A reward structure (salary equity, promotion/retention) that reflected faculty contributions was established. Bridge funding in the event that external support was temporarily lost was recommended. Research faculty may now serve as chair of a graduate student's supervisory committee, and course teaching was reduced. Research faculty view themselves as integral to the department, and feel that the department is supportive and concerned about their career progress.

The department recognizes that faculty diversity among the faculty is low. Both women and minorities are underrepresented.

The faculty teach courses to medical students, pharmacy students, graduate students, and one course for undergraduate students. Student evaluations are good to excellent. Research faculty teach mainly graduate courses.

The faculty are engaged in innovative, productive research activities in six core areas. External support has more than doubled over the past 6 years. NIH funds exceeded $6M per year in direct costs. This represents about a five-fold return on the state support to the
department. Based on external funding and peer-reviewed publications, the research activities are highly successful.

Students

The DPT has a strong focus on graduate student training. Postdoctoral fellows, however, are an increasing component of the department. The Ph.D. program in Pharmacology and Toxicology has 20 students enrolled. In addition, 6 students from the Neuroscience Graduate Program, and 1 student from Biological Chemistry Program are pursuing their Ph.D. research with department faculty. Two more students are enrolled in the new Pharm.D./Ph.D. program.

Because of two years of low enrollment in the graduate program, the faculty created a Recruitment Committee in 2002. This committee implemented several new efforts that resulted in 5 new students in 2003 and 7 in 2004. The efforts included revising the department's web page, participating in the Summer Undergraduate Research Program, and early identification and recruitment of the best applicants.

The DPT is very pro-active in mentoring, advising, reviewing, and teaching its graduate students. This reflects a coordinated effort between the Graduate Training Committee (a standing committee of four faculty who follow the progress of all students and meet with each of them at the end of each semester), the dissertation advisor, and the dissertation supervisory committee. As a result, the DPT graduates high-quality Ph.D. students in a timely fashion. The students were highly enthusiastic and complimentary of the nurturing environment that the faculty create.

First-year students are currently supported with a stipend ($22K for 2004-05). Students also receive tuition, dental, and medical insurance. Students are strongly encouraged to gain external funding via fellowships. The DPT no longer has a NIH training grant to support graduate students.

Curriculum

The DPT focus is on training students for the Ph.D. degree, with the M.S. awarded primarily to those who fail their qualifying exams but have completed some significant research. The curriculum offered by the DPT is fairly standard for programs of this type, and covers all necessary topics. The faculty recently reviewed the overall program, and as a result have made numerous changes designed to improve it.

In addition to required coursework, Ph.D. requirements include completion of research rotations, participation in journal clubs and seminars, passing qualifying exams, fulfillment of teaching requirements, and successful defense of the dissertation. The research rotations consist of three 15-week sessions in three different laboratories during their first year. The students appreciate the broad exposure the rotations provide.

The written qualifying exam has been replaced with a required course. The oral qualifying exam has been changed from that described in the Self Study. The new format aims to encourage greater knowledge of the disciplines of pharmacology and toxicology.
There were concerns that there are not enough choices available for the required coursework in biochemistry, molecular biology, and cell biology, and likewise for DPT courses required of students from those departments.

**Facilities and Resources**

The DPT is currently housed in three separate buildings, two on the Health Sciences Center (HSC) campus and one in Research Park. On the HSC campus, faculty are located in Skaggs Hall and in the nearby Biomedical Polymers Building. The total space occupied is 34K square feet, which is minimal and is limiting the ability of the faculty to expand their research and training programs. Several faculty members have been forced to turn away both graduate students and postdocs due to lack of space. In addition to the issue of space, both faculty and students feel that the current dispersal across three buildings is detrimental to the DPT's teaching and research programs.

A major goal of the College of Pharmacy is to construct a new building for the college that would provide greater and contiguous space.

The library has cancelled subscriptions to journals in pharmacology and toxicology due to increased prices and lack of funds. Journal access is essential to the DPT's research and training program.

**Previous Review**

The last review of the DPT was conducted in 1997. Many of the issues raised by reviewers at that time have been addressed. These include changes in the research rotations and the qualifying exams required of students that now provide a broader exposure to research techniques and knowledge of pharmacology and toxicology. In addition, the roles and expectations of the Research Faculty were clarified and enhanced. Also, efforts are being made to increase research and training in the areas of molecular biology, pharmacogenomics and toxicogenomics, and proteomics to extend and complement current research programs.

**COMMENDATIONS**

1. The DPT faculty were very responsive to the previous review and have instituted the recommended program changes. These include several curriculum changes, as well as clarifying the roles of the Research Faculty, who contribute significantly to the department's research and teaching, and feel that the department is supportive and concerned about their career progress. The DPT has been willing to focus on weaknesses of the department and make significant changes.
2. The DPT's new chair, William Crowley, has shown exemplary leadership. He has been supportive of faculty development, has obtained more student support, made new connections outside the department, and helped to develop a standardized curriculum.

3. The DPT's faculty are engaged in innovative, productive research activities. External support for research is about five times the state support for the department.

4. The DPT houses several outstanding centers and programs, including the Center for Human Toxicology, the affiliated Sports Medicine Research and Testing Laboratory, the Anticonvulsant Drug Development Program, and the Preclinical Drug Development Program. These facilities and their faculty are a tremendous resource for the graduate program.

5. Student enthusiasm for the program is remarkably high. Student mentoring is a major strength of the program, and the atmosphere is friendly and collegial. Students are well-supervised by the active Graduate Training Committee and the students' supervisory committees. The DPT has made excellent efforts to recruit well-qualified and diverse students. A significant number of students in the DPT have applied for and obtained external funding for their research.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The major weakness of the DPT is inadequate space, particularly contiguous space. Without additional space, the DPT will be unable to increase their research productivity and their training program. Inadequate space is arguably the most significant obstacle to current and future faculty reaching their full potentials. A partial solution is to post notices of seminars and grand rounds in the DPT's Research Park locations.

2. It would be advantageous for the DPT to obtain university funds to help support first-year graduate students. The DPT currently uses indirect cost returns for this purpose, but this limits the use of these funds for other initiatives. The DPT is encouraged to submit applications for one or more training grants to support graduate students and postdocs.

3. There should be more choices available for the required coursework in biochemistry, molecular biology, and cell biology. In addition, the DPT's elective courses should be offered on a more regular basis, and the various options available to students should be more effectively communicated to DPT students.

4. Recruit new faculty at the assistant professor level, particularly in the areas of pharmacogenomics and toxicogenomics. Increase gender and ethnic diversity among the faculty.

5. An effort should be made to ensure continued subscriptions, particularly electronic, by the library to those journals needed for the DPT's teaching and research activities.
ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW

1. The Dean of the College of Pharmacy has approved DPT's request to convert a classroom in the Skaggs Building to a shared laboratory and office space for graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and research track faculty. The College of Pharmacy is aiming to secure funding for a new College of Pharmacy building as part of the upcoming University Capital Campaign. The department is now posting notices of seminars and grand rounds in the DPT's Research Park locations.

2. The DPT will propose to Senior Vice President Betz that two first-year stipends each year be provided to the DPT from University of Utah central administration sources. The department has already submitted a training grant application.

3. Two new courses in biochemistry and molecular biology will be evaluated to assess their suitability as elective courses for DPT students. The issues of offering elective courses on a more regular basis, and more effectively communicating to students the various elective options available, will be priorities for the Graduate Training Committee.

4. The DPT will be conducting a recruitment in the recommended areas during the 2005-06 academic year. The chair states that the DPT is unaware of specific strategies that would increase applications by women and underrepresented minorities, other than by conducting national searches.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council

Steven Krueger (Chair), Department of Meteorology
Lisa Cannon-Albright, Department of Medical Informatics
Patricia Murphy, College of Nursing
Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology
Graduate Council Review 2004-2005

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on June 1, 2006, concluding the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology (DPT). A. Lorris Betz, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; John W. Mauger, Dean of the College of Pharmacy; William R. Crowley, Chair, Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology; David S. Chapman, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on February 27, 2006. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1: The major weakness of the DPT is inadequate space, particularly contiguous space. Without additional space, the DPT will be unable to increase their research productivity and their training program. Inadequate space is arguably the most significant obstacle to current and future faculty reaching their full potentials. A partial solution is to post notices of seminars and grand rounds in the DPT's Research Park locations.

The College Dean has approved a DPT request to convert a classroom in the Skaggs Building to shared laboratory and office space for graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and research track faculty. In the longer term, the College of Pharmacy is working to secure funding for a new College of Pharmacy building as part of the University’s capital funding campaign. CF&R funds were not allocated this year; however, the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences will be an alternative source of funding for this purpose. The Department now posts notices of seminars and grand rounds at their Research Park locations. The Department also rotates faculty meetings between the Skaggs Building and its Research Park locations.

Recommendation 2: It would be advantageous for the DPT to obtain university funds to help support first-year graduate students. The DPT currently uses indirect cost returns for this purpose, but this limits the use of these funds for other initiatives. The DPT is encouraged to submit applications for one or more training grants to support graduate students and postdocs.

The Department has submitted a training grant application to support graduate students and postdoctoral trainees. The Willard Eccles Charitable Trust now funds three graduate stipends as a result of donor development initiatives. The College continues actively to seek donor endowments for entering students.
Recommendation 3: There should be more choices available for the required coursework in biochemistry, molecular biology, and cell biology. In addition, the DPT's elective courses should be offered on a more regular basis, and the various options available to students should be more effectively communicated to DPT students.

The Department has accepted two new courses in biochemistry and molecular biology as electives for DPT students. The DPT Graduate Training Committee has made elective course scheduling and communication with graduate students priorities.

Recommendation 4: Recruit new faculty at the assistant professor level, particularly in the areas of pharmacogenomics and toxicogenomics. Increase gender and ethnic diversity among the faculty.

Recruitment is under way for a faculty person whose specialty is in recommended areas. The three finalists are all women. The Department will continue its commitment to increasing faculty diversity.

Recommendation 5: An effort should be made to ensure continued subscriptions, particularly electronic, by the library to those journals needed for the DPT's teaching and research activities.

This is a campuswide issue. The Senior Vice President for Health Sciences is working to maintain access to essential journals to support teaching and research.

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

A. Lorris Betz
David S. Chapman
William R. Crowley
John W. Mauger
Frederick Rhodewalt

David S. Chapman
Assoc. V.P. for Graduate Studies
Dean, The Graduate School
August 2, 2006
## Department Review by Academic Year

**February 21, 2006**

### College of Pharmacy: Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Headcount</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budgeted Faculty Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>$93,590</td>
<td>$101,485</td>
<td>$97,415</td>
<td>$101,428</td>
<td>$120,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>$51,056</td>
<td>$53,985</td>
<td>$60,826</td>
<td>$60,984</td>
<td>$72,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>$52,035</td>
<td>$55,251</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$58,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (Department)</td>
<td>$1,518,340</td>
<td>$2,181,987</td>
<td>$4,535,375</td>
<td>$4,984,189</td>
<td>$6,217,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (College)</td>
<td>$7,525,704</td>
<td>$7,946,571</td>
<td>$12,183,295</td>
<td>$13,202,481</td>
<td>$13,721,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Credit Hours (Budget Model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
<th>Total Undergraduate</th>
<th>Basic Graduate</th>
<th>Advanced Graduate</th>
<th>Total Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>873</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>1,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>888</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Course / Instructor Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate Courses</th>
<th>Undergraduate Instructors</th>
<th>Graduate Courses</th>
<th>Graduate Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enrolled Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Majors</th>
<th>Full Majors (including Intermediate)</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Faculty salaries reflect 9/12 contract amounts only and do not include compensation for administrative duties.
August 19, 2009

David W. Pershing  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
205 Park Building  
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review – Middle East Center

Dear Vice President Pershing:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council's 2007 review of the Middle East Center. The Graduate School recently discovered that the approval process for this review was not completed. Included in this review packet are the report prepared by the Graduate Council, the academic profile, and the Memorandum of Understanding resulting from the review wrap-up meeting.

In order to finalize this review, I request that you forward it to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next meeting of the Senate.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight  
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Bahman Baktiari, Director, Middle East Center  
Robert D. Newman, Dean, College of Humanities

The Graduate School  
302 Park Building  
201 South Presidents Circle Room 302  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9016  
(801) 581-7642 • FAX (801) 585-6749  
www.gradschool.utah.edu

Approved

Please forward
Midterm
8/24/10
May 7, 2007

The Graduate School – University of Utah

GRADUATE COUNCIL REVIEW
OF THE MIDDLE EAST CENTER

The Graduate Council Ad Hoc Committee has completed its review of the Middle East Center.

External review committee:
Roger Allen, University of Pennsylvania
Charles E. Butterworth, University of Maryland
Lawrence Rosen, Princeton University

Internal review committee:
Matthew Burbank, Associate Professor, Political Science
Peter Goss, Professor, Architecture
Elizabeth Peterson, Associate Professor, Art and Art History

This report by the Graduate Council's ad hoc review committee is based on the department's self-study, the report of the internal and external review committees, and the responses from the Director of the Center and the Dean of the College of Humanities.

I. DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview
The MEC began in 1960 with the assistance of federal funding and continues today as a Title VI/National Resource Center for Middle East Studies. As one of the first institutions to apply for this status, the university is considered a "pioneer" in instituting area-studies based research and training in the United States. With its focus on the Middle East, the MEC is interdisciplinary, drawing faculty primarily from the humanities (languages and literature, history) and the social sciences (anthropology, economics, geography, and political science).

The Middle East Center (MEC) identifies its mission as: (1) teaching related to the Middle East focusing on both languages and area studies; (2) research focused on aspects of the Middle East; and (3) outreach to the University and public. The MEC offers an undergraduate degree through the Department of Languages and Literature (BA in Middle East Studies) as well as graduate degrees (MA and PhD in Middle East Studies). Federal grant money awarded to the Center from the US Department of Education provides resources primarily to fund students for instruction in four languages of the Middle East (Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, and Turkish).

Organizationally, the MEC is headed by a director who reports to the dean of the College of Humanities. The bylaws indicate that all MEC faculty members are part of a Center
Committee, which also includes the chairs of the graduate and undergraduate Student Advisory Committees, with ultimate governing responsibility. An executive committee, graduate committee (chaired by the by the director of graduate studies), and RPT advisory committee are also identified as part of the Center's governing structure in the MEC bylaws.

Faculty

There are 16 tenured or tenure-track faculty in the center. Eight hold joint appointments between a home department (Languages and Literature, History, and Political Science) and the Middle East Center, with the department and the center each funding part of the position. The other faculty hold appointments entirely within a department but have a substantive expertise related to the Middle East. Of 16 regular MEC faculty, six are full professors, eight are associate professors, and two are assistant professors. The self-study notes that of the MEC faculty "5 are women and 9 are of Middle Eastern origin or belong to minority groups." Concerns were raised about the need to hire regular faculty to teach in the Turkish language program and about the negative impact of the departure of several women faculty members in languages for positions at other universities.

With regard to research, the self-study makes note of a number of recent books authored or edited by Middle East Center faculty, and a review of the available vita shows evidence of regular publication of scholarly articles and book chapters. Concern was raised, however, about the difficulty of retaining faculty, especially women faculty, given the demands associated with the joint appointments with respect to the need to fulfill service obligations in both the center and the home department.

Faculty commented favorably about the availability of resources from the Middle East Center to assist with travel and to provide resources to host conferences on topics related to the Middle East. The quality of the Middle East collection at the Marriott Library also is viewed as a strong resource.

Though many of the faculty are distinguished scholars, there appear to be an unevenness across the overall faculty profile (great strength in history, for example; comparative weakness in anthropology and literature).

If normal patterns of retirement prevail, some of the most distinguished members of the faculty will be retiring within the next decade.

Students

Graduate student quality is generally regarded as good by most faculty, though there are concerns about continuing to attract quality students. In addition, for graduate students in particular, the quality of appointments made to replace retiring faculty members will be crucial to both retaining current students and continuing to attract quality students in the future.
The external review committee pointed out that the undergraduates they met "were enthusiastic, committed, and impressive." The undergraduates find the interdisciplinary nature of the program useful, especially as many plan government or other service careers. Students' main concerns were about language training, where differing models of language teaching at times conflicted with what the students' desired.

Curriculum

The curriculum is seen as varied and extensive, offering students a wide choice of courses in Middle East Studies and interdisciplinary areas. A BA in Middle East Studies is offered through the Department of Languages and Literature, two tracks are offered for a minor. The center offers its own MA, MPhil, and PhD degrees in Middle East Studies, in partnership with departments in the Colleges of Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences.

The curriculum reflects the Title VI grant requirements, offering language courses in Arabic, Hebrew, Turkish, and Persian. Additional courses are cross-listed with departments of anthropology, economics, history, languages and literature, linguistics, and political science.

Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

The internal review committee noted unevenness in the availability of data regarding students, making outcomes difficult to assess. Students generally perceived the curriculum as strong in core areas, but in general more breadth than depth. In many areas students considered the course offerings as outstanding. However, some desired courses were not offered, for example, because of a lack of suitable instructors.

Facilities and Resources

No issues with budget or physical facilities were mentioned except for student concerns about a lack of a graduate student gathering place, and concerns about computer support. The Middle East section of the Marriott Library is considered to be very good by faculty and students.

Part II. Commendations and Recommendations

A. Commendations

1. The University of Utah has maintained a Middle East Center of great distinction for almost 50 years and the Middle East Center has played an active and highly visible role in the University and the community; in its local, regional, and national outreach programs; in its lecture series which have brought to campus a series of illustrious speakers, attracting large audiences to hear about current issues affecting the Middle East and in its educational mission and impact on the community and the local region.
2. The University of Utah Library has maintained an excellent collection of primary materials for scholarship and teaching that brings national and international prestige to both the Middle East Center and the University.

3. The Center has continued to attract federal funding to support its instruction in the four required languages, and to continue to provide resources for faculty and students in support of teaching and scholarship.

4. Professor Ibrahim Karawan has provided skillful and successful administration of the Center, its academic and outreach programs.

5. The Middle East Center has a clear mission and a number of dedicated faculty, staff, and students striving to fulfill that mission.

B. Recommendations

1. The Center and its associated colleges and departments should strategize how to address the pressing and immediate concern for recruiting and retaining high quality faculty, especially critical in light of anticipated retirements in upcoming years. Faculty gender issues, behaviors, and concerns in recruitment and retention should be attended to with the assistance of the Associate Vice President for Diversity and OEO.

2. The Center and its partner colleges should consider the benefits and potential risks of restructuring the administrative model of the Center. Whatever model prevails, substantial efforts need to be made to foster a center identity for its members, to counter the ambiguity often inherent in entities which span multiple colleges.

3. The Center should work to identify and develop additional sources of external funding for possible additional faculty lines or undergraduate scholarships. In particular, the 50th anniversary of the center in 2010 offers targeted opportunities for programs and fundraising.

4. The Center should determine optimum levels of student populations and develop plans to attract and retain appropriate numbers of students.

5. The departure of the coordinator of Arabic instruction provides an opportunity to re-examine and re-evaluate the goals and methodology of its Middle Eastern language programs, especially in determining appropriate balances between speaking and reading skills. The Center should focus on faculty to teach languages and upper division courses in literature.

6. The Center should clarify its practice with regard to separate degrees.

7. The Center and the University should maintain and enhance Middle East Library funding and staffing to maintain and expand the collection not only for local academic
and research purposes but also for local outreach activities and for the use of the broader scholarly community.

Actions Taken Since the Reviews:

A new tenure track assistant professor position has been established and was filled by a faculty member who has expanded the Turkish program at the Center. A visiting assistant professor has been appointed in the Arabic program at the Center, whose expertise is focused on Arabic language, literature and pedagogy.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council

Ann Marie Breznay, Marriott Library, Chair
Nicola Camp, Biomedical Informatics
Jingyi Zhu, Mathematics
Memorandum of Understanding
Middle East Center
Graduate Council Review 2006 – 2007

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on 15 June 2007, concluding the Graduate Council Review of the Middle East Center. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Robert Newman, Dean of the College of Humanities; Ibrahim Karawan, Director of the Middle East Center; David S. Chapman, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on 7 May 2007, which addressed the following issues:

At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1: The Center and its associated colleges and departments should strategize how to address the pressing and immediate concern for recruiting and retaining high quality faculty, especially critical in light of anticipated retirements in upcoming years. Faculty gender issues, behaviors, and concerns in recruitment and retention should be attended to with the assistance of the Associate Vice President for Diversity and OEO.

The Dean of Humanities is currently developing a College strategic plan which will include options for faculty staffing in the Middle East Center (MEC). Two faculty appointments in Turkish language have recently been filled. With regard to faculty gender issues, the Dean plans to ask the Associate Vice President for Diversity and the Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action to prepare a report assessing and offering guidance in addressing faculty gender issues and attitudes. It is the Dean’s intention to have this report completed by the end of Fall Semester, 2007. The Dean notes that the two recent appointments were women providing evidence that the MEC and affiliated departments have the ability to recruit female faculty. The Dean has identified a group of new faculty appointments within the College who may be appropriate for appointments in the MEC.

Recommendation 2: The Center and its partner colleges should consider the benefits and potential risks of restructuring the administrative model of the Center. Whatever model prevails, substantial efforts need to be made to foster a center identity for its members, to counter the ambiguity often inherent in entities which span multiple colleges.

The Dean and Director of the MEC considered a number of alternative administrative structures suggested by the external reviewers. They conclude that the current structure is most appropriate given the MEC’s position spanning multiple colleges in the University.

Recommendation 3: The Center should work to identify and develop additional sources of external funding for possible additional faculty lines or undergraduate scholarships. In particular, the 50th anniversary of the center in 2010 offers targeted opportunities for programs and fundraising.

The Director of the MEC will coordinate with the College of Humanities Development Office to create a concrete plan for incorporating the 50th anniversary of the center into fundraising and program development opportunities. The Dean has included the MEC in University Capital Campaign and is working with a specific donor in this area.
Recommendation 4: The Center should determine optimum levels of student populations and develop plans to attract and retain appropriate numbers of students.

The Dean recognizes the need to bring more students into the MEC and is discussing strategies to do so with the Director of the MEC. One plan being implemented is a collaboration between the MEC and Department of Languages to offer more cross-listed courses in order to attract more undergraduates.

Recommendation 5: The departure of the coordinator of Arabic instruction provides an opportunity to re-examine and re-evaluate the goals and methodology of its Middle Eastern language programs, especially in determining appropriate balances between speaking and reading skills. The Center should focus on faculty to teach languages and upper division courses in literature.

The Department of Languages and Literatures recently hired two faculty members in the area of Turkish language instruction who will have appointments in the MEC. The Dean has also approved the appointment of a visiting professor in Arabic.

Recommendation 6: The Center should clarify its practice with regard to separate degrees.

The MEC proposes to retain the current practice of designating degrees as Middle East Studies/Specialization (e.g., Arabic, Political Science, etc.) because, in their estimation, the practice best serves the students’ needs.

Recommendation 7: The Center and the University should maintain and enhance Middle East Library funding and staffing to maintain and expand the collection not only for local academic and research purposes but also for local outreach activities and for the use of the broader scholarly community.

The University is facing challenges in funding its library system and is working to find additional support for all libraries and the Middle East collection in particular. The Director of the MEC will continue its own fund raising efforts to support its collection. In particular the Director will work with the Marriott Library as part of the University’s Capital campaign,

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

David W. Pershing
Robert Newman
Ibrahim Karawan
Fred Rhodewalt

David S. Chapman
Associate VP for Graduate Studies
Dean, The Graduate School
College of Humanities: Middle East Language & Area Study Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Headcount</strong></td>
<td>Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgeted Faculty Salary (% USU Average)</strong></td>
<td>Source: OBIA &amp; USU study, Updated annually during Spring term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
<td>NA $(-%)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>Source: OBIA &quot;B&quot; tables, Updated annually during Spring term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (Department)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (College)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Credit Hours (Budget Model)</strong></td>
<td>Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Summer term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Graduate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course / Instructor Evaluations</strong></td>
<td>Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Courses</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Instructors</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Courses</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructors</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolled Majors</strong></td>
<td>Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Majors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Majors (including Intermediate)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees Awarded</strong></td>
<td>Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Faculty salaries reflect 9/12 contract amounts only and do not include compensation for administrative duties.