# ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA

**February 1, 2010**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 p.m. in room 115 C. Roland Christensen Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>REQUEST FOR NEW BUSINESS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>White Paper - &quot;Utah’s Demographic Transformation: A View into the Future&quot; - Pamela S. Perlich, Senior Research Economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CONSENT CALENDAR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Appendix I: Resignations, Administrative and Faculty Appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Appendix II: Auxiliary and Limited Term Appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>REPORT FROM ASUU:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>NOTICE OF INTENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Policy and Rule 6-310 (Auxiliary Faculty Appointment &amp; Evaluations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>DEBATE CALENDAR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Proposed Joint MS Degree in Social Work/Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Minor in Nuclear Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>INFORMATION CALENDAR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Faculty Complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Apportionment of Faculty Senate Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Undergraduate Council Review – Gender Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Graduate Council Review – Department of Family and Preventive Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>NEW BUSINESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>ADJOURNMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE  
January 11, 2010

Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate, held on January 11, 2010, was called to order at 3:03 pm by James A. Anderson, Senate President. The meeting was held in room 115 C. Roland Christensen Center. Jim welcomed everyone back for the New Year.


Excused: Harriett Hopf, Peter Martin, A. Lor Randall

Ex-officio: James Anderson, Fred Esplin, Robert Flores, John Francis, Nancy Lines, Paul Mogren, Michael K. Young

Others: Ann Floor, Theresa Ashman, James Keener, Jim Agutter, Pat Eisenman

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of December 7, 2009 were unanimously approved following a motion from Larry DeVries which was seconded by Michael Goodman.

Request for New Business
Senate president, Jim Anderson, updated the senators regarding the annual report from the Athletics Advisory Council. Their report to the Academic Senate is merely a courtesy as they report directly to the University president. Any recommendations made by the senate are advisory only but they may have more to report in the spring.

President Anderson also reported on administrative response to the recommendation of a three percent tax on endowed chairs. Senior administrators noted that it was unsuccessful and had been rejected by donors. The University is supportive in helping other areas and is looking at ways to expand endowed chairs to other departments.
Consent Calendar
The resignations, retirements, faculty appointments, auxiliary, and limited term appointments, appearing in the Appendices dated December 21, 2009 and January 11, 2010, as well as the Distinguished Teaching Awards recipients: 1) Marissa Diener (Family & Consumer Studies), 2) Sivaraman Guruswamy (Metallurgical Engineering), 3) Janet Lindsley (Biochemistry) and 4) Elizabeth Tashjian (Finance), received approval to forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval following a motion by Larry DeVries which was seconded by Dean Frank Brown.

Executive Committee Report
Jim Metherall, Executive Committee secretary, summarized his written report of the December 21, 2009 Executive Committee meeting.

Report from Administration
The University’s president, Michael K. Young, clarified a statement regarding tax on endowment contributions stating that he has never proposed a tax on endowment funds rather his predecessor had attempted to tax them to support development activities. Because it was not presented properly and the donors were mildly hostile they backed off. President Young indicated that the tax issue is still not off the table but there is a high priority to expand the number of endowed chairs in every department.

President Young reported on the University’s Capital Campaign commending the Deans, Professors, Vice President Esplin and his team and all others involved for their extraordinary work. The 2009 Fiscal Year closed ahead of 2008 and the calendar year is also closing out ahead of last year. Part of the increase was due to the large gifts received at the end of the year.

An announcement will be made this week regarding the graduation speaker. The president urged the faculty to attend and enjoy this special event.

President Young addressed the budget issues indicating the University’s level of State funding is currently a moving target with the legislature. The U is hopeful that the governor and the legislature will understand the centrality of the University to the State. President Young stated that there is talk about what an additional four percent cut would look like. It would be a deep cut with serious consequences, but there seems to be some increased understanding of the importance of the University to the future of the state. He noted that economically speaking, a recent study from the Bureau of Economic Research produced a report suggesting that for every million dollars of research money the University brings into the state 20 jobs are produced, 8 within the University and 12 outside the University, with an average salary of $60K. Last year’s research dollars alone brought in close to 7200 jobs for the state. In addition, the commercialization of research done at the University in many ways is the future of the state. We have been second to MIT in commercializing more companies the past couple of years than any other university and are now four companies ahead of MIT.

He was very pleased with the principle of the Governor’s budget as the principle holds us where we are this year rather than taking additional cuts. However, infrastructure breakdowns are
occurring at both lower and upper campus and great caution must be taken to preserve our capital stock.

In conclusion, the president responded to a few questions clarifying some concerns regarding endowment taxes and budget issues.

**Report from ASUU**
Tayler Clough reported that ASUU has been working on three things which were forwarded to the Trustees today: 1) restructuring of their constitution, 2) reduction in campaign spending, and 3) a new ethical bulletin to prohibit ASUU officers from providing contracts and grants to friends. He also noted that they are continuing to work on the community mentoring program.

**Notice of Intent**
There were no items of intent.

**Debate Calendar**
Susan Olson, associate vice president for academic affairs, commented on the proposed new policy, Policy 9-003 together with Rule 9-003 regarding Endowed Chairs. She reported that this topic has been a largely under-regulated activity and to avoid embarrassment going forward this new policy and rule will provide better protection to the donor and the University in determining who deserves an endowed chair. A suggestion was made to clarify how the word “Presidential” is used in various contexts, including references to Presidential Endowed Chairs (governed by 9-003), or Presidential Professorships (no encompassed in 9-003), and that suggestion was agreed to. **A motion from Steve Carson, seconded by Seth Welborn, to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval received unanimous approval.**

Distinguished Professor Jim Keener from the mathematics department presented an overview of the proposed Center for Quantitative Biology. The purpose of the Center is designed to establish a clearinghouse to encourage interaction between quantitative and empirical researchers and students for collaboration. The role of the center is to bring in visitors, encourage and establish meetings, have a consulting center being a place where researchers can come and ask their questions and quantify their data to make a theory. It will be located in the Mathematics Department for now but will include a broad variety of backgrounds. **A motion was made by David Ailion and seconded by Steve Kern to forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval which was approved unanimously.**

Professor Jim Agutter from Architecture + Planning gave a short précis of the proposed Minor in Design. He stated this proposed minor is to create an opportunity for undergraduate students who don’t have experience and want to compete in an increasingly complex work environment and tackle multi-disciplinary problems. He noted the concerns from the Executive Committee concerning its overly broad originally proposed title and agreed to a friendly amendment that the name be revised as “Minor in Multidisciplinary Design.” **Larry DeVries made a motion to approve the proposal as amended and forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval which was seconded by Suzanne Darais and unanimously approved.**
Information Calendar
The information calendar was accepted with the notation that the proposed Policy 3-043 (Accountability for Intangible Assets now included a friendly amendment that had been offered by Senator Steve Kern after the Executive Committee meeting (clarifying that this particular policy is not intended to affect establishment of intellectual property rights based on scholarly work of faculty.) As amended, 3-043 will now be forwarded to the Trustees for final approval, along with Policy 3-011 (Petty Cash Funds).

New Business
There was no new business.

Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Lines
APPENDIX I

RESIGNATIONS, RETIREMENT & APPOINTMENTS

Resignations

1. Dr. Thomas Abbott, Associate Professor (Clinical) of Pathology, effective January 17, 2010.

2. Dr. Catherine A. Bowles, Instructor (Clinical) in Pathology, effective December 31, 2009.

3. Dr. David P. Knight, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Pathology, effective December 31, 2009.

4. Dr. Gregory P. Smith, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Pathology, effective December 31, 2009.

Retirement

1. Dr. David A. Tomb, Associate Professor with tenure of Psychiatry, member of faculty for 31 years, effective January 27, 2010.

Administrative Appointment

1. Dr. Olivia R. Liu Sheng, Chair, Department of OIS, effective January 1, 2010.

Faculty Appointments

MEDICINE

1. Dr. Lisa A. Albright, Professor with tenure of Internal Medicine, effective January 1, 2010.

2. Dr. Nan Hu, Assistant Professor of Internal Medicine, effective January 11, 2010.

B.S., 1996, China Agricultural University
M.S., 2003, State University of New York
Ph.D., 2009, University of Washington
3. Dr. Tatjana Jevremovic, Professor with tenure of Chemical Engineering, effective January 11, 2010. This is in addition to her appointment as Professor with tenure of Civil & Environmental Engineering.

APPENDIX II

AUXILIARY FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

ENGINEERING

1. Professor Jason M. Alderman, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Computer Science, effective December 2, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.S., 2002, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
   M.S., 2006, Georgia Institute of Technology

2. Dr. Christian B. Schlegel, Adjunct Professor of Electrical & Computer Engineering, effective January 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   D.I.P., 1984, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology
   M.E.E., 1987, University of Notre Dame
   Ph.D., 1988, University of Notre Dame

3. Professor Matthias P. Shapiro, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Computer Science, effective December 2, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.S., 2002, Georgia Institute of Technology
   M.S., 2006, Georgia Institute of Technology

MEDICINE

4. Professor Robert W. Adler, Adjunct Professor of Pediatrics, effective January 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This is secondary to his appointment as Professor with tenure of Law.

5. Dr. Sherwin C. D’Souza, Adjunct Instructor in Internal Medicine, effective January 4, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   M.D., 1996, King Edward Memorial Hospital
6. Dr. Darin Y. Furgeson, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, effective December 16, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010. This is secondary to his tenure track appointment as Assistant Professor of Pharmaceutical Chemistry and is in addition to his appointments as Adjunct Assistant Professor of Bioengineering and of Chemical Engineering.

7. Dr. Gregory A. Harlan, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, effective January 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This supersedes his appointment as Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Pediatrics.

8. Dr. Christopher G. Maloney, Adjunct Professor of Biomedical Informatics, effective January 1, 2009 and ending June 30, 2010. This supersedes his appointment as Adjunct Associate Professor of Biomedical Informatics.

9. Dr. Christopher T. Patin, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective February 15, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.A., 1987, University of Texas
   M.A., 1990, Auburn University
   M.D., 1998, Louisiana State University

10. Dr. Lucy A. Savitz, Adjunct Associate Professor of Pediatrics, effective January 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This is in addition to her appointments as Research Associate Professor of Internal Medicine and Adjunct Associate Professor of Family & Preventive Medicine and Nursing.

   PHARMACY


   Pharm.D., 2005, Rutgers State University
Proposal to clarify regulations of periodic evaluation of auxiliary faculty, and to authorize appointments of Lecturer faculty in certain qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs and ensure their periodic evaluation. Policy 6-310, Rule 6-310 (IDTP), Policy 6-302.

Version 2010-01-21
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(ii) Policy 6-310 proposed Revision 1

(iii) Rule 6-310(ITP) proposed Revision 0.

(iv) Policy 6-302, notice of conforming change (in footnote 4 include cross-reference to revised Policy 6-310 and new Rule 6-310).
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I. Memorandum.

>>
To: Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs David W. Pershing; Senior Vice President for Health Sciences A. Lorris Betz.

From: Susan M. Olson, Associate Vice President for Faculty; Richard J. Sperry, Associate Vice President for Health Sciences

Date: December 14, 2009 [as revised January 17, 2010]

Subject: Proposal on auxiliary faculty and other instructional personnel—clarify regulations on periodic evaluations, and explicitly authorize appointments of Lecturer faculty in qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs. Policy 6-310, Rule 6-310(IDTP), Policy 6-302.

A. Introduction.

This is a proposal for two sets of changes of University Regulations regarding auxiliary faculty (and other instructional personnel)—both stemming in part from the University’s reinvigorated commitment, responding to an accreditation review, to ensure the high quality of the auxiliary faculty (and other instructional personnel). The proposal is to revise existing Policy 6-310, enact new Rule 6-310(IDTP), and add a minor cross-reference in existing Policy 6-302.

The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (“NCCU”) carried out a 10th year reaccreditation review of the University in 2006-2007, and the results included recommendations that:

"the university provide regular and systematic evaluation of the performance of auxiliary faculty, and that the institution’s policies, regulations and procedures provide for such evaluation on a continuing basis consistent with [NCCU] Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation. The university is also advised to define an orderly process for the recruitment and appointment of auxiliary faculty ([NCCU] Standard 4.1.5, 4.1.6, and 4.1.9)."

[emphasis added]

Discussions with the accreditation reviewers at the time made clear that this recommendation was mainly concerned about ensuring the quality of teaching in the University’s credit-bearing courses by auxiliary faculty and any other non-faculty instructional personnel.
In direct response to the accreditation recommendation regarding *systematic evaluation*, the University quickly enacted the original version of Policy 6-310 in May 2007. This imposed for the first time at the level of University-wide Policy a requirement for an evaluation system for auxiliary faculty and other instructional personnel, with the key component being that academic colleges were to develop and submit for vice-presidential review written plans for systematic periodic evaluations.

Also in spring 2007, there was underway a project of revising Policy 6-302, the main University Policy on procedures for appointments of faculty. In keeping with the accreditation recommendation regarding an *orderly process for the recruitment and appointment of auxiliary faculty*, the 2007 revision of 6-302 included clarifications that its procedures are applicable for auxiliary faculty appointments (and a subsequent revision of 6-302 further clarified applicability to both initial appointments and reappointments, including reappointments with promotion). The combination of 6-310 (evaluations) and clarified 6-302 (appointments/reappointments) is important for two reasons. First, for auxiliary faculty, appointments have typically been short term so that reappointments occur frequently, even for long-serving faculty. Second, the proper mechanism for promoting auxiliary faculty is through reappointment-with-promotion. Thus, the most sensible timing for evaluations is in conjunction with reappointments, implicating both 6-310 and 6-302.

The University’s progress on the NCCU recommendations was assessed with a follow-up site visit in fall 2009. The resulting October 2009 Interim Report and accompanying discussions recognized that the University is making satisfactory progress on the two recommendations for evaluation systems and appointments processes—and is now expected to continue apace with further refinement and implementation.

Accordingly, the *first prong* of the present proposal is to make various clarifications to Policy 6-310 (which had been rushed into place in 2007) to better serve as the foundation for refining and continuing to implement the still relatively new combined appointment-evaluation-reappointment systems. These are clarifications based on lessons learned from experience in the early phases of implementation.

One of the most important clarifications is that the systematic evaluation requirements of Policy 6-310 apply not only to academic colleges (and their departments)—but to any type of academic unit through which teaching of credit-bearing courses is being conducted by any auxiliary faculty and/or any other non-faculty instructional personnel. A relatively small but nevertheless significant portion of teaching at the University (particularly of undergraduates) has long been conducted through certain interdisciplinary programs. In retrospect it is apparent that the quickly-enacted original phrasing of Policy 6-310 was not sufficiently clear on the point that the teaching personnel of such programs are necessarily encompassed in the University-wide response to the accreditation concerns. With that clarification being made, there come into view significant problems inherent in the existing structure for appointments—evaluations—reappointments of the auxiliary faculty teaching within such interdisciplinary programs. The solution to those problems lies with the second prong of this proposal.

The *second prong* proposes changes to allow a reconfiguration of the way in which appointments—evaluations—reappointments are made for a small number of the University’s
auxiliary faculty whose primary work is teaching courses within certain interdisciplinary teaching programs. Such reconfiguration would overcome the inherent problems of the existing structures and enable the University to respond effectively to the accreditation concerns by implementing in these programs “orderly processes for the appointment” and “regular and systematic evaluation of the performance” of the auxiliary teaching faculty of the programs. The mechanisms for appointments—evaluations—reappointments within the programs would have the essential features of the systems used within academic colleges and departments. The reconfiguration would also facilitate appointment in the Lecturer faculty category of some long-serving individuals in the programs who have previously been constrained to employment as non-faculty “Associate Instructors,” despite their work and credentials in all ways being consistent with appointments as Lecturer faculty. The proposed new University Rule 6-310(IDTP) would authorize five specified programs to appoint and reappoint Lecturer faculty. The proposal includes creation of a University interdisciplinary programs advisory committee with broad interdisciplinary representation of regular faculty, to advise on and review the implementation of rigorous quality-assurance systems within the programs for appointment—evaluation—reappointment of the Lecturers.

B. Further detail of prong #1 ---clarifications of Policy 6-310.

1. Background.

Documentation from the accreditation review which mandated the original Policy 6-310 and guides this proposed revision is available on request. Some history of the original Policy 6-310, and the related revising of the faculty appointments policy 6-302 is available at these sites: http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-310.html; http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-302.html.

Policy 6-310 was necessarily adopted very quickly during the accreditation review year. Many of the proposed clarifications grow from simply having had more time to carefully consider its content, along with learning from experience with initial implementation. The circumstances of the spring 2007 adoption led to setting what proved to be a very ambitious deadline of January 2008 for academic units to develop evaluation plans and submit them for approval. As noted above, the original Policy phrasing made it clear that academic colleges (or their departments separately) were required to have such plans, but wasn’t sufficiently clear about applicability to other academic units, and so initial implementation efforts focused on the colleges. The colleges, many starting from minimal foundations, mostly responded well to that ambitious deadline. At the time of the fall 2009 accreditation follow-up visit, the University was able to report that at least initial versions of plans had by then been submitted by all colleges, but most reflect their rapid preparation and the somewhat unclear guidance of the original Policy and will benefit from some further refinement. The ambitious time frame has been similarly challenging for the vice-presidential offices designated to review and approve the plans.

After the speedy enactment of the original Policy and as the first plans of colleges began arriving, it was determined that to best serve the underlying principles of the project for the long term, there should be careful scrutiny of the plans with the help of a broad-based committee of faculty. An ad hoc committee was assembled, including some regular faculty members drawn from the Senate-elected University RPT Standards Committee and some auxiliary faculty members from across campus. That ad hoc group has been very helpful in examining some of the submitted plans, reexamining Policy 6-310 and other relevant policies, and holding broad
discussions about the current practices and appropriate future roles for auxiliary faculty in various sectors of campus. Similar discussions have been held with the full membership of the RPT Standards Committee, which is well-situated to be helpful on such matters because of its expertise in reviewing and approving plans for evaluation of faculty in the tenure track. With the insights gained from those discussions, a clearer picture is emerging as to specific issues needing further attention.

A strong recommendation emerging from those activities is that University policies regarding auxiliary faculty are sorely in need of attention. The logical starting point is to clarify 6-310, to provide better guidance for refinement of the colleges’ auxiliary faculty evaluation plans. Meanwhile, as this proposal moves forward, colleges will be informed that the initial versions of their plans are being provisionally approved, and that more careful review and feedback leading to refined plans suitable for final approval will come after the governing Policy has been clarified. This will enable the colleges and departments to proceed with evaluations and reappointments during spring 2010 using the provisionally approved plans—while also allowing more effective feedback to be provided by the vice presidential offices with assistance of the ad hoc faculty committee, using the clarified Policy.

2. Highlights of the proposed changes for clarification of Policy 6-310.

Part I.

- Clarification that the Policy applies to all academics units which appoint any auxiliary faculty of any category, or employ any non-faculty instructional personnel—among the most important changes of this overall project. The original phrasing referred primarily to “colleges and departments” and may have left doubts about applicability for other types of academic units. Most obviously, that old phrasing could be read to make it doubtful whether the University has in place a policy for ensuring the quality of the teachers within our interdisciplinary teaching programs—which would be inconsistent with the core concerns from the accreditation review.

Part III.

- Added phrasing to make it unmistakably clear that the procedures for reappointments of auxiliary faculty are governed by Policy 6-302, and so appointing units should be consulting both 6-310 and 6-302 as they process reappointments (including reappointments with promotion). This has been a matter of frequent misunderstanding and the effectiveness of our response to the two accreditation recommendations is dependent on units adhering to the appointment—reappointment procedures of 6-302, especially as to the roles of departmental Faculty Appointments Advisory Committees. (III-A-1-b, A-2-b).

- Added phrasing encouraging steps to recognize the valuable contributions of auxiliary faculty when the now-required evaluation systems lead to findings of high quality performance. The original version focused on the negative—how to respond when evaluations reveal areas of concern. The new version adds a focus on planning to recognize laudable performance. It encourages use of two appropriate means of recognizing excellent work—promotions in rank, and making reappointments with longer terms (when doing so would further the University’s
overall commitment to excellence by helping to retain high quality faculty). These have been among the most strongly urged points in our consultations with faculty representatives and in discussions regarding the plans initially submitted by colleges. As to the longer-term reappointments, it has long been firmly established in Policy that auxiliary appointments are presumptively annual, but can be longer-term, up to five years. (Policy 6-300, Section 4.B.). However, the availability of the longer-term option appears not to have been well-understood in some quarters, and there have been some perceptions that the central administration would discourage such appointments. This changed phrasing should make clear that longer-term appointments and a greater role in governance can indeed be appropriate mechanisms to retain auxiliary faculty whose outstanding teaching adds significantly to the University’s excellence. (A-2-c, A-4, A-5)

C. Further detail of prong #2 — QIDT Programs’ Lecturers. New Rule 6-310(IDTP) and accompanying changes in Policy 6-310 and Policy 6-302. Establish authority of Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs to appoint Lecturer faculty, and establish structures and procedures for such appointments and periodic evaluations.

1. Background.

Categories of University instructors. The University’s teaching personnel include three broad categories—regular (i.e., tenure-track) faculty, auxiliary faculty, and non-faculty employees. The auxiliary faculty includes five categories, each intended for particular functions: Lecturer, Clinical, Research, Adjunct, or Visiting. Each has the same hierarchy of ranks as regular faculty: Instructor, Assistant, Associate, Professor. (See Policy 6-300, Sec. 4.) This proposal concerns only the Lecturer category, which was established in 1999 to provide an appropriate faculty status for a small but important group serving the University as full-time professional teachers, and typically doing so for lengthy careers. It was designed for those for whom a regular faculty role would be inappropriate because their efforts are focused predominantly on instruction and not also research. Previously, the options available for such instructors were Adjunct faculty, who by definition have a primary affiliation somewhere other than the appointing unit; Clinical faculty, which may mischaracterize the nature of their teaching; or the non-faculty, academic staff title of Associate Instructor (see Policy 6-309).

The Lecturer faculty category has grown moderately across campus since 1999, but certain course-offering units and certain teaching personnel have been excluded from using it. By long-standing practice based on Policies 6-302 and 6-311, only academic departments and colleges have had the authority to appoint faculty in any category. Proposed Rule 6-310 would extend the authority to appoint Lecturer faculty to the Honors College (formerly Honors Program), University Writing Program, Gender Studies Program, Ethnic Studies Program, and LEAP Program (collectively— Qualified Inter-Disciplinary Teaching “QIDT” programs). The teaching personnel of the programs who would be encompassed in this proposal include some very long-serving (essentially career) teachers who are highly qualified, experienced, and dedicated to teaching. (See the attached supporting materials for additional information about the programs and their teaching personnel.) The programs’ important shared characteristics are that they are interdisciplinary in subject areas, are not organized as academic departments (and not housed within any academic department—due to their interdisciplinarity), and have teaching as one of their primary missions (primarily undergraduate curriculum). They are long-established, with well-developed capabilities to manage their important curricular offerings and with internal
governance capabilities for the Lecturer appointment/evaluation responsibilities they would assume once fully approved.

The programs’ existing staffing configurations. Without the authority to make any direct faculty appointments, the programs’ courses are staffed in various ways. The Writing, Gender Studies, and Ethnic Studies programs have affiliated regular faculty in what are often referred to as joint appointments, but even these faculty members’ formal appointments rest in their departments, not the programs. Most Honors College courses are taught by regular faculty temporarily “borrowed” from their home departments. All of these programs have needed additional instructional personnel, however, and they and LEAP have been limited to either (i) depending on academic departments to make what are essentially ‘courtesy appointments’ of Lecturer faculty to teach courses for the programs, or (ii) having the course instructors relegated to a non-faculty status, typically as Associate Instructor (an academic staff title the programs have had authority to use).

Although the programs have made-do with those two course-staffing arrangements, there are significant troubling aspects which make it unwise to continue relying so heavily on those arrangements. The inherent difficulties have been brought into sharp focus as the University has begun implementing the accreditation recommendations.

The non-faculty Associate Instructor title & its inappropriateness for long-serving high quality teachers in the QIDT Programs. A number of long-time Associate Instructors have teaching responsibilities and accomplishments paralleling or exceeding those of individuals (often more junior) whose field and work place them in an academic department that has available the auxiliary faculty appointment authority. Nevertheless, University policy 6-309 precludes any appointment term longer than a year and provides no hierarchy of ranks and opportunity for promotions to recognize increasing accomplishments over a career. Lacking the confirmation of a vote by peers, the Academic Senate, and the Board of Trustees, it is a title that carries significantly less prestige than a faculty appointment—sending a message to the teacher and the students as to the value the University places on the teacher’s work. The array of rights and corresponding responsibilities which various University policies and practices make applicable for faculty (including auxiliary faculty) do not directly apply for the non-faculty personnel. For example, the Faculty Code of Rights and Responsibilities is by its terms applicable only for faculty (see Policy 6-316).

Courtesy appointments & inherent difficulties for implementing newly required evaluation systems. The second existing mechanism, the practice of calling upon a cooperating academic department to use its faculty appointment authority to give a ‘courtesy’ Lecturer appointment to an individual who exclusively teaches courses for the interdisciplinary program, has had various difficulties. Despite being technically available, promotions in rank and long-term reappointments have rarely occurred because department faculty are not personally familiar with the individuals and their achievements. And now, the accreditation requirements make even more clear that the appropriate mechanism for periodic evaluations of auxiliary faculty is to pair evaluations with the process of reappointment—with a peer-faculty group and immediate supervising administrator in their primary workplace units having the major roles in both the evaluation and the accompanying reappointment. Such arrangements would then be essentially parallel to those being implemented.
for auxiliary faculty in academic colleges as part of the accreditation response, except that for Lecturers in these programs, there would be an additional layer of quality-assurance in the form of review of individual appointments by the proposed new University Committee.

In sum, the proposal would allow these specified programs authority to appoint and reappoint well-qualified teachers in the auxiliary category of Lecturer. It would allow the appointments, evaluations, and reappointments to be made by the programs actually responsible for the courses being taught and by the peer faculty and administrators who are in regular contact with the Lecturers and familiar with their curricular setting. It would allow highly qualified teachers to be given an appropriate Lecturer faculty title, rather than being relegated to the inappropriate title of non-faculty Associate Instructor, and allow them to be considered for promotions in rank and for longer term reappointments. A new University committee made up of regular faculty would oversee the process and ensure standards of excellence in those appointments and subsequent reappointments.

2. Highlights of the proposal.

This second prong of the overall proposal involves a proposed new Rule 6-310(IDTP), an addition to Policy 6-310 as a foundation for that Rule, and a minor conforming cross-reference addition in Policy 6-302. With those regulations approved, these points would be in place:

- Defining (and narrowly limiting) the programs encompassed, and defining (and narrowly limiting) the appointment authority being given. Brief additions to Policy 6-310 will create a general anchor point for new Rule 6-310(IDTP), and that Rule in turn will provide the details, to allow for the needed reconfiguration of the appointments-reappointments procedures. It narrowly limits applicability to five specified programs, and narrowly limits their appointing authority to include only Lecturer faculty. (Rule, III-A).

- Requiring the qualified programs to develop internal rules and systems for appointments/reappointments/evaluations of their Lecturers. These regulations will not immediately result in any power to make appointments. Rather, they set in place a process by which the programs can qualify to have such authority, and each may proceed through the qualification process at its own pace. Some are expecting to move quickly within months after the regulations take effect—and others plan to proceed more slowly as suits their circumstances. To qualify, each must develop and submit for approval a very specific plan for appointing—evaluating—reappointing the Lecturers (paralleling the requirements Policy 6-310 imposes for academic colleges/departments). The plan must include a faculty-peer committee with a central role (closely paralleling the process to be used in college/department plans). (Rule, III-C).

- Establishing the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory ("UITP") Committee and setting its membership and functions. A new University committee with broad faculty representation (including representatives of the programs) will be established, with two important functions. It will first review and approve the appointment-evaluation plans developed by each program, and then have a role in the process of approving individual appointments and reappointments of the program’s Lecturers. This second role will ensure that the scrutiny of the programs’ Lecturers will be functionally at least equal to and in some respects exceed the scrutiny applicable for auxiliary faculty in the academic colleges and
departments. It would serve well the teaching quality-assurance principle central to the accreditation response.

3. Limitations within the proposal—responses to expressed concerns.

As this prong of the overall 6-310 proposal has been under discussion over several months, certain concerns have been identified, and the detailed proposal has been crafted to address those concerns.

**Budgetary impact.** None of the steps proposed is expected to have any significant budgetary impact. No increase in overall numbers of personnel in the programs will follow from this. Since the currently cooperating departments derive no revenue from the existing courtesy appointments arrangements, the shift will have no effect on their budgets.

**Detracting from the primacy of academic colleges and departments as the traditional and appropriate structure for the University’s academic missions.** Preliminary discussion of this proposal has questioned whether other administrative units, beyond these five targeted programs, could also be given auxiliary faculty appointing authority now or in the future, potentially including research centers, institutes, and other units bearing the label of ‘program’ or ‘academic program.’ Some commentators have described that possibility as intriguing and likely desirable---and others find it very troubling. In light of the concerns, and to avoid a lengthy debate about such broader prospects, this final proposal is crafted carefully to be very tightly limited in scope. Note again the limitations---it applies only for interdisciplinary programs for which teaching is one of the primary functions and which have the developed capability to carry out the appointment/evaluation responsibilities that accompany the appointing authority, and it applies only for auxiliary faculty whose primary work is teaching (the defining characteristic for the Lecturer category). Only the five specified programs have been identified as currently fitting in that tightly limited scope. If another program were to emerge as possibly appropriate for inclusion, it could be considered, but adding it to the qualified list would require an explicit amendment of Rule 6-310, which would require formal approval of the Academic Senate, and that program would have to go through the rigorous process prescribed within the Rule to achieve approval from the University Committee. To reiterate---any expansion for other types of units, or other categories of faculty, could only occur with formal Senate and administrative approval. If there is a case to be made for allowing such expansion, as some commentators have suggested there may be, that case can be made at another time in some other context—distinct from this narrow proposal.

**Curricular incursion.** Some commentators have expressed concern that having the authority for Lecturer appointments might somehow lead to the QIDT programs inappropriately expanding their course offerings into fields currently occupied by academic departments. However, the reconfiguration of the appointment system for Lecturers in these programs is not tied to any change in course offerings---the programs contemplate offering the same portfolio of courses as in the past---but with different titles now to be possible for the teachers of those courses. Moreover, the University has in place an effective means for managing curricular allocations among units---the Curriculum Review Board. Any change in course offerings proposed by any of the programs at any point in the future would be processed through the same review process as now applies for their courses as well as the offerings of academic departments.
4. Consultation and further information.

This second prong of the overall proposal (Rule 6-310) was developed by an ad hoc committee consisting of John Francis, Senior Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies (administrative responsibility for LEAP); Robert Newman, Associate Vice President for Interdisciplinary Studies and Dean of Humanities (responsibility for Writing); Octavio Villalpando, Associate Vice President for Diversity (responsibility for Ethnic and Gender Studies); and Susan Olson, Associate Vice President for Faculty, with the assistance of Bob Flores, Professor of Law, former president of the Academic Senate, and Special Assistant for Faculty Policy—V.P. Academic Affairs. Over the course of several months of development the proposal was discussed in concept form with the Council of Academic Deans and chairs of academic departments, the Senate Executive Committee, and the Institutional Policy Committee. The entire proposal, in detailed form, has been discussed with representatives of the affected programs, and with the University RPT Standards Committee (to tap the members’ expertise on faculty evaluation systems). It was presented to the Senate Executive Committee for processing in December, and as expected that committee determined that pursuant to Policy 1-001 this matter is academically significant and so designated the proposal for debate and approval in the Academic Senate beginning in January. Further, as recommended by the Senate leadership, additional consultations are also underway with the Graduate Council, the Undergraduate Council, and the Academic Policy Advisory Committee, and presentation of the proposal to the Senate for approval has been delayed by an additional month to accommodate that further broad consultation.

With Senate approval of the overall proposal, the proposed Policy revisions will then be submitted for final approval of the Board of Trustees.

Questions and comments about the revisions to Policy 6-310 (for departments/colleges) are best directed to Susan Olson (susan.olson@utah.edu) or Bob Flores (floresr@law.utah.edu). Questions and comments about Rule 6-310 (for the five interdisciplinary programs) are best directed to John Francis (john.francis@utah.edu) or any others on the ad hoc committee.
II. Proposed amendment of Policy 6-310.  {draft 2010-1-5}

Policy 6-310: Appointment, Reappointment and Evaluation of Auxiliary Faculty and Other Instructional Personnel (Rev. 0 1)  Effective date: [spring 2010 ??]

I. Purpose and Scope

This Policy and associated Regulations are intended to serve the University’s general commitment to excellence in all areas and particularly in its teaching mission, and to maintain the high quality of all the University’s auxiliary faculty members and of non-faculty instructional personnel by establishing minimum guidelines requirements for a systematic process to ensure that quality. Because auxiliary faculty and non-faculty instructional personnel engage in a wide range of activities within a variety of organizational structures, considerable flexibility is allowed for academic units needed for colleges and departments to determine details appropriate to such processes for their own operations. This Policy applies for all academic units of the University which appoint any auxiliary faculty member (of any category) or employ any non-faculty instructional personnel (as defined here), including academic colleges, academic departments, free-standing academic divisions, qualified interdisciplinary teaching programs, and libraries.

Effective date: ____

II. Definitions: Effective Date

The college (and department) policies required by this university policy are due at the office of the cognizant senior vice president no later than January 15, 2008. The remaining portions of this university policy will be effective upon its approval and adoption.

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

“Auxiliary faculty member” means any individual who holds a faculty appointment (including library faculty) within any academic unit of the University as a Lecturer, Clinical, Research, Adjunct, or Visiting faculty member. (See Policy 6-300-- Auxiliary Faculty).

“Non-faculty instructional personnel” means any individual who does not hold a regular or auxiliary faculty appointment at the University but is employed by any academic unit of the University to teach any credit-bearing course. Such personnel may include those classified as academic staff (associate instructors, or research associates), as well as graduate student instructors of record, or postdoctoral fellows). (See Policy 6-309).
“Qualified interdisciplinary teaching program” means an academic unit of the University meeting specified criteria as being a program with teaching as a primary mission, contributing substantially to the University’s overall teaching mission, and interdisciplinary in subject matter. Such Programs, which are not otherwise authorized to appoint members of the University faculty (regular or auxiliary), may pursuant to this Policy and an associated Rule be designated as qualified appointing units to appoint certain instructional auxiliary faculty members.

A “faculty appointing unit” for purposes of this Policy is any academic unit which is authorized to and does make any appointment of any auxiliary faculty member.

III. References

References to other Policies are moved to part V

IV. Policy

A. Auxiliary Faculty.

1. Initial Appointments of Auxiliary Faculty.

a. Authority for appointments of auxiliary faculty by academic units.

i) Any academic unit which has authority to appoint members of the regular faculty (tenure-eligible, tenured) or library faculty equivalent also has the authority to act as an appointing unit to appoint members of the auxiliary faculty in any category (Lecturer, Clinical, Research, Adjunct, or Visiting or equivalent for faculty of the libraries), and to employ any other non-faculty instructional personnel. These units include academic colleges, academic departments, free-standing academic divisions (and libraries). (See Policies 2-004, 6-311, 6-300, 6-301, 6-302, 6-306, 6-312).

ii) Qualified interdisciplinary teaching programs designated for purposes of this Policy as meeting the criteria specified in a University Rule associated with this Policy shall have the limited authority to act as appointing units to appoint members of the auxiliary faculty in an instructional auxiliary faculty category. These include only those academic units specifically designated in such University Rule as being qualified interdisciplinary teaching programs. These programs shall also continue to have the authority to employ other non-faculty instructional personnel.

b. Qualifications and credentials for initial appointments of auxiliary faculty.

All faculty appointing units when initially appointing any auxiliary faculty and academic staff (associate instructors and research associates), departments must verify that they candidates possess appropriate credentials by way of degrees and field of study for the position consistent with University policy Regulations, and Departments must maintain on file appropriate documentation curriculum.
vita for each individual appointed or hired into one of these positions. The terms of such appointments and the processes for making such appointments shall be consistent with University policies and Regulations regarding appointments of auxiliary faculty, including Policies [6-300] (terms of auxiliary faculty appointments) and [6-302] (procedures for faculty appointments and reappointments).

2-B. Evaluation and Reappointment of Auxiliary Faculty.

a. All faculty appointing units which appoint any auxiliary faculty in any category of Colleges (and departments only when necessary because of widely varying circumstances) must establish and develop and present for approval a Statement of academic unit rules that provide a statement of procedures, criteria and standards for the evaluation and reappointment of each category of auxiliary faculty used in the unit and that also provide evaluation plans, which must address evaluation and reappointments of both compensated and uncompensated (volunteer) faculty, and must provide for more thorough review of the former. For academic colleges encompassing multiple departments (or free-standing divisions), such rules shall be established at the college level and be applicable for all appointing units within the college (unless it is determined that independent rules are necessary for one or more of the units because of widely varying circumstances within the college).

b. The procedures for making such reappointments (including reappointments with promotion) of auxiliary faculty members in any category shall be consistent with University policies, especially Policy 6-302 (including the required recommendation from the Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee of the appointing unit) (with adaptations as appropriate for the organizational structure of the appointing unit).

c. Each appointing unit must designate a committee or individual(s) responsible for administering evaluation processes and making a recommendation to the unit’s Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee before that committee’s members vote on the reappointment or non-reappointment of each auxiliary faculty member before the department faculty votes on each such faculty member. That designation shall be described in the unit’s Statement of procedures for evaluations and reappointments.

d. Statements of appointing unit rules may distinguish between procedures followed for annual evaluations associated with annual reappointments, and those followed for more thorough reviews of long-term serving auxiliary faculty, which must occur at least every five years. For faculty whose duties include teaching, multiple indicators of teaching quality must be used in these more thorough reviews. See Procedure 6-310.

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

f6. If an academic unit serves as the appointing unit for a faculty appointment department provides appointment homes for individuals whose work primarily takes place in a different unit, the appointing unit shall consult with the primary workplace unit colleges must coordinate with those units in developing and implementing criteria, standards, and procedures for evaluations. See Procedure 6-310.

g7. Where Adjunct faculty hold regular faculty appointments in another department at the University, a department When a faculty member holding an Adjunct appointment in one academic unit also holds a regular faculty appointment in another unit of the University and is subject to thorough periodic reviews in that home unit, the unit of the Adjunct appointment may simply rely on the regular review procedure in the faculty member’s home department or may do its own review.

C. Evaluation and Reappointment of Other Instructional Personnel. (Drafting note: former contents of this part are for ease of reading moved to Part B below, and then modified as shown there.)

3D. Documentation of Reviews of Auxiliary Faculty.

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

4E. Promotions of Long-Serving Auxiliary Faculty, and Multi-year Reappointments.

The University’s commitment to excellence is served by recognizing and retaining auxiliary faculty of high quality. Accordingly, in conjunction with these requirements, colleges or departments appointing units with auxiliary faculty in the categories of Lecturer, Clinical, Research, or Adjunct must establish criteria, standards, and procedures for promotions in rank (which are accomplished through reappointment with promotion per Policy 6-302). These should apply primarily for long-term long-serving auxiliary faculty. Appointing units are also encouraged to consider offering multi-year reappointments for faculty with high qualifications (particularly for accomplished teaching faculty), as may be appropriate to the circumstances of the unit. (See Policy 6-300--annual terms as norms, longer terms of up to 5 years permitted when appropriate). Statements of unit rules shall include descriptions of the required information regarding promotions in rank, and any rules adopted by the unit regarding length of terms of appointments.

5. F. Governance Roles for Auxiliary Faculty.

Academic units appointing auxiliary faculty (particularly long-serving members) in the categories of Lecturer, Clinical, or Research Colleges are also strongly encouraged to establish policies/rules addressing participation of such faculty members in departmental and/or college governance (and when appropriate, recognition of University service), and
resources for professional development available to such faculty, and other instructional personnel. Description of such matters should be included with the Statement of unit rules required under this Policy. See Procedure 6-310.

B. Employment, Evaluation and Reemployment of Other Non-Faculty Instructional Personnel
[Note: contents moved from former Part II-C, and then modified as shown here]

Academic units which regularly employ any non-faculty instructional personnel (as defined for this Policy) shall develop and submit for approval a description of procedures, criteria, and standards for employing and reemploying, and most importantly for periodically evaluating the teaching work of such personnel. A brief statement describing such matters may be incorporated with the Statement of academic unit rules required under Part III-A of this Policy (for those units which appoint auxiliary faculty). Procedures similar to those in sections B.4 and B.5 must be developed and followed for evaluating teaching by associate instructors, graduate student instructors of record, and postdoctoral fellows. The criteria for employment/reemployment must ensure that such personnel have appropriate qualifications by way of education and field of study appropriate to the assigned duties. Evaluation plans must provide for closer scrutiny of new instructors and those teaching in new areas. Classroom observation of new instructors is encouraged. Academic units must designate a committee or individual(s) responsible for evaluating all such instructional personnel and making a recommendation on each person to the department chairperson or designee responsible for staffing courses prior to reemployment/reappointments. Units must maintain on file appropriate documentation of the qualifications of all active non-faculty instructional personnel.

CG. Approval Requirement for Rules/Policies

The Statements of academic unit rules Policies for appointment, evaluation, for and reappointment (including reappointment with promotion) of auxiliary faculty (Part III-A), and/or employment/reemployment and evaluation of other non-faculty instructional personnel (Part III-B) must be submitted to the cognizant senior vice president for approval.

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

Rules {see attached proposal for Rule 6-310(IDTP)}

Procedures [reserved]

Guidelines [reserved]

Forms [reserved]

Other related resource materials. [reserved]
V. References:

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

VI. Contacts:

Policy Officer: [Sr. VP Academic Affairs. Sr. VP Health Sciences]
Policy Owner: [Academic Affairs: Associate VP for Faculty—Susan Olson—Academic Affairs
[Health Sciences: Associate VP Richard Sperry]

VII. History:

Current version: University Policy 6-310, Revision # 1. Approved_____, with the designated effective date of ____..

Background information on Revision 1. [link]

Earlier versions:

University Policy 6-310, Revision 0. Effective dates May 14, 2007 to ____. {link to Policy 6-310, Rev. 0.}
III. Proposal for new Rule 6-310(IDTP)

{draft 2010-1-13 }

University Rule 6-310(IDTP) Revision 0.
Subject: Appointment, Reappointment and Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty and Other Non-Faculty Instructional Personnel in Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs.

Revision Status: 0 (new) Effective Date: [____]

I. Purpose.

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

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

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

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

   3. Criteria. This designation is made based on the following significant characteristics of these programs:
      - Interdisciplinarity of subject matter.
      - Teaching as one of the primary functions, and with established expertise in offering multiple courses (particularly including credit-bearing courses for the undergraduate curriculum) significant to the overall teaching mission of the University.
Not administratively housed within any academic department and not otherwise authorized to make appointments of regular or auxiliary faculty.

Established internal governance structures suited to providing faculty-peer input and internal administrator input for making recommendations regarding appointments, periodic evaluations, and reappointments of Lecturer faculty candidates.

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

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

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

For its first year of operation, the committee members shall be appointed by the President of the University, with three members appointed for a one-year term, three for a two-year term, and three for a three-year term (so that subsequent membership changes will be staggered). For subsequent years, new members shall be nominated by the Senate Personnel and Elections Committee and appointed by the President, and all new members shall be appointed for three-year terms. Vacancies due to early resignation shall be filled by nomination of the UITP Committee’s chairperson with majority approval of the remaining members of the Committee, to complete the resigning member’s term.

The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs shall appoint the non-voting chairperson (ordinarily the Associate Vice President of Interdisciplinary Studies). The Associate Vice President for Faculty, or designee, shall serve as a non-voting, ex officio member of the committee.

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

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

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

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

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

The procedures shall include the following.

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. Evaluations of non-faculty instructional personnel.

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

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

A. Policies.
   Policy 6-310
   Policy 6-302
B. Procedures [reserved]
C. Guidelines [reserved]
D. Forms [reserved]
E. Other related resources [reserved]

V. Contacts:
   Policy Officer: ____
   Policy Owner: ____

VI. History:

A. Current version. Revision 0. Approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences __[date]____. Reviewed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee and categorized as academically significant for purposes of Policy 1-001. Approved by the Academic Senate ____[date]__.

Legislative history—______ 2009. {link}
IV. Policy 6-302, notice of conforming change, to add in footnote 4 a cross-reference to Policy 6-310.

A. Explanation: If the revision of Policy 6-310 and adoption of new Rule 6-310(IDTP) are approved as now proposed, then a conforming change will be made to Policy 6-302 footnote #4.

Policy 6-302 regulates the procedures for making appointments of all faculty, including appointments and reappointments of auxiliary faculty. The current version of footnote 4 explains how the procedures are adapted for variations in organizational structure of academic units, including variations of colleges with multiple or single departments, and free-standing divisions. If approved, the changed Policy 6-310 and new Rule 6-310 (IDTP) will add another variation of organizational structure relevant to appointments procedures---and so it will be prudent to add in that footnote a minor cross-reference explaining that the general appointments procedures described in 6-302 will be specifically adapted for application to the appointments of Lecturers by the approved Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs. The adapted procedures will then be described in part in new Rule 6-310(IDTP) and then further elaborated in the Statements of rules that will be developed for each Program and approved by the new University Committee.

B. Footnote 4 in Policy 6-302 will have the following conforming addition to clarify the relationship of the two sets of regulations.

Policy 6-302 Footnote 4: ……

[For appointments (including reappointments), of instructional auxiliary faculty in the qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs governed by Policy 6-310 Section III-A-1-a-ii, these Procedures shall be modified appropriately to accommodate the organizational structures of such Programs, as shall be described in Statements approved in accordance with Rule 6-310 (IDTP).]

V. Supporting materials

[Attached letters from Carolyn Bliss (LEAP), John Francis (Associate V.P Undergraduate Studies), Maureen Mathison (Writing), Robert Newman (Dean of Humanities, Associate V.P. Interdisciplinary Studies), Ed Buendia (Ethnic Studies), Kathryn Stockton (Gender Studies), Martha Bradley (Honors)]
December 29, 2009

John Francis, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
195 S. Central Campus Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dear John,

This letter supports the nomination of LEAP as one of the five interdisciplinary teaching programs allowed to make appointments and promotions of Lecturer faculty under the proposed new Rule 6-310. The information herein is meant to assist you in giving Academic Senators familiarity with and assurance about the quality of LEAP and its centrality to the University’s mission.

LEAP (an acronym standing for “Learning, Engagement, Achievement, and Progress”) in most of its versions is a two-semester learning community for entering students. It keeps students with the same cohort of classmates and the same instructor for two three-credit-hour classes in successive semesters, these courses together fulfilling two general education requirements and the University’s diversity requirement. LEAP was initiated in 1994 in response to the recommendations of a University committee charged with increasing freshman to sophomore year retention, something the program has consistently accomplished. In fact, since 1999, LEAP has retained students into their second year at an average rate 6.47% higher than the retention rate of non-LEAP students.

Starting with a student body of approximately 100 and a lock-step curriculum shared by all LEAP students, the program has since grown and diversified. In the fall of 2009, we enrolled 958 students (876 of them entering first-year students), in twelve different versions of LEAP, together constituting 27 first-year sections and five sections for students beyond the first year. The twelve versions of LEAP, taught by a total of twelve different course instructors, are:

- Exploration LEAP for all majors or those exploring for a major;
- Service LEAP, incorporating service experiences and offering service learning credit;
- LEAP for Residence Hall students, allowing them to connect with other residents;
- Pre-professional LEAPs for students planning to major in:
  - Architecture
  - Business
  - College of Health
  - Education
  - Engineering (required for some Engineering majors)
  - Fine Arts
- Multi-year LEAPs for underrepresented students seeking careers in:
  - Engineering (2 years)
  - Law (3 years)
  - Health Sciences (4 years)

Office of Undergraduate Studies
195 S. Central Campus Drive
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-0511
(801) 581-3811
FAX (801) 585-3581
LEAP also partners with the Writing Program to offer LEAP-specific sections of Writing 2010 (14 of these in the fall of 2009), with University College to offer optional courses in major selection, and with the Marriott Library to incorporate into the LEAP seminars the Writing 1060 course in “Methods and Technologies of Library Research.” In addition, Education LEAP and Fine Arts LEAP offer Service Learning credit, as does one of the third year classes in Pre-Law LEAP and both of the fourth-year classes in Health Sciences LEAP.

In addition to retaining students beyond their first year, LEAP aims to give them a good start in college, such that they become fully engaged with the campus, connect with faculty and fellow students, and move smoothly into their majors. In a study of 1491 pairs of demographically similar students starting college between 1999 and 2006 that matched students with the same gender, race or ethnicity, age, high school, year of entering college, and admissions index, we found that those with LEAP “twins,” LEAP students earned higher GPA’s in their first year, attempted and completed more credit hours, were more likely to enroll in the University in the following fall, and graduated at higher rates at both the four and six-year marks. Subsequent analysis of these data reveals that LEAP participation is correlated with especially beneficial educational outcomes for women and students of color, a fact that helps to justify LEAP’s winning of the University’s Diversity Award in 2005. In addition, the program was recognized as innovative and effective by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1998, and its Director was among the top five of 116 candidates for the national Outstanding First-Year Advocate Award in 2008.

All LEAP course instructors hired by Undergraduate Studies hold the Ph.D., and they have been recognized over the years by every University teaching award for which they qualify. These honors include Presidential Teaching Scholar, Student Choice Award, Distinguished Teaching Award, University Professor, Honors Professor of the Year, Beehive Honor Society Faculty Honor Roll, and a number of teaching awards given by the Greek system, University athletic programs, and individual colleges.

The twelve current LEAP course instructors include five men and seven women, two of whom are persons of color. Of the twelve, seven hold faculty appointments (which are made in other academic departments because of the current lack of authority for LEAP to make such appointments). Five of those with faculty appointments are at the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer): three in the English Department, one in the History Department, and one in the Philosophy Department. One holds the rank of Visiting Assistant Professor in the English Department, and one is a Visiting Instructor in Architecture. The remaining five are Associate Instructors (again, employed in those non-faculty positions primarily because LEAP has not had authority to make faculty appointments and because relying on cooperating departments to appoint our course instructors presents great difficulties). Some have been held at the AI rank for many years. In my own case, for example, I was an Associate Instructor for sixteen years before becoming an Assistant Professor Lecturer, a rank I have now held for eight years.

Among the five LEAP course teachers who are now Associate Instructors, three have already taught in LEAP beyond the five years we will propose as the period of service necessary before application to attain the Lectureship rank, and thus might apply for a Lecturer faculty
appointment as soon as the new Rule is approved and our proposed appointment system approved and implemented. Four of the five currently in faculty appointments as Assistant Professors (Lecturer) would also be eligible to apply for promotion to Associate Professor (Lecturer), according to the promotion system we will propose for approval.

Giving LEAP the authority and responsibility to appoint, reappoint, evaluate, and promote Lectureship faculty would benefit the program and the University by enabling us to more effectively recruit and retain top-notch faculty whose central interest and commitment is teaching. We are very grateful to you, John, to Susan Olson, to Bob Flores, to Robert Newman, and to all who have acted as our advocates in bringing this proposal to the Academic Senate.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Bliss, Ph.D.
LEAP Program Director
Professor James Anderson
President, Academic Senate

Dear Jim,

I write in enthusiastic support of the proposal regarding University Policy and Rule 6-310—and particularly the authorization of the specified interdisciplinary programs to appoint instructors as Lecturer faculty. I base this support on observations made over my several decades as a faculty member of the University (Political Science), and long service in our academic administration, including my current role as Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies. My responsibilities in administering Undergraduate Studies and the Undergraduate Council have given me a good overview of the various ways in which multiple parts of our University contribute to our overall mission of providing outstanding education to our undergraduate population. The Council considers for approval all undergraduate majors and conducts periodic review of programs with exclusive undergraduate degrees. The Undergraduate Council contributes to the Graduate Council review process as well.

More specifically, in this administrative role I have had direct responsibility over the LEAP Program, and have thus developed some familiarity with the important contributions LEAP makes for the University’s undergraduate teaching mission. I have come to appreciate the high quality and remarkable dedication of the persons who teach in and administer the program, and an understanding of the significant problems faced by this and the other four affected programs that will best be solved by adopting this carefully tailored proposal.

There is a small but vital community of instructors on our campus who make an important and sustained contribution to our undergraduate teaching mission in programs that serve students outside the disciplines. LEAP is one of those programs, and the instructors who serve in the program are charged to build retention and to facilitate their students’ transition into the University’s impressive array of majors.

These committed instructors, who in many cases have served this university for decades, have doctoral degrees from this University and from other universities. But they do not teach in their disciplines of origin, are supervised elsewhere from these departments, and do not participate in the departments that house the respective disciplines associated with their advanced degrees. Their teaching and advising is designed to serve a great range of students moving into a great range of majors.
The proposal that is before the Academic Senate would authorize LEAP and the other programs to appoint certain well-qualified instructors as Lecturer faculty. This is designed to recognize the roles of this set of instructors in serving the University’s overall teaching mission on an interdisciplinary (or multidisciplinary) basis, rather than the goals and mission of a specific discipline. LEAP instructors serve our students on the path to their joining departments, but by the nature of their roles the teaching missions of the LEAP instructors are outside the traditional disciplines. LEAP, like the other four programs, and the program instructors, serve in ways that are highly valuable to many of our students and that facilitate broad university purposes.

The proposal includes a carefully crafted plan for implementing the new authority for Lecturer appointments—with the important feature of the establishment of a University-wide committee to review and approve the procedures to be adopted by the identified programs. The committee would also have an important role in the recommendation of individuals for appointment as Lecturers. The committee, composed of faculty members drawn from colleges with an undergraduate teaching mission should be in a position to effectively evaluate not only the procedures adopted by the programs to vet these instructors for Lecturer appointments, but also to review the pertinent accomplishments of the recommended individual candidates. There is value in devising a review process that is both transparent and rigorous, given the broad constituency to be served.

I very much hope that you will help give the recognition that I would argue is needed for this small but vital group of instructors, and strengthen the ability of the LEAP Program to make its important contributions toward maintaining the University as an outstanding institution for undergraduate education.

John G. Francis  Professor of Political Science  Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
January 4, 2010

I am writing this letter in support of the nomination of the University Writing Program (UWP) as one of the interdisciplinary programs allowed to make appointments and promotions of Lecturer faculty under the proposed new Rule 6-310. A change in the rule would allow the UWP to continue its standard of excellence in successfully meeting the goals of its mission to the University.

The University Writing Program was established to create undergraduate writing courses and to train teacher for those courses, to develop and support writing-across-the-curriculum initiatives, and to develop and enhance graduate work in writing studies, all under the purview of one academic unit. In 1983 the University Academic Senate charged the UWP with the oversight of all curricular initiatives and teaching of writing on campus.

Brief Overview of the Unit
The University Writing Program is an autonomous unit that offers undergraduate instruction in courses that fulfill general education and university requirements. It has no undergraduate major at this time, but offers a minor in Literacy Studies (2002), MA tracks in rhetoric and composition in English and Communication, and a Ph.D. in rhetoric and composition whose students enroll through the departments of Communication; English; Education, Culture and Society; and Linguistics. For a complete description of UWP requirements and course offerings, please see the 2009-10 University Catalog at http://www.acs.utah.edu/GenCatalog/crsdesc/wrtg.html. The UWP enrolls approximately 4,000 undergraduate students in its general education and baccalaureate requirement courses, 15 literacy minors, 3 Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP) students, and 13 graduate students.

The UWP currently has five tenure-track faculty positions (whose home departments include English and Communication), with members all holding doctoral degrees from highly regarded institutions. Each faculty member has a robust research agenda, evinced by its strong national standing. The UWP faculty members also carry full-service responsibilities in their home departments, as well as a UWP-specific service load that includes full responsibility for writing courses and cross-curricular pedagogy in writing. Specifically each faculty member coordinates at least one undergraduate course, responsible for curriculum content and the training of its instructors; supervises and trains tutors for the University Writing Center; consults with faculty members in the Colleges of Business, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Engineering, Nursing, and Medicine; and presents the UWP’s expertise in pedagogy and evaluation related to writing in state, local, and campus venues. Each faculty member is also responsible for advising undergraduate and graduate students in the minor and graduate degree programs.
Additionally, in recent years the demand across campus for UWP-related expertise has grown, and the UWP plays a more involved and significant role not only for students, but for faculty members and campus organizations as well. We conduct workshops in undergraduate classrooms and in centers across campus, including the Women’s Resource Center (WRC), American Indian Resource Center (AIRC), and Center for Ethnic Student Affairs (CESA), and increasingly, we assist faculty members with their grant writing and publishing efforts. The number of requests, however, is becoming greater than the current faculty can fulfill.

**Importance of Lecturer Positions**

Because of the small number of tenure-track faculty members, the Writing Program relies on a large pool of graduate (53) and associate instructors (22), and on one Assistant Professor/Lecturer through English, whose teaching and service responsibilities are comparable to those of tenure-track faculty members. Twelve of the AIs are male and 10 are female. The Assistant Professor/Lecturer is female. Associate Instructors, many of whom have served for five years or more, comprise the consistent core of our teaching staff. They generally hold an advanced degree in areas related to rhetoric and writing studies and have a range of professional and teaching experiences. Their knowledge serves in many ways to informally continue the support graduate students receive in our teacher-training colloquia; they frequently provide suggestions and advice to newer instructors about the classroom and about dealing successfully with undergraduate students. In addition, lecturers work with other units, such as the Bennion Center and the International Center, to help improve the overall quality of education on campus. Some of our Associate Instructors have helped to develop study abroad opportunities for undergraduate students and have created new courses that enhance our curriculum. Because Associate Instructors are more narrowly focused on their teaching (rather than on graduate coursework), their evaluations tend to be higher and more consistent than those of graduate students across time.

Allowing the UWP to convert some of the Associate Instructor positions to Lecturer positions would allow for continued quality as this shift would translate to less turnover and increased involvement among Lecturers in the UWP’s mission. Associate Instructors who meet the criteria for Lecturer would be eligible not only to apply for teaching grants and awards, but for other opportunities that would enhance their professional development. Lecturers would also be eligible for multi-year appointments, which would improve the effectiveness of the UWP as it annually plans its strategic goals. The criteria for appointment to, and the procedures for promotion for, the position would be developed by the UWP tenure-track faculty members, who would ensure that they are held to the highest standards in the profession.

Sincerely,

Maureen Mathison, Director
MEMORANDUM

December 16, 2009

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee
From: Robert Newman, Dean, College of Humanities and Associate Vice President for Interdisciplinary Studies

Subject: Support for Proposal for Appointment of Teaching Lecturers in Interdisciplinary Programs

I strongly support the proposal for appointment of teaching lecturers in interdisciplinary programs. Under current practice, any department might abruptly decide in any given year that it does not wish to participate in the appointment or reappointment of lecturers who, despite have terminal degrees in its discipline, do not teach in that department. In addition to potentially compromising interdisciplinary programs like LEAP, Writing, Honors, Gender and Ethnic Studies, the possibility of such decisions significantly undercuts the security of a group of faculty who historically have performed an important function for the University. Since many of these lecturers also are women or minorities, the diversity of the University's faculty also is threatened.

For example, the Writing Program in the College of Humanities is an independent program (not housed in a department) with a multi-disciplinary agenda. Increasingly, it is involved in areas of campus like Engineering, Science, Education and Health Sciences in addition to the roles it plays in Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences. While many of its current lecturers come from English and Communication, its multidisciplinary expansion will necessitate lecturers with diverse disciplinary backgrounds. Its potential to serve the needs of so many disciplines is predicated on a consistent and secure system of appointments and reappointments.

The proposal is focused only on teaching appointments within interdisciplinary programs with strong teaching missions. It is not inventing a new category, but is addressing a lingering and potential problem linked to an existing group of faculty. I therefore urge your support.

Thank you for your attention.
January 14, 2010

Academic Senate:

I am writing this letter on behalf of the University of Utah’s Ethnic Studies Program in support of the policy change to Rule 6-310 that would allow several of the interdisciplinary programs on campus to make appointments and promotions of lecturer faculty.

Program Description
Prior to explaining the importance of this policy change, it is necessary to describe the program and its configuration of faculty. The Ethnic Studies program is a unit that is under the guises of the Associate Vice-President of Diversity’s office. It is an interdisciplinary program that serves the campus as a whole in examining issues of race, ethnicity and diversity. The Program offers a minor in five minor areas and is looking to propose a major in the very near future. With this plan, issues of growth in its faculty become very important.

The Ethnic Studies Program is principally comprised of tenure line faculty whom are jointly appointed and whose tenure lie within other units (e.g., Education, Culture & Society; Political Science; History, etc). The program also has several instructors whom have been teaching within the program for many years. The Ethnic Studies Program can be characterized as a unit focused on supporting excellence in teaching as well as in research.

Importance of the Policy Change
The instructors that the Ethnic Studies Program employs are important contributors to the mission of the program. These individuals have served the program for many years and provide students with the scope and depth of knowledge that distinguishes the University of Utah as a leader in the USHE system. Programs such as Ethnic Studies have needed an institutional mechanism that would recognize their service to the University of Utah. The title of Lecturer would help the program accomplish this. Furthermore, the program would be able to offer these individuals a contract that ensures some continuity than the year-to-year arrangement that presently exists. This can only help further the University’s and Programs commitment to excellence in teaching.
The Ethnic Studies Program also realizes that criteria for evaluating the teaching effectiveness of these lecturers will be necessary. The Ethnic Studies faculty has already begun the process of identifying the criteria as well as the timing of such evaluations for all instructors.

Thank you for considering this important revision.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ed Buendia
Director
Associate Professor
John Francis  
Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs  
195 S. Central Campus Drive  

Dear John—  

We in Gender Studies believe that our interdisciplinary program, which richly adds to the University’s teaching mission (as well as to its research goals), would benefit greatly from the allowance, proposed under Rule 6-310, to make our own appointments of Lecturer faculty—and to promote these professors as warranted. Let me therefore remind you about the structure and aims of the Gender Studies Program, as you seek to advocate for this proposal.

Gender studies has emerged as an interdisciplinary academic field with a large and impressive body of scholarship and courses that focus on the complex interaction of gender with race, class, sexual orientation, sexual subjectivity, religion, region, and nationality. In addition to its focus on the history and achievements of women, gender scholarship has also inspired research and curricula that address men’s lives, masculinity, and the lives of people who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered. In fact, gender studies is best understood as an evolution of the women’s studies programs founded in the same era as the women’s movements of the 1960s-1980s. Whereas women’s studies programs traditionally have focused on revealing and celebrating women’s contributions to culture and society, gender studies shifts attention to concentrate more comprehensively on the ways gender structures every social and cultural interaction. In response to this national trend, we changed our program’s name from Women’s Studies to Gender Studies in 2002-2003. The name “gender studies” is meant to convey that the Program intends to offer more than the inclusion of women in the university curriculum; that is, the Program seeks to explore both gender difference and gender inequality throughout the entire human experience, for both men and women.

The Gender Studies Program offers B.S. and B.A. degrees, as well as a minor in gender studies. As an interdisciplinary program, we offer courses that satisfy Upper Division Writing, Humanities Foundation, Humanities Integration, Social and Behavioral Science Foundation, and Social and Behavioral Science Integration requirements. Some of our courses also serve as elective or core credit for the Leadership Studies minor and the International Studies major. The overall mission of the Program is to provide a quality undergraduate education in gender scholarship, to promote an integration of this
scholarship and research into the university curriculum, to encourage new pedagogies, and to foster the growth of an interdisciplinary community of scholars who are interested in gender as a category of analysis. More specifically, the Program provides students with the tools of academic analysis so that they may explore the significance of gender as a crucial component in the organization of personal lives and social institutions. To this end, the courses offered by the Gender Studies Program – core courses, cross-lists with other departments, diversity, and service learning – re-evaluate the assumptions at work in traditional disciplines as they study individuals, cultures, social institutions, policy and other areas of scholarly inquiry. In these ways, the Program prepares students for graduate work and professional studies (e.g. Law or Medical School) and for employment in professional and community organizations.

As for the Program’s size, there are approximately one hundred Gender Studies majors and minors and, over the most recent five-year period, Gender Studies has graduated between fifteen and twenty majors each year. Around two hundred and fifty students enroll in the Program’s diversity and cross-listed classes each year, the majority of whom are not declared Gender Studies majors or minors. Since we changed our program’s name to Gender Studies, there has been an increase in male enrollment and male attendance in our courses and, since our inception as the Women’s Studies Program, we have been perceived as a safe space for gay, lesbian, and transgender students. Promisingly, our student population is also increasing in ethnic diversity, which is probably mostly due to our collaboration with Ethnic Studies and our Faculty/Student Seminars on Gender and Sexuality. Overall, through our publicly visible alliance with the Women’s Resource Center, the LGBTQ Center, Ethnic Studies, the Center for Ethnic Student Affairs (CESA), and Queer Students of Color, we hope to enhance our already diverse population with a greater range of diversity.

Under the Gender Studies curriculum, the requirements for majors are a total of five core courses (among them, “Protests and Movements,” “Feminist Political Thought,” “Masculinities,” “Queer Theory,” and “Critical Theories and Post-Structuralism”) and five electives (such as “Gender and Power in Latin America,” “Feminist Philosophy,” “Gender and War,” and “The History and Psychology of the ‘Gay’ Family”). We believe that our recent reinstatement of both service learning and internship opportunities offers our students the valuable chance to translate theory-speak into forms of praxis and ordinary discourse. By the same token, students in these courses learn to enliven their theoretical understandings by integrating service-learning perspectives into intense academic debates. During the almost five years since our recommitment to service learning and our renewed focus on our internship program, our students have been involved in outreach engagements that span local, national, and international communities.

To enact our teaching mission, the Program currently employs five full-time professors, who are jointly appointed by (and jointly teach in) the Gender Studies Program and a tenuring department (in our case: English, Psychology, Political Science, and History). A new faculty member, jointly appointed in Gender Studies and Education, Culture, and Society, will join our program in Fall 2010. Also teaching for the Program are the Director, the Associate Director, an associate instructor, and a pool of four to six adjunct instructors, of whom all but one have doctoral degrees or are candidates in Ph.D. programs at the University. Additionally, the Program yearly offers a teaching assistantship to an advanced graduate student who assists in our writing-intensive core course, “Protests and
Movements.” (The teaching awards received by our faculty include the Ramona Cannon Award, the Early Career Teaching Award, Distinguished Honors Professor, and the Presidential Teaching Scholar Award.)

Currently, seven of our adjunct instructors, including our Associate Director, are not tenure-track faculty. In the past, we have also had two visiting professors who were not on the tenure track, each of whom taught two diversity courses per semester for the Program. In the case of our adjunct instructors, however, we have so far not had a mechanism for appointing a Lecturer, since the instructors we might have considered for this position are not associated with any university department.

At the present time, for example, we have a long-term teacher in the Program, whom we would very much like to consider for a Lecturer position. Kandie Brinkman, a Ph.D., has consistently taught three or more of our large diversity courses each year for more than ten years. And, since the reincorporation of service learning in our program, she has also coordinated our service learning sections and internship programs. Notably, during the past two years, she has integrated service learning in our regular diversity courses, making these offerings accessible to at least twice as many students as in previous years. (The Bennion Center Service Learning Committee has not only approved Brinkman’s model, but has expressed interest in implementing it throughout the University’s service learning programs.)

In the past, as well, an instructor who is no longer with our program also struck us as an eminently qualified candidate for a Lecturer position. Chris Talbot, a history Ph.D., taught for Gender Studies for a period of about six years. Significantly, she had the knowledge, skills, and interest to teach many of our core courses: at different times she taught both of our diversity courses, our introductory and advanced feminist theory courses, as well as our writing-intensive course, “Protests and Movements,” which she helped design. She has since taken a position at another university, but had the option of promoting her to an Associate Professor (Lecturer) position (with longer-term employment) been available to us, we would have likely retained such an extraordinary instructor in our program.

As you can see, John, Gender Studies, in its significant capacity to strengthen the teaching mission and outcomes of the U, could dramatically benefit from appointing and promoting Lecturer faculty. Thank you in advance—and thanks as well to Susan Olson, Bob Flores, Octavio Villalpando, and Robert Newman—for taking this proposal to the Academic Senate.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Stockton
Director, Gender Studies
Date: December 16, 2009

To: John Francis, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
195 S. Central Campus Drive
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

From: Martha Bradley, Dean Honors College

Subject: Support for Proposal for Appointment of Lecturers in Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs

I strongly support this effort to make possible the appointment of teaching lecturers in interdisciplinary programs like Honors, LEAP, Ethnic Studies, Gender Studies and the Writing Program. The Honors College has a long and distinguished history on this campus. Fifty years ago the Honors Program was one of the first in the country. Three years ago, the University changed the Honors Program to the Honors College. More than 2,200 students participate in the Honors College to satisfy their General Education or Bachelor Degree requirements through Honors courses or to participate in a wide range of special opportunities like the Honors Think Tanks, Forums and Honors College Scholars programs and to earn the Honors Certificate and the Honors degree. The Honors College also offers departmental or college honors tracks of classes across campus that help Honors students complete some of their seven required Honors courses for the Honors degree. The Honors Living and Learning experience includes Honors housing at Officer’s Circle or the Honors Residence Hall. As might be expected, the retention rates of Honors students are high. Honors works to recruit the best students and give them meaningful reasons for staying. In the recent past, we have added to our staff a Distinguished Scholarship advisor who identifies strong candidates for scholarships like the Rhodes, Marshall and Truman, advises them during their time as undergraduates, and guides them through the application process.

Although the majority of Honors classes are and will continue to be taught by tenure-track faculty that we borrow from the academic colleges, there is a group of adjuncts who contribute strongly to our teaching mission. For example, Honors students are required to take at least one Honors writing class to satisfy the requirements for the Honors Certificate. These classes are taught by adjuncts that have had long and distinguished teaching careers and do the majority of their teaching in Honors. The faculty who would receive the lectureship rank in Honors would teach Honors writing or the Intellectual Traditions classes. Many of these individuals have won University teaching awards and are known as devoted mentors and master teachers. This change will represent an important step in supporting the fine efforts of our adjunct instructors to teach in Honors in a consistently excellent way. Although it will not impact a large number, for a small group of five individuals who currently teach for Honors, this designation will recognize the contribution they have made to our teaching mission, validate their effort to develop new and
innovative pedagogies, and provide them with increased access to university teaching awards and grants in the future.

After the last accreditation review, we established a review process for our adjunct faculty that includes the submission of a teaching portfolio and related supporting materials (evaluations, teaching philosophy statement and so forth). Files are reviewed every third year by a faculty committee composed of representatives from such departments as History, English and Philosophy who regularly teach for Honors. This in-place procedure provides a strong base for developing full criteria and procedures for making Lecturer faculty appointments.

Moreover, this authority and responsibility to appoint, reappoint, evaluate, and promote will help Honors maintain and nurture excellent faculty whose principal mission at the university is strong and innovative teaching.

Please give this proposal your serious consideration.

Sincerely,

Martha Bradley
Dean, Honors College
6 November 2009

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

Dear Vice President Pershing,

Enclosed is the proposal for the joint degree Master of Social Work and Master of Public Health which was approved by the Graduate Council on October 26, 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,

Chuck
Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
Proposal for a Joint Degree:
Master of Social Work and Master of Public Health Degree

Institution Submitting Proposal: The University of Utah

College, School or Division affected: College of Social Work
Department of Family and Preventive Medicine
Division of Public Health

Change Description: Proposal of a Joint Master of Social Work
and a Master of Public Health Degree

Proposed Beginning Date: Fall Semester 2010

Institutional Signatures

Larry Smith, MSW Program Director

Stephen C. Alder, MPH Program Director

Jannie H. Mather, Dean, College of Social Work

Michael K. Magill, Chair, Family and Preventive Medicine

David Bjorkman, Dean, School of Medicine

Charles A. Wight, Dean, Graduate School

David W. Pershing, Chief Academic Officer

Michael K. Young, President

Date

November 12, 2009
8.4.1 Template for Submission to the Information Calendar of the Academic. – Items to include transfer, restructuring or consolidation of existing programs or administrative units, stand-alone minors, interdisciplinary minors, emphases, and name changes approved by the Board of Trustees and sent to the Regents as an information item.

SECTION 1: The Action. Briefly describe the change. Include a listing of courses and credits as appropriate.

The University of Utah’s College of Social Work and Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, Division of Public Health request permission to establish a joint degree program that enables students to pursue a Master of Social Work (MSW) degree and a Master of Public Health (MPH) degree simultaneously. If approved, the joint degree program would be available beginning Fall Semester 2010.

This request is NOT to establish a new degree program. Instead, this is a proposal which seeks to take advantage of complementary intellectual benefit from studying social work and public health in a coordinated program. A student enrolled in the joint degree program should be allowed to earn both degrees in less time and with a lower overall credit requirement than were that student enrolled in each school or program independently.

Students seeking to take advantage of the MSW/MPH program must meet current University of Utah admission standards and be accepted to both the MSW program and the MPH program. Upon enrollment, students in the joint degree program will be required to take:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Course Hours</th>
<th>Social Work = 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health = 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Courses</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Course Hours</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum Hours</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option eliminates up to 23 credit hours that would be required for completing the two programs separately. Because of this overall reduction in credit requirements for both degrees, a student enrolled in the joint MSW/MPH degree program can expect to complete the two degrees in approximately 6-8 semesters of full time study. A student enrolled in the joint degree program must complete all MSW and all MPH requirements before either degree will be awarded.

Under the schema illustrated below (Table 1), a joint degree student would complete 32 required course hours in the MSW program and 24 required course hours in the MPH program. Students would enroll in the Health or Public Service Domain for their second year MSW emphasis area. The students enrolled in this joint degree program would be taking one less research course than for the regular MSW program (Research I would not be taken by these students), however, the
MSW research requirements could be met through the MPH program requirements. For each program, the courses taken in either the MSW or MPH program would count as elective credit courses. Students would also have the opportunity to take additional electives from either department. The joint degree students will also be required to complete the MPH comprehensive exam before graduation.

The practicum/internship for the joint degree students will have both a social and public health aspect. Joint degree students will complete their practicum/internship requirement through the MSW Practicum requirement. The MSW/MPH joint degree will require the same 1050 hours (14 credit hours) of practicum required for the MSW degree; the 180 hours of practicum credit required for the MPH will be included in the total practicum hours, fulfilling the practicum requirements for both degrees.

Upon completion of both programs, the student earns two separate degrees: an MSW degree awarded by the College of Social Work and an MPH degree awarded by the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine.

An example of sequencing of coursework is provided as an attachment to this request.

**SECTION II: Need.** Indicate why the change is justified. Reference need or demand data if appropriate.

The MSW/MPH program is designed for students who seek advanced training in social work and public health. Health issues are an area of priority within the public, nonprofit and private sectors. Students pursuing the MSW/MPH joint degree will acquire the skills needed to work in all three sectors, understanding the social service aspect of public health. These skills include the planning, management, and delivery of human and health services at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Students completing the joint degree will have a more rounded understanding of human behavior in the environment, as well as how individuals and communities are impacted by programs developed with a health focus.

Many students’ careers will benefit from the skills gained from obtaining an MSW/MPH degree. Graduates of the program may pursue cross-cultural health/social service programs in the United States or in various international humanitarian agencies. Students with this joint degree could work as program administrators, evaluators, counselors or clinicians, educators, and/or researchers. It is expected that students with these two degrees will be able to fulfill a new niche in the international health arena as well as working with populations who have experienced environmental trauma, refugee/immigrant populations, and underserved populations who would benefit from programs designed to improve health opportunities for groups and individuals in need.

For the past five years, students in the MSW program have expressed an interest in earning an MPH degree simultaneously. Students in the MPH program have also provided input regarding interest in a joint MSW/MPH degree program. Working through the student advisory committee, public health students have been expressing an interest in taking more the social and health service oriented courses for a few years. The MSW/MPH program will also offer more training.
for students wishing to pursue careers at the Utah Department of Human Services, Utah Department of Health and other local health agencies, as well as international agencies outside the U.S.

SECTION III: Institutional Impact
Will the proposed recommendation affect enrollments in instructional programs of affiliated departments or programs? No

The MSW program admits approximately 175 two-year full time students each fall. The MSW program anticipates that the addition of the MSW/MPH option may increase enrollment by 4 to 5 students each fall. Thus we do not expect that the addition of the MSW/MPH option will create any hardship for instructors of these courses. There will be no need for new faculty, physical facilities or equipment if this joint degree program is approved.

The average enrollment per entering class for the MPH is about 35 to 40. Currently, MPH core classes have excess capacity (e.g., 40 students may enroll in a class that is capped at 60). We do not envision that the joint degree program will change this target or our ability to meet the needs.

How will the proposed recommendations affect existing administrative structures?

No change in administrative structures is anticipated. The MSW program already runs one other joint degree (the MSW/MPA joint degree) and the MPH program runs three joint degrees. There will be some need for the coordination of admissions and academic advising between the two programs. The MPH academic coordinator will take the lead in this coordination. The Department of Family and Preventive Medicine will inform the MSW academic coordinator as soon as a current or prospective MPH student indicates his/her intent to apply for or matriculate in the joint program. The MSW academic coordinator will inform the MPH academic coordinator whenever a current or prospective MSW student files an application to the MSW program. These academic coordinators will work collaboratively to ensure that student information is shared and student schedules are coordinated appropriately.

What (new) faculty, physical facilities or equipment will be impacted?

None.

SECTION IV: Finances: What costs are anticipated? Describe any budgetary impact, including cost savings, on other programs or units within the institution.

The addition of the MSW/MPH option will not impose any new direct financial costs on the institution. However, personnel and faculty in both programs will face a modest increase in administrative tasks related to admissions, tracking, and student counseling. These increases are anticipated to be reasonable within the context of administrative work for these programs.
Table 1. Description of Semesters for Completing MPH/MSW Joint Degree*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice I: Individuals &amp; Groups (3)</td>
<td>Practice II: Couples &amp; Families (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBSE I (Human behavior in the social environment) (3)</td>
<td>Diversity &amp; Social Justice (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare &amp; Policy (3)</td>
<td>HBSE II (Human behavior in the social environment) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics I (3)</td>
<td>Epidemiology I (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum (3)</td>
<td>Practicum (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong> (15)</td>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong> (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Practice I: Health Domain (3)</td>
<td><strong>Health Program Planning &amp; Evaluation</strong> (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Policy: Health Domain (3)</td>
<td>Organizations &amp; Community (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Introduction to Public Health</em> (3)</td>
<td>Advanced Practice II: Health Domain (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum (4)</td>
<td>Practicum (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong> (13)</td>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong> (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics (3)</td>
<td><strong>Environmental Health Problems</strong> (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Context of Health (3)</td>
<td>Public Health Administration (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Courses (6)</td>
<td>Advanced Research II: Health Domain (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong> (12)</td>
<td>Elective Courses (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong> (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Courses in italics are MPH courses; courses not italicized are MSW courses.*
Wednesday, September 02, 2009

Charles A. Wight  
Dean of the Graduate School  
310 Park Building  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dear Dean Wight,

This letter of support is for our planned joint degree program connecting the Masters of Social Work and Master of Public Health. We have worked on creating this program for the past three years, and are pleased that we will now be able to offer the program for graduate students in either program.

As you can see by the curriculum, we have worked to develop a program that supports the social work emphasis in health and international work, and links public health courses and concepts so that students will be well informed about current issues in both fields.

If you need further information from us, please contact Caren J. Frost, Ph.D., M.P.H. at 801.581.5287. Thank you for considering our exciting new program.

Sincerely,

Jannah H. Mather, Ph.D.  
Dean

Larry L. Smith, D.S.W.  
Director, MSW Program
March 23, 2009

Dean David Chapman  
The Graduate School  
University of Utah  
Park Building 302  
CAMPUS

Re: Masters of Social Work and Masters of Public Health Joint Degree Program Proposal

Dear Dean Chapman:

The Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, in the University of Utah School of Medicine, enthusiastically supports the proposed Master of Social Work and Masters of Public Health (MSW/MPH) joint degree program. We look forward to collaborating in this joint degree venture as it will give public health students the opportunity to gain an in-depth training in social work. There is a strong demand, and a great need, in the public health sector for individuals with these unique skills and training.

While our faculty members will be engaged with students in the joint program, we do not expect that the MSW/MPH program will add any additional effort beyond what would be required for a student pursuing a MPH degree. This joint program would be an excellent addition to the Intuition.

Sincerely,

Michael K. Magill, MD  
Chairman  
Department of Family and Preventive Medicine
March 23, 2009

Dean David Chapman  
The Graduate School  
Park Building 302  

Dear Dean Chapman:

I offer my support for the proposed Master of Social Work /Master of Public Health (MSW/MPH) joint degree program. This joint degree will train the next generation of community health workers to have a better understanding of both the social and health environment of their clients. It is important that the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, Division of Public Health and College of Social Work collaborate with one another in this future direction. This is a great opportunity with no financial commitment to the institution.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Bjorkman MD, MSPH  
Dean, School of Medicine
December 15, 2009

TO:  David Pershing  
     Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FR:  John Francis  
     Chair, Undergraduate Council

RE:  Stand-alone Minor in Nuclear Engineering

At its meeting of Tuesday, December 8, 2009, the Undergraduate Council voted to approve a proposal from the College of Engineering for a stand-alone Minor in Nuclear Engineering. The proposal, with supporting letters, is attached.

We are asking you, if you also approve of the proposal, to forward it on to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for their consideration.
Program Request for

NUCLEAR ENGINEERING MINOR

Utah Nuclear Engineering Program (UNEP)

College of Engineering

The University of Utah

OCTOBER 2009
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SECTION I

The Request
With this proposal we request to establish a stand-alone Undergraduate NUCLEAR ENGINEERING MINOR offered by the Utah Nuclear Engineering program (UNEP) and housed by the College of Engineering.

There are currently no undergraduate nuclear engineering programs offered in the state of Utah. Because there is an explosive and rapidly growing attempt in the US for developing new nuclear engineering related courses, nuclear engineering certificates or nuclear engineering minors in the programs that never had a history of teaching nuclear engineering courses or doing research in this field, we believe that the University of Utah can emerge as a leader in creating the hub for nuclear education and research in the state of Utah, and beyond. This potential is measured by the years of experience; the Nuclear Engineering Program has been recognized as a degree-awarding program since 1969; in offering core nuclear engineering undergraduate courses since the fall of 1996; and in possessing unique laboratories including one of 13 remaining university TRIGA reactors.

Increased development in the undergraduate curriculum in recent years has attracted more students to nuclear education on campus. The Center for Excellence in Nuclear Technology, Engineering and Research provided some research opportunities and funding not just for graduate students, but also for undergraduate students demonstrating interest in nuclear technology.

Over the course of the past several years, there has been a continuously increasing interest among students from different engineering disciplines in taking nuclear engineering courses that culminated in students petitioning for the undergraduate nuclear engineering minor.

Therefore, the proposed minor will offer interested students the opportunity to obtain the minor in nuclear engineering in addition to their major degree that will directly contribute to alleviating the national shortage of nuclear engineers, and prepare a group of students to pursue graduate degrees in Nuclear Engineering. In next five years, nuclear industry in the US will have to replace 48% of the current work force that will retire; 55% in next ten years.

SECTION II

Complete Program Description

The UNEP undergraduate nuclear engineering minor requires 18 credit units, as follows:

- **FOUR CORE** courses [12 credit units]
- **TWO ADDITIONAL** courses [6 credit units] selected from a list of options or from the student’s major that closely match the suggested subdisciplines [see below]
- The attendance of the NUCL5999/6999/7999 [0 credit units], i.e. the UNEP seminar series, is required as explained below
We allow that all **18 hours** of the UNEP undergraduate nuclear engineering minor courses be used as technical electives in student’s major.

The UNEP undergraduate nuclear engineering minor courses have their own subject code: **NUCL**.

### Core Courses (See Appendix A for more details)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Units</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUCL3000</td>
<td>Nuclear Principles in Engineering and Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL3100</td>
<td>Introduction to Neutron-Based Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL3200</td>
<td>Radiochemistry with Laboratory, I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4000</td>
<td>Nuclear Engineering &amp; Science Using TRIGA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL5999/6999/7999</td>
<td>UNEP Seminar Series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Optional Courses offered by UNEP in next two years (See Appendix A for more details)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Units</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4200</td>
<td>Radiochemistry with Laboratory, II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4300</td>
<td>Nuclear Bio-Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4400</td>
<td>Nuclear Material Detections Using TRIGA, I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4900</td>
<td>Research in Nuclear Engineering &amp; Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL5000</td>
<td>Health Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL5100</td>
<td>Reactor Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL5900</td>
<td>Research in Nuclear Engineering &amp; Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL6400</td>
<td>Computational Reactor Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The courses are linked to provide more depth and knowledge in five different sub-disciplines:

- **Sub-discipline 1**: General Nuclear Engineering & Science
- **Sub-discipline 2**: Radiochemistry
- **Sub-discipline 3**: Nuclear Safeguards

[students enrolled in dual BS/MS program may use 5000 and above level courses toward their non-thesis MS degree]:

Sub-discipline 1: General Nuclear Engineering & Science
Sub-discipline 2: Radiochemistry
Sub-discipline 3: Nuclear Safeguards
Sub-discipline 4: Nuclear Power
Sub-discipline 5: Nuclear Bio-Medicine

**Purpose of the Minor**

**Recognized Need for Undergraduate Nuclear Engineering Minor**

The growth in demand for nuclear energy not just in the United States but world-wide requires increased knowledge in nuclear science and technology. Nuclear scientists and engineers play a vital role in the development and implementation of current and future nuclear power reactors. Additional research is necessary in the fields of Health Physics and Radiochemistry. Understanding the health effects of radiation and nuclear activities as well as the generation and application of radiopharmaceuticals is a fast growing market. Nuclear science and engineering applications can be found not just in the power and health industries, but in military, industrial, environmental, and commercial programs around the world. Developing the insight and awareness of the basic science and engineering principles behind nuclear technologies will not only provide enhanced marketability for students graduating from the University of Utah, but also better prepare them for further studies in nuclear engineering graduate programs or careers that incorporate increased understanding of nuclear science and engineering.

There are approximately 50 general and 195 specific licensees for radioactive materials in Utah. A general licensee is an entity that acquires, uses, or possesses a generally licensed device and has received the device from the device manufacturer or by change of company ownership where the device remains in use at a particular location. A specific license is issued to entities that include medical (nuclear medicine), industrial (moisture-density gauges, well logging, industrial radiography, or flow meters), academic (research), and waste disposal licenses (land disposal or decay in storage). Those entities with a specific license have the facilities, equipment, personnel training, policies and procedures for radiation safety. Each one of these 195 licenses needs nuclear trained personnel.

Utah has a growing economy and the University of Utah is now building the nuclear engineering program to prepare for the growing need for nuclear engineers.

**Undergraduate Nuclear Engineering Minor Objectives Targeting Competency Gaps**

This program is built to prepare the students for nuclear engineering related jobs addressing the expectations of the 21st century nuclear industry and development in US and abroad, and in building US leadership.

The objectives are:

(a) To teach and practice nuclear engineering and science principles in an interdisciplinary core program preparing the undergraduates coming from diversified technical and science fields to directly and effectively support current human resource challenges in nuclear engineering related jobs

(b) To create a unique educational program in offering a specific set of linked courses interfacing various disciplines
(c) To produce a new generation of nuclear engineering and science undergraduates (and graduates) by revitalizing our educational program in radiochemistry, nuclear safeguards and forensics, nuclear reactor hands-on-experience and learning, and assuring that modern technologies are part of the educational program.

With this program we are targeting the following competency gaps in nuclear engineering and science education for the 21st century:

(a) Nuclear principles in engineering and science connecting the concepts in physics, quantum mechanics, radiation transport, mathematics, computational science and engineering, chemistry, environmental engineering, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, biology and bioengineering, nuclear medicine and health physics.

(b) Fundamental principles and concepts of neutron-based engineering with hands-on-experience.

(c) Knowledge of importance to safeguard-related technologies, nuclear forensics and special nuclear material detections.

(d) Basic knowledge and experimental learning pertaining to radiochemistry and radioactive waste engineering.

(e) Theoretical, computational, and experimental understanding of reactor physics using TRIGA reactor and modern technologies.

Admission Requirements

Students are required to be in good standing with the university as evidenced by official transcripts and to have passion for this study!

Any student from the College of Engineering, College of Science, College of Pharmacy, College of Mine & Earth Sciences, or College of Health may apply for an undergraduate nuclear engineering minor.

The undergraduate nuclear engineering minor is offered by the Utah Nuclear Engineering Program (UNEP) as a stand-alone minor. The minor is housed by the College of Engineering.

Students interested in the undergraduate nuclear engineering minor will be asked to complete the UNEP undergraduate nuclear engineering minor form, available in the UNEP Offices, and will be asked to obtain the signature(s) indicated in the form.

Students are required to keep their overall GPA above 2.85 and their Nuclear Engineering Minor GPA over 3.30.

Student Advisement

Applications and advising files will be maintained by the Department for Civil and Environmental Engineering, because the UNEP is housed in this department.
Advisement will take place through group advisement sessions at the beginning of every semester and through individual meetings when needed. The UNEP graduate students will be assigned to assist in advising and will help with group and individual advisement sessions as needed.

The undergraduate advisors from the Departments of Chemical and Civil and Environmental Engineering, will be assisted by the UNEP Director and other UNEP associated faculty as detailed in Appendix C to help advise the undergraduate nuclear engineering minor students.

**Justification for Number of Credits**

The number of credit hours required for the Nuclear Engineering Minor, of 18, is consistent and in the range, with the required number of hours for a minor program across various curricula at the University of Utah. In addition, these 18 required hours are sufficient to expose the student to the fundamental ideas and material related to this topic, and still allow student interested in the minor to include it in a complete program of study regardless of major.

**External Reviews and Accreditation**

No external consultants were involved in the development of this program. However, internal discussions with various faculty helped in framing the minor. There are no requests for accreditation for this minor.

There are currently less than 50 universities in the United States that offer undergraduate or graduate degrees in Nuclear Engineering. The University of Utah is the only university in Utah currently providing Nuclear Engineering degrees, albeit only at the graduate level. The nearest undergraduate degrees available in Nuclear Engineering can be obtained from universities in either Nevada or Idaho. Provision of an interdisciplinary minor in Nuclear Engineering will reward students who have been demonstrating interest in the program, as well as assist in the development towards an undergraduate degree in nuclear engineering. Students’ interest in this minor will demonstrate whether a major in Nuclear Engineering should necessarily become available in the future when the accreditation will be required.

**Projected Enrollment**

Over the course of the past several years, there has been a continuously increasing interest among students from different engineering disciplines in taking nuclear engineering courses that culminated in students petitioning for the undergraduate nuclear engineering minor. More than 20 students signed the petition and basically initiated the formation of this minor. We anticipate having 10 – 25 students in our minor core courses in first years with the expectations of doubling that number in the next five years. The growing interest from other colleges and universities in Utah points to an impressive number of undergraduate students expressing their ultimate desire to study nuclear engineering.
Expansion of Existing Program

The undergraduate Nuclear Engineering Minor is not an expansion of any existing program. The few nuclear engineering courses offered in recent years have been mainly at the graduate level.

Faculty & Staff

The UNEP is growing in faculty. We have an active announcement for assistant tenure track faculty to be hired this academic year. This will add to three faculty who can teach the core courses and majority of the optional UNEP courses. We also have a number of associated faculty who will teach some of the courses. The staff in the Department for Civil and Environmental Engineering, with help from the Department of Chemical Engineering, will provide necessary assistance in scheduling the courses and administrating the minor.

Library

The University of Utah’s Marriott and Eccles Health Sciences libraries currently have materials required to offer a superior program as described in this proposal.

Learning Resources

No additional learning resources are required to support this program.

SECTION III

Program Necessity

There is a growing interest in nuclear engineering among students at the University of Utah and all other colleges and universities in the State of Utah, but there is no formal undergraduate program or minor, offered in this field in Utah. Therefore, the Nuclear Engineering Minor would meet the needs of students interested in nuclear engineering as a field of study and compliment a number of existing majors within the University of Utah such as chemical engineering, chemistry, mechanical engineering, civil and environmental engineering, electrical engineering, computer science and engineering, biomedical engineering, health sciences, pharmacology, biology, physics, astrophysics, material sciences and engineering, and medical studies, to list just a few.

Over the past few years, students have been enhancing their undergraduate education through coursework and educational opportunities provided through the Center of Excellence in Nuclear Technology, Engineering, and Research and the Utah Nuclear Engineering Program (UNEP). A
percentage of these students later enter into a graduate program of study in Nuclear Engineering here at the University of Utah. A number of faculty at the College of Engineering expanded their research into nuclear engineering related disciplines, increasing involvement of students in selecting the nuclear engineering for their masters or doctoral degrees. The minor degree will better prepare our students to pursue advanced degrees, will increase the pool of students in our graduate program, and will address the national need for nuclear engineers.

The Nuclear Engineering Minor if established at the University of Utah, will draw more students into other major disciplines from the region and increase overall enrollment in respective colleges.

**Labor Market Demand**

Industry, national laboratories, government agencies, nuclear power plants and associated facilities, as well as the universities, are facing a huge wave of retirements. In addition, there is a renaissance in nuclear engineering related to power generation. These effects, together, are creating profitable, long-term careers for people with an education in nuclear engineering. Although the standard nuclear engineers are expected to have a college degree in nuclear engineering, the 21st century projects a demand for different profiles; more diversified and broad knowledge gained through dual degrees, such as a combination of major in any relevant discipline + minor in nuclear engineering. The job market also encourages students to complete at least a master degree in nuclear engineering.

Nuclear engineering jobs are found not only in nuclear power plants. Nuclear engineers are in demand:

- in hospitals for treating cancer
- in research labs, developing better nuclear power sources and imaging devices,
- in defense related areas
- in improving the solutions for waste management
- in safety regulations
- in medicine for cancer imaging and treatment
- in environmental protection
- in archeology.

Some recent projections for nuclear engineering jobs are:

- U.S. utilities will hire 470 nuclear engineers a year to keep up with retirement and attrition
- An additional 200 new hires per year are expected to be needed to staff reactors expected to begin operation over the next decade
- NRC projects to hire 400 nuclear engineers per year
- Westinghouse projects a need for 1000/year
- EnergySolutions expects hundreds of new hires in years to come
Student Demand

As already indicated in this proposal, there is a growing interest among the students at the University of Utah and other colleges and universities in the state of Utah, for nuclear engineering discipline. Over 20 students from the Department of Chemical Engineering signed a petition for nuclear engineering minor. There is a steady stream of students approaching the UNEP in anticipation for the undergraduate minor in nuclear engineering to be offered.

The minor in nuclear engineering will be the only one in the state of Utah thus attracting students from other colleges to participate in the program.

Similar Programs

There is no minor in nuclear engineering in the state of Utah. There are a few scattered courses pertaining to nuclear engineering offered at Utah State University, and an introductory course at Brigham Young University.

Collaboration and Impact on other USHE Institutions

We plan, within the next two years, to offer the core minor courses to other institutions in the state of Utah through distance education. Schools that may have enough student interest to support this are BYU and WSU.

Benefits

The University of Utah and the USHE will noticeably benefit by offering a Nuclear Engineering Minor program because it fulfills the need of the student, the ultimate customer. When students have options such as this open to them they will be more likely to stay on track in their education in the University of Utah system.

Consistency with Institutional Mission

The proposed Nuclear Engineering Minor program is consistent with and appropriate to the University of Utah mission toward undergraduate and graduate education, research and scholarship. This undergraduate program will provide high quality academic, professional and applied learning opportunities designed to advance the intellectual, cultural and economic well-being of the students who enroll in it.

SECTION IV

Program Assessment

The quality of the nuclear engineering minor courses and the overall program will be assessed as follows:
(1) By surveying the minor alumni that are out of the program for at least 1 year: these students will be asked to complete questionnaires to assess the quality of basic knowledge provided through core courses, the degree to which the minor has helped in securing employment in the nuclear engineering related jobs or enrolling in graduate program of their interest, and if completing the program has helped meet their personal or career goals. This survey and data analysis would generate the feedback for our program. It is UNEP intention to announce this as a potential collaborative thesis topic of interest to students in the College of Education.

(2) The UNEP Advisory Board (to be established in late December of 2009) will be asked to evaluate the Minor courses and the program as offered. Their feedback will be used in correcting the content of the program if found needed.

(3) The UNEP graduate students will be asked to participate in the minor in supervising the undergraduate students by creating and showing the solutions of some of the assignments for the minor courses. The graduate students will then be asked to evaluate the assignments: how difficult, how easy, how complex and how simple. A special questionnaire will be prepared for this evaluation.

(4) The UNEP instructors will have meetings at the beginning of each semester to discuss their courses taught in a previous semester. Sharing the experience about the students’ response to the course content and assignments will help modify if needed the courses to be offered that semester.

**Expected Standards of Performance**

The minor program is created such that students will have basic knowledge of nuclear principles in engineering and science with hands-on experience as they relate to identified competency gaps in nuclear engineering field in the US: radiochemistry, nuclear safeguards and forensics, reactor physics and health physics, nuclear material detections, computational skills. A grade of C and higher is required in each program courses that will assure the basic knowledge in these areas have been achieved.

**Student Assessment**

Course homework, course tests on materials, and required power point presentations to peers in required courses as well as required minimum grade of C in all program courses will be adequate measure of competency.

**Continued Quality Improvement**

The Nuclear Engineering Minor will be internally reviewed by the UNEP faculty in consultation with graduate students participating in the courses. These reviews will collate and respond to student evaluations of the Minor's courses and curriculum, faculty perceptions of student performance and outcomes, and requests for including additional courses across undergraduate curricula. At the end of each semester, student course evaluations will be collected and analyzed in order to make adjustments to course content and instruction styles, as well as level of details in assessing what will be most important how difficult or how interesting the course content is. In addition, assessing the progress and success of the students who continue into graduate nuclear
engineering program will provide additional information regarding the adequacy of training and preparation offered by the Minor.

SECTION V

Budget

Salaries and Wages – N/A
Benefits – N/A
Current Expense – none
Library – none
Equipment – none
Travel – none
TOTAL – zero

No additional resources are required, either as new funding or reallocation of existing budget. The existing UNEP faculty together with the UNEP associated faculty [http://www.nuclear.utah.edu/faculty.html] will teach the Minor courses.

Funding Sources

No additional funds will be required to develop and administer the Nuclear Engineering Minor, as current staff, materials and facilities can absorb the projected student load. One new faculty member is being recruited this year, so will be available to help with the teaching, but that hire is not dependent upon this minor being approved. Courses required for the Minor program are not currently offered but will be offered starting in Spring 2010.

Reallocation

The reallocation of funds is not needed for the implementation of Nuclear Engineering Minor.

Impact on Existing Budgets

It is possible that if there are more than 15 students per year taking undergraduate nuclear engineering courses in fulfillment of the Nuclear Engineering Minor, we may increase our budget based on increased student credit hours (SCH). However, we are not relying on these funds, nor do we currently require them for our proposed Minor, except for the NUCL3200 Radiochemistry course that is cross-listed with the CHEM3200.
Appendix A

All Program Courses

- **New Courses to be Added in Next Two Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUCL3000</td>
<td>Nuclear Principles in Engineering and Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL3100</td>
<td>Introduction to Neutron-Based Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL3200</td>
<td>Radiochemistry with Laboratory, I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[cross-listed with CHEM3200]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4000</td>
<td>Nuclear Engineering &amp; Science Using TRIGA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4200</td>
<td>Radiochemistry with Laboratory, II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4300</td>
<td>Nuclear Bio-Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4400</td>
<td>Nuclear Material Detections Using TRIGA, I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4900</td>
<td>Research in Nuclear Engineering &amp; Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL5000</td>
<td>Health Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL5100</td>
<td>Reactor Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL5900</td>
<td>Research in Nuclear Engineering &amp; Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL6400</td>
<td>Computational Reactor Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **General Education: Not Applicable**

- **List of Core Courses at the UNEP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUCL3000</td>
<td>Nuclear Principles in Engineering and Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL3100</td>
<td>Introduction to Neutron-Based Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL3200</td>
<td>Radiochemistry with Laboratory, I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[cross-linked with CHEM3200]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCL4000</td>
<td>Nuclear Engineering &amp; Science Using TRIGA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All four of these courses can be counted as technical electives for student’s major.

Starting Fall 2009, the NUCL5999/6999/7999: UNEP Seminar Series [0 credit units], has already been offered. The students are required to attend minimum two semesters of the NUCL5999/6999/7999 during the Minor studies.

- **Brief Description of the Core Courses at the UNEP:**

**NUCL3000:** Nuclear Principles in Engineering & Science  [3 credit units]  Fall 2010

**Instructor:** Tatjana Jevremovic

Additional: Interactive web site available to practice fundamental concepts in nuclear engineering and science using modern technology

Objectives:
Nuclear principles in engineering and science course will provide the students with fundamental understanding of basic principles covering the modern theory of the atomic and nucleus structure, quantum description of nuclear phenomena of interest in nuclear engineering, radiation types and interactions with matter, radioactive decay. Each of the section will address the application of learned principles thus connecting the concepts in physics, quantum mechanics, radiation transport, mathematics, computational science and engineering, chemistry, environmental engineering, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, biology and bioengineering, nuclear medicine and health physics.

Prerequisites: Introductory courses in physics, mathematics, computer science/engineering

UNEP3100: **Introduction to Neutron-Based Engineering** [3 credit units] Spring 2011
Instructor: Tatjana Jevremovic
Additional: Interactive web site available to practice fundamental concepts in nuclear engineering and science using modern technology
Objectives: Introduction to neutron-based engineering will provide the students with fundamental understanding of basic principles of neutron interactions and neutron transport. The course will address the application of learned concepts thus connecting the concepts in physics, radiation transport, mathematics, computational science and engineering, chemistry, environmental engineering, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering. Students will learn how to use state-of-the-art numerical simulation methods to model neutron behavior in different reactors. The uniqueness of this course is that the students will model the TRIGA reactor using these state-of-the-art numerical simulation methods, visit the reactor and see how it operates, and be able to compare the numerical data with the real data thus ensuring that the student will learn fundamental principles and concepts of neutron-based engineering with the hands-on-experience.

Prerequisites: NUCL3000

NUCL3200: **Radiochemistry with Laboratory, I** [3 credit units] Spring 2010
Instructor: Chuck Grissom, Chemistry
Textbook: TBA
Laboratory: Next to TRIGA
Objectives: Radiochemistry is almost non-existent in US and sporadically found around the world. The renaissance in nuclear engineering around the globe including the US, points toward revitalization of radiochemistry, nuclear safeguards, nuclear forensics and similar, and is supported by major nuclear agencies and vendors. The UNEP has great possibility to become an educational hub for nuclear
chemistry. This course will give the students understanding of what the radiochemistry is, where to apply, and how to become a radiochemist.

Prerequisites: PHYS 2210 & 2220, CHEM 1210 & 1220, MATH 1210 & 1220, and an introduction to engineering computing, or by the consent of Instructor

NUCL4000: Nuclear Engineering & Science Using TRIGA [3 credit units] Spring 2010
Instructor: Tatjana Jevremovic and Dong-Ok Choe
Laboratory: Next to TRIGA
Objectives: Students will have nuclear reactor hands-on-experience and be able to learn important and crucial aspects of nuclear engineering and science practical applications. The set of three laboratory experiments will help students understand the vast use of neutron activation analysis, meaning of thermal neutron flux in a reactor and the techniques that are used to determine the profile of thermal flux, and the calculation of gamma dose around the reactors. Students will develop the habit and knowledge of how to protect themselves from radiation, what are the dosimeters and how to read the dose from dosimeters.

Prerequisites: NUCL3000; NUCL3100

NUCL5999/6999/79999: UNEP Seminar Series [0 credit units] Fall 2009
Instructor: Tatjana Jevremovic
Objectives: Students signed for Nuclear Engineering Minor are required to attend the UNEP seminar series. There will be no more than four speakers per semester.

Optional UNEP Courses: Subtotal: 6

Additional 6 credit units must be taken. However, student is allowed to select from the UNEP list of courses (as provided here in addition to any new or existing course that will be offered by UNEP faculty) OR from the student’s major with the consent of the UNEP Director.

The UNEP optional courses to be offered in next two years:

NUCL4200: Radiochemistry with Laboratory, II [3 credit units]
NUCL4300: Nuclear Bio-Medicine [3 credit units]
NUCL4400: Nuclear Material Detections Using TRIGA, I [3 credit units]
NUCL4900: Research in Nuclear Engineering & Science [3 credit units]
NUCL5000: Health Physics [3 credit units]
NUCL5100: Reactor Physics [3 credit units]
NUCL5900: Research in Nuclear Engineering & Science [3 credit units]

1 Modernized, improved and revised 2/3rd of the CVEEN5710/6710 courses became NUCL4000. The rest of the CVEEN5710/6710 is combined with new topics into NUCL4400 and NUCL6200.
NUCL6400: Computational Reactor Physics [3 credit units]

Brief Description of the Optional UNEP Courses: Subtotal: 6

Courses to be offered in next 2 years:

**NUCL4200 (or 5200):** Radiochemistry with Laboratory, II [3 credit units] Spring 2011
Textbook: Chuck Grissom, Chemistry
Objectives: To be added
Prerequisites: NUCL3200

**NUCL4300:** Nuclear Bio-Medicine [3 credit units] Spring 2011
Instructor: Scott Miller
Textbook: TBA
Objectives: Students will learn about the radiation interactions with human tissue, the use of radiation in medicine for imaging and diagnostics, and treatment of mainly cancer, as well as about the radiation doses in medical application of radiation.
Prerequisites: NUCL3000, NUCL3100

**NUCL4400:** Nuclear Material Detections Using TRIGA, I [3 credit units] Fall 2010
Instructor: Tatjana Jevremovic with Dong-Ok Choe; with Rapiscan Laboratories
Textbook: TBA
Objectives: Students will have a unique opportunity to learn how to detect the nuclear materials and why that is not an easy and straightforward task. In addition, we will use the TRIGA to demonstrate some of the aspects regarding the nuclear materials detection.
Prerequisites: NUCL3000, NUCL3100, NUCL4000

**NUCL4900/5900:** Research in Nuclear Engineering & Science [3 credit units] Spring 2010
Instructor: Any UNEP faculty
Coordinator: Tatjana Jevremovic
Objectives: Students signed for Research in Nuclear Engineering & Science are advised to split the course work in two semesters; if they start in Spring for example they should sign for 1 credit unit and in the following Fall (or even summer) for the rest of 2 credit units.
The research topics will vary between the instructors and yearly depending on the availability of the research projects and topics suitable for undergraduate students. Students are strongly encouraged to take this course and plan to present their research results at the ANS Student Conference (usually held in March or April every year). Students with the approval from their Instructors to present the research at the ANS Student Conference will be funded by the Utah ANS Chapter. This course will be offered for the first time in Spring of 2010. Any professor can be instructor; however the coordinator of this course is the UNEP Director. The
role of the coordinator is to make sure that the students are given appropriate load, research instructions and guidelines.

**Available topics working with Dr. Tatjana Jevremovic (starting Spring 2010):**

- Adapting the Geant4-based dose estimator for electron therapy; X-ray microbeam therapy; or proton therapy
- Develop the car battery full model using Geant4
- Develop 2D and 3D model of TRIGA using AGENT code
- Contribute in developing some of the web-based interactive tools for NUCL3100
- Learn about the FPGA acceleration approach and develop one segment of the hardware algorithm
- Parallel computing applied to computational neutronics: develop parallel version of AGENT through OpenMP, MPI (Message Passing Interface), and/or other techniques
- Application of GPU (Graphics Processing Unit) to computational neutronics: the graphics card of the new group server supports the CUDA model of NVidia; the graphics card can be used for general purpose numerical computations such as to accelerate AGENT
- Application of Geant4 for nuclear reactor modeling; Geant4 is mainly developed for physics modeling not for reactor physics: How does it work for nuclear reactor simulations? How well it compares to MCNP, which has been widely accepted for reactor simulations?

**NUCL5000: Health Physics [3 credit units] Spring 2011**

**Instructor:** New faculty coming in 2010

**Textbook:**
- “Nuclear Principles in Engineering”, Tatjana Jevremovic, 2nd Edition

**Objectives:**
This course will provide students with the overview of atomic and nucleus structure, radioactive decay and types of radiation (in condensed manner) based on NUCL3000 to build the understanding related to health physics: radiation interactions with matter in respect to human health, biological effects, regulation, instrumentations, and real-world examples.

**Prerequisites:** NUCL3000, NUCL3100

**NUCL5100: Reactor Physics [3 credit units] Fall 2010**

**Instructor:** PostDoc Shanjie Xiao with Dong-Ok Choe

**Textbook:**
- “Nuclear Principles in Engineering”, Tatjana Jevremovic, 2nd Edition
Objectives: This course will provide students with the overview of cross sections and fission process (in condensed manner) based on UNEP5200 to build the comprehensive understanding of reactor physics and its application to reactor design. The course will mainly focus on the theory of the reactor steady-state (normal) operation. Methods of neutron transport modeling will be explained: diffusion, method of characteristics, finite difference method, Sn, Pn. Some aspects of the reactor kinetics will be also introduced. Students will learn about modern methods in reactor physics and will be able to use modern technologies to visualize and estimate the neutron behavior in the reactor cores.

Prerequisites: NUCL3000; NUCL3100, or by consent of the Instructor

NUCL6400: Computational Reactor Physics [3 credit units] Spring 2011
Instructor: PostDoc Shanjie Xiao with Tatjana Jevremovic
Textbook: Various books and handouts
Objectives: Computational reactor physics course consists of two parts: theoretical/numerical training in reactor physics using modern technology and the practical application by solving a real-world problem (modeling, benchmark, development, or similar). Strong computational skills are advantage. Students are expected to have their laptops for the second half of this course.
Appendix B

Program Schedule

It is recommended that students enroll in the Minor when they are sophomores or juniors, having completed introductory courses in chemistry, mathematics, physics, computer science and engineering or similar. Although, the core courses are at the level of 3000 and 4000, the content will be encouraging for students with sophomore standing coming into the program.

Ideally, students would take their courses according to the following schedule (NUCL4900 and NUCL5900\(^2\) are highly recommended and the students can start with this research course as early as Sophomore fall semester):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sophomore/Junior</th>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>NUCL3000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore/Junior</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>NUCL3100, NUCL3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/Senior</td>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td>NUCL4000, Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/Senior</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\)The UNEP has the unique opportunity of providing student/faculty interaction and research using a TRIGA (Training, Research, and Isotope-production – General Atomic) nuclear research reactor. Approximately 25 nuclear research reactors or assemblies are available at universities in the United States, while many of these reactors are not directly tied specifically to a nuclear educational program. There are currently less than 15 TRIGA reactors available in the United States for nuclear research opportunities. Next to TRIGA reactor the UNEP offers a good size lab space mainly for radiochemistry, radiobiology and radiation detection studies, experiments and research that will be put in use for undergraduate and graduate classes. Faculty are encouraged to use UNEP facilities and create NUCL4900/5900 topics for undergraduate students.
Appendix C

Faculty and Staff To Be Used In Support Of Program

- Faculty To Be Used In Support Of Program

Full time faculty at UNEP:
Tatjana Jevremovic, PhD, Professor, Director UNEP
Dong-OK Choe, PhD, Research Assistant Professor, UNEP
[Assistant tenure track faculty will be hired by Fall 2010]

Associated UNEP faculty:
Scott Miller, PhD, Director of Radiobiology Division, Research Professor of Radiology & Radiobiology
Terry Ring, PhD, Professor of Chemical Engineering
Charles Grissom, PhD, Professor of Chemistry
James J. Thompson, PhD, Adjunct Professor, Civil & Environmental Engineering; Manager, Radioactive Waste & Nuclear Materials Disposition Department at Sandia National Lab
[more faculty will be joining the UNEP in coming year]

- Staff To Be Used In Support Of Program

Civil and Environmental Engineering and Chemical Engineering Departments will provide necessary staff support of the Minor program.
Richard B. Brown  
Dean of Engineering  
1692 Warnock Engineering Building  
72 S. Central Campus Drive  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112  
PH: (801) 585-7498  FAX: (801) 581-8692  
brown@utah.edu  
October 28, 2009

Prof. Tatjana Jevremovic  
Director, Nuclear Engineering Program  
MEB 2298  
The University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dear Prof. Jevremovic,

I am pleased to provide a letter of support for the Nuclear Engineering Minor that you are proposing. For more than four decades, the University of Utah has provided graduate education for students interested in nuclear engineering. Although small, Utah's program is well respected among academic and industry professionals, and our graduates have achieved professional distinction. In 1980, there were 95 nuclear engineering programs in the U.S. Due to the decline of funding for nuclear research nationally over the past 30 years, there are now only 13 universities that have research reactors such as our TRIGA. These research reactors plus 10 smaller teaching reactors are the basis for the few remaining nuclear engineering programs in the US. With a resurgence in interest in nuclear power (now widely recognized as the cleanest source of electrical power that can meet the nation's needs), with growing use of nuclear medicine, with new applications for nuclear technology in industry and food processing, and with growing government funding for nuclear research, there is a serious shortage of engineers trained in this field. Half of the nuclear energy employees are over 47 years of age. Fewer than 8% are under 32 years of age. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Chairman, Dr Nils Diaz announced the intention to hire 350 new employees to offset retirements and increase staff to meet the expected number of new licensees. Other employers of nuclear engineers have expressed a similar need for more engineers as their workforce reaches retirement age. The Nuclear Energy Institute estimates a workforce shortfall of 50%. This equates to huge opportunities for our students. We and other universities are now building our Nuclear Engineering programs in response to the needs in industry and government. There is also great interest among our students. This minor was initiated in response to a petition from students. We have waited until you arrived at the U to work out its details.

The 100 kW research reactor is used for classroom experiments, demonstrations, undergraduate and graduate research, and to provide unique services to local industries. Recent research at the U has included verifying doses to Russian nuclear workers at the Mayak Plant, determining the location and microdistribution of plutonium and its relation to osteosarcoma, advanced core design, and groundwater transport of radionuclides. Graduate nuclear engineers from the University of Utah are highly sought after and have found employment at Idaho National Laboratory, Sloan Kettering Memorial Hospital, Northrop Grumman, Boeing, and EnergySolutions, to name a few. It is my belief that students with a degree in any of the engineering disciplines, hard sciences, or health sciences and a minor in Nuclear Engineering, will find wonderful career opportunities. Employees are needed who have strengths in the basic disciplines, plus a knowledge of nuclear engineering.

I am especially happy that your proposal is inclusive of all of the engineering disciplines, plus chemistry, physics and health sciences. I support the concept of having a common core of requirements, complemented by relevant courses in the specific area of a student's study. The curriculum is flexible, allowing a student to focus on General Nuclear Engineering & Science, Radiochemistry, Nuclear Safeguards, Nuclear Power, or Nuclear Bio-Medicine. Each minor graduate will fulfill the requirements of their own department's program, and will be able to satisfy the Nuclear Engineering core and option requirements for one of the five emphasis areas through judicious use of their elective courses and/or by taking other courses.
This minor is an excellent example of collaboration with local industry to enrich our program. We are very fortunate to have in the area leading nuclear engineers with Ph.D.s who are willing to teach for us as adjunct faculty members, bringing a perspective that we could not otherwise provide. The establishment of an advisory committee made up of industrial leaders who hire nuclear engineers will provide the needed feedback to make the program excellent.

I strongly encourage all who review this minor to support it as I do.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard B. Brown
October 26, 2009

Tatjana Jevremovic, Ph.D.
Professor and Energy Solutions Presidential Endowed Chair
Director, University of Utah Nuclear Engineering Program
University of Utah

Dear Professor Jevremovic,

It is with great enthusiasm that I write to support the proposal to create a minor in Nuclear Engineering. At present, there are currently no undergraduate nuclear engineering programs in the state of Utah, although the University of Utah has conducted research using the TRIGA reactor for many years. A formal minor will serve as a catalyst for a more expansive nuclear program, which is needed to meet the needs of industry and student demand. Coupled with the growing interest in nuclear power as a possible solution to the ever-increasing demand for electricity in the U.S., demand for trained nuclear engineers is increasing. Given its history and the presence of unique laboratories and a fairly rare training reactor, the University of Utah is well positioned to play a major role in the education of future nuclear engineers. With the minor as a start, the University of Utah can develop into a leader in this education effort and create the hub for nuclear education and research in the state of Utah and in the Intermountain West.

It is my understanding that three of the courses proposed for the minor are to be taught in Spring 2009 and will be listed using the subject code NUCL. I believe the new subject code will help students become aware of the opportunities in nuclear engineering. As you are aware, there has been a very solid collaborative relationship between nuclear engineering and mechanical engineering programs historically. We intend to continue to support the nuclear engineering program, primarily through our courses in heat transfer, fluid dynamics, convection heat transfer, conduction heat transfer, and radiation heat transfer. We will also encourage our undergraduate students to consider enrolling in the nuclear engineering courses when they are selecting their technical electives. Our department is currently determining areas of emphasis that will be placed on student transcripts. In addition to the more traditional areas of solid mechanics and robotics, we will be considering an emphasis in nuclear engineering, which could be obtained by taking the required courses in the proposed minor.

I believe the proposed minor in nuclear engineering will be a great addition to the College of Engineering. I look forward to working with you as you get the new program underway.

Best Regards,

Tim Ameel
Professor and Chair

Tim Ameel
Professor and Chair
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November 27, 2009

Prof. Tatjana Jevremovic, Director
Utah Nuclear Engineering Program
50 S. Central Campus Drive, MEB 1206
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Re: Letter of Support for Nuclear Engineering Minor

Dear Prof. Jevremovic-

I understand that the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Academic Senate will soon be considering your proposal for the offering of an undergraduate Nuclear Engineering Minor Degree Program at the University of Utah. I have reviewed the UNEP’s program request, dated October 2009, and as Chairman of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, I strongly support this proposal.

The proposed minor degree program in Nuclear Engineering will bring additional opportunities to our undergraduate major that have a strong interest in Nuclear Physics and the Nuclear Industry. The Department of Physics and Astronomy currently upper-level courses in particle physics, relativity and quantum mechanics, and stellar astrophysics (including discussion of the stellar fusion cycle), but does not currently offer any undergraduate or graduate courses in Nuclear Physics. I believe he proposed Nuclear Engineering Minor can help provide coursework to our undergraduate students in Nuclear physics, nuclear bio-medicine, reactor physics and energy mechanisms, and neutron transport and nuclear transmutation. The proposed coursework for the minor may be able to be accommodated into a traditional Physics major program.

At the same time, there is strong synergy and diversity in the courses that the Department of Physics and Astronomy be able to offer to the UNEP undergraduate students. We will welcome Utah Nuclear Engineering Program (UNEP) minor students who have an interest in particle physics, stellar nuclear astrophysics, and relativity to incorporate courses from our Department into the UNEP minor degree program. I will propose to work with UNEP to develop an upper level theoretical Physics course in Nuclear Forces and Nuclear Structure; such a course would be a welcome addition to our undergraduate degree program, and could serve as a useful course for the UNEP minor and a future UNEP major. We also are willing to work to develop joint Research
Experiences for Undergraduate (REU) student internship, including sending Physics REU students to the UNEP program for summer research opportunities.

In summary, I am very enthusiastic about the proposed UNEP minor degree program. I will work with you and our Departmental Curriculum committee to develop programmatic aspects that will allow physics majors to achieve a UNEP minor, and will also allow UNEP students to integrate physics courses into their degree programs. I wish you the best of success with this very ambitious program, and offer my personal help to make it success.

With Best Regards,

[Signature]

Dave Kieda  
Chair, Department of Physics and Astronomy  
Professor of Physics  
University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112  
801-581-3538
November 4, 2009

Tatjana Jevremovic, Ph.D.
Energy Solutions Presidential Endowed Chair Professor
Director, University of Utah Nuclear Engineering Program
Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Professor, Chemical Engineering
2298 MEB
50 South Central Drive
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
Phone: 801.587.9696
E-mail: Tatjana.Jevremovic@utah.edu
URL: http://www.nuclear.utah.edu/nep.html

Re: Request for Adjunct Appointment

Dear Dr. Jevremovic,

This letter is to support your proposal to establish a minor in Nuclear Engineering at the University of Utah. I am delighted that the program includes elective courses in nuclear medicine and I truly believe a subset of Bioengineering students would benefit from these courses and from establishment of the minor.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard D. Rabbitt, Ph.D.
Prof. and Chair, Bioengineering

Department of Bioengineering
72 South Central Campus Drive, Rm. 2646
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9202
(801) 581-8528 Fax: (801) 585-5361

Richard D. Rabbitt
Office: (801) 581-6968
Lab: (801) 581-4549
Email: r.rabbitt@utah.edu
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 9, 2009
To: Tatjana Jevremovic, Professor of Nuclear Engineering
From: Paul J. Tikalsky, Chair and Professor
Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering
Re: Endorsement of Minor

The civil and environmental engineering faculty and student advisory committee have strongly endorsed the formation of the nuclear engineering minor. It is estimated that 10-15 civil engineering undergraduates would pursue the minor at any one time. The advanced requirements for environmental engineers to address medical, industrial and energy waste streams derived from nuclear technologies are creating a need for a stronger knowledge base for the reprocessing, handling or disposal of low-level and high-level waste streams. In addition, the growing needs for structural, geotechnical and construction materials engineers that understand the science of nuclear facilities to design the next generation of safe and reliable power will be served well with the nuclear engineering minor.

There is a substantial need for engineers to better understand the technical issues related to nuclear science to design and maintain a globally sustainable civil infrastructure. The minor will put the University of Utah is a unique situation nationally to meet this need.
October 13, 2009

To whom it may concern:

I write this letter to express the strong support of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering for the proposal from Professor Tatjana Jevremovic to establish a minor in nuclear engineering at the University of Utah. The minor and the associated courses that are being created will nicely complement the new program of our department in electric power systems. We expect strong industry demand for graduates from these programs, and anticipate that additional students may be recruited to the College of Engineering as a result of this initiative.

Sincerely,

Marc Bodson
Professor and Department Chair
Phone: (801) 581 8590
Email: bodson@ece.utah.edu
Web: www.ece.utah.edu/~bodson
October 19, 2009

Tatjana Jevremovic
Professor
Energy Solutions Presidential Chair
Utah Nuclear Engineering Program

Dear Tatjana:

On behalf of the Department of Chemical Engineering, I would like to extend our endorsement of the Nuclear Engineering minor. Approximately two years ago, our department supported the concept of the minor based on the interest of our undergraduate students; approximately fifteen signed a petition asking the department to implement the minor. As you know, due to the changes within the Nuclear Engineering Program, we wanted to wait on final endorsement until your arrival.

There is no question that, in the future, chemical engineering will play a role in the nuclear industry in many ways. The department wants to ensure that our students are prepared to meet the future challenges. The minor will effectively accomplish this through its course offerings.

We look forward to working with you on this new, exciting educational opportunity. If you need any additional help, please let me know.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Slama Lighty
Professor and Chair

Department of Chemical Engineering
50 S. Central Campus Dr., Rm. 3290
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
(801) 581 6915
Edward Barbanell  
Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies  
University of Utah  

Dear Dr. Barbanell:  

The University of Utah Libraries’ appreciate your request to comment on our ability to support students in a new undergraduate minor in nuclear engineering. The libraries are committed to supporting the university and its faculty as they develop programs needed by our students.  

We have just ordered those books identified by Dr. Jevremovic as essential which we did not already own. Using the ISI Web of Knowledge Journal Citation Report we have checked our holdings of the most cited journals in nuclear science and engineering. We have access to 14 of the 15 journals in the top half of that subject.  

We encourage faculty to work with subject librarians to build up specific sub-disciplines where our collection needs supplementing. This will be important since new courses are to be offered. Despite budget constraints, we are usually able to order any books necessary to directly support classes. We modify our journal subscriptions to reflect current teaching and research. As the scholarly communication landscape evolves, new options may exist beyond traditional print book purchases and conventional subscriptions. We would like to work with faculty to evaluate the most workable alternatives.  

Student difficulties in locating materials often stem not from collection weaknesses, but from the complexities of using a large research library. We offer class presentations and one-to-one consultations with library specialists who will help students find the most relevant works and suggest the most appropriate search strategies.  

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

Yours truly,  

Rick Anderson  
Associate Director  
Scholarly Resources and Collections  

Juli Hinz  
Associate Director  
Research and Learning Services
MEMORANDUM

To: Senate Executive Committee
From: Paul Brinkman, Associate VP for Budget and Planning
Date: January, 2010
Re: Annual report on the faculty complement

As part of the agreement on faculty ranks reached by the Academic Senate in the Spring of 1999, it was stipulated that the administration “shall report annually to the Academic Senate on the faculty make up by category (University Policy 6-300 Sec.5)(formerly PPM 9-2).” On behalf of the administration, I am pleased to provide the tenth annual report. The attached tables contain data on the faculty headcount in the Fall of 2009, a comparison with prior years, and student credit hours by type of faculty.

Individuals with faculty status can be grouped into differing categories by virtue of the type of faculty they are, their actual role in the University at the time of the census, and whether or not they are on the University payroll. The attached tables are designed to reflect that complexity.

Table 1 provides a view of the faculty complement by headcount. As can be seen, a large number of individuals, 3,567, can be said to be faculty at the University by virtue of either what they do or their status, i.e., they have been given a faculty designation. Tenured/tenure eligible faculty comprise about 42% of all active faculty.

Table 2 provides a comparison of Fall headcounts from 2003 to 2009. The data show modest increases in the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty, as well as several types of auxiliary faculty, over that period.

Table 3 shows the percentage of student credit hours (SCH) taught during Fall semesters from 2003 to 2009 by type of faculty by level of instruction, for the University as a whole. For this analysis, “full-time faculty” includes all tenured/tenure eligible faculty plus those individuals who were employed by the University at least .75 FTE as faculty. “Part-time faculty” refers to individuals who taught one or more classes but were neither full-time faculty nor teaching assistants or teaching fellows. The category “TA/TF” includes only those teaching assistants or teaching fellows who signed grade sheets. The three instructional levels refer to courses not students. “Lower division” refers to SCH taught in courses numbered from 1000 to 2999, “upper division” to courses numbered 3000 to 5999, and “graduate” to courses numbered 6000 to 7999.
Table 4 provides a percentage distribution of SCH taught by college by type of faculty and level of instruction during Fall 2009. The inclusion rules for the several types of faculty are identical to those used for Table 3, as are the course levels. Table 5 is similar in all respects to Table 4 except that tenured and tenure-track faculty are pulled out of the full-time faculty category and shown separately.

The data in Tables 4 and 5 reveal that the use of tenured/tenure-track, other full-time, and part-time faculty as well as teaching assistants varies considerably by college and by level of instruction. These data should be interpreted with caution, as various contextual factors lie behind them. For example, colleges may teach few SCH at a particular instructional level, which means that high or low percentages in a given instance may not be material. Colleges differ in the extent to which they must rely on teaching assistants, rather than on research assistants, in fulfilling their graduate training function, with implications for the SCH likely to be generated by teaching assistants. Colleges may differ in their approach to granting auxiliary faculty appointments, which could affect the distribution of SCH taught by full-time versus part-time faculty. Arguably, course offerings related to basic skills, such as writing and computing, are well suited for instruction by teaching assistants and part-time faculty.
Table 1.
University of Utah
Faculty Headcount, Fall 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Working as:</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>% of</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>% of</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>% of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>662%</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Not on U payroll</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer Faculty</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting Faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GTF³</td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other⁴</td>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Analysis.

NOTE: Headcount includes all active tenured or tenure-eligible faculty and librarians. All clinical, research, and lecturer faculty who are on the payroll, and all other faculty who are on the payroll and taught during the fall semester. There are also several thousand individuals who are not on the payroll and did not teach in the fall but have auxiliary faculty status who are not reflected in these figures. There are also individuals who taught but are not on the payroll nor on tenure track including 12 faculty who taught in the University's various ROTC programs.

²Full-time/part-time status reflects a relationship with the University, not necessarily with faculty duties except for GTA/GTF.
³Paid by other organizations, leave without pay
⁴Graduate teaching assistants and graduate teaching fellows who signed a grade sheet.
⁵Associate instructors, post docs, research associates, wage rated, etc. Full-time are .75 FTE or more with faculty benefits status. Academic staff do not have faculty appointments.
## Table 2

**University of Utah**

**Faculty Headcount, Fall 2002 through Fall 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Working as:</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Not on U Payroll</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer Faculty</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting Faculty</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GTF²</td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other³</td>
<td>Academic staff</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Analysis.

**NOTE:** Headcount includes all active tenured or tenure-eligible faculty and librarians, all clinical, research, and lecturer faculty who are on the payroll, and all other faculty who are on the payroll and taught during the fall semester. Typically there are also several thousand individuals who are not on the payroll and did not teach in the fall but have auxiliary faculty status who are not reflected in these figures. There are also individuals who taught but are not on the payroll and are not tenure track, such as faculty who teach in the University's various ROTC programs.

²Paid by other organizations, leave without pay, e.g., paid by the VA.

³Graduate teaching assistants and graduate teaching fellows who signed a grade sheet.

Associate instructors, post docs, research associates, wage rated, etc. Academic staff do not have faculty appointments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Share of Student Credit Hours Taught</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Share of Student Credit Hours Taught</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Share of Student Credit Hours Taught</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Share of Student Credit Hours Taught</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Share of Student Credit Hours Taught</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Share of Student Credit Hours Taught</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Share of Student Credit Hours Taught</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Share of Student Credit Hours Taught</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Analysis.
Full-time faculty are all tenured or tenure-track faculty plus all other faculty employed at least .5 FTE by the University. Part-time faculty are all faculty who are not full-time nor GTA/GTF. GTA/GTF are Graduate Teaching Assistants and Fellows who are not grad students. Academic staff are included in the full-time and part-time counts in accord with their FTE status.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Lower Division SCH</th>
<th>Lower Division %</th>
<th>Upper Division SCH</th>
<th>Upper Division %</th>
<th>Graduate SCH</th>
<th>Graduate %</th>
<th>Total SCH</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,179</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>10,665</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>8,190</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>25,087</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>5,464</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6,691</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14,449</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9,556</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>30,998</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3,853</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>7,007</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,488</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9,948</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>10,212</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>6,770</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>21,435</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5,775</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>10,813</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7,394</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>23,822</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>9,657</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>9,848</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>21,081</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>14,535</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>12,385</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28,020</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>8,510</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>16,836</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>5,164</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>3,576</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9,217</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>9,367</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>13,111</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,989</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28,467</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>8,886</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>16,017</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>27,930</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>4,415</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>8,966</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>10,629</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>24,130</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>23,032</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50,586</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>11,471</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>13,591</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>12,574</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14,764</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Faculty Type</td>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines &amp; Earth Sciences</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>3,541</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,484</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>6,997</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>32,723</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>7,124</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>4,183</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>44,030</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>5,596</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6,565</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>44,250</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7,899</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>54,485</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Science</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>10,018</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>8,174</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>3,591</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>31,833</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2,906</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>5,428</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>9,239</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>17,539</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28,159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,546</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>52,448</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>3,376</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,425</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>6,034</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Studies, Honors, Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>5,009</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>5,831</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7,167</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOCE - Direct Pay Courses</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>83,372</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>94,407</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>62,105</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>239,884</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>26,459</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>23,855</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>10,344</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>60,688</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>25,591</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>9,495</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>35,649</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>135,422</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>127,755</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>72,712</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>355,919</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Office of Institutional Analysis.
Full-time faculty are all tenured/tenure eligible faculty plus all other faculty employed at least .75 FTE by the University.
Part-time faculty are all faculty who are neither full-time nor GTA/GTF. GTA/GTF are Graduate Teaching Assistants or
Fellows who signed grade sheets. Academic staff are included in the full-time and part-time counts in accord with FTE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCH %</td>
<td>SCH %</td>
<td>SCH %</td>
<td>SCH %</td>
<td>SCH %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>2,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>5,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>5,224</td>
<td>5,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>5,468</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>12,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>5,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6,652</td>
<td>14,449</td>
<td>9,958</td>
<td>30,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>2,729</td>
<td>3,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>3,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>2,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>4,466</td>
<td>4,715</td>
<td>9,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>6,424</td>
<td>15,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>5,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>2,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5,775</td>
<td>10,813</td>
<td>7,394</td>
<td>23,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>6,134</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>10,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>6,211</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>10,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>6,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>14,535</td>
<td>12,385</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>28,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>8,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>4,624</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>8,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>5,164</td>
<td>3,576</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>9,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>9,367</td>
<td>13,111</td>
<td>5,989</td>
<td>28,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>12,464</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>19,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>4,876</td>
<td>3,553</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>8,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>4,415</td>
<td>4,366</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>8,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>10,829</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>13,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>24,130</td>
<td>23,082</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>50,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8,528</td>
<td>8,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>5,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA/GTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>12,574</td>
<td>14,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Type</td>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mineral &amp; Earth Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GrTF</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nursing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>1,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GrTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pharmacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GrTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>14,612</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>5,056</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>3,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>18,111</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>5,598</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GrTF</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>44,250</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7,899</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social &amp; Behavioral Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>6,078</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>12,623</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>3,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>18,111</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>5,598</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GrTF</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>17,559</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28,159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>1,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GrTF</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Studies, Honors, Ethnic Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>3,693</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GrTF</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AACE - Direct Pay Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GrTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten/TT</td>
<td>34,272</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>55,636</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>46,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>49,101</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>38,771</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>15,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>26,459</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>23,883</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>10,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA/GrTF</td>
<td>25,591</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>9,495</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>135,423</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>127,765</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>72,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Analysis.

Full-time faculty are faculty employed at least .75 FTE by the University, excluding tenured tenure-track faculty. Part-time faculty are faculty who are neither tenured tenure-track, nor other full-time, nor GTA/GrTF. GTA/GrTF are Graduate Teaching Assistant or Fellow who signed grade sheets. Academic staff are included in the full-time and part-time counts in accord with their FTE status.
## Information Calendar

**Academic Senate** – February 1, 2010  
**Executive Committee** – January 25, 2010

### THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

**Aportionment of Faculty Seats in the Academic Senate**

Based on 2009 Calendar Student Credit Hours and Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty as of Fall Semester 2009

The apportionment at The University of Utah is based on student credit hours following the following formula:

\[ \text{Number of Faculty} = \frac{\text{Student Credit Hours}}{\text{Number of Faculty Members}} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>2007-08 thru 2009-10</th>
<th>2009 SCH Apportionment per College</th>
<th>2009 SCH Faculty Apportionment per College</th>
<th>2010-11 thru 2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13 thru 2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13,062</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58,959</td>
<td>3.469</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24,753</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48,047</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58,528</td>
<td>2.944</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67,442</td>
<td>3.393</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>107,644</td>
<td>5.415</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11,650</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36,545</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>12.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nines/Earth Sci.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17,412</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,610</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc./Beh Sci.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>116,882</td>
<td>5.880</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13,759</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23,764</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**  
78  
745,478  
37,500  
1555  
37,500  
75,000  
74  
79

Representation from the University Libraries is determined by taking the average number of student credit hours per faculty member, of all other colleges (the numbers used were 716,714 divided by 1498) and multiplying that value by the number of library faculty (60).

- **a** - this number was calculated by taking the number of Student Credit Hours (SCH) per College, dividing that by the total number of SCH and multiplying that by a constant (in this case 37.5)
- **b** - this number was calculated by taking the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty members in each college and dividing that by the total number of faculty on campus and multiplying that by a constant (in this case 37.5)
- **c** - this number was calculated by adding a and b together
- **d** - this number was calculated by rounding up or down the results from column c
- **e** - this number was calculated by adding a number where necessary to ensure each college has a minimum of 2 senators
OFFICE OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES—UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

UNDERGRADUATE REPORT TO THE ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT
AND THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

October 14, 2009

The Undergraduate Council has completed its study of the Gender Studies Program.

The External Review Committee was:

Dr. Eileen Boris, Hull Professor and Chair
Department of Feminist Studies
University of California, Santa Barbara

Dr. Kathryn Flannery, Professor
Departments of English and Women’s Studies
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. Robert Buffington, Associate Professor
Women and Gender Studies Program
University of Colorado, Boulder

The Internal Review Committee was:

Dr. Rosemarie Hunter, Assistant Professor
Social Work and Director, University Neighborhood Partners
University of Utah

Dr. Elizabeth Tashjian, Associate Professor
Department of Finance
University of Utah

Kaye Richards, Associate Professor
Department of Modern Dance
University of Utah
The following summary is based on the Gender Studies self-study, reports provided by External and Internal review Committees and the response to those reports by the Director of the Gender Studies Program.

**Program Overview**
When this program was last reviewed, in 1997, it was known as Women’s Studies. In addition to changing its name, Gender Studies has redefined its mission as a program, undergone significant administrative restructuring and faculty turnover, and developed an entirely new curriculum. The program’s self-study states that its mission is “to provide a quality undergraduate education in gender scholarship, to promote an integration of this scholarship and research into the university curriculum, to encourage new pedagogies, and to foster the growth of an interdisciplinary community of scholars who are interested in gender as a category of analysis.”

Gender Studies’ faculty now includes six tenured/tenure-track professors holding joint appointments in a number of departments in the colleges of Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences and Education. The program offers B.A. and B.S. degrees and a minor in Gender Studies. It has sponsored the Faculty Seminar on Gender, has begun to collaborate with Ethnic Studies to establish curricular links between the two programs, and has continued to participate in various community-centered service projects.

Both external and internal review committees had high praise for the quality of the faculty, both for their published research in gender studies and the courses they designed and offered. They also were impressed by the Gender Studies students they met with and felt that the program’s leadership and administrative structure were working successfully.

**Administration**
Gender Studies degrees are granted through the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the College of Social and Behavioral Science Curriculum Committee has oversight over the program’s courses and degree requirements. However, the program’s budget, including Gender Studies’ contribution to faculty salaries and support for faculty research, is overseen by the Associate Vice President for Equity and Diversity.

The program’s administration now includes a Director, Associate Director and full-time Administrative Assistant. The Directorship is to rotate among the tenured faculty every three to seven years. The current Director, however, does not hold a joint appointment in Gender Studies; her home department, English, is compensated by the Associate Vice President for the .5 FTE the Director devotes to administration while the courses she teaches are cross-listed. The Associate Director is a permanent position held by a full-time, non-tenure-track faculty member who devotes .5 FTE to administration and teaches two courses each year.

The external review committee noted that this administrative structure was “unconventional” but observed that it had proved effective. They encouraged the program to continue exploring ways to make the transition to a new director move smoothly. The next director will presumably come
from among the jointly appointed faculty, and the AVP may need to consider how the faculty member’s department will be compensated. The reviewers noted that a great deal of responsibility for the program’s continuity will continue to fall to the Associate Director, who is not a tenure-track faculty member but “should be eligible for reviews, merit raises, and incentives.”

Faculty
The greatest strength of the Gender Studies Program is its faculty and excellent leadership. The program houses six faculty members who have joint appointments in regular tenure-granting departments, but does not grant tenure itself. The standard arrangement is that a faculty member is 0.5 FTE in an academic department and 0.5 FTE in Gender Studies. No faculty members are fully appointed to the program. Although Gender Studies faculty members have the responsibility to teach in the program, they must gain tenure, merit, and promotion in their academic departments. In terms of teaching load, faculty members teach two classes each year in their home department and two for Gender Studies. The role of Gender Studies is straightforward: it determines what faculty will teach, develops curriculum and evaluates faculty performance in the classroom. Gender Studies participates in the RPT process by conducting formal reviews of its faculty members and providing a report to the appropriate department.

Core faculty come from the Humanities, especially History and English. The program is unusual in that it has had faculty in Psychology and Economics as well as an appointment in Political Science and Education. A single male professor specializes in the field of masculinity students. Because it is at its core interdisciplinary, its research paradigm is less clear, but depth exists particularly in feminist and queer theory, and cultural studies. Its faculty compares favorably with comparable programs in other Research 1 Universities and is very productive, active in professional societies and conferences, with significant publishing and service profiles. They have received numerous recognitions, including book and article prizes and major grants appropriate to their fields of expertise.

Reviewers commented that faculty members are equally committed to their academic disciplines and to Gender Studies. As a group, several of the Gender Studies faculty members are highly respected scholars in their fields and several of the younger faculty members have promising scholarly agendas. The review of faculty scholarship, service and teaching is conducted in the academic department, not in Gender Studies. Retention of faculty is a concern with limited resources for supporting research or for competitive salaries.

Students
The Gender Studies Program does not formally recruit students, although they make informal contacts at orientation and have placed posters around campus. Students find their way to the program through challenging, thought-provoking classes, a strong recruiting tool. The self-study suggests that the student body is increasing in ethnic diversity, which is partially attributed to the collaboration between GS and Ethnic Studies. Since the name change the program has experienced greater diversity in terms of gender and sexual orientation.
The program has approximately 80 Gender Studies majors and about 10 minors. Approximately 200 students enroll in the program’s diversity and cross-listed classes every year. The self-study reports that the number of students earning bachelor degrees in Gender Studies has increased from 14 in the 2003-4 school year, to 19 in the 2007-8 school year, for a total of 72 in this 5-year span.

**Curriculum**
The Gender Studies major is structured around an upper-division (3000 level) core course, *Protests and Movements: A Contemporary History*, that examines women’s rights and gay rights movements in relation to civil rights and labor movements. The core course also provides Gender Studies majors with an upper division writing-intensive experience. In addition to courses in Feminist Theory and electives chosen from among cross-listed courses, majors and minors must take “disciplinary cell” courses. These 5000 level classes allow Gender Studies students to learn the ways in which gender research is conducted in different disciplines. The Internal Review Committee noted that students were not always equally prepared for these advanced courses, but the Program Director responded that this approach to a capstone experience gave Gender Studies flexibility in scheduling and intellectual rigor in its most advanced offerings. Indeed, the External Review Committee praised the program’s faculty for its “well-crafted, intellectually rich, and pedagogically thoughtful” course offerings.

Gender Studies does not offer any graduate courses and there are no immediate plans to develop any program at the graduate level. Gender Studies does advise graduate students about courses in their respective fields that seem appropriate to those wishing to pursue the issues and methods of gender study. In 2004 the program reactivated its service learning program and the self-study highlighted Professor Susie Porter’s recent work with the Westside Leadership Institute as an example of continued efforts to involve students in community-based projects.

**Diversity**
The Gender Studies faculty as it is currently configured lacks the diversity the reviewers had hoped to see in a program of this sort. This is, in part due to the loss of some faculty members, but it is also the result of the difficulties inherent in recruiting joint appointments; the program’s recruitments are always dependent on the programmatic needs of the departments willing to hire in concert with Gender Studies. For example, constraints on the English Department’s budget led to a cancellation of last year’s search for a specialist in Asian-American literature and/or film; it is uncertain when or whether that search will be resumed.

Gender Studies has been successful at introducing and fostering intellectual diversity on campus. The current faculty includes scholars doing significant work in Masculinity Studies, Disability Studies, Queer Theory, and Latin American Studies. The program has also cross-listed as electives a number of Ethnic Studies courses, including *La Chicana, American Racism, Black Feminist Thought* among others. Ongoing discussions between Ethnic Studies and Gender Studies promise to bring about further collaboration between the two programs.
The Internal Review Committee suggested that the program might offer more courses that met the University’s Diversity requirement. The Program Director responded by promising to revisit Gender Studies’ contributions to general education requirements, but she also noted that limited FTE and the program’s commitment to offering a coherent and intellectually rigorous major make it difficult to expand its offerings to the general student body. The program faculty continues to debate this issue and recognizes that General Education courses often help recruit future majors.

**Assessment**
Gender Studies has had a difficult time getting useful data from OBIA but assesses the program’s effectiveness through other vehicles, particularly narrative data. Routine assessment includes review of course grades and student course evaluations at the end of each semester, and has made it easier to gauge student learning, especially with the addition of an upper division core course, Protests and Movements, that provides a common experience for majors and minors and thus an opportunity to assess progress within the course and over the program of study. Cross-listed courses also allow for comparison between Gender Studies majors and majors in other fields.

**Facilities and Resources**
Gender Studies’ impressive success has been accomplished with limited resources. Funds received from the Associate Vice President for Diversity made it possible to remodel and redesign the program space in Building 44 (which needs a more appropriate name) to make it more inviting and professional. Adequate space and resources continue to be a pressing need. The most serious concern with the space is that it is located so far from the academic departmental offices of the faculty, all of whom have joint appointments. Faculty members meet with students in their home offices. Space issues have an impact on program cohesion. Operating costs have remained constant, but with projected growth of faculty and students, these will need to be augmented appropriately.

**Commendations and Recommendations**

1. **Commendations**
   a. The Gender Studies Program wonderfully and uniquely fulfills its mission, and fills a tremendous need on campus.
   b. The interdisciplinary nature of the Program creates visibility and cross campus collaborations that enrich the experiences of students, faculty, and the community alike.
   c. The leaders of the Program, Kathryn Stockton, Director, and Gerda Saunders, Associate Director - are highly dynamic, respected, responsive, and productive.
d. The support given to the Program by the Office of Equity and Diversity and the College of Social and Behavioral Science is strong and greatly appreciated. This support effectively links the Program to administration, and allows it to expand its reach.

e. The Program has excellent and committed faculty from all over campus and the community.

f. Students in the Program are strong, growing in numbers, diverse, and supportive, and believe the program to be a safe space for them to engage personally and academically.

2. Recommendations

   a. Continue to resolve the challenges in getting accurate enrollment data from OBIA.

   b. Continue to work to increase the diversity of faculty and students. The committee recommends that a recruitment plan be put in place, in cooperation with campus departments, to assist the Program in its efforts. Faculty should be recruited from as wide a range of disciplines as possible, and departments should be encouraged to make joint appointments.

   c. If the program continues to be housed in Building 44, the physical facility needs to have more visibility. A permanent name, new and permanent signage, and perhaps some general updating would be great places to start. Efforts should be made to utilize the space as a gathering space to better engage students and faculty alike.

   d. A succession plan is needed for leadership if this Program is to remain strong. If the Associate Director position continues to be held by a non-tenure-track faculty member, the committee recommends that the program institute a review procedure to ensure that the AD’s performance is adequately evaluated and rewarded.

   e. An effort should be made to have more Gender Studies courses satisfy the Diversity Requirement on campus.
Department Review by Academic Year

GENDER STUDIES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Expenditures</td>
<td>186,991</td>
<td>300,234</td>
<td>356,696</td>
<td>416,429</td>
<td>228,178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Credit Hours</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>2593</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate</td>
<td>3739</td>
<td>2856</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>2336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Class Size</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course/Instructor Evaluations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Courses</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Instructors</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled Majors – Autumn Census</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Majors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Majors</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMO: Gender Studies Follow-up about Data Discrepancy between Program Data and OBIA Data

This memo references and relates to Section 1.4 “Program Profile” (p. 16) of the 2009 Gender Studies Review Report.

As we noted under “Program Profile” under the subtitle “Concerns and Plan of Action” (p. 18), we agreed to continue working with OBIA to seek a solution to the problem of data discrepancies.

While we have not yet been able to follow up on all the discrepancies we note on p. 18, OBIA has tried a different way of counting to deal with the apparent underreporting of our majors; they generated a new Program Profile which counts the combination of students who declared Gender Studies as their first, second, third, and fourth majors (see the attachment titled “Figure 1.4.i_UPDATED_Gender Studies Program Profile OBTAINED FROM OBIA AFTER COMPLETION OF REVIEW REPORT.doc”).

Comparison of the Program Profile obtained by this method to the original Profile (see attachment titled Figure 1.4.i_Gender Studies Program Profile INCLUDED IN REVIEW REPORT.doc) shows that the major count increases significantly if the major search is broadened as described. For the purposes of this analysis, we don’t distinguish between “Pre-majors” and “Majors,” since (as noted on p. 18), we don’t utilize a category of “Pre-majors” and don’t know who is counted under that description. The table shows the totals by each method and the percentage increase in counted majors for each of the academic years covered in our Review Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors obtained by original method</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors obtained by expanded method</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the fact that the expanded method picks up more majors than the original, we still believe that our majors are undercounted. We understand that OBIA counts only those declared majors who are registered for at least one class in Gender Studies for a particular semester. Even if that is the case, it seems that some of our majors still are still somehow omitted. To illustrate this contention, we asked OBIA to provide us with their data for the current semester, Fall 2009. We then compared this information with the results of a comprehensive survey of our majors.
which we completed this month (October 2009): OBIA reports 53 majors for this semester, while we received e-mail confirmation from 80 students that they are still Gender Studies majors. The difference is 27 students, which represents a 51% undercount by OBIA’s reckoning. A portion of this difference may be accounted for by students who are not currently enrolled in a Gender Studies course. Nevertheless, the difference still seems significant and we will continue to work with OBIA to understand the reasons for the discrepancy. This memo addresses only the issue of our major count. We have not yet attempted to discover the reason for the other discrepancies listed on p. 18 or the discrepancies between OBIA’s and Paul Brinkman’s SCH data. With OBIA’s continued collaboration and support, we hope to get more insight into these issues as well. In closing we would like to reiterate that OBIA has been extremely helpful and responsive both during the preparation of our initial Review Report and in the time that has elapsed since we submitted that report.
Memorandum of Understanding  
Gender Studies Program  
Undergraduate Council Review  

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on November 23, 2009 and concludes the Undergraduate Council Review of the Gender Studies Program. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs; John Francis, Senior Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs; Steve Roens, Senior Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies; Octavio Villalpando, Associate Vice President for Equity and Diversity; Kathryn Stockton, Director of the Gender Studies Program; and Gerda Saunders, Associate Director of the Gender Studies Program, were present.

The discussion centered on, but was not limited to, recommendations included in the Undergraduate Council Review completed on October 27, 2009.

At the wrap-up meeting, the group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1: *Program Data*

The Gender Studies Program will continue to work with the administration to get a more accurate count of multiple majors. Gender Studies will track multiple majors by student declaration and by later confirmation by advisors. Gender Studies will communicate these results to the administration for comparison with the Gender Studies Program Profile with the purpose of eliminating discrepancies.

Recommendation 2: *Diversity*

Gender Studies should continue to try to increase its diversity by collaborating more closely with the Ethnic Studies Program. As has now begun to be the case, students should move between the two programs, whenever feasible and with greater encouragement and frequency. Gender Studies and Ethnic Studies should continue jointly to consider establishing a LGBT Concentration to be shared between the Gender Studies Program and the Ethnic Studies Program.

Recommendation 3: *Housing for the Program*

The Associate Vice President for Equity and Diversity should explore the possibility of moving Gender Studies out of Building 44, or updating and renaming the building. Other tenants might move to allow the Gender Studies Program to expand, and a donor might be found to name the building and pay for an upgrade. If a donor could not be found but current tenants could move, the building might be renamed for Gender Studies. Otherwise, Gender Studies should consider moving to another building with a higher profile and better space and facilities. Since the Gender Studies Program does not have the benefit of a college development office, it will need to rely on the administration for the means of enacting one of these solutions.

Recommendation 4: *Plan for Succession of Program Leadership*

The current director will stay on through the 2010-11 academic year. After consulting with Gender Studies faculty, the Associate Vice President for Equity and Diversity will appoint a designee to shadow the current director during the 2010-11 academic year.
Recommendation 5: Satisfying the Diversity Requirement

The Director will discuss with the faculty the possibility of designating more existing Gender Studies courses as satisfying the Diversity Requirement. Acceptance of students who wish to satisfy the requirement would be limited by maintaining the small size of classes desirable for the Program. Consequently Gender Studies classes having the Diversity designation would have to have caps.

This memorandum of understanding is to be followed by annual letters of progress from the Director of the Program to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Letters will be submitted each year until all of the actions in the preceding paragraphs have been addressed.

David W. Pershing  
Senior VP for Academic Affairs

Octavio Villalpando  
Associate VP for Equity and Diversity

Kathryn Stockton  
Director, Gender Studies Program

Gerda Saunders  
Associate Director, Gender Studies Program

John Francis  
Senior Associate VP for Academic Affairs
December 30, 2009

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

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Family and Preventive Medicine

Dear Vice President Betz:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council's review of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine. 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: David J. Bjorkman, Dean, School of Medicine
Michael K. Magill, Chair, Department of Family and Preventive Medicine
Stephen Alder, Chief, Division of Public Health
Donald M. Pedersen, Director, Physician Assistant Program
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine. The External Review Committee included:

James F. Cawley, MPH, PA-C (Chair)
Professor, Department of Prevention and Community Health
School of Public Health and Health Services
George Washington University

Patricia M. Dieter, MPA, PA-C
Program Director
Department of Community and Family Medicine
Duke University Medical Center

Dr. Richard Muma, PhD, MPH, PA-C
Professor and Director, Public Health Program
Wichita State University

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Dr. Deborah Scammon
Professor, Department of Marketing

Dr. Norman Waitzman
Professor, Department of Economics

Dr. Les Chatelain
Professor, Department of Health Promotion and Education

This report by the Graduate Council is based on the self-study report submitted by the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, the results of the internal and external review committees, and the comments/responses from Dr. Michael K. Magill, Chair and Professor of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine; Dr. Stephen Alder, Chief of the Division of Public Health; David Keahey, Associate Director of Graduate Studies for the Physician Assistant Program; and Dr. David Bjorkman, Dean of the School of Medicine at the University of Utah.
DEPARTMENT PROFILE

The Department of Family and Preventive Medicine is in the School of Medicine. The Department has recently been reorganized and is now composed of 3 Divisions: 1) the Division of Public Health, 2) the Division of Family Medicine, and 3) the Division of Occupational and Environmental Health; and 1 Program, the Physician Assistant Program. The Division of Occupational and Environmental Health is a new Division and was therefore not included in this review. The Graduate Council does not review medical education and therefore the Division of Family Medicine is not included in this review. This Graduate Council review includes the Division of Public Health and the Physician Assistant Program.

Program Overview

Division of Public Health

The Division of Public Health operates its own master’s and doctoral degree programs, awarding MPH, MSPH, and PhD degrees. The Division offers several joint degrees including an MD/MPH (or MSPH), and MPA (master of public administration)/MPH. The Division also offers courses at the undergraduate level, and there is some discussion of developing an undergraduate BA in Public Health. The Division has a large number of students, approximately 150, enrolled in their master’s and doctoral programs. Tuition from these students is an important revenue source for the Division; however, adequate resources and faculty support appears to be a concern. The Division has recently undergone several important transitions including the appointment of a new Chief for the Division, a move to new facilities at the University, the loss of several faculty members, and recent reorganization with the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine to separate the Division of Public Health and the Division of Occupational Health. The changes in structure and leadership have led the Division of Public Health to refocus its mission towards capitalizing on its strengths to serve as a resource within the School of Medicine, instead of moving towards a School of Public Health that is separate from the School of Medicine, which is the model used in some institutions.

Physician Assistant Program

The Physician Assistant Program is a well-established program with an excellent national reputation. The Program currently enrolls 36 students annually, although based on recommendations from the Utah Medical Education Council, enrollment is anticipated to increase to 50 students by 2012. The Physician Assistant Program has a 2-year curriculum and awards a Master of Physician Assistant Studies degree. Students have an excellent pass rate on the Physician Assistant National Certifying Examination, well above the national averages. The current Program Director, who is very highly regarded both internally and nationally, will retire from the position in 2010. The Program appears to have a strong plan in place to recruit an effective replacement and facilitate this transition.
Faculty
Division of Public Health

The Division of Public Health currently consists of 9 faculty members, 1 full professor, 4 associate, and 4 assistant professors. Four are clinical track faculty (3 at the associate professor level and 1 at the assistant professor level). The Division is currently conducting a search for 2 additional tenure-track faculty members in Biostatistics and Epidemiology, and 1 clinical faculty member. Of the 9 total faculty members within the Division, 5 are women. One is African American. There is a need for additional faculty members to allow the Division to meet the needs of its current students and establish its role in the School of Medicine. The Division has outlined its plan to improve the recruitment of minorities in the Division. Faculty members in the Division have historically carried heavy teaching and advising responsibilities due to the large number of students in the Division. Many of the faculty members have been recognized for their teaching excellence, and overall the faculty has demonstrated resiliency and productivity in the face of a great deal of change.

Physician Assistant Program

The Physician Assistant Program has 8 core faculty members, each of whom is a Physician’s Assistant with a master’s degree. Four faculty members are female, none are minorities. Faculty in the Physician Assistant Program can gain faculty appointment in the School of Medicine’s Department of Family and Preventive Medicine. Currently 1 faculty member is a full professor, 1 an associate professor, and 1 an instructor in the non-tenure, clinical track. Two additional faculty members are in the process of attaining appointments as instructors. Continued efforts to assist faculty in attaining appointments in the Department will assist with improving the visibility of the Program within the School of Medicine. The Program uses a large number of adjunct faculty for both instruction and clinical supervision.

The faculty and adjuncts in the Physician Assistant Program are enthusiastic and dedicated to their profession and the development of their students. There is a strong sense of collegiality among the faculty. Many faculty members are engaged with national professional organizations and contribute to professional education journals. The faculty have enjoyed strong and stable leadership in the Program. Current faculty:student ratio is excellent. The increase in enrollment will challenge the ability to maintain this ratio, and to continue to provide outstanding clinical instruction.

Students

Division of Public Health

In the 2007-2008 academic year, the Division of Public Health had 80 students enrolled in its master’s degree programs and 32 students in its doctoral degree program. In the same academic year the Division awarded 42 master’s degrees and 4 doctoral degrees. The Division has two scholarships designated for support of minority students. A limited number of students are supported as Teaching Assistants, Research Assistants, Fellowships and Graduate Assistants. Based on the last review by the Graduate Council, the Division of Public Health has improved efforts towards advising students. Students appear satisfied with their progress towards degrees.
in their programs. For the master’s degree programs the average time to degree attainment has remained at about 2 years, and attrition rates have been generally low. The doctoral program awarded its first degrees in 2007-2008. As a new program, tracking student progress towards degree attainment will need to be monitored. The doctoral program has taken on a large number of students, and although admissions have been reduced in the past few years, there remain a large number of doctoral students in the program relative to the size of the faculty.

The Division takes advantage of opportunities for student input on specific courses and the programs as a whole while students are in their programs. The Division appears to be very receptive and responsive to this feedback. The Division does not have an adequate process to track the outcomes of its graduates. This feedback would provide important input to identify areas of strength or deficiency in their programs that students may perceive only after graduation.

**Physician Assistant Program**

The Physician Assistant Program currently admits 36 students annually. The Program receives approximately 450-500 applicants for these positions, allowing them to select highly qualified students. Students note that the process of application and notification of acceptance occurs late relative to other programs, creating pressure to accept admission from other programs and hardships in getting affairs in order to begin the program. Over the past 5 academic years, approximately 70% of accepted students have been female, and 15% are minorities. The percentage of minorities in the program has risen over the past 7 years. The Program makes use of a Diversity Coordinator, which is likely responsible for the successful minority recruitment efforts. Unlike many programs in the School of Medicine, students in the Physician Assistant Program receive almost no financial support and little or no state financing, creating a large financial burden to be borne by the students.

Students in the Physician Assistant Program express a great deal of satisfaction with the Program and are happy with the support they receive from faculty and staff and express a high degree of satisfaction with the Program as a whole. The Program has a defined process of remediation for students who are experiencing difficulty with the Program. Attrition from the Program is very low. The Physician Assistant Program surveys graduates on various aspects of the Program, and although response rates are somewhat low, the efforts to gather this information are laudable.

**Curriculum and Programs of Study**

**Division of Public Health**

The Division of Public Health offers master’s degrees in public health (MPH), master of science in public health (MSPH), master of statistics (MStat), joint master’s degrees with medicine (MD/MPH or MD/MSPH), and healthcare administration (MPH/MHA). The Division also offers a Doctor of Philosophy in Public Health (PhD). The MPH is a 2-year, 45 credit curriculum that may be completed in 3 semesters, although a 2-year time frame is more typical. The MPH does not require completion of a research project. The MSPH is a 55 credit curriculum that requires at least 2 years for completion. The MSPH degree requires a research project presented as a thesis or paper of publishable quality. The PhD program has a 72 credit hour
minimum and requires both a teaching and research practicum. The program is designed to require 4-5 years for completion. The coursework for the master’s degree programs involves instruction from a large number of adjunct instructors, which has created some inconsistency in the quality of some courses. Students commented on a desire to have more elective courses available in the curriculum; however, this may not be realistic considering the limited faculty resources.

**Physician Assistant Program**

The curriculum for the Physician Assistant Program requires 89 credit hours taken over two years. The first year is primarily didactic while the second year involves preceptorships in various clinical settings. The curriculum is well-designed to cover current topics in medicine including evidence-based medicine, genetics, community-oriented primary care, etc. A deficiency in the clinical training is the lack of exposure for all students to experiences with residency-trained physicians in the area of internal medicine and psychiatry. The concern will only grow with expansion of student enrollment.

**Program Effectiveness – Outcomes Assessment**

**Division of Public Health**

The tracking of student outcomes and program effectiveness is a concern for the Division of Public Health. There is little data provided to examine the overall effectiveness of the program or to permit comparison to other programs nationally.

**Physician Assistant Program**

The Physician Assistant Program assesses effectiveness through recent graduate and alumni surveys and scores on the national board examination. The Program has examined student performance while in the Program to performance on the national examination. Overall the pass rates on the national examination have been excellent. The Program effectively tracks the outcomes of its graduates. The percentage of graduates working in primary care vs. specialty care, and the percentage working with underserved populations compare favorably with national averages. The Program could benefit from additional evaluation of particular didactic components of the curriculum.

**Facilities and Resources**

**Division of Public Health and Physician Assistant Program**

The Division of Public Health and the Physician Assistant Program are currently housed in Research Park in the same building with the Family Medicine Division and the Administration for the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine. The space within this building has been undergoing reallocation to decrease fragmentation among these different entities. Classroom and student computing facilities are also housed in the same building. The Physician Assistant
Program also uses the classroom and clinical facilities in the new Health Science Education Building at the University of Utah.

The funding for the Division of Public Health is generated largely from student credit hours, although the Division does not directly receive this funding. A differential tuition assessment has recently been established which provides greater and more predictable financial support for the Division. Funding remains a concern for the Division, as does the balance between teaching responsibilities and other scholarly activities for the faculty. The Physician Assistant Program has a self-retaining tuition arrangement and generates revenue from student contact hours, creating a stable financial situation for the Program.

COMMENDATIONS

**Division of Public Health**

The Division faculty and staff have shown remarkable resiliency through numerous recent changes. The Division has energetic new leadership and a highly capable faculty to move the Division into the future.

The Division is evaluating its mission and role within the School of Medicine and the University, and positioning itself to capitalize on its core strengths.

The Division and its faculty are committed to the education of its students. Students in the Division are very satisfied with the quality of their education and enjoy strong relationships with faculty.

The Division provides degree programs that are integral to the University of Utah and the School of Medicine.

The Division has a strong commitment to interdisciplinary collaboration in research and program development.

**Physician Assistant Program**

The Program has a clear sense of mission and purpose, strong and well-regarded leadership, and a highly-committed faculty and staff.

The Program is recognized nationally as a leader in Physician Assistant education.

The Program has a well-established procedure for examining its overall performance and the outcomes of its graduates. The Program is very responsive to any issues or concerns that arise from these assessments.

The Program has been proactive in anticipating changes that will be occurring due to the retirement of its Director and expansion of its enrollment.

The Program takes explicit steps to assist with recruitment of minority students. These efforts have resulted in rising rates of minority students in the Program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

**Division of Public Health**

The Division should continue to refine its mission and strategic plan for the future. A written mission statement with measurable outcomes should be developed.
The Division should continue to focus and define its role in the areas of biostatistics and epidemiology, and continue to build collaborative efforts related to these areas.

The Division should continue to seek opportunities for sustainable financial support for the Division that do not rely strictly on funding that results from teaching activities. Continued reliance on revenues from teaching may hamper the scholarly development of the Division. It is recommended that the Division should develop a strategy to mentor junior faculty and anticipated new faculty hires with the School of Medicine’s RPT process in order to improve retention of faculty.

The Division should develop a strategy to regularly evaluate its degree programs and the outcomes of its graduates. Consultation with the Physician Assistant Program is a positive step towards this goal.

The Division should carefully track the progress of doctoral students to insure progress towards degree completion.

Continued growth in the Division is likely to provide opportunities to diversify the faculty with respect to minority representation.

**Physician Assistant Program**

The Program should seek additional opportunities to financially support students through scholarships or other mechanisms.

The Program should continue its careful planning towards hiring a new Program Director.

The Program should consider revisions of the timing of its application process to insure that top applicants are not lost to other programs.

The Program should continue efforts to assist faculty members in attaining faculty appointments within the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine.

Hiring additional faculty members within the Program will provide opportunities to diversify the faculty with respect to minority representation.

**ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW**

**Division of Public Health**

Since the reports from the internal and external review teams, the Chief of the Division of Public Health and the Chair of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine have taken actions to address some of the concerns raised. The Division is continuing to work towards better defining its mission and role in the School of Medicine through a planned faculty retreat, and ongoing efforts are underway to recruit additional faculty members with expertise in the core areas of the Division (Epidemiology and Biostatistics). Recent budget concerns have presented additional challenges in faculty recruitment efforts. The Division has also established additional joint degree offerings across the University and is moving towards a fully-online MPH curriculum. The Division has consulted with the Physician Assistant Program for assistance with outcomes assessment and graduate surveys.

**Physician Assistant Program**

Since the reports of the internal and external review teams, the Associate Director of Graduate Studies for the Physician Assistant Program and the Chair of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine have taken actions to address some of the concerns raised. The Program is
continuing to move forward with a thoughtful and inclusive process for recruiting a new Director for the Program. Funding has been allocated for two new faculty positions in anticipation of growth in enrollment. The Program has made plans to produce an annual Outcomes Assessment Report to further evaluate the didactic and clinical components of its curriculum. Additional efforts to secure scholarship support for students have been undertaken.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council:
Julie Fritz (Chair, Department of Physical Therapy
Sally Planalp, Department of Communication
Mary Jane Taylor, College of Social Work
Memorandum of Understanding  
Department of Family and Preventive Medicine  
Graduate Council Review 2008-09

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on October 27, 2009, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine. A. Lorris Betz, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; David J. Bjorkman, Dean of the School of Medicine; Michael K. Magill, Chair of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine; Stephen Alder, Chief of the Division of Public Health; Donald M. Pedersen, Director of the Physician Assistant Program; 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 April 27, 2009. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

DIVISION OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Recommendation 1: The Division should continue to refine its mission and strategic plan for the future. A written mission statement with measurable outcomes should be developed.

The Division Chief reports that based on input from the faculty, a draft of the Division’s new mission statement should be available in a few weeks. The mission statement will better align the Division’s goals with those of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine (DFPM), the School of Medicine, and the University. The revised mission statement will be forwarded to the Graduate School by the end of December, 2009.

Recommendation 2: The Division should continue to focus and define its role in the areas of biostatistics and epidemiology, and continue to build collaborative efforts related to these areas.

Since the review, the Division has successfully recruited two new faculty to address this recommendation. One is a biostatistician and the other is an epidemiologist hired in collaboration with the Huntsman Cancer Institute. The Division anticipates that the new faculty hires will contribute substantially to their goal of increasing collaborative interdisciplinary research projects in biostatistics and epidemiology.
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**Recommendation 3:** The Division should continue to seek opportunities for sustainable financial support for the Division that do not rely strictly on funding that results from teaching activities. Continued reliance on revenues from teaching may hamper the scholarly development of the Division.

Adequate funding continues to be a challenge for the Division. The Division has instituted differential tuition, and increased revenue from this source will help offset loss of teaching revenue as faculty research and grant seeking activities increase. The Division is well positioned to contribute collaboratively to researchers across the University and plans to develop those relationships in order to increase extramural funding.

**Recommendation 4:** It is recommended that the Division should develop a strategy to mentor junior faculty and anticipated new faculty hires with the School of Medicine’s RPT process in order to improve retention of faculty.

The Division has taken several actions to address this recommendation. It has instituted annual reviews of all faculty and all new faculty hires are assigned a mentor to help guide them through the RPT process. The School of Medicine also provides faculty mentoring support and mentoring workshops for the Division.

**Recommendation 5:** The Division should develop a strategy to regularly evaluate its degree programs and the outcomes of its graduates. Consultation with the Physician Assistant Program is a positive step towards this goal.

Division personnel are continuing to meet with the Physician Assistant Program Outcomes Director in order to identify best practices in outcome assessment for the purpose of developing a set of outcomes assessment strategies for their program. They are also conducting exit surveys and maintaining contact information from past graduates, which will allow them to collect information on post-graduate outcomes and satisfaction.

**Recommendation 6:** The Division should carefully track the progress of doctoral students to insure progress towards degree completion.

The Division has instituted formal periodic reviews of all doctoral students in the program. It has also adjusted its admission procedures in order to match students with faculty mentors at the time of matriculation.
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Recommendation 7: Continued growth in the Division is likely to provide opportunities to diversify the faculty with respect to minority representation.

The Division reports that as a result of the recent restructuring of DFPM the Division has attained greater faculty diversity with respect to gender balance. The Division will continue to seek increased diversity through hiring underrepresented minorities. They also see opportunities for increasing diversity through their joint MD/MPH program.

PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT PROGRAM

Recommendation 1: The Program should seek additional opportunities to financially support students through scholarships or other mechanisms.

The Program Director reports that they have taken a larger endowed fellowship and divided it into five smaller fellowships in order to provide partial support to more students. These fellowships carry a payback obligation of service to underserved areas. The faculty is working on a development effort to commemorate the Program’s 40th year. A central focus of this effort is to raise money for scholarships. They are also trying to raise funds for international study experiences. DFPM provides support for these development activities within the Program.

Recommendation 2: The Program should continue its careful planning towards hiring a new Program Director.

The DFPM Executive Committee is currently conducting a search for a new Program Director. They are working with a consultant to assist with the process. The search committee is currently advertising the position and targeting specific individuals. The goal is to complete the search by the end of this academic year.

Recommendation 3: The Program should consider revisions of the timing of its application process to insure that top applicants are not lost to other programs.

The application deadline has been moved forward to September 1.

Recommendation 4: The Program should continue efforts to assist faculty members in attaining faculty appointments within the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine.

The Program Director reports that 6 of 10 clinical teachers (formerly academic staff) are currently DFPM faculty and that the Program is working to move remaining academic staff into clinical faculty appointments.
Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Family and Preventive Medicine
Page 4

Recommendation 5: Hiring additional faculty members within the Program will provide opportunities to diversify the faculty with respect to minority representation.

In accord with this recommendation, the Program reports that it has achieved gender balance through its recent faculty hires. Although not directly related to the recommendation, the Program reports that they have hired a part-time diversity coordinator to work with community groups to recruit underrepresented students.

This memorandum of understanding is be followed by annual letters of progress from the chair of the Department of Family and Preventive Medicine 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
Michael K. Magill
Stephen Alder
Donald M. Pedersen
Charles A. Wight
Frederick Rhodewalt

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
December 30, 2009