ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA  
August 30, 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 p.m. in room 220 Aline Wilmot Skaggs Building

2. MINUTES: May 3, 2010

3. REQUEST FOR NEW BUSINESS:

4. CONSENT CALENDAR:
   a. Senate Appointments:
      ● Parliamentarian
      ● Senate-Institutional Policy Committee Liaison
   b. Appendix I: Resignations, Administrative and Faculty Appointments
   c. Appendix II: Auxiliary and Limited Term Appointments

5. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT:

6. REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATION: State of the University 4:00 p.m.

7. REPORT FROM ASUU:

8. NOTICE OF INTENT:
   a. Revised Policy 6-100 - Instruction and Evaluation
   b. New Rule 6-100A - Credit/No-Credit Grading for Undergraduates
   c. Revised Policy 6-101 - Undergraduate Study and Degrees

9. DEBATE CALENDAR:
   a. Revised Policy 6-001 - Undergraduate Council
   b. Center for Parallel-computing at Utah (CPU)
   c. Revised Rule 4-002 - Illegal file sharing - Higher Education Opportunity Act

10. INFORMATION CALENDAR:
    a. College of Health Council Charter
    b. Graduate Council Reviews:
       ● Department of Theatre
       ● Interdepartmental Program in Neuroscience
    c. Revised Policy 3-215 and New Rule 3-215 - University Motor Vehicles
    d. Honors and Awards Approved at Board of Trustees Meeting June 2010

11. NEW BUSINESS:
    a. Futures Committee

12. ADJOURNMENT:
    Next meeting of the Academic Senate will be October 4, 2010.
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
May 3, 2010

Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate, held on May 3, 2010 was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Senate President James A. Anderson. The meeting was held in room 115 C. Roland Christensen Center.

Roll:

Ex-officio: James Anderson, Robert Flores, Nancy Lines, Paul Mogren, Susan Olson, David Pershing, Octavio Villalpando, Chuck Wight

Others: Ann Floor, Kevin Hanson

Excused: Loris Betz, Richard Forster, Lauren Holland, Ed Levine, Chris Nelson, Maria Newton, Andrea Rorrer, Bam Dev Sharda, Michael K. Young

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of April 5, 2010 were unanimously approved following a motion from Larry DeVries and seconded by Vincent Cheng.

Special Orders: Senate President Jim Anderson explained the ballots for the Academic Senate president-elect and the Academic Senate Executive Committee and asked that they be completed and forwarded to the aisle so that the Personnel and Elections Committee could tally the votes during the meeting. The results are to be announced later during the meeting.

Request for New Business
Jim Anderson, senate president, presented the ‘white paper’ entitled “The State of Shared Governance.” The Academic Senate is involved by being the voice of the faculty and it is present in all levels of administration. Faculty are given the necessary resources and information to effectively participate in the development of policy, the general means of effecting that policy, and further sufficient means to evaluate the intended and unintended consequences of the
University’s day to day operations. Shared governance means the administration may be in charge but the faculty are the stewards of the University and form the wise counsel which, if used properly, does not impede administrative initiatives but refines them and ensures that they will continue into the future. It is the pathway to success according to President Anderson. He announced a new Futures Committee which will make its debut in the fall in the form of a ‘White Paper’ to allow more transparency for faculty to access information.

**Consent Calendar**
The resignations, retirements, faculty appointments, auxiliary and limited term appointments, appearing in the Appendices dated April 19 and May 3, 2010, received approval to forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

**Executive Committee Report**
Jim Metherall, Executive Committee Secretary, summarized his written report of the April 19, 2010, Executive Committee meeting.

**Report from Administration**
Senior Vice President David Pershing representing the administration, thanked the senators for the great work they have done this year, especially in the absence of an increase in compensation. He invited the senators to participate in Friday’s commencement and strongly encouraged them to attend their college’s convocations, especially those who are doctoral advisors.

He acknowledged the faculty who will be receiving special awards at commencement. Distinguished Teaching awards will be awarded to Marissa Diener (family and consumer studies), Sivaraman Guruswamy (metallurgical engineering), Janet Lindsley (biochemistry), and Elizabeth Tashjian (finance). The Distinguished Scholarly and Creative Research Award recipients are Brenda Bass (biochemistry), Glenn Prestwich (medicinal chemistry), and David Strayer (psychology). Donald Strassberg (psychology) will receive the Calvin S. and JeNeal Hatch Prize in Teaching. Honorary degrees will be awarded to Jon M. Huntsman, Jr, doctor of humane letters, Sue D. Christensen, doctor of humane letters, E. Gordon Gee, doctor of laws, Shane Robison, doctor of engineering, and W. Dean Singleton, doctor of business. Three professors will receive 2010 Distinguished Professor awards, David Chapman (geology and geophysics), Christopher Hacon (mathematics), Michael K. Young (law), and finally the Distinguished Service Award to Luke Garrott (political science).

He concluded by wishing the senators a good summer.

**Report from ASUU**
ASUU humanities senator Sam Thomas, filling in for Tayler Clough, reported that the new ASUU president, Chase Jardine, is now in office and doing very well. He thanked everyone for the opportunity ASUU had this year to participate and be part of the Academic Senate.

**Notice of Intent**
There were no intent items.
Debate Calendar
Kevin Hanson, chair of the department of Film and Media Arts, represented Ellen Bromberg’s request for the proposed graduate certificate program in Screen Dance. The new art form is an exciting opportunity for the College of Fine Arts to merge dance and film together and to be the first in the country to offer such a specialized program. A motion from Larry DeVries to forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval was seconded by David Ailion and unanimously approved.

Paul Mogren gave a short précis on the newly established Policy Review Committee of the Executive Committee to review the current policy and regulations of the Academic Senate, and to evaluate and incorporate them into the new University Regulations, recommending changes and updates to outdated, inaccurate and inappropriate policies, and to also to write history of the Senate since its exception in 1890. The committee will also look at the organizational procedures as to how issues get to the senate, whether it’s a bottoms-up or top-down process. They plan to encourage the senate to become more proactive and may expand the Senate Handbook. A motion from Larry DeVries to approve the Policy Review Committee was seconded by Marianna DiPaolo and received unanimous approval.

Information Calendar
The information calendar, containing two Graduate Council reviews for the Molecular Biology Program and the Department of Political Science, and two emphases approved for Cross 3-D: Ceramics and Sculpture, and Entertainment Arts & Engineering, was approved following a motion from Eric Hinderaker.

New Business
Jim Metherall presented outgoing senate president Jim Anderson with an autographed and framed picture and personal note from author Garrison Kellor, Anderson’s favorite quotes used at each Senate meeting this year, to thank him for his behind the scenes service to the Academic Senate.

Special Orders:
The Senate elected Patricia Hanna, a faculty member in the department of linguistics, college of humanities, as the Senate president-elect for 2010-2011. The following were elected as members of the Academic Senate Executive Committee: Stephen Alder, Amanda Barusch, David Blair, Ronald Coleman, Suzanne Darais, Larry DeVries, Robert Fujinami, Martin Horvath, Mollie Poynton, and Donna White.

Ballots for the other Senate-elected committees are still being tallied and will be announced at the first Senate meeting in the fall.

Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Lines
{{ Appointments of Senate Parliamentarian, and Senate Liaison to Institutional Policy Committee.}}

Pursuant to Policy 6-002, a Senate Parliamentarian is annually appointed by the Senate President, subject to approval of the Senate. For 2010–2011, the Senate President with concurrence of the Executive Committee proposes to appoint Paul Mogren (Marriott Library) as Parliamentarian.

Pursuant to Policy and Rule 1–001, a Liaison from the Senate to the Institutional Policy Committee is appointed by the Senate President subject to approval of the Senate. The Liaison advises and assists in developing proposals for revising University Regulations and bringing them forward to the Senate, and represents the Senate in the various activities of the IPC. For 2010–2011 the Senate President with concurrence of the Executive Committee proposes to appoint Bob Flores (College of Law) as Senate–IPC Liaison. }}
APPENDIX I

RESIGNATIONS, RETIREMENT & APPOINTMENTS

Resignations

1. Dr. James G. Carlisle, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Radiology, effective March 31, 2010.

2. Dr. Reid R. Harrison, Associate Professor with tenure of Electrical & Computer Engineering, effective July 15, 2010.

3. Dr. Adam Luedtke, Assistant Professor of Political Science, effective July 1, 2010.

4. Dr. Matthew Magilke, Assistant Professor of Accounting, effective May 4, 2010.

5. Dr. Lynn Million, Associate Professor (Clinical) of Radiation Oncology, effective June 11, 2010.

6. Dr. Marios A. Panayides, Assistant Professor of Finance, effective April 12, 2010.

7. Dr. David A. Quijada, Assistant Professor of Education, Culture & Society, effective June 30, 2010.

8. Dr. Nicole Richardt, Assistant Professor of Political Science, effective June 30, 2010.

9. Dr. Markus Vodosek, Assistant Professor of the Management Department, effective June 30, 2010.

10. Dr. Robert L. Walzel Jr., Professor with tenure of Music, effective July 1, 2010.

Retirement

1. Dr. Walter J. Arabasz, Research Professor of Geology & Geophysics, member of faculty for 35 years, effective June 30, 2010. (See Emeritus Appointment)

Administrative Appointments

1. Dr. Robert Baldwin, Interim Director, School of Music, effective July 1, 2010.
2. Dr. Chris M. Ireland, Dean, College of Pharmacy, effective July 1, 2010.

Faculty Appointments

DAVID ECCLES SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

1. Dr. Stanislav D. Dobrev, Professor of the Management Department, effective May 1, 2010.
   B.A., 1993, Suny at Stony Brook
   M.A., 1995, Stanford University
   Ph.D., 1997, Stanford University

2. Dr. Manu Goyal, Assistant Professor of Operations and Information Systems, effective July 1, 2010.
   B.E., 1996, University of Delhi
   M.B.A., 1998, Institute of Management Technology
   Ph.D., 2005, University of Pennsylvania

FINE ARTS

3. Dr. Winston C. Kyan, Assistant Professor of Art & Art History, effective July 1, 2010.
   B.A., 1989, Brown University
   M.A., 1996, University of Chicago
   Ph.D., 2006, University of Chicago

HUMANITIES

4. Dr. Gregory E. Smoak, Associate Professor with tenure of History, effective July 1, 2010.
   B.A., 1984, Florida Atlantic University
   M.A., 1985, Northern Arizona University
   Ph.D., 1999, Florida Atlantic University

SCIENCE

5. Dr. Yekaterina Y. Epshteyn, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, effective July 1, 2010.
   B.S., 2000, Moscow Institute of Physics
   Ph.D., 2007, University of Pittsburgh
6. Dr. Fernando Guevara Vasquez, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, effective July 1, 2010. This represents a track switch and supersedes his appointment as Assistant Professor (Lecturer) of Mathematics.

SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

7. Professor Joseph L. McKinley, Assistant Professor of Naval Science, effective February 11, 2010.

   B.S., 2003, Citadel Military College

APPENDIX II

AUXILIARY FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Auxiliary Faculty Appointments

ARCHITECTURE + PLANNING

1. Mr. Patrick R. Barickman, Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.S., 1992, University of Utah
   M.S., 1995, University of Utah

2. Dr. Matthew W. Bradley, Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1994, Brigham Young University
   M.A., 2001, Purdue University
   M.E.D., 2006, University of Utah
   Ph.D., 2008, Purdue University

3. Mr. Craig Call, Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.S., 1972, Brigham Young University
   J.D., 1976, Brigham Young University

4. Ms. Maria J. Garciaiz, Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1981, University of Utah
   M.S., 1992, Utah State University
5. Ms. Natalie Gochnour, Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is in addition to her appointment as Adjunct Instructor in Economics.

6. Professor Libby Haslam, Adjunct Associate Professor of the School of Architecture, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes her appointment as Adjunct Assistant Professor of the School of Architecture.

7. Mr. Michael J. Hathorne, Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.
   
   A.S., 1993, College of Eastern Utah  
   B.S., 1997, Utah Valley State College

8. Mr. Kirk R. Huffaker, Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.
   
   B.A., 1992, Augustana College  
   M.S., 1994, Eastern Michigan University

9. Professor Alice Kimm, Visiting Associate Professor of the School of Architecture, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.
   
   B.A., 1986, Cornell University  
   M.A., 1999 Harvard University

10. Mr. Randall K. Knight, Visiting Instructor in the School of Architecture, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.S., 1999, Brigham Young University  
   M.A., 2004, University of Michigan

11. Mr. Alan A. Matheson, Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1985, Stanford University  
   J.D., 1989, University of California

12. Professor Patrick J. Putt, Adjunct Assistant Professor of City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes his appointment as Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning.
13. Ms. Christine Richman, Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1985, University of Utah
   M.A., 1992, University of Utah
   M.B.A., 1994, University of Utah

14. Dr. Thomas W. Sanchez, Adjunct Professor of City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This represents a track switch and supersedes his appointment as Associate Professor with tenure of City & Metropolitan Planning.

15. Mr. Soren D. Simonsen, Adjunct Instructor in City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1992, University Texas San Antonio
   M.A., 2005, Westminster College

16. Mr. Stephen Tobler, Visiting Instructor in the School of Architecture, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.S., 1986, University of Utah
   M.A., 1990, University of Utah


   B.A., 1988, College of Saint Benedict
   M.A., 1993, University of Utah

18. Professor George W. Welch, Adjunct Professor of City & Metropolitan Planning, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.S., 1982, University of Utah
   M.B.A., 1986, DePaul University

19. Mr. Dwight J. Yee, Visiting Instructor in the School of Architecture, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   M.A., 2006, University College
20. Professor Richard B. Dunie, Assistant Professor (Lecturer) of Finance, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

B.A., 1972, Northwestern University

21. Dr. Arthur C. Nelson, Adjunct Professor of Finance, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2013. This is secondary to his appointment as Presidential Professor of City & Metropolitan Planning.

22. Professor George W. Welch, Associate Professor (Lecturer) of Finance, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2013. This is in addition to his appointment as Adjunct Professor of City & Metropolitan Planning.

EDUCATION

23. Dr. Cori A. Groth, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership & Policy, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes her appointment as Adjunct Instructor in Educational Leadership & Policy.

ENGINEERING

24. Dr. Eberhard Bamberg, Research Assistant Professor of Mechanical Engineering, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This represents a track switch and supersedes his appointment as Assistant Professor of Mechanical Engineering.

25. Dr. Roy D. Bloebaum, Adjunct Professor of Bioengineering, effective February 26, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This is in addition to his appointment as Research Professor of Orthopaedics, and Adjunct Professor of Biology.

26. Dr. Harold C. Daume, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Computer Science, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

B.S., 2001, Carnegie Mellon University
M.S., 2003, University of Southern California
Ph.D., 2006, University of Southern California

27. Dr. Eric J. Hunter, Adjunct Professor of Bioengineering, effective January 22, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This is in addition to his appointment as Adjunct Professor of Surgery.
28. Dr. Jens H. Krueger, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Computer Science, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This represents a track switch and supersedes his appointment as Research Assistant Professor of Computer Science.

29. Dr. John D. McLennan, Adjunct Professor of Civil & Environmental Engineering, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is secondary to his tenure track appointment as Associate Professor of Chemical Engineering, and supersedes his appointment as Research Professor of Civil & Environmental Engineering.

30. Dr. Harry J. Perrin, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Civil & Environmental Engineering, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This represents a track switch and supersedes his appointment as Research Assistant Professor of Civil & Environmental Engineering.

HEALTH

31. Dr. Darinka Djordjevic, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Nutrition, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.S., 1999, University School
   M.S., 2001, University of Massachusetts
   Ph.D., 2006, University of Massachusetts

HUMANITIES

32. Dr. Ginger L. Guardiola, Adjunct Assistant Professor of History, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1992, University of California
   M.A., 1994, Colorado State University
   Ph.D., 2004, University of Colorado

33. Professor Alison E. Regan, Adjunct Associate Professor of Communication, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is secondary to her appointment as Associate Librarian in the Marriott Library.

34. Dr. Sheikh M. Safiullah, Adjunct Assistant Professor of History, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1983, University of Garyounis
   M.A., 1985, University of Manitoba
   Ph.D., 2001, University of Utah
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

35. Dr. Gaurav Aggarwala, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Internal Medicine, effective May 3, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.S., 1997, Houston Baptist University
M.D., 2001, University of Texas

36. Dr. Thomas J. Allred, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective May 16, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.A., 1972, Brigham Young University
M.D., 1975, Baylor College of Medicine

37. Dr. Rahul Anand, Instructor (Clinical) in Internal Medicine, effective May 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

M.B.B.S., 1999, Maulana Azad Medical College
M.D., 2003, Maulana Azad Medical College

38. Dr. Maureen L. Condic, Adjunct Associate Professor of Pediatrics, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes her appointment as Adjunct Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, and is secondary to her appointment as Associate Professor with tenure of Neurobiology.

39. Dr. Mark J. Eliason, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Dermatology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes his appointment as Instructor (Clinical) in Dermatology.

40. Dr. Gregory C. Frech, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective March 16, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.S., 2000, University of Virginia
M.D., 2008, Eastern Virginia Medical School

41. Dr. Kathryn E. Gibson, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective August 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

B.A., 1998, Rice University
M.S., 2002, University of Texas
M.D., 2007, University of Utah
42. Dr. Deserae J. Goble, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective May 16, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.A., 1986, Brigham Young University  
M.D., 1998, George Washington University

43. Dr. Judith L. Gooch, Adjunct Professor of Pediatrics, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is secondary to her appointment as Professor (Clinical) of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, and supersedes her appointment as Adjunct Associate Professor of Pediatrics.

44. Dr. Lisa H. Gren, Visiting Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective April 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.S., 1985, Brigham Young University  
M.S., 1988, University of Utah  
Ph.D., 2009, University of Utah

45. Dr. Kimberly E. Hanson, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Pathology, effective March 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This is secondary to her tenure track appointment as Assistant Professor of Internal Medicine.

46. Dr. Robert W. Hastings, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Radiology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes his appointment as Visiting Instructor in Radiology.

47. Dr. John C. Kirkham, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Radiology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes his appointment as Visiting Instructor in Radiology.

48. Dr. Kristi K. Kleinschmit, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Psychiatry, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes her appointment as Instructor (Clinical) in Psychiatry.

49. Dr. Sirisha T. Komakula, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Radiology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes his appointment as Visiting Instructor in Radiology.

50. Dr. Eric J. Kress, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective May 16, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.A., 1978, University of Montana  
M.D., 1984, University of Washington

51. Dr. Nicholas A. Lazzaro, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Radiology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes his appointment as Visiting Instructor in Radiology.
52. Dr. Edward M. Levine, Adjunct Associate Professor of Neurobiology & Anatomy, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is secondary to his appointment as Associate Professor with tenure of Ophthalmology, and supersedes his appointment as Adjunct Assistant Professor of Neurobiology & Anatomy.

53. Dr. David H. Lum, Research Assistant Professor of Oncological Sciences, effective April 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.S., 1993, Simon Fraser University
   Ph.D., 2001, University of Toronto

54. Dr. Rachel T. McCandless, Visiting Instructor in Pediatrics, effective August 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.S., 1999, University of Cincinnati
   M.D., 2004, Case Western Reserve University

55. Dr. Kimberly M. Molina, Visiting Instructor in Pediatrics, effective July 26, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1999, Stanford University
   M.D., 2004, University of California

56. Dr. Janine E. Morris, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Radiology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes her appointment as Visiting Instructor in Radiology.

57. Dr. Albert H. Park, Adjunct Professor of Pediatrics, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is secondary to his appointment as Professor with tenure of Surgery, and supersedes his appointment as Adjunct Associate Professor of Pediatrics.

58. Dr. Raul A. Peragallo, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Anesthesiology, effective May 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   M.D., 1994, Universidad Del Salvador

59. Dr. Sherrie L. Perkins, Adjunct Professor of Pediatrics, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is secondary to her appointment as Professor with tenure of Pathology, and supersedes her appointment as Adjunct Associate Professor of Pediatrics.

60. Dr. Sarah C. Petersen, Adjunct Instructor in Pediatrics, effective April 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.S., 2002, Southern Utah University
   M.D., 2006, University of Utah
61. Dr. Robert E. Smith, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology, effective March 25, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This supersedes his appointment as Adjunct Instructor in Ophthalmology.

62. Dr. Terrence S. Spencer, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Ophthalmology, effective March 25, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This supersedes his appointment as Adjunct Instructor in Ophthalmology.

63. Dr. Louisa A. Stark, Research Associate Professor of Human Genetics, effective February 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This is in addition to her appointment as Clinical Professor of the College of Education – Dean’s office.

64. Dr. Caroline R. Tadros, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Internal Medicine, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes her appointment as Instructor (Clinical) in Internal Medicine.

65. Dr. Brian Whisenant, Adjunct Associate Professor of Internal Medicine, effective May 3, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.A., 1988, Brigham Young University
   M.D., 1992, Columbia University

66. Dr. Xiu Quan Zhang, Research Assistant Professor of Surgery, effective March 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.S., 1984, Hunan Medical University
   M.D., 1993, Shanghai Medical University
   Ph.D., 1993, Shanghai Medical University

MINES

67. Dr. Manoranjan Misra, Adjunct Professor of Metallurgical Engineering, effective April 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.S., 1970, Utkal University
   M.A., 1977, South Dakota School of Mines
   Ph.D., 1981, University of Utah

68. Dr. Xuming Wang, Research Associate Professor of Metallurgical Engineering, effective May 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This supersedes his appointment as Research Assistant Professor of Metallurgical Engineering.
NURSING

69. Dr. Marc E. Babitz, Adjunct Professor of Nursing, effective March 22, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.S., 1969, University of California
   M.D., 1972, University of California

70. Mr. Peter Durkson, Adjunct Instructor in Nursing, effective March 22, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.A., 1958, Swarthmore College
   M.S., 1964, Harvard University

PHARMACY

71. Dr. Ryan M. Van Wagoner, Research Associate Professor of Medicinal Chemistry, effective March 16, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

   B.S., 1996, University of Utah
   Ph.D., 2001, University of Utah

SCIENCE

72. Dr. Dane R. McCamey, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Physics, effective June 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010. This represents a track switch and supersedes his appointment as Research Assistant Professor of Physics.

73. Dr. Vagharsh Mkhitaryan, Research Assistant Professor of Physics, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.S., 1994, Yerevan State University
   M.S., 1997, Yerevan State University
   Ph.D., 2000, Yerevan State University

74. Dr. Tho Duc Nguyen, Research Assistant Professor of Physics, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1996, Can Tho University
   B.S., 1998, Can Tho University
   M.S., 2004, University of Iowa
   M.S., 2007, University of Iowa
   PhD., 2008, University of Iowa
75. Dr. Russell W. Teichert, Research Assistant Professor of Biology, effective January 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2010.

B.A., 1992, Brigham Young University
M.B.A., 1994, Brigham Young University
Ph.D., 2005, University of Utah

SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

76. Dr. Jorie M. Butler, Adjunct Assistant professor of Psychology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

B.A., 1998, University of California
Ph.D., 2005, University of California

77. Dr. Kevin M. Duff, Associate Professor (Clinical) of Psychology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is secondary to his tenure track appointment as Associate Professor of Neurology.

78. Dr. Ramona O. Hopkins, Adjunct Professor of Psychology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This supersedes her appointment as Assistant Professor of Psychology.

79. Dr. Benjamin R. Peterson, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Psychology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

B.A., 1998, Wake Forest University
M.A., 2001, Northern Arizona University
Ph.D., 2009, University of Utah

80. Dr. Michael W. Tragakis, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Psychology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

B.A., 1991, American University
M.S., 2000, University of Utah
Ph.D., 2006, University of Utah

APPENDIX III

EMERITUS APPOINTMENT

Emeritus Appointment

1. Dr. Walter J. Arabasz, Research Professor Emeritus of Geology & Geophysics, member of faculty for 35 years, effective July 1, 2010. (See Retirement Appointment)
July 19, 2010

TO:  David Pershing  
     Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FR:   John Francis  
      Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: Revision of University Regulation 6-100 (Instruction and Evaluation) and Related Policies

Attached for your review is a thoroughly revised version of University Policy 6-100 (Instruction & Evaluation), along with two related policies: University Policy 6-101 (Undergraduate Study & Degrees), an existing policy to which some parts of the current Policy 6-100 have been moved, and R6-100A, a new Rule to which some parts of the current 6-100 have been relegated. Susan Olson, Robert Flores and James Metherall have all reviewed the attached documents and feel that the document package is ready to move forward.

If you approve of the changes and the process through which they have gone, then we are asking you to forward the documents on to the Academic Senate for their consideration.

The initial impetus for what turned out to be a quite broad revision of 6-100 was virtually simultaneous requests in Spring 2009 from two separate areas for updates to disparate parts of this policy. As we began to look over the policy, we soon realized that it was long overdue for a more extensive revision, one that dealt not only with content but also with language and organization. Accordingly, we began working with several administrative areas and with the Academic Senate, which created an ad hoc committee for this purpose in September 2009, chaired by Michael Timberlake (Sociology). Subsequently, we included Susan Olson and Robert Flores, from Academic Affairs, in our drafting process. Finally, we presented the documents to the Council of Academic Deans (CAD) and solicited their feedback.

The result of this eighteen-month process is a major overhaul of perhaps one of our most central and important Academic Policies, one that governs the teaching of every course, affecting every student and every course instructor every day.

There are three types of changes reflected in the revision: (1) substantive changes, which have material effects on University practices; (2) content changes, which add/remove verbiage from the policy but have no material effects – expansions or restrictions – on University practices;
and (3) organizational changes, which make the policy easier to understand, use and reference, i.e., more “user friendly”. Each of these is outlined below. Additionally, there are two significant changes that we did NOT make, and this is addressed at the end.

Part of the process of revising 6-100 (and the slight revision to 6-101 as well) involved changing the section labeling to make it consistent with new Regulations Library guidelines, e.g., Section 1 is now Section A, and the word “Section” has been deleted. References below are to the new labeling scheme.

Additionally, we have included in the revision several “Drafting notes,” which are labeled as “Drafting NOTE”, are highlighted in yellow and are set aside by “{ }”. These are intended to help in the review of the draft but to be removed once the revised policy is approved. There are as well some footnotes, labeled as [Note ], and one USER NOTE (see Section J), which are part of the revised policy.

(1) With regard to substantive changes, we:

- Completely rewrote the section (Section N) on Course Assessment and Feedback (Course Evaluations) to reflect two technological changes that have already occurred and process changes proposed by the Course Evaluation Oversight Committee.
- Modified Scholastic Standards for Undergraduates (Section K) by increasing the minimum suspension period for students placed on academic suspension from two semesters to three semesters, and, concomitantly, modified the Academic Renewal (Section M) policy, decreasing from ten years to seven years the age of courses that are subject to discounting if the student received a grade of D+ or lower. These changes were made on the recommendation of University College and the Vice President for Student Affairs.
- Consolidated and clarified the policy on class Attendance Requirements (Section O), adding as well language covering unexpected University facility closures, as we experienced in Spring 2009.
- Assigned responsibility to the administrator of the course-offering unit and the cognizant dean (or equivalent) for approving changes to final examination times (Section F) for instructors who give a final examination and who want to give it at a time other than the time scheduled by the Scheduling Office.
- Added Grades (Section G-1) a reference to important principles of fairness in grading – including non-discrimination, avoidance of nepotism, and the like – to make explicit that such policies extend to all individuals, including non-faculty, involved in grading and/or evaluating students.
- Added policy to Grades (Section G-6) regarding the repeating of courses; such policy reflects operative administrative practices that have been in place for several years.
- Clarified aspects of noncredit courses – what they are and how they are managed and reported – in order to comply with new OCHE reporting requirements.

(2) With regard to content changes, we:

- Added a “Purpose and Scope” statement
• Added a definition of "Course-offering unit" to label, more broadly than "department", an academic unit authorized to offer credit-bearing courses and bearing primary responsibility for the content, instruction and evaluation of such courses.

• Added, throughout, specific references to other University or Board of Regents policies.

• Moved information about "Special Examinations" and "Comprehensive Examinations" (the last three paragraphs of Section F) to Policy 6-101. Policies on such examinations are relevant to the completion of undergraduate degree requirements rather than to the instruction and evaluation of individual courses; the former policy is the subject of 6-101 rather than 6-100.

• Removed language from the Grades section (Section G) regarding particular exceptions to the general grading scheme for the College of Law and the College of Medicine. We have instead added a note [Note ] which we believe effectively deals with this and other analogous, foreseeable situations.

• Relegated to a new Rule (R6-100A) rules about the election of CR/NC grading (Section G-7).

• Removed altogether from policy the requirement that, with regard to Course Credit Reduction (Section G-8) "[t]he deans of the colleges will report annually to the vice president for academic affairs and the Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee as to the frequency of cases in which adjustment was used and a reason leading to adjustment in each case."

(3) With regard to organizational changes, we:

• Moved sentences, paragraphs and entire sections around throughout the document to consolidate related items and make it more "user friendly". Such moves are indicated by "Drafting NOTE".

• Split up Sections and added numbered sub-sections (see particularly Section G) to again, make the document more "user friendly".

• Standardized terminology (e.g., "courses" instead of a mix of "courses" and "classes") and updated references to administrative offices (e.g., "University College" instead of "Center for Academic Advising"; capitalizing "University," "Registrar", etc.)

• Rewrote lots of vague and awkward sentences.

Lastly, there are two parts of this policy that we have not updated as fastidiously as might otherwise have been expected. First, other than renumbering and removing some redundant definitional language, we have left essentially intact the section on content accommodations (Section Q), which is the product of a 2005 settlement of a federal civil rights lawsuit. Second, we have not adequately yet dealt with Section J, a short section which discusses the Academic Evaluation and Standards (AES) Committee. The AES Committee described in 6-100 is scheduled to undergo a five-year regular review by the Senate Personnel and Elections Committee during 2010-2011. We will revise this section after that review. In the meanwhile, we have inserted a statement, in the form of a USER NOTE that says: As of 2010 this section J is under review for major revision.
Purpose and Scope

This Policy governs University courses, including how courses shall be offered and approved, what units within the University may offer courses, who may teach University courses, when final examinations are conducted, what the standards are for course credit (i.e., credit hours), how courses are assessed and feedback is provided to instructors, what attendance requirements are, and how instructors may accommodate students’ scheduling conflicts and accommodate students’ objections to the substantive content of particular courses. These policies bear upon the responsibilities of individual instructors, students, course-offering units and the University administration. This Policy applies to all course-offering units [Note i]

Definitions

“Course-offering unit” is an academic unit authorized to offer credit-bearing courses and bearing primary responsibility for the content, instruction and evaluation of such courses.

Policy

A. The Academic Year

The academic year shall be divided into a Fall and Spring semester of approximately fifteen weeks each and a Summer term of approximately twelve weeks. A semester may be subdivided into two sessions of approximately eight weeks each and the Summer term may be subdivided into two sessions of approximately six weeks each.

B. The Credit Hour

A University credit hour shall represent approximately three clock hours of the student’s time a week for one semester.

C. Standards for Undergraduate Credit-Bearing Courses [Note ii]

1. Courses are developed by course-offering units and academic administration in compliance with University Regulations and any applicable regulations of the State Board of Regents. In keeping with the principles of faculty shared governance and Policy 6-001-III-Sec. 1, courses shall be
approved by the faculty members of course-offering units before being submitted for higher-level approval. While faculty must play a major role, comparability of credits across the University should be maintained. The methods of instruction, time taught, or sites should make no difference in the integrity of the credit hour.

2. Credit should be given only to those courses which apply toward completion of requirements for a certificate or degree at the University. Consistent with Regent’s Policy R470, the University does not offer credit for courses defined as remedial. No credit should be assigned to any course whose purpose is only to qualify students for financial aid.

3. Courses should be appropriately rigorous, complex and numbered at comparable levels as determined by the course-offering unit, college curriculum committee, and University review processes. “Credit awarded for successful educational performance should reflect comparable quality and be uniformly defined within an institution, regardless of the methods of instruction used, the time when the course is taught” [Note iii] or the site.

4. Courses may be offered only by the teaching staff and with the approval of academic administration. Courses should be taught, evaluated, or directly supervised by an instructor approved by the course-offering unit, whose teaching qualifications meet the criteria adopted by the course-offering unit in furtherance of the University’s commitment to excellence in teaching. See Policy 6-303 (qualifications of regular faculty teachers) and Policy 6-310 (qualifications of auxiliary faculty and non-faculty teachers).

5. Course descriptions should clearly state the learning outcomes and activities essential to credit being awarded.

6. Credit hours and student workload per credit hour should be comparable across courses and course-offering units, taking into account special requirements of accrediting agencies. Catalog, curriculum guide, and syllabi should accurately reflect the work load and the work load should be commensurate with the credit hours awarded. It is generally expected throughout the University that there is at least one hour in class and two hours outside of class per week or the equivalent combination connected to every credit hour for the appropriately prepared student. In laboratories it is expected that at least 2 to 3 hours are spent in class and approximately the same amount outside for each credit hour awarded. Where these minimums are exceeded, the approximate workload should be made clear in catalog descriptions, advising materials, and course syllabi.

7. Classes of one hour or less are usually graded as credit/no credit.

8. The learning outcomes and requirements must be assessed appropriately.

9. Credit-bearing courses must be recorded on the student’s permanent academic record (transcript).
10. The faculty and academic administration need to provide policies for allowing students to repeat classes. These should be clearly communicated and coordinated across course-offering units.

11. Acceptance of transfer credits depends upon quality of instruction from the sending institution, comparability of the nature, content, and level of credit earned, and appropriateness and applicability of credit to University and the student's educational goals. Rules regarding the acceptance of transfer credits are approved by the Academic Senate, based upon recommendations made by the Credits and Admissions Committee (See Policy 6-404, Sec. 2)

D. Class Meetings

Classrooms and hours shall not be changed without the consent of the director of scheduling.

Classes shall begin promptly, be dismissed promptly, and take precedence over any special examination or exercise not a part of the official University calendar unless such examination or exercise is authorized by the Academic Senate.

E. Course Numbers

Courses of instruction shall be classified and numbered in the publications and records of the University in accordance with the rules developed by the University Curriculum Policy Review Board and approved by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. See Policy 6-003–III-B-3.

F. Final Examinations

Final examinations shall be given under regulations to be determined by the Academic Senate.

Final examinations in University courses may be required at the instructor's discretion. When they are required, final examinations must be given at times officially set. A schedule for such examinations shall be prepared by the Scheduling Office and published by the University.

Instructors who require a final examination and who want to give it at a time other than the time scheduled by the Scheduling Office must obtain the approvals of the administrator of the course-offering unit and the cognizant academic dean (or equivalent), with adequate notice given to the students. Any individual student has a right to take the examination at the originally scheduled time if the rescheduled time would impose undue hardship and the student gives notice to the instructor prior to the earlier of the original or rescheduled time.

G. Grades
1. General Grading Criteria


The criteria for grading students shall be performance in examinations, papers, or assignments, participation in class discussion and activities, and other evaluative processes necessary in determining the students’ achievement levels. All of these procedures may be part of the total evaluation, as adapted by the individual course instructor to fit the needs of the particular course and student.

Grading of individual student performance shall be performed consistent with the University’s fundamental principles prohibiting discrimination on improper grounds, and requiring that academic activities be performed without prejudice or favoritism based on family, romantic, or sexual relationships, or financial interests. See Policy 6-316-Section 4-A & B (Faculty Code---prohibitions on discrimination, prejudice, or favoritism in grading); Policy 6-400, Section II–E (Student Code- rights against discrimination and sexual harassment); Policy 5-105 (Nepotism--defining “immediate family” relationships in which favoritism is presumed to exist); Policy 5-107 (Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationships--prohibiting exercising of grading authority when a romantic or sexual relationship exists); and Policy 1-006-Sec.VI (A)(3) (prohibiting evaluation of students based on participation in outside business activities in which evaluator has significant financial interest). These principles apply to any person engaged in grading activities, including course instructors and their assistants. Course instructors and course-offering units shall take appropriate steps to ensure the application of these principles, including providing for alternative grading methods or assignment of grading responsibilities to another person, as appropriate to the circumstances.

2. Incompletes

The mark "I" (incomplete) shall be given and reported for work incomplete because of circumstances beyond the student’s control. The grade of "I" should be used only for a student who is passing the course and who needs to complete 20% or less of the course. An "I" should not be used in a way that will permit a student to retake the course without paying tuition. If the student attends the course during a subsequent semester as part of the effort required to complete the course, he/she must be registered (either as a regular student or for audit) in the semester in which he/she attends.
If a student has not finished incomplete work within one calendar year after the "I" was given, the "I" will be changed to an "E" by the Registrar's office. If the student graduates within one calendar year after receiving the "I," but before completing the work, the "I" will remain in the record, but will not contribute to credit toward graduation or the grade point average. An instructor may override the automatic change from an "I" to an "E" by submitting a grade change form (see Sec. I, "Change of Grade," below).

3. Non-Attendance and Non-Performance

When an instructor has no record of attendance or other evidence of participation in the course by a person whose name appears on the Registrar's final grade report, the instructor should enter the grade "EU" for that person. When no grade is entered for any person listed in a final grade report, the Registrar shall record an "EU" for that person. The grade "EU" shall be treated as an "E" in calculating grade point averages, but it shall be disregarded in calculating "section mean grade."

Upon the recommendation of the course instructor and the dean of the course-offering unit (or equivalent), the Registrar may withdraw a student from a course for nonattendance or nonperformance of assigned course work. The student shall then receive the grade of "E." Before this grade is recorded under these circumstances, the Registrar shall send written notification to the student and advise the student of the right to appeal to the dean.

4. In-Progress Courses

The mark "T" shall be given for thesis or other independent work in progress, but not for regular courses. The mark "T" shall remain on the student record until the work is completed and a letter grade is reported to the Registrar's office. The mark "T" does not contribute credit toward graduation nor will it be used in the computation of the grade point average. There is no time limit governing the removal of the "T" grade.

5. Dropping and Withdrawing From Classes

Students may drop any class in a regular University term without penalty or permission for a period extending for ten calendar days from the first day of the term. Beginning the eleventh day from the first day of the term and continuing through Friday of the first full week beyond the midpoint of the term (as determined by the Registrar), students may withdraw from a course or from the University without permission, but a "W" will be recorded on the academic record and applicable tuition and fees will be assessed for each course. The latter date is the final day on which a student may withdraw from a course or from the University.
Students may drop workshops, short term courses, or non-credit courses without penalty or permission as follows: classes of one to two days in length, before the first day of class; classes of three to five days in length, on the first day of class; classes of six to ten days in length, through the second day of class; classes of eleven or more days in length, through the third day of class.

Students may withdraw from workshops, short term courses, or non-credit courses following the drop deadline for such courses only up to the midpoint in the course (as determined by the Registrar). Any withdrawal after the initial drop period will cause a "W" to be recorded on the academic record and applicable tuition and fees will be assessed for the course.

Students taking regular term courses may appeal the deadline for withdrawal in the case of compelling, non-academic emergencies by submitting a petition and supporting documentation to the office of the dean of their major college. Undeclared, non-matriculated and premajor students apply to the University College. Students in workshops, short term courses, or non-credit courses shall appeal to the Academic Outreach and Continuing Education. Appeals must be submitted to the appropriate dean's office by the last day of regular course instruction preceding the final exam period. Colleges must respond to an appeal from a student within seven calendar days of receiving the petition.

For extraordinary reasons, approved by the student's dean and the Registrar, the grade of "W" may be given after the end of the term. Such requests must be submitted within three years of the affected term(s) or prior to graduation from the University, whichever comes first.

6. Repeating Courses

Students may repeat any course they have previously taken at the University as long as it is still offered. However, students may earn credit hours for a given course for graduation only once unless the course has been designated as repeatable for credit. The last grade received is used to compute the student's grade point average (and grades from previous instances of the same course are not considered in computing the GPA, but are shown on the record for the term the course was taken). The grades of I, NC, W, V, or T may neither be removed by repeating the course, nor may they be used to replace a grade in a previous course that has been repeated. All repeated courses are identified as such on the student’s academic record.

Per Regents’ Policy R510-4.16, students will assessed the “full cost of instruction” the third time (and any subsequent time) they enroll in the same course.
7. Credit/No Credit Option
   a. In courses in which activity or attendance is the controlling factor in the
determination of grades, the grade "CR" (credit) shall be substituted for the grades "A" through "C-
and the grade "NC" (no credit) shall be substituted for the grades "D+" through "E."
   b. Under Rules approved by the Academic Senate, students may elect a limited number of courses in which they will receive the grade "CR" in place of grades "A" through "C-
or the grade of "NC" in the place of "D+," "D," "D-," "E" and "EU". The "CR" grade shall carry credit toward graduation, but neither the "CR" nor "NC" grades will be included in computing grade point averages.
   c. A graduate student is granted the option, subject to the approval of the administrator of the course-offering unit and the cognizant dean (or equivalent)student's major department and review by the graduate dean, to enroll in some courses in which the graduate student will be graded on a CR/NC basis, rather than on a letter basis.
   d. Courses which produce one hour or less of academic credit should be graded exclusively on a CR/NC basis Instructors wishing to assign a letter grade to such classes, or to grade other kinds of classes solely on a Credit/No Credit basis must obtain permission to do so from the relevant college’s curriculum committee.

8. Course Credit Reduction

A reduction in course credit may be used in "studio-type" or in independent study courses only. Individual departments may determine which of their courses should use this option. No foundation courses, or courses used to satisfy either General Education or Bachelor Degree requirements, courses for which completion of the full semester’s work is essential for a graduation requirement may be involved. The intent of this policy provision on course credit reduction is to let the grade reflect the quality of work—and the credit earned reflect the quantity of work completed in this type of course. If a student fails to complete the volume of work he/she contracted to do for such a course, the instructor and student may agree to reduce the credit earned and the student is graded on the quality of work completed. The deadline for making the adjustment corresponds with the last day of classes prior to final exams.

H. Report of Grades
Instructors shall report the academic standing of each student in their courses at such times and in such form as the Registrar may direct, subject to the approval of the Academic Senate. At the end of each semester, the Registrar shall report the grades of each student to the student.

Students shall not receive credit for work done in a course in which they have not been regularly registered or receive credit greater in amount than that for which they are duly registered.

I. Change of Grades

A final grade, after it has been formally reported to the Registrar’s office, cannot be changed unless the instructor who awarded the grade requests a change on a form provided for this purpose by the Registrar, and unless that request is approved by the course-offering unit. A grade can be changed without the instructor’s request or approval in accordance with the Procedures of [Policy 6-400, Section IV].

J. Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee

[USER NOTE: As of 2010 this section J is under review for major revision.]

The president shall appoint the Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee. In addition, academic deans may set up scholarship committees to operate within their respective schools or colleges with the advice and consent of the president. The Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee shall have jurisdiction only in those schools or colleges where such scholarship committees have not been established. It shall be the duty of all scholarship committees to assist in the rehabilitation of the academically delinquent student. These committees shall have the cooperation of all student personnel services maintained by the university, and may administer, subject to the university regulations, such discipline as shall seem proper.

K. Scholastic Standards for Undergraduates

The Undergraduate Council shall have jurisdiction over the scholastic standards for undergraduates and shall delegate to University College the responsibility for administering the scholastic standards policy.

1. Dean’s List and President’s Award. A student who earns a grade point average of 3.5 or higher in at least 12 graded hours during any one term shall be placed on the Dean’s List. A student who is on the Dean’s List during fall and spring semesters of the same academic year will receive the President's Award.

2. All students are required to maintain a cumulative grade point average of not less than 2.0. The cumulative grade point average of students who have transferred to the University is computed on the work taken at the University
3. Academic Probation. A student who fails to maintain a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or above shall be placed on scholastic probation and have a hold placed on his or her registration. To clear this hold, the student must contact University College to determine the conditions under which the student will be allowed to register.

4. Suspension: A student whose cumulative grade point average has been below a 2.0 for three consecutive semesters is subject to suspension. A registration hold will be placed on the student's record and will prevent the student from registering for courses at the University during the suspension period. The suspension period will be for a minimum of three (3) semesters unless revoked on appeal.

5. Appeal of Suspension. A student may appeal suspension, based on extenuating circumstances, to the Scholastic Standards Committee of University College. If the Committee finds extenuating circumstances and revokes the suspension, the student will be readmitted on academic probation and permitted to register for courses. The student must maintain a grade point average of at least 2.0 during each subsequent semester until the student's cumulative grade point average reaches 2.0. A student who does not meet these conditions is subject to re-suspension.

6. Readmission after Suspension. A student wishing to return to the University after the expiration of the three-semester suspension period must petition the Scholastic Standards Committee of University College for readmission. The Committee will readmit the student if there seems a reasonable likelihood of academic success. The readmitted student must maintain a grade point average of at least 2.0 each subsequent semester until the student's cumulative grade point average reaches 2.0. A student who does not meet these conditions is subject to re-suspension.

L. Honors for Undergraduates

Honors shall be awarded at graduation to those students who complete with distinction at least 90 credit hours at the University. The basis, terms, and degrees of distinction shall be determined by the Academic Senate. Names of students attaining honors shall be published in the commencement program and elsewhere as the president may direct.

M. Academic Renewal

A currently enrolled undergraduate student may petition University College for academic renewal. This is a Procedure which allows the student to request that his or her academic record be reviewed for the purpose of discounting, University of Utah courses with a D+ or lower grade on the student’s academic record. The courses must have been taken seven or more calendar years prior to the request. If approved, the discounted courses will remain on the student’s academic record (and the grades received for the courses will be shown), but the discounted courses and
grades received for them will not count towards total hours, cumulative grade point computation, or graduation requirements.

The renewal option can be used only once during a student's undergraduate career. This Procedure does not apply to graduate students or to students pursuing a second undergraduate degree.

Responsibility for administration of this Procedure rests with the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

N. Course Assessment and Feedback (course evaluations)

The University will assess its courses and instruction in multiple ways, including by soliciting students' feedback. Student feedback has several uses: it provides information of interest to students planning their programs of study, it is useful in making improvements in instruction and curricula, and it provides a student perspective on teaching for evaluations of course instructors.

1. Student Course Feedback Oversight Committee, structure and functions.

   - The University Student Course Feedback Oversight Committee ("Course Feedback Committee") is established. The membership and leadership shall be as follows: There shall be 10 members serving limited terms, 6 members of the faculty and 4 students, and 3 permanent ex officio members.

   i. Faculty. One faculty representative shall be a member of the Graduate Council during the term of service on the Committee and shall be appointed by the chairperson of the Graduate Council. One faculty representative shall be [a] member of the Undergraduate Council during the term of service on the Committee and shall be appointed by the chairperson of the Undergraduate Council. Four faculty representatives (no more than one from any one academic college) shall be appointed by the Senate Personnel and Elections Committee. For the Committee's first year of operation, two of the faculty representatives will be appointed to terms of one year, and two to terms of two years. For the second and subsequent years, all new members will be appointed for terms of [two] years (so that the subsequent membership changes will be staggered). Faculty may not serve multiple consecutive terms.

   ii. Students. The 4 student representatives will include the ASUU Academic Affairs Director, the ASUU Senate chairperson, and two Student Advisory Committee (SAC) representatives appointed by the
ASUU Academic Affairs Director. Students will have annual terms of service.

iii. Ex officios. There shall be three ex officio permanent members with voting rights, including the Associate Dean for General Education (or designee), one representative from the Center for Teaching & Learning Excellence, and the Student Course Feedback Program Manager. The Manager reports to the Director of the Center for Teaching & Learning Excellence.

iv. The chairperson of the Committee shall be one of the limited-term faculty representatives, and nominated annually by the President of the Academic Senate and elected by the Committee.

v. The Committee will report directly to the Academic Senate.

b. The Course Feedback Committee’s primary function shall be to develop (and revise as necessary) a standardized “Student Course Feedback Instrument,” and a standardized “Course Feedback Report.” The Instrument and Report forms shall be designed to be suitable for use in all credit-bearing courses, of both undergraduate and graduate levels. The Committee shall also develop appropriate Procedures for the administration of the Instrument and Report forms (and other appropriate publication of the resulting data). In developing and periodically revising the Instrument and Report forms, and Procedures, the Committee shall solicit and consider input from the chairpersons of all course-offering units. The Instrument and Report forms and Procedures (and any revisions) shall be presented to the Academic Senate for approval.

2. The approved Course Feedback Instrument and Report forms shall be made available for use by all course-offering academic units. All credit-bearing courses shall be assessed every term they are offered using the approved Instrument. Chairpersons of each course-offering unit have the responsibility of seeing that assessments are conducted according to regulations, working with the Student Course Feedback Program Manager. For non-credit courses, assessments may be conducted as determined in the discretion of the course-offering unit.

   a. Course feedback for individual courses, including all collected data, shall be made available to course instructors, and appropriate administrators of the course-offering unit after grades for the course are filed.
b. An appropriate set of data for a given course shall be made available to any University student, as determined appropriate in the standard Report form and Procedures approved as described above.

c. The Student Advisory Committee of the course-offering unit, after meeting pertinent training requirements, shall be provided with an appropriate set of feedback data for individual courses for specified purposes of carrying out approved functions of such Advisory Committees, as determined appropriate in the Procedures approved as described above.

O. Attendance Requirements

The University expects regular attendance at all class meetings. Instructors must communicate any particular attendance requirements of the course to students in writing on or before the first class meeting. Students are responsible for acquainting themselves with and satisfying the entire range of academic objectives and requirements as defined by the instructor.

Students absent from class to participate in officially sanctioned University activities (e.g., band, debate, student government, intercollegiate athletics) or religious obligations, or with instructor’s approval, shall be permitted to make up both assignments and examinations. The University expects its departments and programs that take students away from class meetings to schedule such events in a way that will minimize hindrance of the student’s orderly completion of course requirements. Such units must provide a written statement to the students describing the activity and stating as precisely as possible the dates of the required absence. The involved students must deliver this documentation to their instructors, before the absence.

Except in cases of sudden illness or emergency, students shall in advance of the absence arrange with the instructor to make up assignments.

Unexpected University facility closures due to weather, emergency or disaster may occur from time to time. Students may be required to complete coursework missed due to these or other class cancellations; however, instructors requiring mandatory make-up sessions may not penalize students if they are unable to attend due to time conflicts, etc.

P. Noncredit Courses

1. Course development procedures for noncredit courses should be academically sound and as rigorous, though perhaps different, as those applying to credit courses.
2. The national standard for Continuing Education Units (CEU) is "ten contact hours of participation in an organized continuing education experience under responsible sponsorship, capable direction, and qualified instruction." The CEU may be the appropriate unit of measurement for qualifying noncredit courses.

3. For purposes of this subsection, a noncredit course:

   a. Is one for which credit is not awarded, registration is required and payment changes hands;

   b. meets criteria established by the offering unit;

   c. incorporates content, teaching methods and attendance requirements appropriate to the students eligible to enroll;

   d. is taught or supervised by an instructor who has met institutional qualifications established by the offering unit; and

   e. recognizes participation of students appropriately.

4. Units offering noncredit courses must report the nature and extent of those activities to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee) annually.

Q. Accommodations

   (Section Q is in effect starting Fall semester 2005)

   i. Introduction

   The values held most strongly by the University of Utah community are those of academic freedom and integrity as they are expressed collectively by the colleges and departments as well as individually through research and teaching and as they exist within the wider context of advanced study as commonly understood by all universities. The community also values diversity and respect, without which there can be no collegiality among faculty and students. In addition, the University community values individual rights and freedoms, including the right of each community member to adhere to individual systems of conscience, religion, and ethics. Finally, the University recognizes that with all rights come responsibilities. The University works to uphold its collective values by fostering free speech, broadening fields of inquiry, and encouraging generation of new knowledge that challenges, shapes, and enriches our collective and individual understandings.

   This policy Section addresses course content accommodations. Regardless of any accommodation that may be granted, students are responsible for satisfying all academic objectives, requirements and prerequisites as defined by the instructor and by the University. Because the burdens and appropriate criteria are different for
scheduling accommodations and content accommodations, granting of one type of accommodation has no bearing on the granting of the other type.

ii. Definitions

a. Scheduling Accommodations permit students to be absent from class meetings or to arrange to fulfill assignments on days other than their scheduled dates. Such accommodations are addressed above in Section O.

b. Content Accommodations are modifications of otherwise generally applicable reading, writing, viewing, listening, or performing requirements.

c. Legislated Accommodations are modifications made in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and other State and Federal statutes and are not included in this policy.

3. Content Accommodations

a. Consistent with principles of academic freedom, the faculty, individually and collectively, has the responsibility for determining the content of the curriculum.

b. Students are expected to take courses that will challenge them intellectually and personally. Students must understand and be able to articulate the ideas and theories that are important to the discourse within and among academic disciplines. Personal disagreement with these ideas and theories or their implications is not sufficient grounds for requesting an accommodation. Accommodations requested on such grounds will not be granted. The University recognizes that students' sincerely-held core beliefs may make it difficult for students to fulfill some requirements of some courses or majors. The University assumes no obligation to ensure that all students are able to complete any major.

c. It is the student's obligation to determine, before the last day to drop courses without penalty, when course requirements conflict with the student's sincerely-held core beliefs. If there is such a conflict, the student should consider dropping the class. A student who finds this solution impracticable may request a content accommodation from the instructor. Though the University provides, through this policy, a process by which a student may make such a request, the policy does not oblige the instructor to grant the request, except in those cases when a denial would be arbitrary and capricious or illegal. This request must be made to the instructor in writing, and the student must deliver a copy of the request to the office of the department Chair or, in the case of a single-department college, to the office of the Dean. The student's request must articulate the burden the requirement would place on
the student's beliefs.

d. The instructor must respond to any accommodation request within two school days of receiving it. The response must be made in writing and a copy must be delivered to the office of the department Chair or, in the case of a single-department college, to the office of the Dean. In the event that the class does not meet on the day by which the Instructor must respond, the student must make arrangements to receive the response in a timely manner. Instructors are not required to grant content accommodations, as long as the subject course requirement has a reasonable relationship to a legitimate pedagogical goal, but they may do so, only if a reasonable alternative means of satisfying the curricular requirement is available and only if that alternative is fully appropriate for meeting the academic objectives of the course, after considering the following:

   i. the difficulty of administering an accommodation;

   ii. the burden on the student's sincerely-held core belief;

   iii. the importance of the particular requirement to the course.

In considering whether or not to make an accommodation, the faculty member may evaluate the sincerity but not the validity of the student's belief. If an instructor in a course makes content accommodations for any reason other than those covered under Section 2-c (Legislated Accommodations) of this policy, the instructor must similarly consider requests made during the same semester for the same course for accommodations based on conflicts with sincerely-held core beliefs. Requests will be individually evaluated in relation to the above considerations; the granting of one such request will not guarantee that all requests will be granted. Because the criteria and requirements discussed above will apply differently to each instructor and to each course, accommodations granted by an instructor in one course will not affect decisions by the same instructor in other courses or by other instructors in the same or other courses.

e. If an instructor does not grant a content accommodation request, the student may appeal that denial in writing to the Dean of the college. If the Dean is the Instructor of the course, the student may appeal the denial to the cognizant Vice President.

f. The Dean (or Designee) will, in consultation with the faculty member and the department Chair (or Designee), act within two school days. The Dean (or Designee) will uphold the denial unless she or he finds that the denial was arbitrary and capricious or illegal. In the case of single-department colleges, the decision will rest with the Dean alone. The Dean's determination shall be final.
as it pertains to the specific accommodation request. Faculty challenges to the appropriateness of this decision should follow established channels. The student may but is not required to participate in these further reviews.

g. If the instructor disagrees with the dean's decision that the instructor's denial of the student's request was arbitrary and capricious or illegal, the instructor may not be compelled against his/her professional judgment to administer the requested content accommodation for the student. If the faculty instructor disagrees with the dean's decision that the instructor's denial of the student's request was arbitrary and capricious or illegal, the faculty instructor may not be compelled against his/her professional judgment to administer the requested content accommodation for the student. If the faculty instructor declines to administer the accommodation, it will be the responsibility of the dean in consultation with the department chair to design and administer the alternative academic requirement for the student in order to satisfy the student's content accommodation request. The dean (or dean's appropriate designee) will determine the student's grade on that specific alternative assignment and will report that grade to the course instructor, who will incorporate that grade for the assignment into the total grade for the course. The final grade in the course will be determined by the faculty instructor and will be calculated in the same way as the final grade is determined for all other students in the course.

h. If a student determines, after the last day to drop courses without penalty, that course requirements may conflict with the student's sincerely-held core beliefs, and the instructor has denied the student's written accommodation request, the student may seek permission in writing from the Dean to withdraw without receiving a W on his/her transcript and to receive a refund of tuition for that class. In making this request the student must demonstrate the following:

i. that the student is in good standing in the course as defined by the department.

ii. that he or she could not have made this determination prior to the last day to drop courses without penalty.

5. The Dean's determination shall be final.

a. Decisions on accommodation requests may not be considered adversely to a faculty member in faculty code, Retention, Promotion and Tenure, or other proceedings as long as those decisions are made in good faith. Faculty may not take adverse academic action against students who make accommodation requests. The Dean or Department Chair may not take any adverse action against an instructor based on his/her decision
to make or not make a content accommodation for a student.

b. Instructors who believe that course materials may conflict with students’ deeply held core beliefs may include a statement in the syllabus for the course that advises students that some of the writings, lectures, films or presentations, or other requirements in the course include materials that may present such conflicts. However, this policy recognizes that Faculty will not always be able to predict in advance which if any materials may conflict with the beliefs of a given student or group of students.

c. The Academic Senate will evaluate this policy in January 2007.

IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources
A. Rules
   R6-100A, Election of CR/NC Grading for Undergraduate Students
B. Procedures
C. Guidelines
D. Forms
E. Other related resource materials
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ENDNOTES

i. The colleges of law and medicine, and other academic units offering professional degrees, may be permitted to vary from the specific terms of this Policy for their professional degree curriculum when such variations are determined to be appropriate for compliance with accreditation requirements and principles applicable to such professional degree curriculum. Such variations shall be described in a supplemental rule (see Policy 1-001-II-F) adopted pursuant to this Policy, which shall be approved by the faculty (and, if applicable, chairperson) of the academic unit, the cognizant college council and dean, and the cognizant senior vice president, and shall be published in a form accessible to the affected students and course instructors.

ii. These standards are all based on a report of the American Council on Education adopted September 27, 1983 by ACE and November 1, 1983 by the Board of Directors, National University Continuing Education Association. Any changes reflect adaptation to our governance model. Some language is identical to the ACE recommendations; any additions specific to the University of Utah are the work of the Task Force. All other language is intended simply to translate the ACE and Task Force recommendations.

iii. ACE report, “Procedural Guidelines”, p. 3.
Policy 6-100: Instruction and Evaluation

IV. Purpose and Scope

This Policy governs University courses, including how courses shall be offered and approved, what units within the University may offer courses, who may teach University courses, when final examinations are conducted, what the standards are for course credit (i.e., credit hours), how courses are assessed and feedback is provided to instructors, what attendance requirements are, and how instructors may accommodate students' scheduling conflicts and accommodate students' objections to the substantive content of particular courses. These policies bear upon the responsibilities of individual instructors, students, course-offering units and the University administration. This Policy applies to all course-offering units.

V. Definitions

"Course-offering unit" is an academic unit authorized to offer credit-bearing courses and bearing primary responsibility for the content, instruction and evaluation of such courses.

VI. Policy

Section 1A. The Academic Year

The academic year shall be divided into a Fall and Spring semester of approximately fifteen weeks each and a Summer term of approximately twelve weeks. A semester may be subdivided into two sessions of approximately eight weeks each and the Summer term may be subdivided into two sessions of approximately six weeks each.

Section 2B. The Credit Hour

A University credit hour shall represent approximately three clock hours of the student's time a week for one semester.

Section 3C. Standards for Undergraduate Credit-Bearing Courses

1. Courses are developed by departments, programs, by course-offering units and academic administration in compliance with governing board policies, University Regulations and any applicable regulations of the State Board of Regents. In keeping with the principles of faculty shared governance and Policy 6-001-III-Sec. 1, courses shall be approved by the faculty members of course-offering units before being submitted for higher-level approval. While faculty must play a major role, comparability of credits across the University should be maintained. The methods of instruction,
12. Credit should be given only to those courses which apply toward completion of requirements for a certificate or degree at the University. Consistent with Regent’s Policy R470, the University does not offer credit for courses defined as remedial. No credit should be assigned to any course whose purpose is only to qualify students for financial aid. [Drafting NOTE: added sentences have been moved from #’s 12 and 14 below to consolidate related items.]

13. Courses should be appropriately rigorous, complex and numbered at comparable levels as determined by the department/course-offering unit, college curriculum committee, and University review processes. "Credit awarded for successful educational performance should reflect comparable quality and be uniformly defined within an institution, regardless of the methods of instruction used, the time when the course is taught" [Note 2iii] or the site.

14. Courses may be offered only by the teaching staff and with the approval of academic administration. Courses should be taught, evaluated, or directly supervised by an instructor approved by the course-offering unit, whose teaching qualifications meet the criteria adopted by the course-offering unit in furtherance of the University’s commitment to excellence in teaching. See Policy 6-303 (qualifications of regular faculty teachers) and Policy 6-310 (qualifications of auxiliary faculty and non-faculty teachers) an academic department or program, whose teaching qualifications satisfy departmental criteria.

15. Course descriptions should clearly state the learning outcomes and classroom activities essential to credit being awarded. If attendance is essential to credit, the rationale should be made clear to students.

16. Credit hours and student/faculty workload per credit hour should be comparable among classes, departments, and colleges across courses and course-offering units, taking into account special requirements of accrediting agencies. Catalog, curriculum guide, and syllabi should accurately reflect the work load and the work load should be commensurate with the credit hours awarded. At the University of Utah we assume it is generally expected throughout the University that there is at least one hour in class and two hours outside of class per week or the equivalent combination connected to every credit hour for the appropriately prepared student. In laboratories it is expected that at least 2 to 3 hours are spent in class and approximately the same amount outside for each credit hour awarded. Where these minimums are exceeded, the approximate workload should be made clear in catalog descriptions, advising materials, and course syllabi.

17. At the University of Utah Classes of one hour or less classes are usually graded as credit/no credit.

18. The learning outcomes and requirements must be assessed appropriately.
Catalog, curriculum guide, and syllabi should accurately reflect the work load and the work load should be commensurate with the credit hours awarded.  \[\text{Drafting NOTE: This statement is deleted from here but has been moved to \#6 above to consolidate related items}\]

19. Credit-bearing courses must be recorded on the student’s permanent academic record (transcript).

20. The faculty and academic administration need to provide policies for allowing repeating of students to repeat classes. These should be clearly communicated and coordinated across departments course-offering units.

   No credit should be assigned to any class whose purpose is only to qualify students for financial aid. \[\text{Drafting NOTE: This statement is deleted from here but has been moved to \#2 above to consolidate related items}\]

21. Acceptance of transfer credits depends upon quality of instruction from the sending institution, comparability of the nature, content, and level of credit earned, and appropriateness and applicability of credit to the receiving institution University and the student’s educational goals. Rules regarding the acceptance of transfer credits are approved by the Academic Senate, based upon recommendations made by the Credits and Admissions Committee. (See Policy 6-404, Sec. 2)

   Consistent with Regents’ policy, the University of Utah does not offer credit for classes defined as remedial. \[\text{Drafting NOTE: This statement, with added reference to Regents’ policy, has been moved to \#2 above to consolidate related items}\]

Section 4 Noncredit Courses \[\text{Drafting NOTE: This following section has been moved below; it is now Section P.}\]

Course development Procedures for noncredit courses should be academically sound and as rigorous, though perhaps different, as those applying to credit courses.

The national standard for Continuing Education Units (CEU) is “ten contact hours of participation in an organized continuing education experience under responsible sponsorship, capable direction, and qualified instruction.” The CEU may be the appropriate unit of measurement for qualifying noncredit courses.

A noncredit course is one which, at a minimum:

- meets criteria established by University and Governing Board guidelines.
- incorporates content, teaching methods and attendance requirements appropriate to the students eligible to enroll.
- is taught or supervised by an instructor who has met institutional qualifications for noncredit courses.
- is accurately described in appropriate publications of the University and for which an institutional record is established and maintained.
- recognizes participation of students appropriately.
Section 5D. Courses

Class Meetings

Courses of instruction may be offered only by the teaching staff and with the approval of the president. (Drafting NOTE: this statement has been moved to C.4 above to consolidate related items.)

Classrooms and hours shall not be changed without the consent of the director of scheduling.

Classes shall begin promptly, be dismissed promptly, and take precedence over any special examination or exercise not a part of the official University calendar unless such examination or exercise is authorized by the Academic Senate.

Section 6E. Course Numbers

Courses of instruction shall be classified and numbered in the publications and records of the University in accordance with the resolutions of the Academic Senate, the rules developed by the University Curriculum Policy Review Board and approved by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. See Policy 6-003–III-B-3.

Section 7F. Final Examinations

Final, comprehensive, and special examinations shall be given under regulations to be determined by the Academic Senate.

Final examinations in University courses may be required at the instructor’s discretion. When they are required, final examinations must be given at times officially set. A schedule for such examinations shall be prepared by the director of the Scheduling Office and published by the University.

Instructors who require a final examination and who want to give it at a time other than the time scheduled by the Scheduling Office must obtain the approvals of the administrator of the course-offering unit and the cognizant academic dean (or equivalent), with adequate notice given to the students. Any individual student has a right to take the examination at the originally scheduled time if the rescheduled time would impose undue hardship and the student gives notice to the instructor prior to the earlier of the original or rescheduled time.

A regular examination may be given a student at a time other than that officially scheduled only under specified conditions.

{Drafting NOTE: The following three paragraphs will be moved to Policy 6-101, Sec. J & K, as shown on the attached revision of that Policy.} At the discretion of the department, each candidate for graduation with a baccalaureate degree may be required to pass a comprehensive examination (written, oral, or both) in the candidate’s field of concentration. This examination shall not excuse the candidate from any regular examination.

Special examinations for college credit shall not be given in courses not offered by the university or in courses which the student has attended as an auditor or for which credit has been received.

A maximum of 32 semester credit hours in areas other than foreign languages and in addition a maximum of 25 credit hours in foreign languages may be allowed by special examination.
toward a bachelor’s degree to a resident student, provided the student has shown proficiency in the subject to the satisfaction of the Credits and Admissions Committee and the appropriate dean or chairperson of the department concerned.

Section 8G. Grades

1. General Grading Criteria


   In the School of Medicine, final grades for all students working toward the M.D. degree may be reported as either "P" (pass) or "F" (fail), and using an "I" (incomplete) as an interim grade when appropriate. In the College of Law, some advanced problem courses or clinical courses may be offered on an exclusively pass/fail basis. (Drafting NOTE: The preceding sentences establishing special policy for Medicine and Law are deleted because these and similar variances from the general terms of this Policy are now covered more effectively in Footnote i of this Policy.)

   The criteria for grading students shall be performance in examinations, papers, or assignments, participation in class discussion and activities, and other evaluative processes necessary in determining the students’ achievement levels. All of these Procedures may be part of the total evaluation, as adapted by the individual course instructor to fit the needs of the particular class, course and student. Physical attendance may be used as a criterion in determining the final grade only where it indicates lack of participation in a class where student participation is generally required or as required by accrediting bodies.

   Grading of individual student performance shall be performed consistent with the University’s fundamental principles prohibiting discrimination on improper grounds, and requiring that academic activities be performed without prejudice or favoritism based on family, romantic, or sexual relationships, or financial interests. See Policy 6-316-Section 4-A & B (Faculty Code—prohibitions on discrimination, prejudice, or favoritism in grading); Policy 6-400, Section II–E (Student Code—rights against discrimination and sexual harassment); Policy 5-105 (Nepotism—defining “immediate family” relationships in which favoritism is presumed to exist); Policy 5-107 (Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationships—prohibiting exercising of grading authority when a romantic or sexual relationship exists); and Policy 1-006-Sec.VI (A)(3) (prohibiting evaluation of students based on participation in outside business activities in which evaluator has significant financial interest). These principles apply to any person engaged in grading activities, including course
instructors and their assistants. Course instructors and course-offering units shall take appropriate steps to ensure the application of these principles, including providing for alternative grading methods or assignment of grading responsibilities to another person, as appropriate to the circumstances.

2. Incompletes

The mark "I" (incomplete) shall be given and reported for work incomplete because of circumstances beyond the student's control. The grade of "I" must be used only for a student who is passing the course and who needs to complete 20% or less of the course. An "I" must not be used in a way that will permit a student to retake the course without paying tuition. If the student attends the course during a subsequent semester as part of the effort required to complete the course, he/she must be registered (either as a regular student or for audit) in the semester in which he/she attends.

If a student has not finished incomplete work within one calendar year after the "I" was given, the "I" will be changed to an "E" by the registrar’s office. If the student graduates within one calendar year after receiving the "I," but before completing the work, the "I" will remain in the record, but will not contribute to credit toward graduation or the grade point average. An instructor may override the automatic change from an “I” to an “E” by submitting a grade change form (see Sec. I, “Change of Grade,” below).

4. Non-Attendance and Non-Performance

When an instructor has no record of attendance or other evidence of participation in the course by a person whose name appears on the Registrar's final grade report, the instructor should enter the grade "EU" for that person. When no grade is entered for any person listed in a final grade report, the Registrar shall record an "EU" for that person. The grade "EU" shall be treated as an "E" in calculating grade point averages, but it shall be disregarded in calculating "section mean grade."

The change of the mark "I" to grade "E" after one calendar year may be avoided by a written agreement between the instructor and student. The agreement will specify the grade to be given if the work is not completed. Copies of this agreement will be filed with the instructor, student, and registrar's office. A fourth copy may be kept by the department. The action will be reported to the department.

Upon the recommendation of a student, the course instructor and the dean of the course-offering unit (or equivalent), the Registrar may withdraw a student from a course for nonattendance or nonperformance of assigned course work. The student shall then receive the grade of "E." Before this grade is recorded under these circumstances, the Registrar...
shall send written notification to the student and advise the student of the right to appeal to the dean. *(Drafting NOTE: This paragraph has been moved from below to consolidate related items.)*

4. **In-Progress Courses**

The mark "T" shall be given for thesis or other independent work in progress, but not for regular courses. The mark "T" shall remain on the student record until the work is completed and a letter grade is reported to the Registrar's office. The mark "T" does not contribute credit toward graduation nor will it be used in the computation of the grade point average. There is no time limit governing the removal of the "T" grade.

10. **Dropping and Withdrawing From Classes**

Students may drop any class in a regular University term without penalty or permission for a period extending for ten calendar days from the first day of the term. Beginning the eleventh day from the first day of the term and continuing through Friday of the first full week beyond the midpoint of the term (as determined by the Registrar), students may withdraw from a course or from the University without permission, but a "W" will be recorded on the academic record and applicable tuition and fees will be assessed for each course. The latter date is the final day on which a student may withdraw from a course or from the University.

Students may drop workshops, short term courses, or non-credit courses without penalty or permission as follows: classes of one to two days in length, before the first day of class; classes of three to five days in length, on the first day of class; classes of six to ten days in length, through the second day of class; classes of eleven or more days in length, through the third day of class.

Students may withdraw from workshops, short term courses, or non-credit courses following the drop deadline for such courses only up to the midpoint in the course (as determined by the Registrar). Any withdrawal after the initial drop period will cause a "W" to be recorded on the academic record and applicable tuition and fees will be assessed for the course.

Students taking regular term courses may appeal the deadline for withdrawal in the case of compelling, non-academic emergencies by submitting a petition and supporting documentation to the office of the dean of their major college. Undeclared, non-matriculated and premajor students apply to the University College. Students in workshops, short term courses, or non-credit courses shall appeal to the Academic Outreach and Continuing Education. Appeals must be submitted to the appropriate dean's office by the last day of regular course instruction.
preceding the final exam period. Colleges must respond to an appeal from a student within seven calendar days of receiving the petition.

For extraordinary reasons, approved by the student's dean and the registrar, the grade of "W" may be given after the end of the term. Such requests must be submitted within three years of the affected term(s) or prior to graduation from the University, whichever comes first.

The student shall have the option of adding a class through the fourteenth calendar day of the semester.

Upon the recommendation of a student’s instructor and a student’s dean, the registrar may withdraw a student from a course for nonattendance or nonperformance of assigned course work. The student shall then receive the grade of "E." Before this grade is recorded under these circumstances, the registrar shall send written notification to the student and advise the student of the right to appeal to the student's dean. [Drafting NOTE: This paragraph has been moved above, to sec. 3, to consolidate related items.]

8. Repeating Courses

Students may repeat any course they have previously taken at the University as long as it is still offered. However, students may earn credit hours for a given course for graduation only once unless the course has been designated as repeatable for credit. The last grade received is used to compute the student’s grade point average (and grades from previous instances of the same course are not considered in computing the GPA, but are shown on the record for the term the course was taken). The grades of I, NC, W, V, or T may neither be removed by repeating the course, nor may they be used to replace a grade in a previous course that has been repeated. All repeated courses are identified as such on the student’s academic record.

Per Regents’ Policy R510-4.16, students will assessed the “full cost of instruction” the third time (and any subsequent time) they enroll in the same course. A student seeking to register for a course for the third time shall receive last priority in registration for that course. A grade of "W," "V" or "I" shall be regarded as one registration for the course.

9. Credit/No Credit Option

a. In courses in which activity or attendance is the controlling factor in the determination of grades, the grade "CR" (credit) shall be substituted for the grades "A" through "C-" and the grade "NC" (no credit) shall be substituted for the grades "D+" through "E."

b. Under policies approved by the Academic Senate, students may elect a limited number of courses in which they will receive the grade "CR" in place of grades "A" through "C-" or the grade of "NC" in the place of "D+," "D," "D-," "E" and "EU". The "CR" grade shall carry credit toward
graduation, but neither the "CR" nor "NC" grades will be included in computing grade point averages.

(Drafting NOTE: the contents of former #7 below have been relegated to attached new Rule R6-100A.) The following rules govern the undergraduate CR/NC option:

Any undergraduate student who is permitted to register in university courses for credit is eligible to exercise a CR/NC grading option. A student may exercise the option of CR/NC grading for a maximum of 15 semester hours while an undergraduate at the University of Utah. However, an undergraduate student who has accumulated more than 22.5 quarter hours under the CR/NC option prior to Fall of 1998 shall be permitted to register for up to a total of 30 semester hours (or 45 quarter hours) of CR/NC. Any CR/NC course registration in excess of the applicable maximum will be considered a registration for a letter grade. Hours from courses graded CR/NC as a matter of policy (courses producing one credit hour or less) will not be included in the total.

A student may not exercise a CR/NC option in Writing 111, in Writing 112, in Writing 210, in Liberal Education Core Courses, or in courses which are required for the baccalaureate degree by the student's major department. However, a student's major department may allow the student to exercise the CR/NC option in required allied courses taken outside the student's major department. In the event a student changes his/her major department, the student may request that a maximum of two courses previously taken in the department (constituting the student's new major) on a Credit/No Credit basis be changed to a letter grade. This option can be exercised for no more than two changes of a major department (i.e., a maximum of four courses).

The CR/NC option must be initiated at the office of the registrar on the form prescribed by the registrar for that purpose. Requests for changing to the CR/NC option will not be accepted after the 14 calendar day of the semester. Change from CR/NC back to graded status may occur any time before Monday of the last week of classes. The hours for any class thus changed will continue to count toward the maximum specified in paragraph (1) above. If a student feels there is justification for an exception to the preceding restriction, the student must appeal in writing to the registrar. If the request is denied, the student will have the right to request a review of the denial by a committee composed of the student's college dean, the director of academic advising, and the registrar. Appeals will not be accepted after the semester is completed. Retroactive requests must be initiated by the dean of a student's major college.

Final grade sheets will not indicate which students have exercised CR/NC options. The registrar will convert the letter grades "A" through "C-" to credit, and "D+," "D," "D-," "E," and "EU" to no credit.

A statement must accompany each form prescribed by the registrar for CR/NC options advising students of the various disadvantages of taking many classes CR/NC. Specifically, they should be warned that some graduate schools consider "credit" grades as "C" work when looking at transcripts and that some schools place more emphasis on exams such as the G.R.E. than on transcript grade point averages when those transcripts contain numerous grades of "credit."

When students change majors, their new major department will have the right to accept or not to accept, in partial satisfaction of the department's requirements for graduation, courses in that department which the students have previously taken on a CR/NC basis.

Students shall have earned letter grades in not less than 75 percent of the credit hours of course work that they present as their minor for teaching certification.

c. A graduate student is granted the option, subject to the approval of the administrator of the course-offering unit and the cognizant dean (or equivalent) student's major department and review by the graduate dean,
to enroll in some courses in which the graduate student will be graded on a CR/NC basis, rather than on a letter basis. (For details, refer to the Graduate School Bulletin.)

d. Courses which produce one hour or less of academic credit must be graded exclusively on a CR/NC basis, unless permission to assign letter grades is given. Courses which produce more than one hour of academic credit may be graded by a letter grade (with existing Credit/No Credit options) or solely on a Credit/No Credit basis, upon the discretion of the individual college in which the course is offered. Instructors wishing to assign a letter grade to such classes, or to grade other kinds of classes solely on the Credit/No Credit basis grading option as a means of grading students in a particular class shall obtain permission to do so from the relevant college’s curriculum committee/administrative unit designated for this purpose.

8. Course Credit Reduction

Course Credit Adjustment Policy. An adjustment in course credit (reduction only) may be used in "studio-type" classes or in independent study courses only. Individual departments may determine which of their courses should use this option. No foundation classes or classes used to satisfy either General Education or Bachelor Degree requirements or liberal education classes whose for which completion of the full semester’s work is essential for a graduation requirement may be involved. No courses may be involved where completion of the full semester’s work is essential to graduation requirement. The intent of this policy provision on course credit reduction is to let the grade reflect the quality of work—and the credit earned reflect the quantity of work completed in this type of course. [Drafting NOTE: This sentence has been moved from the second paragraph below to increase the coherence of this section.] If a student fails to complete the volume of work he/she contracted to do for such a specified course, the instructor and student may agree to reduce the credit earned and the student is graded on the quality of work completed. The deadline for making the adjustment corresponds with the last day of classes prior to final exams.

The intent of this policy is to let the grade reflect the quality of work—and the credit earned reflect the quantity of work completed in this type of class. [Drafting NOTE: This sentence has been moved above to increase the coherence of this section.] The deans of the colleges will report annually to the vice president for academic affairs and the Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee as to the frequency of cases in which adjustment was used and a reason leading to adjustment in each case.

Section 9H. Report of Grades

Instructors shall report the academic standing of each student in their classes at such times and in such form as the registrar may direct, subject to the approval of the Academic Senate. At the end of each
semester, the Registrar shall report the grades of each student to the student.

Students shall not receive credit for work done in a course in which they have not been regularly registered or receive credit greater in amount than that for which they are duly registered.

I. Change of Grades

A final grade, after it has been formally reported to the Registrar's office, cannot be changed unless the instructor who awarded the grade requests a change on a form provided for this purpose by the Registrar, and unless that request is approved by the instructor's department chairperson/course-offering unit. A grade can be changed without the instructor's request or approval in accordance with the Procedures of [Policy 6-400, Section IV].

When a student repeats a course previously taken at the university, only the last grade received in that course shall be used in computation of the student's grade point average. The mark of NC may not be used to replace any previous grade or mark for a course.

Section 10J. Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee [Drafting NOTE: This section J is in need of a complete rewrite. The AES Committee described here is scheduled to undergo a five-year regular review by the Senate Personnel and Elections Committee during 2010-2011. We will revise this section after that review. In the meanwhile, the following statement about a pending revision will be inserted here:]

[USER NOTE: As of 2010 this section J is under review for major revision.]

[The president shall appoint the Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee. In addition, academic deans may set up scholarship committees to operate within their respective schools or colleges with the advice and consent of the president. The Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee shall have jurisdiction only in those schools or colleges where such scholarship committees have not been established. It shall be the duty of all scholarship committees to assist in the rehabilitation of the academically delinquent student. These committees shall have the cooperation of all student personnel services maintained by the university, and may administer, subject to the university regulations, such discipline as shall seem proper.]]

Section 11K. Scholastic Standards for Undergraduates

The Undergraduate Council shall have jurisdiction over the scholastic standards for undergraduates and shall delegate to the Center for Academic Advising University College the responsibility for administering the scholastic standards policy.

7. Dean's List and President's Award. A student who earns a grade point average of 3.5 or higher in at least 12 graded hours during any one term shall be placed on the Dean's List. A student who is on the Dean's List during fall and spring semesters of the same academic year will receive the
President's Award.

8. All students are required to maintain a cumulative grade point average of not less than 2.0. The cumulative grade point average of students who have transferred to the University is computed on the work taken at the University of Utah only.

9. Academic Probation. A student who fails to maintain a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or above shall be placed on scholastic probation and have a hold placed on his or her registration. To clear this hold, the student must contact the Center for Academic Advising, University College to determine the conditions under which the student will be allowed to register.

10. Suspension: A student whose cumulative grade point average has been below a 2.0 for three consecutive semesters is subject to suspension.

   A registration hold will be placed on the student's record and will prevent the student from registering for courses at the University of Utah during the suspension period. The suspension period will be for a minimum of two (2) three (3) semesters unless revoked on appeal.

11. Appeal of Suspension. A student may appeal suspension, based on extenuating circumstances, to the Scholastic Standards Committee of the Center for Academic Advising, University College. If the Committee finds extenuating circumstances and revokes the suspension, the student will be readmitted on academic probation and permitted to register for courses. The student must maintain a grade point average of at least 2.0 during each subsequent semester until the student's cumulative grade point average reaches 2.0. A student who does not meet these conditions is subject to re-suspension.

12. Readmission after Suspension. A student wishing to return to the University of Utah after the expiration of the two-three-semester suspension period must petition the Scholastic Standards Committee of the Center for Academic Advising, University College for readmission. The Committee will readmit the student if there seems a reasonable likelihood of academic success. The readmitted student must maintain a grade point average of at least 2.0 each subsequent semester until the student's cumulative grade point average reaches 2.0. A student who does not meet these conditions is subject to re-suspension.

Section 12L. Honors for Undergraduates

Honors shall be awarded at graduation to those students who complete with distinction at least 90 credit hours at the University of Utah. The basis, terms, and degrees of distinction shall be determined by the Academic Senate. Names of students attaining honors shall be published in the commencement program and elsewhere as the president may direct.

Section 13M. Academic Renewal
A currently enrolled undergraduate student may petition the vice president for student affairs University College for academic renewal. This is a Procedure which allows the student to request that his or her academic record be reviewed for the purpose of discounting, for grade point average computation, all courses which were entered on the student’s academic record ten or more calendar years prior to the time of the request for renewal. Under this Procedure, courses with a D+ or lower grade would not count toward the requisite total hours needed for graduation. University of Utah courses with a D+ or lower grade on the student’s academic record. The courses must have been taken seven or more calendar years prior to the request. If approved, the discounted courses will remain on the student’s academic record (and the grades received for the courses will be shown), but the discounted courses and grades received for them will not count toward total hours, cumulative grade point computation, or graduation requirements. 

The renewal option can be used only once during a student’s undergraduate career. This Procedure does not apply to graduate students or to students pursuing a second undergraduate degree.

Responsibility for administration of this Procedure rests with the Office of the Vice President for student Affairs.

Section 14N. Course Evaluation

Course Assessment and Feedback (course evaluations)

The University will assess its courses and instruction in multiple ways, including by soliciting students’ feedback. Student feedback has several uses: it provides information of interest to students planning their programs of study, it is useful in making improvements in instruction and curricula, and it provides a student perspective on teaching for evaluations of course instructors.

4. Student Course Feedback Oversight Committee, structure and functions.
   a. The University Student Course Feedback Oversight Committee (“Course Feedback Committee”) is established. The membership and leadership shall be as follows: There shall be 10 members serving limited terms, 6 members of the faculty and 4 students, and 3 permanent ex officio members.

   i) Faculty. One faculty representative shall be a member of the Graduate Council during the term of service on the Committee and shall be appointed by the chairperson of the Graduate Council. One faculty representative shall be a member of the Undergraduate Council during the term of service on the Committee and shall be appointed by the chairperson of the Undergraduate Council. Four faculty representatives (no more than one from any one academic college) shall be appointed by the Senate Personnel and Elections Committee. For the Committee’s first year of
operation, two of the faculty representatives will be appointed to terms of one year, and two to terms of two years. For the second and subsequent years, all new members will be appointed for terms of [two] years (so that the subsequent membership changes will be staggered). Faculty may not serve multiple consecutive terms.

ii) Students. The 4 student representatives will include the ASUU Academic Affairs Director, the ASUU Senate chairperson, and two Student Advisory Committee (SAC) representatives appointed by the ASUU Academic Affairs Director. Students will have annual terms of service.

iii) Ex officios. There shall be three ex officio permanent members with voting rights, including the Associate Dean for General Education (or designee), one representative from the Center for Teaching & Learning Excellence, and the Student Course Feedback Program Manager. The Manager reports to the Director of the Center for Teaching & Learning Excellence.

iv) The chairperson of the Committee shall be one of the limited-term faculty representatives, and nominated annually by the President of the Academic Senate and elected by the Committee.

v). The Committee will report directly to the Academic Senate.

b. The Course Feedback Committee’s primary function shall be to develop (and revise as necessary) a standardized “Student Course Feedback Instrument,” and a standardized “Course Feedback Report.” The Instrument and Report forms shall be designed to be suitable for use in all credit-bearing courses, of both undergraduate and graduate levels. The Committee shall also develop appropriate Procedures for the administration of the Instrument and Report forms (and other appropriate publication of the resulting data). In developing and periodically revising the Instrument and Report forms, and Procedures, the Committee shall solicit and consider input from the chairpersons of all course-offering units. The Instrument and Report forms and Procedures (and any revisions) shall be presented to the Academic Senate for approval.

5. The approved Course Feedback Instrument and Report forms shall be made available for use by all course-offering academic units. All credit-bearing courses shall be assessed every term they are offered using the approved Instrument. Chairpersons of each course-offering unit have the responsibility of seeing that assessments are conducted according to regulations, working with the Student Course Feedback Program Manager. For non-credit courses, assessments may be conducted as determined in the discretion of the course-offering unit.
6. **Uses of feedback.**

   a. Course feedback for individual courses, including all collected data, shall be made available to course instructors, and appropriate administrators of the course-offering unit after grades for the course are filed.

   b. An appropriate set of data for a given course shall be made available to any University student, as determined appropriate in the standard Report form and Procedures approved as described above.

   c. The Student Advisory Committee of the course-offering unit, after meeting pertinent training requirements, shall be provided with an appropriate set of feedback data for individual courses for specified purposes of carrying out approved functions of such Advisory Committees, as determined appropriate in the Procedures approved as described above.

The University will evaluate its courses and instruction in multiple ways, including by soliciting students' evaluation. The primary purpose of student evaluation of courses is to provide a measure of the student assessment of the effectiveness of courses and of the effectiveness of faculty, teaching assistants/teaching fellows and other instructional personnel. This information has several uses: it provides base information to student advisory committees for retention/promotion/tenure recommendations, it gives instructors and academic units feedback about their classes and it provides information of interest to students planning their programs.

**Course Evaluation Procedures**

The University Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council shall jointly develop, approve and amend as necessary a course evaluation instrument with a series of questions suitable for use in all courses and with a series of optional questions suitable for use in various types of courses. The Councils shall also develop appropriate Procedures for the administration of the instrument. The University Administration will make this instrument available to all academic units.

At the beginning of each academic year, the chairperson of each department shall meet with the chairperson of the departmental student advisory committee and develop a policy for course evaluation for the year. The policy shall state the criteria for determining which courses are evaluated and the mechanism by which they will be evaluated. The policy adopted shall be one mutually agreeable to the department administration and the student advisory committee. A written copy of this policy shall be sent to the office of the college dean. A copy shall also be made available to interested parties by the departmental office.

Completed course evaluation forms may be returned to the departmental office by a non-instructional staff member, a student advisory committee member, or a volunteer from the class, but under
no circumstances are the course evaluations to be handled by the evaluated instructor between the time they are completed by the students and the time that grades are issued.

Department chairpersons have the responsibility of seeing that evaluations are conducted according to regulations, including, but not limited to, arranging distribution and collection, and paying costs arising from tabulation of any optional questions chosen by the department. Provided the department has used the course evaluation instrument developed by the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, the University Administration shall provide for the tabulation of the questions developed for use in all courses.

5. Course evaluations or summaries thereof shall be made available to faculty and any University of Utah student requesting them after grades for the course are filed. The departmental student advisory committee and the ASUU shall be provided with the numerical data contained in course evaluations or summaries thereof for publication purposes. The costs of copying, printing or publishing this data are the responsibility of the departmental student advisory committee or the ASUU.

Section 150. Attendance Requirements

Attendance

The University expects regular attendance at all class meetings. Any particular attendance requirements of the course must be available to students at the time of the first course meeting. Instructors must communicate any particular attendance requirements of the course to students in writing on or before the first class meeting. Students are responsible for acquainting themselves with and satisfying the entire range of academic objectives and requirements as defined by the instructor.

Excused Absences

Students absent from class to participate in officially sanctioned University activities (e.g., band, debate, student government, intercollegiate athletics) or religious obligations, or with instructor’s approval, shall be permitted to make up both assignments and examinations. The University expects its departments and programs that take students away from class meetings to schedule such events in a way that will minimize hindrance of the student’s orderly completion of course requirements. Such units must provide a written statement to the students describing the activity and stating as precisely as possible the dates of the required absence. The involved students must deliver this documentation to their instructors, preferable before the absence, but in no event later than one week after the absence.
Except in cases of sudden illness or emergency, students shall in advance of the absence arrange with the instructor to make up assignments.

Unexpected University facility closures due to weather, emergency or disaster may occur from time to time. Students may be required to complete coursework missed due to these or other class cancellations; however, instructors requiring mandatory make-up sessions may not penalize students if they are unable to attend due to time conflicts, etc.

P. Noncredit Courses

2. Course development procedures for noncredit courses should be academically sound and as rigorous, though perhaps different, as those applying to credit courses.

3. The national standard for Continuing Education Units (CEU) is "ten contact hours of participation in an organized continuing education experience under responsible sponsorship, capable direction, and qualified instruction." The CEU may be the appropriate unit of measurement for qualifying noncredit courses.

3. For purposes of this subsection, a noncredit course: is one which, at a minimum:
   a. Is one for which credit is not awarded, registration is required and payment changes hands;
   b. meets criteria established by University guidelines the offering unit;
   c. incorporates content, teaching methods and attendance requirements appropriate to the students eligible to enroll;
   d. is taught or supervised by an instructor who has met institutional qualifications for noncredit courses established by the offering unit;
   e. is accurately described in appropriate publications of the University and recognizes participation of students appropriately.

6. Units offering noncredit courses must report the nature and extent of those activities to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee) annually.

Section 16Q. Accommodations

(Section 16Q is in effect starting Fall semester 2005)

1. Introduction

The values held most strongly by the University of Utah community are those of academic freedom and integrity as they are expressed collectively by the colleges and departments as well as individually
through research and teaching and as they exist within the wider context of advanced study as commonly understood by all universities. The community also values diversity and respect, without which there can be no collegiality among faculty and students. In addition, the University community values individual rights and freedoms, including the right of each community member to adhere to individual systems of conscience, religion, and ethics. Finally, the University recognizes that with all rights come responsibilities. The University works to uphold its collective values by fostering free speech, broadening fields of inquiry, and encouraging generation of new knowledge that challenges, shapes, and enriches our collective and individual understandings.

This policy Section addresses two different types of accommodations: course scheduling accommodations and course content accommodations. Regardless of any accommodation that may be granted, students are responsible for satisfying all academic objectives, requirements and prerequisites as defined by the instructor and by the University. Because the burdens and appropriate criteria are different for scheduling accommodations and content accommodations, granting of one type of accommodation has no bearing on the granting of the other type.

2. Definitions

d. Scheduling Accommodations permit students to be absent from class meetings or to arrange to fulfill assignments on days other than their scheduled dates. Such accommodations are addressed above in Section O.

e. Content Accommodations are modifications of otherwise generally applicable reading, writing, viewing, listening, or performing requirements.

f. Legislated Accommodations are modifications made in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and other State and Federal statutes and are not included in this policy.

a. Accommodations

b. Scheduling Accommodations

e. Students should register only for those courses for which they have no scheduling conflicts that will interfere with their ability to complete course requirements.

d. In accordance with the Attendance Policy of the Student Code (ref.), students who must be absent from a specific class to participate in officially sanctioned University activities (e.g. band, debate, student government, intercollegiate athletics), religious obligations, or other obligations meeting with the instructor's
approval will be permitted to make up or otherwise receive credit for both assignments and examinations.

e. Except in cases of sudden illness or emergency, students shall in advance of the absence arrange with the instructor to make up materials.

f. Students whose religious obligations, University activities, or other legitimate obligations as determined by the instructor may interfere with their ability to fulfill any course requirements on their scheduled dates shall in advance of those dates arrange with the instructor to fulfill the requirements.

[Drafting NOTE: the contents of this section formerly labeled “Scheduling Accommodations” are deleted because it merely repeats what is already stated above in Section O (Attendance Requirements). An explanation of the relationship of Sections Q and O is added to the definition of Scheduling Accommodations, above. No changes are proposed for the “Content Accommodations” section—and if any changes are ever to be considered for this section, it must be remembered that this section is the product of a 2005 settlement of a federal civil rights lawsuit.]}

3. Content Accommodations

i. Consistent with principles of academic freedom, the faculty, individually and collectively, has the responsibility for determining the content of the curriculum.

j. Students are expected to take courses that will challenge them intellectually and personally. Students must understand and be able to articulate the ideas and theories that are important to the discourse within and among academic disciplines. Personal disagreement with these ideas and theories or their implications is not sufficient grounds for requesting an accommodation. Accommodations requested on such grounds will not be granted. The University recognizes that students’ sincerely-held core beliefs may make it difficult for students to fulfill some requirements of some courses or majors. The University assumes no obligation to ensure that all students are able to complete any major.

k. It is the student’s obligation to determine, before the last day to drop courses without penalty, when course requirements conflict with the student’s sincerely-held core beliefs. If there is such a conflict, the student should consider dropping the class. A student who finds this solution impracticable may request a content accommodation from the instructor. Though the University provides, through this policy, a process by which a student may make such a request, the policy does not oblige the instructor to grant the request, except in those cases when a denial would be arbitrary and capricious or illegal. This request must be made to the instructor in writing, and the student must deliver a copy of the request to the office of the department Chair or, in the case of
single-department college, to the office of the Dean. The student's request must articulate the burden the requirement would place on the student's beliefs.

l. The instructor must respond to any accommodation request within two school days of receiving it. The response must be made in writing and a copy must be delivered to the office of the department Chair or, in the case of a single-department college, to the office of the Dean. In the event that the class does not meet on the day by which the Instructor must respond, the student must make arrangements to receive the response in a timely manner. *Instructors are not required to grant content accommodations, as long as the subject course requirement has a reasonable relationship to a legitimate pedagogical goal,* but they may do so, only if a reasonable alternative means of satisfying the curricular requirement is available and only if that alternative is fully appropriate for meeting the academic objectives of the course, after considering the following:

iv. the difficulty of administering an accommodation;

v. the burden on the student's sincerely-held core belief;

vi. the importance of the particular requirement to the course.

In considering whether or not to make an accommodation, the faculty member may evaluate the sincerity but not the validity of the student's belief. If an instructor in a course makes content accommodations for any reason other than those covered under [*Section II.C 2-c (Legislated Accommodations)]* of this policy, the instructor must similarly consider requests made during the same semester for the same course for accommodations based on conflicts with sincerely-held core beliefs. Requests will be individually evaluated in relation to the above considerations; the granting of one such request will not guarantee that all requests will be granted. Because the criteria and requirements discussed above will apply differently to each instructor and to each course, accommodations granted by an instructor in one course will not affect decisions by the same instructor in other courses or by other instructors in the same or other courses.

m. If an instructor does not grant a content accommodation request, the student may appeal that denial in writing to the Dean of the college. If the Dean is the Instructor of the course, the student may appeal the denial to the cognizant Vice President.

n. The Dean (or Designee) will, in consultation with the faculty member and the department Chair (or Designee), act within two school days. The Dean (or Designee) will uphold the denial unless she or he finds that the denial was arbitrary and capricious or
illegal. In the case of single-department colleges, the decision will rest with the Dean alone. The Dean's determination shall be final as it pertains to the specific accommodation request. Faculty challenges to the appropriateness of this decision should follow established channels. The student may but is not required to participate in these further reviews.

o. If the instructor disagrees with the dean's decision that the instructor's denial of the student's request was arbitrary and capricious or illegal, the instructor may not be compelled against his/her professional judgment to administer the requested content accommodation for the student. If the faculty instructor disagrees with the dean's decision that the instructor's denial of the student's request was arbitrary and capricious or illegal, the faculty instructor may not be compelled against his/her professional judgment to administer the requested content accommodation for the student. If the faculty instructor declines to administer the accommodation, it will be the responsibility of the dean in consultation with the department chair to design and administer the alternative academic requirement for the student in order to satisfy the student's content accommodation request. The dean (or dean's appropriate designee) will determine the student's grade on that specific alternative assignment and will report that grade to the course instructor, who will incorporate that grade for the assignment into the total grade for the course. The final grade in the course will be determined by the faculty instructor and will be calculated in the same way as the final grade is determined for all other students in the course.

p. If a student determines, after the last day to drop courses without penalty, that course requirements may conflict with the student's sincerely-held core beliefs, and the instructor has denied the student's written accommodation request, the student may seek permission in writing from the Dean to withdraw without receiving a W on his/her transcript and to receive a refund of tuition for that class. In making this request the student must demonstrate the following:

iii. that the student is in good standing in the course as defined by the department.

iv. that he or she could not have made this determination prior to the last day to drop courses without penalty.

7. The Dean's determination shall be final.

d. Decisions on accommodation requests may not be considered adversely to a faculty member in faculty code, Retention, Promotion and Tenure, or other proceedings as long as those decisions are made in good faith. Faculty may not take adverse academic action against students who make accommodation
requests. The Dean or Department Chair may not take any adverse action against an instructor based on his/her decision to make or not make a content accommodation for a student.

e. Instructors who believe that course materials may conflict with students' deeply held core beliefs may include a statement in the syllabus for the course that advises students that some of the writings, lectures, films or presentations, or other requirements in the course include materials that may present such conflicts. However, this policy recognizes that Faculty will not always be able to predict in advance which if any materials may conflict with the beliefs of a given student or group of students.

f. The Academic Senate will evaluate this policy in January 2007.

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

A. Rules

R6-100A. Election of CR/NC Grading for Undergraduate Students

B. Procedures

C. Guidelines

D. Forms

E. Other related resource materials
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ENDNOTES

[Note i] The colleges of law and medicine, and other academic units offering professional degrees, may be permitted to vary from the specific terms of this Policy for their professional degree curriculum when such variations are determined to be appropriate for compliance with accreditation requirements and principles applicable to such professional degree curriculum. Such variations shall be described in a supplemental rule (see Policy 1-001-II-F) adopted pursuant to this Policy, which shall be approved by the faculty (and, if applicable, chairperson) of the academic unit, the cognizant college council and dean, and the cognizant senior vice president, and shall be published in a form accessible to the affected students and course instructors. [Drafting note: This footnote recognizes a need for professional degree programs to vary from the otherwise applicable specific terms of this policy, and sets forth a careful process for such variations to be formally adopted and approved. This footnote replaces passages from the older version of the policy which much less effectively addressed the issue. This will bring Policy into line with current practices of the professional degree programs, and better ensure that students and faculty within such programs are given adequate notice of the]
proper relationship of University general policies and the specific internal rules of such programs.)

[Note 1 ii] These standards are all based on a report of the American Council on Education adopted September 27, 1983 by ACE and November 1, 1983 by the Board of Directors, National University Continuing Education Association. Any changes reflect adaptation to our governance model. Some language is identical to the ACE recommendations; any additions specific to the University of Utah are the work of the Task Force. All other language is intended simply to translate the ACE and Task Force recommendations.

University Rule 6-100A: Election of Credit/No-Credit (CR/NC) Grading for Undergraduates

I. Purpose
To implement Policy 6-100 – III-G-7 regarding the use by undergraduate students of the option for electing the credit/no-credit (CR/NC) grading option

II. Definitions
(Reserved)

III. Rule
Undergraduate Students may elect a limited number of courses in which they will receive the grade "CR" in place of grades "A" through "C-" or the grade of "NC" in the place of "D+," "D," "D," "E" and "EU". The "CR" grade shall carry credit toward graduation, but neither the "CR" nor "NC" grades will be included in computing grade point averages.

1. Any undergraduate student who is permitted to register in university courses for credit is eligible to exercise a CR/NC grading option. A student may exercise the option of CR/NC grading for a maximum of 15 semester hours while an undergraduate at the University. However, an undergraduate student who has accumulated more than 22.5 quarter hours under the CR/NC option prior to Fall of 1998 shall be permitted to register for up to a total of 30 semester hours (or 45 quarter hours) of CR/NC. Any CR/NC course registration in excess of the applicable maximum will be considered a registration for a letter grade. Hours from courses graded CR/NC as a matter of policy (courses producing one credit hour or less) will not be included in the total.

2. A student may not exercise a CR/NC option in Writing 1010 or Writing 2010, in any General Education Core Course, or in courses which are required for the baccalaureate degree by the student's major department. However, a student's major department may allow the student to exercise the CR/NC option in required allied courses taken outside the student's major department. In the event a student changes his/her major department, the student may request that a maximum of two courses previously taken in the department (constituting the student's new major) on a Credit/No Credit basis be changed to a letter grade. This option can be exercised for no more than two changes of a major department (i.e., a maximum of four courses).

3. The CR/NC option must be initiated at the Office of the Registrar on the form prescribed by the Registrar for that purpose. Requests for changing to the CR/NC option will not be accepted after the 14 calendar day of the semester. Change from CR/NC back to graded status may occur any time before the Monday of the last week of classes. The hours for any class thus changed will continue to count toward the maximum specified in paragraph (1) above. If a student feels there is justification for an exception to the preceding restriction, the student must appeal in writing to the Registrar. If the request is denied, the
A student will have the right to request a review of the denial by a committee composed of the student's college dean, the director of University College, and the Registrar. Appeals will not be accepted after the semester is completed. Retroactive requests must be initiated by the dean of a student's major college.

4. Final grade sheets will not indicate which students have exercised CR/NC options. The Registrar will convert the letter grades "A" through "C-" to credit, and "D+," "D," "D-," "E," and "EU" to no credit.

5. A statement must accompany each form prescribed by the Registrar for CR/NC options advising students of the various disadvantages of taking many classes CR/NC. Specifically, they should be warned that some graduate schools consider "credit" grades as "C" work when looking at transcripts and that some schools place more emphasis on exams such as the G.R.E. than on transcript grade point averages when those transcripts contain numerous grades of "credit."

6. When students change majors, their new major department will have the right to accept or not to accept, in partial satisfaction of the department's requirements for graduation, courses in that department which the students have previously taken on a CR/NC basis.

7. Students shall have earned letter grades in not less than 75 percent of the credit hours of course work that they present as their minor for teaching certification.

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

A. Policies

   Policy 6-100
B. Procedures [reserved]
C. Guidelines [reserved]
D. Forms [reserved]
E. Other related resources [reserved]

V. Contacts:

Policy Officers:
   Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs, 801-581-5057
   Sr. Vice President for Health Science, 801-581-7480
Policy Owner:
   Sr. Associate Vice President - Undergraduate Studies, 801-585-3582

VI. History
Policy 6-101: Undergraduate Study and Degrees [Revision 10 11]  
{Effective Date ??}

I. Purpose and Scope

(Reserved)

II. Definitions

Catalog Year means the set of requirements in place at the beginning of fall semester and running through the end of the following summer semester.

III. Policy: Undergraduate Study and Degrees

Section 1A. (Reserved)

Section 2B. (Reserved)

Section 3C. Awarding of Diplomas and Degrees

Undergraduate certificates, diplomas and degrees may be earned and awarded at the conclusion of each semester, and regular commencement exercises may be held at the end of each semester. However, the regular annual commencement exercises shall occur at the conclusion of the spring semester.

Section 4D. Semester Credit Hours & Residency Requirements

To receive a baccalaureate degree from the University of Utah, a student must complete at least 122 semester credit hours and any additional hours required by a department or college. Of these hours, at least 40 credit hours must be upper division work (students pursuing a Bachelor of University Studies Degree must complete at least 56), and at least 30 semester credit hours must be earned from the University of Utah, regardless of the number of semester credit hours transferred or earned elsewhere. In addition, at least 20 of the last 30 semester credit hours earned toward the degree must be earned from the University of Utah. [Policy 6-404, Section 7.] Undergraduate Admission, discusses the limitations of applying course work done as a non-matriculated student to graduation requirements for matriculated students. Additional credit hours or residency requirements may be established by a department or college, with the approval of the appropriate college council. Any requirements greater
than 130 hours or any change to residency requirements will require approval of the Academic Senate.

Section 5E. Scholastic Average Required

Each candidate for a baccalaureate degree must maintain a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or above for the total number of semester credit hours earned at the University of Utah. Accepted transfer work shall not be considered in computing the cumulative grade point average.

A cumulative grade point average of 2.0 will constitute the university minimum standard for all course work required by the student's major department. A department or college, with the approval of the appropriate college council and the Undergraduate Council, may establish higher minimum grade criteria or other measures of aptitude or achievement to be used as relevant criteria for admission, retention or graduation in that department or college. The higher criteria must be reported to the Academic Senate.

Section 6F. Catalog Rights

Each candidate for a baccalaureate degree may elect to satisfy the set of requirements for Majors, minors and certificate programs in effect at the time of declaration or any more recent set of requirements. However, in no case may a student select a set of requirements that was in effect more than 4 years prior to the catalog year in effect at the time of graduation.

Colleges and departments can make changes to majors, minors, and certificates once a year. Such changes must be communicated to the Office of Curriculum Administration in the manner and by the date established by the University Curriculum Policy Review Board (See Policy 6-003-III, Section 2-B-3). Such changes will take effect the following fall semester, which is the start of the new catalog year.

Section 7G. General Education and Baccalaureate Degree Requirements for Graduation

General Education Requirements. All students shall meet general education requirements as required by state law, approved by the Academic Senate and administered by the Undergraduate Council. Current lists of the requirements, approved courses for meeting them, criteria for course selection, and Undergraduate Council members are available through the Office of Undergraduate Studies. Utah System of Higher Education Policies and Procedures [No. R470-3], General Education Policy, discusses state policies regarding general education.
Transfer students who have completed courses in the college of their previous registration that are deemed equivalent, by either statewide or institutional articulation agreements, to courses in the general education program of the University of Utah will have those courses applied to the requirements. Transfer students who enter the university from an institution in the Utah System of Higher Education will have completed the general education program of the University of Utah if they have completed the general education program of the college of their previous registration, as evidenced by proper documentation. Utah System of Higher Education Policies and Procedures [No. R470-7], Transfer of Credits, discusses state policies regarding general education.

Baccalaureate Degree Requirements. All students graduating from the University of Utah shall meet the Baccalaureate Degree Requirements as approved by the Academic Senate and administered by the Undergraduate Council. Current lists of the requirements, approved courses for meeting them, criteria for course selection, and Undergraduate Council members are available through the Office of Undergraduate Studies.

Section 7AH. Majors and Minors

Majors and minors shall be designated as follows: department majors, interdisciplinary majors, teaching majors, composite teaching majors, department minors, interdisciplinary minors, and teaching minors. Upon selecting a major and/or minor students must contact the appropriate departments for official declaration.

A department major or teaching major is a course of study within a department or in a subject totaling not fewer than 30 semester credit hours. A teaching major is designed to prepare students to teach this subject at the secondary school level. The requirements shall rest with the department concerned. Minimum grade requirements are governed by Section 5 of this chapter [Part III-E of this Policy].

An interdisciplinary major or interdepartmental composite teaching major is a course of study within one or more departments and may be offered either (1) when the major department offers regularly fewer than 30 semester credit hours, or (2) when such a combination of courses is desirable. The requirements shall rest with the departments concerned. Minimum grade requirements are governed by [Part III-E of this Policy] Section 5 of this chapter.

A department minor may be offered by a department with enough undergraduate courses in its curriculum from which to structure a list of courses totaling not less than 16 semester credit hours, including a minimum of 6 upper division semester credit hours.
An interdisciplinary minor of not less than 16 semester credit hours, including a minimum of 6 upper division semester credit hours, may be offered by two or more cooperating departments. If the cooperating departments all belong to the same college, that college shall be responsible for the organization and administration of the interdisciplinary minor. If the cooperating departments belong to two or more colleges, the Academic Senate shall be responsible for approving a plan for the organization and administration of the interdisciplinary minor.

A teaching minor is a course of study within a department or in a subject designed to prepare students to teach this subject at the secondary school level. This minor shall comprise not less than 18 semester credit hours. The requirements shall rest with the department concerned. In order to be awarded a teaching minor, a student must be awarded a teaching major at the same time. Teaching majors, composite teaching majors, and teaching minors are governed by the University Council on Teacher Education, in conjunction with the Academic Senate (See Policy 6-105, Section 11).

Any student seeking a baccalaureate degree may take one or more structured minors. A department minor must be outside a student's major department. An interdisciplinary minor may include a student's major department. Completion of a minor shall not be a requirement for graduation. A minor is an attribute of an undergraduate degree, not an entity by itself; therefore it can only be received at the same time a student graduates with a major.

Departments shall specify the requirements of all their majors and minors in the department section of the printed and online catalogs, and in the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS). The requirements a student completes are governed by the catalog rights policy as outlined in Part III-F of this Policy, Section 6 above.

Section 7B1. Application for Graduation

Each candidate for a baccalaureate degree should consult a departmental advisor regarding the graduation application process and deadline dates. The Registrar's Office is responsible for establishing graduation application requirements and deadlines. Filing an application for graduation by the deadline is required to ensure that a detailed analysis of each candidate's transcript can be completed in time for graduation.

J. Special Examinations  [Drafting Note: The contents of Parts J on Special Examinations and K on Comprehensive Examinations previously appeared as part of Policy 6-100—III-F, and are now moved here to 6-101 and slightly reorganized—but otherwise are not substantively changed. These topics are simply more appropriate for inclusion here in 6-101 regarding overall]
undergraduate degree requirements rather than 6-100, which focuses on individual courses.)

1. A maximum of 32 semester credit hours in areas other than foreign languages and in addition a maximum of 25 credit hours in foreign languages may be allowed by special examination toward a bachelor’s degree to a resident student, provided the student has shown proficiency in the subject to the satisfaction of the Credits and Admissions Committee and the appropriate dean or chairperson of the department concerned.

2. Special examinations for college credit shall not be given in courses not offered by the University or in courses which the student has attended as an auditor or for which credit has been received.

K. Comprehensive Examinations
At the discretion of the department, each candidate for graduation with a baccalaureate degree may be required to pass a comprehensive examination (written, oral, or both) in the candidate's field of concentration. This examination shall not excuse the candidate from any regular examination.

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

A. Rules
B. Procedures
C. Guidelines
D. Forms
E. Other related resource materials

V. References:

Policy 6-003, Section 2.B.3, University Curriculum Policy Review Board, discusses the constitution and role of the University Curriculum Policy Review Board.

Policy 6-404, Section 7, Undergraduate Admission, discusses the limitations of applying course work completed as a non-matriculated student to graduation requirements for matriculated students.

Policy 6-105, Section 11, Requirements for Graduation from the Graduate School of Education, discusses the role of the University Council on Teacher Education.

Utah System of Higher Education Policies and Procedures No. R470-3 & R470-7, General Education, Course Numbering, Lower-Division Pre-Major Requirements, Transfer of Credits, and Credit by Examination, discusses state policies regarding general education and transfer of credits.
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RE: Change to Regulation 6-001 (Faculties, Committees and Councils)

Since the makeup of the Undergraduate Council is exhaustively stipulated in University Regulation 6-001, Sec. 6, the decision by the College of Pharmacy to no longer be represented on the Undergraduate Council requires a change to this section of the policy. In addition to striking “Pharmacy” from the list of colleges with voting members, we are elevating the representative from Honors (now the Honors College) from an ex officio to a voting member, since they make a significant contribution to undergraduate education.

Also, we have taken this opportunity to make a few editorial changes to the Regulation, to bring it in compliance with the new numbering and formatting schema for University Regulations.

If you approve of our recommended changes, then we ask that you forward the revised 6-001 on the the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for their consideration.
To: A. Lorris Betz, M.D., Ph.D.
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
Executive Dean, School of Medicine
CEO, University of Utah Health Care
5th Floor Clinical Neuroscience Center
University of Utah

David W. Pershing, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
201 S. Presidents Circle, Room 205
University of Utah

Re: Amendment of Policy 6-001, Section 6
regarding College of Pharmacy Participation
on the Undergraduate Council

Dear Lorris and Dave,

I am appending an excerpt from Policy 6-001: Faculties, Committees and Councils:

“SECTION 6. Undergraduate Council

The Undergraduate Council consists of one elected faculty representative from each college offering undergraduate degrees and making a significant contribution to undergraduate education across the campus (Architecture, Business, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Health, Humanities, Mines & Earth Science, Nursing, Pharmacy, Science, and Social and Behavioral Science)”

When this policy was written, Pharmacy offered a Bachelors of Pharmacy degree, because it was the principal degree required by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE) for professional practice. In 2004/05 the ACPE mandated that the entry level degree for licensing and professional practice be a Doctor of Pharmacy. As a result, the College eliminated the baccalaureate degree and revised its curriculum to establish a Doctor of Pharmacy Program. Now, all degrees offered by the College of Pharmacy are graduate degrees, and all of our students regardless of their program enter through the graduate school. In fact only one course in the
College (PHTX 2700, Common Medicines).

Thus, I propose that Policy 6-001, Section 6 be revised with the removal of Pharmacy from the list of participating Colleges.

Removing the College of Pharmacy from the Undergraduate Council would make the policy consistent for Colleges on Campus that only offer graduate degrees. Specifically, Law and Medicine are not on the Council. It is my understanding from discussions with Bob Flores that if you endorse this request it will be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Senate for discussion and hopefully approval.

Sincerely,

Chris M. Ireland
Professor and Interim Dean
Policy 6-001: Faculties, Committees and Councils
Revision #17, Effective: [???]

I. Purpose and Scope

(Reserved)

II. Definitions

(Reserved)

III. Policy

SECTION 1A. Composition and Authority of the University Faculty

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

The university faculty shall have authority, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, to legislate on matters of educational policy, to enact such rules and regulations as it may deem desirable to promote or enforce such policies, and to decide upon curricula and new courses of study involving relations between schools and colleges or departments. The faculty has a right to a meaningful role in the governance of the university including primary responsibility for course content and materials, degree requirements and curriculum; it has a right to participate in decisions relating to the general academic operations of the university including budget decisions and administrative appointments. Substantial alterations in existing operations, i.e., establishment of a branch, extension center, college, professional school, division, institute, department or any new program in instruction, research, or public services, or any new degree, diploma, or certificate, shall not be made without prior approval of the State Board of Regents. Utah Code Ann. 53B-16-102(4) (1994). The legislative power will normally be exercised by the faculty through their representatives in the Academic Senate and the college or area councils, except that the voting members of the university faculty shall have the appellate power to review all actions affecting educational policy.

SECTION 2B. Composition and Authority of the Academic Senate

There shall be an Academic Senate constituted as provided in the Faculty Regulations.

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

The Academic Senate shall also have the following powers:

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

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

3. to propose to the Board of Trustees amendments or additions to the University Regulations for the government of the university.

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

The university president shall also inform the Academic Senate of all resignations. Any faculty member shall have the right to request the review of any resignation. Each request for such a review must be referred to the Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee for proceedings a described in Policy 6-302, Sec.6.

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

SECTION 3C. Composition and Authority of University Committees

The Academic Senate shall establish an Executive Committee to include the following voting members: ten faculty members elected annually from the Senate's elected membership to serve one year, the ASUU president, a graduate and an undergraduate representative from the student Academic Senators, one of whom shall be the Student Senate Chair and the other of whom shall be selected by the Student Senate; and the President of the Academic Senate. The President of the Academic Senate shall chair the
committee but shall vote only when necessary to prevent an equal division of the committee. The ex officio, non-voting members will include the university president, the vice president for academic affairs and the vice president for health sciences or their designees, the president-elect of the Academic Senate, and the past-president of the Academic Senate.

The Executive Committee shall screen and review matters for the Academic Senate and perform other functions as assigned to it by Regulations or by action of the Academic Senate. (See Policy 6-300, et. seq., Faculty Regulations.)

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

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

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

The university president shall appoint, before the opening of the academic year, such standing committees as the work of the university may require. Special committees may be appointed at any time as the university president may deem wise, which shall report to the faculty, or to the appropriate council, or to the university president the progress of their work and their recommendations.

The University President, Administration or Academic Senate will notify the Personnel and Elections Committee about the creation of any university-wide standing committees. Upon the creation of a university-wide standing committee, the Personnel and Elections Committee will review the committee charter and membership requirements, and shall make any requested nominations.

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

SECTION 4D. Composition and Authority of School and College Faculties
A school or college faculty shall consist of the dean of the school or college and such members of the staffs of departments pursuing research or offering a major, a teaching major, or prescribed work in the school or college as are eligible to membership in the university faculty. If a department serves more than one school or college, the department chairperson may designate a staff member to represent the department at meetings of the faculties of schools or colleges other than that to which the department is assigned for administrative purposes without abrogating the right of other members of the department to participate and vote in the meetings of such faculties. The president shall be an ex officio member of all school and college faculties.

In accord with Policy 6-003 college or area councils shall be created by the colleges of the university with compositions defined by the colleges involved, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. College or area councils may include councils serving more than one college where appropriate. Such councils shall have decision-making authority, as stated in Faculty Regulations, subject to review by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and subject to the power of the Academic Senate to legislate on matters of general university concern.

SECTION-5E. Composition and Authority of Graduate Council

The Graduate Council supervises graduate study at the University of Utah. It is responsible for the review and evaluation of all existing departments and programs that award graduate and undergraduate degrees and certificates. The Undergraduate Council participates with the Graduate Council in the review of undergraduate programs based in departments awarding graduate degrees. The Graduate Council also reviews and evaluates proposals for new graduate degrees and certificates; academic administrative units (e.g., departments, divisions); centers, institutes and bureaus and proposals for name changes or major revisions of the preceding. It assumes other responsibilities as established by University or Board of Regents Policy. The administration of professional degrees may be delegated by the Graduate Council to colleges, schools, or departments.

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

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

SECTION-6E. Undergraduate Council

The Undergraduate Council consists of one elected faculty representative from each college offering undergraduate degrees and making a significant contribution to
undergraduate education across the campus (Architecture, Business, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Health, Humanities, Mines & Earth Science, Nursing, Pharmacy, Science, and Social and Behavioral Science), a second elected representative from three colleges (Humanities, Science, and Social and Behavioral Science), one elected representative from the University Libraries, one elected representative from the Honors College, and an appointed representative of interdisciplinary programs and three undergraduate students each representing a different college and recommended by ASUU, two of which shall come from the Student Senate. Elected members of the Undergraduate Council shall serve for three-year terms. Ex-officio non-voting members shall come from: Enrollment Management (Student Affairs), the Academic Outreach and Continuing Education, Academic Advising, Honors-the Graduate School, University Professor(s), and administrators in Undergraduate Studies; other ex officio non-voting members may be added as deemed necessary by the Associate Academic Vice President for Undergraduate Studies. The Associate Academic Vice President for Undergraduate Studies or a person so designated by that office shall chair the Council. The Council shall report directly to the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs through the Associate Academic Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the academic policies and Procedures recommended by the Council shall be subject to approval through the regular governance process.

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

SECTION 7G. University of Utah Libraries - Policy Statement for Their Government and Administration

A-1. Administrative Units in the University Library System
Marriott Library and its branches are operated under the administrative jurisdiction of the Director of Libraries. The Law and Health Sciences Libraries are autonomous administrative units, are located on the sites of their respective schools and have their own directors, who shall cooperate closely with their faculties in the development and maintenance of their collections and make these available to researchers in related fields. The following regulations pertain essentially to the operations of the Marriott Library.

B-2. The Marriott Library Collections

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

C-3. “Area Collections” in Marriott Library

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

D-4. Departmental or Branch Libraries

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

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

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

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

**E. Library Policy Advisory Committee (LPAC)**

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

**F. The Director of Libraries**

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

**G. Duties of the Director**

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

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

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

3. **c.** Present to the university administration the needs of the various collections and shall prepare and submit library budget requests and recommendations, after consultation with the library staff and LPAC.

4. **d.** Work closely with LPAC, the office of facilities planning, with architects and academic units in developing plans for expansion, addition or remodeling of the physical plant or the utilization of space in the libraries when changes become necessary.
5-e. Present for action by LPAC and the vice president for academic affairs such plans for expansion and addition of buildings or other major changes in library operations.

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

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

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

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

IV. Changes in Instructional and Research Programs Affecting the Library

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

IV. University Archives

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

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

A. Rules

B. Procedures
C. Guidelines
D. Forms
E. Other related resource materials

V. References:
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May 6, 2010

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

Dear Vice President Pershing,

Enclosed is the proposal for the University of Utah Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU) which was approved by the Graduate Council on March 29, 2010. 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,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
Proposal to Establish the CENTER FOR PARALLELISM AT UTAH (CPU)

Institution Submitting Proposal: The University of Utah

College(s) in Which the Unit Will Be Located: COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Department(s) in Which the Unit Will Be Located: SCHOOL OF COMPUTING

Proposed Beginning Date: JANUARY 1, 2010

Institutional Signatures (as appropriate):

[Signature]
Department Chair
11/20/09

[Signature]
College Dean
11/20/09

[Signature]
Graduate School Dean
5/4/2010

[Signature]
Sr. Vice President
5/12/10

[Signature]
President
5/12/10

Procedures for approvals of Centers, Institutes and Bureaus are established by the Utah State Board of Regents Policy R-401 (http://www.utahsbr.edu/policy/R401.pdf)

One hard copy of this signature page should be signed by the Chair and Dean and forwarded with the proposal to the Graduate School. An electronic copy of the proposal in Microsoft Word format is required.
Proposal to Establish the CENTER FOR PARALLEL COMPUTING AT UTAH (CPU)

Section I: Request
This request is for the establishment of the Center for Parallel computing at Utah (hereinafter referred to as ‘CPU’). CPU will address several critical needs in the growth of our university, including: (1) channeling the vast array of talent that our university has in the area of parallel computing, and representing this collective strength to external organizations; (2) helping advance our capabilities in parallel computing by obtaining external resources and enhancing the placement of our students; (3) enriching the talent pool in parallel computing within the university and the Utah region, ultimately leading to the growth of local high-tech jobs; and (4) enhancing our outreach, including addressing the critical international dimension of the high technology enterprise.

Section II: Need
The primary motivation for creating such a center stems from the fact that we live in a world where computers and computation underlie all human activities: from weather prediction done by powerful supercomputers, data storage on Cloud Computing facilities that are often larger than a dozen football fields, all of Science and Engineering research that is conducted on multi-million and billion dollar supercomputers, all the way to personal communication devices (e.g., the iPhone) which are being sold in counts of billions. In this context, the scientific community is faced with one fundamental fact: all continued advances in computing at all these scales – from personal communication devices to billion-dollar supercomputers – depends on our ability to develop high-performance parallel / concurrent programs that compute correctly, cause the computers to consume the least amount of electrical energy, and deliver answers that are accurate. That is, the whole approach to programming these computers must change! In other words, (1) we must re-educate every student and every practitioner of programming, (2) we must invent new ways to develop the electronics that underlies these computers, (3) we must develop and teach parallel programming approaches that work best for each problem, and (4) we must show that large-scale problems – such as modeling the whole human body at a cellular level for studying the susceptibility of cells to electromagnetic radiation – must be feasible in days, and not centuries as today’s computing capacities would deliver. This is widely acknowledged by the scientific community to be a crisis that equals the very crises that large-scale computing is being used for – such as earthquake prediction.

The most fascinating aspects of the aforesaid crises is that in order to address them, not only must Computer Scientists help address the energy-related challenges and parallel programming challenges, but also that application developers – researchers and engineers specialized in branches of engineering (e.g., Mechanical, Chemical, Electrical) and sciences (e.g., Atmospheric Science, Physics, Chemistry) – must inform Computer Scientists about relevant and growing computational demands such as what applications must be run at scale and what the societal demands for communication and privacy are. Ultimately it is application developers who will be playing a key role in shaping future computer hardware, software, and applications.
The organizational structure of CPU will be as follows. There will be a Director who is elected from among the Active Members of CPU. The director will hold a term of one year, and can be re-appointed an indefinite number of times. *Active Members are mostly those who are requesting the formation of CPU, and will be limited to 10 members.* These members are expected to devote significant amounts of time and energy to the operation (and ultimately to the success) of CPU. There will also be Primary Affiliated Members associated with CPU. These members will either express a strong interest and/or possess international fame in the subject area of CPU. Additional active members or primary members will be inducted by serving active members based on either (1) requests originated by the aspiring active/primary members, or (2) the initiative of one or more serving active members. An External Advisory Board will help CPU project itself to the outside world, help launch initiatives and collaborative ventures, and help garner resources. All members shall seek the widest possible outreach and collaboration, including at the international level. An exciting opportunity for such international collaboration was brought to light during the recently held Indo/US Workshop on High Performance Computing, held in Bangalore, India, on December 9th and 10th, 2009 (detailed in Section III).

The active members seeking the formation of CPU are: Professors Rajeev Balasubramonian, Martin Berzins, Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, Mary Hall, Robert M. Kirby, Matthew Might, and John Regehr, all of the School of Computing, University of Utah. *Based on a majority vote, Ganesh Gopalakrishnan has been appointed Director for the 2010-2011 term.* In addition, Professor James Sutherland (ChemE) will serve as an Active Member. We believe that this involvement broadens our agenda and includes a leading edge Parallel Applications Developer who can provide valuable directions for the Center. The list of Primary Affiliated Members to date include: Professors Alan Davis, Erik Brunvand, and Matthew Flatt (SoC), Gianluca Lazzi (ECE), Tim Ameel (ME), Julio Facelli (Biomed Informatics), and Milind Deo (ChemE).

We have obtained letters of support from potential External Advisory Board members including researchers from Microsoft, Intel, IBM, Freescale, Polycore, NEC, Argonne National Laboratory, Hewlett-Packard, and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. These letter writers as well as more such researchers from companies such as Nvidia, IBM’s Austin Research Laboratory, Cray, and Samsung will be invited to be members of our EAB. International EAB members from the Indian Institute of Science in Bangalore, India, and IBM locations in Bangalore and New Delhi will be invited, especially to promote Indo/US collaboration in High Performance Computing. This effort will ramify into other international locations as well.

CPU will maintain a comprehensive website to serve all its missions. Active members will meet in person or electronically with a frequency of at least once every month, and post the minutes of their meetings on the CPU website. The primary affiliated members and EAB members will be invited to meet, and will be sent updates. In addition we will invite EAB members once a year to participate in our showcasing event of research and achievements, and seek their formal evaluation of CPU. An Industrial Affiliates program (Section IV) is anticipated once sufficient relationships are cultivated.
Section III: Institutional Impact

While Parallel Computing is going on in several of the organizations and departments on campus, no existing organization has the reach and coordination of forces that CPU promises to bring about. A quote from the flagship journal of Computing says “Industry needs help from the research community to succeed in is recent dramatic shift to parallel computing. Failure could jeopardize both the IT industry and the portions of the economy that depend on rapidly improving information technology.” Given that Berkeley, Illinios, Stanford, Georgia Tech, and Rice have formed Centers for Parallel computing addressing these needs, it is imperative that we act with urgency to field Utah also in this extremely important area of national priority.

Members of the CPU will take advantage of their strengths and submit joint funding proposals. Given that future innovations in parallel computing will occur at the seams between areas, more collaborative projects will be launched, with the IAB advising us on critical areas of emphasis. The Utah Valley continues to nurture high-tech startups in several emerging areas. CPU will directly contribute to the creation of the necessary talent pool. Important areas of anticipated impact (with industries that stand to benefit from the CPU) include: Disney-Avalanche (computer games), Nvidia (GPU computing), Novell (networking and OS), and Microsoft. CPU will organize a regular seminar series and also offer Summer Institutes in MPI programming, Formal Verification, and CUDA/game programming.

CPU’s academic mission will include a strong emphasis on developing and disseminating new curricular material. There is an acute shortage of information on parallel programming techniques, verification techniques, and performance evaluation/tuning techniques. CPU will maintain a prominent web presence where educational resources in these areas will be maintained. It will invite EAB members to visit our campus and offer lectures on advanced topics which will tie into classes on parallel computing taught by CPU members and others.

In this Flat World, innovation has ceased to respect political boundaries. President Young continually emphasizes international outreach. As initial steps, Hall, Gopalakrishnan, and Balasubramanian participated in the NSF sponsored Indo/US Workshop on High Performance Computing organized in Bangalore. The growing needs of developing nations in rapidly acquiring the Parallel Computing technology and the mutual benefits that we stand to derive through exchanges is invaluable for our long-term viability. Just to list some statistics: India is in need of over 35,000 PhDs over the next five years. With the lack of local opportunities for training these PhDs, but having the economic climate to financially support exchanges, this Indo/Utah collaboration can be a harbinger for many more such international collaborations where Utah leads the nation.

Section IV: Finances

The CPU will have modest financial needs in its first few years to run its meetings, facilitate visits by its EAB members, organize seminars, and develop Summer Institutes. Its revenues will be obtained through returned overheads, industrial gifts, fees assessed for summer institutes, and eventually a well developed External Affiliates program that charges membership fees. In turn,
the External Affiliates Program will benefit its members with ready access to the parallel computing and applications technology being developed on campus.
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

November 25, 2009

To Whom it may Concern:

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support of the Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU) that has been proposed by Ganesh Gopalakrishnan and his colleagues in the School of Computing.

As computers have moved from single-processors to multi-processors, all of the issues with concurrencies that have made hardware design and programming difficult in the past are at the forefront again. The U has a strong group of faculty who work on various aspects of these problems: in addition to Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, Martin Berzins, Mary Hall, Robert Kirby, Rajeav Balaubramonian, John Regehr, and Matthew Might. By working together in a center, our faculty will be able to raise the profile of the group and secure larger research grants. Having a center will bring more attention to issues of concurrency on the educational side, as well.

It is my hope and expectation that establishing a Center for Parallelism at Utah will help to address the important hardware and software challenges of the next generation of computers, will facilitate collaboration among our faculty, and will grow the research enterprise in our School of Computing.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard B. Brown
19 March 2010

To the Graduate Council
University of Utah
CAMPUS

I am writing to convey my enthusiastic support for the creation of a Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU). This Center will serve as a place of encounter and collaboration of a team of faculty from your School of Computing including Professors Mary Hall and Ganesh Gopalakrishnan. I have known Professor Hall for many years and have the most positive impression of her. She has an excellent reputation built on numerous accomplishments. I recently met Prof. Gopalakrishnan during the Indo/US Workshop on High Performance Computing that I organized as part of the PPoPP 2009 conference in Bangalore, India. He made an excellent presentation at the workshop and made important contributions to the discussions. My conversations with him during the workshop, as well as his presentations clearly show that he is both knowledgeable and accomplished. The participation of Profs Hall and Gopalakrishnan in the organization of the proposed Center is a clear indication that this is a promising enterprise worth supporting.

Computer Science is at the dawn of a new era when parallelism will be the norm. Without the use of parallelism at all scales of computing -- from embedded communication devices such as cell phones to supercomputers -- no future advances in computational speeds can be expected. CPU will assemble talent that can impact this highly important area -- much like our own UPCRC Center at Illinois. I have also seen all the excellent testimonials received by CPU, and strongly endorse its formation.

Finally, I would like to highlight the unique opportunity that CPU has in making an international impact in high performance computing. Given the tremendous upsurge in India's HPC standing, CPU is in a position to tap into the talent pool and other resources available in India. I can easily foresee CPU's international activities blossoming beyond India, reaching into other countries enjoying growth and success in HPC. I wish the participants in CPU all success and look forward to many years of fruitful interactions.

Sincerely,

David Padua
Donald Biggar Willett Professor of Engineering
To the Graduate Council,
University of Utah,
CAMPUS

I am writing to convey my enthusiastic support for the Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU) being proposed jointly by Prof. Ganesh Gopalakrishnan of the School of Computing and several prominent faculty across campus. It is well known that computation and computers are fundamental to Science, Engineering and Medicine at a scale unprecedented in human history. Theories are put to test using computers; systems and processes are understood using computers; and day to day life depends on them. Most advances in biomedical sciences require novel computational approaches of increasing complexity. A situation that will not change as more high thought and full genome sequencing data becomes of common use.

A major inflection point has recently been reached in computing. All future computers must embrace parallelism at unprecedented levels. Without parallelism, no future advances in computational speeds can be expected. This means that we must learn to parallelize applications and not expect old codes to run faster merely riding the curve of the Moore's law. This cuts into all the new computer programs being developed by the scientific community. Unfortunately, the scientific community has not learned yet how to do this without introducing serious bugs, without consuming excessive amounts of energy, or without underutilizing hardware. It is imperative to train our students in these new areas of computational sciences.

CPU views this predicament as a real opportunity. Utah is renowned for its contributions in Engineering, Applied Sciences and Medicine. With faculty from across disciplines involved in CPU as Active Members, Primary Affiliated Members, or members of its External Advisory Board, we will build on each others’ strengths, be able to showcase our research with focus, and even reach out to the global community through an international focus. For these reasons, I view CPU as a timely effort and look forward to backing its efforts for years to come.

Sincerely,

Julio C. Facelli, Ph.D.

Professor and Vice Chair of Biomedical Informatics
Director Center for High Performance Computing
March 23, 2010

Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Computing
University of Utah

Dear Dr. Gopalakrishnan,

It is with great enthusiasm that I write to support the proposal to create the Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU). The CPU Center will promote collaboration amongst professionals working on computationally intensive problems, enhance external requests for computational resources, provide educational opportunities to students working with CPU professors, and enhance outreach. A number of faculty in the Department of Mechanical Engineering are currently engaged in research that requires significant computational resources. Most of these activities are using parallel processing to enhance computational efficiency. Examples of current computational in M.E. include: atmospheric modeling for particle dispersion, container dynamics in the event of explosions, and heat transfer enhancement using fluid structure interaction at the microscale. The last of these examples represents a problem that I am working on with NSF funding. Current simulations take days with 100s of processors. The need to develop parallel programming approaches to reduce computational time is very real. The CPU Center will provide the framework for University professionals to collaborate on the education of students in parallel programming, to develop new algorithms for parallel programming efficiency, and to develop proposals that are nationally competitive.

I believe the proposed Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU) will be a great addition to the College of Engineering and the University and will serve as a mechanism to expand interdisciplinary research. I look forward to working with you as you get the new Center underway.

Best Regards,

Tim Ameel
Professor and Chair
March 19, 2010

Dear Ganesh,

I am very pleased indeed to support the Center for Parallelism in Utah. Your proposed center brings together many strands of activity on campus and provides a focus for what is and what will be key areas of intellectual endeavor over the next decade.

My support is not without self-interest in that this center covers my own research. This notwithstanding your proposed center will be of both significant interest and serious practical research help to many across campus. As Chair of the University Cyber Infrastructure activity I know that the work of the proposed center will be of interest to this community. As Director I know that the Center for Parallelism will provide a focus for significant activity in the school and at the university. The center will strengthen and bring together individual research programs and will advance research in this important area.

Your center has my full and enthusiastic support.

Best,

[Signature]

Martin Berzins
Director
School of Computing
November 25, 2009

Subject: Support of Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU)

I am happy to express my support for the formation of the Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU). As a committer on the Eclipse Parallel Tools Platform, we have worked hard to assemble tools to assist users in developing, running, debugging, and analyzing parallel applications. Ganesh Gopalakrishnan and his undergraduate students (Alan Humphrey and Chris Derrick) have put forth a great deal of effort to contribute to this open-source Eclipse project, with the happy result that their Eclipse support for their MPI analysis system (ISP) is in the soon-to-be-released version of PTP from the Eclipse foundation.

This collaboration included inclusion of ISP and the Eclipse integration in the PTP full-day tutorial recently taught at Supercomputing 2009 in Portland, presented by Alan Humphrey. And we are co-authoring a paper on ISP and the Eclipse integration into PTP for the upcoming HiPS conference.

The research that went into development of the analysis of ISP, and the software engineering expertise that culminated in a working integration within the Eclipse and PTP environment are to be commended. Also their enthusiasm: it has been a joy to work with them and I look forward to future collaborations as well. ISP tackles a real-world problem of analyzing MPI codes, and they have worked hard to assure it works on large-scale projects, an importance as the scale of future applications is rising as the promise of larger parallel machines bears fruit.

The Center for Parallelism (CPU) proposed at Utah holds further assurance for future work, including research and collaboration with open-source projects and industry. Based on my work with Ganesh and his students, I am confident of the high quality of future work from this group. In conclusion, I enthusiastically support the proposed center and am certain that it will have the resources to support future research and collaboration with industry on increasingly complex problems at scale.

Sincerely,

Beth R. Tibbitts
Senior Software Engineer
IBM Systems and Technology Group
Committer, Eclipse Parallel Tools Platform (http://eclipse.org/ptp)
Email: tibbitts@us.ibm.com
March 5, 2010

Graduate Council
University of Utah
CAMPUS

Dear Council:

I would like to enthusiastically endorse the proposal for the Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU) headed by Prof. Ganesh Gopalakrishnan of the School of Computing and several prominent faculty across campus.

Research in Science and Engineering continues rely on computation and computers, at a scale unprecedented in history. However, the point has been reached were all future computers must embrace parallelism to advance computational speeds. This requires parallelizing applications, both old and new. Mature and stable codes of the past must be rewritten to exploit parallelism. Unfortunately, this transition may introduce serious bugs, consume excessive amounts of energy, or underutilize hardware. Researchers such as James Sutherland (Assistant Professor, Chemical Engineering) are already developing state-of-the-art algorithms requiring Exascale computing resources and the ability for him to extend collaborations with other members of the computing community, on campus and elsewhere, are imperative.

With faculty from across disciplines involved in CPU as Active Members, Primary Affiliated Members, or members of its External Advisory Board, CPU can build on opportunities and become a showcase for research and even reach out to the global community through an international focus. CPU is a needed and timely effort which the University should embrace. As stated above, I fully support the proposal and am happy to answer any additional questions.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Slama Lighty
Professor and Chair

Department of Chemical Engineering
50 S. Central Campus Dr., Rm. 3290
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
(901) 581-6915
November 18, 2009

School of Computing
Attn: Professor Ganesh Gopalakrishnan
50 S. Central Campus Dr. Rm. 3190
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

To whom it may concern:

Multicore and concurrent computing presents the opportunity of meeting our continuous demand for increasing performance and lower power consumption. However, it also substantially increases software complexity.

The gap between software and hardware is greater now than it has ever been during my 28 years in the computing industry. In fact, PolyCore Software was founded for the purpose of simplifying multicore.

Challenges of this magnitude requires further collaboration between and among academia and the industry. From my interactions with the University of Utah, primarily though Professor Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, I have some insight into their current research in the area of concurrency, which I believe is relevant and well positioned to help in reducing multicore complexity.

The formation of the Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU) would further strengthen the research in this area and the University of Utah’s position in an industry wide collaboration to address the hardware to software gap.

I therefore strongly support the proposed formation of CPU.

Sincerely,

Sven Brehmer
President & CEO
PolyCore Software, Inc.
November 9, 2009

Prof. Ganesh Gopalakrishnan
School of Computing
University of Utah
50 South Central Campus Drive, Room 3190 MEB
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9205

Dear Ganesh:

I am pleased to write a letter expressing my enthusiastic support for the formation of the Center for Parallelism at Utah, comprising several distinguished faculty members from your school, namely, Martin Benzina, Mary Hall, Robert M. Kirby, Rajeev Balaubramaniam, John Regher, Matthew Might and you.

The computing world has entered an era of increasing parallelism and concurrency at all levels. This shift is mandated by the increased power consumption of microprocessors. It is no longer possible to ride the performance curve by simply increasing the clock frequency of processors. Instead, all vendors are building chips with more and more cores, and it is up to the application software to profitably use the multiple cores. Concurrent programming has always been hard and is now being forced on all programmers. In this context, the formation of the Center for Parallelism at Utah is important and timely.

My colleagues and I in the Mathematics and Computer Science Division at Argonne National Laboratory have had a fruitful collaboration with you and Prof. Mike Kirby on applying formal verification techniques to detecting bugs in MPI and multithreaded programs. In fact, you were able to find a bug in one of our published algorithms that neither the paper's reviewers nor we knew of until your verification tool pointed it out. That example shows how difficult parallel programming really is and how easy it is to have undetected bugs in programs.

The team of faculty members you have put together is impressive and covers a broad spectrum of expertise, including applications, compilers, architecture, and formal methods. I am confident that high-quality research will come out of this center and that the center will train the next generation of parallel programmers and researchers. I look forward to the creation of the center and to continued collaboration with you in parallel computing.

Sincerely,

Ewing L. Lusk
Division Director

Ewing L. Lusk
Division Director
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my strongest support for the proposed Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU).

I am highly qualified to evaluate the proposed center. I lead the Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC) Application Development Environment Performance Team (ADEPT) at LLNL. In this role, I direct a team of approximately 15 staff members to provide advanced computing capabilities that serve key missions in the national interest. We conduct computer science research and development, with a primary focus on parallel computing as we rely heavily on supercomputers to accomplish our mission. Our research focuses on issues for large-scale computing systems, including performance analysis and modeling, memory systems, parallel programming models and power-aware computing.

We need considerable research to sustain our dramatic advances in computational capabilities. It already costs several million dollars for the annual electricity needs of our large scale systems and the community is aiming to attain a thousand-fold increase in computational capability in the next eight years but without a thousand-fold increase in energy costs. Parallel processing is the key advance needed to achieve our computational capability goals. CPU proposes to do exactly the kind of research needed to attain this level of computational efficiency per Watt, as well as a commensurate gain in the ease of programming and debugging parallel systems.

In a nutshell, future parallel processing must employ multiple (millions) of central processing unit cores. This huge scale will precipitate dramatic changes in both the types of hardware and software employed, and the applications that will be designed. The CPU team assembles some of the finest talent in parallel computing including formal verification, compilation, computer architecture, languages and frameworks, and high-end applications. CPU will advertise this already famous team to the world as a focus team assembled behind this critical issue of this century: how to harness parallelism in order to advance computing capabilities. My team has a particularly strong working relationship with the research team of Professor Gopalakrishnan whose student's summer internship has led to some of the advanced debugging techniques for parallel software that will be critical in the coming decade. We look forward to many such productive interactions with CPU.

In conclusion, I heartily support CPU and strongly believe that it will truly put the University of Utah on the international map, helping it bring in the necessary resources and international talent to solve future large scale parallel computing challenges.

Sincerely,

Bronis R. de Supinski
ASC ADEPT Leader
Center for Applied Scientific Computing
To whom it may concern:

It is my great pleasure to express my enthusiastic support for the formation of the Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU).

Intel has been a leader in the relentless drive of the Moore’s Law, which has unleashed enormous amount of parallelism in even the humblest computing devices. But parallelism is notoriously hard to harness. A paradigm shift in both hardware and software organization is needed before the potential that current and future semiconductor technologies make available can be fully exploited. I believe that CPU would be an ideal setting under which to conduct the kind of research that will eventually lead to such a paradigm shift.

My belief in the promise of CPU is based on my past collaboration and interaction with the faculty of the University of Utah, especially Professor Ganesh Gopalakrishnan. I have served as the industry mentor in multiple research projects that Ganesh led and helped to advise several of his former students. I am impressed by the quality of both the research and the students that Ganesh’s group produced, by his willingness to tackle real-world problems of interest to industry, and by his readiness to collaborate with industry liaisons and other faculty members.

In conclusion, I heartily support the proposed center and strongly believe that it will be well-positioned to address important and urgent research problems that not only my company but in fact the whole computing industry faces.

Sincerely yours,

Ching-Tsun Chou, Ph.D.
Principal Engineer
Platform Architecture Research
Microprocessor and Programming Research
Intel Labs
Intel Corporation
November 25, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

It is my pleasure to write this letter in strong support of the formation of the Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU).

I work in the Systems Analysis and Verification Group at NEC Laboratories in Princeton, New Jersey. My group has a strong interest in concurrency-related research activities, especially on the analysis of multi-core and parallel systems. Concurrent systems are notoriously difficult to design and to debug. There has been a surge of interest in tools and techniques for verifying their correctness. At the same time, concurrent systems have become ubiquitous in this new era of multi-core computers, which harness the computational power of multi-core and parallel architectures. I believe that a center like CPU (Center for Parallelism at Utah) would be an ideal environment to nurture ideas, facilitate collaborations, and incubate technologies that will lead to significant breakthroughs.

In the past few years, we have collaborated with Prof. Ganesh Gopalakrishnan and his group on developing techniques for analyzing concurrent programs. Prof. Gopalakrishnan is an expert in the areas of concurrency and formal methods, with many significant contributions. In addition to the high quality of their research results, I have been very impressed with their success in delivering useful software tools to the wider research and education community. Two of their recent software verification tools, Inspector and ISP, for example, have been very well received. We are always glad to hire his students as summer interns. In the summers of 2007 and 2008, his students Yu Yang and Guodong Li did excellent work with my group, which led to significant advancements in our research, and publication of four papers in top conferences in the area.

Prof. Gopalakrishnan is also widely acknowledged for his enthusiasm and leadership roles in the research community. Two recent workshops on EC2 (Exploiting Concurrency Efficiently and Correctly) that he helped to co-organize were very successful in attracting a large number of attendees, and in bringing together experts from different areas that relate to concurrency and parallel computing. Prof. Gopalakrishnan also recently served as the General Chair of the Workshop on Parallel and Distributed Systems (PADTAD 2009).

We look forward to future collaborations with Prof. Gopalakrishnan and other faculty at the University of Utah. We are particularly interested in applying trace-based analysis for monitoring and diagnosing concurrent programs, e.g., those using MPI (message-passing interface), NCAPI (multi-core API). I believe that the Center for Parallelism at Utah (CPU) would provide a great platform for our future collaborations.

In summary, I strongly support the proposed center. It holds great promise for achieving strong results and making significant contributions to important research problems facing the computer industry.

Sincerely,

Aarti Gupta, Ph.D.

Department Head, Systems Analysis & Verification, NEC Laboratories America
Phone: (609) 951-2966
Email: agupta@nec-labs.com
To: Academic Senate Office
From: The Office of Information Technology—contact Kevin Taylor 801-585-3314
Date: April 28, 2010

Enclosed, please find the proposed revised version of University Rule 4-002. This purpose of this Rule is to bring the University into compliance with the illegal file sharing provisions of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA).

In response to a request from the Academic Senate when it initially considered approval of this Rule in November 2009, it is proposed that Section C of this Rule be rewritten to address questions/concerns raised regarding the electronic process that may be followed by the University when performing responsibilities required by the HEOA. Specifically, the act requires the University of Utah to:

- Provide an annual disclosure informing students and other computer users of potential civil and criminal penalties; provides a summary of the penalties for violations of federal copyright law; and, a description of the University’s policies with respect to unauthorized peer-to-peer file sharing, including disciplinary actions.
  - We have implemented this provision by displaying the attached memo, “Illegal Sharing of Copyrighted Materials,” via the Campus Information System to all students, staff, and faculty.

- Develop plans to effectively combat the unauthorized distribution of copyrighted material, including through the use of a variety of technology-based deterrents and to suggest alternatives to illegal file sharing.
  - Note: We have complied with this provision by implementing technology deterrents in front of high risk areas including student housing and the open (unauthenticated) wireless system. Additionally, we have implemented a robust response process when we receive proper notification of a copyright infringement claim.
Also included in the Rule is the formalization of our copyright infringement claim process, as required under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA). The University has complied with the provisions of the DMCA since it became law. Section III(C) formalizes the requirements as a University Rule.

This Rule applies to all University of Utah students, faculty, and staff members. Also included with this Rule is a sample memo that may be used to communicate with members of the campus community.

The proposed revised version of the Rule has been approved by Stephen Hess, Chief Information Officer. It was also reviewed and approved by the Campus Information Technology Council. The President’s cabinet reviewed and approved the proposal as well.

For further information, please contact Kevin Taylor at 801-585-3314.

Approved by: ___________________  date: ______________
Memorandum

To: Stephen Hess, Chief Information Officer
From: Kevin Taylor
Date: April 28, 2010
RE: Proposed University Rule 4-002 (P2P compliance with the HEOA Act)

Attached for your consideration and approval is a proposal for a revised version of University Rule 4-002 which brings the University into compliance with illegal file sharing provisions of the Higher Education Opportunity Act.

The Rule has been reviewed by the University Institutional Policy Committee (IPC), the Information Technology Council, the Office of General Counsel, and the campus Privacy and Security Office.

If you approve of this proposal, it will then be forwarded to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for its review. The Executive Committee will make a determination as to whether or not this Rule has academic impact and will forward it to the Academic Senate with its recommendation.

It is proposed that this Rule become effective immediately upon completion of the action of the Senate.
University Rule 4-002 Revision 1  [Effective date: upon Senate approval]  
Compliance with Illegal File Sharing Provisions of the HEOA (Higher Education Opportunity Act)

I. Purpose
   A. This Rule outlines the requirements for meeting the safe-harbor provisions of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act and for implementing the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008.

II. References:
   A. Policy 4-002: Information Resources Policy
   B. Policy 4-004: University Information Technology Resource Security Policy
   C. Policy 7-013: Copyright Policy: Copying of Copyrighted Works
   D. Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998
   E. Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (PL 110-315)
   F. Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 Manager's Report
   G. Peer-To-Peer File Sharing Memorandum

III. Rule
   A. The University will provide an annual disclosure to all University of Utah students, faculty, and staff members that:
      1. Informs all students, faculty and staff members that unauthorized distribution of copyrighted material, including unauthorized peer-to-peer file sharing, may subject the students, faculty, or staff members to civil and criminal liabilities;
      2. Provides a summary of the penalties for violation of Federal copyright laws; and
      3. A description of the University's policies with respect to unauthorized peer-to-peer file sharing, including disciplinary actions that are taken against students, faculty, or staff members who engage in unauthorized distribution of copyrighted materials using the institution's information technology system.
   B. The University, under the direction of the Chief Information Officer or his or her designee:
      1. Shall develop plans to effectively combat the unauthorized distribution of copyrighted material, including through the use of a variety of technology-based deterrents.
      2. Will, to the extent practicable, suggest alternatives to illegal downloading or peer-to-peer distribution of intellectual property, as determined by the institution in consultation with the chief technology officer.
   C. Compliance with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998:
      1. Upon proper notification of a copyright infringement claim involving music, video, software, or other digital material, the University will take appropriate steps to remove the offending content as quickly as possible, and notify the alleged infringer of the claim.
      2. A first offense may result in loss of access to information resources until the end-user signs the Network Reinstatement form.
      3. A second or repeat offense by the same individual may result in termination of the end-users account and/or disciplinary action in accordance with University Regulation 5-111, Corrective Action and Termination Policy for Staff Employees,
4. **Pre-Litigation Notices from Copyright Owners:** If a pre-litigation notice is received by the University, the University [as a courtesy] shall attempt to identify the appropriate end-user and forward the pre-litigation letter to the end-user.

1. **Upon proper notification of a copyright infringement claim involving music, video, software or other digital material, the University will take appropriate steps to remove the offending content as quickly as possible, and notify the alleged infringer of the claim.** Where possible, the following process will be followed:
   a. **Quarantine the offending computing device from the University network,**
   b. **Redirect the user to a web page which will**
      i. explain the reason for the quarantine,
      ii. provide instructions on what steps the user may take to resolve the copyright infringement problem, and
      iii. provide an electronic form to the user which requires the user to acknowledge that they have received notice of a copyright infringement claim and that will take steps necessary to remove infringing materials from the University network.

2. **Where possible, quarantine of a specific computing device does not result in the termination of user accounts.**

3. **A second or repeat offense by the same individual may result in termination of the end-user’s account and/or disciplinary action in accordance with University Policy 5-111, Corrective Action and Termination Policy for Staff Employees, University Policy 6-316, Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, or in accordance with University Policy 6-400, Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities.**

IV. **Contacts:**
   A. Policy Officer: Chief Information Officer, 801-581-3100
   B. Policy Owner: Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer, 801-587-9241
      compliance@utah.edu

V. **History:**
   Current version. Revision 1. Approved by the Chief Information Officer April 28, 2010. Reviewed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee June 1, 2010 and classified as academically significant. Approved by the Academic Senate [date pending ??? August 30, 2010]

   History of Revision 1. [link to the history document, cover memo]

   Prevision versions. Revision 0, approved by the Academic Senate November 2, 2009. [Link to revision 0].
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate
From: James E. Graves, Dean, College of Health
Subject: College of Health Council Charter
Date: May 18, 2010

I am pleased to provide the latest revision of the College of Health Council Charter. This document was revised by our College Council and approved by the faculty and me following the directives we received from Executive Senate in Spring, 2009. You will note a clean copy of our Charter, as well as a copy with edits, is included for review.

If you have any questions on the attached document, please do not hesitate to contact me at 581-8537.

[Signature]

Richard J. Sperry, MD, Ph.D.
Associate Vice President for Health Care
Associate Dean, School of Medicine
College of Health Council Charter

ARTICLE I: NAME

The name of this Council shall be the College of Health Council.

ARTICLE II: FUNCTIONS

The University of Utah College of Health Council (hereafter referred to as Council) is established as a part of University governance. Its function is to serve as the legislative body for the College in accordance with University Regulations. The Council may instruct its respective committees regarding academic policy and may approve, revise, or reject the recommendations of its committees. All powers residing in the Council that have been delegated to its committees may be retrieved by the Council at any time with a majority vote. The Council Charter shall be consistent with all University of Utah policies as contained in University Regulations.

The Council may recommend to the Academic Senate, through the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, new policies or policy modifications in relationship to any aspect of the University’s operation. All actions taken by the Council shall be reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and shall be subject to the power of the Senate to establish uniform policies and take final action on all matters of University concern.

ARTICLE III: MEMBERSHIP

Section A: Eligibility
Elected members of the Council shall be full-time (.75 FTE or greater) faculty, including tenured, tenure-track, or auxiliary, hereafter referred to as full time College faculty. Student representation shall be by full-time students in residence.

Section B: Representation
Faculty: Each department or division shall elect one member to the Council. Each elected member of the Council shall serve for a period of three years. Initially, terms of office will need to be staggered by department/division representation; as a term of office is completed, a new member will be elected for a full three-year term.

Department and division faculty members holding administrative appointments (i.e. department and division chairs, associate deans) are eligible to be elected by their respective department or division faculty to serve as voting faculty representatives.
**Dean:** The Dean of the College of Health shall serve on the Council as a non-voting, ex-officio member.

**Staff:** A full-time member of the College of Health staff shall be nominated and elected by the staff of the College to serve a one-year term as a non-voting member. Election of the staff representative will be coordinated by the Dean’s Office.

**Council’s Subcommittees:** The Academic Senators for the College of Health and each of the Council’s standing subcommittees (i.e., College Advisory, Computing Information Services, Curriculum, and Research) shall each elect one member to serve a one-year term as non-voting members of the Council.

**Chair:** The College faculty, (.75 FTE or greater) as a whole, shall elect a Chair for the Council for a two-year term. In the second year of service, the outgoing Chair will initiate a “call for nominations” seeking eligible nominees (tenured faculty member with prior Council experience). Each department representative on the Council will directly solicit eligible and interested tenured faculty within their department as potential candidates. The call for nominations will be initiated not less than five weeks prior to the final day of classes of the Spring Semester. The department representatives will forward the name(s) of nominees to the Chair. The retiring Chair will then forward the list of nominees to the Dean’s office no later than three weeks prior to the final day of classes. The Dean’s office will then conduct an online election allowing sufficient time for all eligible faculty to vote. The Dean’s office will oversee the execution of the election and counting of ballots. The results of the election will be announced at the annual Spring meeting of the College of Health.

**Student Representation:** One graduate and one undergraduate major student within the College shall be elected during the last meeting of the academic year by the College of Health Student Council for a one-year term, with each having full voting rights.

**Section C: Elections**
Council members are nominated and elected by departments or divisions during the Spring Semester preceding the appropriate term. Each term begins July 1 of the election year.

**ARTICLE IV: OFFICERS**

**Section A: Chair**
The College faculty shall elect a chair for the Council during the Spring Semester to serve a two-year term beginning July 1. A temporary chair will be appointed by the current Chair in the event of his/her absence.

**Section B: Recording Secretary**
A recording secretary shall be elected annually by the Council members from within their ranks.
Section C: Parliamentarian
A parliamentarian shall be elected annually by the Council members from within their ranks.

ARTICLE V: MEETINGS

Section A: Regular and Special Meetings
One regular meeting of the Council shall be scheduled each semester and as deemed necessary during the academic year. In the event that a member cannot be present, he/she may designate a department/division alternate from their faculty for that meeting.

A simple majority of the Council, or the Chair, may call a special College-wide faculty meeting. Notice regarding a special meeting must be provided to each faculty member at least three working days prior to the date of the meeting.

Meetings will be considered open to all interested faculty. Notice regarding regularly scheduled meetings must be provided to the College of Health faculty and staff at least one week prior to the meeting. Non-members may address the Council when invited to speak by an elected Council member and recognized by the Chair.

Section B: Robert’s Revised Rules of Order
Robert’s Revised Rules of Order shall be the authority for parliamentary procedure.

Section C: Minutes and Records of the Council
The recording secretary shall take minutes of all Council meetings, distribute such minutes to all Council members and keep records. The Council Chair will notify all College faculty members of meetings, notify appropriate committees and individuals of actions taken by the Council and distribute the agenda for each Council meeting.

Section D: Agenda
Agenda items may be submitted by any Council member or chair of a standing committee or special committee. Agenda items shall be submitted to the Chair seven (7) working days prior to the scheduled meeting and distributed five (5) working days prior to the meeting. The agenda shall be developed by and be the responsibility of the Chair of the Council.

Section E: Voting
The Chair of the Council shall be non-voting with the exception of casting the deciding vote in the event of a tie.

Motions or resolutions requiring a vote may only be presented by elected Council members, the Council Chair, or Chairs of standing or special committees duly constituted by the Council or Council Chair.

Upon request, any member of the Council may secure a ballot vote.
One-half of the voting members shall constitute a quorum. A simply majority of those voting is required to carry a motion.

Officially designated alternates shall have full parliamentary privileges during the session they attend.

ARTICLE VI: COMMITTEES

SECTION A: STRUCTURE
Membership on standing committees of the Council shall be elected by the College faculty (.75 FTE or greater) within their respective department or division. The Chair of each committee shall be elected by the respective committee members unless otherwise noted.

Special committees may be created as determined to be necessary by the Chair or by the Council. When formed by the Chair, the special committee shall be designated a task force; when formed by the Council, the special committee shall be designated an ad hoc committee.

Standing committees and special committees shall, in general, be (a) advisory; and (b) fact finding. The Committees shall provide an oral report to the faculty and Dean at the end of the year College meeting and shall make recommendations to the Council. Committees required by University Regulations will adhere to University policy in formation, charge, and reporting procedures.

SECTION B: MEMBERSHIP
Except for the College Advisory Committee (Section C, 1A) full-time College faculty (as defined in Article III, Section A) are eligible for full membership on committees as specified by University Policy 6-300-Sec.4-A.

Student representatives are eligible for membership on committees specified by University and College policy.

SECTION C: STANDING COMMITTEES

COLLEGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RETENTION PROMOTION AND TENURE (CAC)
Function: The function of the CAC is to suggest, debate, review and enact College policies governing retention, promotion, and tenure. The decisions of this Committee shall, with appropriate administrative approval, be College policy on these matters. When considering recommendations for retention, promotion, or tenure, the Committee shall evaluate candidates and present a recommendation that is (a) consistent with the criteria established by the department/division making the recommendations; (b) consistent with College criteria (where available); and (c) in agreement with University Policy 6-303.

The College Advisory Committee shall review the file of each case referred to it and shall determine if the department/division reasonably applied its written criteria, standards and
procedures to each case. The College Committee shall make its recommendations on an individual’s retention, promotion, or tenure, based upon its assessment whether the department’s/division’s recommendations are supported by the evidence presented. The College Committee shall use the department’s/division’s criteria and standards in making their assessment. The College Committee shall advise the Dean in writing of its vote and recommendations. (University Policy 6-303-III-,G-,1-,d.)

**Membership:** The Committee shall consist of one member from each department/division, each of whom shall be tenured regular faculty as defined in University Policy 6-300. Committee members shall be elected by tenured and tenure track faculty of the department/division that they represent. In the event that no tenured faculty member for a particular department/division is available for service on the CAC, tenure track faculty of that department/division shall elect a representative from another department/division within the College or University who is a tenured faculty member. Such representatives shall serve a one year term. All other CAC members shall serve for a period of two years, with eligibility for re-election following each two-year term. Membership shall be arranged so that the term of office shall expire for approximately one-half of the Committee members each year.

Department and Division Chairs are eligible for election. Tenured faculty who serve as Associate Dean are eligible for election to the CAC. Associate Deans who participate as members of the CAC may not, however, also participate in consideration of candidates at the Dean’s level of review.

**Voting:** For retention recommendations, CAC members who are tenured, regardless of rank, are eligible to vote. For tenure recommendations, all CAC members, who are tenured, regardless of rank, are eligible to vote. For promotion recommendations, CAC members who are of equal or higher rank than the rank proposed for the candidate shall be eligible to vote.

**CAC ad hoc Committee on Promotions to Professor:** During years in which one or more candidates are under consideration for promotion to professor, a CAC ad hoc committee on Promotion to Professor shall be formed. The ad hoc committee shall consist of all full Professors (regular, not auxiliary) in the College. All members of the ad hoc committee shall be eligible to participate in discussions of and vote upon promotion of candidates to Professor. Results of the ad hoc committee’s actions shall be forwarded directly to the Dean. Members of the CAC, who are not full professors, do not participate in discussions of and are not eligible to vote upon candidates being considered for promotion to Professor.

CAC and ad hoc committee members who cast a vote on a particular candidate for retention, promotion or tenure at the department/division level are not eligible to cast a vote on retention, promotion or tenure for that candidate at the College level. CAC and ad hoc committee members who participate and vote at the department/division level may attend the College RPT meeting of the candidate under review from their department/division, to answer questions about the file that other CAC members may have, but they do not participate in the discussion and may not vote.
COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SERVICES COMMITTEE (CIS)

Membership: The Committee shall consist of one voting faculty member from each department/division in the College and one voting student representative. The faculty members shall serve a two-year term. The student member shall be elected by the CIS Committee members to one year terms from a list of nominees (one per department/division) provided by the respective Student Advisory Councils. The College Network Coordinator and Facilities Manager will serve as ad-hoc members.

Functions: The CIS Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Dean of the College of Health. In this role, the CIS Committee shall represent the College Faculty in all matters pertaining to the orderly, efficient, and effective operations of computers and associated information services and technology in the College.

Specific duties of the CIS Committee shall include:
Advise the Dean of the College, in a timely manner, on all matters relating to computing and information services.

Advise and recommend to the Dean, in a timely manner, the position of the faculty in response to any and all proposed computing and information systems policy and management decisions made by any level of College Administration.

Advise the Dean and represent the College faculty in all strategic planning for College computing and information services.

Advise the Dean regarding priorities for faculty and student computing and information services needs.

Prepare and submit to the Dean requests for software and hardware in the Student Computing Facility.

Prepare and submit to the Dean requests for instructional computing hardware to meet the needs of College faculty.

Assist the Dean, as needed, with preparing of institutional requests for computing resources.

Periodically evaluate and assess the level of computing and information service literacy, use and level of satisfaction among faculty, staff and students in the College.

Assist in the advancement of personal and professional computer literacy among College of Health faculty and staff through formal and informal seminars highlighting current uses and applications or by referral to University resources.

Respond to specific requests from the College Council and/or the Dean regarding any special computing and/or information service issues before the College.
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Membership: The Committee shall consist of one member from each department and division in the College. Committee members shall be elected by the faculty of the department/division that they represent. Each member shall serve for a period of two years. Membership shall be arranged so that the term of office shall expire for approximately one-half of the committee members each year. Department/division Chairs are ineligible for election.

Functions: Evaluate curriculum at the undergraduate and graduate levels relative to the College Mission, the goals and purposes of the University, and the needs of the professions and the community. The Committee has the delegated responsibility from the Council to approve/disapprove curriculum changes.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Membership: Members of the Research Committee shall be full-time (.75 FTE or greater) faculty, including tenured, tenure-track, or auxiliary, hereafter referred to as full-time College faculty.

Faculty: Each department or division Chair shall assign one member to the Research Committee from their respective department or division. Each member of the Research Committee shall serve for a three-year term for no more than two consecutive terms. Initially, terms of office will need to be staggered by department/division representation; as a term of office is completed, a new member will be assigned for a full three-year term. Members are assigned during the Spring Semester preceding the appropriate term. Each term begins July 1 of the assignment year.

Department/division faculty members holding administrative appointments (i.e. department or division chairs, associate deans) are eligible for the Research Committee. Subcommittees will be formed on an as-needed basis. These subcommittees will not necessarily be limited to Research Committee members.

Dean: The Dean of the College of Health shall serve on the Research Committee as a non-voting, ex-officio member. The College of Health Grants and Contracts Officer may serve as the designated alternate for the Dean.

Chair: The Research Committee, as a whole, shall elect a Chair for the Research Committee for a three-year term for no more than two consecutive terms. The Chair must be a tenured faculty member with prior membership on the Research Committee. The Chair will ensure that all parliamentary procedures are upheld. A temporary chair will be appointed by the Chair in the event of his/her absence.

Function: The College of Health Research Committee (hereafter referred to as Research Committee) is established as a part of University governance. Its function is to coordinate and implement the annual College of Health Research and Creative Grant Competition. It also
oversees and selects from a list of nominees those who will receive the College of Health Research Awards (every one to two years).

Voting:
- The Chair of the Research Committee shall have full-voting privileges.
- Motions or resolutions requiring a vote may only be presented by Research Committee members or the Research Committee Chair.
- Upon request, any member of the Research Committee may secure a ballot vote.
- One-half of the voting members shall constitute a quorum. A simple majority of those voting is required to carry a motion.
- Officially designated alternates shall have full parliamentary privileges during the session they attend.

**ARTICLE VII: LIAISON**

The Council shall maintain continuous liaison with the Dean and the College of Health’s Dean Advisory Council (DAC) so as to communicate on matters that are deemed important to the overall operation of the College.

**ARTICLE VIII: AMENDMENTS TO CHARTER**

The Charter may be amended by a two-thirds vote of Council members. Due written notice of proposed amendments must be submitted to each faculty member five working days prior to the meeting. Approved amendments to the Charter must be ratified by a majority vote of the full-time (.75 FTE or greater) College faculty, and finally approved by the Academic Senate Executive Committee (University Policy 6-003).

Approved:
10/29/2009  College Council
04/28/2010  College Faculty
08/02/2010  Academic Senate Executive Committee
May 7, 2010

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

RE: Graduate Council Review
   Department of Theatre

Dear Vice President Pershing:

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

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

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Gage Williams, Chair, Department of Theatre
    Raymond Tymas-Jones, Dean, College of Fine Arts
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Theatre. The External Review Committee included:

Carole Brandt, Ph.D.
Dean and Professor Emerita
Meadows School of the Arts
Southern Methodist University

Gorden O. Hedahl, Ph.D.
Professor
Communication Studies and Theatre Arts
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

Mark Shanda
Chair and Professor
Department of Theatre
Ohio State University

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Erin O’Connell
Associate Professor of Classics
Department of Languages and Literature

Jeff Metcalf
Assistant Professor
Department of English

Frances Friedrich
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology

This report of the Graduate Council is based on the self-study report submitted by the Department of Theatre, the findings of the internal and external review committees, comments from Gage Williams, Chair of the Department of Theatre, and comments from Raymond Tymas-Jones, Dean of the College of Fine Arts.
DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Department of Theatre is in the College of Fine Arts. The department offers a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in Theatre Studies, and three Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) degrees in Actor Training, Performing Arts and Design, and Stage Management. The department also offers a Master of Fine Arts (MFA) and a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Theatre that have been temporarily suspended. The department supports two auxiliary programs including Youth Theatre at the U and Salt Lake Shakespeare. Students and faculty members in the department also participate in the Classical Greek Theatre Festival.

The department’s administrative structure includes a department chair and faculty heads of the BA and BFA programs. The department chair and area heads constitute an executive committee that provides leadership for the department.

The previous Graduate Council review of the department identified several areas of needed improvement: (1) developing a strategic plan that could guide programmatic and curricular decisions; (2) developing a strategy to improve morale among faculty; (3) obtaining space that would meet the department’s classroom, rehearsal, and performance needs; (4) assessing the viability of the undergraduate and graduate programs; (5) establishing a cohesive department development program; and (6) improving programmatic and artistic relationships with the Pioneer Theatre Company (PTC). The department self-study report indicates that some steps have been taken to address these needs. However, both the internal and external review committees note that little progress has been made and that these issues continue to be of serious concern.

Faculty

The Department of Theatre has 9 tenure track, 3 clinical, and 19 auxiliary faculty members. Of the current tenure track faculty, 4 are full professors, 3 are associate professors, and 2 are assistant professors. There are 6 male and 3 female tenure track faculty members and among them are 8 Caucasians and 1 African-American. The clinical faculty consists of 2 males and 1 female, all of whom are Caucasian.

The faculty members in the department are respected scholars and practicing artists. The evidence suggests that the faculty members are strong teachers who garner a great deal of respect from their students.

The external reviewers expressed concerns about leadership roles assumed by some of the Assistant Professor and Clinical faculty members. The committee suggested that the department establish a faculty mentor program to support the professional development of these individuals. In addition, concerns were raised about the fact that most of the auxiliary faculty members have received their degrees either from the University of Utah or Brigham Young University. Further, some auxiliary faculty members do not hold academic degrees in the areas that they are being asked to teach. The external reviewers were concerned that these situations
might negatively impact the department’s ability to receive accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST).

**Students**

In 2007-2008 the department awarded 29 Bachelor degrees and no Master or Doctoral degrees. The number of undergraduate majors has dropped from 186 in 2004-2005 to 151 in 2007-2008. The number of undergraduate degrees awarded during the same period declined from 40 to 29. Finally, undergraduate student credit hours decreased by 24% (2,113) between 2004-2005 and 2008-2009. The department has had essentially no graduate student hour generation for the last five years. The vast majority of undergraduate majors are recruited from the state of Utah.

The available data suggest that undergraduate students are generally satisfied with the quality of their education and the level of support that they receive from faculty members. The department self-study report indicates that the majority of program graduates go on to work or pursue advanced graduate training in theatre-related areas.

The department provides over $60,000 in scholarship support per year to students. These scholarships range from $500 to $2,500 per year.

**Curriculum**

The undergraduate curriculum has several emphasis areas including theatre studies, the actor training program, performance arts and design, and stage management. In addition, students can pursue a secondary teaching endorsement in theatre as part of a BA or BFA degree program. The department also has minors in theatre and child drama.

The undergraduate programs share a common core of courses. However, the department offers an exceptionally high number of courses given the size of the faculty. Both the internal and external review committees expressed concern about the number of courses offered and the need to reexamine the scope of the core and the focus of the specialization areas.

Concerns were also raised about the alignment of the expertise and academic training of the faculty and the courses they are asked to teach. For example, the internal review committee noted that nearly half of the dramatic literature courses are taught by auxiliary faculty members who do not have academic degrees in this area. The external review committee also commented that in several cases tenure track faculty members were not teaching courses in their primary areas of expertise.

**Program Effectiveness and Outcome Assessment**

The department reports using several measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and determine graduate outcomes. These include student course evaluations, mid-
program assessments with area heads and faculty, a written exit questionnaire, exit interviews with the department chair, and informal follow-up with graduates by advisors. However, the only data provided by the department in the self-study were summaries of student course evaluations and a summary of graduate accomplishments reported by advisors. The external reviewers noted that the department does not have a culture of comprehensive program evaluation. For example, course syllabi do not include clearly articulated course objectives, there is no uniform process for carrying out mid-program assessments within or across emphasis areas, and formal graduate follow-up surveys are not conducted.

**Facilities and Resources**

The department’s offices, classrooms, and rehearsal spaces are located in the Performance Arts Building, Pioneer Memorial Theatre, and the West Institute. Performance space includes the Babcock Theatre in the Pioneer Memorial Theatre and Studio 115 in the Performance Arts Building. The department’s self-study report, and the internal and external review committees, expressed significant concerns about the adequacy of the current facilities. The primary issues are: (1) the location of faculty and staff in three buildings contributes to fragmentation among various parts of the program; (2) classroom space often does not match the requirements of courses; (3) rehearsal space is limited and not readily available to students and faculty; and (4) faculty members do not have adequate office space to carry out their work. An overarching concern is that the facilities of the department would fall short of meeting NAST accreditation standards in many areas.

**COMMENDATIONS**

1. The faculty in the department are productive and are actively engaged in local, regional, national, and international professional activities.
2. Strong regular faculty members are committed to the success of students.
3. Students report high levels of satisfaction with coursework and advising.
4. The department’s auxiliary faculty is extremely strong and make significant contributions to the quality of the degree programs.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. A critical need for the department, college, and university is to appoint and support a department chair who can effectively address the immediate problems facing the undergraduate and graduate programs, and provide the leadership necessary to secure the department’s long-term success.
2. The department should develop a comprehensive strategic plan that clearly articulates its mission within the university, long-term goals that will assure its success, and the specific steps that need to be taken to meet these goals. The plan should address a number of critical issues including the long-term viability of existing undergraduate and graduate programs; the match between degree programs that have potential for success and the make-up of the regular and auxiliary faculty; the contribution of programs such as Youth Theatre Utah and Greek Theatre Festival to the undergraduate and graduate programs; the relationship between the department and Pioneer Theatre Company and how this relationship can be leveraged to improve the quality of the undergraduate and graduate programs; and the development of physical space (e.g., shops, labs) needed to allow the department to meet its academic mission and to provide high quality undergraduate and graduate programs. The strategic plan should also incorporate specific strategies that will improve faculty morale such as increased faculty input on, and oversight of department governance.

3. The department should develop a cohesive strategy for continuously evaluating the effectiveness of the program in preparing students for their professional roles and advanced graduate study. The elements of the evaluation strategy should be formalized and the data gathered from these instruments and procedures should be reviewed annually by the faculty, department chair, and dean.

4. The department should hire an external consultant to assist in Professor Williams to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the strategic plan. The consultant should also assist the faculty to modify the strategic plan as necessary to ensure that targeted goals are achieved.

5. Based on the feedback from the internal and external review committees, the department postponed its scheduled NAST accreditation. While this action was logical given the circumstances, the department should reinitiate the accreditation process within two years. It is further recommended that the Graduate Council conduct an interim review of the department within the same time frame using the self-study report and other related materials developed for the NAST accreditation review.

6. The department, in conjunction with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity, should formulate and implement efforts to recruit women and minority faculty members and students in order achieve appropriate diversity. The use of annual reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the Department to work effectively toward this goal.

**ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW**

Actions taken by the department and the college in response to internal and external committee reviews are summarized in memos from Professor Gage Williams, Chair of the Department of Theatre (June 8, 2009) and Dean Tymas-Jones (July 31, 2009). The following actions have been taken in response to the internal and external committee reports:
1. Dean Tymas-Jones initiated several meetings with the faculty concerning the department’s leadership and the concerns raised in the internal and external committee reviews.

2. Dr. Carole Brandt was hired as a consultant to assist the department in addressing the concerns raised in the internal and external committee reviews and to prepare for NAST accreditation.

3. Professor Robert Nelson resigned as Chair and Professor Gage Williams was appointed as interim chair in January, 2009. Professor Williams was appointed department chair in June, 2009.

4. During spring semester 2009, the faculty participated in a series of meetings to develop a comprehensive strategic plan for the department. This process was facilitated by Dr. Carole Brandt. The memo from Professor Williams reports significant progress in developing a strategic plan.

5. The department has reviewed and adjusted the core curriculum to reflect the mission of the department. In addition, the number of courses offered by the department has been reduced.

6. Regular faculty teaching loads have been adjusted and these faculty members have taken on many of courses previously taught by auxiliary faculty members.

7. Professor Williams has initiated a series of meetings with staff from the Pioneer Theatre Company to improve collaboration between the department and the PTC.

8. The department has developed a preliminary plan to address the concerns raised by the review committees about facilities, with the emphasis being placed on remodeling and upgrading the existing physical space.

9. The department has put the NAST accreditation process on hold until more progress is made in addressing the concerns raised in the internal and external review committee reports.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council:

John McDonnell (Chair), Department of Special Education
Julie Fritz, Department of Physical Therapy
Robert Young, School of Architecture
### College of Fine Arts: Department of Theatre

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Theatre
Graduate Council Review 2008-09

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on December 10, 2009, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Theatre. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Raymond Tymas-Jones, Dean of the College of Fine Arts; Gage Williams, Chair of the Department of Theatre; 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 October 26, 2009. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

The wrap-up meeting began with a conversation about the status of the Department of Theatre’s graduate program. The Department of Theatre suspended all of its graduate degree programs during the period since its last Graduate Council Review in 2001. The dean of the College of Fine Arts and chair of Theatre report that the department has a set of issues that must be addressed before it reinstates graduate training. These include establishing financial stability in the department’s budget, increasing undergraduate SCH production, and creating a new undergraduate BFA in musical theatre. At that point the department will start to offer an MFA in directing. The estimate is that this will happen within two to three years of the date of this MOU. The department will provide the Graduate School with a plan to reinstate the MFA in directing by Spring semester, 2012. The department will also seek approval to remove the MFA degree in design from its catalog.

Recommendation 1: A critical need for the department, college, and university is to appoint and support a department chair who can effectively address the immediate problems facing the undergraduate and graduate programs, and provide the leadership necessary to secure the department’s long-term success.

The Dean of Fine Arts reports that this recommendation has been successfully achieved with the appointment of Gage Williams as chair.

Recommendation 2: The department should develop a comprehensive strategic plan that clearly articulates its mission within the university, long-term goals that will assure its success, and the specific steps that need to be taken to meet these goals. The plan should address a number of critical issues including the long-term viability of existing undergraduate and graduate programs; the match between degree programs that have potential for success and the make-up of the regular and auxiliary faculty; the contribution of programs such as Youth Theatre Utah and Greek Theatre Festival to the undergraduate
and graduate programs; the relationship between the department and Pioneer Theatre Company and how this relationship can be leveraged to improve the quality of the undergraduate and graduate programs; and the development of physical space (e.g., shops, labs) needed to allow the department to meet its academic mission and to provide high quality undergraduate and graduate programs. The strategic plan should also incorporate specific strategies that will improve faculty morale such as increased faculty input on, and oversight of department governance.

The department has revised its mission and vision statement as well as its RPT statement and procedures. The department will provide final versions of these documents to the Graduate School early in the Spring semester, 2010. The faculty also reviewed its curriculum with an eye to increase the number of regular faculty teaching the core courses in the major. The department is now working more collaboratively with Pioneer Memorial Theatre Company, including appointing PMT direction and production staff to adjunct teaching appointments, having PMT handle publicity for the department’s Babcock Theatre season, and receiving guidance from PMT on production budget issues.

**Recommendation 3:** The department should develop a cohesive strategy for continuously evaluating the effectiveness of the program in preparing students for their professional roles and advanced graduate study. The elements of the evaluation strategy should be formalized and the data gathered from these instruments and procedures should be reviewed annually by the faculty, department chair, and dean.

Although the department has collected data on student outcomes, it has not been stored in usable form. The department staff is now working on assembling and collating these data so that they can be used to implement program improvements. Three department faculty have taken on the task of consulting with the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence to develop procedures for evaluating learning outcomes.

**Recommendation 4:** The department should hire an external consultant to assist Professor Williams to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the strategic plan. The consultant should also assist the faculty to modify the strategic plan as necessary to ensure that targeted goals are achieved.

The department and college have worked for the past year with an outside consultant who helped the department develop its strategic plan. The new chair has attended workshops on program development and academic leadership. At this time the department feels confident that it has achieved a position where it can work independently in addressing the challenges that remain.

**Recommendation 5:** Based on the feedback from the internal and external review committees, the department postponed its scheduled NAST accreditation. While this action was logical given the circumstances, the department should reinitiate the accreditation process within two years. It is further recommended that the Graduate
Council conduct an interim review of the department within the same time frame using the self-study report and other related materials developed for the NAST accreditation review.

The Dean of Fine Arts states that the department will be in position for accreditation review in four years after it is stable and has had time to address its deficits. The Graduate School will conduct an interim program review in 2013.

**Recommendation 6:** The department, in conjunction with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity, should formulate and implement efforts to recruit women and minority faculty members and students in order to achieve appropriate diversity. The use of annual reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the department to work effectively toward this goal.

The department is concerned that this Graduate Council Review does not accurately reflect the diversity of the faculty, although it agrees that they should strive to create a more diverse teaching staff. Currently 4 of the 10 regular faculty are women and one is a minority. They have increased the diversity of their adjunct faculty through recent hires. When the department next has the opportunity to fill faculty positions they will work with the Associate Vice President for Diversity’s office and the Assistant Dean for Diversity in the Graduate School to incorporate strategies for increasing the number of diversity applications. The department also now includes faculty and student diversity as elements in their strategic plan.

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

David W. Pershing
Raymond Tymas-Jones
Gage Williams
Charles A. Wight
Frederick Rhodewalt

___________________________________________
Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
May 7, 2010
A. Lorris Betz  
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences  
5th Floor, Bldg. Clinical Neurosciences Center  
Campus

RE: Graduate Council Review  
Interdepartmental Program in Neuroscience

Dear Vice President Betz:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council's review of the Interdepartmental Program in Neuroscience. 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 W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
David J. Bjorkman, Dean, School of Medicine  
Mary T. Lucero, Director, Neuroscience Program
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Neuroscience. The External Review Committee included:

- Michael Levine, Ph.D. (chair)
  Chair, Neuroscience Graduate Program
  Professor, Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences
  Semel Institute-UCLA

- Frank L. Margolis, Ph.D.
  Professor, Department of Anatomy and Neurobiology
  University of Maryland

- Alan F. Sved, Ph.D.
  Professor and Chair, Department of Neuroscience
  University of Pittsburgh

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

- Donald E. Ayer, Ph.D.
  Professor
  Department of Oncological Sciences

- Christopher P. Hill, Ph.D.
  Distinguished Professor
  Department of Biochemistry

- Carl S. Thummel, Ph.D.
  Professor
  Department of Human Genetics
This report is based on the 2002 Graduate Council review ad hoc committee report and memorandum of understanding, as well as the 2009 self-study report submitted by the Neuroscience Program, the reports of the internal and external review committees, and the responses from Mary T. Lucero, Director, Interdepartmental Neuroscience Program, and David J. Bjorkman, Dean of the School of Medicine.

PROGRAM PROFILE

Overview

Neuroscience is the scientific study of the nervous system. It has been traditionally viewed as limited to neurobiology, a branch of biology. Increasingly, however, progress in the study of neurobiology requires multidisciplinary approaches that draw from other areas such as electrophysiology, molecular biology, genetics, statistics, and the study of behavior and cognition. As a result, the study of neuroscience today requires an interdisciplinary approach which the Interdepartmental Program in Neuroscience at the University of Utah seeks to provide. The Program enrolled its first class in 1986.

Curriculum and Programs of Study

The Neuroscience Program is the only interdepartmental program which grants a Ph.D. degree at the University of Utah. Students must complete no fewer than three full years of approved graduate work, at least one year of full-time academic work in residency at the University, and a dissertation. The Program also grants a Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.) degree, which has the same qualifications for admission and scholarly achievement as the Ph.D. degree, but does not require a doctoral dissertation.

The core curriculum of the Neuroscience Program includes didactic sessions designed to provide a basic theoretical understanding of the electrical properties of the cell, development of the nervous system, systems-level function of the nervous system and basic cognitive psychology. Students conduct experiments during four half-semester laboratory rotations. The didactic sessions and laboratory rotations combine with neuroscience "boot camps" in which students learn electrophysiological and molecular biological techniques from acknowledged experts in the field. The University of Utah neuroscience community meets twice a year at local resorts in the Wasatch Mountains to hear talks from specialists to discuss selected topics of interest.

Faculty and Faculty Diversity

The Program is comprised of an executive committee made up of representatives from 15 departments and 73 participating faculty. These include 41 full professors, 14 associate professors, 15 assistant professors, and 3 non-tenure-track research faculty members. Overall academic administration is provided by Dr. Mary Lucero, the Program Director.
Faculty who wish to participate in the Program submit a letter of interest to the program indicating a willingness and ability to train graduate students, and to participate in the teaching and administrative functions of the Program. Faculty applicants must have a primary appointment in one of the participating departments, and the resources to both support and train students. In addition, the research interests of faculty applicants must be compatible with current program members so that such faculty can participate productively in teaching within the Program. Participating faculty are expected to undertake both teaching and administrative functions. Applications are evaluated by the Neuroscience Program Directorate Committee.

**Faculty Diversity:** 21 of the 73 participating faculty are women, and 4 of the 7 leadership positions in the Program are held by women. However, there are only two ethnic minority faculty members—a Hispanic and a Pacific Islander—among the 73 participating faculty.

**Students and Student Diversity**

There are a total of 49 graduate students currently enrolled in the Neuroscience Program. Total enrollment has increased steadily from 30 students in 2001-02 to 50 students in 2008-09. An average of 8 to 12 students enter the program each year. During the same 8-year period, the Program awarded a total of 38 degrees (5 M.Phil. and 33 Ph.D.s), for an average of about 5 degrees per year.

The Program admissions committee, consisting of 8 faculty members and 2 graduate students, reviews student applications for admission to the Program. The admissions process has two components: (1) a review of the applicant's application materials and (2) subsequent interviews during a "visit weekend." Criteria used to determine whether a student will be invited to interview at the "visit weekend" include: GRE scores, undergraduate education and grades (particularly in relevant biology and neuroscience classes), research experience, research interest statement, and particularly, letters of recommendation.

The admissions committee selects from 15 to 22 applicants for a "visit weekend" each year. The itinerary for the visit weekend begins on Thursday when candidates arrive and are housed at the University Park Hotel or the University Guest House. On Friday morning there is a breakfast reception followed by a Program overview and a meeting with the chair of the curriculum committee. One-on-one interviews with three or four admissions committee members are then conducted followed by lunch with Program students. In the afternoon, candidates meet with 3 or 4 more Program faculty in whom they have expressed a research interest. On Friday evening there is a large reception and poster session which is an opportunity for applicants to socialize with all members of the Program and see student research. On Saturday the applicants are accompanied on an outing by Program students to various Salt Lake City locations (including skiing or sightseeing). The students take the recruits to dinner on Saturday evening.
**Student Diversity:** In order to increase diversity, the Program has (1) participated in minority recruitment conferences, (2) sent out targeted mailings, (3) sent faculty on recruiting trips, and (4) participated in the Summer Research Opportunities Program (SROP).

However, in the past three years the Program has received only two applications from underrepresented minorities: one was a Hispanic and the other was Native American. One of these was interviewed and offered admission, but declined. The other student's application was considered too far below the Program's minimum standards to merit an interview. It therefore appears that there are no ethnic minority students currently enrolled in the Program. However the program does have three students with documented disabilities and two students from disadvantaged backgrounds, all of whom qualify as underrepresented under NIH guidelines.

**Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment**

Mechanisms are in place to assess outcomes of the training program in both the short and long term. Student feedback is obtained for the courses and the program in general, and this student feedback is evaluated by the appropriate committees of the Program. This feedback is readily utilized to optimize the program. The longer-term assessment is in the form of alumni surveys and tracking the progress of alumni. The response rate of these alumni surveys is quite high, which is not surprising given how connected the students feel to the Program. The vast majority of Program graduates compete successfully for academic post-docs, faculty positions and positions in biotech/pharma, indicating the overall quality of the Program.

**Facilities and Resources**

The Program's operating budget for 2008-09 was $606,706, which originates from Central Funds and an NIH T32 Training Grant.

While overall academic administration is provided by Dr. Mary Lucero, the Program Director, day-to-day management of the Neuroscience Program is carried out by Ms. Tracy Marble, the Program Coordinator. The Program office is located in the Medical Research and Education Building (MREB). Ms. Marble manages all aspects of the Program, including website maintenance, newsletter preparation and distribution, student recruiting, retreat planning and organization, and tracking of student progress. She also manages all aspects of the T32 training program. Other than this office, there is no other space allocated to the Program. Teaching, research space and equipment for participating faculty members are housed within individual participating departments.

**COMMENDATIONS**

1. This is an excellent graduate training program in neuroscience, deserving of strong support so that it can not only maintain its current status, but expand. A thoughtfully designed training program has been developed and has now matured.
2. Administration of an interdepartmental program presents unique challenges that are being met well. The Program Director, Program Coordinator, and the Program Directorate Committee are all outstanding.

3. The program promotes collaborative efforts related to neuroscience research on campus, bringing together researchers from both the basic sciences and clinical disciplines.

4. The Program has established a close and cooperative interaction with the Brain Institute that has benefitted both parties.

5. The graduates of the Program readily obtain post-graduate training positions in top-tier labs. The track record for the program graduates ultimately moving into positions as university faculty or non-university research organizations is commendable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Faculty and Student Diversity: The Program, in conjunction with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity, should formulate and implement efforts to successfully recruit minority faculty members and students and achieve appropriate diversity. The use of annual reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the Program to work effectively toward this objective. Particular attention should be paid to the relationship between the absence of minority participating faculty members and the corresponding lack of minority student applications. The Program also should consider including diversity as a positive factor in reviewing faculty participation applications, as well as in the student application review process and interviews. The Program's new Neuroscience Recruitment Committee should expressly adopt the objective of increasing diversity as one of its major responsibilities, and should monitor and report the Program's progress toward achieving that objective.

2. Teaching Requirement: The Program should proceed with its plan to require a formal teaching experience that must be fulfilled by the end of Spring Semester in the fourth year. The experience will include feedback in the form of evaluations and a dedicated faculty mentor. The Program plans to implement the new requirement in August 2010 for incoming students.

3. Procedure for Replacement of Faculty in Administrative and Teaching Positions: The Program should proceed with its plan to implement a 3-year term for faculty service on Program committees. Replacements for committee positions will be arranged by an online survey tool that will ask faculty to sign up for appointments a year in advance. Core course teaching commitments and the position of Director will have 5-year terms to provide more continuity. The Program Directorate Committee will review membership in the program annually to make sure members are participating and informed of their commitment to the Program.

4. Formalized Training in Graduate Student Presentations: The Program already provides students with numerous opportunities to make formal oral presentations. The Program should implement
a formal evaluation and feedback system for each of such presentations to assure that students fully benefit from making such presentations.

5. **Interplay Between Program, Departmental, and University Administrative Structure:** The 2002 review of the Program recommended clarification of the budgetary, teaching, and student advising implications of having faculty participate in an interdepartmental program in order to assure that such faculty and their departments received proper "credit" for such work. The 2009 internal and external reports note that the same coordination concerns still exist. The Program should formulate and propose a "letter of understanding" among the Program, each participating department, and the University administration that clearly sets out and formalizes these relationships in all their dimensions, including budgetary, teaching, student advising, and all other aspects unique to the interdepartmental character of the Program.

6. **Relation Between Program and Brain Institute:** The Program should proceed with its plan to formalize the relations between the Program and the Brain Institute. Items currently being discussed are space use, potential serving on each other's directorate/advisory board, and continued collaboration on Brain Awareness Week and Intermountain Neuroscience programs.

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

John Martinez (Chair), Law  
Ann Marie Breznay, Marriott Library  
Mary Jane Taylor, Social Work
Memorandum of Understanding
Interdepartmental Program in Neuroscience
Graduate Council Review 2009-2010

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on May 19, 2010, concluding the Graduate Council Review of the Interdepartmental Program in Neuroscience. A. Lorris Betz, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; David J. Bjorkman, Dean of the School of Medicine; Mary Lucero, Director of the Neuroscience 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 February 22, 2010. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1 - Faculty and Student Diversity: The Program, in conjunction with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity, should formulate and implement efforts to successfully recruit minority faculty members and students and achieve appropriate diversity. The use of annual reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the Program to work effectively toward this objective. Particular attention should be paid to the relationship between the absence of minority participating faculty members and the corresponding lack of minority student applications. The Program also should consider including diversity as a positive factor in reviewing faculty participation applications, as well as in the student application review process and interviews. The Program's new Neuroscience Recruitment Committee should expressly adopt the objective of increasing diversity as one of its major responsibilities, and should monitor and report the Program's progress toward achieving that objective.

The director acknowledges that increasing faculty diversity is a particular challenge for the Program because it does not participate directly in faculty recruitment, which is done by the departments that support the Interdepartmental Program in Neuroscience. The Program can suggest appropriate candidates to departments and will work through that channel to nominate women and underrepresented minority candidates when available. The Program’s new Neuroscience Recruitment Committee will consult with the Assistant Dean for Diversity in the Graduate School to formulate strategies for increasing applications from women and minorities. The Program will make annual reports to the Graduate School on the status of student diversity.
Recommendation 2 - Teaching Requirement: The Program should proceed with its plan to require a formal teaching experience that must be fulfilled by the end of Spring Semester in the fourth year. The experience will include feedback in the form of evaluations and a dedicated faculty mentor. The Program plans to implement the new requirement in August 2010 for incoming students.

The Program plans to add a formal teaching requirement to be fulfilled by the end of the fourth year. This will be implemented in the August 2010 Program Policy and Procedures. As indicated in the recommendation, the teaching requirement will include feedback and a dedicated faculty mentor.

Recommendation 3 - Procedure for Replacement of Faculty in Administrative and Teaching Positions: The Program should proceed with its plan to implement a 3-year term for faculty service on Program committees. Replacements for committee positions will be arranged by an online survey tool that will ask faculty to sign up for appointments a year in advance. Core course teaching commitments and the position of Director will have 5-year terms to provide more continuity. The Program Directorate Committee will review membership in the program annually to make sure members are participating and informed of their commitment to the Program.

The Program is currently implementing this recommendation and will report to the Graduate School by August 1, 2010 on its progress.

Recommendation 4 - Formalized Training in Graduate Student Presentations: The Program already provides students with numerous opportunities to make formal oral presentations. The Program should implement a formal evaluation and feedback system for each of such presentations to assure that students fully benefit from making such presentations.

Students have three opportunities to give presentations during the course of their training. They are instructed in how to give PowerPoint presentations and are given formal feedback on their presentations.

Recommendation 5 - Interplay Between Program, Departmental, and University Administrative Structure: The 2002 review of the Program recommended clarification of the budgetary, teaching, and student advising implications of having faculty participate in an interdepartmental program in order to assure that such faculty and their departments received proper "credit" for such work. The 2009 internal and external reports note that the same coordination concerns still exist. The Program should formulate and propose a "letter of understanding" among the Program, each participating department, and the University administration that clearly sets out and formalizes these relationships in all their dimensions, including budgetary, teaching, student advising, and all other aspects unique to the interdepartmental character of the Program.

The issue of coordinating with participating departments is a concern for interdisciplinary programs within the health sciences. The Senior Vice President for Health Sciences has instructed the Director of the Neuroscience Program to coordinate with the directors of the Molecular Biology Program and the Biological Chemistry Program to develop a document of understanding to be used by all combined and
interdisciplinary programs. This document will specify the obligations and responsibilities of the program to students as well as indicate the relationship between programs and participating departments. Currently, the Program tracks student credit hours and returns SCH funds to departments. In turn, chairs commit departments to support students and chairs sign off on students mentored within their departments.

Recommendation 6 - Relation Between Program and Brain Institute: The Program should proceed with its plan to formalize the relations between the Program and the Brain Institute. Items currently being discussed are space use, potential serving on each other's directorate/advisory board, and continued collaboration on Brain Awareness Week and Intermountain Neuroscience programs.

A proposal is being developed to formalize relations between the Program in Neuroscience and the Brain Institute. Discussion items include space, board service, and collaborations. This process is facilitated by the fact that, at present, directors serve on each other’s executive committees. A memorandum of understanding between the Program and the Brain Institute is currently being finalized and will be transmitted to the Graduate School when completed.

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

A. Lorris Betz
David J. Bjorkman
Mary Lucero
Charles A. Wight
Frederick Rhodewalt

__________________________________________

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
July 16, 2010
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

FROM: ARNOLD COMBE, VICE PRESIDENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

SUBJECT: PROPOSED CHANGES TO UPOL 3-215: UNIVERSITY MOTOR VEHICLES

DATE: 8/30/2010

In response to President Young’s request to develop and adopt an institutional vehicle idling policy, and in consideration of new policy formatting requirements, we submit the following revised Policy and associated Rule document for your review and consideration.

Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) was given the lead in this project, and it was determined to incorporate proposed changes to the University’s existing Motor Vehicle policy, UPol 3-215. This effort has involved input from several University stakeholders, including Marty Shaub, Director EHS; University Police Chief Scott Folsom; Dave Rees from Motor Pool; Jerry Allred from Risk and Insurance Management, as well as personnel from Facilities Management and Auxiliary Services.

Those involved reviewed existing University policy, state statutes and guidance, as well as benchmarked similar documents with peer institutions, and drafted a proposed update. Proposed campus idling guidelines were developed from State of Utah Environmental Quality recommendations and are similar to guidelines in place in Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County.

Deleted procedural elements from the current policy document are now captured in the Rules document instead, and are updated to address changes related to available lease options and associated insurance plans.

We welcome input from interested parties and other stakeholders on this policy as we move these documents through the approval process. Thank you.
Proposed Policy 3-216: University Motor Vehicles

I. Purpose & Scope

In order to maintain a safe and healthful environment this policy sets forth the intent of the University of Utah with respect to acquisition, ownership, assignment, maintenance, and use of motor vehicles.

II. Definitions

A. Motor Vehicle - motorized vehicle capable of carrying passengers. Motor vehicle includes golf carts, forklifts, construction equipment, etc.

B. University Motor Vehicle – any motor vehicle owned, operated, or leased by the University of Utah; any other vehicle so designated by the vice president for administrative services.

C. Official University Business - the authorized activities of university employees, students, and designated agents related to approved programs and functions of the university and its colleges, departments, operating units and related organizations.

D. Authorized Carrier - a common or contract carrier regulated by the Public Service Commission or Interstate Commerce Commission or successor agencies.

E. Motor Pool - the University of Utah department assigned the responsibility for the management and operation of university motor vehicles.

F. Vehicle Donation – a vehicle that is donated to the University for the purpose of resale or to be placed in service for university business.

G. Idling – vehicle engine is running while the vehicle is stationary or the piece of equipment is not performing work.

H. Expansion vehicle – a vehicle that is new to the university vehicle inventory, thus increasing the total number of vehicles owned, operated or leased by the University.

I. Drivers Eligibility Board – the panel formed for the purpose of determining state vehicle driving privileges.

J. University Police – the law enforcement agency with jurisdiction for traffic accident investigations on campus.

K. Environmental Health and Safety – the University of Utah department assigned responsibility for chemical and biological program management on campus.

L. Risk and Insurance Management – the University of Utah department assigned responsibility for insurance management and driver safety education on campus.

M. University Surplus and Salvage – the University of Utah department assigned
III. Policy

A. Ownership, acquisition, maintenance, licensing and disposal of vehicles shall be administratively managed by the university's Motor Pool. [Comment [u5]: Note: New Definitions]

B. University motor vehicles shall be used only for official university business purposes. [Comment [u6]: See Current Policy IV. A. 1 - 5]

C. Operation of university motor vehicles is limited to persons who are authorized by college or department administration to use a university vehicle, and who are (1) employees of the university or registered students, (2) at least 18 years of age, and (3) possess a valid Utah operator's license, except that authorized nonresident students over 18 years of age may operate a university motor vehicle if they possess a valid operator's license from the state or country of their residence. [Comment [u7]: See Current Policy IV. C.]

D. University vehicles and equipment are prohibited from idling except under certain pre-determined conditions (Further information is available in Rule 3-215, Section III.E.10. University Motor Vehicle Rules). [Comment [u8]: See Current Policy IV. D. 1.]

E. Drivers of university vehicles shall be personally responsible for fines, forfeitures of bail, or other penalties based upon parking and traffic violations and citations or other infractions or violations of law involving the use of university motor vehicles. [Comment [u9]: New Content]

F. The privilege of driving university motor vehicles may be suspended or permanently revoked for repeated traffic citations, at-fault accidents, or for the unauthorized use of university vehicles. [Comment [u10]: See Current Policy IV. G. 1.]

G. All motor vehicle accidents must be promptly reported and subsequent repairs completed within 90 days, except for cases as approved by Risk Management or the Motor Pool. [Comment [u11]: See Current Policy IV. G. 2.]

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

A. Rules
   1. University Motor Vehicle Rule 3-215

B. Procedures (Reserved)

C. Guidelines (Reserved)

D. Forms (Reserved)

E. Other related resource materials (Reserved)

V. References
Proposed University Motor Vehicles Rule 3-215

I. Purpose and Scope

These rules support Policy 3-215, University Motor Vehicles with respect to acquisition, ownership, assignment, maintenance, and use of motor vehicles.

II. Definitions

Definitions are provided in the Policy

III. Rules

A. Ownership, Acquisition, and Disposal of Vehicles

1. All motor vehicles owned or leased by the university shall be held under the administrative management and control of the university Motor Pool.

2. Acquisition, maintenance, and licensing of all motor vehicles shall be performed by or at the direction of the Motor Pool.

3. The Motor Pool shall determine the type of motor vehicle to be purchased and made available for departmental use. Departmental needs will be considered as well as the vehicle's record for reliability, low maintenance costs, and fuel economy. The Motor Pool will ordinarily purchase only compact and sub-compact vehicles if available and capable of meeting departmental and university needs.

4. The Motor Pool shall determine when disposal of university motor vehicles should occur. Vehicles no longer needed, no longer serviceable, or scheduled for replacement, shall be transferred to the Surplus and Salvage Department for final disposition. Proceeds from the sale, less disposition costs, shall be returned to the Motor Pool, except in the case of special lease plans, in which case the net proceeds shall be returned to the lessee.

5. Departments may lease motor vehicles from the Motor Pool under one of five lease plans set forth in Section K. Lease rates charged for the type of vehicle under the various lease plans shall be revised from time to time, with the approval of the vice president for administrative services or designee, to reflect the actual costs incurred by the Motor Pool.

6. Vehicle donations for resale will be coordinated with the University Surplus and Salvage department.

7. Vehicle donations for use shall meet the following criteria:

   a. Motor Pool personnel shall inspect the vehicle to ensure it will pass state safety and emissions inspections.

   b. If repairs are required the cost of the repairs shall not exceed 60% of the current value of the vehicle.

   c. If the vehicle requires repairs that exceed 60% of the vehicle’s current value, the vehicle shall be sold and not be placed into service. Exceptions to this must be approved by Motor Pool.

8. Utilization. If it is determined that a vehicle is not sufficiently utilized to justify the vehicle being retained, Motor Pool may transfer the vehicle to another
department on campus or direct that the vehicle be transferred to Surplus and Salvage for sale.

9. **Expansion Vehicles.** Requests for expansion vehicles must be forwarded to the vice president for administrative services to be evaluated and forwarded to the Legislature for approval. If the requesting department has a vehicle that is underutilized, the department may be directed to replace or transfer the underutilized vehicle instead of receiving an expansion vehicle.

**B. Vehicle Identification**

University motor vehicles shall be of a color selected by the Motor Pool, shall bear the authorized state seal on the outside of both front doors, and must carry EX (exempt) license plates. Exceptions for these requirements may be granted for good reason by the vice president for administrative services in accordance with applicable state laws.

**C. Official Use**

University motor vehicles shall be used only for official university business purposes. University motor vehicles shall not be used for personal transportation or other personal purposes of persons authorized by college or department administration.

**D. Safety Issues.**

1. The driver is required to obey all state and federal traffic laws pertaining to the safe operation of a vehicle. The driver is personally liable for any fines, traffic or parking violations received.
2. Use of seat belts is required for all persons occupying the vehicle. It is the driver’s responsibility to ensure that all persons are properly secured before the vehicle is put in motion.
3. Smoking is not permitted in University-owned, leased, or rented vehicles.
4. Hazardous materials should not be transported in University owned, leased or rented vehicles unless approved by Environmental Health and Safety.
5. Drivers are required to complete approved driver training courses as prescribed by Risk and Insurance Management.

**E. Restricted Use**

1. Operation of university motor vehicles is limited to persons who are authorized by college or department administration to use a university vehicle, and who are (1) employees of the university or registered students, (2) at least 18 years of age, and (3) possess a valid Utah operator’s license, except that authorized nonresident students over 18 years of age may operate a university motor vehicle if they possess a valid operator’s license from the state or country of their residence.

2. University motor vehicles may not be driven outside the state of Utah without prior written permission from the vice president for administrative services or his or her designee.

3. University motor vehicles shall not be used to transport groups or individuals not affiliated with the university. Programs, courses, conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes, or athletic programs will not be offered for credit or non-credit, where the primary reason for the offering is to attempt to make legitimate the use of university vehicles to provide transportation to the participants in competition with authorized carriers.
4. Affiliated university groups may be transported in university motor vehicles where costs are included in the tuition and fees for a specific program. When registered, enrolled, or affiliated students, including those enrolled in continuing education, are transported in university vehicles, no charge will be imposed upon said students for that transportation service. If transportation costs are incurred, they will be deemed to have been incorporated and paid as part of that student's tuition and fees, which includes all materials, instruction, services, and facilities, when those tuition and fees are assessed and collected at the time the student enrolls in the specific course. The "tuition and fees" shall relate to a specific program of instruction which is normally offered and a description of the course and amount of the tuition and fees to be assessed are published in the university's catalog or regular class listings.

5. University motor vehicles may be used for the transportation of students, employees, and guests involved in official university business or engaged in university sponsored activities provided no fare is charged to the transported individual.

6. University departments will not advertise, solicit, or release announcements off campus which solicits participation in transportation provided by the university.

7. University departments shall not provide routine non-programmatic transportation (e.g. to or from an airport, to or from hotels) for students, visitors, or guests in university vehicles where (1) the transportation is for-hire or the specific costs of the transportation are ultimately borne directly or indirectly by the traveler and not the university; and (2) there is no significant educational, administrative, business, or similar activity occurring during the travel time which would be adversely affected in a substantial way if an authorized carrier rather than a campus vehicle and driver were used; and (3) the university or travelers can arrange appropriate transportation with an authorized carrier on a timely and cost-effective basis.

8. University motor vehicles shall be returned to the university campus promptly after each official use. Employees, students, and others authorized to use university motor vehicles shall not be allowed to have a university vehicle at their place of residence before or after official use unless prior written permission of the cognizant vice president or his or her designee is obtained. Such permission shall be granted only if the university's best interests are served, i.e. early morning departure is planned and additional vehicle mileage will not result.

9. In some cases, it may be in the university's best interest to assign a university motor vehicle to an employee and allow the employee, on a continuing basis, to keep the vehicle at his/her place of residence when not in use. If this arrangement is sought, the department head, or next higher authority, shall submit a letter to the cognizant vice president setting forth the reasons and the savings that will result. If endorsed by the cognizant vice president, the request, accompanied by the cognizant vice president's endorsement and comments, shall be forwarded to the vice president for administrative services. If the vice president for administrative services approves the request, he/she will provide the employee, the cognizant vice president, the cognizant department, the Motor Pool, and director of finance a letter authorizing the arrangement. Such authorization and approval shall clearly set forth the period of time the authorization is in effect and shall be reviewed annually. Such authorization may be renewed, following the same procedure set forth above. All IRS guidelines
shall be followed when reporting imputed income from take home vehicles. It is the responsibility of the department's payroll reporter to input the appropriate information for imputed income for IRS purposes.

10. University vehicles and equipment are prohibited from idling for periods longer than 60 seconds except under the following conditions:
   a. Idling is necessary to power auxiliary equipment such as lifts, hoists, computers or safety lighting. Auxiliary equipment does not include the vehicle's air conditioner, heater, or defrost for wintertime vehicle warm up.
   b. Idling is necessary for testing, maintenance, repair or diagnostic purposes.
   c. Idling is necessary to maintain factory installed emissions equipment on diesel equipment.
   d. Vehicle is stopped at a traffic control signal, in heavy traffic at a train or railroad crossing or traveling through a construction zone.
   e. Situations where turning off the motor could jeopardize the health and safety of the driver, passenger, or pedestrian.

F. Extraordinary Wear and Tear
   1. If it is determined by the Motor Pool upon the basis of prior experience or other relevant factors that a department's use of motor vehicles will result in unusual or extraordinary wear and tear, the normal lease rates may be increased to offset the resulting additional costs.
   2. If unusual wear and tear, not offset by special lease rates, is evident at the time of disposition of a vehicle, the using department may be charged for the difference in value of the vehicle in its condition and the expected value if the vehicle had not been subjected to such unusual wear and tear.

G. Insurance
   1. Motor vehicles, while in use for official university business, will be insured for both liability and physical damage with commercial insurers and/or self-insurance program managed by the state or the university, in accordance with state law and consistent with prudent risk management. Additional and unique insurance provisions apply to the use of university buses and their drivers.
   2. The cost of motor vehicle physical damage insurance will be included in the lease rate charged for vehicles leased under the short-term lease plan (see Section K.3 in this rule). Physical damage insurance coverage for motor vehicles leased will be included under full lease plan (see Section K.1 in this rule) and the capital lease plan (see Section K.2 in this rule) will be determined by the university risk manager based on the value of the motor vehicle, the departmental loss experience, vehicle usage, and other factors normally considered in setting insurance rates. The cost of such insurance will be billed to the leasing department annually by the university risk manager.
Pool. Each user must furnish appropriate departmental authorization before a vehicle will be furnished. Charges for use of these 'trip' vehicles will be based on a combination of daily and mileage charges.

L. Motor Vehicle Records

The Motor Pool shall maintain records on each university motor vehicle which shall include but not be limited to:

1. Dates of annual emission/safety inspections.
2. Dates of semi-annual maintenance inspection.
3. Dates and description of repairs made.
4. License number issued.
5. Odometer reading at the end of each six-month period.

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

A. Policies

1. Policy 3-215, University Motor Vehicles
2. Policy 5-310, Accident and Liability Reporting and Prevention

B. Procedures (Reserved)

C. Guidelines (Reserved)

D. Forms (Reserved)

E. Other related resource materials (Reserved)

VI. References:

- Policy and Procedures No. 5-310, Accident and Liability Reporting and Prevention
- Utah State Board of Regents Policy, R556 Transportation in Campus Vehicles
- Utah Administrative Rule, R-27, Fleet Operations
- Utah Code Annotated 1953, Section 41-7-1.5 Vehicle Identification
- Utah Code Annotated 1953, Section 41-1-44.1 Vehicle Registration
- Utah Code Annotated 1953, Section 41-1-49.7 Vehicle Registration
- Utah Division of Air Quality: Choose Clean Air Program: Idle Free Utah.
  - http://www.cleanair.utah.gov/
- Utah Indoor Clean Air Act Stature and Rule, UC 26-38-3(1)

VII. Contacts:

Motor Pool Manager, 801-581-8155

VIII. History:

Originated 2010
Current Policy 3-215 Revision 4: University Motor Vehicles
Revision Date: April 15, 1991

I. Purpose
To set forth the policy of the University of Utah with respect to acquisition, ownership, assignment, maintenance, and use of motor vehicles.

II. Definitions
A. Motor Vehicle - any motor vehicle owned or leased by the University of Utah which in accordance with state laws must be registered and licensed with the Utah Department of Motor Vehicles and any other motor vehicle so designated by the vice president for administrative services.

B. Official University Business - the authorized activities of university employees, students, and designated agents related to approved programs and functions of the university and its colleges, departments, operating units and related organizations.

C. Authorized Carrier - a common or contract carrier regulated by the Public Service Commission or Interstate Commerce Commission or successor agencies.

D. Motor Pool - the University of Utah department which has been assigned the responsibility for the management and operation of university motor vehicles.

III. References
Policy 5-310, Accident Reporting Procedure
Utah State Board of Regents Policy R556 Transportation in Campus Vehicles
Utah Code Annotated 1953, Section 41-7-1.5 Vehicle Identification
Utah Code Annotated 1953, Section 41-1-44.1 Vehicle Registration
Utah Code Annotated 1953, Section 41-1-49.7 Vehicle Registration

IV. Policy
A. Ownership, Acquisition, and Disposal of Vehicles
1. All motor vehicles owned or leased by the university shall be held under the administrative management and control of the university Motor Pool.
2. Acquisition, maintenance, and licensing of all motor vehicles shall be performed by or at the direction of the Motor Pool.
3. The Motor Pool shall determine the type of motor vehicle to be purchased and made available for departmental use. Departmental needs will be considered as well as the vehicle's record for reliability, low maintenance costs, and fuel economy. The Motor Pool will ordinarily purchase only compact and sub-compact vehicles if available and capable of meeting departmental and university needs.
4. The Motor Pool shall determine when disposal of university motor vehicles should occur. Vehicles no longer needed, no longer serviceable, or scheduled for replacement, shall be transferred to the Surplus and Salvage Department for final disposition. Proceeds from the sale, less disposition costs, shall be returned to the Motor Pool.
except in the case of special lease plans, in which case the net proceeds shall be returned to the lessee.

5. Departments may lease motor vehicles from the Motor Pool under one of five lease plans set forth in Section V. Lease rates charged for the type of vehicle under the various lease plans shall be revised from time to time, with the approval of the vice president for administrative services or designee, to reflect the actual costs incurred by the Motor Pool.

B. Vehicle Identification
University motor vehicles shall be of a color selected by the Motor Pool, shall bear the authorized state seal on the outside of both front doors, and must carry EX (exempt) license plates. For good reason, designated vehicles may be excepted from one or more of these requirements by the vice president for administrative services in accordance with applicable state laws.

C. Official Use
University motor vehicles shall be used only for official university business purposes. University motor vehicles shall not be used for personal transportation or other personal purposes of university employees, students, visitors or guests.

D. Restricted Use
1. Operation of university motor vehicles is limited to persons who are authorized by college or department administration to use a university vehicle, and who are (1) employees of the university or registered students, (2) at least 18 years of age, and (3) possess a valid Utah operator's license, except that authorized nonresident students over 18 years of age may operate a university motor vehicle if they possess a valid operator's license from the state or country of their residence.

2. University motor vehicles may not be driven outside the state of Utah without prior written permission from the vice president for administrative services or his or her designee.

3. University motor vehicles shall not be used to transport groups or individuals not affiliated with the university. Programs, courses, conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes, or athletic programs will not be offered for credit or non-credit, where the primary reason for the offering is to attempt to make legitimate the use of university vehicles to provide transportation to the participants in competition with authorized carriers.

4. Affiliated university groups may be transported in university motor vehicles where costs are included in the tuition and fees for a specific program. When registered, enrolled, or affiliated students, including those enrolled in continuing education, are transported in university vehicles, no charge will be imposed upon said students for that transportation service. If transportation costs are incurred, they will be deemed to have been incorporated and paid as part of that student's tuition and fees, which includes all materials, instruction, services, and facilities, when those tuition and fees are assessed and collected at the time the student enrolls in the specific course. The "tuition and fees" shall relate to a specific program of instruction which is normally offered and a
description of the course and amount of the tuition and fees to be assessed are published in the university's catalog or regular class listings.

5. University motor vehicles may be used for the transportation of students, employees, and guests involved in official university business or engaged in university sponsored activities provided no fare is charged to the transported individual.

6. University departments will not advertise, solicit, or release announcements off campus which solicit participation in transportation provided by the university.

7. University departments shall not provide routine nonprogrammatic transportation (e.g. to or from an airport, to or from hotels) for students, visitors, or guests in university vehicles where (1) the transportation is for-hire or the specific costs of the transportation are ultimately borne directly or indirectly by the traveller and not the university; and (2) there is no significant educational, administrative, business, or similar activity occurring during the travel time which would be adversely affected in a substantial way if an authorized carrier rather than a campus vehicle and driver were used; and (3) the university or travellers can arrange appropriate transportation with an authorized carrier on a timely and cost-effective basis.

8. University motor vehicles shall be returned to the university campus promptly after each official use. Employees, students, and others authorized to use university motor vehicles shall not be allowed to have a university vehicle at their place of residence before or after official use unless prior written permission of the cognizant vice president or his or her designee is obtained. Such permission shall be granted only if the university's best interests are served, i.e. early morning departure is planned and additional vehicle mileage will not result.

9. In some cases, it may be in the university's best interest to assign a university motor vehicle to an employee and allow the employee, on a continuing basis, to keep the vehicle at his/her place of residence when not in use. If this arrangement is sought, the department head, or next higher authority, shall submit a letter to the cognizant vice president setting forth the reasons and the savings that will result. If endorsed by the cognizant vice president, the request, accompanied by the cognizant vice president's endorsement and comments, shall be forwarded to the vice president for administrative services. If the vice president for administrative services approves the request, he/she will provide the employee, the cognizant vice president, the cognizant department, the Motor Pool, and director of finance a letter authorizing the arrangement. Such authorization and approval shall clearly set forth the period of time the authorization is in effect and under no circumstances will such authorization be for a period longer than 90 days. Such authorization may be renewed, following the same procedure set forth above.

E. Extraordinary Wear and Tear

1. If it is determined by the Motor Pool upon the basis of prior experience or other relevant factors that a department's use of motor vehicles will result in unusual or extraordinary wear and tear, the normal lease rates may be increased to offset the resulting additional costs.
2. If unusual wear and tear, not offset by special lease rates, is evident at the time of disposition of a vehicle, the using department may be charged for the difference in value of the vehicle in its condition and the expected value if the vehicle had not been subjected to such unusual wear and tear.

F. Insurance

1. Motor vehicles, while in use for official university business, will be insured for both liability and physical damage with commercial insurers and/or self-insurance program managed by the state or the university, in accordance with state law and consistent with prudent risk management. Additional and unique insurance provisions apply to the use of university buses and their drivers.

2. The cost of motor vehicle physical damage insurance will be included in the lease rate charged for vehicles leased under the short-term lease plan, V-E. Physical damage insurance coverage for motor vehicles leased under plans described in V-A, V-B, V-C, and V-D will be determined by the university risk manager based on the value of the motor vehicle, the departmental loss experience, vehicle usage, and other factors normally considered in setting insurance rates. The cost of such insurance will be billed to the leasing department annually by the university risk manager.

G. Traffic Violations

1. Drivers of university vehicles shall be personally responsible for fines, forfeitures of bail, or other penalties based upon parking and traffic violations and citations or other infractions or violations of law involving the use of university motor vehicles.

2. The privilege of driving university motor vehicles may be suspended or permanently revoked by the vice president for administrative services for repeated traffic citations, at-fault accidents, or for the unauthorized use of university vehicles. Prior to ordering any such suspension or revocation, the vice president for administrative services will give notice of his proposed action to the employee, and will provide an opportunity for an informal hearing.

H. Reporting of Motor Vehicle Accidents

All motor vehicle accidents must be promptly reported to (1) the office of university police if the accident occurred on campus, or to the cognizant law enforcement agency (police or highway patrol) if the accident occurred off campus. The university risk manager and the Motor Pool Office must also be notified immediately. (Refer to Policy 5-310 for specific information on accident reporting.)

I. Reporting of Mechanical or Safety Defects

Vehicles with mechanical or safety defects should be promptly reported to the Motor Pool Office. Upon receipt of such report, the Motor Pool shall inspect the vehicle and take appropriate action to bring the vehicle into compliance with current university safety standards and/or the standards for efficient mechanical operation. A copy of the inspection report and report of corrective action taken shall be filed in the Motor Pool Office and, upon request, will be made available to the driver and to cognizant line management officers of the university.
V. Motor Vehicle Lease Plans

A. Five-Year Lease Plan

Vehicles will be leased for a five-year period. The lease amount will include amortization of the vehicle cost (adjusted for inflation) less estimated residual value, and all operating, maintenance, inspection, and repair costs exclusive of gas and oil. The cost of gas and oil shall be borne by the lessee. The lessee will be billed a pro rata portion of the total lease cost each month.

B. Variable Term Lease Plan

Vehicles will be leased for a specific period of time determined by the lessee and acceptable to the Motor Pool. A maintenance program suitable to the department’s needs will be negotiated between the using department and the Motor Pool. The department may choose a total maintenance contract or pay for maintenance as required. A semi-annual preventive maintenance inspection, a 4,000 mile or six-month lubrication, and annual state emission/safety inspections will be mandatory. The lease amount will include amortization of the vehicle cost (adjusted for inflation), less estimated residual value, contractual maintenance, and required maintenance costs. All other vehicle operating and maintenance costs will be borne by the lessee. The lessee will be billed a pro rata portion of the total lease cost each month.

C. Special Lease Plan

The special lease plan is designed for vehicles which are to be acquired with funds transferred by a department to the Motor Pool for that purpose, such as those acquired under sponsored research agreements or for vehicles which are donated to a university department. An amount equal to the total vehicle acquisition cost must be transferred to the Motor Pool by the leasing department at the time the vehicle is acquired. Amortization of the vehicle’s value will not be included in the lease rate. Approval to acquire donated vehicles, which must meet minimum university standards, must be obtained from the cognizant vice president and the vice president for administrative services or designee. The using department may choose a complete maintenance program at a fixed price or may pay for maintenance as required. A six-month preventive maintenance inspection, a 4,000 mile or six-month lubrication service, and annual state emission/safety inspections will be mandatory. The lease rate will include contractual maintenance and required maintenance costs. The lessee will be billed a pro rata portion of the total lease costs each month.

D. Off-Campus Lease Plan

With approval of the cognizant vice president and the vice president for administrative services or designee, departments may request the Motor Pool to lease for their use a particular type of motor vehicle from off-campus lessors. Such requests must be justified in writing and will not be granted if the Motor Pool has similar vehicles available for use. Users may choose a total maintenance contract in which case the department will be billed for lease costs, and
maintenance or may choose to pay for maintenance only as needed, in which case the lease rate will exclude maintenance and repair costs except those which are mandatory.

A six-month preventive maintenance check, a 4,000 mile or six-month lubrication service, and annual state emission/safety inspections will be mandatory. The lessee will be billed a pro rata portion of the total lease cost each month.

E. Short-Term Lease Plan

This plan provides vehicles on an individual trip basis (daily, weekly, or monthly). The type of vehicle in the "trip fleet" will be determined by the Motor Pool manager. Reservations for vehicles shall be made by contacting the Motor Pool Office. Each user must furnish appropriate departmental authorization before a vehicle will be furnished. Charges for use of these "trip" vehicles will be based on a combination of daily and mileage charges.

VI. Motor Pool Records

The Motor Pool shall maintain records on each university motor vehicle which shall include but not be limited to:

A. Dates of annual emission/safety inspections.
B. Dates of semi-annual maintenance inspection.
C. Description of general condition of vehicle at the time of emission/safety or maintenance inspections.
D. Dates and description of repairs made.
E. License number issued.
F. Odometer reading at the end of each six-month period.
Honors and Awards to Members of the University Community

1. The University of Utah is being recognized for its use of alternative energy. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) says the University is using more renewable energy than any other school in the Mountain West Conference. The EPA says 23 percent of the University's electricity comes from renewable sources. The agency ranks collegiate athletic conferences by the amount of green power used by member schools. Fifty-four universities in 26 athletic conferences across the country participated in this year's challenge.

2. Short Solutions, a University of Utah startup company consisting of four current and former engineering students, won the Palo Alto Software Challenge Award at the 2010 Global Moot Corp Competition - the "Super Bowl of business plan competitions," at The University of Texas in Austin. Only 40 teams from 12 countries qualified to participate. Short Solution's win has brought the team's total earnings from grants and competitions to $86,500. The student company, comprised of students Jordan Nicholls, Chase Thompson, Justin Ferguson and Chad Mann, earned the right to participate in Moot Corp by winning first place at the 2010 Utah Entrepreneur Challenge, where they earned $40,000 to help develop their technology.

3. In a recently released national ranking by the Public Accounting Report, the School of Accounting’s undergraduate program was ranked third and its graduate program was ranked fifth in a national survey of accounting schools. This is a vast improvement over the undergraduate program’s 24th place ranking last year. The graduate program did not appear in the survey’s top 25 accounting programs list last year. Each year, the Public Accounting Report conducts an annual survey to determine the quality of accounting schools’ undergraduate, graduate and doctoral programs across the country. The basic guideline for the survey is to weigh how likely the program’s graduates are to obtain a partner status with an accounting firm.

4. Leading the list of University programs that improved their rankings in the 2011 edition of America’s Best Graduate Schools are the S.J. Quinney College of Law, moving up three spots to 42, and the Department of Mathematics, which also jumped three spots to 30. A University spokesperson credited the math department’s ability to retain faculty as a major reason for the ranking. Similarly, the S.J. Quinney College of Law’s administration credit faculty for its improved ranking. “Once again, the rankings reflect the school’s achievements along almost every index that the methodology weighs,” said Hiram Chodosh, dean of the S.J. Quinney College of Law.

5. Baldomero “Toto” Olivera is one of 13 recipients of a 2010 Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) Professors award for undergraduate science education. The 13 HHMI professors with successful science education programs were awarded a total of $9 million over the next four years. Individual grants range from $600,000 to $800,000.
program, created in 2002, assists top research scientists in putting their innovative ideas for science education into practice. The program reflects the Institute’s long-time commitment to finding and funding talented scientists, then giving them the freedom to follow their instincts.

6. The Department of Dance recently received a Learning in the Arts grant of $80,000 to support the Tanner Dance program's Side-by-Side Teacher Training Residency. Students in kindergarten through sixth grades and their teachers will practice dance skills on a weekly basis through in-school residencies and workshops for teachers. The learning grants are designed to strengthen American educational opportunities by providing children with focused arts instruction, exposing them to legendary artists, and introducing children to artworks of the highest quality.

7. Joyce L. Ogburn, university librarian and director of the Marriott Library, has been elected as the vice-president/president-elect of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). She will become president-elect following the 2010 American Library Association’s Annual Conference in Washington, DC. She will then assume the presidency in July 2011 for a one-year term. ACRL, a division of the American Library Association (ALA), is a professional association of academic librarians and other interested individuals dedicated to enhancing the ability of academic library and information professionals to serve the information needs of the higher education community and to improve learning, teaching, and research.

8. Dr. William T. Couldwell, professor and Joseph J. Yager Chair of the Department of Neurological Surgery, was named secretary of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons (AANS) for the second year of a three-year term at the association's annual meeting May 1-5. He has been an active member of the surgeons' association since 1995, and has served on the group's board of directors since 2006. Dr. Couldwell also serves as chairman of the editorial board of the association's peer-reviewed socioeconomic publication, AANS Neurosurgeon.

9. Joseph V. Simone, MD, clinical director emeritus of the Huntsman Cancer Institute and professor emeritus of pediatrics and medicine is the recipient of the 2010 American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO)-American Cancer Society Award and Lecture. Dr. Simone was given the award for his contributions to the prevention and management of cancer and for his leadership in the field of oncology. He played a leadership role in the development of curative treatments for childhood leukemia and lymphoma. Dr. Simone was also the founding medical director and chairman of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network and was instrumental in the creation of the ASCO's Quality Oncology Practice Initiative (QOPI). Each year through its Special Awards Program, ASCO recognizes quality researchers, patient advocates, and leaders of the global oncology community who through their work have made significant contributions to enhancing cancer care. Recipients of ASCO's highest, most prestigious awards collectively represent significant strides in cancer treatment and leadership in the oncology community.