ACADEMIC SENATE

AGENDA

December 6, 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 p.m. in the Warnock Engineering Classroom Building

2. MINUTES: November 1, 2010

3. REQUEST FOR NEW BUSINESS:

4. CONSENT CALENDAR:
   a. Appendix I: Resignations, Administrative and Faculty Appointments
   b. Appendix II: Auxiliary and Limited Term Appointments
   c. University Distinguished Teaching Awards

5. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT:

6. REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATION:
   a. Sustainability Report
   b. Diversity Presentation

7. REPORT FROM ASUU:

8. NOTICE OF INTENT:

9. DEBATE CALENDAR:
   a. Proposed John Moran Institute
   b. Proposed Minor in Modern Dance
   c. Proposed Name Change - Rio Mesa Center
   d. Proposed Revised Policy 6-100
   e. Proposed Revised Policy 6-101
   f. Proposed New Rule 6-100a

10. INFORMATION CALENDAR:
    a. Graduate Council Review – Department of Biochemistry
    b. Annual Report – Athletics Advisory Council

11. NEW BUSINESS:

12. ADJOURNMENT:
Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate, held on November 1, 2010, was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by James E. Metherall, Senate President. The meeting was held in room L105 Warnock Engineering Classroom Building.

Roll:

Excused: John Bowman, Ryan Morrison, Alison Regan
Excused w/o proxy: Timothy Garrett, David Blair, Richard Barton, Henryk Hecht

Ex-officio: James E. Anderson, Robert Flores, John Francis, James E. Graves, Nancy Lines, James Metherall, Paul Mogren, Susan Olson, David W. Pershing, Michael K. Young

Others: Ann Floor, Ed Barbanell, Michael Timberlake, Laura Snow, Donna White, Theresa Martinez, Gerda Saunders, Mary Ann Dresher

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of October 4, 2010, were unanimously approved with one correction, Joelle Lien should be marked present, following a motion from Jim Anderson which was seconded by Teri Mauch.

Request for New Business
There was no request for new business.

Consent Calendar
The resignations, retirements, faculty appointments, auxiliary, and limited term appointments, appearing in the Appendices on October 18, 2010, and November 1, 2010, received approval to
forward to the Board of Trustees following a motion by Richard Dorsky and seconded by Robert Fujinami.

Executive Committee Report
Pat Hanna, Executive Committee Secretary, summarized her written report of the October 18, 2010, Executive Committee meeting.

Report from Administration
President Michael K. Young informed the Senate of the serious high powered water line break earlier today injuring twelve, with two or three critically injured, and indicated that some buildings could be affected with temporary water and heating problems.

President Young extended congratulations to the Health Sciences for their recent award as the number one health care system in the United States, receiving a five star rating, after rating in each of the five categories.

The President was pleased to announce the dedications of the Floyd and Jeri Meldrum Civil Engineering Building, the Annette Poulson Cumming Nursing Building, and the McCarthy Family Track and Field facility.

The President encouraged the senators to get out and vote on Tuesday and reminded everyone that Saturday morning ESPN will be broadcasting Game Day from the University of Utah and that it should be a good day for the University.

Report from ASUU
Chase Jardine, ASUU President, reported that ASUU has been working on two initiatives. The first was Impact Day in which 75 political candidates came to the campus and interacted with students. In conjunction with this program, ASUU is working Vice President Kim Wirthlin to start a program that would bring legislators, preferably from the Higher Ed appropriations committee, to the campus and allow the students to interact and tour with them. The second initiative is a program called ‘Career Advantage’. This program would allow undergraduate students who are undecided in their careers a website to view case studies and student profiles of former students now in graduate school to offer advice. ASUU is working with other organizations and graduate schools on this program. When asked why more women don’t run for the top ASUU office, Chase noted that there are a couple of women considering to run this year.

Notice of Intent
Ed Barbanell, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, presented a proposed new revision of Policy 6-100 (Instruction and Evaluation). A motion to move to the Debate Calendar was made by Orest Symko, seconded by Larry DeVries, and approved with one objection.

Donna White, Associate Dean of Graduate School, provided a short synopsis of the proposed new policy, Policy 6-225 to put Graduate Emphases on transcripts. She indicated that this was nearly identical to the Undergraduate Emphases which passed the senate two years ago and would now like to move it forward. A motion from Jim Anderson to move this to the Debate Calendar was seconded by Suzanne Darais and approved.
Debate Calendar
Policy 6-225 for Undergraduate Emphasis on Transcripts was acted on. A motion to forward as the Board of Trustees as an information item was made by Jim Anderson, seconded by Suzanne Darais, and unanimously approved.

Laura Snow, Special Assistant to the President, explained the two options to clarify the language in the description of awarding Honorary Degrees in Section A, Policy 9-002. A motion to accept the shorter version with the friendly amendment to add “. . . achieved unusual distinction” in the shorter version, was made by Jim Anderson and seconded by Douglas Johnson and called to a vote and failed. After further discussion, and following a second friendly amendment, it was suggested to accept the longer version and to include the word ‘society’ following “. . . in service to the University and/or”, and to end the paragraph following the word ‘invention’. A motion to accept the second friendly amendment came from Larry DeVries, and was seconded by Chad Peterson and approved. Larry DeVries then made a motion to approve the entire proposal and forward the amended policy to the Board of Trustees for final approval which was seconded by Jim Anderson and approved.

Ed Barbanell introduced Michael Timberlake, chair of the ad hoc committee that was appointed to review this policy. Ed summarized the changes by section for Policy 6-100. Jim Anderson moved to divide the policy into sections which was seconded by Suzanne Darais and approved. After reviewing the policy, section by section, Section M could not be approved and a recommendation to table Policy 6-100 was received. A motion from Amanda Barusch, seconded by Steve Alder to table the entire policy until the December Senate meeting was approved. As every section except Section M was agreed upon and as the accompanying Policy 6-101 and Rule 6-100A have been accepted, only Section M will be reviewed in December in an effort to approve the entire package.

Information Calendar:
The revision of the College of Fine Arts Charter, the proposed 12 Emphases for Undergraduate Music Majors, and the Charter revisions to the University Requirement Committee received approval at the Executive Committee on October 18, 2010.

The President’s Honors and Awards Report from the Board of Trustees meeting on October 12, 2010 was included on the information calendar.

New Business
There was no new business.

Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Lines
APPENDIX I

RETIREMENT, RESIGNATIONS & APPOINTMENTS

Retirement

1. Dr. Robert M. Brooks, Professor with tenure of Mathematics, member of faculty for 43 years, effective December 31, 2010.

Resignations

1. Dr. Soumen Khatua, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Pediatrics, effective November 27, 2010.

2. Dr. Arden Weintraub, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Psychiatry, effective July 1, 2010.

Faculty Appointments

MEDICINE

1. Dr. Robin D. Kim, Associate Professor of Surgery, effective September 1, 2010. This represents a track switch and supersedes his appointment as Adjunct Associate Professor of Surgery.

2. Dr. Leslie Lenert, Professor of Biomedical Informatics, effective September 1, 2010. This is in addition to his appointment as Professor of Internal Medicine.

SCIENCE

3. Dr. Sarah E. Bush, Assistant Professor of Biology, effective September 1, 2010. This represents a track switch and supersedes her appointment as Research Assistant Professor of Biology.
APPENDIX II

AUXILIARY FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Auxiliary Faculty Appointments

ENGINEERING

1. Dr. Shu Jiang, Research Assistant Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, effective September 17, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.S., 2000, China University of Geosciences  
   Ph.D., 2005, China University of Geosciences

HEALTH


   B.S., 2007, University of Utah  
   M.S., 2009, University of Utah

MEDICINE

3. Dr. Joan C. Abele, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Anesthesiology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1972, Ohio University  
   Ph.D., 1976, University of Detroit  
   M.D., 1980, Wayne State University

4. Dr. Nivedita Agarwal, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Radiology, effective November 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is in addition to her appointment as Adjunct Assistant Professor of Neurology.

5. Dr. McKay H. Bateman, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Anesthesiology, effective November 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 2000, Brigham Young University  
   M.D., 2005, Tulane University
6. Dr. Jonathan C. Bowman, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective November 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1996, University of Utah
   M.D., 2000, University of Utah

7. Dr. Howard Colman, Adjunct Associate Professor of Internal Medicine, effective December 7, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is secondary to his tenure track appointment as Associate Professor of Neurosurgery.

8. Dr. Sheila E. Crowell, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is secondary to her tenure track appointment as Assistant Professor of Psychology.

9. Dr. Stephen Fafinski, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Radiology, effective November 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.A., 1988, University of California
   M.D., 1999, St. Georges University School

10. Dr. Helen E. Hong, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Radiology, effective December 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is in addition to her appointment as Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Internal Medicine.

11. Dr. Shuanghu Liu, Research Instructor in Internal Medicine, effective November 9, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   M.D., 1986, Zhongshan Medical College
   M.S., 1991, Hunan Medical University
   Ph.D., 1995, Hunan Medical University

12. Dr. David Liu, Adjunct Instructor in Anesthesiology, effective July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.E., 2004, University of Queensland
   Ph.D., 2010, University of Queensland

13. Dr. Mikio Obayashi, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective November 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

   B.S., 1989, University of Utah
   M.D., 1994, University of Utah
14. Dr. Kimberly N. Page, Adjunct Instructor in Family & Preventive Medicine, effective November 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

B.S., 2001, University of California
M.D., 2005, Loma Linda University

15. Dr. Natalie A. Sanders, Instructor (Clinical) in Internal Medicine, effective November 9, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

B.S., 1998, University of Nevada
D.O., 2002, College of Osteopathic Medicine

16. Dr. Jerry D. Walker, Adjunct Instructor in Radiology, effective December 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011. This is in addition to his appointment as Instructor (Clinical) in Internal Medicine.

SOCIAL WORK

The following individuals have been recommended for appointment as Clinical Instructor in Social Work effective October 4, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

17. Mr. Robert S. Bain, M.S.W., 2007, University of Utah
18. Mr. William R. Cook, M.S.W., 1979, Arizona State University
19. Ms. Jilynne Hafen, M.S.W., 2005, University of Nevada
20. Ms. Kysa C. Osborne, M.S.W., 2000, University of Utah
21. Ms. Amy Pollard, M.S.W., 2005, University of Utah
22. Ms. Gretchen W. Skelly, M.S.W., 1996, Brigham Young University
MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 23, 2010

TO: David W. Pershing  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Greg Owens, Acting Chair  
University Teaching Committee

RE: Recommendation for the 2011 University Distinguished Teaching Awards

The University Teaching Committee met on November 19, 2010 to select the recipients for the 2011 University Distinguished Teaching Awards. Upon careful consideration and evaluation of the sixteen candidates, the University Teaching Committee strongly recommends the following four to be the recipients for the 2011 Distinguished Teaching Award:

- Cynthia Burrows  
  Distinguished Professor, Chemistry
- Elizabeth Clement  
  Associate Professor, History
- John Funk  
  Clinical Instructor, Education
- Robert Young  
  Professor, Architecture

Upon approval, please forward the candidates of the Distinguished Teaching Award to the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees for approval.

Thank you.

Approved:  
David W. Pershing  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date: 11/23/2010
November 1, 2010

A. Lorris Betz
Senior Vice President for Health Sciences
Bldg 550, 5th Floor
Campus

Dear Vice President Betz,

Enclosed is the proposal for the creation of the John Moran Institute which was approved by the Graduate Council on October 25, 2010. Included in this packet are the proposal and signature page.

Please forward this packet to the President’s Office for his signature before being forwarded 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
Program/Administrative Unit Title: The John Moran Institute

Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code: N/A

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

Proposed Beginning Date: January 1, 2011

Institutional Signatures (as appropriate):

Department Chair
Randall J. Olson, MD

Dean or Division Chair
David J. Bjorkman, MD

Graduate School Dean
Charles A. Wight, PhD

Chief Academic Officer
Lorris A. Betz, MD, PhD

President
Michael K. Young, JD

Date

October 19, 2010
MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Fred Esplin, Vice President for Institutional Advancement
       Laura Snow, Secretary to the University
SUBJECT: Proposed John Moran Institute
DATE: November 19, 2010

It is our understanding that the Academic Senate will be considering the recommendation for the creation of the John Moran Institute at your next meeting. We are writing to make you aware of a parallel action involving the honorary naming of the Institute. In accordance with Policy 9-001: Naming of University Facilities and Programs, the honorary naming proposal has been both reviewed and approved by the Vice President for Institutional Advancement, the senior administration and President Young. As the next step in the process, it will be presented to the Board of Trustees for review and action at their December 14, 2010 meeting. We anticipate no problem with it being approved by the Trustees.
Request (section 1)

The leadership team of the John A. Moran Eye Center requests the establishment of the John Moran Institute (JMI). This proposal is a result of the growing realization that seemingly disparate diseases share common etiologies and thus, the study of disease diagnostics and therapeutics must combine the expertise of multiple disciplines and clinical groups. The establishment of the JMI will allow the broadening of the JMEC mission beyond ophthalmology, and into the arena of translational medicine. The JMI will embrace a multidisciplinary, multi-department approach to the study of diseases focusing on immune system dysregulation and vascular diseases and will serve as an additional campus wide resource for the exploration of translational medicine.

Forming the JMI will include establishment of the Moran Center for Translational Medicine (MCTM). The goal of the proposed MCTM would be the acceleration of the translation of basic scientific discoveries to clinically effective diagnostics and therapies for the treatment of devastating eye disorders such as age-related macular degeneration and glaucoma, as well as other diseases with shared etiologies. The MCTM will house a clinically-based research effort combining clinical observation/phenotyping and the collective strengths and expertise of an interdisciplinary, collaborative team of cell biologists, molecular immunologists, geneticists, microbiologists, pathologists to create new diagnostics and therapeutics, primarily focussed on immunologic and vascular dysfunction mechanisms common to many progressive diseases. The unique resources, clinical acumen and scientific expertise of the MCTM will complement the core competencies of collaborating corporate and academic partners to insure its success. In establishing the MCTM the JMI would combine the motivation of the Moran Eye Center and expand it beyond ophthalmology creating a new mission focused on learning in the clinic and using that knowledge to guide research in creating new diagnostic tools and treatments in diseases that share etiologies with common...
ocular diseases.

**A Brief History of the John A. Moran Eye Center**

Evolving from a surgical division in 1979 and a department in the School of Medicine in 1981, the John A. Moran Eye Center opened in July 1993, marking the beginning of a new era for the patients and patrons of the University of Utah Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences. In 1993, the Center included three fully equipped operating rooms, a clinical floor with 25 exam rooms, minor procedure rooms, laser suites, a pharmacy, and the Utah Lions Eye Bank. Specialties included cornea and external eye disease, ophthalmic plastic and reconstructive surgery, refractive surgery, glaucoma, cataract, neuro-ophthalmology, pediatric ophthalmology, macular disease, vitreoretinal disease, uveitis and ocular infections, immunologic disease, and contact lenses.

In 2005 the new John A. Moran Eye Center was designed and built based on input from focus groups consisting of individuals with varying levels of sight abilities. It is now home to more than 450 faculty, staff and students, including one of the top retinal research teams in the world and boasts among its accomplishments:

- Faculty are involved in more than 30 active clinical trials, compared to three in 1993. These studies involve more than 2,700 clinical visits each year.
- Annual research grants from the National Institutes of Health exceeding $6.5 million dollars, placing the Center 6th in the nation.
- A graduate physician training program that has been ranked among the top 10 residency programs in the country.
- The Utah Lions Eye Bank, which provides donor tissue for vision-restoring corneal transplants to more than 500 recipients in Utah and around the U.S. every year.
- Private funding, by patient care and research grants, requiring less than 1 percent of the center's budget from the State of Utah.
- 11 satellite clinics that host more than 120,000 clinic visits each year.
- Surgeons that perform more than 6,500 surgical procedures annually.
- More than 150 articles published annually in a wide variety of different medical and research publications.
- One of the top ophthalmology training centers in North America receiving over 300 applications from top medical graduate students for only three residency positions.
- More than 15,000 free eye screenings throughout the Wasatch Front.
- “The Highest Patient Satisfaction” award from University of Utah Health Care. This is the highest of 33 clinics specialty clinics. The Moran Eye Center scored in the top 90th percentile nationally for treating our patients extraordinarily well.
- Individually, our faculty and staff have received numerous awards and honors including:
An Expanding Mission

In 2010, the JMEC is focusing on the future. Our research and clinical findings and those of others worldwide has shown that many of the most serious blinding diseases, age-related macular degeneration, geographic atrophy, glaucoma, and others are often accompanied by a distinct set of comorbidities. Genetic analyses of the various diseases and their respective comorbidities also point to diseases of the eye being systemic in nature rather than limited to the ocular tissues. To understand these diseases our research and clinical missions must expand and reach out to a variety of other research disciplines and clinical specialties. It is with this new mindset that we request establishment of the John Moran Institute and the Moran Center for Translational Medicine.

In its initial instantiation the JMI will encompass two unique centers and their activities:

1. **The John Moran Eye Center (JMEC)**
   Under the direction of Chairman Randy Olson, Medical Director Norm Zabriskie, Research Director Robert Marc, and Clinical Research Director Paul Bernstein the JMEC will continue its focus on Clinical Ophthalmology, Education in Clinical Ophthalmology, Clinical Research in Vision Sciences, Basic Research in Vision Sciences, and training in the area of Vision Sciences research.

2. **The Moran Center for Translational Medicine (MCTM)**
   The MCTM will focus on research toward the creation of therapeutic targets for diseases that share small vessel and immune system etiologies. The MCTM will be intrinsically multi-disciplinary and encompass clinical phenotyping, systems biology analysis, statistics, and genetics.

   The broadening of mission that the addition of the MCTM represents is significant in bringing multiple disciplines together to study disease and potential diagnostics and therapeutics.
The overarching leadership will embrace the idea of translational medicine. Where clinical findings heavily influence basic and translational research, in turn providing new therapies, treatments, procedures, and even preventative strategies improving patient care and patient’s lives. The Director’s Council (illustrated in the above organizational chart) represents the mixing of research and clinic at the leadership level with the JMI Director, JMEC Medical Director, JMEC Research Director, JMEC Clinical Research Director, and MCTM Director all sitting on the panel - a mix of clinicians and researchers directing the JMI.

**Need (section II)**

**Translational Medicine Requires a Multidisciplinary Approach**

A common goal of biomedical research, whether in ophthalmology, radiology, oncology or any other area of clinical activity, is the actualization of significant impact of its research discoveries. In translational medicine this is generally conceived as clinical impact. With this goal in mind, it will be important to focus
on all aspects of translational research including: 1) Discovery; 2) Laboratory Testing; 3) Clinical Testing; and 4) Translation into the Market and Clinic. As simple as these four steps may seem, assembling individuals and teams that hold expertise in each area is complex. Often, experts in Discovery are different than experts in Laboratory Testing and this is true for every step in the translational chain. Thus, primary needs in actualizing translational medicine include assembling a collaborative group of experts with a shared goal and providing the group with resources to accomplish that shared goal. Resources are often conceived as material in nature (e.g. personnel, supplies and equipment). Translational medicine certainly requires the typical resources, but the needs also extend into “atypical” resources such as expertise in intellectual property, corporate partnering, regulatory compliance, marketing, and finance. Thus, an institute committed to expanding its mission to include translational medicine must provide an environment that reaches out to atypical communities, at least for a university entity. Following this thought, a multidisciplinary team takes on an expanded meaning, not only including scientific and medical disciplines such as genetics, molecular biology, and cardiovascular but also including disciplines in regulatory navigation, research ethics, intellectual property, finance, etc.... The need is for cross-campus interactions, from the school of medicine to the business school, and collaborations that extend outside the University and include other academic institutions and corporate partners. The JMI would be an institute built specifically with the idea of fostering these types of collaborations.

Building an Awareness of Translation Medicine

While generally recognized as one of the most efficient methods of building large, complex projects, team-based science is difficult to organize. There is a need for ongoing training, discussion, and “brainstorming” on the emerging field of translational medicine and, in general, team-based science. As with the actual work of translational medicine, the training and discussion of translational medicine also requires engaging individuals with diverse expertise ranging from University scientists to administration. Training must include bringing the next generation of scientists, clinicians, and other experts into the fold of translational medicine or more broadly team-based science. There is a need on campus for the assembly of groups that heighten the general community awareness around translational medicine and can also serve as general resources and champions in this area. Ultimately, research funding mechanisms and academic advancement concepts must also evolve rapidly to meet the objectives of translational research. While the central campus entity that focuses on the agenda of Clinical and Translational Science is the NIH-sponsored Center for Clinical and Translational Sciences (CTSS) which works in the boarder area of building on the University's strengths in genetics and bioinformatics to translate promising bench science into practices that improve human health. The MCTM would look to partnering with the CTSS and its other partners in increasing the visibility, volume, and quality of participatory research by focusing on the study of the common etiologies of eye disease and other diseases involving the immune and vascular systems. Essentially, the MCTM would serve as a node in the translational science network at the University.

Institutional Impact (section III)

John A. Moran Eye Center at the Crossroads

The John A. Moran Eye Center at the University of Utah has accomplished a series of important milestones that positions it for expansion into a strong translational research institute. The Center is in a solid position to make significant contributions due to its extensive resources; expertise in genetics, molecular biology, morphology, biochemistry, cell physiology, and pathobiology; its extraordinary sample collection, which numbers over 4,000 samples; and its demonstrated leadership in the diagnosis and treatment of ocular disease. This unique combination of resources, knowledge, talent and a desire of the faculty and staff to
work as a team represents an unprecedented opportunity for the Center to expand its mission and undertake a mission directed towards elucidating the biology of disease, identifying key pathways that lead to human disease and devising pharmaceutical strategies for the diagnosis and treatment of these devastating conditions.

We are fortunate to have a marvelous facility with over 100,000 square feet (sf) dedicated to research. This 210,000 sf facility includes clinical care, eye banking, education, as well as all elements of a first-class research facility. As evidence for the quality of the facility, the University of Melbourne in Australia, in reviewing changes for their own facility, sent a crew of architects and clinicians to all the major centers in the world and notified us that they had concluded the John A. Moran Eye Center was the best thought out, laid out, as well as the most functional facility, that they had a chance to review in their international travels. This is a huge asset.

We are also blessed with an expanding, talented and collaborative research faculty. We have superb leadership and staff dedicated to the expanded mission that would be formed with the establishment of the JMI. Critically, we have a mix of researchers including several holding both MD’s and PhD’s, with a foot in both the clinical and research camps, such as Drs. Paul Bernstein (Director of Clinical Research), Bradley Katz, and Bala Ambati, as well as internationally recognized researchers and endowed Professors such as Dr. Robert Marc, Director of Research, Dr. Wolfgang Baehr, and Dr. Gregory Hageman, who would serve as the Director of the Center for Translation Medicine. We have a very active experimental pathology group under the able leadership of Dr. Nick Mamalis. Dr. Randall Olson would lead the JMI and Mr. Wayne Imbrescia serve as as our administrative lead. Dr. Greg Jones would foster business development for our institute, an essential element of the team if discoveries are to “get to the clinic”. The team’s combined expertise in operations, entrepreneurial activity and great vision will chart our path forward.

With all of these elements in place, there is also an entrepreneurial spirit and a desire to exploit synergies. There is a palpable enthusiasm and excitement about the potential future of the JMI.

The initial membership of the JMI would be the faculty of the Department of Ophthalmology and Vision Sciences:

Balamurali Ambati
Alessandra Angeluci
Wolfgang Baehr
Paul Bernstein
Meg Deangelis
Jeanne Frederick
Yingbin Fu
Sabine Fuhrmann
Gregory Hageman
Mary Elizabeth Hartnett
Bryan Jones
Brad Katz

David Krizaj
Edward Levine
Nick Mamalis
Robert Marc
Ning Tian
Liliana Werner
Jun Yang

Additionally faculty with other home departments would be offered positions within the JMI structure based on the mission and collaborative community of the JMI being an enabling factor in that faculty member’s work.

**Impact Across Campus**

*Campus-Wide Collaboration*
As the JMI forms we will seek a variety of collaborations across the campus. In fact, many Moran Eye Center-campus collaborations exist today. An example of the type of collaborations we envision in the JMI is the recent high-throughput transmission electron microscopy collaboration between Dr. Robert Marc's laboratory and the groups of Drs. Tolga Tasdizen and Ross Whitaker at the Scientific Computing and Imaging (SCI) Institute. From slow, manual exploration and image capture (typically 10-50 images/day), we now have the ability to automatically collect 5,000 micrographs per day, seven days a week, in which all distortion is computationally compensated and 3-dimensional images volumes automatically assembled. In addition, the data is electronically archived. This allows new computational correlations between research and clinical specimens, which could only have been dreamed of even a few years ago. This is an example of what can happen when multidisciplinary teams work together on complex issues. The software and data generated by this collaboration are being used nationwide (Stanford, UC Santa Barbara, UC Davis, U Texas / Houston, and others) and is being discussed with an industry partner. This work has resulted in both grant applications or grant awards in departments ranging from the Departments of Biology and Electrical and Computer Engineering to the Brain Institute. Additionally, the collaboration has also aided in generating a new class offering in microscopy that is cross-listed with both the Department of Biology and the School of Computing.

The JMI, via the Center for Translation Medicine will also pursue and foster collaborations focused on translation of the research into the marketplace. In this area we have had a number of successful collaborations and have recently formed several potential high impact project. Examples of collaborations based on the translational mission include a collaboration that was formed after a chance meeting in 1996 between newly arrived Moran faculty member Paul Bernstein, MD, PhD and members of the University of Utah physics department. Dr. Bernstein and Professor Werner Gellermann realized that resonance Raman spectroscopy could be used in a novel manner to assess nutritional status in the living human retina by measuring the amounts of the carotenoids lutein and zeaxanthin in the macula. This technology has been successfully used in eye research projects around the world, and has resulted in numerous grants, patents, and publications. In the early stages of the project, one of Dr. Bernstein's laboratory technicians noted that when he put his hand in the path of the eye instrument's laser, he could also quantify the carotenoid levels in his skin. This skin Raman technology was patented and licensed to NuSkin/Pharmanex who developed the BioPhotonic Scanner as a marketing tool for its multi-level marketing vitamin distributors. Over 15,000 units are currently in use worldwide, yielding millions of dollars of royalties to the University of Utah and recent induction to the Technology Commercialization Office's Hall of Fame.

An example of new collaboration that has significant potential of finding a place in the market is a technique known as Computational Molecular Phenotyping. This work is being moved toward commercialization in the area of drug discovery. The plan for going forward was developed through a collaboration with a student team from the Pierre and Claudette MacKay Lassonde New Venture Development Center. This work provides a unique educational experience in new business development of the students and has resulted in a business plan that the students have used to compete in several national business competitions. Additionally, this work is the recipient of a 2010 Stoel-Rives Utah Innovation Award.

Another example of translational collaborations that would be fostered by the JMI is that between the laboratories of Drs. Bala Ambati and Bruce Gale (Mechanical Engineering), which has potential for a large clinical impact. Using his clinical experience in cataract surgery and his research experience in neovascularization of the cornea, Dr. Ambati initiated a collaboration with the Center for Biomedical Microfluidics (led by Dr. Gale) to develop a validated prototype drug delivery device that would alleviate the need for monthly injections into the eyes of patients suffering from macular degeneration. This device has been introduced to the FDA via a pre-IND meeting and the Ambati laboratory is currently preparing an
investigational new drug (IND) application that would allow the device to be introduced into phase I clinical trials.

This collaboration has gained recognition as a new State of Utah Center of Excellence and is the foundation of a new company, iVeena, that was awarded as a finalist in the 2010 Stoel-Rives Utah Innovation Award Program.

Ongoing interdepartmental collaborations include the Departments of Human Genetics (Hageman/Leppert); Neurobiology and Anatomy (Krizaj/Vetter); Physics (Bernstein/Gellermann); Biochemistry (Baehr/Hill); Mechanical Engineering (Ambati/Gale); Obstetrics and Gynecology (Hageman/Varner); and the SCI Institute (Marc/Tadizen/Whitaker).

These limited examples show the impact of the expanding mission of the JMEC. With the establishment of the JMI the mission will be formalized and accelerated. We envision impact to be campus wide with example interactions shown in the accompanying graph.

Educational Impact

An Expanded Educational Mission

The JMEC has always had a strong educational component that is well represented in both the clinical and research areas. In regards to training, the JMEC boasts a graduate physician training program that is consistently ranked in the top 10 residency programs in the country. The fellows program at JMEC is also a consistent high performer and nationally recognized. On the research side, JMEC trains over 15 graduate students from a variety of departments and programs including molecular biology, neuroscience and computer science. Additionally, the JMEC has a number of undergraduates serving roles throughout its laboratories including Ms. Heather Fillerup, a member of the Fu laboratory and recipient of a 2010 NIH/NIDDK Step-up program undergraduate participation grant.

Expansion of our mission as the JMI would also expand our educational mission. Keeping in mind the campus-wide need for the assembly of groups that heighten the general community awareness around translational medicine the JMI will establish, in collaboration with groups such as the Technology Commercialization Office, Eccles School of Business, CTSA, and other relevant groups, a seminar series on translational medicine and best practices on moving basic research to the clinic. It is expected that as we pull collaborations together that we, with our partners, will discovery a variety of educational opportunities to train both the new scientists and clinicians and also the established scientists and clinicians.

In addition, as the JMI we will look toward the potential of partnering with groups such as genetics, internal medicine, and computer science to create granted training programs for the next generation of scientists and clinicians. These training programs would be at the graduate, post-doctoral, and fellow levels and focused on clinical findings influencing basic research direction and research both basic and clinical influencing the standard of clinical care.
Finances (section IV)

The collaborative graph: This graph shows a subset of the areas of collaboration envisioned as part of the JMI. Areas of collaboration are associated with various departments and outside partners that would be involved in the collaborations.
Current Funding: The JMEC is funded using a five-pronged strategy of clinical revenue; federal funding; private foundation funding, corporate research, and benefactor funding. JMEC also receives a limited part of its funding from the State of Utah (less than 2% of the total budget). This model has shown success in the past as the operational research budget has seen steady growth and projections show continued financial success, for instance the research budget shown in the table shows both historical growth and projected growth.

Future Funding - Success Breeds Success...

The JMI would follow the same funding strategy with a soon to be announced partnership with a large pharmaceutical partner being an example of the corporate funding possible in translational medicine. This partnership will bring in roughly $800K per year in research and $400K in indirect funding. In addition to creation of a marketable therapeutic, success in this partnership would result in meaningful revenues for several years via both milestone payments and royalties. In addition to corporate partnerships, the JMI will pursue moving technology and discovery to the market via licensing and new company spin-outs. Examples are PerfectVision, FlickerFusion, iVeena, LLC and Metaboview, Moran spin-offs that are aggressively moving Moran technology to the market. State funding, which makes up roughly 2% of the Moran Eye Center will continue to directly fund the Moran Eye Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget and 5-Year Comparison for JMEC Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel Expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Dr. Wight:

It is with great enthusiasm and even greater expectations that I offer this letter of support for the establishment of the John Moran Institute (JMI).

While the clinical operations and training programs of the John Moran Eye Center (JMEC) are well established here at the University of Utah Health Sciences Center the expanding research and educational agenda represented in this application marks an exciting future direction for the proposed John Moran Institute. In 2010 the JMI would expect to have a research budget exceeding $12M and would include funding from federal sources, foundations, and corporations. This significant growth has come from the increasing competitiveness of the research and clinical faculty and a focused recruiting effort aimed at creating the top retinal research team in the world.

Institute status would allow the JMEC to become the John Moran Institute and expand its research and clinical missions to an interdisciplinary effort focused on translational medicine, research that moves basic discoveries from the laboratory to the clinic. This expansion is a natural result of JMEC’s early research into the most common blinding condition, macular degeneration. Recent findings by the JMEC research team have shown that macular degeneration, while thought to be solely a disease of the eye, is actually a result of immune system dysfunction and vascular disease. In fact, the basis of the JMEC research thrust is now the study of several disease states that share Macular Degeneration’s underlying etiology. To achieve the JMI mission statement the proposed institute must embrace a multi-disciplinary research agenda. It is evident from the combination of the group’s recent recruitment of Gregory Hageman, PhD, a specialist in macular degeneration and its immune system underpinnings, and Margaret DeAngelis, a specialist in genetics and the history of multi-department collaborations that the leadership is already well on the way to establishing a fundamentally multi-disciplinary effort.

The expansion of the educational mission and embracing of a multi-faceted approach to translational medicine are very exciting directions for both the proposed JMI and the university at-large. Translational medicine, while still being defined on a national level, will be a critical area for high-caliber research universities and having the JMI as a node in the university’s growing translation medicine network will be a very positive step forward in our efforts.
It is with this understanding that I fully endorse and support the John Moran Eye Center's application for Institute status, and creating the John Moran Institute.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

A. Lorris Betz, M.D., Ph.D.

Cc: Randall J. Olson, M.D.
    Greg Jones, Ph.D.
    Thomas N. Parks, Ph.D.
October 14, 2010

Chuck Wight, Ph.D., Dean
University of Utah Graduate School
302 Park Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Dear Dr. Wight,

It is with great pleasure that I strongly support the establishment of the John Moran Institute. I completely concur with all of the points made by Senior Vice President Betz in his letter of support.

The remarkable development and unprecedented opportunities that exist within the current John Moran Eye Center will be allowed to flourish and be even more successful within the proposed institution.

The John Moran Eye Center has recruited the top investigators and clinicians in the world. They have developed an innovative and collaborative approach to the basic, clinical, and translational investigation that will be able to take full advantage of the institute status.

I am confident that the proposed institute will be extraordinarily successful and be an enormous asset for the University.

Sincerely,

David J. Bjorkman, M.D., M.S.P.H.
Dean, School of Medicine
October 26, 2010

TO:    David Pershing  
       Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FR:    John Francis  
       Chair, Undergraduate Council

RE:    Minor in Modern Dance

At its meeting of Tuesday, October 19, 2008, the Undergraduate Council voted unanimously to approve a proposal from the College of Fine Arts for a Minor in Modern Dance. The proposal, along with letters of support, is attached.

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

To: Ed Barbenell, Associate Dean
From: Stephen Koester, Interim Chair
Date: October 18, 2010
Re: Proposal to Create a Minor in Modern Dance at the University of Utah

The Department of Modern Dance seeks approval to create and implement a Minor in Modern Dance at the University of Utah. The primary impact would be an increase of student numbers in the existing non-majors and selected majors courses. This proposal is in response to numerous inquiries and requests, over the span of many years, from students who want to minor in Modern Dance and continue their studies in the discipline without having to declare a major in modern dance or take the full four year BFA degree curriculum. This would also allow students who auditioned for the BFA degree program and who were not accepted into the program an outlet to continue their studies.

Our proposal for the Minor in Modern Dance is attached for your consideration.

As Interim Chair in the Department of Modern Dance, I fully support this proposal. It is long overdue and a win-win possibility for the Department and students. Please contact me if you require additional information.
PROPOSAL TO CREATE A MINOR IN MODERN DANCE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Section I: Request

The Department of Modern Dance at the University of Utah is proposing to create and implement a "Minor in Modern Dance." The primary activities impacted would be an increased number of students in the existing non-majors courses and in selected major courses as well.

Section II: Need

This proposal is in response to numerous inquiries and requests, over the span of many years, from students who want to minor in Modern Dance. These are students who want to continue to develop expertise in Modern Dance but who do not want to do the full 4 year major (BFA degree). We believe that offering the option of a minor (minimum 18 credits including a minimum of 6 upper division credits) will serve students who are attending the University of Utah, and who desire to receive a minor in dance while they are majoring in other disciplines. This curricular design offers Dance minors the possibility to complete two Fine Arts General Education requirements, the Diversity requirement, and the CW (upper division writing requirement) all within the minor. Our ability to offer a minor will undoubtedly increase our student credit hour productivity and provide more in-depth opportunities for our TA’s and Auxiliary faculty members to teach. Southern Utah University and Weber State University both offer dance minors that are similar in some respects. However, the University of Utah minor offers more theory based courses and is more Modern Dance focused with a well-rounded curriculum that includes courses in Service Learning, Kinesiology, and Culture and History.

Section III: Institutional Impact

The proposed creation of a minor will not affect enrollments in instructional programs of any affiliated departments or programs. The only change to the existing administrative structures would be listing the minor requirements in the University catalog, creating an information packet for interested students, and assigning a faculty advisor within the Department. The faculty advisor within the Department will personalize the curricular plan for each modern dance minor based upon one’s past experience and ability, and will be responsible to guide a student’s study in order for he/she to meet expected proficiencies required for a minor in modern dance. The current College of Fine Arts academic advisors are able to handle any additional University advising that might be needed (see support letter attached). There will be no changes in faculty or staff, no new physical facilities or modification to existing facilities, and no additional equipment commitment. This is not a reinstated program or a program for off-campus delivery.

Section IV: Finances

The proposed creation of a minor will generate an increase in enrollments for the Department of Modern Dance thereby increasing SCH and productivity funds. We can only estimate enrollments at this time but believe there would be between 20-25 students at any given time.
Other Relevant Information Including Faculty Approval, Entrance Requirements and Process, Curriculum, and Grading Requirements:

Faculty Approval to create a minor: Faculty vote to approve was taken on October 14th, 2010. Result: Unanimous approval.

Entrance Requirements: Acceptance into the Minor in Modern Dance program is based on an application/audition process. The student must be 1) an undergraduate student with any major other than Modern Dance who is in good standing at the University of Utah, 2) complete and submit the Minor in Modern Dance Application form (available to download at www.dance.utah.edu) including the approval signature from the advisor in the major department, and 3) pass a performance audition which includes Modern Technique and Improvisation. Auditions for the minor will take place concurrently with the auditions for the major.

Students must complete a minimum of 18 credit hours (minimum of 6 upper division) from the selection of Modern Dance courses listed below. Each student’s curriculum will be designed with guidance from Department and Academic advisors.

Introductory Courses Majors and Non-Majors – Groupings for Studio and Theory.

Upper Division Courses Major’s – Groupings for Studio and Theory
Modern Dance Minors (Choose courses to equal 6 credits minimum)

Total Credit Hours Required for Modern Dance Minor = 18 minimum

Grade Requirements: All courses for the Minor must be taken for a letter grade and completed with a “C-” or better to count toward the Minor in Modern Dance. Students must also maintain a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0 throughout his/her Minor course work in the Department.
### Studio Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name/Description</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANC 1200</td>
<td>Non Majors Beginning Modern Dance*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(This course has multiple sections focusing on different genres.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 1310, 1320</td>
<td>Major's Technique Level 1 (by placement)*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 2310, 2320</td>
<td>Major's Dance Technique Level 2 (by placement)*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 1020</td>
<td>Non Majors Intermediate Modern Dance*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(This course has multiple sections focusing on different genres.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 1030</td>
<td>Non Major's Advanced Modern Dance Technique*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 2610</td>
<td>West African</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 1023 (Section 001 or 002)</td>
<td>Dance Composition (Fulfills FA General Education requirement)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 1075</td>
<td>Dance- Creative Process (Fulfills FA General Education requirement)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 1330, 1340</td>
<td>Beginning Ballet for Modern Majors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 1210</td>
<td>Cultural Dance Forms (includes Jazz technique)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theory Courses (minimum of one semester)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name/Description</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANC 1010, Dance in Culture</td>
<td>(Fulfills FA General Education and Diversity requirements)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 1410, 1420</td>
<td>Modern Workshop I (by placement)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 2410, 2420</td>
<td>Modern Workshop II (by placement)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Upper Division Courses (choose to = minimum 6 credits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name/Description</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANC 4420</td>
<td>Service Learning in Modern Dance (by placement)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 4510, 4511</td>
<td>Kinesiology I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 4571</td>
<td>Movement in Culture (Fulfills Upper Division Communication/ Writing requirement)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 4711</td>
<td>Dance History (Fulfills Upper Division Communication/ Writing requirement)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 3310, 3320</td>
<td>Major's Technique Level 3 (by placement)*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 4310, 4320</td>
<td>Major's Technique Level 4 (by placement)*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 3410</td>
<td>Advanced Improvisation (by placement)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANC 4388</td>
<td>Dance Performance*</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This course can be taken more than once for credit.
October 4, 2010

To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing in support of the creation of a minor in Modern Dance at the University of Utah. As two academic advisors working with both undecided students and those within the College of Fine Arts, we often encounter students inquiring regarding a dance minor. Additionally, many prospective students we see are curious about this option as well. Since we see many of these students anyway, the additional work load to advise these students regarding the minor would be something that we would feel capable of handling in conjunction with a departmental faculty advisor.

Sincerely,

Liz Abbott
College of Fine Arts Academic Advisor

Libby Oberg
College of Fine Arts Academic Advisor
PROPOSAL TO CREATE A MINOR IN MODERN DANCE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Signature Page

Stephen Koester, Chair – Modern Dance

Raymond Jymas-Jones, Dean of the College of Fine Arts

David Pershing, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs

Michael K. Young, President – University of Utah
October 5, 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 Rio Mesa Center which was approved by the Graduate Council on September 27, 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,

[Signature]

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
Program/Administrative Unit Title: Rio Mesa Center

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

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

Proposed Beginning Date: ________________________________

Institutional Signatures (as appropriate):

[Signature]
Thomas N. Parks
Vice President for Research

[Signature]
Charles A. Wight
Dean, Graduate School

[Signature]
David W. Pershing
Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs

[Signature]
Michael K. Young
President

Date
Memorandum

Date: August 23, 2010
To: Chuck Wight, Dean, Graduate School
From: Thomas N. Parks, Vice President for Research
Subject: New Center Approval Request

I write to request the approval of the Rio Mesa Center, formerly known as the Entrada Research Field Station. This change reflects the multidisciplinary use as a center and distinguishes it from other entities in Utah named Entrada.

Enclosed are supporting documents. This center reports to the vice president for research. Thank you for your attention to this request.

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

Enclosures
1. Briefly describe the administrative change or new unit, its central goals and mission, and its academic and teaching contributions.

History
The Entrada Field Station was established in 2007 when a group of University faculty requested that the University acquire the 380-acre Entrada Ranch in order to establish an outdoor laboratory/classroom that could be used to develop new programs in environmental science and education. Initially, Continuing Education administered the field station. In the fall of 2008, administration was assigned to the Vice President for Research. Recently, the name was changed to Rio Mesa Center to reflect the Ranch's broad, multidisciplinary mission, as well as to distinguish it from other entities in Utah named Entrada.

Goals
The central goal of Rio Mesa Center is to provide the University of Utah with a multidisciplinary, modern outdoor laboratory that emphasizes research, education, and outreach related to ecosystems of the Colorado Plateau. Rio Mesa is a place where diverse disciplines (e.g., science, architecture, engineering, humanities and art) come together to question the notion of what it means to live on the Colorado Plateau—its past, present and future. Faculty and students in the Colleges of Science, Architecture and Planning, Engineering, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and Office of Sustainability are currently using the Center.

Rio Mesa Center offers research and educational opportunities to the University and the public that cannot be duplicated in classrooms or laboratories at the University’s urban campus.

The Center is open to University of Utah students and faculty, as well as individuals and groups from other local, state, national and international institutions/agencies.

Mission

The mission of Rio Mesa Center is to support and promote any area of study on the Colorado Plateau, but owing to its unique location and history, the Center is developing interdisciplinary research, education, outreach and professional training around three integrative themes:
Water in the West. Rio Mesa Center's location along the Dolores River on the Colorado Plateau allows active investigation into all aspects of water in the West. The Dolores River, which runs for almost three miles through the property, is a key tributary to the Colorado River. Studies at the Center will provide critical information for land managers, policy makers, and stakeholders on water quality and quantity in the upper Colorado River Basin. Studies will also help predict how ecosystems will respond to future land use and climate changes to ensure a sound understanding of water and its connectivity across ecosystems, dynamics within watersheds, and its role in sustaining human activities.

In addition to ecosystem-based questions about water resources, the Center presents the opportunity to research the functional aspects of water use by humans. For example, Dr. Steve Burian, Civil Engineering, and his graduate students completed our flood plain analysis, which will determine septic placement and facility construction. Students in Civil Engineering and Architecture are exploring the possibility of alternative wastewater treatments, gray water reuse, water purification through solar distillation and rain water harvesting at the Center. Engaging students and faculty in the research behind the development of these systems offers real-world problems in a remote, outdoor laboratory. The intention of the Center is for every facility and system constructed in the coming years to function as both a research question and an educational tool.

Humans and Sustainability on Fragile Lands. The recent concern about sustainability arises from the wide-spread recognition that historic and current modes of utilizing natural resources are not only unsustainable, but are having large-scale, unintended, negative consequences. Such consequences include climate change, topsoil erosion, depletion of arable land and loss of freshwater, waste management issues and loss of species and ecosystem services.

The University of Utah is the current caretaker of the land that makes up the Rio Mesa Center, a place that many people, over the last thousand years, have called home. Hundreds of years from now, different people, living in a very different world, will inhabit the Center. This historic perspective calls on us to be sensitive caretakers of the land into the future, but also to use the beauty and history of Rio Mesa to examine how sustainable living has evolved (with successes and failures) through time, and to anticipate, explore, and imagine what life might be like in the future.

Faculty associated with Rio Mesa Center are developing programs that address these issues. The Center is currently supporting research and education into early humans and historical homesteaders and will use this research to develop educational curricula. In addition, the Center is functioning as a laboratory for new technologies in engineering and architecture, including studies on biomimicry, solar energy, environmental treatment of water, etc. As such, the Center provides a real-world laboratory that requires students to exercise integrated thinking about humans and their place in biologically complex, but fragile, systems.

Solitude and Inspiration. Rio Mesa Center preserves land amidst a growing population. Utah is one of the fastest growing states in the nation and in the next 40
years, the population will double, making remote, undeveloped lands even more rare and valuable. Rio Mesa Center will provide a place where scholars and artists can find the solitude, quiet, and space that supports their work.

**Research: 2007-2010**

**Tamarisk.** Researchers in the Department of Biology and Department of Geography, in collaboration with scientists from USGS, are investigating the hydrologic and ecologic consequences of beetle-induced tamarisk defoliation and mortality. In addition, the Tamarisk Coalition and BLM are using Rio Mesa to monitor tamarisk populations. To date, two peer-reviewed papers have been produced:


**Hydrological Research.** Dr. Roger Burnett, US Bureau of Reclamation, established shallow wells in the tamarisk vegetation to monitor changes in water levels and show longer-term fluctuation in depth of water, temperature, and salinity. These data will inform understanding of ground water flow and how changes in temperature and salinity could relate to river recharge/discharge relationships and normal seasonal variability.

Mike Cline, Ph.D. candidate. University of Arizona. Used the Center to collect soil samples for a study on paleohydrology of the Dolores River.


**Archaeology/Historical Inhabitants.** Researchers in the Department of Anthropology have initiated a long-term study of human-ecosystem interactions in the “Utah Bottoms” (Rio Mesa Center).

**Ecological Competition of two Seed Harvester Ants.** A researcher in the Department of Biology is currently establishing a study of two co-occurring seed harvester ant species. This study will involve a collaboration with K12 teachers and the Rio Mesa GMAP program (see below).
Development of Plant and Insect Collections. Students and faculty in biology and environmental studies are collaborating to survey and produce teaching and research collections of the plant and insect diversity of Rio Mesa Center.

Interdisciplinary Research. Recently, a group of faculty comprised of architects, engineers and biologists have initiated a working group to develop interdisciplinary research at the Center. This group is defining research relevant to the development of future facilities with a focus on the integration of ecologically-sensitive and cutting-edge technologies. They will address every future facility design at the Center as a research question. Facilities, once constructed, will actively test new technologies and serve as educational tools for all visitors.

Educational training

University of Utah Courses 2007-2010
- Plant Systematics (Biology)*
- Plant Structure and Function (Biology)*
- Advanced Ornithology Lab (Biology)
- Plant Ecology Lab (Biology)*
- Entomology (Biology)*
- Fluid Dynamics (Mechanical Engineering)
- Senior Capstone Course (Civil Engineering)-2010 Center road improvements
- Architectural Design (senior course, Architecture)*
- Advanced Architecture Studio (Architecture)-2009 Center master planning
- Desert Backpacking (Parks, Recreation and Tourism)
- Red Rock Institute Class (Environmental Studies)
- Wilderness Writing for Youth (Continuing Education)
- Bennion Center Alternative Fall Break (University volunteer corps)*

*Courses taught annually at Center

Graduate, Undergraduate & Professional Development 2009-2010

Ultimately, the reach of Rio Mesa's research and educational programs will depend on how well students understand the complex environmental issues facing the world and whether they are poised—through skills and imagination—to act on their knowledge. Even the most energy-efficient buildings and well-studied landscapes will prove irrelevant if students do not develop a sophisticated understanding of the environmental, professional and economic challenges that the next 20-50 years will bring.

Securing a sustainable environmental future will require innovative social, technological and scientific solutions that will come from broadly trained professionals who are adept at complex thinking and conversing across their disciplines. Unlike field stations founded in the past, which were often motivated by strictly biological or land management needs, Rio Mesa is being developed from an interdisciplinary perspective, bringing in disciplines and students not traditionally associated with field stations (e.g., architecture, engineering, anthropology,
communication).

In 2009-2010, the Center established an innovative professional training model, which leverages this Center, it’s development and all of the resources available at the University in a way that adds to the richness of students’ education and provides them with unique training opportunities.

In this program, undergraduate and graduate students engage real-world challenges associated with the development of this remote field center. As they design solutions to Center needs, they are exposed to a range of disciplines and must devise solutions that meet the needs of their special area of work, but that also consider and mitigate the needs of all Center stakeholders. Students participating in this training program meet regularly with their “clients” (e.g., Dr. Torti and advisory committee members), produce deliverables on a schedule, and finally justify and present their work both in written and oral form. Forty-one undergraduate and graduate students have participated in this program.

Their contributions, which simultaneously act as professional training opportunities, include:

- Creation of an interpretive trail (Parks, Recreation and Tourism Master’s professional project);
- Completion of archaeological/historical analysis (Anthropology PhD candidate);
- Completion of floodplain analysis (two Civil Engineering PhD candidates);
- Design of road repairs (Civil Engineering senior capstone course; 22 students);
- Development of Rio Mesa’s master plan (Architecture, 9 graduate students);
- Initiation of insect collection: Rio Mesa Undergraduate Fellow, 2009;
- Anthropological study of geophytes: Rio Mesa Undergraduate Fellow, 2010;
- Creation of an art book that interprets Scharf Homestead: Rio Mesa Undergraduate Fellow, 2010 (see undergraduate scholarship flyer);
- Rio Mesa Internships
  - Initiation of plant collection, 2009, Whitney Williams;
  - Development of insect and plant collections, 2010, Sean Meyers;

**Outreach**

A central mission of Rio Mesa Center is to connect with Grand County and the Moab community. The Mayor and Economic Development Director of Moab, Grand County High School and various non-profit organizations are extremely supportive of the Center and are collaborating to develop formal and informal educational programs that serve this rural constituency of Utah. We expect that the Center will also help to familiarize and recruit students to the University. Finally, the presence of the Center provides myriad economic opportunities to local businesses.

**Outreach 2008-2010**

- Rio Mesa Center partnered with Grand Canyon Trust and The Nature
Conservancy to put on Moab’s First Sustainability Festival, October 2009.

- **Rio Mesa Seminar Series.** The University of Utah partners with Moab community to present talks on ecosystems studies, tamarisk and restoration.

- **Utah Field Station Network.** Rio Mesa spearheaded the UFSN, a state-wide network of field stations similar to the California Reserve system.
  
  http://www.utahfieldstations.org/.

- **Rio Mesa GMapK12**
  

  - Founded by Ms. Pat Lambrose, Salt Lake City School technology specialist, GMap is a "real-world" three-day workshop where educators collaborate with scientists from the University of Utah to collect, analyze, and map data at Rio Mesa Center.

- **Moab Multicultural Center** is developing a partnership with Rio Mesa Center.

- **Grand County High School** is using Rio Mesa Center for environmental education.

**User Days/Demand**

Based on University faculty members who have voiced interest in using the Center, as well as growing interest in the Moab community (Grand County High School, K-12 teacher training, Moab Multicultural Center), we expect user days in the coming years to exceed 2000/year, especially after the off-grid camping facility is completed (see below).

2007-2008: Accurate user days were not recorded in 2007-2008.
2009: Rio Mesa Center had 331 user days.
2010: (as of July 31st) Rio Mesa Center has had 418 user days
  
  127 researcher user days
  215 UU education user days
  67 non-UU education user days
  9 community day visitors
  418 user days (expected 2010 user days- 800)

2. **Provide a program description and justification, including rationale, demand, activities, and location, and consultation with relevant or similar units across the Utah System of Higher Education.**

Rio Mesa is a University of Utah facility intended to educate students, K-12 teachers and the public about the environment, the Colorado Plateau, and alternative technologies and building strategies for arid environments. This is a place to learn about the ecological, cultural and geological wonders of southern Utah.
The University of Utah has one other field station: Range Creek Field Station, which was officially established following a three-way land transfer between the State of Utah, Division of Wildlife Resources and the State of Utah, School and Institutional Lands Administration. Full management responsibilities for the property have been transferred to the Utah Museum of Natural History. Administrators and researchers from Rio Mesa Center and Range Creek Field Station have developed very good relations; they communicate frequently and integrate their efforts whenever possible.

Utah currently has twelve field stations administered by universities, federal agencies and/or non-profit organizations. In 2009, Dr. Torti, of Rio Mesa Center took the lead in organizing these field stations into a network, following a model similar to that of the UC Natural Reserve System of thirty-six field stations across California, administered by the California System of Higher Education.

This network, Utah Field Station Network—UFSN—is dedicated to promoting a deeper understanding of Utah’s diverse ecosystems and contributing to the sustainable, economic use of Utah’s natural resources (www.ufsn.org). USFN is a consortium of research stations administered by universities, state and federal agencies in Utah. The network facilitates socially and economically relevant scientific research and provides long-term, uniform and centralized data. These data will help land managers understand current and future environmental conditions in Utah as they relate to global change, drought, infectious diseases, health and changing economies. The network also promotes education and public awareness across disciplines and institutions.

Rio Mesa Center has completed a preliminary business plan for its development and administration within the context of this statewide network.

3. **Describe the structure and organization of the unit, including key personnel if they are known.**

The Vice President for Research has administrative governance over Rio Mesa Center. Biologist and writer Sylvia Torti, Ph.D., is the center’s manager. Kathryn (Kate) Call is the facility manager, and lives on the property. There are two a part-time staff: a staff specialist and a project coordinator. The facility manager and part-time personnel report to Dr. Torti. In addition, there is a rotating Research Director selected from the University’s faculty. Currently, Assistant Professor Ryan Smith in the School of Architecture and Planning is the Research Director @ 20% time, and reports to the VP for Research. A 19 member advisory committee, consisting of diverse faculty and staff, meets regularly.

Center policies have been developed and are based on policy criteria described by the Organization of Biological Field Centers (http://obfs.org); Rio Mesa Center has
joined this national organization for support and guidance. All requests for use of the center for educational and research purposes are made through Sylvia Torti. Requests are promptly reviewed for appropriateness before access is granted. All visitors are required to complete and sign a UU Liability Waiver form. Students must complete an emergency contact form prior to the field trip date.

A final fee schedule has not been established for use of the Rio Mesa Center. Currently, Center use is supported entirely by the University of Utah at no cost to students, professors or researchers. Once camping facilities with a bathhouse and pavilion are constructed, reasonable fees will be implemented.

4. Describe needed facilities and equipment.

Rio Mesa Center: property and facilities

At the present time, Rio Mesa has three accommodation buildings at the western end of the property: 1) the Dalton House can hold up to eight people with bunk beds, a futon, a kitchen and a bathroom; 2) El Shack has two full beds and electricity; 3) the Gazebo House has a full bed and electricity. Neither El Shack nor the Gazebo House has water, bathroom or kitchen. Camping is available. Portable toilets can be arranged for larger groups.

Critical equipment/infrastructure at the Ranch:
- a stable 120-240 VAC electrical power supply
- water rights for both river and ground water
- good, year round gravel road access (12 km to a paved highway)
- weather stations
- computers for general use
- satellite telephones
- satellite-based high-speed, wireless Internet connections
- An on-line, real-time virtual laboratory
Research activities began in 2007 with the installation, calibration and operation of climate-related and ecology-related equipment that forms the basis of long-term record collections.

- **Meteorology centers.** Two Campbell Scientific weather centers have been installed and have been operational since June 2006. The centers provide online continuous measurements of air temperature, soil temperature at multiple depths, relative, wind speed and direction, solar radiation, precipitation, and barometric pressure. The centers are located along the Dolores River (adjacent to USGS gauging center) and in Line Canyon. Data are transmitted to a receiver at the Dalton House and from there satellite linked to the University and the Internet.

- **U.S.G.S. water gauging center.** The US Geological Survey has maintained a gauging center here along the Dolores River for 60 years. The Dolores River is unmanaged for nearly 150 km upstream of the Rio Mesa Center, resulting in large and dynamic fluctuations in river flows in response to summer thunderstorms and spring snowmelt.

- **Webcam to record phenology.** An internet-based and remotely adjustable webcam provides a record of the leaf phenology of both aquatic and terrestrial vegetation at the field center. The webcam can be programmed to take high-quality web cam photographs of specific plants or vegetated areas on a daily basis.

- **Continuous sap-flux measurements on riparian trees.** In May 2006, Drs. Kevin Hultine and Jim Ehleringer installed Granier sap-flux measurement systems to measure continuous, tree-scale transpiration measurements on native cottonwood and the woody invasive tamarisk that currently dominates riparian vegetation at the field center and throughout the Colorado Plateau.

- **High-precision atmospheric trace gas measurements.** In Spring 2007, Dr. Dave Bowling and colleagues installed a high-precision atmospheric carbon dioxide monitoring center on the bluff above the Center. This is the first continuous, online high-precision measurement system on the Colorado Plateau and will complement a network of other centers operated in northern Utah by the University of Utah (http://co2.utah.edu) and by Britt Stevens at NCAR (http://www.ctl.ucar.edu/~stephens/RACCOON/).

- **Biological surveys** have also been initiated. Dr. Sylvia Torti, in collaboration with Dr. Lynn Bohs, a plant systematist, has begun a plant collection; an insect collection was initiated in 2009 by Rio Mesa's Undergraduate Fellow, Matt Mau, under the direction of Dr. Donald Feener; insect specimens are being further processed by Dr. Feener's entomology course. Bird surveys have been started by Dr. Dale Clayton. Plant and insect collections will be housed at the center as well as the Department of Biology and the Utah Museum of Natural History.

- **The Virtual Laboratory.** The value of field stations pivots, to a large degree, on their ability to provide stakeholders with relevant, long-term data sets. Rio Mesa has developed a unique virtual lab with web-based, live-streaming data that allows researchers, teachers and land managers direct access to the full

**Facility Upgrades**
The following facility upgrades have been completed at the west end of the property:
- Replacement of septic system to Dalton and Deck Houses;
- Improvements to electrical system in Deck and Dalton Houses;
- Improvements to water system to Dalton and Deck Houses
- Upgraded irrigation system.

Preliminary plans for an off-grid camping area at the eastern end of the property have been completed and funds have been allocated for a culinary well, septic and bathhouse construction. In addition, the VP for Research recently submitted a successful proposal to the Utah Division of Facility and Construction Management for a matching grant for solar panels. The Center is exploring development opportunities for a four-season pavilion, which is an important addition to the planned east-end camping area.

The campsite research/educational area at the east end of the property is intended to serve a maximum of 40 persons. The site will be entirely off-grid; all utilities and services will be minimized and provided through sustainable, local methods and resources. In keeping with Rio Mesa’s mission as a place to test new research and use innovative ideas to solve perennial human problems of water, energy and waste, the camping facilities will be constructed using new methods of construction and resource generation. Additionally, this area has been designed to allow for future changes as technologies become more efficient and/or change form. The University has allocated funds for site development, camping and bathhouses.

The campsite will provide twenty recycled deck or wood tent pads (8' x 16”) with wall tents for forty students/faculty members. In addition to these 2-person sleeping/gear areas, there will be three bath houses and one dining/lecture pavilion. A fire pit with shade structure will provide an exterior gathering area for organized and spontaneous use. There is an exterior storage structure located by the six available parking spaces on site. Access to this location will be limited and include van shuttling, biking and walking from the entrance facility downriver.
**Rio Mesa Pavilion.** The pavilion (1,300 sq feet) is a passive solar structure designed to facilitate diverse classroom, laboratory and dining activities year round. Spring and summertime conditions are hot and arid (35-45°C temperatures and 5-30% humidities); winters can be quite cold with substantial snow. In addition, there is a biting midge season and a biting fly season in the summer months.

The interior of this space is designed for maximum flexibility. Collapsible tables and chairs will allow faculty, students and researchers to organize the space for dining, as laboratory benches or large work areas; tables and chairs can be collapsed and removed for auditorium seating, dance or musical performances. The pavilion includes one ADA accessible bathing facility and a large kitchen for preparing individual and group meals. The kitchen has a full stove and refrigerator and there will be exterior cooking facilities just outside.

---

**Bathhouses.** We will be constructing three small bathhouses (64 sq feet) to accommodate campers. Each bathhouse will contain two units. The bath houses are very efficient passive solar structures, highly insulated with insulated panel walls. Their shed roofs will hold solar hot water panels to provide 10 gallons of hot water per person per day for bathing. These showers will be on the south facing wall and have glass block to allow for solar heat gain into the building. In addition there will be movable screens on the south side of the structures to create outdoor shower areas for sun showers, which will double the showering capacity of the facility when weather conditions are appropriate. Water from hand and face washing goes from the sink into the toilet to be used for flushing, conserving water. The possibility of composting toilets is still being weighed.

---

5. **Provide costs, including new funds, budgeting and financial reporting structures, budgetary impact on other programs or units, and cost savings.**
At the time of acquisition, the University of Utah entered into an agreement with the property owner (a private investor) to lease the property for $1/year for 10 years, with the option to purchase the property for $1.5 million. The Central Development Office is committed to securing future donations and partners for this project.

The University has committed to the center’s management personnel, infrastructure improvements, and annual operating costs. It is anticipated that funds will be raised for an endowment to cover the operating expenses.

The budget for Rio Mesa Center for fiscal year 2011 is:
$125,000 one-time equipment and infrastructure
$418,000 one-time camping facility
$81,111 on-going operational expenses
$88,577 State support for salaries
$36,317 approximate State benefits @ 41%
$749,005 TOTAL

FY10 funding for Entrada was:
$550,000 one-time
$158,325 State support
$708,325 TOTAL

FY09 funding for Entrada was:
$196,833 one-time
$88,549 State support
$285,382 TOTAL

FY08 funding for Entrada was:
$86,104 TOTAL

6. Provide letters of support and explanation from affected units and administrators.
August 18, 2010

Chuck Wight, PhD
Dean, Graduate School
University of Utah
Via Campus Mail

Dear Dean Wight,

I am very pleased to be a part of and support the Rio Mesa Center. I have visited the site of the Center and it is truly a spectacular and unique location. The architecture program has already taken advantage of this site and its environmental conditions to test various ideas in sustainable planning and construction. We look forward to working with interdisciplinary groups to further the research aims that are articulated in the Center proposal.

I am also very enthusiastic about the potential of using the site as a retreat center or other rustic gathering. It is a majestic place, very remote, and you get the immediate sense of being far from the contemporary world. These experiences are part and parcel of what it means to be in Utah and therefore, a very meaningful place of potential for our faculty and students.

Please let me know if I can provide further information about our involvement or support in the Center.

Sincerely,

Brenda Scheer
Dean
July 27, 2010

Dr. Thomas N. Parks  
Vice President for Research  
210 Park Building  
CAMPUSS

Dear Vice President Parks:

I am writing to express the strong support of the College of Science for changing the Entrada Research Field Station to a University of Utah center called the Rio Mesa Center.

The Rio Mesa Center will provide opportunities for field-interdisciplinary studies that emphasize the natural and physical sciences, ecology and the environment, and human history in complex biological and ecological systems. This center will provide a unique opportunity for interdisciplinary studies and professional research training at the interface of history, anthropology, biology, art, and human sustainability. Imagine, if you will, a research center where you could stay, write or do art, attend a wet lab or herbarium, all next to the classrooms where scientists are doing science during the day and sharing their ideas at the dinner table with others of different interests.

The Rio Mesa Center will promote collaborative interdisciplinary research among many different groups, within the College of Science and across campus, and with other professionals of similar interests. The College of Science strongly supports such interdisciplinary research and is committed to the long-term success of this proposed Rio Mesa Center.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Pierre V. Sokolsky  
Dean, College of Science, and  
Professor of Physics and Astronomy
August 12, 2010

Tom Parks
Vice President for Research
201 Presidents Circle, Room 210
Salt Lake City, UT, 84112-9011

Subject: Rio Mesa Center support letter

Tom:
I am writing to express support for the formation of the Rio Mesa Center. The new center would facilitate the advancement of sustainable practices at the University of Utah by enabling the following activities or themes:

- Interdisciplinary Research, Education and Outreach: The formation of the Rio Mesa Center will help facilitate the interaction of diverse disciplines in order to dissolve academic department boundaries traditionally found on campus. The Center will help increase cooperation between scientists, engineers, social scientists, designers and others to join in addressing complex issues like sustainability that must be dealt with simultaneously from different perspectives.

- Environmental Issues: The center will increase understanding of ecosystem-based issues and facilitate the concept of environmental stewardship and human interaction in the west’s fragile landscape.

- Access to remote and native landscapes: The Rio Mesa Center will provide the much-needed remote ecosystem outdoor space to support solitude, connection and appreciation of natural processes to help spread these values to the campus community and beyond.

For these reasons, I wholeheartedly support the formation of the Rio Mesa Center. Please don’t hesitate to contact me for additional clarification as needed.

Sincerely,

Myron

Myron Willson, AIA, LEED-AP
Director, Office of Sustainability
Memorandum

To: Dr. Thomas Parks, Vice President for Research
   210 Park Building

From: Elizabeth Cashdan, Professor and Chair
      Department of Anthropology

Date: August 10, 2010

Re: Rio Mesa Center

Entrada has potential not only for research, but for a broader range of activities including education, conferences, and outreach. The change from "Entrada Research Field Station" to the broader "Rio Mesa Center" is an appropriate acknowledgment of this broader mission.

Currently, Anthropology has two research interests in Entrada: (1) experimental research on pre-European foraging and cultivation methods, to better inform our inferences from the archaeological record, and (2) archaeological and archival research on the history of the area. Both have educational potential, and the latter could also play a role in management issues involving environmental impact and cultural resources.

Our investment in these activities is currently modest, and our Utah research focus will no doubt remain centered on the Range Creek Field Station. However, Range Creek will remain a place of limited access. The broader potential of Rio Mesa Center for conferences, retreats, education, and public policy issues is intriguing, and we look forward to having the opportunity to take advantage of them.

[Signature]

Elizabeth Cashdan, Professor and Chair
Department of Anthropology
Dr. Tom Parks,
VP for Research
201 Presidents Circle, Rm. 210
CAMPUS

August 14, 2010

Dear Dr. Parks,

I am writing in response to your request for a letter in support of changing the Entrada Field Research Station to a University of Utah center named the Rio Mesa Center. I understand that this is part of a change that is desired in order that the facility and associated land parcel located on the former site of the Entrada Ranch be characterized as a multidisciplinary center rather than a ‘field station’, which connotes a much narrower scope. Additionally, I know that use of the Entrada name had become complicated by other claims thereby necessitating a name change.

As you are aware, the Department of Biology has already made extensive use of the Rio Mesa Center both in terms of research and teaching and Biology faculty were active advocates for the initial acquisition of the Entrada site. Research performed at the Center has yielded publications on the consequences of introduction of biocontrol agents on invasive tamarisk trees. In addition we have several undergraduate field courses that utilize the Center on a regular basis (many of these courses are offered annually).

Faculty, staff and students in the Department of Biology will benefit from the planned infrastructural improvements at the Rio Mesa Center. Furthermore, by explicitly stating its mission as one of encouraging multidisciplinary use, the Center will provide a framework for new intellectual opportunities for those utilizing this extraordinary facility. In summary, the Department of Biology looks forward to remaining an active participant in the use and development of the Rio Mesa Center as a resource for the people of the State of Utah.

Yours sincerely,

Neil J. Vickers
Chairman & Professor of Biology
Tel: (801)-581-1930
Fax: (801)-581-2174
biochair.vickers@utah.edu

Department of Biology
257 South 1400 East, Rm 201
Salt Lake City UT 84112-0840
Phone: (801) 581-6517 Fax (801) 581-4668
www.biology.utah.edu
MEMORANDUM

TO: James Metherall, President, U of U Academic Senate

FROM: Sharon A. Aiken-Wisniewski, Asst. VP for Undergraduate Studies

CC: John G. Francis, Sr. Associate VP for Academic Affairs
    Ed Barbanell, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies

DATE: November 22, 2010

RE: 6-100, Section M – Academic Renewal
     Additional Information

I was asked to provide information that would address questions from the Nov. 1, 2010 Academic Senate discussion on the revised Academic Renewal policy.

Policy Revision Before the U of U Academic Senate

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.

Overview of Academic Renewal and General Guidelines Followed By Other Institutions

When reviewing academic renewal policies across the PAC-10 as well as previously identified U of U peer institutions and Utah State University, specific elements emerged. First, some of these institutions do not use an academic renewal policy at all (U of Washington, U of OR, UC-Berkeley, and USC). If the institution does have an academic renewal policy, then the following elements are present:

1. A period of time must have elapsed from when a course is taken (U of AZ at 5 years) OR a period of time must have elapsed since the student was enrolled at the institution (U of Virginia at 10 years, ASU, OSU, U of New Mexico, U of Pittsburgh and USU at 5 years and WSU at 4 years).

2. The institution requires from a student a certain level of performance after he or she returns to classes to qualify for academic renewal (ranges from 12 to 30 credits with 2.0 to 3.0 GPA at U of AZ, ASU, WSU and USU).

3. The institution, rather than the student, specifies exactly which courses will be renewed (limit on number of semesters, credits, and disposition of courses with grades of C or higher (U of AZ, ASU, WSU and OSU).

4. Some institutions have limits on the amount of work that can be considered for renewal (U of AZ, ASU and OSU).

5. Some institutions specifically focus this policy on students who have been suspended from the institution (U of AZ, U of New Mexico, and U of Pittsburgh).
The proposed policy for the U of U is different from other peer institutions (especially in the PAC-10) in that

- it allows students to retain credits and grades above a D+,
- it is accessible to all students (not just suspended students),
- students are not required to prove their academic commitment and ability prior to receiving academic renewal,
- and students are not limited on the number of continuous semesters or total credits for academic renewal.

After reviewing policies for all these institutions, one could conclude that the U of U policy is the most student-centered policy among peer institutions.

**EXAMPLE: Student Using The U of U Policy**

- Freshmen Yr. (1) – student fails all courses except Writing 2010 (B-) but not suspended
- LVS for two years (2 & 3)
- Returns to complete degree (4) – completes 24 credits (and 3 cr from Writing 2010) = 27
- Progressing on degree (5) – completes 20/47 credits (working & family)
- Progressing on degree (6) – completes 24/71 credits
- Progressing on degree (7) – completes 24/95 credits (ACADEMIC RENEWAL for higher GPA and retains 3 credits as well as meeting requirement)
- Progressing on degree (8) - completes 27/122 and ready to graduate

At other peer institutions this student would not be eligible for academic renewal due lack of suspension or failure to have 4 or 5 years between enrollments; additionally, the student would not be able to retain either the credit or the grade for Writing 2010.

**Data to Answer Questions About Academic Renewal at the U of U (2000 – 2010)**

- Students involved in past: Average 63 students/year with high of 89 and low of 49
- Students returning from suspension: average 6 to 10 students a year
- Graduation rate of participants: 43%
- Average Cum GPA after renewal: 2.90 Cum GPA with high of 3.97 and low of 1.10
- Average credits lost for graduation: 3.6 cr. (most courses discounted are grades of “E” or “EU”)
- Number of students waiting on vote to change from 10 to 7 yrs: 117 students

**Advising Students To Improve GPA**

Academic renewal is one of many policies used to address academic challenges that are reflected through courses in early enrollment. Others include:

- Exception to Policy for Retro-withdrawal: adjust for situations that have negatively impacted a semester or more within the last three years.
- Repeat: appropriate especially if the course is foundational for the major or minor.

A student would be advised to use one or more of these policies as appropriate based on their individual situation.

Another key factor involves whether the student is benefitting from federal financial aid. If federal aid is used, students are advised to consult with the financial aid office to understand how any of these policies might impact aggregate completion. Finally, the grade never leaves the transcript but receives an academic renewal notation. It is important to advise students of this fact. When applying to graduate school or professional school, the admitting institution might use all grades to identify a cumulative grade point average for the undergraduate degree.
Policy On Grade Criteria for Courses Discounted
Concerns were raised on the policy criteria of "a D+ or lower grade" being discounted in this process. Please consider the following:

- The CR/NC Policy establishes credit (CR) for a C- or higher and no credit (NC) for a D+ or lower. By using the grade of "D+" in the academic renewal policy as a demarcation, the CR could stand within the transcript for credit and not be part of the Academic Renewal process.
- As 10 years of data were reviewed on students who participated in Academic Renewal, it became clear that the "D" grade range had a low issue rate with minimal impact on students who applied for Academic Renewal. The average graduation credits lost were 3.6 credits. Thus, students lost few if any graduation credits in the Academic Renewal process by using the "a D+ or lower grade" criteria in the policy.

Conclusion
Academic renewal is a policy that discounts previous grades from the cumulative grade point average. Higher education institutions craft this policy in many ways. The significant change for your consideration is reducing the time to apply for academic renewal from 10 years to 7 years. Since this policy change was initiated over 2 years ago, 117 students have been identified through advising appointments as eligible if the reduction of years was to occur. At present, the U of U policy offers all students the opportunity to adjust for earlier academic challenges, which is far more lenient that current or previous peer institutions.
I. 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]

II. 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.

III. 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-A, 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. Courses 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 courses. 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 the 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–Sec. 2-B-3.

F. Final Examinations

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

When they are required, in-class 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.

G. Grades

General Grading Criteria

Student work in University courses shall generally be reported in terms of
the following grades: "A," "A-," excellent performance, superior
achievement; "B+," "B," "B-," good performance, substantial achievement;
substandard performance, marginal achievement; "E," unsatisfactory
performance and achievement. Grade point averages will be computed as
follows: "A" = 4.0, "A-" = 3.7, "B+" = 3.3, "B" = 3.0, "B-" = 2.7, "C+" = 2.3,
"C" = 2.0, "C-" = 1.7, "D+" = 1.3, "D" = 1.0, "D-" = 0.7, "E" = 0.0.

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

The grade of "EU" (Unofficial Withdrawal) is given when a student’s name appears on the registrar’s final grade report but there is no record of attendance or other evidence of participation in the course. The "EU" grade is treated as an "E" in calculating the student's GPA. 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 coursework. 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" may 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 Courses
Students may drop any course 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: courses of one to two days in length, before the first day of class; courses of three to five days in length, on the first day of class; courses of six to ten days in length, through the second day of class; courses 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 courses, or to grade other kinds of courses, 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.

9. Auditing a Course

An audit grade can be elected in credit courses when no grade is desired. A student may audit a course if it is not available to be taken as non-credit, and/or if the student wants to attend the course for their own personal benefit. Students auditing a course are not held responsible for completing course work or taking examinations during the course. An audited course will show on a student’s transcript with a 'V' grade and '0.00' as the awarded number of credit hours. Audited courses are not included in the student's GPA calculation.

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 a student who has transferred to the University is computed on the work taken at the University of Utah only.

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 dismissal.

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 dismissal. A student who has been dismissed due to the provisions described here will not be re-admitted to the University until the student is eligible for Academic Renewal.

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 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
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 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.
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The college of law, the school of 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.

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.

Policy 6-101: Undergraduate Study and Degrees [Revision 11] [effective date: July 1, 2011]

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 4A. (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

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.

VI. Contacts:

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

   Faculty_Policy@utah.edu

   Students_policy@utah.edu

VII. History:

a. Renumbering: Renumbered as Policy 6-101 effective 9/15/2008, formerly known as PPM 9-8, and formerly as Faculty Regulations Chapter VIII Sections 1 to 7A.

b. Revision history:
1. Current version: Revision 101:

   Approved Academic Senate: **February 5, 2007**

   Approved Board of Trustees: **February 12, 2007**, with effective date [????], to take effect upon approval.

   **Editorially revised: October 24, 2008**

   Background information for Revision 11 [link]

2. Earlier versions:

   Revision 10: effective dates February 12, 2007 to [??]

University Rule 6-100A: Election of Credit/No-Credit (CR/NC) Grading for Undergraduates [effective date: July 1, 2011]

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 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 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
November 2, 2010

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

RE: Graduate Council Review  
Department of Biochemistry

Dear Vice President Betz:

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

Please forward this review to President Michael K. Young. After approval by President Young, the review will be forwarded to the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next Senate meeting.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight  
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: David J. Bjorkman, Dean, School of Medicine  
Christopher P. Hill, Co-Chair, Department of Biochemistry  
Wesley I. Sundquist, Co-Chair, Department of Biochemistry

The Graduate School  
302 Park Building  
201 South President’s Circle Room 302  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9016  
801-581-7642 • Fax 801-585-6749  
www.gradschool.utah.edu
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GRADUATE COUNCIL REPORT TO THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
FOR HEALTH SCIENCES AND THE ACADEMIC SENATE

August 30, 2010

The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Biochemistry. The External Review Committee included:

Alan Weiner, Ph.D. (Chair)
Department of Biochemistry
School of Medicine
University of Washington

Elizabeth Goldsmith, Ph.D.
Department of Biochemistry
Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center

Scott Strobel, Ph.D.
Department of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry
Yale University

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Chris Ireland, Ph.D. (Chair)
Professor
Department of Medicinal Chemistry

Thure Cerling, Ph.D.
Distinguished Professor
Departments of Geology and Geophysics and Biology

Jon Seger, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Biology
This report by the Graduate Council’s ad hoc review committee is based on the department’s self-study, the report of the internal review committee, the report of the external review committee, and responses from the department chair and the dean of the School of Medicine.

DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Program Overview

The Department of Biochemistry’s primary mission is to carry out innovative research that advances the field of biochemistry, and to train and mentor medical students, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows. To this end, the department engages in a variety of activities that help faculty members maintain and expand their research programs, recruit and effectively mentor graduate students, and contribute to teaching at the graduate level.

Faculty

The department has had a small but distinguished faculty of 10 tenure-track professors plus a similar number of adjunct and research professors. The department has an excellent record of faculty promotion and retention, so that few of the current tenure-track faculty can truthfully be called “junior.” An expansion of the department to around 15 regular faculty is currently under way. This will establish a more balanced age profile, and offers an opportunity to increase faculty diversity in other ways as well (gender, ethnicity, scientific interests, etc.).

Reviewers noted that faculty in Biochemistry are engaged, energetic, collegial, well-funded, and do excellent science. There is good collaboration both internally and with other departments in the School of Medicine. Members of the Biochemistry faculty play key roles in the umbrella Biological Chemistry Graduate Program and Molecular Biology Graduate Program that serve many departments within the School of Medicine and the main campus. They also participate in the committee that is restructuring the medical school curriculum to integrate basic science into all four years of medical education. There is ample evidence of collegiality within the department and a shared sense of mission. Faculty are published in leading journals representing biochemistry, molecular biology, cell biology, structural biology, virology, and metabolism.

Students

Graduate students come into the department through the campus-wide Molecular Biology and Biological Chemistry Programs. First-year recruits are supported financially by the programs with money derived ultimately from research grant overheads. These programs have been very successful, and have worked especially well for the Department of Biochemistry, which currently has around 25 graduate students (more than two per regular faculty member).
The department is also home to nearly 20 postdoctoral researchers. Students are perceptive and articulate on a broad range of topics, and deeply engaged with their research and other aspects of their training. Student diversity seems excellent with respect to gender, geography, and other factors, except for ethnicity. Graduate students and postdoctoral trainees articulated to the review teams that they are satisfied with their programs. They are happy with the quality of mentoring and the attention they have received in faculty research groups. The graduate students find the courses challenging and generally well taught. The required teaching assistantship experiences are seen as beneficial without being onerous.

Curriculum

Course offerings are comprehensive and varied, and provide students with a broad background. Students complete their preliminary examinations in their first semester in the department (following the first year in the cross-departmental umbrella program). The format and expectations for these exams are spelled out in detail, and applied with rigor. Students are required to participate in a wide range of seminars, retreats and other activities that contribute to the broader scientific life of the department.

Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

The department provides information on the graduation rates and time to graduation as part of its outcomes assessment. Twenty-five students have completed Ph.D.s during the last eight years. Data for specific cohorts admitted from 2001-2003 indicate that there were 10 students admitted to the graduate program in 2001-2002. Six completed the Ph.D., with an average time to completion of 6.4 years. Two left with the master’s degree, and 2 did not complete the Ph.D. In the 2002-2003 admission cohort, 11 were admitted, and 11 received the Ph.D., with an average time to completion of 5.7 years. For the 2003-2004 cohort, 12 were admitted and 6 have graduated, with an average time to degree of 5.2 years. Two left with a master’s; 3 left without completing the Ph.D., and one student is still in the program. Overall, during the last eight years, nine students left the graduate program with master’s degrees, and eight left without degrees, an observation that might warrant more investigation.

The department tracks its graduates and postdocs and is able to demonstrate that, of those who have completed their training in the department since 1998, 16 are assistant or full professors, 31 have gone into industry or other professional activities, and 24 are still doing postdoctoral work.

The department makes important contributions to courses for medical students and for graduate students in the Molecular Biology and Biological Chemistry Programs. Both sets of curricula have been modified periodically in response to formal and informal assessments of their effectiveness.

Research expenditures have risen from $5,580,481 in 2004-2005 to $8,724,623 in 2007-2008 (a 56% increase before "stimulus" funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act) to $9,245,860 in 2008-2009 (a 65% increase after "stimulus" funding).

Facilities and Resources

The previous review raised issues regarding the need to bring all members of the department together into a single building. This has been remedied and the department moved to the new Emma Eccles Jones Medical Research Building in 2005. The new Eccles space and facilities are excellent.
Both review teams raised some concerns that the current mission-based management (MBM) budget formula does not sufficiently recognize and reward the role of external research grants, all but insuring a perpetual "deficit" despite the department’s remarkable success in securing external grant support. A change in the MBM formula to recognize both direct and indirect grant support would be welcomed by the department. The two department co-chairs manage departmental expenditures with a formula for faculty salaries that provides stability, rewards faculty success and manages the risk entailed by long-term University commitments.

**Diversity**

The department is making efforts to increase the diversity of the faculty, especially the core faculty where there are only three women and no minorities, by utilizing resources such as the National Minority Faculty Identification Program and engaging in discussions with the University’s Office of Equal Opportunity.

The department also is making proactive efforts to increase student diversity and recruit underrepresented students. It has been able to admit and retain relatively equal numbers of men and women to the program. It has been more challenging for the department to recruit underrepresented minority students despite extensive promotion and outreach. The department devotes considerable energy to advising and retaining minority students who have been accepted.

**COMMENDATIONS**

1. The Department of Biochemistry is “a jewel in the University’s crown,” due to its outstanding leadership and stellar faculty.

2. The faculty, including recent hires, are uniformly excellent, scientific leaders in their respective fields and have collectively created an exemplary department, maintaining a departmental culture of mutual support and commitment to research, teaching and service.

3. The department is commended for its role in refashioning the medical school curriculum in order to present biochemistry (and other basic sciences) in clinically relevant ways.

4. The department is commended for envisioning ways to modify the two umbrella programs administered cooperatively across the two campuses to improve cooperation to better serve both the School of Medicine and main campus.

5. The department has worked vigorously and visibly to recruit, mentor, and retain women students and students from underrepresented ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. In anticipation of the projected 50% growth in faculty, the department should strategize its plans for scientific diversity and balance, and formalize some aspects of departmental governance, including a mentoring plan for junior faculty, and clearer delineation of the position and responsibilities of Director of Graduate Studies.
2. In the interest of greater transparency and collegiality, the department should review/update, formalize and publicize its policies for promotion in non-tenure-track (e.g., research track) lines.

3. The department should strategize with senior leadership at the School of Medicine and the University to address perceived inequities in the mission-based management budget model.

4. Student success and retention rates should be evaluated, reasons for attrition determined, and a strategic plan developed to support student success.

5. Efforts should be urged to actively recruit new faculty who represent gender and ethnic diversity, in consultation with the University Diversity Committee and the Office of Equity and Diversity. Future self-studies should include information about changes in gender and ethnic diversity among faculty during the period under review.

ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW

A mentoring program for new assistant professors is being planned for the basic sciences as well as within the department to start September 2010.

The department is taking steps to solidify the visibility of the role of the Director of Graduate Studies, and the process for preliminary exams has been revised, with faculty input.

The mission-based management budget model was reviewed and revised after this review. Dedicated funding is now established for basic science departments in a pool separate from the clinical departments. Metrics for distributing state funds have been redefined as well.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council

Patricia Murphy (Chair), Nursing
Eric Hinderaker, History
Edward Ruddell, Parks, Recreation, Tourism
# Department Review Sheet

**Office of BUDGET & INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH**

FEB. 28TH 1850

## Department Review by Academic Year

### BIOCHEMISTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research*</td>
<td>$5,580,481</td>
<td>$4,954,516</td>
<td>$5,561,218</td>
<td>$8,724,623</td>
<td>$9,245,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>$1,544,842</td>
<td>$1,634,014</td>
<td>$1,889,722</td>
<td>$1,928,039</td>
<td>$1,888,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Graduate</td>
<td>1093.5</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1073.5</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>1083.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>1096.5</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>886.5</td>
<td>759.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate</td>
<td>2277.5</td>
<td>2177.5</td>
<td>2045.5</td>
<td>1973.5</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Research expenditures include Facilities and Administrative costs (F&A)*
Memorandum of Understanding  
Department of Biochemistry  
Graduate Council Review 2009-10

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on October 14, 2010, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Biochemistry. A. Lorris Betz, Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; David J. Bjorkman, Dean of the School of Medicine; Christopher P. Hill, Co-Chair of the Department of Biochemistry; Wesley I. Sundquist, Co-Chair of the Department of Biochemistry; Charles A. Wight, Dean of the Graduate School; and Donna M. White, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on August 30, 2010. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1:** In anticipation of the projected 50% growth in faculty, the Department should strategize its plans for scientific diversity and balance, and formalize some aspects of departmental governance, including a mentoring plan for junior faculty, and clearer delineation of the position and responsibilities of Director of Graduate Studies.

The Department has created a well-conceived plan as to how they will address scientific diversity and balance in their new hires. Their plan is strategic and will involve input from senior faculty. At this time, they are planning to hire five new Assistant Professors and one mid-career faculty member. Currently, they have made one new junior-level hire. They are planning to do a search each year until positions are filled but have not given themselves absolute deadlines to ensure finding optimal candidates for each of the positions.

In terms of a mentoring plan for junior faculty, all hire letters make mentorship assignments that are followed up by the Chairs, and the Department’s Basic Science Working Group is establishing a working group for all new Assistant Professors hired within the basic science departments at the Health Sciences Center to begin Spring 2011. Additionally, there is a College-wide mentorship program in place, which is institutional in scope.

As for clearer delineation of the position and responsibilities of the Director of Graduate Studies, the Department believes that some confusion over the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) may have arisen because they have not used this job title in discussions with faculty or students. In fact, the DGS along with support from the Department Administrator have implemented some effective improvements in several areas of the graduate program including an annual supervisory committee verification form. It was noted that great strides have been made in tracking and retaining graduate students. The Co-Chairs are now looking to improve graduate tracking post graduation.
Recommendation 2: In the interest of greater transparency and collegiality, the Department should review/update, formalize and publicize its policies for promotion in non-tenure-track (e.g., research track) lines.

While Assistant Research Professors are typically hired to funded research under the direction of a regular faculty member, the Dean and Vice President spoke to the value of “keeping the door open” to the possibility of promotions and the seeking of independent grant funding when warranted. This will allow the Department to reward Assistant Research Professors that are performing at a level where tangible rewards, such as a promotion, are warranted. There is a valuable layer of ambiguity in place, which allows for upward movement in these positions without locking these people into expectations that might not be suited to their expertise. Co-Chairs are developing and introducing a proposal that will include a way to evaluate and make recommendations to Assistant Research Professors in biannual review meetings.

Recommendation 3: The Department should strategize with senior leadership at the School of Medicine and the University to address perceived inequities in the mission-based management budget model.

This has been done successfully. Additional funding was allocated for 2010-11 and the Department is on track through 2011. There are some concerns about 2012 but all parties involved realize the budget challenges faced by the institution.

Recommendation 4: Student success and retention rates should be evaluated, reasons for attrition determined, and a strategic plan developed to support student success.

The Department wants students to be successful and increase graduation rates but not at the expense of rigor and quality. Co-Chairs will continue to further evaluate the impact of Biochem 7010, a course designed to mentor students in their research, to determine its impact on getting to the core issues of improving the “critical analysis skills” of their graduate students and further reduce attrition rates.

Recommendation 5: Efforts should be urged to actively recruit new faculty who represent gender and ethnic diversity, in consultation with the University Diversity Committee and the Office of Equity and Diversity. Future self-studies should include information about changes in gender and ethnic diversity among faculty during the period under review.

The Co-Chairs, Dean, and Vice President are all in support of the active recruitment of new faculty candidates who represent gender and ethnic diversity. However, in their proposed action plan, they state their “overriding goal” as “recruiting and hiring new faculty members who will
further improve the scientific excellence of the Department/University and also contribute to the essential missions of education and service.” They are also committed to hiring faculty members whom they are confident will be successful in their positions. The Co-Chairs have been proactive in working with the Associate Vice President for Equity and Diversity, Octavio Villalpando, and have a system in place to be as thorough as possible in their search and hiring processes.

This memorandum of understanding is be followed by annual letters of progress from the chair of the Biochemistry 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.

A. Lorris Betz  
David J. Bjorkman  
Christopher P. Hill  
Wesley I. Sundquist  
Charles A. Wight  
Donna M. White

__________________________________  
Charles A. Wight  
Dean, The Graduate School
ANNUAL REPORT
2009-2010
ATHLETICS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Colby Bostock, Tayler Clough, Kristina Diekmann, Marissa Diener (Chair), John Firmaje, Tim Larson, Howard Lehman, Brian Patrick, Keven Rowe, William Smith, Paul Tikalsky, Patrick Tripeny (Vice-Chair), Joyce P. Valdez, Ada Van Zanten, Scott Veenis, Diane McVey Ward

Submitted to
President Michael K. Young
Athletics Director Chris Hill
University of Utah Academic Senate

October 2010
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Athletics Advisory Council Summary Report

The Athletics Advisory Council (AAC) serves as a policy recommendation and review body for the Athletics Department and intercollegiate athletics at the University of Utah. The Council is composed of faculty, alumni, Board of Trustees representatives, ASUU and student athlete representatives, and ex-officio members from throughout the University campus. Issues brought before the Council are first discussed in the appropriate standing committee and recommendations are then forwarded to the Council for further discussion. There are four standing committees – Athletics Academic Standards Committee, Finance Committee, Gender Equity and Diversity Committee and the Compliance Committee. One of the responsibilities of the Council is to submit an annual report to the President, the Academic Senate and the Athletics Director each academic year. This document fulfills that obligation.

The reports of the four standing committees are summarized in this section of the report, with more detailed explanations and information in the sections following.

FINANCE

Although the 2009-2010 budget for the Athletics Department was anticipated to be a deficit of about 1.54 million, the actual deficit was $800,000, which was $600,000 less than anticipated. The difference was due to a decrease in expenses, an increase in ticket sales, and money distributed by the Mountain West Conference from the Texas Christian University’s BCS bowl game against Boise State. The $800,000 deficit was covered with funds from the BCS Sugar Bowl. The Sugar Bowl BCS fund has about $750,000 remaining for future use.

Income for the 2010-2011 year is expected to increase due to an increase in student fees, increased income from football ticket sales, and income from the football team’s game with the University of Notre Dame at Notre Dame. Total income is budgeted at 29.8 million. Expenses are also expected to increase by $2 million, to a total of $29.6 million.

The transition to the Pac10 will present budgetary challenges to the Athletics Department for several years until the University of Utah receives full compensation from the Pac10 Conference in 2014-2015.

ATHLETICS ACADEMIC STANDARDS

During the 2009-2010 academic year, the Athletics Academic Standards Committee considered the following issues: 1) excused absences and final exam policy; 2) the choice of majors by student-athletes; 3) What is the APR?; 4) What is the GSR?; 5) APR & GSR for University of Utah student athletes for AY 2000-2010; 6) Academic summary and awards and honors for academic year 2009-2010; and 7) review of Academic Support Services for student athletes.

University of Utah student athletes continue to do well academically. The Academic Progress Rate (APR) for all teams was above the 925 benchmark, and 8 teams received a single year APR of 1000, a perfect score. The Graduation Success Rate of Utah athletes (56%) compares favorably to the comparable rate for all U of U students, which is 51%. Twelve (out of 17) teams in Fall 2009 and 11 (of 17) teams in Spring 2010 had GPAs above 3.0, and over a fifth of
all student athletes were on the Dean’s List (with a 3.5 GPA or higher with at least 12 graded units). The percentage of students receiving a GPA of less than 2.0 has declined over time.

GENDER EQUITY AND DIVERSITY
The Gender Equity and Diversity Committee addressed the gender distribution of participation rates, athletic student aid, equipment funds, team travel funds, recruiting funds, coaches’ salaries, and diversity issues. The Committee concluded that the Athletics Department continues to do a very good job of fulfilling its mandate in regards to gender equity and diversity. Continued monitoring of all the indicators of gender equity is warranted to ensure that the Athletics Department maintains and improves on an already successful record. Particular attention should be given to preventing the gap from widening in student aid, equipment, and travel expenses. The Committee also identified a list of diversity indicators to be tracked in future reports. Finally, the Committee created a new 5-year diversity plan as mandated by the NCAA.

COMPLIANCE
This year the Compliance Committee reviewed the external audits of the Athletic Department’s NCAA rules compliance, the MWC institutional compliance review, rules violations and waiver requests, and compliance education. It was concluded that comprehensive rules education is provided, and there is a heightened awareness by coaches and staff regarding compliance rules and expectations, as well as a functioning process for identifying and reporting rules violations. The committee approved a six-year internal audit cycle. The committee also reviewed 18 rules violations and 17 requests for waiver of rules submitted to the NCAA and MWC. The majority of the requests for rule waivers were granted, suggesting that the requests were reasonable and the Compliance Office did a good job in making the case for the exceptions.

MENTORING AND TUTORING REVIEW
The NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative, Dr. William Smith, reviewed the mentoring and tutoring programs to ensure there were no improper benefits or academic assistance provided to student-athletes. No evidence of improper assistance to student-athletes was found. Several recommendations were made to prevent deliberate or inadvertent improper assistance to student-athletes.
Finance Committee Report

Members:
Chair: Patrick Tripeny
Board of Trustee: Tayler Clough
Students: Colby Bostock, Ada Van Zanten
Alumni: John Firmaje III
Ex-Officio: Chris Hill

Budget 2009-2010

The 2009-2010 budget for the Athletics Department was anticipated to be a deficit of about $1.54 Million. This projected deficit was largely due to budget cuts accrued for the 2009-2010 academic year at the University of Utah. Despite this anticipated deficit, the Athletics Department chose not to make significant cuts to their budget and make up the shortfall in income by using most of the $1.6 Million income from the BCS Sugar Bowl. The actual deficit was $800,000, which was $600,000 less than anticipated. The difference was due to a decrease in expenses by the Athletics Department, an increase in ticket sales, and money distributed by the Mountain West Conference from the Texas Christian University’s BCS bowl game against Boise State. The savings mean that the reserve fund from the University of Utah’s Sugar Bowl appearance still has about $750,000 for future use.

Projected 2010-2011 Budget

Income
The anticipated income for the next budget year is up from the 2009-2010 budget. There are three major areas for this increase. First, the students chose to increase their student fee, which goes to the Athletics Department. This fee increase results in about $1 Million of additional income. Second, there is an anticipated increase of $1.3 Million dollars from football ticket sales because of high demand and an increase in ticket prices. Finally, the football team’s game with the University of Notre Dame at Notre Dame means an increase of about $800,000. Total income is budgeted at $29.8 Million or $3.5 Million over the 2009-2010 budget.

Expenses
The major expenses of the athletics department include salaries, travel expenses, athletes’ tuition and facility costs. The largest increase in budgetary expenses is for travel, which will increase by $500,000. The anticipated increase in all expenses is approximately $2 Million for total expenses of $29.6 Million.

Impact of the Switching to the Pac10 on the Athletic Department’s Finances

The move from the Mountain West Conference to the Pac10 Conference will have little effect on the 2010-11 finances as the switch does not take place until Summer 2011. The largest negative impact on the Athletics Department budget will be in the 2011-12 academic year when the Athletic Department will not get any income from either the Mountain West Conference or the Pac10 Conference as per the agreement between the Pac10 and the University of Utah. This translates to a loss of approximately $1.6 Million in income. The University of Utah will then get 50% compensation from the Pac10 in 2012-13,
75% compensation in 2013-14 and full compensation in 2014-15. Thus, it is not until the 2014-15 academic year that the switch to the Pac10 Conference impacts the finances of the Athletic Department positively.

Summary

The University of Utah’s women and men’s athletic teams continue to meet with success. This has translated to increased visibility and recognition within the Mountain West Conference and nationally. This increased visibility and recognition was recognized with the invitation to switch to the Pac10 Conference. The 2010-11 finances are anticipated to be solid. The transition years to the Pac10 will be difficult with the loss in income.

University of Utah
Athletics Department
2 Year Consolidated Budget Comparison

REVENUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>09-10 Budget</th>
<th>10-11 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>$3,998,691</td>
<td>$4,978,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Support</td>
<td>$1,260,521</td>
<td>$1,208,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Rental Support</td>
<td>$795,000</td>
<td>$795,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Sales - FB</td>
<td>$4,734,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Fee</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Sales - MBB</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Sales - Other</td>
<td>$392,000</td>
<td>$409,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>$4,710,000</td>
<td>$5,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National TV</td>
<td>$1,222,222</td>
<td>$1,244,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Sports Property</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA</td>
<td>$1,425,730</td>
<td>$1,386,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWC Distributions</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions/Novelties</td>
<td>$1,002,241</td>
<td>$1,482,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Away Games</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
<td>$1,210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$679,935</td>
<td>$520,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post Season Revenues</td>
<td>$25,625,340</td>
<td>$29,115,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Season Revenues</td>
<td>$700,001</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$26,325,341</td>
<td>$29,815,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>09-10 Budget</th>
<th>10-11 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>10,995,071</td>
<td>11,214,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees</td>
<td>2,059,385</td>
<td>2,244,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room and Board</td>
<td>1,588,184</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>3,012,113</td>
<td>3,513,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>893,550</td>
<td>893,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>1,589,405</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>764,600</td>
<td>764,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Operations</td>
<td>1,776,750</td>
<td>1,776,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium Rental</td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Fee</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Wages</td>
<td>402,437</td>
<td>402,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Meals</td>
<td>376,150</td>
<td>376,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2,464,782</td>
<td>2,564,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post Season Expenses</td>
<td>27,097,428</td>
<td>28,936,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Season Expenses</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,797,428</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,636,902</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Operating Profit / Loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>($1,472,087)</td>
<td>178,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Standards Committee Report

Voting members:
2009-2010 Report
Chair: William A. Smith, Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR)
Faculty: Diane McVey Ward
Faculty: Marissa Diener
Alumni Representative: Keven Rowe

Ex officio members
Associate Dean, University College: W. Jency Brown
Athletic Dept. Rep.: Mary Bowman

The Athletics Academic Standards Committee (AASC) is composed of six members: three faculty members, one that is the faculty athletics representative, an alumni representative, and two ex-officio members. The two ex officio members are the associate dean of the University College and the associate athletics director for athletics student support services/senior woman administrator. All members, except the associate dean of University College, are on the Athletics Advisory Council.

The charge of the AASC is to review the academic performance each academic term of every student-athlete, compile an annual statistical composite profile of academic performance and honors, and investigate various issues that relate to the academic performance of student-athletes.

During the 2009-10 academic year, the Athletics Academic Standards Committee considered the following issues: 1) excused absences and final exam policy; 2) the choice of majors by student athletes; 3) What is the APR?; 4) What is the GSR?; 5) APR & GSR for University of Utah Student-Athletes for AY 2000-10; 6) Academic Summary and Awards and Honors for AY 2009-10; and 7) the Review of Academic Support Services. Supporting materials, including tables outlining the academic performance of student-athletes, GSR data, and APR data are included in the report.

1) The Excused Absences and Final Exam Policy
Because one persistent issue that arises between a small number of university instructors and athletics representatives is a conflict over student-athletes missing class for university-related business (i.e., athletic competition) and when the final exam should be administered, the AASC considered this issue again. Often, faculty members are not aware that the excused absences policy covers intercollegiate athletics. Moreover, some student-athletes felt that they were unfairly penalized when final exams were moved up a week and fell outside of the university final exam calendar. As a result, the faculty athletics representative met with John G. Francis, the Sr. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Susan Olson, the Associate Vice President for Faculty, to review the current policy and its applicability for student-athletes. It was
agreed that the current policy is sufficiently written to cover student-athletes. Additionally, it was agreed that an email would be sent to all faculty prior to the start fall and spring semesters. Furthermore, the Assistant Athletics Director of Compliance followed up with an email that provided a brief overview of NCAA compliance issues that many faculty may encounter in their respective roles at the University of Utah.

2) USA Today Article: College athletes studies guided toward 'major in eligibility'

For the second year in a row, we examined declared majors (or expected majors) for all student-athletes by sport and looked for patterns of majors being overrepresented within a sport or few majors being represented in the sport. Examining choice of major was in response to a USA Today article about college athletes being guided and clustered in "easy" academic majors published in 2008. The article suggested that certain majors were chosen because it would be easier for student-athletes to stay eligible while persisting toward degree completion. Unfortunately, this article also reported that many of the athletes in the story left college without fulfilling their real academic goals, and their education did not prepare them for post-sports careers. Last academic year, the AASC decided to examine student-athletes’ majors to determine if clustering existed among student-athletes. If clustering existed, like what was identified in the USA Today article, this might be an indication of a larger problem. We continued the examination of majors this year. Our examination included all sixteen sports. We saw a wide range of majors from all colleges including Biology, Exercise and Sport Science, Health Education, Mechanical Engineering, History, Business, Mass Communication, Human Development and Family Studies, International Studies, Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, Urban Planning, Spanish, and Chemistry. The table below shows the top majors of junior/senior student-athletes who had declared a major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Sports Science</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Recreation, &amp; Tourism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Dev. &amp; Family Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In analyzing the information the committee concluded that clustering of majors is not occurring among the student athlete population. Although there are large numbers of student-athletes in several majors, these majors are also popular among the undergraduate population as a whole, in terms of the number of degrees conferred. Because the committee did not see any clustering, the likelihood of academic fraud and coaches and athletics academic advisors inappropriately influencing students’ decisions on majors and classes does not appear to be happening at the
University of Utah. The committee decided that no further study was necessary because of these results. However, the committee will continue to periodically monitor this area in the future.

3) What is the APR? (according to the NCAA)

Why was APR established? The Academic Progress Rate (APR) is a tool the NCAA developed for every Division I sports team. Since it is calculated term-by-term, it provides a near real-time assessment of student-athlete and team academic performance. With APR, schools no longer have to wait for graduation day to see how student-athletes are doing academically.

Why was APR established? Presidential leadership on campuses across the nation recognized a need to track how student-athletes are doing academically prior to graduation. APR has changed how schools approach academics, recruit, and manage academic programs for the student-athlete.

What does the APR measure and whom does it affect? The APR is a dual measurement. It is calculated based upon individual student-athlete academic progress but is reported as a composite team measurement. If a team's APR falls below the 925 benchmark, the team could be sanctioned. Penalties start with the loss of scholarships and become more severe. The NCAA works with APR-challenged schools because the goal is improvement, not punishment.

How is APR calculated? Each Division I sports team receives an APR. An APR of 925 roughly corresponds with a 60 percent graduation success rate. To calculate the APR, every student-athlete is tracked by eligibility and retention, the two most reliable factors in predicting graduation. Those who do well in the classroom and stay in school earn two points. Those who pass but do not return to school earn one point. If a student-athlete fails academically and leaves school, their team loses two points. If a student-athlete returns to school later and graduates, the school earns one bonus point. The team's APR is calculated by dividing the total points earned in a year by the total points possible.

How are University of Utah teams doing across the board? The average APR is 961 out of a perfect 1,000. Of note, more student-athletes are staying in school and graduating.

How are football, baseball and men's basketball doing? There's good news for all three teams. The four-year APR figures for these three sports are all above the 925 cutoff. In fact, no single sport is below the benchmark.

How does the NCAA assist teams with APR challenges? When a school has APR challenges, they are encouraged to present the NCAA a get-well plan. The NCAA national office staff then works with the school to make sure the plan is a bona fide way to achieve the necessary improvement.

4) What is the GSR? (according to the NCAA)

What is the Graduation Success Rate?
The NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) is designed to show the proportion of student-athletes on any given team who earn a college degree. The NCAA has imposed a new set of academic standards that seeks to hold teams and institutions accountable for how well a student-athlete progresses toward a degree.

The GSR was developed in response to colleges and universities who asked for an alternative rate that more accurately reflects the movement among college student-athletes. The GSR takes into account incoming transfers who graduate from a different institution than the one they started at and transfers who leave an institution in good standing.
How does it differ from the Federal Graduation Rate? The Federal Graduation Rate (FGR) is compiled by the U.S. Department of Education and is used as an indicator of academic success for college student-athletes. FGR measures the percentage of first-time, full-time freshman who graduate within six years of entering their original four-year institution.

The NCAA developed its GSR in response to criticism that the FGR understates the academic success of athletes because the FGR method does not take into account two important situations in college athletics:

- Those student-athletes who transfer away from an institution before graduating but are in good academic standing (perhaps to transfer to another institution for more playing time, different major, or to go pro);
- Those student-athletes who transfer in to an institution (e.g. from a community college or another 4-year college) and earn a degree from the new institution.

The FGR treats transfers as non-graduates for the original institution the student-athlete attended, even if that student-athlete later graduates from another institution. Also, the FGR does not include that student-athlete in the graduation rates at the new institution where he/she does graduate. Therefore, once a student-athlete transfers to another school he/she is no longer recognized in the federal graduation rate. The GSR takes into accounts both situations and gives credit to institutions for successful transfers, whether they are leaving or entering an institution.

How is GSR the calculated? The GSR, like the FGR, starts with all freshmen who enter college in a given year. The GSR is different in that it excludes from the denominator those athletes who leave the institution in good academic standing and includes in the numerator those who transfer into the institution and go on to graduate. The GSR better accounts for the high mobility of student-athletes.

Reading the GSR and FGR: The GSR report shows a breakdown of each team sponsored by the institution and that team’s graduation success rate over a four-year period. Also listed is the federal graduation rate, which shows lower percentages because of the difference in the calculation methods of the two separate reports.

There are no consequences or penalties for teams with low graduation rates. Rather the GSR serves as an information tool for prospective student-athletes and a comparison of each sport’s success between institutions.

5) APR & GSR for University of Utah Student-Athletes

The Athletics Academic Standards Committee also reviews annually the APR, the Athletics Progress Report, and the GSR, the graduation success rate. The NCAA requires an APR score equal to or greater than 925 or the team is subject to penalties. This year, all teams were above the benchmark of 925, and 8 teams received a perfect single year rate of 1000. Ten teams improved their single year rate from 07-08 to 08-09. In 2008-09 the Athletics Department posted an average multi-year rate APR above 965, an increase of nearly 9 points above the previous
high, which was the largest year-to-year increase ever.

In terms of the GSR, our student athletes have a graduation rate of 56% (based upon the most recent data from 2002-2003). This rate compares favorably to the comparable rate of all U of U students, which was 51%. Furthermore, all University of Utah GSR numbers are above the national GSR.

6) Academic Summary and Awards and Honors for AY 2009-10
The AASC reviewed the academic performance of each student athlete. Statistical summaries of each semester are presented in Tables 1 and 2. These tables present the number of student athletes (and percentages) who were on the Dean’s List (receiving a 3.5 GPA or higher), those who were on the Athletic Honor Roll (GPA of 3.0 or greater), as well as those with a cumulative GPA below 2.0.

Examination of the data from Table 1 and 2 indicate that the majority of student athletes are doing well academically. For example, 12 (out of 17) teams in Fall 2009, and 11 teams in Spring 2010 had GPAs above 3.0. Furthermore, in Fall 2009, nearly a quarter (22%) of student athletes were on the Dean’s List (3.5 GPA with at least 12 graded units), and in Spring 2010 there were 89 students (24%) on the Dean’s list. Women’s and Men’s Skiing had over half of their team on the Dean’s List for both Fall and Spring Semesters. Furthermore, few student athletes (< 2%) received a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or lower. The percentage of student athletes receiving a cumulative GPA below 2.0 is well below the overall percentage of undergraduate students at the U who have a cumulative GPA below 2.0 (10% of all undergraduate students in Fall 2009, and 7.9% of students Spring 2010).

The strong academic performance of student athletes at the University of Utah is also exemplified in the MWC awards our student athletes have received. This year, Zane Beadles, a Utah football player, received the Scholar-Athlete of the Year Award in the Mountain West Conference. The award is bestowed annually to one male and one female who best exemplify the term “student-athlete” by achieving excellence in academics, athletics and community involvement. In addition to athletic achievement, recipients of the Scholar-Athlete of the Year Award must have a minimum 3.5 grade point average, demonstrate leadership and exhibit good character and conduct on and off the playing field.

Sixty-five (17%) student-athletes were selected as Mountain West Conference Scholar-Athletes for the 2009-10 academic year. The MWC Scholar-Athlete Award is one of the highest academic honors bestowed by the conference, and requires that student-athletes have completed at least two academic terms at the university, while maintaining a cumulative grade point average of 3.5 or better, and have participated in varsity competition in an NCAA-sponsored sport. In addition to the MWC Scholar-Athlete awards, the University of Utah had 80 student-athletes on the Mountain West Conference Academic All-Conference team Spring semester. To be eligible for selection to the Academic All-MWC team, student-athletes must have completed at least one academic term at the member institution while maintaining a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or better, and be a starter or significant contributor on their athletic team.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Fall 09 Term GPA</th>
<th>Change from Spring 09</th>
<th>Change from Fall 08</th>
<th># SAs Team</th>
<th># on Dean's List</th>
<th>% Team on Dean's List</th>
<th>% 3.0 or above (Honor Roll)</th>
<th>% Team above 3.0</th>
<th>CUM GPA below 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W Skiing</td>
<td>3.581</td>
<td>0.029+</td>
<td>0.098+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Gymnastics</td>
<td>3.575</td>
<td>0.089+</td>
<td>0.237+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Skiing</td>
<td>3.553</td>
<td>0.124+</td>
<td>0.182+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Swimming</td>
<td>3.437</td>
<td>0.144+</td>
<td>0.389+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Tennis</td>
<td>3.218</td>
<td>0.160+</td>
<td>0.027+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Volleyball</td>
<td>3.199</td>
<td>0.212+</td>
<td>0.192+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>0.600-</td>
<td>0.418-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>3.099</td>
<td>0.110-</td>
<td>0.121+</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Basketball</td>
<td>3.093</td>
<td>0.267-</td>
<td>0.035+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Basketball</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>0.251+</td>
<td>0.195-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Softball</td>
<td>3.012</td>
<td>0.185+</td>
<td>0.182+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Tennis</td>
<td>3.001</td>
<td>0.068-</td>
<td>0.174-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Swimming</td>
<td>2.976</td>
<td>0.216-</td>
<td>0.226-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Soccer</td>
<td>2.946</td>
<td>0.261-</td>
<td>0.251-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Baseball</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td>0.018-</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Football</td>
<td>2.456</td>
<td>0.102-</td>
<td>0.201-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Golf</td>
<td>2.317</td>
<td>0.664-</td>
<td>0.630-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.935</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.051-</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.060-</strong></td>
<td><strong>406</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td><strong>49%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total w/o Football</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.104</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>286</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Academic Performance of Student Athletes Spring 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Term GPA</th>
<th>Change from Fall 09</th>
<th>Change from Spring 09</th>
<th># Student-Athletes on Team</th>
<th># on Dean's List</th>
<th>% Team on Dean's List</th>
<th># 3.0 or above (Honor Roll)</th>
<th>% Team above 3.0</th>
<th># CUM GPA below 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W Skiing</td>
<td>3.503</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Gymnastics</td>
<td>3.387</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Tennis</td>
<td>3.381</td>
<td>+0.163</td>
<td>+0.323</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Tennis</td>
<td>3.327</td>
<td>+0.326</td>
<td>+0.258</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Skiing</td>
<td>3.307</td>
<td>-0.246</td>
<td>+0.122</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Soccer</td>
<td>3.270</td>
<td>+0.324</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Volleyball</td>
<td>3.252</td>
<td>+0.053</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>+0.150</td>
<td>-0.450</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Swimming</td>
<td>3.113</td>
<td>-0.324</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>3.150</td>
<td>+0.051</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Basketball</td>
<td>3.060</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Swimming</td>
<td>2.899</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.293</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Basketball</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Football</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>+0.264</td>
<td>+0.162</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Softball</td>
<td>2.694</td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>+0.133</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Baseball</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
<td>-0.201</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Golf</td>
<td>2.624</td>
<td>+0.307</td>
<td>-0.357</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.968</strong></td>
<td><strong>+0.033</strong></td>
<td><strong>####</strong></td>
<td><strong>372</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>212</strong></td>
<td><strong>57%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total w/o Football</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.064</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Examination of data from the past few years (see Figures 1 and 2) shows that the positive trends in academic performance noted last year continue, especially for Spring Semester. More specifically, a greater percentage of student athletes are earning GPAs of 3.0 or greater, and fewer are doing poorly, with GPAs below 2.0.

**Figure 1 - Academic Indictors Over Time Fall Semester**

**Figure 2 - Academic Indicators Over Time - Spring Semester**

7) Review of Academic Support Services
Under action implemented by the NCAA in 2007 (NCAA Bylaw 22.2.2.2-(d)), the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (“Athletics Department”) at the University of Utah is required to conduct an external comprehensive review and evaluation of the academic support services
provided student-athletes at the institution. Such review is required, at a minimum, every four years. This year, the external review was conducted in conjunction with the duties of the Athletics Academic Standards Committee. Only the faculty members and an alumni representative participated in this review:

- FAR: William A. Smith
- Faculty: Diane McVey Ward
- Faculty: Marissa Diener
- Alumni Representative: Keven Rowe

**NCAA 22.2.2.2 Academic Support.**

Members of the Association have the responsibility to conduct intercollegiate athletics programs in a manner designed to protect and enhance the educational experience of student-athletes and to assure proper emphasis on educational objectives. Consistent with this responsibility, the institution shall demonstrate that “Adequate academic support services are available for student-athletes.” The external committee was directed to conduct a comprehensive academic support service evaluation which included the following 10 areas A thru J in addition to all other services provided to student-athletes which fall under area K or that might emerge in L:

- Academic advising resources and services;
- Mentoring/Tutoring;
- Assistance for Special Academic Needs;
- Assistance for at-risk students;
- Academic Support Facilities;
- Academic evaluation of prospective student-athletes;
- Mentor/Tutor Interviews;
- Academic Fraud;
- Student-athlete degree selection;
- Academic progress monitoring and reporting;
- Admission Standards; and
- Additional Areas to Review.

**Summary Findings:**

The Athletics Academics Standards subcommittee completed a comprehensive review of the academic support services programs and resources associated with the University of Utah Athletics Department as our major task for the year. The review encompassed the 10 specific areas set forth in our charge, as well as elements of the program relating to admissions standards and relationships between the academic services office and other campus entities such as the Registrar’s Office and the Office of Disability Services.

The final report is on file with the Athletics Director and the Assistant Athletics Director of Compliance. The primary finding of our review is that the academic support services program within the Athletics Department at University of Utah is very strong and the leadership, under the directorship of Mr. Lucas Moosman, is in excellent hands. The program is sound in many ways, including:

- The staff of advisors, mentors, tutors, learning specialists, and career/life skills staff are highly professional and committed to the academic successes of the student-athletes.
• The program is well organized, with a formal structure of divisions and reporting relationships.
• Consistency is improving through the implementation of guidelines and the development of manuals that govern how the services are provided.
• The staff feels willingly obligated to provide skilled and meaningful services to student-athletes.
• The staff members assist rather than hinder the selection of majors by student-athletes, and there has been an enhancement of career services available to them.
• The introduction of the learning specialists has been beneficial to student-athletes, in general, and in particular, to “at-risk” and “special needs” student-athletes. The learning specialist brings a student-centered perspective that builds capacity in the student while being a dependable resource and ally for their specialized needs. The learning specialist’s skills greatly assist student-athletes’ transition to university academics and concomitantly increases their chances at successfully achieving a university degree.
• Similarly, the emergence of the mentoring program adds another important component to the overall set of student-athlete services. The committee looks forward to its continuation and growth. Equally important is the tutoring program. Since this program is less developed, the committee recommends an increased focus and commitment to this area.

Of particular note is the outstanding leadership provided by the Director of Academic Services, Mr. Lucas Moosman. The University of California, Berkeley’s Athletics Department previously employed Mr. Moosman with similar responsibilities. Since his arrival, there has been unanimous acclaim for his organizational skills, commitment to excellence, vision, and his ability to work well with staff inside the office while building relationships with other departments and campus entities. This background experience is believed by most to be one of his greatest assets. As an experienced Pac-10 athletics department staff member, Mr. Moosman is highly respected, both by those who work with and for him, and by those within the Athletics Department and growing numbers of campus entities with whom he interacts on a frequent basis. This will certainly be of increasing significance and benefit, as the program will be compared against our new Pac-12 peer institutions.

Staff in the Academic Services department recognized Mr. Moosman for the strong program foundation he has built during his short tenure and for his dedication to staff development. As Mr. Moosman continues to grow in his position, and given the importance of academic services in enhancing the overall campus experience of student-athletes, the committee believes that consideration should be given to making him an Assistant Athletics Director in the Athletics Department. This is no token move; this move recognizes the efforts and importance of the position. Moreover, it is consistent with most directors in the Pac-12. Mr. Moosman is currently a member of the senior management team and this level of consideration would not only acknowledge Mr. Moosman’s important role in the Athletics Department, but also would enhance the visibility of the position of the Director of Academic Services and reaffirm the Athletics Department’s continued commitment to academic as well as athletic excellence.

As with any such review, the external committee has identified areas that provide opportunities for even more improvements in the academic services offered to student-athletes. Most of the following suggestions reflect the committee’s view that the accomplishments and
strengths of the academic services program provide a strong foundation for taking academic support services to an even higher level of performance and contribution.

The academic services office and senior staff within the Athletics Department has worked hard to instill in both student-athletes and coaches an appreciation for the importance of academics in the overall campus experience of student-athletes. The committee has seen and heard positive anecdotal evidence that many coaches and other personnel in specific sports have heard the message and have internalized it in their programs. The Athletics Department should build on these positive efforts to reinforce this message and ensure that it is carried consistently throughout all sports.

The services to student-athletes appears to be particularly strong at the entry point of their campus experience, however major improvements should be made to strengthen those services at the exit point—graduation and departure from campus—as well. The academic services department should extend these accomplishments by focusing more, as well, on the coordination of its services with those of the advising assistance offered by departments, colleges, and schools on the University of Utah campus. The committee recognizes that turning over some of the advising to the departments is never an easy task, but more coordination in this area will further enhance the student-athlete experience on campus. The committee recognizes that efforts have been made in this area.

One final note is in order; particularly in consideration of the difficult financial times facing campuses in general, including Athletics Departments. The accomplishments of the University of Utah academic services program are impressive, as highlighted in this report. The external committee enthusiastically takes note of the fact that these endeavors have been the result of a solid, sustained commitment on the part of the Athletics Department to promote the academic performance and experience of student-athletes as part of their overall campus experience. In this period of increased financial scrutiny and potential cutbacks, it will be critical that the Athletics Department maintain its unqualified support for academic services; these highly committed student-athletes deserve no less.
Gender Equity and Diversity Committee Report
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INTRODUCTION

The Gender Equity & Diversity Subcommittee reviewed the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act Report and five-year comparisons of data regarding key indicators of gender equity. Areas included in the report are athletics participation, grants and scholarships, coaching salaries, travel and recruiting expenses. Also reviewed was the subcommittee’s annual report for the previous year (2008-09). Members of the subcommittee met several times during the fall and spring semesters to plan and review the available data, monitor both accomplishments and deficiencies in equity, discuss goals, and make recommendations for any needed changes. Our subcommittee continued with the practice of meeting with Dr. Chris Hill (Athletic Director) to get a report and update on the issues raised in the previous year’s subcommittee report. In addition, as recommended last year, we created a list of potential issues for the subcommittee to evaluate each year (items are listed below). A draft of the subcommittee report was distributed via e-mail to all subcommittee members for their input and the final report is a product of the full committee.

Meeting with the athletic director at the beginning of every year, starting last year in 2008, is a means for the director to discuss his department’s priority issues and to allow the subcommittee to raise questions about gender and diversity concerns. Dr. Hill told the committee that the athletics department needed to put together a new five-year gender equity plan as mandated by the NCAA. Based on this request, the subcommittee worked on this plan during the year.

The Gender Equity and Diversity Committee also reviewed the degree of equity between the men and women’s teams (e.g., scholarships, salaries, travel, per diem, and recruiting expenses). Data was analyzed by including football as well as excluding football. The committee sought to examine both gender and minority issues. The
committee tracked and identified what is currently being done and what can be done to monitor diversity issues and raise awareness.

Currently, there are seven topics the subcommittee identified as gender equity and ethnic diversity issues in this year’s report (which are the same ones used in last year’s report). The topics are participation rates, athletic student aid, equipment funds, team travel funds, recruiting funds, coaches’ salaries (including comparison salaries within the MWC), and diversity general issues. The other potential topics the Subcommittee developed as indicators for gender equity and ethnic diversity for future reports are scheduling (games and practice), tutoring access, facilities (locker rooms, training and competition facilities), medical and training services (physicians and trainers, weight room scheduling), housing and dining services, publicity and support services for coaches and athletes.

Below are brief descriptive assessments for each of the gender equity and ethnic diversity indicators reviewed along with a graphic depiction of the available data.

1. Participation: The subcommittee is pleased to report that the University of Utah’s Athletics Department is well within the Title IX requirements for athlete participation rates. Women at the U of U participate in sports at a rate slightly above (49.6%) their percentages in the student population (44.7%), which continues a trend of increasing percentage in participation since 2004-05 (see Figure 1). Dr. Hill continues his goal of achieving a 50% rate of sports participation for females.

![Gender Enrollment and Participation Trends](image)

*Figure 1: Enrollment and participation trends by gender*
2. **Athletic Student Aid**: There is a discrepancy between men and women’s sports in terms of both actual dollars spent, as well as percentage of equivalencies awarded to each gender. In looking at the actual dollars spent per athlete, there is a growing gap since 2004-05 (see Figure 2). However, there are other issues that need to be considered. Hard dollar values are most indicative of the number of resident versus non-resident student-athletes who are receiving an athletic scholarship. The estimated in-state tuition and fees for 2008-09 was $4,840 compared to $15,196 for out-of-state tuition and fees (based on 12 credit hours). The subcommittee found that of the student-athletes who received aid in men’s sports for 08-09, 50.5 were labeled as residents versus 118.5 labeled as non-residents. For women’s sports, those numbers were 59 residents versus 77 non-residents. Thus, men’s teams undoubtedly will have higher actual dollar values associated with the awarding of scholarship money.

![Figure 2: Average funds spent per athlete for student aid](image)

As a result, the subcommittee does not believe the actual dollars spent on scholarships for each gender is a good indicator of the athletics department’s commitment to funding men and women’s sports. The subcommittee believes a better indicator of the athletics department’s commitment to funding is the growth in the percentage of equivalencies awarded to women’s teams. The “equivalency” of a scholarship is the percentage of a full grant-in-aid being received by a student-athlete, regardless of whether she or he is classified as a resident or non-resident. According to the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) regulations, there is compliance when institutions offer total scholarship dollars at a rate within one percentage point of women and men’s rate of participation. In 2008-09 participation rate for women was 49.6% and financial aid for women was 43.1%. Even though there is a 6.5% difference, there is justification for the differences—1) in-state vs. out-of-state tuition, 2) women sport coaches did not award all the scholarships available for women and 3) Full-time equivalent scholarship actual amount used for women was 46%, thus narrowing the gap. Women’s sports are now fully funded (as are all men’s sports). The subcommittee again recommends encouraging coaches for the women’s sports to use all of the scholarships available to them for their teams.
Figure 3: Equivalence percentages for student aid

3. Equipment and Supplies: Overall, there still exists a discrepancy in the dollars spent for women’s sports for equipment and supplies (per athlete) compared to that spent for men’s sports. The discrepancy narrowed in the last year. The exclusion of football demonstrates an even more significant closure of the gap. The remaining discrepancies are largely explained by the different needs and desires of the sports programs and not based on any inequities in the availability of funds for the men’s and women’s sports. In order to better understand the discrepancy, the subcommittee recommends continued monitoring of the expenses for football, and increased funding of women’s sports, as needed for equipment.
Figure 4: Average funds spent per athlete for equipment

4. Team Travel: In the last three reports, discrepancies were noted between the amounts of money expended by men and women’s sports for team travel (per athlete). This gap was maintained between female athletes and males excluding football. In 2005-06, the gap between men and women’s sports was $1,940 ($1,313 excluding football) and increased to $3,126 ($1,929 excluding football) in 2006-07. For 2008-09, the gap is now $6,151 overall ($2116 excluding football) (see Figure 5). An athletic department self-study report (2006-07) suggested that these discrepancies are due to differences in need (particularly relating to post-season competition) and preferences (e.g. dining and per diem arrangements) by the various sports and not due to deficiencies in equity. For instance, in 2008-09 Sugar Bowl expenses for travel amounted to a total of $838,000. Dr. Hill suggested conducting future analyses on team travel for non-conference, conference, and post-season schedules to understand the gap better. The subcommittee also recommends that the travel expenditures continue to be monitored and efforts made to reduce some of the discrepancy that exists even when football is not included in the comparison.
Figure 5: Average funds spent per athlete for travel

5. Recruiting: In last year’s report, it was noted that there were discrepancies between the amounts of money expended (per athlete) by men and women’s sports for recruitment of student athletes. The discrepancies not only continued this year, but the gap has widened (see Figure 6).

Figure 6: Average funds spent per athlete for recruitment

Overall, the recruitment expenditures increased for men’s, but dropped somewhat for women’s sports in 2008-09. In 2006-07, the gap between men and women’s sports was $817 ($382 excluding football) and decreased to $496 ($270 excluding football) in 2007-08. These respective numbers increased to $949 and $687 in 2008-09. Any disparity appears to be the result of recruiting styles of coaches for the various sports and unique
circumstances that apply to recruiting in any given sport in a particular year. For example, the preference of the football and men’s basketball coaches is to be out recruiting year-round because the other schools will be out recruiting. However, this is not typically the case for many women’s sports. No budgetary restraints exist which limit the amount that women’s sports programs can spend on recruiting as long as permission is granted from the sport supervisor. The subcommittee again suggests that coaches, particularly of women’s sports, be encouraged to request additional recruitment funds if needed. If these coaches feel that they are adequately funded for recruitment, the existing disparity may not be problematic. As suggested in last year’s report, each sport’s recruitment budget was monitored to see if particular sports were going over or under their budget differentially. Dr. Hill informed us that only women’s volleyball and women’s basketball went over budget for 2008-09, which may account for the closing of the gap. The subcommittee recommends an assessment from the coaches about their recruiting budgets to better understand if their recruitment needs are being met.

Since this committee has been charged to monitor the recruiting budgets for men and women sports, the following table compares MWC actual recruiting expenses for men and women sports. In comparison with four other MWC schools, the University of Utah in 2008-09 spent 66% of actual expenses for men versus 34% for women. In comparing the other four MWC schools, the University of Utah did better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Recruiting Budget</th>
<th>M &amp; W Totals from EADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBB</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$351,301/141,101 71/29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td></td>
<td>$478,017/195,795 71/29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>$61,898</td>
<td>$413,191/172,340 71/29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$414,201/209,859 66/34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$329,567/151,483 69/31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>$18,434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$34,490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>$18,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$29,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>$23,181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$29,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>$11,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Golf**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>$5,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>$9,494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Swimming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>$5,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>$18,543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Track/X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>M &amp; W $20,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>$9,891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7: MWC Recruiting Budget Comparisons: Women Sports*

6. **Coaches' Salaries:** Current coaches' salaries at the U of U (including head coaches and assistants) are characteristic of college athletics both in the Mountain West Conference and nationally. Both men's and women's sports have 23 FTE coaching slots filled. But, based upon the available data (see Figure 8), the subcommittee is concerned with a growth in the difference in relative salary positions between coaching salaries of men's versus women's sports. The relative differences for 2008-09 are the largest in many years. The subcommittee will need to evaluate these figures next year to see whether there is relative equity in salary between men's and women's sport coaches. In response to an issue raised by the Academic Senate, we examined coaches' salaries with and without men's basketball and football. It appears that the major disparity is due to the expected larger salaries for men's basketball and football coaches (see Figure 9 below). These disparities most likely are market, rather than gender, driven. A preliminary look at coaching salaries relative to Mountain West Conference salaries (in response to a question raised by the Academic Senate) indicates that head coaching salaries are close to the 50th percentile for coaches of women's sports, but lower for coaches of men's sports (see Figure 10). These data suggest that the disparities in men's and women's coaches may be due to market forces. Attention is warranted, however, to continue monitoring these data to reduce the likelihood of the gap widening. In addition, the subcommittee recommends developing other indices to track this item (e.g., salaries of female and male coaches) to better understand coaches' salaries.
Figure 8: Percentage of coaches’ salaries for men and women’s teams

Figure 9: Average Coaching Salaries for Men’s and Women’s Sports with and without Men’s Basketball and Football
7. **Diversity issues:** As mentioned in our meeting with Dr. Hill, the subcommittee is developing a list of indicators for diversity issues to be monitored. One item is to track the ethnicity of student athletes in relation to the general student population at the University of Utah. These data could inform us on the percentage of student athletes of color attending and staying at the university compared to the general population. In addition, the subcommittee recommends monitoring the athletic department staff demographics regarding gender and ethnic diversity. We recommend the tracking of applicants for coaching positions based on ethnicity. Finally, we encourage the tracking of minority recruitment of athletes. With the list now in place, we can begin incorporating those indicators into the annual report. Also, this year a new 5-year diversity plan was created since the previous plan had expired.

**Conclusions**

The Gender Equity and Diversity Committee of the Athletics Advisory Council believes that the athletics department continues to be doing a very good job of fulfilling its mandate in regards to gender equity and diversity. Continued monitoring of all the indicators of gender equity is warranted to ensure that the athletics department maintains and improves on an already successful record. Particular attention should continue to be given to preventing the gap from widening in a few particular areas. First, regarding the funds spent for student aid, the gap has widened in the past year. We recommend encouraging coaches for the women's sports to use all of the scholarships available to them for their teams. Second, for equipment, we recommend continued monitoring of the expenses for football, and to increase funding of women's sports, as needed for equipment. Third, with respect to travel expenses, we recommend looking at the team's non-conference, conference, and post-season schedules, which may explain differences in expenses as a result of more travel due to competitions further away from
Utah and more post-season activities. Finally, with recruitment of student athletes, we recommend looking at each sport’s recruitment budget to see if particular sports are going over or under their budget differentially, with the goal of making sure all coaches have sufficient funds for recruitment.

In addition to these items, the committee would like to continue some activities started this year. First, with the assistance of Mary Bowman and her staff, we helped to develop a new Five-Year Gender Equity Plan and Five-Year Diversity Plan. These plans now need to be monitored and evaluated each year. Second, we recommend that the athletics department revise the Gender Equity Coaches Survey from the University of Iowa and administer this survey in fall 2010. This survey provides specific data that will allow for an in-depth review of gender equity and feedback from the thirteen program areas (Athletic Scholarships, Accommodation of interests and Abilities, Equipment, Scheduling of Games and Practice Times, Travel, Tutors, Coaching, Facilities, Medical and Training Services, Housing Services and Recruiting). In addition, because all head coaches of men and women’s sports will complete the survey, it will provide gender equity information from a department wide perspective. Third, next year’s subcommittee should continue to evaluate the MWC coaches’ salaries by gender. Fourth, we suggest that the subcommittee also assess student-athlete scholarships by gender based on in-state and out-of-state students. Fifth, recruitment expenses also should be examined compared to MWC expenses based on sports. Finally, the Subcommittee recommends continued monitoring with attention paid during the exit interviews to see if issues of comfort and treatment arise differently for women and students of color as reasons for leaving.

The subcommittee would like to continue to meet with Dr. Hill at the beginning of the academic year to discuss the previous year’s report and plan for the current year. Finally, the subcommittee recommended a change in its title from Gender and Equity to Gender Equity and Diversity to mirror the terminology used by the NCAA. The AAC approved of the change.
Compliance Committee Report

Voting members:
Chair: William A. Smith
Faculty: Brian Patrick
Faculty: Paul Tikalsky

Ex officio members
Athletic Dept. Rep.: Chris Hill
General Counsel: Robert Payne
Athletic Dept. Compliance Officer: Kyle Brennan
Registrar’s Office: Suzanne Jones
Financial Aid Office: Derek Boyle
Senior Academic Officer: John Francis

The Athletics Compliance Committee is required to meet twice each academic year, once in the fall and once in the spring, in addition to such ad hoc meetings as may be required. The committee held its scheduled fall meeting on November 16, 2009 and its spring meeting on April 19, 2010.

The following items came before the committee during the 2009-2010 academic year:

1) External Audits of the Athletics Department’s NCAA Rules Compliance
In 2001, the University investigated various allegations of NCAA rules violations leveled against the Athletics Department by a former coach. Though the investigation disproved many allegations, it also revealed a number of secondary violations that were reported to the NCAA. This report resulted in an Official Inquiry by the NCAA and ultimately an Infractions Report. A part of this process, the University informed the NCAA of its intent to, with the assistance of its outside counsel (Mike Glazier), create a new “comprehensive compliance audit program to be implemented by the University’s existing internal auditors who are independent of the Athletics Department.” During each year of the probationary period imposed by the Infractions Report, the University informed the NCAA about its progress with the external audit and attached a copy of the planned audit schedule. In the final probation report in 2006, the schedule contemplated a five-year audit cycle. During each year of the cycle, the auditors planned to review several compliance areas across all sports, and all compliance areas within one to three sports. By the conclusion of the five-year cycle, all areas of compliance in all sports would be audited.

In the first few years of the audit cycle, the internal auditors learned that the initial audit plan was very ambitious, very time consuming, and very costly. In 2008, the auditors proposed a modified auditing plan that would review all areas of compliance during a four-year cycle. The four-year cycle would emphasize compliance in the sports of football and men’s
basketball with a random sampling from other sports to test compliance in those programs. The revised auditing plan eliminated the complete audit of the individual sports each year across all areas of compliance. This revised plan was considered and approved by the University’s outside counsel and approved by the compliance subcommittee.

The recession beginning in 2008/2009 has caused significant financial hardships on the University of Utah. The University has had to make budget cuts across all areas of campus, including the Internal Audit Department. As a consequence of these cuts, Internal Audit does not have the resources to meet the four-year audit cycle. Internal Audit has proposed a further modification to the audit schedule that would extend the audit cycle to a six-year (or an eight year) cycle. The auditing plan would otherwise be the same as proposed for the four-year cycle. The only change would be the review of fewer areas of compliance during each year of the extended cycle. This proposal was discussed with the University’s outside consultant. The consultant recommended that the University ultimately strive for a maximum five-year audit cycle but expressed the view that the University has some flexibility to account for current economic difficulties.

The subcommittee recognizes that since the infractions investigation in 2001, the Compliance Office in the Athletics Department has vastly improved. There is a genuine culture of compliance within the Athletics Department that involves excellent and comprehensive rules education, a heightened awareness by the coaches and staff of the compliance rules and expectations, and a well functioning process for identifying and reporting rules violations. The committee notes that every four years the Mountain West Conference (MWC) conducts an external compliance review which satisfies the requirement of Bylaw 22.2.1.2(e). The most recent MWC review was completed in the fall of 2009. Significantly, both the MWC reviews and the audit reports from the Internal Auditors since 2006 have made recommendations for improvement, but have revealed no rules violations. Although an ongoing external review of compliance by the Internal Audit Office remains an important check on Athletics’ compliance efforts, the subcommittee feels that extending the audit cycle from four to six years will not create a significant risk of potential compliance failures within Athletics. The subcommittee feels that an eight-year cycle is too lengthy and would not be appropriate. Therefore, the subcommittee has approved the proposed six-year audit cycle. The subcommittee will annually re-evaluate the effectiveness of this program with a goal to work toward a five-year audit cycle when University finances permit.

2) Mountain West Conference Institutional Compliance Review

The Mountain West Conference Institutional Compliance Review is intended to assist the University of Utah examine its compliance efforts and at the same time allow the Mountain West Conference associate commissioner for compliance to become more familiar with the programs in place at Utah. This review is designed to assess whether the compliance program at Utah possesses certain key components, using a questionnaire, review of selected documents and on-campus interviews.

This institutional compliance review report may be used to satisfy the requirements of NCAA Bylaw 22.2.1.2 (e). Bylaw 22.2.1.2 (e) requires that the institution demonstrate that at
least once every four years its rules compliance program is the subject of evaluation by an authority outside of the athletics department.

The institutional compliance review focuses on organization and structure, finance and use of funds, eligibility, financial aid, recruitment monitoring, investigatory and self-reporting processes, student-athlete issues, rules education and the NCAA Academic Performance Program. The report also includes a brief evaluation of each area and if applicable includes suggested recommendations for improvement.

It is important to note that this is a conference-assisted self-study intended to assist the University of Utah in examining and improving its compliance program. It should not be viewed as a comprehensive “audit” or as a “seal of approval” relative to the institution’s compliance efforts. Even the most sound compliance program cannot eliminate completely an institution’s ability to prevent or detect violations, and to take appropriate actions should violations occur, consistent with the provisions of Constitution 2.8.1.

While the Mountain West Conference did not find anything that was remotely “potentially serious,” the Office of Athletics Compliance will adjust policies, procedures, and forms, and address all mechanisms implemented or enhanced in response to the recommendations of the contained in the MWC Compliance Review Report. Additionally, the Office of Athletics Compliance will seek the suggestions of the Athletics Compliance Committee in implementing the recommendations contained in the report.

There were twelve MWC recommendations, with one that this committee supported the assistant athletic director’s recommendation to be forwarded for review to the Academics Standards Subcommittee of the Athletics Advisory Council—“Formally review the policies and procedures for the academic and general support services provided to student-athletes.”

3) Rules Violations and Waiver Requests
As per its charge, the committee reviewed 18 (eighteen) rules violations. Of these 18 violations, 10 were Level I violations, and eight were Level II. Men’s football had three Level I and no Level II violations, and Women’s volleyball and softball and Men’s baseball each had two Level I violations. The remaining Level I violation was in Men’s basketball. Men’s basketball (1), Men’s baseball (2), Women’s volleyball (1), Women’s softball (2), Women’s tennis (1), and Men’s tennis (1) had Level II violations.

The committee also reviewed 17 (seventeen) requests for a waiver of rules submitted by the Compliance Office to the NCAA (15) and MWC (2). The University did not withdraw any requests; the MWC denied one (1) request and NCAA granted all fifteen. The committee concluded that high percentage of requests granted indicated that the Compliance Office was doing a good job in making the case for exceptions and that the requests submitted were reasonable and appropriate.

4) Increased & Focus Specific Compliance Education Sessions
The Athletics Compliance Office has created/improved upon its already very focused education sessions. Compliance has provided a tremendous service for coaches, administrators, and parents.
by offering over 30 education sessions. These sessions range from “financial aid equivalency” to “nutritional supplements” to “social networking” and everything in between. The challenges that Compliance has in developing these sessions are to keep them interesting, relevant, and memorable in order to decrease rules violations. This committee believes they are accomplishing this responsibility.
Mentoring and Tutoring Review

William A. Smith, NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative

1) Mentors/Tutors: University athletics departments were put on notice about the importance of maintaining institutional control over its mentoring and tutoring programs after a high profile NCAA investigation at Florida State University. This investigation by an NCAA committee determined that a tutor, an academic advisor and a learning specialist, all former FSU employees, facilitated and encouraged 61 student-athletes in ten sports to cheat. During the Fall 2006 to Summer 2007 semesters, student-athletes were provided answers to an online exam in a music history course and staff members typed papers for them. The sports that were affected were football, baseball, softball, men's golf, men's and women's track, basketball, and swimming.

As a result, athletics departments across the country responded by more closely monitoring the academic services they offered student-athletes. The University of Utah, in a proactive and preventative response, decided that the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) would be the best person to assist in independently monitoring and providing a level of institutional control outside of the athletics department. Consequently, beginning in 2008, the FAR began doing random drop-ins to tutoring/mentoring sessions and individually interviewing mentors and tutors about whether they intentionally (coerced or not) or inadvertently offered improper benefits to student-athletes.

The following are the major highlights regarding mentor/tutor recommendations as well as the results of the interviews accessing whether there were improper benefits or academic assistance provided to student-athletes.

Major Highlights: Mentors generally state that the mentor program is very well structured and almost all of the interviewees reference the importance of Beth. One mentor stated that Beth has improved the communication and reporting practices in the mentoring program. Another mentor highlighted the usefulness of the Beth’s communication over email. A mentor noticed a positive change in the program since Beth became a full time employee. Although all of the mentors and tutors had positive things to say about the program, some of them expressed concern mainly regarding communication between the professors and themselves. Additionally, some mentors stated that the travel schedule and general schedules of the student-athletes disrupted their ability to properly mentor student-athletes. Furthermore, one mentor expressed frustration over student-athletes who were tardy or did not show up to mentoring sessions. One mentor stated that athletes needed to be better matched to their classes. Overall the feedback was positive from the mentors and tutors. Many had very specific but minor recommendations rather than general and major problems with the program. More specifically, there was no indication that improper benefits or academic assistance were provided to student-athletes.

a. FINDINGS
i) Overall, there were no major or minor incidents of inappropriate requests made by student-athletes or offers of assistance from mentors, tutors, or other staff members.

ii) There were no mentors or tutors who were aware of others violating NCAA rules or university policies.

iii) Mentors mentioned developing a very close relationship with their student-athletes and that they were often in a position to talk about moral issues and/or perceived unfair treatment.

iv) Academic advisors have carefully balanced being very professional while warm and engaging. Despite this relationship, there was no evidence of inappropriate behaviors.

v) Female mentors and tutors did not feel sexually harassed or spoken to in a sexist manner by male student-athletes. In fact, they report that male student-athletes were among the most respectful men they have encountered.

vi) Beth Brennan, the Learning Specialist/Mentor Coordinator, is an exceptionally capable staff member and has worked diligently to ensure that mentors are professional and knowledgeable of NCAA compliance rules and institutional policies. Likewise, she is viewed as competent by the mentors, tutors, and student-athletes and respected in her role. Beth has not reported hearing or being told of violations by mentors or students.

vii) Lucas Moosman, the Director of Academic Services, is the steady hand of the academic services program. Since his appointment he has been very program oriented and aimed at promoting best practices. Lucas has also indicated that he has not been asked to fulfill a request that is inappropriate or a violation of the written NCAA and University of Utah policies.

viii) There continues to be significant tutor turnover in the program. This is an area that needs immediate attention.

ix) Some of the mentors and tutors who were hired in the spring semester did not receive the same comprehensive orientation and training as those hired in the summer/fall. This is another area that needs to be addressed.

2) RECOMMENDATIONS

a. Given the turnover among mentors and tutors, there needs to be a consistent orientation and training model no matter when a person is hired. Additionally, the new person should be cleared through Kyle Brennan (compliance) and/or the FAR before working with student-athletes.

b. Based on the close relationship that, specifically, mentors expressed having with their student-athlete, it might be prudent to have these employees sign Form 08-02 Certification of Compliance for Staff.

c. There should be a formal exit interview of all tutors who decide not return to the program prior to the submission of their final paycheck.
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#### Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email/Mailing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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