ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA
October 4, 2010

1. CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 p.m. in room L105 of the Warnock Engineering Classroom Building (directions included on last page of packet)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 30, 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. Appendix III: Emeritus Appointments

5. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT:

6. REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATION:

7. REPORT FROM ASUU:

8. NOTICE OF INTENT:
   a. Proposed Revised Policy 9-001 (Naming of University Facilities and Programs) 6
   b. Proposed Revised Policy 9-002 (Honorary Degrees) 12

9. DEBATE CALENDAR:
   a. Proposed Revised Policy 6-100 (Instruction and Evaluation) 17
   b. Proposed New Rule 6-100A (Credit/no-credit Grading for Undergraduates) 60
   c. Proposed Revised Policy 6-101 (Undergraduate Study and Degrees) 62

10. INFORMATION CALENDAR:
    a. Emphasis in Energy Engineering, Department of Chemical Engineering 68
    b. Graduate Council Reviews:
       ● Department of Art and Art History 75
       ● Department of Biology 90
       ● Department of Economics 102
       ● Department of Educational Psychology 113

11. NEW BUSINESS:
    a. Thoughts for Futures Committee 121

12. ADJOURNMENT:
Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate on August 30, 2010, was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by James E. Metherall, Senate President. The meeting was held in the Aline Wilmot Skaggs Building in room 220.

Jim Metherall welcomed the new members of the Senate and informed the entire body of the change of location for all future Senate meetings. Beginning October 4, the meetings will be held in the Warnock Engineering Classroom Building in room L105. A map will be provided with the next Senate agenda.


Ex-officio: James E. Anderson, Annie Christensen, Robert Flores, John Francis, Pat Hanna, Nancy Lines, James Metherall, Joyce Ogburn, Susan Olson, David Pershing, David Rudd, Octavio Villalpando, Chuck Wight, Michael K. Young

Others: Ed Barbanell, Ann Floor, Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, Kevin Taylor

Excused: Loris Betz, Paul Mogren, Chris Nelson, Alison Regan, Andrea Rorrer, David Viskochill

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of May 3, 2010, were unanimously approved following a motion from Jim Anderson which was seconded by Robert Fujinami.

Request for New Business
There was no new business.
Consent Calendar
The Executive Committee forwarded the names of Paul Mogren as Parliamentarian, and Robert Flores as Senate-Institutional Policy Committee Liaison for approval of the Senate. A motion by Larry DeVries to approve both names was seconded by Rachel Nardo and unanimously approved.

The resignations, retirements, faculty appointments, auxiliary and, limited term appointments, and Emeritus appointments appearing in the Appendices dated June 1, 2010 and August 30, 2010, received unanimous approval to forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval following a motion from Larry DeVries and seconded by Robert Fujinami.

Executive Committee Report
Patricia Hanna, Executive Committee Secretary, provided a summary of the Executive Committee meetings held on June 1, 2020, and August 2, 2010.

Report from Administration
President Michael K. Young delivered the “State of the University” immediately following the business portion of the Senate meeting.

Report from ASUU
Chase Jardine, ASUU president gave a summary of ASUU activities over the summer, including the ambassador program which currently has 15 students trained to go out into the schools. They plan to continue working on their goal of 25. ASUU is also creating a Career Guide for freshman students which will be resource specific in various areas. Former student profiles and case studies will be included to assist students interested in internships, service, or research. ASUU would appreciate feedback and advice from the Senate.

Following the ASUU report, Jim Anderson, chair of the Futures Committee, gave a short overview of the function of the Futures Committee and explained their purpose which is to allow faculty and students to bring up possible issues for future senate meetings. The main concern is regarding the direction Higher Education and the environment will be facing during the next 10 years. He invited suggestions be directed to him, james.anderson@utah.edu, or the Academic Senate office.

Notice of Intent
John Francis, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, explained that there were two points considered in the revisions of Policy 6-100 and Policy 6-101, and the creation of the new Rule 6-100A. First, substantive changes in class attendance, and second, several grammatical errors needed to be corrected. Ed Barbanell, associate dean of undergraduate studies, explained the proposed revisions basically clarify everything that is done every day as faculty, i.e. scholastic requirements, classroom attendance requirements, who can modify when final exams are given, course assessment and feedback, language clarification in reporting non-credit courses, academic suspension, discounting courses for previous students. He requested the senators discuss the revisions with their peers forward suggestions and thoughts directly to
himself or John Francis so that they can be implemented before the next Senate meeting. He noted that the undergraduate requirements have been moved into another policy.

**Debate Calendar**

Ed Barbanell explained that the membership of the Undergraduate Council needs to be changed. The proposed changes to Policy 6-001 would remove the College of Pharmacy from the Council as they no longer have an undergraduate program, and would change the status of the Honors College, with an undergraduate program, from non-voting to a voting member. Norm Waitzman suggested that they be voted upon as two separate issues. *Norm Waitzman motioned to approve the removal of the College of Pharmacy from membership in the Undergraduate Council which was seconded by Jim Anderson and approved unanimously. Norm Waitzman made a motion to approve the request to change the status of the Honors College from non-voting to voting member which was seconded by Steve Alder and unanimously approved.*

Professor Ganesh Gopalakrishnan from the School of Computing summarized his request to establish the Center for Parallel-computing at Utah (CPU). The purpose for this center is to increase the University’s ability to develop high-performance parallel/concurrent programs that compute correctly and deliver correct answers. *A motion from Larry DeVries to forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval was seconded by Ron Coleman and approved unanimously.*

Kevin Taylor, director of University Information Technology, explained the requested revisions to Rule 4-002 regarding illegal file sharing. The revised rule will bring the University into compliance with the Federal Higher Education Act (HEOA) as it relates to policies regarding downloading copyrighted material and will become effective immediately for all students, faculty and staff who share materials. *A motion was made by Jim Anderson to approve the proposed rule which was seconded by Mike Goodman and unanimously approved.*

**Information Calendar**

The information calendar included three items: the revised College of Health Council Charter which was approved by the Executive Committee on August 2, 2010; two Graduate Council Reviews: 1) the Department of Theatre and 2) the Interdepartmental Program in Neuroscience which were approved by the Executive Committee during the summer; and the revised Policy 3-215 and new Rule 3-215 regarding University Motor Vehicles which were approved during the summer by the Executive Committee.

**New Business**

There was no new business.

**State of the University Address:**

President Young presented the annual State of the University address as part of the Academic Senate meeting. He began by acknowledging the tragic death of one of our Hinckley interns in Washington D.C., Eric Wright, and extended his condolences to the Wright family.

The president commenced his address with acknowledgments for the tremendous leadership team and faculty which are central and important to the future of the University. He provided an
overview of the University’s research growth, discoveries, and achievements and noted that research funding is up 27 percent to over $450 million, an increase of over $1 million over the last fiscal year. He notes that such record numbers are due to the extraordinary faculty at the U, competing with the best of the best nationwide for research dollars.

In addition to the strides in research, the President pointed out the successes in commercialization. The Technology Transfer Commercialization Office set another record by bringing in over $3 million in new revenue. Nineteen new technology companies were started bringing the five year total to over 100 while still being ranked #1 (tied with MIT) in the country.

The President mentioned the physical facilities which are necessary to compliment the trajectory and level of growth the University is experiencing. Fifteen major projects have been completed or are either under construction or in design. The collective construction value is over $725 million of which 80 percent is non-state funded with 18 percent funded by State resources. Among the structures he mentioned are: the David Eccles School of Business classroom building, the James L. Sorensen USTAR building, the Utah Museum of Natural History, the Student Life Center, and 4 Honors Housing facilities at the foot of Legacy Bridge. And our Campus Master plan was honored this year by the Society for College and University Planning with the Excellence in Planning Merit Award for Planning for a District or Campus Component.

The Together We Reach campaign for the University of Utah” is doing extraordinarily well with more than $949 million raised and pledged to date or 79 percent of the $1.2 billion goal. That number represents an increase of almost $30 million since last year.

He communicated that the University continues to attract exception students, and also continues to expand the international reach for students from various countries while encouraging our own students to participate in study abroad programs. Our international programs are doing exceptionally well. The College of Humanities was recently selected by the Department of Education to receive a Title VI National Resource Center Consortium grant for its Asia Center. The grant will provide $4.5 million over the next 4 years to support students, faculty, research and community outreach.

President Young expounded on sustainability and acknowledged the U has always been at the forefront of responsibility in thoughtful environmental energy usage. He was pleased that our efforts have not gone unnoticed as the U ranks #4 in the nation on the EPA’s list of college and university “green power partners.” He recognized all who were engaged in this campaign and could not go on without mentioning the most important element, the exceptional students for really leading the way. Another personal note he said he was glad to see the U’s Farmer’s Market back in full swing for its third year.

President Young stated that this year the enrollment is up approximately 1500 students for a total enrollment of over 31,000 students. We have 2300 students qualifying for the Honors College and 500 additional students from out of state.
Going forward, the President commented that the University’s inclusion into the Pac 12 is important not only athletically but academically. We are now joining a conference of fellow exceptional, like-minded research universities. This change will present more challenges and opportunities to do more things.

He shared his vision of some far-reaching initiatives like the new U Signature Experience/Early Assurance Program to transform the way students prepare for college life and beyond; a commitment to bring the best and brightest students to the U; enhance communication and collaboration with faculty, students and staff; and provide cutting-edge technology tools to improve the efficiency of the business processes at the U.

In conclusion, the President noted that we are entering a critical time for this University, with change right around the corner. He indicated that the University welcomes and embraces that change and looks to grow and accept the challenges that come with it. He said that “this University is a remarkable academic jewel and our work and commitment to you is to join you in unleashing that sparkle for that jewel in an even more profound capacity.” He closed by stating that the growth and innovation at the U really comes from our faculty and that this sets U up for future greatness--trending upward and outward, further than ever been before.

Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Lines
Memorandum

To: Fred Esplin, Vice President Institutional Advancement and Laura Snow, Secretary to the University
    cc: Senior Vice Presidents David Pershing and Lorris Betz

From: Carla Flynn, Associate Vice President for Development

Date: May 20, 2010

Subject: Executive Summary – Proposed Changes to Policy 9-001 (Rev. 3) for Naming of University Facilities and Programs

This is a proposal to amend University Policy 9-001 which governs the naming of University facilities and programs. The proposed changes have been developed through a coordinated effort of the Development Office, the Office of Space Planning and Management, and the Office of General Counsel, and with consultation from the Dean of the Graduate School and the offices of the Senior Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Health Sciences. The proposal has been reviewed by the Institutional Policy Committee.

If you approve of the proposal, with your signature of approval it should then be forwarded for the approval and signature of President Young, and subsequently submitted for approval of the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees.

It is recommended that the effective date of the amended version be immediately upon approval by the Trustees.

The changes have been made to reflect current practice for named facilities, to more clearly outline regulations for naming programs (including current practices on formal approval steps), to include language relating to the useful or functional life of facilities, and to describe the process for removal of named recognition. The policy has been reformatted along current University Regulations Library guidelines.

Please contact me if you have any questions. Thank you.
I. Purpose and Scope

To state the Policy related Procedures provide for the naming of or changing the name of University facilities and programs.

II. Definitions

A. In this Policy, the terms “facility” and “facilities” include but are not limited to any building, structure, room, plaza, open space, landscaped area, or other physical improvement or natural feature of the university campus or of other property under the administrative control of the University. A road is also included, but the naming of a road shall be managed on a case by case basis by the Vice President for Administrative Services, in consultation with the President, and, if the name honors an individual, organization, or group, with the involvement of the Vice President for Institutional Advancement.

B. For the limited purposes of this Policy, the terms “program” or “programs” include but are not limited to specialized administrative units; any college, department, division, degree-granting interdisciplinary unit, center, or institute or bureau under the administrative control of the University.

III. General Policy

A. A University facility or program may be given an honorary name to pay tribute to an individual, organization, or group having made a distinguished contribution of service, research, teaching, or support to the University. Except where an honorary name for a particular facility or program has been approved by the Board of Trustees, university facilities will ordinarily be given functional names that are reasonably descriptive of and will identify the principal activity or purpose of the facility or program.

B. IV. Functional Names of Facilities and Programs

A. Policy

1. Upon recommendation of the cognizant vice president, the president may assign a functional name to the facility or program or change the existing functional name.

B. Procedures

A decision to name or change the functional name of a facility will be managed by the Office of Space Planning and Management. In the event that a University administrator wishes to recommend a functional name for a single, dedicated-use facility, he or she may do so by submitting a request for a new name or name change to the Office of Space Planning and Management. The Office of Space Planning and Management may require a written request.
including approval signatures and supporting reasons for a particular functional name. The Director of the Office of Space Planning and Management shall forward his or her recommendation to the cognizant vice president for final approval, or, in his or her discretion, the cognizant vice president may seek final approval by the President or his or her designee.

2. Naming or Changing the Functional Name of Programs
   a. 1. A written proposal, including supporting reasons, to name or change the functional name of a facility should be submitted through appropriate administrative channels to the cognizant vice-president. The process for adopting or changing the functional name of a program is managed by the Graduate Council. A written proposal regarding the functional name of a program should first be submitted through the established procedures of the relevant department and college, and then to the Graduate School for review by the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council shall then forward the proposal for approval by the cognizant vice president and the President, the Academic Senate, the Board of Trustees, and the State Board of Regents consistent with applicable Regents’ policies. (See Board of Regent’s Policy R401, as amended or modified from time to time).

   2. After considering all relevant information, the cognizant vice president may recommend approval of the functional name or functional name change.

   3. The recommendation is then presented to the president for approval.

3. C. Implementation
   1. Once the recommendation is approved by the president, actions necessary to establish the newly designated name will be carried out by the vice president for administrative services.

   a. Upon approval, the Office of Space Planning and Management will inform all affected parties and coordinate the functional naming or renaming of facilities with the office of the Vice President for Administrative Services.

   b. Upon approval, the cognizant vice president will inform all affected parties and oversee the functional naming or renaming of programs.

C. V. Honorary Names of Facilities and Programs
   A. Policy
   1. A university facility or program may be given an honorary name to pay tribute to an individual, family, corporation, or foundation having made a distinguished contribution of service, research, teaching, or support to the university. It is the responsibility of the president to propose an honorary name to the Board of Trustees for its approval. Naming or Changing the Honorary Name of Facilities or Programs

B. Procedures
   a. 1. A proposal to name university facilities or programs a University facility or program in honor of an individual, family, corporation, or foundation, may be initiated in
writing organization, or group is managed by the Office of the Vice President for Institutional Advancement. The proposal is initiated by a dean or director to the cognizant vice president in a written submission that includes: (a) biographical summary of the individual, organization, or group proposed to be honored; (b) description of the facility or program and the proposed name and; (c) a brief explanation of how the contribution to the University reasons the contribution to the university by the individual, family, corporation, or foundation satisfy the standard set out in the Policy satisfies contribution standards established by the President in consultation with the Board of Trustees; (paragraph V-A above) and (d) a completed signature form (available from the Development Office) to document appropriate administrative review and approval.

b. 2. The cognizant vice president receiving a proposal for an honorary naming shall advise the vice president for development to forward the documentation to the Vice President for Institutional Advancement, who shall discuss the proposal with the President. If the proposal is approved by the President, the Vice President for Institutional Advancement shall prepare the appropriate agenda item for approval by the Board of Trustees and the Board of Regents consistent with applicable Regents’ policies. (See Board of Regent’s Policy R401 as amended or modified from time to time).

c. 3. If a university program or facility that has received an honorary name should cease to exist, the vice president for development will ensure, in consultation with the honoree or the honoree’s descendants that determination the appropriate action, which may include continuance or appropriate recognition is sustained. In addition, no honorific naming will not be modified or changed without the endorsement of the original honoree or the honoree’s descendants of the original honoree.

d. An honorary name attached to an interior room, feature, object, or space will ordinarily remain for the functional life of the room, feature, object, or space. Transfer of recognition beyond the useful life will be at the discretion of the Vice President for Institutional Advancement and the President. Plaques in or near a room recognizing a gift but not intended to name the room in perpetuity and donor recognition walls will not require Board of Trustee approval and will not be expected to extend the recognition beyond the life of the designated space.

2. C. Implementation
If the recommendation is approved

a. Upon approval by the Board of Trustees, actions necessary to establish a newly designated honorary name for a facility will be carried out by the vice president for administrative services. Contacts: Vice President for Administrative Services and the Office of Space Planning and Management.

b. Upon approval by the Board of Trustees, actions necessary to establish a newly designated honorary name for an academic or other program will be carried out by the cognizant vice president.

D. Removal of Names

Naming actions shall not detract from the University’s values, dignity, integrity, or reputation, nor shall such actions create a conflict of interest or confer special privileges. If for any reason it becomes necessary to remove an honorary name from a facility or program, then, prior to any such action, the University’s senior administration, President, and Board of Trustees shall approve removal.

E. Sponsorship or Advertising

This policy does not apply to names temporarily attached to facilities, such as performance spaces for a season or for other designated finite periods.

{Drafting note: Information below this line is not included as part of the contents of the official Policy approved by the Senate and Board of Trustees, is provided only as a convenience for readers/users, and may be changed at any time by persons authorized by the President, subject to review by the Institutional Policy Committee.}

A. Current version: University Policy 9-001, Revision [#] 3, approved by the Academic Senate [date], approved by the Board of Trustees [date], with the designated effective date of [date].

New Legislative History of Policy 9-001 Revision 3 [description of changes from prior policy].

B. Earlier versions

1. Revision 2. Effective dates: June 10, 1998 to [enter prior version's effective dates].

2. Revision 1. [Effective dates: insert additional lines as appropriate].
Memorandum

To:        Institutional Policy Committee
From:     Laura Snow
Date:      May 25, 2010
Subject:  Executive Summary – Changes to Policy 9-002: Honorary Degrees

Existing Policy 9-002, in the University Regulations Library, has been updated to reflect current practices along with the change in requirements for the submission and awarding of Honorary Degrees at the University of Utah.

The policy has also been reformatted to conform to current policy templates as outlined in the Regulations Library. Additionally, procedural information has been removed from the Policy and has become in Rule 9-002.

Please contact me at 801-581-5113, if you have any questions.
Policy 9-002: Honorary Degrees

Revision 1

I. Purpose and Scope

To define the requirements for the University’s highest honor – the honorary doctorate degree.

II. Definitions

(Reserved)

III. Policy

A. Standards

1. Upon recommendation by the President and approval by the Board of Trustees, honorary degrees are awarded to individuals who have achieved unusual distinction in academic pursuits, in the arts, in the professions, in business, in government, in civic affairs and/or in service to the University.

2. The selection of honorary degree recipients should be made in a manner that will bring honor to both the recipients and the University.

3. Honorary degrees generally will be awarded only at official commencements or at special convocations held on the campus of the University.

B. Limitations

1. No limit is set on the number of honorary degrees that may be awarded, but the number should never become so large as to diminish their significance or importance.

2. Honorary degrees will not be awarded in absentia and, generally not posthumously.

3. Honorary degrees will not be awarded to members of the Board of Trustees or the Board of Regents while they are serving in that capacity.

4. Honorary degrees will generally not be awarded to current faculty or staff members.
C. Confidentiality

All matters pertaining to the nomination and selection of honorary degree candidates are confidential.

II. Procedure  (This section was removed and is now Procedure 9-002.)

IV. Rules, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms and other related resources.
   A. Rules (Reserved)
   B. Procedures
      Procedure 9-002 (P9-002) [link]
   C. Guidelines (Reserved)
   D. Forms (Reserved)
   E. Other related resource materials (Reserved)

V. References:
   (Reserved)

VI. Contacts
   Policy Officer: Vice President for Institutional Advancement
   Policy Owner: Secretary to the University

VII. History:
   Current version: University Policy 9-002, Revision # 1
   Approved by the Academic Senate: 
   Approved by the Board of Trustees: 
   This Policy was reformatted in compliance with the new Regulations Library. Procedures were removed from the Policy, and Procedure 9-002 was created.

Earlier versions:
   Revision 0: (link) in effect: February 10, 1975 to
Procedure 9-002: Honorary Degrees

I. Procedure
   A. Nominations

1. Nominations of individuals to be considered for honorary degrees may be submitted to the President Secretary to the University by any member of the faculty or staff of the University, as well as by Board members, alumni, and friends of the University. Each nomination should be submitted in writing or electronically, using the online nomination form. Nominations should contain the full name of the nominee and any or all of the following information:

   a. Date of birth.
   b. Chronological list of academic degrees earned and the institutions granting them.
   c. Chronological summary of vocational achievements
   d. Other career history or experience that is deemed relevant to the nomination.
   e. List of important publications and/or scholarly activities not enumerated under one of the preceding items.
   f. List of memberships in learned societies, professional association, and civic organizations, etc.
   g. List of significant honors already attained.
   h. Identify any current or past connections or ties to the University.
   i. Any additional comments that add interest or pertinent information concerning the nominee.

2. Nominations should be submitted to the President Secretary to the University according to the following schedule:

   j. For May the University’s annual Commencement -- not later than November 1st of the previous year.

   k. For Special Convocations -- not later than three to six months before the date of the Special Convocation.

   c. Other nominations may be invited by members of the Board of Trustees on an ongoing basis.

B. The President Secretary to the University will submit the list of nominees to the Honorary Degrees Honors Committee of the Board of Trustees. This committee, after consultation with the President and Vice President for Institutional Advancement, will make its
selection of honorary degree recipients and submit its choice(s) to the full Board of Trustees for final approval.

C. All matters pertaining to the nomination and selection of honorary degree candidates are confidential.
July 19, 2010

TO: David Pershing
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FR: John Francis
Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) With regard to substantive changes, we:

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

(2) With regard to content changes, we:

- Added a "Purpose and Scope" statement
• Added a definition of “Course-offering unit” to label, more broadly than “department”, an academic unit authorized to offer credit-bearing courses and bear primary responsibility for the content, instruction and evaluation of such courses.
• Added, throughout, specific references to other University or Board of Regents policies
• Moved information about “Special Examinations” and “Comprehensive Examinations” (the last three paragraphs of Section F) to Policy 6-101. Policies on such examinations are relevant to the completion of undergraduate degree requirements rather than to the instruction and evaluation of individual courses; the former policy is the subject of 6-101 rather than 6-100.
• Removed language from the Grades section (Section G) regarding particular exceptions to the general grading scheme for the College of Law and the College of Medicine. We have instead added a note [Note ] which we believe effectively deals with this and other analogous, foreseeable situations.
• Relegated to a new Rule (R6-100A) rules about the election of CR/NC grading (Section G-7).
• Removed altogether from policy the requirement that, with regard to Course Credit Reduction (Section G-8) “[t]he deans of the colleges will report annually to the vice president for academic affairs and the Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee as to the frequency of cases in which adjustment was used and a reason leading to adjustment in each case.”

(3) With regard to organizational changes, we:
• Moved sentences, paragraphs and entire sections around throughout the document to consolidate related items and make it more “user friendly”. Such moves are indicated by “Drafting NOTE”.
• Split up Sections and added numbered sub-sections (see particularly Section G) to, again, make the document more “user friendly”.
• Standardized terminology (e.g., “courses” instead of a mix of “courses” and “classes”) and updated references to administrative offices (e.g., “University College” instead of “Center for Academic Advising”; capitalizing “University,” “Registrar”, etc.)
• Rewrote lots of vague and awkward sentences.

Lastly, there are two parts of this policy that we have not updated as fastidious as might otherwise have been expected. First, other than renumbering and removing some redundant definitional language, we have left essentially intact the section on content accommodations (Section G), which is the product of a 2005 settlement of a federal civil rights lawsuit. Second, we have not adequately yet dealt with Section J, a short section which discusses the Academic Evaluation and Standards (AES) Committee. The AES Committee described in 6-100 is scheduled to undergo a five-year regular review by the Senate Personnel and Elections Committee during 2010-2011. We will revise this section after that review. In the meanwhile, we have inserted a statement, in the form of a USER NOTE that says: As of 2010 this section J is under review for major revision.
Policy 6-100: Instruction and Evaluation [Revision 20] [Effective date ??]

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.

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 i]

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

2. Credit should be given only to those courses which apply toward completion of requirements for a certificate or degree at the University. Consistent with Regent’s Policy R470, the University does not offer credit for courses defined as remedial. No credit should be assigned to any course whose purpose is only to qualify students for financial aid.
3. Courses should be appropriately rigorous, complex and numbered at comparable levels as determined by the course-offering unit, college curriculum committee, and University review processes. "Credit awarded for successful educational performance should reflect comparable quality and be uniformly defined within an institution, regardless of the methods of instruction used, the time when the course is taught" [Note iii] or the site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. Course Numbers

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

F. Final Examinations

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

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

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

G. Grades

1. General Grading Criteria


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

2. **Incompletes**

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

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

3. **Non-Attendance and Non-Performance**

When an instructor has no record of attendance or other evidence of participation in the course by a person whose name appears on the Registrar’s final grade report, the instructor should enter the grade "EU" for that person. When no grade is entered for any person listed in a final grade report, the Registrar shall record an "EU" for that person. The grade "EU" shall be treated as an "E" in calculating grade point averages, but it shall be disregarded in calculating "section mean grade."
Upon the recommendation of the course instructor and the dean of the course-offering unit (or equivalent), the Registrar may withdraw a student from a course for nonattendance or nonperformance of assigned course work. The student shall then receive the grade of "E." Before this grade is recorded under these circumstances, the Registrar shall send written notification to the student and advise the student of the right to appeal to the dean.

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

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

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

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

Students taking regular term courses may appeal the deadline for withdrawal in the case of compelling, non-academic emergencies by submitting a petition and supporting documentation to the office of the dean of their major college. Undeclared, non-matriculated and premajor students apply to the University College. Students in workshops, short term courses, or non-credit courses shall appeal to the Academic Outreach and Continuing Education. Appeals must be submitted to the appropriate dean's office by the last day of regular course instruction preceding the final exam period. Colleges must respond to an appeal from a student within seven calendar days of receiving the petition.
For extraordinary reasons, approved by the student's dean and the Registrar, the grade of "W" may be given after the end of the term. Such requests must be submitted within three years of the affected term(s) or prior to graduation from the University, whichever comes first.

6. Repeating Courses

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

Per Regents’ Policy R510-4.16, students will assessed the “full cost of instruction” the third time (and any subsequent time) they enroll in the same course.

7. Credit/No Credit Option

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

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

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

d. Courses which produce one hour or less of academic credit should be graded exclusively on a CR/NC basis. Instructors wishing to assign a letter grade to such classes, or to grade other kinds of classes solely on a Credit/No Credit basis must obtain permission to do so from the relevant college's curriculum committee.
8. Course Credit Reduction

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

H. Report of Grades

Instructors shall report the academic standing of each student in their courses at such times and in such form as the Registrar may direct, subject to the approval of the Academic Senate. At the end of each semester, the Registrar shall report the grades of each student to the student. Students shall not receive credit for work done in a course in which they have not been regularly registered or receive credit greater in amount than that for which they are duly registered.

I. Change of Grades

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

J. Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

L. Honors for Undergraduates

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

M. Academic Renewal

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

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

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

N. Course Assessment and Feedback (course evaluations)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   a. Course feedback for individual courses, including all collected data, shall be made available to course instructors, and appropriate administrators of the course-offering unit after grades for the course are filed.
   b. An appropriate set of data for a given course shall be made available to any University student, as determined appropriate in the standard Report form and Procedures approved as described above.
   c. The Student Advisory Committee of the course-offering unit, after meeting pertinent training requirements, shall be provided with an appropriate set of feedback data for individual courses for specified purposes of carrying out approved functions of such Advisory Committees, as determined appropriate in the Procedures approved as described above.

O. Attendance Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q. Accommodations

(Section Q is in effect starting Fall semester 2005)

i. Introduction

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

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

ii. Definitions

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

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

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

3. Content Accommodations

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

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

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

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

i. the difficulty of administering an accommodation;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. The Dean's determination shall be final.

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

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

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

i 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.

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

IV. Purpose and Scope

(Reserved) 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]

V. Definitions

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

VI. Policy

Section 1A. The Academic Year

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

Section 2B. The Credit Hour

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

Section 3C. Standards for Undergraduate Credit-Bearing Courses [Note ii]

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

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

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

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

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

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

18. The learning outcomes and requirements must be assessed appropriately.
Catalog, curriculum guide, and syllabi should accurately reflect the work load and the work load should be commensurate with the credit hours awarded.

(Drafting NOTE: This statement is deleted from here but has been moved to #6 above to consolidate related items)

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

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

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

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

Consistent with Regents' policy, the University of Utah does not offer credit for classes defined as remedial. (Drafting NOTE: This statement, with added reference to Regents' policy, has been moved to #2 above to consolidate related items.)

Section 4 Noncredit Courses

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

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

A noncredit course is one which, at a minimum:

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

Section 5D. Courses Class Meetings
Courses of instruction may be offered only by the teaching staff and with the approval of the president. [Drafting NOTE: this statement has been moved to C.4 above to consolidate related items.]

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

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

Section 6-E. Course Numbers

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

Section 7-F. Final Examinations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 8-G. Grades
General Grading Criteria


In the School of Medicine, final grades for all students working toward the M.D. degree may be reported as either "P" (pass) or "F" (fail), and using an "I" (incomplete) as an interim grade when appropriate. In the College of Law, some advanced problem courses or clinical courses may be offered on an exclusively pass/fail basis. [Drafting NOTE: The preceding sentences establishing special policy for Medicine and Law are deleted because these and similar variances from the general terms of this Policy are now covered more effectively in Footnote 1 of this Policy.]

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

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

Incompletes

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

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

3. Non-Attendance and Non-Performance

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

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

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

4. In-Progress Courses

The mark "T" shall be given for thesis or other independent work in progress, but not for regular courses. The mark "T" shall remain on the student record until the work is completed and a letter grade is reported to the Registrar's office. The mark "T" does not contribute credit toward graduation nor will it be used in the computation of the grade point average. There is no time limit governing the removal of the "T" grade.
Any Student may drop any class in a regular University term without penalty or permission for a period extending for ten calendar days from the first day of the term. Beginning the eleventh day from the first day of the term and continuing through Friday of the first full week beyond the midpoint of the term (as determined by the Registrar), students may withdraw from a course or from the University without permission, but a "W" will be recorded on the academic record and applicable tuition and fees will be assessed for each course. The latter date is the final day on which a student may withdraw from a course or from the University.

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

Any Student 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.

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

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

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

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

8. Repeating Courses
Any student 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 be assessed the “full cost of instruction” the third time (and any subsequent time) they enroll in the same course. A student seeking to register for a course for the third time shall receive last priority in registration for that course. A grade of “W,” “V” or “I” shall be regarded as one registration for the course.

9. Credit/No Credit Option

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

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

[Drafting NOTE: the contents of former #s 1-7 below have been relegated to attached new Rule R6-100A.] The following rules govern the undergraduate CR/NC option:

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

A student may not exercise a CR/NC option in Writing 111, in Writing 112, in Writing 210, in Liberal Education Core Courses, or in courses which are required for the baccalaureate degree by the student’s major department. However, a student’s major department may allow the student to exercise the CR/NC option in required allied courses taken outside the student’s major department. In the event a student changes his/her major department, the student may request that a maximum of two courses previously taken in the department (constituting the student’s new major) on a Credit/No Credit basis be changed to a letter grade. This option can be exercised for no more than two changes of a major department (i.e., a maximum of four courses).
The CR/NC option must be initiated at the office of the registrar on the form prescribed by the registrar for that purpose. Requests for changing to the CR/NC option will not be accepted after the 14 calendar day of the semester. Change from CR/NC back to graded status may occur any time before Monday of the last week of classes. The hours for any class thus changed will continue to count toward the maximum specified in paragraph (1) above. If a student feels there is justification for an exception to the preceding restriction, the student must appeal in writing to the registrar. If the request is denied, the student will have the right to request a review of the denial by a committee composed of the student's college dean, the director of academic advising, and the registrar. Appeals will not be accepted after the semester is completed. Retroactive requests must be initiated by the dean of a student's major college.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Course Credit Reduction

Course Credit Adjustment Policy: An adjustment A reduction in course credit (reduction only) may be used in "studio-type" classes or in independent study courses only.

Individual departments may determine which of their courses should use this option. No foundation classes or classes used to satisfy either
General Education or Bachelor Degree requirements, or liberal education classes or courses whose completion of the full semester's work is essential for a graduation requirement, may be involved. No courses may be involved where completion of the full semester's work is essential to graduation requirement.

The intent of this policy provision on course credit reduction is to let the grade reflect the quality of work--and the credit earned reflect the quantity of work completed in this type of course. [Drafting NOTE: This sentence has been moved from the second paragraph below to increase the coherence of this section]

If a student fails to complete the volume of work he/she contracted to do for such a specified course, the instructor and student may agree to reduce the credit earned and the student is graded on the quality of work completed. The reduction in credit should be reported on a course credit adjustment card provided by the registrar's office. The deadline for making the adjustment corresponds with the last day of classes prior to final exams.

The intent of this policy is to let the grade reflect the quality of work--and the credit earned reflect the quantity of work completed in this type of class. [Drafting NOTE: This sentence has been moved above to increase the coherence of this section]

The deans of the colleges will report annually to the vice president for academic affairs and the Academic Evaluation and Standards Committee as to the frequency of cases in which adjustment was used and a reason leading to adjustment in each case.

Section 9H. Report of Grades

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

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

I. Change of Grades

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

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

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

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

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

Section 11K. Scholastic Standards for Undergraduates

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 12L. Honors for Undergraduates

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

Section 13M. Academic Renewal

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

Section 14N. Course Evaluation: Course Assessment and Feedback (course evaluations)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   a. Course feedback for individual courses, including all collected data, shall be made available to course instructors, and appropriate administrators of the course-offering unit after grades for the course are filed.
   b. An appropriate set of data for a given course shall be made available to any University student, as determined appropriate in the standard Report form and Procedures approved as described above.
   c. The Student Advisory Committee of the course-offering unit, after meeting pertinent training requirements, shall be provided with an appropriate set of feedback data for individual courses for specified purposes of carrying out approved functions of such Advisory Committees, as determined appropriate in the Procedures approved as described above.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 150. Attendance Requirements

Attendance

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

**Excused Absences**

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

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

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

**P. Noncredit Courses**

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

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

4. **For purposes of this subsection, A noncredit course: is one which, at a minimum:**
   
   a. **is one for which credit is not awarded, registration is required and payment changes hands;**
   
   g-b. **meets criteria established by University guidelines for noncredit courses established by the offering unit;**
   
   h-c. **incorporates content, teaching methods and attendance requirements appropriate to the students eligible to enroll;**
   
   i-d. **is taught or supervised by an instructor who has met institutional qualifications for noncredit courses established by the offering unit;** and
   
   j. **is accurately described in appropriate publications of the University and for which an institutional record is established and maintained.**
2.5. Units offering noncredit courses must report the nature and extent of those activities to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee) annually.

Section 16Q. Accommodations

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

1. Introduction

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

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

2. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

f. Students whose religious obligations, University activities, or other legitimate obligations as determined by the instructor may interfere with their ability to fulfill any course requirements on their scheduled dates shall in advance of those dates arrange with the instructor to fulfill the requirements. **Drafting NOTE: the contents of this section formerly labeled “Scheduling Accommodations” are deleted because it merely repeats what is already stated above in Section O (Attendance Requirements). An explanation of the relationship of Sections Q and O is added to the definition of Scheduling Accommodations, above. No changes are proposed for the “Content Accommodations” section—and if any changes are ever to be considered for this section, it must be remembered that this section is the product of a 2005 settlement of a federal civil rights lawsuit.**

3. Content Accommodations

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

j. Students are expected to take courses that will challenge them intellectually and personally. Students must understand and be able to articulate the ideas and theories that are important to the discourse within and among academic disciplines. Personal disagreement with these ideas and theories or their implications is not sufficient grounds for requesting an accommodation. Accommodations requested on such grounds will not be granted. The University recognizes that students’ sincerely-held core beliefs may make it difficult for students to fulfill some requirements of some courses or majors. The University assumes no obligation to ensure that all students are able to complete any major.
k. It is the student's obligation to determine, before the last day to drop courses without penalty, when course requirements conflict with the student's sincerely-held core beliefs. If there is such a conflict, the student should consider dropping the class. A student who finds this solution impracticable may request a content accommodation from the instructor. Though the University provides, through this policy, a process by which a student may make such a request, the policy does not oblige the instructor to grant the request, except in those cases when a denial would be arbitrary and capricious or illegal. This request must be made to the instructor in writing, and the student must deliver a copy of the request to the office of the department Chair or, in the case of 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.

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

iv. the difficulty of administering an accommodation;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6. The Dean's determination shall be final.

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

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

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

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

A. Rules

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

B. Procedures

C. Guidelines

D. Forms

E. Other related resource materials
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ENDNOTES

1. 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.  [Drafting note: This footnote recognizes a need for professional degree programs to vary from the otherwise applicable specific terms of this policy, and sets forth a careful process for such variations to be formally adopted and approved. This footnote replaces passages from the older version of the policy which much less effectively addressed the issue.]
This will bring Policy into line with current practices of the professional degree programs, and better ensure that students and faculty within such programs are given adequate notice of the proper relationship of University general policies and the specific internal rules of such programs.

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

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

I. Purpose

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

II. Definitions

(Reserved)

III. Rule

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

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

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

3. The CR/NC option must be initiated at the Office of the Registrar on the form prescribed by the Registrar for that purpose. Requests for changing to the CR/NC option will not be accepted after the 14 calendar day of the semester. Change from CR/NC back to graded status may occur any time before the Monday of the last week of classes. The hours for any class thus changed will continue to count toward the maximum specified in paragraph (1) above. If a
student feels there is justification for an exception to the preceding restriction, the student must appeal in writing to the Registrar. If the request is denied, the 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.
Policy 6-101: Undergraduate Study and Degrees [Revision 10 11]
{Effective Date ??}

I. Purpose and Scope

(Reserved)

II. Definitions

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

III. Policy: Undergraduate Study and Degrees

Section 1A. (Reserved)

Section 2B. (Reserved)

Section 3C. Awarding of Diplomas and Degrees

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

Section 4D. Semester Credit Hours & Residency Requirements

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

Section 5E. Scholastic Average Required

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

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

Section 6E. 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 7B. Application for Graduation

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

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

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

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

K. Comprehensive Examinations

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

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

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

V. References:
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September 8, 2010

TO:  David Pershing
     Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FR:  John Francis
     Chair, Undergraduate Council

RE:  Emphasis in Energy Engineering, Department of Chemical Engineering

At its meeting of Tuesday, September 7, 2010, the Undergraduate Council voted unanimously to approve a proposal from the Department of Chemical Engineering to have an emphasis in Energy Engineering listed on the transcripts of Chemical Engineering majors who complete the prescribed program of study. A copy of the proposal 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 information.
Emphasis in Energy Engineering, Department of Chemical Engineering

1.0 Introduction
Three of the major challenges facing humanity are limitations in the supplies of food, water, and energy. The proposed emphasis in energy engineering is meant to give undergraduates in Chemical Engineering a suite of technical electives that will equip them with the engineering and professional skills required to address the need for clean and secure energy. Environmental protection, energy use, and energy production are included in the emphasis. The appearance of the emphasis on students’ transcripts and resumes will help potential employers and graduate programs identify those with an interest and background in energy engineering.

The emphasis will require 15 units and this requirement fits within the current requirement of 17 hours of technical electives in Chemical Engineering. The Chemical Engineering Program requires 130 hours and is summarized as an attachment to this proposal.

1.1 Core Electives
Table 1 lists the core electives for the proposed emphasis. Students will complete 9 units from these 6 courses. The core courses include petroleum and natural gas engineering (5155, 5157, and 5159), combustion engineering (5153), air pollution control engineering (5305) and green engineering (5307). The latter includes energy conservation via process synthesis, pollution prevention, and the fate of contaminants in the environment. One additional core elective is planned, Production Engineering III, that will cover production management and transportation.

Table 1 Core Chemical Engineering Courses in Energy (9 units required)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 5153</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Combustion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 5155</td>
<td>Reservoir Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 5157</td>
<td>Production Engineering I</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 5159</td>
<td>Production Engineering II</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 5305</td>
<td>Air Pollution Control Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 5307</td>
<td>Green Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Supporting Electives
Table 2 lists supporting courses that provide a broad overview of energy related topics including climate change, sustainability, geology, ethics, and statistics. The supporting courses also include nuclear engineering and the design of thermal systems for power plants. Two of the supporting courses satisfy other undergraduate requirements: PHIL 4540 satisfies the humanities foundation requirements and PHYS 3150 satisfies the international requirement. One additional supporting course is planned, an introduction to logging and geophysics.

Table 2 Supporting Courses in Other Departments (6 units required)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATMOS 5400</td>
<td>The Climate System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE 2210</td>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering for Non-majors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE 3600</td>
<td>Introduction to Electric Power Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 5220</td>
<td>Seismology II: Exploration and Engineering Seismology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 5240</td>
<td>Physical Fields II: Electrical Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 5260</td>
<td>Petrophysics and Well Logging</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 5370</td>
<td>Contaminant Partitioning for Scientists &amp; Engineers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 5390</td>
<td>Solute Transport and Subsurface Remediation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 5690</td>
<td>Aqueous Geochemistry for Engineers &amp; Scientists</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 5760</td>
<td>Stratigraphy and Sedimentary Processes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 5920</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Applied Earth Science</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3070</td>
<td>Applied Statistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3090</td>
<td>Design of Experiments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3150</td>
<td>Partial Differential Equations for Engineering Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 5600</td>
<td>Survey of Numerical Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME EN 5800</td>
<td>Sustainable Energy Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 Significance of Energy Engineering

Energy is fundamental to all aspects of our lives. We transform energy from one form to another in order to heat and cool our buildings, cook our food, heat water, go from one place to another, clean our clothes, raise food, purify water, and run the labor saving devices that make our lives so comfortable. We currently rely heavily on fossil fuels to meet our energy needs. Concerns over the limited supplies of these fuels and over their environmental impact make energy engineering a critically important discipline.

The increasing awareness of the importance of energy in our society is leading to the development of departments, programs, institutes, journals, and professional organizations devoted to energy. For example, at Stanford University you will find the Department of Energy Resources Engineering and the Global Climate & Energy Project (http://pangea.stanford.edu/ERE/index.php and http://gcep.stanford.edu/). Penn State has a new undergraduate program entitled, Energy Engineering. The University of Utah is home to the Institute for Clean and Secure Energy (http://www.icse.utah.edu/) and the Energy and Geoscience Institute (http://www.egi.utah.edu/).

As a profession, energy engineers are represented by several professional societies that also publish energy-related journals. The Association of Energy Engineers (AEE) (http://www.aeecenter.org/) publishes three journals: Energy Engineering, Strategic Planning for Energy and the Environment, and Cogeneration & Distributed Generation. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) publishes the Journal of Energy Engineering. The American Institute of Chemical Engineers (AIChE) publishes Environmental Progress and Sustainable Energy. The American Chemical Society (ACS) publishes Energy and Fuels and Environmental Science and Technology. The Society of Petroleum Engineers has more than 90,000 members worldwide and publishes the Journal of Petroleum Technology.

3.0 Synergy with Chemical Engineering Major

The Chemical Engineering Program provides a natural home for an emphasis in energy engineering because its required curriculum includes basic science and engineering courses that
are fundamental to energy engineering. Some of the relevant required courses are summarized in Table 3.

In addition, the Chemical Engineering Program requires 17 hours of technical elective credits. Of these, at least 9 are usually in Chemical Engineering, at least two must be in upper division mathematics, and the balance can be from departments other than Chemical Engineering. Hence, it will be possible for students to complete their technical elective requirements inside the proposed energy engineering emphasis.

Table 3 Required, Energy-related Courses in Chemical Engineering Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 2210</td>
<td>Physics for Scientists and Engineers I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 2220</td>
<td>Physics for Scientists and Engineers II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 2300</td>
<td>Thermodynamics I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 2800</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Process Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 2310</td>
<td>Organic Chemistry I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lab as 2315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 3060</td>
<td>Quantum Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 3353</td>
<td>Fluid Mechanics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 3453</td>
<td>Heat Transfer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 3853</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 3603</td>
<td>Mass Transfer &amp; Separations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 3553</td>
<td>Chemical Reaction Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 4203</td>
<td>Process Control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 4253</td>
<td>Process Design I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH EN 5253</td>
<td>Process Design II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 Supporting Documents
A supporting letter from Dean Richard Brown is attached, followed by the standard, four-year Chemical Engineering Program of Study.
Richard B. Brown  
Dean of Engineering  
1522 Warnock Engineering Building  
72 S. Central Campus Drive  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112  
Ph: (801) 585-7498  FAX: (801) 581-8692  
brown@utah.edu  
http://www.coe.utah.edu/~brown  
July 22, 2010

Professor John G. Francois  
Associate Vice President  
Undergraduate Studies  
University of Utah

Dear John:

I am writing in support of the Energy Engineering Emphasis in the Undergraduate Chemical Engineering program. Providing adequate energy to the growing population while safeguarding the environment is one of the greatest challenges of our time. I believe it is the right time to institute this option in Chemical Engineering for the following reasons.

- Chemical Engineering students are appreciating the fact that energy is an important component in their discipline. They are asking for more exposure to energy related courses because there are jobs in the energy sector and because they feel that they can make a difference by working in this field.
- The Energy industry is going through a transition of sorts. There is a recognition that the low-carbon, green energy sources will continue to grow. The fossil energy sector will still play a dominant role over the next few decades. Innovative engineers will be needed in the new energy sector, and to manage the conventional sector efficiently and responsibly. Demographics of the conventional sector are such that large numbers of engineers will be needed to fill anticipated retirements.
- The Department of Chemical Engineering has always had a strong energy research component. The College of Engineering and all of its departments will be able to provide students with a balanced view on energy development. Active collaboration with the Energy and Geoscience Institute adds another dimension to this educational initiative that is not commonly available in other universities. These facets will ensure that a unique, high-quality program will be delivered.
- The state of Utah is home to vast amounts of conventional energy resources (oil, gas and coal) which are currently being utilized. The state is also at the forefront of some commercial development in geothermal and wind energy. Providing a quality energy emphasis option is in the best interest of the state.
- The program is structured so that the number of credit hours required to graduate in Chemical Engineering will not be affected. The students will acquire this additional skill set without losing any other critical component.

This or similar programs will be applied college-wide based on the experiences and lessons learned in this effort. I request the Undergraduate Council to approve this emphasis in Chemical Engineering.

Best Regards,

Richard B. Brown  
Dean of Engineering
FOUR-YEAR PROGRAM IN CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

### FIRST YEAR

**FALL SEMESTER**
- MATH 1210 or 1270 Calculus I (4)
- CHEM 1210 General Chemistry I (4)
- CHEM 1215 General Chemistry Lab I (1)
- WRTG 2010 Intermediate Writing (3)
- CH EN 1703 Intro to Computing in ChE (2)
- General Education (3)

**SPRING SEMESTER**
- MATH 1220 or 1280 Calculus II (4)
- CHEM 1225 General Chemistry Lab II (1)
- PHYS 2210 Physcs For Scien & Eng I (4)
- CH EN 4755 Undergraduate Seminar (0.5)
- General Education (3)

**TOTAL HOURS: 17**

### SECOND YEAR

**FALL SEMESTER**
- MATH 2250 Diff Equ & Lin Algebra (4)
- ME EN 1300 Statics and Strength of Matls (4)
- PHYS 2220 Phycs For Scien & Eng II (4)
- PHYS 1809 General Physics Laboratory (1)
- CH EN 2450 Numerical Methods (2)
- General Education (3)

**SPRING SEMESTER**
- MATH 2210 as a technical elective.
- CH EN 2300 Thermodynamics I (2)
- CHEM 2310 Organic Chemistry I (4)
- CH EN 4755 Undergraduate Seminar (0.5)
- General Education (3)

**TOTAL HOURS: 18**

### THIRD YEAR

**FALL SEMESTER**
- CHEM 3060 Quantum Chem (4)
- CH EN 3353 Fluid Mechanics (3)
- CH EN 3453 Heat Transfer (3)
- CH EN 3853 Chemical Eng Thermo (3)
- CH EN 4753 Undergraduate Seminar (0.5)
- Technical Elective (3)

**SPRING SEMESTER**
- MATH Technical Elective (2 to 4)
- CH EN 2800 Fund. of Process Engineering (3)
- CHEM 2315 Organic Chemistry lab I (1)
- CH EN 4755 Undergraduate Seminar (0.5)
- General Education (3)

**TOTAL HOURS: 17.5**

### FOURTH YEAR

**FALL SEMESTER**
- CH EN 4903 Projects Laboratory I (4)
- CH EN 4253 Process Design I (3)
- CH EN 4203 Process Control (3)
- CH EN 4753 Undergraduate Seminar (0.5)
- Technical Elective (3)
- General Education (3)

**SPRING SEMESTER**
- MATH Technical Elective (2 to 4)
- CH EN 5253 Process Design II (3)
- Technical Elective (3)
- General Education (3)

**TOTAL HOURS: 16**

**TOTAL HOURS: 16**

**GRAND TOTAL HOURS: 130**

1. Students with adequate math preparation are encouraged to take the MATH 1270 and 1280, Accelerated Engineering Calculus series, in place of MATH 1210 and 1220. Students who take 1210/1220 are encouraged to take MATH 2210 as a technical elective.
2. Students who qualify should take CHEM 1221, Honors General Chemistry II and CHEM 1241, Honors General Chemistry Lab II, instead of CHEM 1220, General Chemistry II, and CHEM 1225, General Chemistry Lab II.
3. A total of 17 credit hours of technical elective courses are required.
4. Students who qualify should take CHEM 2311, Honors Organic Chemistry I, instead of CHEM 2310.
5. CH EN 4905 fulfills the Upper-division Writing/Communication requirement.
August 4, 2010

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

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Art and Art History

Dear Vice President Pershing:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Department of Art and Art History. 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 the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next meeting of the Senate.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Brian Snapp, Chair, Department of Art and Art History
Raymond Tymas-Jones, Dean, College of Fine Arts
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Art & Art History, The External Review Committee included:

Erika Doss  
Chair and Professor  
Department of American Studies  
University of Notre Dame

Cristin Millett  
Associate Professor  
School of Visual Arts  
The Pennsylvania State University

Garrison Roots  
Chair and Professor  
Department of Art and Art History  
University of Colorado, Boulder

The Internal Committee of the University of Utah was composed of:

Terry Kogan, J.D.  
Professor  
College of Law

Carol Sansone, Ph.D.  
Professor  
Department of Psychology

This report by the ad hoc committee of the Graduate Council is based on the Department of Art & Art History Self-Study (2008), the Internal Review of the Department of Art & Art History (2009), the Report of the External Review Committee (2009), the meeting with the external reviewers (2009), the Department of Art & Art History Chair’s response to the internal
and visiting review committees (2009), the College of Fine Arts Dean’s response to the internal and visiting review committees (2009) and the previous Graduate Council Report to the Academic Vice President and the University Senate (2001).

DEPARTMENT PROFILE

Overview

The School of Fine Arts was created in 1947 and was renamed the College of Fine Arts in 1948. The School is housed within the Art and Architecture Center, which was completed in 1970 to juxtapose related areas of art, art history, architecture, and the Utah Museum of Fine Arts.

The Department of Art & Art History is one of six academic departments in the College of Fine Arts and provides instruction and training in visual arts disciplines. The MFA in Art was first offered in 1948, and an MA in Art History was first offered in 1969-1970. The Department of Art History was instituted in 1995. In 1996, the department name changed to Department of Art and Art History to reflect the distinct identities of the Art History Program and the Studio Arts Program, a twin emphasis that continues until the present day. The department became the academic home for the Arts Technology Certificate Program in Fall 2007 following the approval of an Interdisciplinary Minor in Arts and Technology.

Administrative roles are carried out by the Department Chair (currently from the Art History Program), with reporting lines from the Director of the Art History Program, the heads of each emphasis area in the Studio Arts (Art Teaching, Ceramics, Graphic Design, Painting/Drawing, Photography/Digital Imaging, Printmaking, Sculpture Intermedia), the Director of [MA] Graduate Studies, the Director of [MFA] Graduate Studies, and a group of faculty-led advisory committees.

The department mission is to educate and train graduate and undergraduate students in the visual arts disciplines and assist students in making decisions for their careers and their lives. The faculty is comprised of an assortment of tenure track regular faculty and a small contingent of auxiliary faculty. The faculty to student ratio is relatively low, and faculty express a strong commitment to the students and provide high quality individualized feedback. The faculty and staff are committed to the mentoring of future artists, art educators, and art historians, and look for ways to assist all students and reward the most talented ones.

Beyond the School of Fine Arts, the department introduces the visual arts to students in General Education and other non-major classes and engages the community through internships, partnerships, and other outreach programs. The department has recently incorporated an emphasis in its mentoring and teaching that facilitates cross-cultural understanding for students.

Faculty
The faculty complement is composed of 19 regular faculty (tenured and tenure-eligible), 4 assistant professor lecturers (full-time, appointed, benefited auxiliary faculty), 4 full-time, non-appointed, benefited auxiliary faculty, and a dedicated group of associate instructors (part-time non-benefited auxiliary faculty). For 2008-2009, a Visiting Assistant Professor is teaching courses in Asian art history as a replacement for a May 2008 resignation. There are 13 in the Art Studio program and 6 in the Art History program. There are 5 full professors, one of whom is in the first stage of phased retirement (0.75 FTE). Six faculty members hold the rank of Associate Professor. Currently 8 faculty members are appointed in the rank of Assistant Professor. Two Assistant Professors are currently in the final stages of the promotion and tenure process. The distribution of faculty by gender is 4 males and 1 female at the professor rank; 2 males and 4 females at the associate professor ranks; and 4 males and 4 females at the assistant professor rank; This results in a distribution of 10 males and 9 females throughout all regular faculty ranks. As with most departments on campus, ethnic diversity is not strong, with only 2 faculty (1 professor, 1 associate professor) of Hispanic ancestry.

The twin programs of Art History and Studio Arts within the department appear to work well together. However, some tension exists due to maintaining both programs with limited resources and the different needs of each of them. A typical concern is the use of faculty lines between programs. For example, an open faculty line formerly held by someone from Studio Arts was used to recruit a new Art History faculty member. This decision was made by the Dean of the College, who concluded that hiring in Art History would provide a greater overall benefit to the department. Other concerns include the imbalance in the teaching loads, tenure and promotion transparency, and faculty governance. To a certain extent, the two programs tend to operate autonomously and this may enhance miscommunications between them.

Studio Arts faculty spend many hours consulting with undergraduate and graduate students, maintaining the studios, and providing hands-on feedback both in the classroom and outside of class (where the majority of graduate level instruction takes place). Some faculty members have exhibited their work in regional galleries and special shows.

Art History has fewer faculty members and includes a higher percentage of junior faculty members. Many have presented papers at national conferences, and the number of intramural grants and awards seems to be increasing. In contrast to the traditional approach to Art History that emphasizes different epochs in Art History, the Art History faculty has collaborated to develop a common perspective on critical evaluation of the visual arts that emphasizes the cultural roots and functions, which are in turn illustrated by “art” from diverse cultural and historical contexts. This departure from the traditional approach appears to have helped to develop a core identity, which will enhance future growth. Although one of the department’s development goals is to create a Ph.D. program in Art History, no one sees that occurring soon.

Faculty in the Studio Arts Program (including the Arts Teaching emphasis) spend many hours in consultation with undergraduate and graduate students, maintaining the different studios (e.g., ceramics, printmaking, photography), and providing hands-on feedback formally in classes and informally outside of class. A number of the faculty have exhibited their work in regional galleries and special shows, and there seems to be a concerted effort since the last Graduate
Council review for more faculty to show their work, both to foster the reputation of the department and to shepherd burgeoning artists in the program.

The course load for full-time tenured and tenure-eligible Art History faculty is four courses per academic year, and student enrollment caps range from 20 (seminar and upper-division writing/communication course) to 80 (introductory courses). The course load for full-time tenured and tenure-eligible Studio Art faculty is five courses per academic year. Appointed, full-time, benefited auxiliary studio art instructional faculty members (Assistant Professor Lecturer) teach six courses per academic year. Student enrollment caps in Studio Art courses range from 20 (seminar) to 25 (upper-division studio art courses) with the first-year studio visual language course capped at 200.

Staffing the lower enrollment undergraduate studio classes and seminars fulfills most faculty members’ teaching load. Instruction outside of the classroom on individual student projects (including supervising undergraduate independent studies and graduate student thesis and final projects) is not counted as part of faculty course load. Unlike many other disciplines on campus, student projects in the Studio Arts program cannot typically grow out of and/or contribute to a faculty member’s research and scholarship. Thus, Studio Arts faculty members are less able to combine instruction with the generation of their own work products. Similarly, formal graduate courses are also typically taught over and above the course load requirement. This has created a relatively informal curriculum at the graduate level, which creates strong bonds between faculty and students but engenders idiosyncratic highly specialized approach to training by each individual faculty member.

**Students**

The Department of Art and Art History has averaged 675 pre-majors, majors and minors at the undergraduate level over the past six years. There are currently 8 active students in the MA in Art History program and 12 students in the MFA in Studio Arts program. The external review notes that although it is a “modest to small program,” the MFA program has done very well in student preparation. Similarly, the MA in Art History program is a “small, thorough, and rigorous program that has had good success in placing students in doctoral programs across the country.”

The department has recently increased student recruiting at the undergraduate and the graduate levels. At the undergraduate level, these efforts are directed mostly at the in-state applicant pool. Relatively few minority students apply to the program, thus limiting racial diversity. Recent enhancements to retention efforts include a mentoring program and advising sessions with the newly designated Senior Academic Advisor. The self-study reports that recruiting is focused on in-state recruiting and is vague on how they recruit out of state, international, or minority students. Unfortunately, the decline of scholarship money, especially for needy students, has negatively impacted the department’s ability to retain students. More recently, the department, along with the College of Fine Arts, has given greater attention to undergraduate student advising. The new Senior Academic Advisor advises all pre-art, pre-art
history, pre-art teaching, art history, art teaching, graphic design, studio art, and arts technology students on all baccalaureate, General Education, major/minor, and departmental Honors degree requirements. This consolidation of all advising is intended to make the advising process more comprehensive and efficient. With few exceptions, the department gathers few statistics with respect to post-graduation employment of either undergraduate majors or graduate students.

Graduate level recruitment strategies are less targeted. The Studio Arts faculty are concerned that more specific attention should be paid to identifying and recruiting the best graduate students possible. However, the greatest problem facing the department in attracting students is the lack of funding and limited studio space. Overall, the funding problem limits graduate program recruitment to attracting in-state students only.

Graduate students are mentored by faculty throughout the two-year program. A Supervisory Committee and the Directors of Graduate Studies for the MA and the MFA programs oversee the progress of each student. The Art History Program is formalizing a training program for graduate student instructors by pairing a graduate student TA with a faculty instructor in one of the lower-level courses. Thereafter, the TA is offered a non-major introductory course as the instructor of record. In the MFA Program in Studio Art, a newly created Fall Semester TA training program provides all incoming graduate students the opportunity to learn how to teach, either before teaching as instructor of record or concurrently with teaching a non-major introductory class.

Graduate students in Studio Arts are concerned about the orientation program and the lack of a formal process where students can meet their mentors at the outset of their program. Some felt that they were not given adequate program information and requirements before arriving on campus. Additional comments were made on the Studio Arts Graduate Seminar that is required every semester during the two-year program. The perception was that faculty do little to coordinate the topics coverage, which results in inconsistent educational experiences. Students specifically cited instances where identical materials were presented by the same faculty member in two consecutive years.

Graduate and undergraduate students in Studio Arts were very positive about the education they are receiving and about the dedication of that program’s faculty. There was a uniform observation that faculty are generally available to consult with students. Graduate students expressed high satisfaction with regard to the community that develops among the graduate students.

**Curriculum**

The Department of Art and Art History offers degrees to both undergraduate and graduate students, including Bachelor of Arts in Art History, Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art (with a range of emphases in nine specializations), Masters of Arts in Art History, and a Masters of Fine Arts in Art (with a range of emphases in studio art and art education). In addition the department
offers a Minor in Art History, a Minor in Ceramics, an Interdisciplinary Minor in Arts and Technology, and a Certificate in Arts Technology.

For the undergraduate students, the department offers courses in art history, studio art, and arts technology. The Bachelor of Arts in the Art History Program provides the fundamentals for understanding formal aesthetics, basic visual vocabulary, basic technical skills and relationships between idea, technique, materials, and process. A Certificate Program in Arts Technology, begun in 2005, is intended to create an interdisciplinary academic environment that promotes arts computing and digital visualization.

At the graduate level, the department offers a two-year MA in Art History program in which students specialize in one of the traditional areas of the discipline offered to BA students. Requirements include 30 hours of coursework, demonstrated proficiency in one foreign language, a qualifying paper, a thesis and an oral defense.

The graduate MFA Program in Studio Art prepares students in one of seven specialized fields: art education, ceramics, graphic design, painting/drawing, photography/digital imaging, printmaking, and sculpture. Requirements include coursework in a specialization and other areas of studio art and art history, a graduate seminar, an MFA exhibition, oral defense, and a final project report. The degree requires 60 credit hours and is considered the terminal degree in the field.

To complement the formal coursework, the department offers various lecture series involving visiting artists, critics, art historians, and art educators. Opportunities also exist for students to participate in invitation art exhibitions at other universities and art centers. Moreover, art teaching majors integrate internships/practica into their program to gain real world work experience.

**Program Effectiveness—Outcomes Assessment**

The effectiveness of the programs can be attributed to a committed faculty and staff. Course evaluations by students indicate a high degree of satisfaction with courses. Informal feedback from students indicates a high satisfaction with faculty instruction and supervision. The faculty has a number of tools available to assess outcomes including course evaluations, peer review of teaching, department and college curriculum committees, and reviews by external sources. In addition, the department holds an Annual Student Exhibition, juried by a visiting artist funded through the Fine Arts Fees Committee, and portfolio reviews for scholarships and entry into graphic design.

There are fewer indicators of “success” of students post-completion of their degrees. In part this is because there are few formal means through which post-graduation data is currently being collected and assessed. Some subprograms in the department (e.g., Arts Teaching) have a better sense of what students are doing post graduation (i.e., successful placement in related positions in the community), but for many students in Studio Arts, post-graduate “success” is
difficult to define, and therefore difficult to assess. There does appear to be close attention paid to the quality of the students’ experiences and their progress while at the university. Again, the external review notes that “only a few students responded to an exit interview in spring 2008, and only a few students evaluate classes via the online evaluation process.”

**Facilities and Resources**

**Facilities:** The Art and Sculpture Building, completed in 1970, is shared by the Department of Art and Art History, the Division of Film Studies, and most of the administrative offices of the College of Fine Arts. The building houses the department’s art gallery, office, faculty offices, studio art graduate studios, a lecture hall, classrooms, a small seminar room, specialized labs/shops serving also as classrooms, a third-floor reading room, and a basement storage area for the department, film, and the college. In general, the department lacks space for nearly every purpose. Despite recent upgrades (most related to health and safety issues), this facility is inadequate for the delivery of quality education by the Studio Arts and Art History programs. While, the Division of Film Studies will move to the former art museum, it is uncertain when that will happen and whether financial resources will be available to renovate their vacated space.

Regular faculty members each have a private office/studio. Two small offices, actually former storage rooms, house approximately 30 Associate Instructors. Graduate students in studio art have their own “cubicles” for their studios in the Art Building. These individual student studios were created since the last review and are a clear improvement over previous facilities. Art history graduate students share vacant faculty offices.

The studio art classrooms and shops are cramped. Demands for increasingly specialized equipment have further reduced the already limited space. Teaching spaces are inadequate. Studio Arts faculty members have had to be creative in finding temporary spaces in classrooms for students to store their artwork. Nonetheless, the useful space in the building has been exhausted and it is clear that the department’s future growth and development dictates that new, improved spaces be added onto the existing building or found elsewhere on campus. Faculty members are forced to schedule large lecture courses in other buildings on campus, although the two new multimedia classrooms in the Marriott Library are seen as a good resource. Classrooms within the Art Building with adequate data projection equipment are few. Despite recent university funding providing for wiring and data/telephone port updates throughout the building, there is no departmental funding available to maintain the physical plant and to upgrade equipment. The Alvin Gittins Gallery, the principal space for department-based exhibitions, is inadequate because of its limited size and its lack of digital/electronic technologies. The Katherine W. Dumke Fine Arts and Architecture Library, located in the Marriott Library, provides a major resource for both faculty and students. It is generally agreed that the Fine Arts staff provides excellent institutional support.

**Resources:** Budgetary cutbacks have significantly and negatively affected the Department of Art and Art History’s ability to provide quality programs. The lack of resources to fund graduate
education is one of the greatest problems. Some graduate students receive a 50% Teaching Assistantship (TA) or 50% Graduate Assistantship (GA) in their first year, while all receive teaching stipends in their second year. Furthermore, cutbacks have curtailed support for student travel for presentations at conferences and the students say this undermines their professional development. Lastly, only limited funding is available for supplies and equipment.

A major budgetary dilemma has been caused by the university’s funding formula. The department relies highly on “soft” productivity money that is based on student credit hour (SCH) production. Considerable enrollment variations make it virtually impossible for the department to develop a firm annual budget. To generate sufficient operating funds, the SCH funding system requires that the department offer large lecture courses. However, the facilities include only one 84-seat lecture hall in the Arts Building. Conversely, successful Studio Arts education requires small classes. This model conflicts directly with the SCH funding system. Departmental funding decreases in 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 have caused an operational deficit. Thus, the department canceled low enrollment courses in Spring Semester 2009 to offset the losses.

Minimal funding is available for the new equipment needed to meet the technological innovations in studio art. There are no resources for equipment maintenance and replacement and few funds for facility maintenance and upgrade. Finally, the lack of discretionary funding makes it extremely difficult for the department to assist with faculty travel, development, research projects, or teaching initiatives.

PROGRESS SINCE THE LAST GRADUATE COUNCIL REVIEW (2001)

In reflection of the 2001 Graduate Council Report on this department, the following progress is noted:

- As a direct result of the internal and external reviewers’ reports, the Dean and the Chair have begun the process of providing the foundation for a more open atmosphere regarding department decision making.
- Significant efforts have been made to raise deficiencies in salary equity.
- Studio spaces have been modified with regard to safety and space concerns.
- There has been an effort for more faculty members to show their work.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The department provides a full range of curricular offerings. The MFA program is praised for its collegiality. Graduate seminars in the MA program are highly praised by students. Students at the MA level are often placed in excellent PhD programs.

2. The department has hard-working faculty, excellent faculty-student relationships, and excellent staff. The faculty represents a diversity of fields and expertise. Several faculty members are involved in interdisciplinary studies with other departments and those sorts of collaborative cross-campus efforts are strongly encouraged. Despite the lack of research and
travel budgets, the faculty has found creative ways to attend and present at conferences and otherwise further their professional development.

3. The department has placed greater emphasis on student advising, including the recent creation of the position of an undergraduate Senior Academic Advisor. In general, faculty-student relations are excellent in the Department of Art & Art History, and faculty expertise and accessibility are cited as outstanding by both undergraduates and graduate students. The intimate size of the graduate program creates a personalized educational experience for the students.

4. The Art History Program has first-year graduate students partner with a faculty member to assist in teaching a course, which assists graduate students in developing pedagogical skills. In addition, shifting the Art History Program to a broader focus on visual culture has refreshed the curriculum and expanded diversity. This has provided a good foundation for crafting a unique identity for the program and subsequently will enhance its national reputation.

5. The Studio Arts faculty is committed to training its students in the skills necessary for their participation in the professional art world. The Art Education Program offered by the Studio Arts Program is universally praised by students.

6. The creation of the Arts Technology certificate program and minor is an important addition to the curricular offerings of the Department and is in keeping with the 21st century technology directions in the field.

7. There has been considerable improvement in terms of health and safety and meeting OSHA requirements, which is a major achievement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The University’s use of SCH productivity funding undermines the requirement of Studio Arts and Art History’s highly specialized teaching paradigm to provide small classes with individualized attention. The lack of predictable funding provided from this model severely reduces the department’s ability to nationally recruit the best graduate students and support their education. The department is simply unable to compete with out-of-state universities in attracting students. The department should explore the means to provide more graduate students with full tuition waivers to attract better students and expand the graduate student enrollment.

2. Additional funding is needed to support the professional development of the faculty and graduate students. The lack of funding to maintain its physical plant and equipment, as well as to purchase new and technologically up-to-date equipment compromises the department’s competitiveness and should be addressed.
3. The department, in conjunction with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity, should formulate and implement efforts to recruit women and minority faculty members and students in order to achieve appropriate diversity. The use of annual reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the department to work effectively toward this objective.

4. The department should continue working on further efforts at establishing a “new vision” with greater input from the faculty and then monitoring the implementation and acceptance of that vision.

5. The heavy demand placed on the limited space for studio art and teaching classrooms must be addressed. The department should also better utilize appropriate space in nearby buildings such as the new multi-media classrooms in Marriott Library. Plans to construct new gallery space must be pursued.

6. The department should improve its gathering of statistics concerning the post-graduation employment of graduate students. Lacking this information makes it extremely difficult to judge the ultimate success of its programs.

7. The department needs to develop an effective orientation program for graduate students entering the Studio Arts Program. In addition, the Studio Arts Program needs to upgrade the coordination of the teaching of its Graduate Seminar, required of all graduate students throughout their two-year program, to reduce redundant coverage of subject matter.

**ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW**

The Dean of Fine Arts has initiated conversations regarding the faculty governance and has begun taking steps to address this issue. These steps have focused on the responsibilities of the chair and the faculty in decision making processes and accomplishing department business. This has resulted in the reevaluation and restructuring of the department. A new department chair was appointed effective July 1, 2009. The Executive Committee has been reinstated to enlist a sense of partnership department-wide. These actions are seen as the fundamental steps to addressing and standardizing expectations of faculty with regards to teaching, research, and service, including committee assignments, tenure, and teaching loads. According to the Dean, the department will submit a strategic plan that will reflect a holistic academic and artistic vision of goals and priorities.

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

Robert A. Young (Chair), College of Architecture + Planning  
Patricia Murphy, College of Nursing  
Nicola J. Camp, Biomedical Informatics  
Stuart K. Culver (Undergraduate Council), English
# Department Review by Academic Year

## College of Fine Arts:

| Faculty Headcount - Source: OBIA, Updated annually during Autumn term. |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Full Professors          | 10                       | 8                        | 7                        | 6                        | 5                        |
| Associate Professors     | 2                        | 2                        | 2                        | 5                        | 5                        |
| Assistant Professors     | 10                       | 10                       | 10                       | 6                        | 8                        |
| Instructors              | 0                        | 0                        | 0                        | 0                        | 0                        |

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

| Research Expenditures (Department) | $52,271 | $27,305 | $7,711 | $21,844 | $15,522 |
| Research Expenditures (College)   | $129,934 | $132,913 | $124,628 | $81,116 | $66,710 |

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

| Lower Division            | 9,500    | 9,474    | 9,517    | 9,383    | 6,952    |
| Upper Division            | 7,583    | 7,877    | 7,463    | 6,873    | 5,321    |
| Total Undergraduate       | 17,183   | 17,351   | 17,000   | 16,256   | 12,283   |
| Basic Graduate            | 559      | 494      | 434      | 487      | 245      |
| Advanced Graduate         |          |          |          | 487      | 245      |
| Total Graduate            | 559      | 494      | 434      | 487      | 245      |

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

| Undergraduate Courses     | 5.13     | 5.18     | 5.25     | 5.24     | NA        |
| Undergraduate Instructors | 5.21     | 5.32     | 5.37     | 5.35     | NA        |
| Graduate Courses          | 5.27     | 5.26     | 5.64     | 5.35     | NA        |
| Graduate Instructors      | 5.35     | 5.29     | 5.88     | 5.92     | NA        |

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

| Pre-Majors                | 279      | 303      | 316      | 283      | 278      |
| Full Majors (including Intermediate) | 347 | 360 | 339 | 318 | 335 |
| Master's                  | 30       | 24       | 22       | 22       | 18       |
| Doctoral                  | NA       | NA       | NA       | NA       | NA       |

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

| Bachelor's                | 84       | 104      | 94       | 75       | 59       |
| Master's                  | 4        | 4        | 5        | 5        | 7        |
| Doctoral                  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |

## Budgeted Faculty Salary

| Full Professors          | $57,823.67 | $59,923.91 | $61,838.57 | $63,695.00 | $68,718.40 |
| Associate Professors     | $52,498.67 | $53,050.00 | $54,975.00 | $59,250.00 | $56,554.60 |
| Assistant Professors     | $41,927.38 | $45,220.00 | $46,432.00 | $48,728.89 | $48,475.00 |

http://www.obia.utah.edu/dm/drec/apps/drAction.php
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Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Art and Art History
Graduate Council Review 2008-09

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on February 25, 2010, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Art and Art History. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Raymond Tymas-Jones, Dean of the College of Fine Arts; Brian Snapp, Chair of the Department of Art and Art History; Charles A. Wight, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on November 30, 2009. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1: The University’s use of SCH productivity funding undermines the requirement of Studio Arts and Art History’s highly specialized teaching paradigm to provide small classes with individualized attention. The lack of predictable funding provided from this model severely reduces the department’s ability to nationally recruit the best graduate students and support their education. The department is simply unable to compete with out-of-state universities in attracting students. The department should explore the means to provide more graduate students with full tuition waivers to attract better students and expand the graduate student enrollment.

The Department of Art and Art History reports that the recent drop in student credit hours (SCH) is partly attributable to the loss of critical instructors in the Art History program. The anticipated replacement of retired faculty will allow the department to staff large sections and restore SCH productivity. The department is attempting to identify opportunities to provide support for graduate students, including the establishment of a summer curriculum that will produce teaching opportunities.

Recommendation 2: Additional funding is needed to support the professional development of the faculty and graduate students. The lack of funding to maintain its physical plant and equipment, as well as to purchase new and technologically up-to-date equipment compromises the department’s competitiveness and should be addressed.

The dean’s office maintains a faculty travel support program as well as funding for research and scholarship. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs is working to establish a pool of funds to support the purchase of new technologically current equipment for instructional needs.
Recommendation 3: The department, in conjunction with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity, should formulate and implement efforts to recruit women and minority faculty members and students in order to achieve appropriate diversity. The use of annual reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the department to work effectively toward this objective.

The department currently has offered a faculty position to a minority scholar who was drawn from a pool of exclusively diverse applicants. The department will provide annual reports to the Graduate School in which they chronicle their efforts to increase and maintain faculty diversity. The Senior Vice President reports that he hopes the central administration can soon return to a position of being able to provide new funds for the Office of Diversity which, in turn, will be better able to assist departments in recruiting faculty from diverse populations.

Recommendation 4: The department should continue working on further efforts at establishing a “new vision” with greater input from the faculty and then monitoring the implementation and acceptance of that vision.

The department has a new chair who has reestablished the departmental executive committee among his efforts to create greater transparency in departmental planning and governance. The college is currently developing a college-wide strategic plan that will be transmitted to departments within the college to guide department level planning. The department will provide a final copy of their strategic plan to the Graduate School before the end of Spring semester, 2012.

Recommendation 5: The heavy demand placed on the limited space for studio art and teaching classrooms must be addressed. The department should also better utilize appropriate space in nearby buildings such as the new multi-media classrooms in Marriott Library. Plans to construct new gallery space must be pursued.

Funding to create additional gallery space is being pursued through College of Fine Arts development efforts. The Film & Media Building (the former Museum of Fine Arts) has vacant space that can be renovated for classroom and multi-media space. Additional studio art space will become available when the Department of Film & Media Arts moves to the Film and Media Building.

Recommendation 6: The department should improve its gathering of statistics concerning the post-graduation employment of graduate students. Lacking this information makes it extremely difficult to judge the ultimate success of its programs.

The department has hired a full-time student advisor. Part of this person’s responsibilities will be to conduct exit interviews and to develop a student tracking system. The College of Fine Arts is partnering with the Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis to develop a post-graduate
survey for use by all departments in the college. This survey will be fully implemented within two years.

**Recommendation 7:** The department needs to develop an effective orientation program for graduate students entering the Studio Arts Program. In addition, the Studio Arts Program needs to upgrade the coordination of the teaching of its Graduate Seminar, required of all graduate students throughout their two-year program, to reduce redundant coverage of subject matter.

The department understands the complaints that led to this recommendation and believes that they reflect atypical experiences in the Studio Arts Program. The department has instituted a new mentoring program with incoming Studio Arts students. Each student is assigned a three-person committee at entry to provide guidance to the student.

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

David W. Pershing  
Raymond Tymas-Jones  
Brian Snapp  
Charles A. Wight  
Frederick Rhodewalt

______________________________
Charles A. Wight  
Dean, The Graduate School  
August 4, 2010
September 8, 2010

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

RE: Graduate Council Review
Department of Biology

Dear Vice President Pershing:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Department of Biology. 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 the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next meeting of the Senate.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Neil Vickers, Chair, Department of Biology
    Pierre Sokolsky, Dean, College of Science
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Biology. The External Review Committee included:

Jasper Rine, Ph.D.
Department of Molecular and Cell Biology
University of California, Berkeley

Michael Ryan, Ph.D.
School of Biological Sciences
University of Texas, Austin

Victoria Sork, Ph.D.
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
University of California, Los Angeles

The Internal Committee of the University of Utah was composed of:

Gregory A. Clark, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Bioengineering

Henry C. Harpending, Ph.D.
Distinguished Professor
Department of Anthropology

William C. Michel, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Physiology.
INTRODUCTION

The following report was prepared by the Graduate Council’s ad hoc review committee and is based on the department’s self-study materials, the reports of an external review committee, an internal review committee, and responses of the department chair and college dean to the review committees’ reports, which will henceforth be referred to as “the report.” Both the external and internal reports were very thorough in their analysis. The goal of the graduate committee report was to capture the important common themes found in this body of work.

The report indicated that the Biology Department is generally very strong. Both review committees were very impressed with the overall quality of the faculty, elements of the teaching programs, and the facilities. The undergraduate program, which has been the focus of the department’s activities, is in excellent shape overall. The program is lauded for providing a signature research experience to half of its undergraduate majors. The report also revealed areas for improvement, including department operational structure and processes, department-level strategic planning, and the graduate training program, which are presently preventing the department from achieving an overall evaluation of excellent.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Department of Biology is in the College of Science and consists of 43 tenure-track faculty (40.75 FTE), 6 auxiliary faculty (5.57 FTE), and 25 support staff. It offers programs leading to bachelor’s, master’s or doctoral degrees in Biology. In addition, the department provides all of the nonmajor undergraduate biology classes at the University of Utah. In the fall of 2008, the department had 780 undergraduate majors (pre- and full majors), 66 graduate students, and approximately 50 research faculty and postdoctoral fellows. In the 2007–2008 academic year, its teaching activities generated 24,500 student credit hours (SCH) and extramural research support of over $13M.

The department is administered by a faculty chair (currently Dr. Neil J. Vickers) and three senior staff members (an administrative manager, a facilities manager, and a financial manager). Faculty governance is achieved through an advisory executive committee consisting of the department chair and one elected regular faculty member from an interest area. At the time of the self-study four such areas existed, including: (I) Ecology, Evolution, & Population Biology; (II) Genetics, Cell, & Developmental Biology; (III) Molecular Biology & Biochemistry; and (IV) Physiology & Organismal Biology. In several areas of the report concerns were raised concerning the organization, operation, and governance of the department. Specific concerns included the lack of a focused and forward-looking mission statement, the need for clearly understood operational policies, and the lack of a department-level strategic planning process. Both the chair and the dean acknowledged the importance of these concerns as well as the need to address them at the department level.

Faculty
The review teams were very impressed with the overall quality of the faculty in areas of undergraduate teaching, research, and service. In particular, the lecturing faculty were commended for providing excellent courses that generate enthusiasm among undergraduates. The level of research funding, teaching productivity, and scholarship among the regular faculty was viewed as excellent at all levels across the department.

The number of assistant, associate, and full professors was not viewed as unusual. As mentioned in the self-study, the department is weighted towards full professors, including several distinguished professors. Plans to replace retiring faculty with junior faculty members were mentioned and it was noted that the department has hired 10 new faculty members since 2000. The biggest concern was the nonexistent underrepresented minority population (0%) and the lower percentage of women (~19%). The report contains suggestions for changing the situation, and these are acknowledged as important concerns and suggestions by the chair and dean.

An area of concern centered on faculty engagement in department governance as it relates to policies, processes, and decision rights. Many faculty members were not aware of the standing rules or “by-laws” that define how the department operates, and felt frustrated by the lack of knowledge and transparency.

Undergraduate Students

The report indicates that the undergraduate program is strong and draws most of its students from Utah. The quality of teaching to majors and nonmajors is high. Undergraduate student satisfaction and enthusiasm is high. Many undergraduate majors participate in independent research in faculty laboratories, providing them with a unique and valuable educational experience. Career advising is excellent with regard to graduate school and medical school, and less so with regard to finding employment in industry or other career paths. Minor weaknesses were identified, including the need for better assessment at the undergraduate level, a lack of upper division classes in areas of specialization, and a shortage of scholarship funds.

Graduate Students

The Department of Biology offers both a master’s and a doctoral degree in Biology. Enrollment has remained relatively constant at between 60–65 students, who are admitted to the department directly or enter through interdisciplinary programs including Molecular Biology and Biological Chemistry. In addition, faculty may elect to advise Ph.D. students recruited and admitted by the interdisciplinary Neuroscience program, but the degree requirements as well as the degrees themselves are not determined solely by the department. The diversity of admission routes results in differences in both the type of admitted students as well as their personal experiences, which creates a lack of cohesion among the graduate students. A number of concerns were expressed in the self-study that include the low size of the graduate student population, an insufficient number of graduate course offerings, the need to update training areas, variability in preliminary exams, low community spirit, and a lack of a formal recruitment.
effort at the department level. Other concerns were raised in the report regarding the quality of
the Ph.D. students entering the department, inequities in the level of student support, lack of
uniform mentoring, and a lack of career advising, especially with those students headed to
industry or non-academic positions. In addition, it was not clear if degree satisfaction was
assessed in program alumni.

**Curriculum**

The curriculum at the undergraduate level is strong. The degree requirements are clear
and the offerings are appropriate. The majority of the 24,500 student credit hours are derived
from the undergraduate curriculum. Only minor concerns were raised about the number of
advanced courses offered in specialized areas at the undergraduate level. Significant concerns
were raised with the graduate curriculum. Although degree requirements are clearly stated, the
course offerings are very limited. Areas of specialization include ecology, evolution, genetics,
microbiology, neurobiology, physiology, plant science, cell and molecular biology. There are no
formal course requirements for any areas of specialization, with the exception that students
admitted into the Biology program through the Molecular Biology or Biological Chemistry
combined programs do take a year of core courses. Faculty instructional resources are focused at
the undergraduate level, resulting in few graduate-level classes and, hence, a lack of cohesive
graduate curriculum. In addition, there is substantial variation among graduate students in the
time to degree completion, which is indicative of problems with graduate program oversight.
Data in the external report suggested that half of the Ph.D. students did not finish the program.

**Facilities and Resources**

The department occupies five buildings near President’s Circle and the Biology Growth
Area near Fort Douglas. The Life Sciences Building is aging and in need of significant repair
and renovation. There appears to be adequate classroom space, but teaching laboratory space is
limited. This is an impediment to providing a bench laboratory experience for the larger, entry-
level core courses. The chairman reports that there is sufficient research laboratory space to
support hiring of one or two new faculty if salary lines and start-up packages can be secured.

**Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment**

Adequate mechanisms for assessing the quality of the education at the undergraduate and
graduate level are not in place. At the undergraduate level some information is gathered at exit
interviews and with student visits conducted at the biology advising office and preprofessional
health advising office. Occasionally, exit questionnaires were mailed to graduating students.
However, at the current time there is no systematic assessment methodology in place by which
undergraduates and graduate students can offer feedback about their educational experience.

**ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST PROGRAM REVIEW**

The report indicates that some progress was made on the recommendations of the
previous Graduate Council review.
Prior Recommendation 1. The department was asked to define its mission with detailed goals that involve the Ecology & Evolution and Cell & Molecular areas. This goal was not accomplished.

Prior Recommendation 2. The chair, dean, and senior vice president were asked to review the department and ensure resources are commensurate with the caliber of the department. A report was finished in 2004, but not implemented.

Prior Recommendation 3. The department should work together to develop a department-wide scholarly community. Progress was made, including several activities established to create more intellectual exchange. The “Fusion” program is a step in the right direction and is bringing graduate students together, but needs more faculty participation.

Prior Recommendation 4. The department should become a more visible part of the interdepartmental programs and initiatives. It is not clear to what extent the department has acted on this recommendation. It was noted that students and faculty are involved in these programs, but until the department clarifies its own strategic priorities for its graduate training program, it is unclear how simple involvement in these initiatives is sufficient to improve its goals and objectives. The department needs to set goals and then leverage these opportunities accordingly.

Prior Recommendation 5. The department should enhance its graduate student recruitment efforts. The department has initiated additional communications such as distribution of posters, and has improved its website. However, these activities alone will not substantially change the outcome. It was noted that many of the graduate students (but not all) are locally recruited.

Prior Recommendation 6. The department should standardize graduate student requirements, timelines, and stipends to avoid the perception of different classes of students. The department has made some progress in this area, but challenges still remain. The reality is that the current system creates different classes of graduate students. The new changes in the department structure will help. As the department moves forward, it needs to standardize stipends, timelines to graduation, and training rigor, even if the specific requirements for rotations and coursework differ between its divisions. This recommendation still needs to be addressed.

Prior Recommendation 7. The department should enhance its recruitment efforts with attention to diversity. As noted in other areas of the report this recommendation is vague, but the department self-study discusses this issue with regard to graduate student and faculty recruitment. The report mentions several activities that are currently in practice to enhance diversity of graduate student populations, which should continue, especially for underrepresented minorities. With respect to faculty, the department needs to step up its efforts to recruit underrepresented groups.
COMMENDATIONS

1. The overall quality of the faculty is strong, including many outstanding members who are recognized for the impact of their scholarship, the high quality of their teaching, and service both to the university and their profession. These contributions bring recognition to the department, college and university at the national and international levels.

2. We commend the new policy changes implemented by the department. These changes have improved morale and spirit. Implementation of regular faculty meetings, initiation of a policy of transparency with respect to important management issues, and a greater reliance on input from the faculty were the primary reasons cited for improved departmental relationships.

3. The undergraduate program is very strong. The quality of teaching and student enthusiasm is high. The department is commended for its efforts to engage undergraduates in research, which enhances their educational experience. Undergraduate advising in preparation for medical and graduate school is also commendable.

4. The department is commended for providing a fertile environment for fostering the development of outstanding junior investigators, the development of new research centers, and initiatives including the Center for Cell and Genome Science and the Ecosystem and Global Change Center.

5. We commend the department for its efforts to improve the graduate student environment with such programs as the Fusion seminar series, which provide a mechanism for faculty support and engagement in the graduate training program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The department needs to improve its graduate training program, including improving its graduation completion rates, directing more faculty resources at graduate level instruction to enhance the number of classes, abolishing inequities in the level of graduate student support, establishing more uniform mentoring practices, reducing variability in preliminary exams, enhancing its recruiting efforts, updating its training areas; and adopting practices to build community spirit.

2. We recommend that the full Graduate Council report be distributed to each faculty member in the department so that they may be aware of this analysis of their strengths and weaknesses as well as the recommendations for improvement.
3. The department should regularly engage its faculty in a strategic planning and review process that identifies its long-term goals and objectives, determines the best approach for achieving these goals and objectives, and regularly reviews its progress.

4. As the department moves forward, it should engage its faculty in a review of its by-laws, modify them when necessary, and follow through with implementing the changes in a transparent manner. Engaging faculty in governance will improve its effectiveness and enhance trust and collegiality within the faculty. Moreover, increasing faculty familiarity with how the department operates will help identify and train future leaders.

5. Efforts to recruit minority faculty and students members need to improve. The Department, in conjunction with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity, should formulate and implement efforts to recruit minority faculty members and students in order to achieve a more diverse community. The use of annual reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the Department to work effectively toward this objective. There are many best practices available, but they require a commitment by the department to define positions broadly and actively seek applications from underrepresented groups. The department could be more effective at recruiting high caliber women if they would follow the best practices developed elsewhere (e.g., see University of Michigan ADVANCE website). The external report notes that flexibility in what areas one is searching for is essential for success.

6. The program needs to develop a plan to track and analyze student progress, outcomes, and placement in both the undergraduate and graduate programs to provide empirical data for evaluating the program’s successes and failures. In addition, such a process should engage alumni and ultimately provide advancement and development opportunities.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Graduate Council

Patrick A. Tresco, Ph.D., Department of Bioengineering (Chair)
Darrell Davis, Ph.D., Department of Biochemistry
Jay Mace, Ph.D., Department of Atmospheric Sciences
Patricia Hanna, Ph.D., Departments of Philosophy and Linguistics
(Undergraduate Council Representative)
**Department Review by Academic Year**

**College of Science: Biology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (Department)</td>
<td>$11,282,752</td>
<td>$11,410,438</td>
<td>$11,777,838</td>
<td>$11,952,891</td>
<td>$13,260,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (College)</td>
<td>$29,197,520</td>
<td>$32,373,556</td>
<td>$31,456,325</td>
<td>$31,467,430</td>
<td>$34,209,007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>18,931</td>
<td>18,873</td>
<td>17,443</td>
<td>17,299</td>
<td>17,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>5,618</td>
<td>5,226</td>
<td>5,798</td>
<td>5,575</td>
<td>5,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate</td>
<td>24,549</td>
<td>24,099</td>
<td>23,241</td>
<td>22,874</td>
<td>22,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Graduate</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Courses</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Instructors</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Courses</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructors</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Majors</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Majors (Including Intermediate)</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office of Budget & Institutional Analysis (OBIA)
110 Park Building, 201 South President's Circle, Salt Lake City, UT 84112
Office: 801-581-6948 | Fax: 801-581-7541 | Email: info@obia.utah.edu
The University of Utah © - Disclaimer | Privacy Statement
Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Biology
Graduate Council Review 2008-09

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on June 2, 2010, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Biology. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Pierre Sokolsky, Dean of the College of Science; Neil J. Vickers, Chair of the Department of Biology; Charles A. Wight, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on March 29, 2010. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

Recommendation 1: The department needs to improve its graduate training program, including improving its graduation completion rates, directing more faculty resources at graduate level instruction to enhance the number of classes, abolishing inequities in the level of graduate student support, establishing more uniform mentoring practices, reducing variability in preliminary exams, enhancing its recruiting efforts, updating its training areas; and adopting practices to build community spirit.

At this time the department has been restructured into two divisions: Molecular, Cellular and Evolutionary Biology (MCEB), and Environmental and Organismal Biology (EOB). The divisions are developing curricula for the MCEB and EOB programs. It is believed that the new curricula will increase the coherence of the graduate training programs. The department will inform the Graduate School of its progress in addressing each of the specific items in this recommendation through annual reports.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that the full Graduate Council report be distributed to each faculty member in the department so that they may be aware of this analysis of their strengths and weaknesses as well as the recommendations for improvement.

The chair has agreed to distribute the Graduate Council report as part of his efforts to include and inform faculty.

Recommendation 3: The department should regularly engage its faculty in a strategic planning and review process that identifies its long-term goals and objectives, determines
the best approach for achieving these goals and objectives, and regularly reviews its progress.

The chair states that departmental reorganization had to take place before strategic planning could be undertaken. The department is now in position to develop a strategic plan and will do so over the next academic year (2010-2011). They intend to have a draft completed by the end of the Fall 2010 semester. A copy of the strategic plan will be forwarded to the Graduate School when it is available.

Recommendation 4: As the department moves forward, it should engage its faculty in a review of its by-laws, modify them when necessary, and follow through with implementing the changes in a transparent manner. Engaging faculty in governance will improve its effectiveness and enhance trust and collegiality within the faculty. Moreover, increasing faculty familiarity with how the department operates will help identify and train future leaders.

The department has adopted a new structure which requires a new set of by-laws. The faculty is currently in the process of writing these by-laws with the goal of adopting them during the Fall 2010 semester.

Recommendation 5: Efforts to recruit minority faculty and students members need to improve. The Department, in conjunction with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity, should formulate and implement efforts to recruit minority faculty members and students in order to achieve a more diverse community. The use of annual reports to the Graduate Council should be considered as a way to encourage the Department to work effectively toward this objective. There are many best practices available, but they require a commitment by the department to define positions broadly and actively seek applications from underrepresented groups. The department could be more effective at recruiting high caliber women if they would follow the best practices developed elsewhere (e.g., see University of Michigan ADVANCE website). The external report notes that flexibility in what areas one is searching for is essential for success.

The dean notes that the College of Science has been very aggressive in supporting the hiring of women and minority faculty and that more than 50% of recent hires have been in those categories. The number of women and minority faculty in biology has not increased substantially because the department has not hired for several years, although they have recently hired a woman faculty member and have offers extended to two others. The dean encourages the department to increase the density of recruiting (plan recruiting so that several searches are conducted in the same year) in order to increase flexibility in searches and to provide cohorts for junior faculty. The department plans to work with Sweeney Windchief, Assistant Dean for Diversity in the Graduate School, to enhance applications from women and underrepresented minority students.
Recommendation 6: The program needs to develop a plan to track and analyze student progress, outcomes, and placement in both the undergraduate and graduate programs to provide empirical data for evaluating the program’s successes and failures. In addition, such a process should engage alumni and ultimately provide advancement and development opportunities.

The department acknowledges that student tracking has been an issue. They are currently developing a set of learning outcome expectations for their undergraduate and graduate programs. They intend to use these learning outcome expectations as the starting point for tracking students and evaluating their programs.

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

David W. Pershing
Pierre Sokolsky
Neil J. Vickers
Charles A. Wight
Frederick Rhodewalt

______________________________
Charles A. Wight
Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
September 8, 2010
Dear Vice President Pershing:

Enclosed is the Graduate Council’s review of the Department of Economics. 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 the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next meeting of the Senate.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School

Encl.

XC: Peter W. Philips, Chair, Department of Economics
    M. David Rudd, Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Science
The Graduate School – University of Utah

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

November 30, 2009

The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Economics. The external reviewers were:

Dierdre McCloskey, Ph.D. (Chair)
Distinguished Professor of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Department of Economics
The University of Illinois at Chicago

Eileen Applebaum, Ph.D.
Professor and Director of the Center for Women and Work
Rutgers University

Michael Piore, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Economics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Christine Botosan, Ph.D. (Co-Chair)
Professor
School of Accounting

Karin Fladmoe-Lindquist, Ph.D. (Co-Chair)
Associate Professor
Department of Management

Deen Chatterjee, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Philosophy

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 Chair of the Economics Department and the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science.

DEPARTMENT PROFILE
Program Overview

The Department of Economics is deeply committed to a heterodox approach to education which emphasizes economic history and the history of economic thought. The Department, as well as the internal and external reviewers, viewed its heterodox approach as a key point of distinction and an important strength. The mission statement of the Department is to be a leading heterodox Department, with a strong reputation for applied, policy-relevant research. The external review noted that the Department includes foundation courses in the usual core of principles and models of economics which focus on individual-maximizing behavior in a competitive marketplace. However, the Department differs from other schools of economics by emphasizing in later courses a more critical approach to economic theory by providing instruction in economic history and the history of economic thought. These courses open students to a range of approaches to economics and to economic problems in which the standard tools and theories are called into question. The external reviewers noted that the Department does this without compromising the theoretical core of more mainstream economic academic units in other universities.

Faculty

The Department has 12 full professors, 5 associate professors, and 3 assistant professors. Approximately 82% of its faculty is male, making it less diverse than the 72% proportion of male faculty for the University of Utah as a whole. However, the Department has taken steps to improve gender diversity and the last four hires have been women. Minority representation on the faculty is limited to 1 Hispanic and 1 Asian faculty member.

The internal review cites “evidence of reasonably good teaching quality.” Average course teaching evaluation scores are 5.0 or better on a 6.0 scale, across all levels of instruction. During the period of 2000-2008, the faculty published 125 articles in refereed journals, resulting in 6.25 articles per tenured/tenure-track professor over a period of 8 years, or less than one publication per year per faculty member. These articles are spread across 82 different journals. Both internal and external reviews noted that this is a very wide variety of journals and faculty members are publishing in both top-tier and less prestigious journals. They suggest that the Department agree on a smaller number of top journals in the field and use these as criteria when making RPT decisions. However, the external review reported that economics is a highly interdisciplinary field and faculty members specialize in different areas of economics. The array of avenues for dissemination is further amplified by the heterodoxy of the Department in which diverse schools of thought are promoted.

The internal review cited inadequate resources to supervise students, especially in the undergraduate program. However, the Chair’s response mentioned a strong administrative staff, including one staff member who provided “a new higher level of skill and energy” in meeting student advising and administrative needs within the Department.
Students

Undergraduate

There are 431 undergraduate majors enrolled in the Economics Department, with 403 students listing Economics as their sole or primary major. The Department has suffered a decline in enrollment, consistent with the University as a whole. The Department has responded by developing a series of advanced electives and by staffing the foundation series with core research faculty.

The students are generally satisfied with their economics program. However, they stated two concerns: (1) lack of contact with tenured and tenure-track faculty, particularly in the lower level courses, and (2) overlap and poor sequencing of courses, with the result of frequent review of basic economic concepts in the first weeks of more advanced courses. The internal review noted that, due to the many options and combinations of coursework available for students, the Department provides inadequate advising which, if left unaddressed, will “constrain the Department’s ability to implement strategic initiatives needed to address declining enrollments.”

Master’s Program

The master’s program had 40 students enrolled in the 2007-2008 academic year. This is a decline in enrollment which is of concern to the Department. Most of the master’s students are working full time and are not on campus during the day. The Department is considering a more cohort-based program.

Doctoral Program

There are 68 doctoral students enrolled in the Department. The students consider the heterodox approach to be a strong point of the program, and a reason for choosing this program over others. The students expressed a desire for more opportunities to engage in research with the faculty, more stable teaching preparations, and greater stability in the content and rigor of field courses. They also mentioned that they would appreciate greater oversight during the third year of the program in which they move from coursework to dissertation.

Student Diversity

Neither the internal nor the external report provided any information on student diversity in the Department. However, the Department self-study noted that, in the Ph.D. program, there has been a steady decline in the percent of women enrolled between 2000 and 2009, from over 73% in 2000, to 13% for the 2008-09 cohort. The number of international students has varied also from year to year, between 14% and 45%, but does not show the steady decline seen in the percent of female students over time. The self-study did not report on diversity among the master’s and undergraduate students.

Curriculum and Programs of Study
At the undergraduate level, the Department offers two degrees, the Bachelor of Science and the Bachelor of Arts degree. All students fulfill the requirements for a B.S. degree. Students may qualify for a B.A. by completing additional work in a foreign language. Most students receive the B.S. degree.

At the master’s level, both the M.S. and the M.A. degrees are oriented toward the preparation of professional economists who might work in a variety of contexts, either in the public or private sectors. The M.A. degree is an option for students who satisfy an additional language requirement of the University. The Department has been concerned with declining enrollment in the master’s program and is taking measures to reform the program. The Department is developing a Graduate Certificate in Environmental Economics which will be attractive for master’s students in economics and also appeal to graduate students from other fields.

The doctoral program involves coursework in core technical areas, methodology, and fields of specialization, as well as a dissertation. Students take the first set of core qualifying exams upon completion of the first year in the program. After the second year, students take exams in their selected field of specialization. The Department formerly supported 13 different areas of specialization, but has streamlined its offerings around a limited number of focus areas.

The Department has a backlog of doctoral students who have completed coursework but have not completed the dissertation. This is partly due to the departmental practice of not removing inactive students from its rolls. Also, the students said they needed more support during the third year of the program as they transition from the structured environment of coursework and field exams to the unstructured environment of dissertation writing.

A major focus of both internal and external reviews was competition from the David Eccles School of Business, which offers a course in economics to its undergraduate students. This has been a source of both practical and academic concern. The practical concern arises from the diminishing enrollment of undergraduates in the Department of Economics. According to the external review team, the more academic concern is that business schools tend to teach economics from a narrow approach, which is either taught by, or designed to support, the Department of Finance. The internal review team also indicated that this issue may require mediation at the University level.

Facilities and Resources

The internal review noted that physical facilities were in transition, as the Economics Department was in the process of moving from its offices in the Business Classroom Building and Kendall Garff Building to Orson Spencer Hall. At the time of this ad hoc committee report, that move has been completed.

Three resource issues were raised in the internal and external reviews. The first is the severe budgetary crises due to declining student credit hours and mandated budget cuts.
Mandated budget cuts will harm the Department. The Department has eliminated all travel, including bringing in outside speakers. The Department has also scaled back on course offerings. If this continues, the scholarly environment of the Department will diminish and the ability of the Department to meet its mission will be harmed.

A prominent issue in terms of the budgetary crisis was the decrease in enrollments in basic economics courses. One reason for the decrease is the growing number of transfer students who take basic economics courses at schools other than the University of Utah. The other stems from offering economics courses on other areas of campus, as discussed above.

Additionally, the Student Advisor staffing is not sufficient to work with the number of students who need advising. The situation will deteriorate further with the new University requirement for each student to see an advisor at least once per year. The result is an overworked advising staff, which leads to the problem of staff retention.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The Department’s strength lies in its heterodox approach to education, which emphasizes economic history and the history of economic thought.

2. In response to comments from a previous program review, the Department has narrowed its areas of research focus from 13 fields to 5. The five fields are interrelated, giving the Department a core cluster of research concentrations, creating a stronger identity and greater opportunities for national recognition for the Department.

3. The external reviewers were impressed by the number of graduates of the Department in recent years who have obtained solid academic appointments at other universities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Department should produce its own defensible criteria of excellence, and develop observable metrics for assessing the quality of its scholarship.

2. The dispute between the Departments of Economics and Finance must be addressed and a long-term resolution found. This could require a University-level mediated discussion between the two groups.

3. The Department needs additional staff support for its student advising office.

4. The Department needs to improve the experience of Ph.D. students by limiting the number of course preparations, increasing opportunities for doctoral students to engage in collaborative research with core faculty, and reviewing its procedures for keeping doctoral students active in the program.
5. The Department should develop an overall plan for undergraduate education that includes course sequencing to provide the best education and also includes plans for determining graduate student teaching assignments early enough to allow for full preparation.

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

**ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW**

The Department’s last four tenure-track hires, in the order of most recent to less recent, have been: 1) bringing one female full professor up from half-time to full-time in the Department (2008-09); 2) hiring the husband of a female faculty member (2008-2009); 3) hiring two female faculty members at the assistant professor level (2007-08). The most recent last two appointments above were made subsequent to the visit of the Ad Hoc Committee. Prior to these hires, the Department hired a male faculty member at the assistant professor level in 2004-05.

As a result of events that transpired subsequent to the writing of the Department self-study and the external review, in the academic year 2009-2010, the Economics Department has 12 full professors, 4 associate professors and 4 assistant professors. However, 3 of the full professors are on phased retirement with one of these set to retire in June 2010. The Department has used the hard funds released by these phased retirements to hire the last three assistant professors mentioned above, so that effectively, the Economics Department has 18 faculty members.

Of the Department’s 18 tenure track faculty who are not on phased retirement, 4 are women and two are minority. The Department is therefore 22% female and 11% minority. Of those 18, 9 are full professors, of whom 2 are female, so the Department is 22% female at the full professor level, 0% female at the associate level and 50% female at the assistant professor level. One minority faculty is tenured at the associate level while the other is an untenured assistant professor. The Department also has two non-tenure track faculty, one female Assistant Professor (Lecturer) and one male Full Professor (Lecturer).

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review committee of the Graduate Council

Mary Jane Taylor (Chair), Social Work
Martha Eining, Accounting
John Martinez, Law
## College of Social and Behavioral Science: Department of Economics

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (Department)</td>
<td>$329,484</td>
<td>$754,097</td>
<td>$399,090</td>
<td>$54,114</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (College)</td>
<td>$4,100,459</td>
<td>$5,606,763</td>
<td>$5,056,288</td>
<td>$3,363,124</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>9,575</td>
<td>8,649</td>
<td>8,895</td>
<td>8,874</td>
<td>8,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>12,114</td>
<td>11,656</td>
<td>11,552</td>
<td>11,165</td>
<td>10,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate</td>
<td>21,789</td>
<td>20,305</td>
<td>20,447</td>
<td>19,739</td>
<td>18,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Graduate</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Graduate</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Courses</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Instructors</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Courses</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructors</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Majors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Majors (including Intermediate)</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum of Understanding  
Department of Economics  
Graduate Council Review 2008-09

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on March 9, 2010, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Economics. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; M. David Rudd, Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science (CSBS); Peter W. Philips, Chair of the Department of Economics; Stephen E. Reynolds, Department of Economics; Charles A. Wight, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on November 30, 2009. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1:** The Department should produce its own defensible criteria of excellence, and develop observable metrics for assessing the quality of its scholarship.

The Department of Economics maintains that its unique position as a leader in the area of heterodox economics is not adequately reflected by traditional quantitative metrics for evaluating scholarly productivity and contribution. The Department has reached an agreement about the quantitative criteria, and is currently engaged in discussions about the appropriate qualitative criteria. The Dean of CSBS has instructed the Department to have the evaluative criteria in place within two years of the date of this MOU. A draft statement of excellence and metrics will be submitted to the Dean of CSBS by Spring 2011. The Department will provide the Graduate School with a memo outlining their criteria for excellence when they are finalized.

**Recommendation 2:** The dispute between the Departments of Economics and Finance must be addressed and a long-term resolution found. This could require a University-level mediated discussion between the two groups.

The Deans of CSBS and the David Eccles School of Business are working on a set of recommendations to address the issues underlying this dispute. The recommendations will be completed by the end of September, 2010.

**Recommendation 3:** The Department needs additional staff support for its student advising office.

The Department has allocated one staff member to full-time student advising. In addition, they have a graduate student who was a former undergraduate serving as an undergraduate advisor.
The Dean of CSBS will continue discussions with the Department regarding how best to address this recommendation.

**Recommendation 4:** The Department needs to improve the experience of Ph.D. students by limiting the number of course preparations, increasing opportunities for doctoral students to engage in collaborative research with core faculty, and reviewing its procedures for keeping doctoral students active in the program.

The Department is taking several actions to address Ph.D. students’ experiences in the program. First, it has streamlined its graduate course sequence and requirements in order to help students to progress through the program in a timely manner. Second, faculty members are more involved in teaching courses, which reduces the teaching demands on graduate students. Third, the faculty is increasing efforts to obtain external funding, which will provide research assistantship opportunities for Ph.D. students. The Department will report its progress with these interventions through annual reports to the Dean of CSBS and to the Graduate School.

**Recommendation 5:** The Department should develop an overall plan for undergraduate education that includes course sequencing to provide the best education and also includes plans for determining graduate student teaching assignments early enough to allow for full preparation.

The Chair reports that graduate student concerns such as preparation time are now considered in Department planning. However, he contends that course sequencing is difficult because of the combined horizontal and vertical nature of the curriculum integration. Further, he contends that a highly hierarchical curriculum would be detrimental to non-major enrollments. The Department is planning to offer the major at night at the Sandy satellite campus, which should provide students with greater access to the entire curriculum. The Department will continue to explore creative ways to enhance and strengthen the undergraduate curriculum (i.e., to both improve the educational experience and address the loss of productivity funding).

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

The Department strongly supports this recommendation and will work with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity to increase the number of women and minority faculty and students. The Chair notes that the Department has made progress in the area of recruiting
women faculty. The Department will provide the Graduate School with annual reports on its progress toward achieving appropriate diversity.

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

David W. Pershing
M. David Rudd
Peter Philips
Stephen E. Reynolds
Charles A. Wight
Frederick Rhodewalt

______________________________
Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
July 26, 2010
David W. Pershing  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
205 Park Bldg.  
Campus  

RE: Graduate Council Review  
Department of Educational Psychology  

Dear Vice President Pershing:  

Enclosed is the Graduate Council's review of the Department of Educational Psychology. 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 the Academic Senate to be placed on the information calendar for the next meeting of the Senate.  

Sincerely,  

Charles A. Wight  
Dean, The Graduate School  

Encl.  

XC: Elaine Clark, Chair, Department of Educational Psychology  
    Michael L. Hardman, Dean, College of Education
The Graduate Council has completed its review of the Department of Educational Psychology. The external reviewers were:

Glenn E. Snelbecker, Ph.D. (Committee Chair)
Psychological Studies in Education
Temple University

Linda M. Forrest, Ph.D.
Department of Counseling Psychology
University of Oregon

Richard J. Nagle, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Appalachian State University

The Internal Review Committee of the University of Utah included:

Alan Fogel, Ph.D. (Committee Chair)
Professor, Dept. of Psychology

Hank Liese, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, College of Social Work

Cheryl Wright, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Dept. of Family and Consumer Studies

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

Program Overview

The Department of Educational Psychology is one of four departments within the College of Education. The department was established in 1945 and grew out of earlier programs in the Department of Psychology and the Department of Social Education. Educational Psychology’s degree granting programs are all at the graduate level; however, the department also provides undergraduate teacher education courses. The department offers seven degree programs organized into three broad areas of study: Counseling/Counseling Psychology (CCP); School Psychology (SP); and Learning Sciences (LS). Each program trains graduate students in its own areas of specialty. Due to the restructuring of the College of Education and the elimination of the Department of Teaching and Learning, in the next academic year the department will be integrating three faculty members from the Reading and Literacy Program.

Faculty

The Department of Educational Psychology has 14 tenured or tenure-track faculty (7 full professors, 4 associate professors, and 3 assistant professors) and recently hired a new CCP tenure-track faculty member. The department also has one visiting assistant professor, one clinical professor, and utilizes the resources of a large number of auxiliary faculty. Maintaining the diversity of faculty and students is an important goal in the department and is handled by a diversity committee composed of faculty and students. Currently, 3 of 16 faculty are from ethnic minority groups. The diversity profile of the department would have been better if not for faculty departures in 2007-2008 that resulted in the loss of three ethnic minority faculty.

Faculty members pursue a broad range of research interests and have a strong record of publishing in the top journals in their respective disciplines. Student course and instructor evaluations are excellent. The faculty also maintains an exemplary record of service to university, state, and professional organizations. While the department contains a number of programs, the faculty functions as an integrated whole. The department climate is characterized by mutual respect and collaboration across the three program areas.

Faculty turnover since the department’s last external review (2003) has resulted in four open lines, with three of the vacant positions in the Counseling Psychology Program (the new CCP hire will fill one of those positions). Given the current size of the counseling faculty, there is some concern about excessive workload for the remaining faculty and the ability to maintain the quality of graduate education.

Students

There are approximately 180 students in the department spread across 6 master’s degree and 3 Ph.D. programs. There is an adequate stream of qualified applicants for the various degree
programs and graduate student quality is comparable to students at other research universities. One of the main sources of student recruitment is the department’s Web site.

The various programs within the Department of Educational Psychology have developed minority recruitment plans to attract students from diverse backgrounds. These plans include the cultivation of relationships with key agencies and individuals across campus and participation in the Summer Research Opportunities Program (SROP), which brings upper-division undergraduate ethnic-minority students to campus each summer for an intensive 10-week program of research and mentoring. Some programs have been more successful than others in creating a diverse student population. Ethnic–minority students comprise approximately 12% of the overall student population. Continued attention to recruiting a diverse student body remains a high priority in the department.

Student funding has improved since the last external review of the department, despite substantial cuts to the department’s base budget. The increase in support has come from faculty grants, placements of students in university positions (e.g., the Counseling Center), and contracts with community and school agencies that provide training opportunities. Given the current economic situation, however, both the external and internal review teams encouraged the department to explore additional sources of financial support for graduate students.

**Curriculum**

The Department of Educational Psychology offers doctoral and master’s degrees within three areas: Counseling and Counseling Psychology; School Psychology; and Learning Sciences. Each area has two or more sub-programs. The CCP program has three sub-programs: 1) Counseling Psychology (Ph.D.); 2) Professional Counseling (M.Ed.); and 3) School Counseling (M.Ed.). The Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology is an American Psychological Association (APA) Accredited Program and emphasizes a behavioral science and psychology practitioner core. The M.Ed. in Professional Counseling is designed to meet the requirements for licensure as a Professional Counselor (LPC) in the state of Utah and prepares students for entry level counseling positions in community mental health and service agencies. The M.Ed. in School Counseling is designed to meet the requirements for licensure from the Utah Office of Education (USOE) as a Professional School Counselor.

The School Psychology program offers both a master’s and a doctoral degree. The master’s degree is designed to prepare qualified psychologists who will practice in schools or school-related settings. The doctoral program is accredited by the APA and is approved by the National Association of School Psychologists. It also prepares psychologists who will practice in schools and other education-related settings.

The Learning Sciences Program is composed of three sub-programs. The Learning and Cognition area grants M.S. and Ph.D. degrees. Students in this area acquire theoretical and methodological skills to conduct original research on a broad variety of topics. The Instructional Design and Educational Technology (IDET) program offers M.Ed. and M.S. degrees and prepares students to understand the theoretical and practical issues associated with technology-
based instruction. Finally, the Statistics and Research Methods sub-program is part of the university’s interdepartmental Master of Statistics program and prepares students to design experiments, analyze and interpret data, evaluate programs, and find employment in a variety of applied settings.

Program Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment

The department uses multiple methods of gathering data to evaluate program effectiveness. Information is gathered through annual reviews of students and programs, course evaluations, faculty retreats, meetings with students, department and program meetings, and exit interviews. The self-assessment data have been used successfully to enhance the quality of the various graduate programs. The department also monitors graduation rates and progress toward degree completion. All programs in the department have acceptable graduation rates and average times to degree completion.

The APA periodically evaluates the Counseling Psychology and School Psychology Ph.D. programs. Each program received excellent ratings in 2006 and was awarded a seven-year extension of its accreditation (i.e., the best decision possible). The department’s Web site provides prospective doctoral students with in-depth information about time to completion, program costs, internships, licensure, and admissions data. Similar information is also provided for other graduate programs in the department.

Outcome data suggest that students in the department are very successful in finding employment in their areas of training. The department is a major source of educational and mental health professionals for the state of Utah.

Facilities and Resources

The Department of Educational Psychology has a hard-lined budget of approximately $1.4 million, most of which is dedicated to faculty/staff salaries and benefits. These funds are supplemented by soft funding of various sorts (e.g., productivity funds, returned overhead, faculty buyouts, temporary funds from open lines). Given the current economic downturn, the department is facing budget challenges similar to other departments on campus. If budget cuts continue and become permanent, they could eventually affect the quality of the program. Of particular concern is the fate of two open lines in the CCP program, which are currently being used to help balance the budget. Permanent cuts leading to the loss of those lines could have serious consequences for a program already struggling to meet student demand in two master’s programs and one doctoral program.

The serious space problems noted in the last external review of the department have diminished; however, finding adequate space remains a concern. The department has been able to add to its research and training facilities by acquiring space in the Annex Building. In addition, the creation of a college-wide student lounge in Milton Bennion Hall (MBH) has increased student opportunities for studying and socializing. The department will eventually benefit from the replacement of MBH (groundbreaking originally scheduled for 2013) and the
construction of the Beverly Taylor Sorenson Arts and Education Complex (originally scheduled for 2009); however, the timeline for these projects has been extended due to economic constraints.

COMMENDATIONS

1. Faculty members in the department have a strong record with respect to publishing and obtaining financial support for research, maintaining collegial relationships in a diverse environment, and mentoring graduate students.

2. The department chair (Elaine Clark) and associate chair (Michael Gardner) have earned the respect of their colleagues and have provided excellent leadership in an era of severe budget challenges.

3. The department maintains a number of high quality master’s and Ph.D. programs across diverse areas that prepare students well for licensure and employment following graduation.

4. Through a variety of labs and clinics, the department provides excellent training opportunities for students and valuable services for the Utah community.

5. The department upholds a strong commitment to recruiting a diverse faculty and student body.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The department should engage in strategic planning on key issues, including integrating the Reading and Literacy program, identifying curricular overlap and ways to expand existing programs, creating a hiring plan for open lines, preparing for the eventual move to newly constructed buildings, and addressing salary concerns that could affect recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty of high quality.

2. An infrastructure that supports faculty efforts to seek external funding should be explored and developed by the department.

3. The department should consider ways to avoid excessive workloads for faculty, especially in the CCP area where the recent loss of three members places additional supervising burdens on the remaining faculty and potentially compromises the quality of graduate education in the area.

4. In order to provide more specific feedback and support for junior faculty, it is recommended that a formal mentoring system involving senior faculty replace the informal approach currently practiced in the department.
5. The department should continue to seek constructive ways to enhance financial support for graduate students.

**ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE INITIATION OF THE REVIEW**

1. Over the 2009-2010 academic year, the department intends to develop a detailed strategic plan that addresses some of the issues raised by the internal and external review teams.

2. The department plans to develop a junior faculty mentoring program and will seek information from the Department of Psychology, which has already implemented such a program.

Submitted by the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the Graduate Council

Kevin Rathunde (Chair), Family and Consumer Studies
Sally Planalp, Department of Communication
Martha Eining, School of Accounting
### Department Review by Academic Year

#### College of Education: Educational Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Research Expenditures (Department)                           | $44,265   | $37,452   | $23,498   | $50,728   | NA        |
|///////////////////////////////////////////////////////////////|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Research Expenditures (College)                              | $208,512  | $94,226   | $39,424   | $160,345  | $139,514  |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
<th>Total Undergraduate</th>
<th>Basic Graduate</th>
<th>Advanced Graduate</th>
<th>Total Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,094</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>5,928</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>2,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,517</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>3,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>4,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>4,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>4,263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate Courses</th>
<th>Undergraduate Instructors</th>
<th>Graduate Courses</th>
<th>Graduate Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Majors</th>
<th>Full Majors (including Intermediate)</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bachelor’s</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office of Budget & Institutional Analysis (OBIA)
110 Park Building, 201 South President's Circle, Salt Lake City, UT 84112
Office: 801-581-6948 | Fax: 801-581-7541 | Email: info@obia.utah.edu
The University of Utah © - Disclaimer | Privacy Statement

http://www.obia.utah.edu/dm/drev/apps/drAction.php
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Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Educational Psychology
Graduate Council Review 2008-09

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on April 7, 2010, and concludes the Graduate Council Review of the Department of Educational Psychology. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Michael L. Hardman, Dean of the College of Education; Elaine Clark, Chair of the Department of Educational Psychology; Charles A. Wight, Dean of the Graduate School; and Frederick Rhodewalt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, were present.

The discussion centered on but was not limited to the recommendations contained in the Graduate Council review completed on November 30, 2009. At the wrap-up meeting, the working group agreed to endorse the following actions:

**Recommendation 1:** The department should engage in strategic planning on key issues, including integrating the Reading and Literacy program, identifying curricular overlap and ways to expand existing programs, creating a hiring plan for open lines, preparing for the eventual move to newly constructed buildings, and addressing salary concerns that could affect recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty of high quality.

The chair reports the faculty is in the process of developing a strategic plan. Two faculty meetings have been conducted to discuss a strategic plan that will address the recommendations in this Graduate Council review. The department will provide a draft of its plan to the Graduate School during Fall semester, 2010.

**Recommendation 2:** An infrastructure that supports faculty efforts to seek external funding should be explored and developed by the department.

The dean of the College of Education reports that his office provides a number of programs and support staff to assist faculty seeking external funding. The department currently has one staff opening that will be reorganized to provide support for grant budget development and accounting.

**Recommendation 3:** The department should consider ways to avoid excessive workloads for faculty, especially in the Counseling and Counseling Psychology (CCP) area where the recent loss of three members places additional supervising burdens on the remaining faculty and potentially compromises the quality of graduate education in the area.
The department recognizes this problem and has initiated several actions to address it. They have made one new faculty hire, although three open faculty lines were eliminated as a result of budget cuts. They have hired additional auxiliary faculty to help reduce regular faculty workloads. They have suspended the Professional Counseling Licensing Program admissions for a year to reduce workloads (the department plans to reopen admissions to this program in 2011). Finally, the department is streamlining its curriculum with the goal of increasing teaching efficiency and, thus, freeing faculty time. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs suggested that the department needed to consider right-sizing the graduate program to be commensurate with the current size of the faculty.

Recommendation 4: In order to provide more specific feedback and support for junior faculty, it is recommended that a formal mentoring system involving senior faculty replace the informal approach currently practiced in the department.

This recommendation has been addressed through the completion of a written plan for faculty mentoring.

Recommendation 5: The department should continue to seek constructive ways to enhance financial support for graduate students.

The chair reports that through external funding and increased student credit hour productivity the department funded $500,000 in teaching assistantship support while having only $16,000 in base funding. They plan to continue this practice.

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

David W. Pershing
Michael L. Hardman
Elaine Clark
Charles A. Wight
Frederick Rhodewalt

Charles A. Wight
Dean, The Graduate School
August 4, 2010
Thoughts for the Futures Committee Agenda

This short overview of the possible environment for the future of higher education is intended to be an heuristic aid for developing the particular items for the Futures Committee agenda. Readers are encouraged to send their thoughts on what the Committee should consider to the Academic Senate office.

The traditional funding model is dead in public higher education. State support will account for less than 10 percent of the total income and less than 50 percent of the core activities (teaching and research) of the university. Faculty will have to earn their pay based on income metrics—student credit hours, grants, consulting, development, entrepreneurial activities, etc.

The return to faculty (and the support of faculty) from these activities is wildly variable across departments and colleges depending on what can be negotiated by the individual faculty member and administration. This does not appear to be an effective way to provide the proper incentives to faculty to take on this non-traditional work.

Current University policy is poorly designed to respond to these changing conditions. Actual practice often violates outdated policies on salaries, FTE, overload pay schedules, consultant time and the like.

Increases in faculty salaries will increasingly come from non-state income streams. The potential for serious inequities among faculty segments is not only great it is nearly inevitable as our current practice already shows.

Colleges and departments that carry the primary responsibilities of undergraduate teaching or of providing the intellectual diversity demanded of a university but not highly valued in the market place are in grave danger of not being adequately paid or respected in the merit/RPT processes.

Curriculum design cannot be based on debatable academic principles but will have to consider cost and revenue as well as the value returned to the student.

According to some pundits, the US economy has probably peaked and will be overtaken by China in the next 10 years. The major impact of this change will be both the demand for places in our universities from students abroad and our need to import these very same students.

The demography of the US is changing rapidly. Whiteness will be a minority feature in the population but not the university, which will be in real danger of becoming an isolated enclave.
Overall, higher education will be weighted female (currently about 57% overall nationally for undergraduates; much higher within minority groups). This shift has already happened in all but the most patriarchal states and the most male dominated professions. Not sure what all that means except that the face of both the students and the faculty will reflect that.

Main line media are discussing the decline in value of a college education, particularly in relation to escalating costs at major universities. Citing a weakened curriculum and less market value for university degrees, commentators are reporting that community colleges, certification programs, and technical training offer many a higher return on investment.

Both the weak economy and the escalating climate change will dislocate the current practices of instruction at a common location. At this University, we bring something like 40,000 people to campus each day. Most drive; most drive as a single occupant. This is not a sustainable model. The proposed changes to the policy on instruction do not address this eventuality; we need to, however.

Given the potential influx of non-US students and the changing demographics of the US population as well as the changing income streams, much of our Euro-centric, single language curriculum makes little sense in the minds of some.

E. Gordon Gee, President of Ohio State University says that tenure must preserve "multiple ways to salvation" inside even R1 institutions if higher education is to thrive in this changing economic system.

The next decade then will offer these challenges and opportunities to the faculty, students and administrators of the University

- Defining the nature of faculty work
- Developing adequate and equitable compensation models that account for both profitable and necessary activities.
- Developing workload models that allow everyone's best work to appear
- Managing transparency across an increasingly diverse faculty involved in increasing diverse activities
- Maintaining collegiality, community, and a collectively shared vision across this diversity
- Ensuring that merit and RPT processes reflect that diversity and its contribution to the good of the University
- Managing economic change in the interests of the department and its faculty
- Creating the incentives for the development of new income streams and the opportunities for all to participate as they can
- Developing management and policy models across grants, contracts, and entrepreneurial activities. (A dollar is a dollar regardless of source.)
- Managing development initiatives in the best interests of the University and its faculty
- Managing the changing instructional climate vis-à-vis technology and student base
- Liberating instruction from outdated notions of time, place duration, practice, and outcomes
- Managing entrepreneurial instruction Providing adequate support for instruction in the 21st Century
- Assisting the faculty to become multi-lingual and multi-cultural

James Anderson, Chair
Futures Committee
james.anderson@utah.edu
INFORMATION & DIRECTIONS TO WARNOCK ENGINEERING CLASSROOM BUILDING

The senate meetings for the remainder of the year will be held in the Engineering Complex which is the northern most buildings on lower campus. The room is WEB L105

The Merrill Engineering Building (MEB) parking lot just north of MEB (the large dark glass building off north campus drive) should have ample parking (A, U, and parking meters) at the times we meet. Just east of this lot across Central Campus Drive is an E parking lot.

To get to WEB L105 from this lot follow either of the following two routes. From the parking lot there are two entrances on the north side of MEB:

A- If you enter the northwest entrance (also a loading dock) of MEB, proceed directly south down the hall, at the end of which are stairs. Go gown the stairs and out the south entrance, proceed south another 50 paces or so and you will see a walkway going down into a courtyard. Follow this into the courtyard and enter the doors in the middle of the south side of this court yard. As you pass through these doors L105 will be directly to you left.

B- If you enter the eastern entrance, proceed directly south down the hall, at the end of which are stairs. Go gown the stairs, do a U-turn to your right and pass through the door into a tunnel. Walk through the tunnel, through a second set of doors and down the hall to the south which runs right into L105

C- If you are walking from the south part of lower campus. Take the northerly path that runs from the Bookstore between the Union Building and the Student Services Building toward MEB (the large dark glass building). About 50 paces or so before you get to the south entrance to MEB you will see a walkway going down into a courtyard. Follow this into the courtyard and enter the doors in the middle of the south side of this court yard. As you pass through these doors L105 is directly to your left.